A SURVEY OF PUPIL DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIORS AS VIEWED BY STUDENT TEACHERS

> Thesis for the Degree of Ph. D. MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY ROBERT LLOYD DRISCOLL 1970

THERE



This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

A SURVEY OF PUPIL DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIORS AS VIEWED BY STUDENT TEACHERS

presented by

Robert Lloyd Driscoll

has been accepted towards fulfillment of the requirements for

<u>Ph.D.</u> degree in <u>Education</u>

Major professor

Date _____ July 17, 1970

O-169





.

ABSTRACT

A SURVEY OF PUPIL DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIORS AS VIEWED BY STUDENT TEACHERS

By

Robert Lloyd Driscoll

Problem and Purpose

Student teachers have long identified pupil disruptive behaviors as their primary problem area. Research typically has identified this problem on a global basis while concern for specific forms of pupil disruptive behaviors virtually have been left unexamined. This descriptive study was designed to (1) examine the relationship of sex of the student teacher, socioeconomic level of the schools as perceived by the student teacher, size of classes taught by the student teacher, classes taught by the student teacher all day, special education classes taught by the student teacher, team teaching of which the student teacher is a member, and school types identified by the Michigan Department of Education to one hundred and thirty-two specific forms of pupil disruptive behaviors, (2) identify the pupil disruptive behaviors that student teachers perceive to be most frequent and serious.

Procedures

The questionnaires, (form one and form two) designed by Learning Systems Institute of Michigan State University, were administered to 664 student teachers from Michigan State University during the final seminar of Spring term--1969. The entire spring term student teaching population was used in the study; each subject was randomly assigned one of the forms of the questionnaire. Purpose one was analyzed from each questionnaire by analysis of variance-repeated measures design. Purpose two was analyzed from each questionnaire by using group mean scores for each pupil disruptive behavior.

Conclusions and Discussion

The following conclusions were supported for purpose one:

- Pupil disruptive behaviors, as they relate to class size, special education, teaching the same group all day, and population and economic focal point of communities that have schools in which student teachers are placed were not significantly effected.
- 2. This study concluded that it is questionable whether team teaching has any affect upon the way student teachers responded to the frequency and seriousness of pupil disruptive behaviors.

- 3. Sex of the student teacher was not a primary factor in the way student teachers as a group responded to all of the pupil disruptive behaviors.
- Perceived socioeconomic levels of schools had little effect upon the way student teachers as a group responded to all the pupil disruptive behaviors.
- 5. It was concluded that specific pupil disruptive behaviors could be identified for each dependent variable category except team teaching. Conclusions for purpose two:
- The most <u>frequent</u> pupil disruptive behaviors were considered by student teachers as a <u>nuisance</u> or as <u>harmless</u>.
- The most <u>serious</u> pupil disruptive behaviors were considered by student teachers as <u>seldom</u> occurring.
- 3. Analysis of the most <u>frequent</u> forms of pupil disruptive behaviors for both forms were whispering in class, failing to follow directions for assignment, making noise in the hall, talking out while class is working, day dreaming in class, reading or writing while teacher is talking, chewing gum in class, and clicking pens, etc., in class.

- 4. Analysis of the most <u>serious</u> forms of pupil disruptive behaviors for both forms were possessing guns, being under the influence of narcotics while in school, turning in false alarms and bomb threats, stealing materials from school, stealing from another student, stealing from the teacher, starting fires, possessing brass knuckles and/or Molotov cocktails, and possessing narcotics.
- The identified positive forms of pupil disruptive behaviors for both questionnaires were

 questioning teacher's opinion, (2) pointing out teacher's mistakes.

The findings of this explorative study suggests that further analysis could be undertaken regarding:

- Specific forms of pupil disruptive behaviors that relate to the categories of sex of the student teacher, class size, special education, teaching same group all day, and population and economic levels of schools.
- 2. The relationship of pupil disruptive behaviors to the professional development of a teacher. The intent of such analysis could be the determination of specific activities and professional experiences that cause student teachers' primary perceptions to change from

<u>serious</u> behaviors related to violations of school regulations to that of experienced classroom teachers primary concern over behaviors that interfere with achieving instructional goals.

3. An analysis of the two forms of the questionnaire. The present questionnaires need extended item analyses, and reliability and validity checks.

Applying the results of this exploratory study to teacher education courses at Michigan State University should be done once fuller consideration has been given to identifying other possible disruptive behaviors that student teachers are anxious about and to examining the relationship of student teachers' perceptions of disruptive behaviors to community, school, and classroom variables.

A SURVEY OF PUPIL DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIORS

AS VIEWED BY STUDENT TEACHERS

Ву

Robert Lloyd Driscoll

A THESIS

Submitted to Michigan State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Elementary and Special Education

1970



667223

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated with humility and appreciation to members of my family. In particular, this thesis is dedicated to my wife, Marty, for her constant love, patience, and understanding; to my daughters, Tanya and Elizabeth, who have given my life such great purpose and meaning; to my father, who is deeply loved and sadly missed; to my mother, whose inner strength and love have provided a constant source of encouragement to me as a son and a student; and finally, to my two brothers and four sisters, whom I deeply love and cherish.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This writer is particularly indebted to Dr. Robert Schmatz, his doctoral committee chairman. Dr. Schmatz's interest, support, and guidance can never be stated so that it appropriately indicates the profound positive effect he has had upon my life. I would like to thank him for his help and insights in bringing this study to completion.

Thanks are also extended to Drs. Dale Alam, Glen Cooper, Ted Ward, and James McKee for their encouragement and effort in helping me with this study. Their influences as individuals and teachers serve as a continual reminder of what it is to be committed to the individual and the teaching profession.

To Dr. Judith Henderson, Mr. Howard Teitlebaum, Mr. Robert Hermann, Mr. David Wright, and Mr. Urban Oen a special thank you for their time and advice.

I would also like to extend a thank you to Dr. Kennedy of the Office of Student Teaching at Michigan State University, the college supervisors, the student teachers, and secretarial staff in the Office of Student

iii



Teaching, for their special efforts and willingness to pursue and contribute to this study.

Lastly, I would like to thank Elaine Repasch, secretary, Office of Field Experience at the State University College of New York at Fredonia, for her special effort in typing rough drafts and handling office affairs while I was at Michigan State University completing the final stages of this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. THE INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem	5
	8
Importance of the Study	9
Assumptions of the Study	11
Limitations of the Study	12
Definition of Terms Pertinent to	1.0
This Study.	
Hypotheses Examined in the Study	14
Hypotheses for Perceived Student Teacher Frequency of Pupil Dis- ruptive Behaviors Hypotheses for Student Teacher Attitudes Toward Pupil Disruptive	14
Behavior	15
	15
Overview	16
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	17
Introduction	17
Disruptivo Bohaviors	19
	10
The Case Study Method	18
The Case Study Method	20
The Observational Method.	20
The Experimental Method	22
The Survey: Questionnaire	23
The Wickman Study and Subsequent	
Studies	24
Specific Areas and Findings	32
Degree of Teacher and Experience	32
Race	33
Lower Ranges of Intelligence	34
Grade Levels.	36



Chapte	r												Page
		Sex of Sex of	the the	Teac Stuc	cher lent	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	39 41
	Sum	mary .	•	•••	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	42
		Major	Find:	ings	Sum	nari	ized	1.	•	•	•	•	42
III.	PROCEDUI	RES AND	METI	HODOI	JOGY	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	46
	The	Introd	uctio	on.	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	46
	The	Popula	tion									•	46
	The	Design				-			•				48
	Comr	municat	ion	and (`onta	acts			•		•		49
	Data		ction	$\hat{\mathbf{u}}$				•	•	•	•	•	50
		Instru	mont	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	53
	111e	Instru		• •	•	•	•	•	•	٠	•	•	50
	Alla.	LYSIS.	•	• •	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	50
	Sum	nary .	•	• •	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	20
IV.	ANALYSIS	5	•	•••	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	٠	60
	Free	nuencv	of Pi	liqu	Dis	rupt	tive	a Be	ehav	vio	r		
	Ana	lvsis.									-		60
			•	•••	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
		Hypoth	esis	1 Re	at i	ina	to	Sea	r of	=			
		Studen	+ To:	acher	~	9	00	002		-			61
		Hypoth	Deie	$2 D_{2}$.la+:	ina	÷		·	Si	• 70	•	67
		Hypoth	ests	2 10		ing	10	CIC	133	51	26 0f	•	07
		Namia	.esis	эл с		LIIG		SCI	1001	15	01		60
		varyin	g EC			τατι	1S	•	•	•	•	•	69
		нуротл	esis	4 RE	elati	Lng	το	Spe	ecla	ΞT			
		Educat	lon	•_ •	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	٠	/1
		Hypoth	esis	5 Re	elati	ing	to	Tea	am				
		Teachi	ng	• •	•	•	•	•	•	•	٠	•	73
		Hypoth	esis	6 Re	elati	ing	to	Теа	achi	ing			
		Same G	roup	A11	Day	•	•	•	•	•	٠	٠	75
		Hypoth	esis	7 Re	elati	ing	to	Pop	bula	ati	on		
		and Ec	onom	ic Fo	cal	Poi	int	•	•	•	•	•	77
			-	_	_								
	Ser:	iousnes	s of	Pupi	.1 D:	isrı	lpti	Lve	Beł	lav	ior		
	Ana.	lysis.	•	• •	•	•	•	•	•	•	٠	•	79
					-	•		-		-			
		Hypoth	esis	1 Re	elat	ing	to	Se	c of				
		Studen	t Tea	achei	:	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	79
		Hypoth	esis	2 Re	elat	ing	to	Cla	ass	Si	ze	٠	80
		Hypoth	esis	3 Re	elat	ing	to	Sch	100]	ls (of		
		Varyin	g Eco	onomi	LC St	tati	ls	•	•	٠	•	•	82
		Hypoth	esis	4 Re	alat	ing	to	Spe	ecia	al			
		Educat	ion		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	85
		Hypoth	esis	5 Re	alat	ing	to	Теа	am				
		Teachi	ng	• •	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	87

Hypothesis 6 Relating to Teaching		
Same Group All Day	•	89
Hypothesis 7 Relating to Population		
and Economic Focal Point	•	91
Analysis of Data For Purpose Two:		
Frequency and Seriousness of Dunil Dis-		
riequency and Seriousness of Fupit Dis-		0.2
ruptive Benaviors	٠	93
General Overview for Frequency		
Interpretation	•	93

Page

	Interpret	atio	on	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	94
	Interpretatio	n of	E tl	ne	Fre	eque	ncy	an	đ			
	Seriousness D	imer	nsid	ons	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	109
	Introduct	ion	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	109
	Positive Perc	epti	ions	50	fF	upi	1 D	isr	upt	ive		
	Behaviors .	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	115
	Summary	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	115
v.	SUMMARY AND CONCL	USIC	ONS	•	•	•	٠	•	•	•	٠	119
	Summary	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	119
	Conclusions.	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	120
	Discussion .	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	123
	Implications	for	Fu	rth	er	Res	ear	ch	•	•	•	133
	Implications	for	Теа	ach	er	Edu	cat	ion	•	•	•	137

General Overview for Seriousness

Interpretation .

BIBLIOGRAPHY . 141 . . .

APPENDICES

Appendix

Α.	Directions	and	Questionnaires					(Form One and							
	Form Two).	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	146	
в.	Communicati	lons	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	153	



LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
2.1.	Significant Decreases In Three Original Wickman Serious Pupil Disruptive Behaviors	31
2.2.	Descriptive Pupil Disruptive Behaviors For Grade Levels 1-6, 7-9, and 10-12	37
3.1.	Student Teachers Assigned by Michigan State University Spring Term 1969	48
3.2.	Per Cent of Student Teachers Responding to Questionnaire	54
4.1.	Analysis of Variance By Sex of Student Teacher (Frequency) Form One	62
4.2.	Analysis of Variance By Sex of Student Teacher (Frequency) Form Two	67
4.3.	Analysis of Variance By Class Size (Frequency) Form One	68
4.4.	Analysis of Variance By Class Size (Frequency) Form Two	69
4.5.	Analysis of Variance By Perceived Schools of Varying Economic Status (Frequency) Form One	70
4.6.	Analysis of Variance By Perceived Schools of Varying Economic Status (Frequency) Form Two	71
4.7.	Analysis of Variance By Special Education (Frequency) Form One	71
4.8.	Analysis of Variance By Special Education (Frequency) Form Two	72



Table

4.9.	Analysis of Variance By Team Teaching (Frequency) Form One	•	•	73
4.10.	Analysis of Variance By Team Teaching (Frequency) Form Two	•	•	74
4.11.	Analysis of Variance For Teaching Same Group All Day (Frequency) Form One .	•	•	75
4.12.	Analysis of Variance For Teaching Same Group All Day (Frequency) Form Two .	•	•	76
4.13.	Analysis of Variance of Schools Classified By Population and Economic Focal Point (Frequency) Form One	•	•	77
4.14.	Analysis of Variance of Schools Classified By Population and Economic Focal Point (Frequency) Form Two	•	•	78
4.15.	Analysis of Variance By Sex of Student Teacher (Seriousness) Form One	•	•	79
4.16.	Analysis of Variance By Sex of Student Teacher (Seriousness) Form Two	•	•	80
4.17.	Analysis of Variance By Class Size (Seriousness) Form One	•	•	81
4.18.	Analysis of Variance By Class Size (Seriousness) Form Two	•	•	82
4.19.	Analysis of Variance By Perceived Schools of Varying Social, Economic Status (Seriousness) Form One	•	•	83
4.20.	Analysis of Variance By Perceived Schools of Varying Social, Economic Status (Seriousness) Form Two	•	•	84
4.21.	Analysis of Variance By Special Education (Seriousness) Form One	•	•	85
4.22.	Analysis of Variance By Special Education (Seriousness) Form Two	•	•	86
4.23.	Analysis of Variance By Team Teaching (Seriousness) Form One	•	•	87

Table Page 4.24. Analysis of Variance By Team Teaching (Seriousness) Form Two . 88 4.25. Analysis of Variance For Teaching Same Group All Day (Seriousness) Form One 89 4.26. Analysis of Variance For Teaching Same Group All Day (Seriousness) Form Two 90 4.27. Analysis of Variance of Schools Classified By Population and Economic Focal Point (Seriousness) Form One . 92 -4.28. Analysis of Variance of Schools Classified By Population and Economic Focal Point (Seriousness) Form Two . 92 . • • 4.29. Mean Scores For Form One: Frequency of Pupil Disruptive Behaviors. 95 4.30. Mean Scores For Form Two: Frequency of 98 Pupil Disruptive Behaviors. 4.31. Mean Scores For Form One: Seriousness of Pupil Disruptive Behaviors. 102 4.32. Mean Scores For Form Two: Seriousness of Pupil Disruptive Behaviors. 105 • 4.33. Frequency of Pupil Disruptive Behaviors Perceived As Occurring Hourly to 110 Daily (Form One) . • Frequency of Pupil Disruptive Behaviors 4.34. Perceived As Occurring Hourly to Daily (Form Two) . 112 . 4.35. Pupil Disruptive Behaviors Perceived As Being Serious or Extremely Serious 113 (Form One) . . . Pupil Disruptive Behaviors Perceived As 4.36. Being Serious or Extremely Serious 114 (Form Two) . Summary of Findings of Hypotheses Regarding 4.37. Frequency and Seriousness of Pupil 116 Disruptive Behaviors.

• • • • •



Table

5.1.	Frequent Pupil Disruptive Behaviors Derived From Tables 4.33 and 4.34 and Classified According to Wickman's Schema	•	129
5.2.	Serious Pupil Disruptive Behaviors Derived From Tables 4.35 and 4.36 and Classified According to Wickman's Schema	•	130



LIST OF FIGURES

		Page
l .	•	6
.on	•	27
ysi: •	s •	62
s.	•	64
ive		65
	on ysi it s.	on ysis



CHAPTER I

THE INTRODUCTION

Teaching practitioners and education researchers have long had difficulty in effectively communicating with one another. However, some notable efforts have been undertaken to bridge this gap. One such effort began twenty years ago under the influence of Stephen Corey.¹ This effort was functionally labelled "action research" and its basic thrust was to improve teaching behaviors by training teachers to be mini-researchers. It was also designed to help teachers appreciate and learn how to structure objective inquiry. This orientation has received criticism from Cookingham,² Corman,³

1

¹Stephen Corey, <u>Action Research to Improve School</u> <u>Practices</u> (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1953).

²Frank Cookingham, "Critical Research: A Two-Way Street Between Research and Practice," Papers of the Institute No. 52, Learning Systems Institute, Michigan State University, June, 1967.

³Bernard R. Corman, "Action Research: A Teaching or A Research Method?" <u>Review of Education Research</u>, XXVII (1957), 544-47.



Hodgkinson⁴ as it did not necessarily fulfill its two primary missions. If anything, it tended to foster poor research practices. The action research movement in teacher education lost its impetus because little data was accumulated to show that it actually improved teacher instructional behavior.

Ward⁵ hypothesized that the failure of action research to fulfill its primary missions was essentially due to the lack of planned integration of the following groups of people: practioners, researchers, and practitioner trainers. Ward further stated that the integration of the above people can be realized through clinical research studies of instruction. This can be achieved through the

. . . efforts of highly trained behavioral scientists to research with practitioners--first to develop descriptions of the real world in which their clientcontact tasks exist, then to describe the variables the practitioners manipulate and the effects these manipulations produce, and finally, to so precisely define the vocabulary of the descriptions that corollary statements from basic research can be reliably identified and constructively related to applied problems.⁶

In the clinical research model the results of the joint efforts of the practitioners and researchers would be

⁴Harold L. Hodgkinson, "Advantages and Limitations of Informal Classroom Investigations," <u>American Business</u> Education Yearbook (1961), pp. 17-27.

⁵Ted W. Ward, "Professional Integration and Clinical Research," Learning Systems Institute, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1966.

2

⁶Ibid.

consciously integrated by teacher trainers into teacher education courses. The added integrative emphasis of the teacher trainer in the clinical research model could overcome the serious shortcoming of action research.

Recent efforts to bridge the research-to-practice gap have been increased by application of the clinical research approach of all the related educational workers.

The supporters of clinical research usually contend that decision-making is basic to teaching and, therefore, emphasis ought to focus upon that process. Past teacher education efforts have hoped to "indirectly" improve a teacher's decision-making as was the case of the action research movement.

The value of clinical research, directly amalgamated into teacher education programs, is that it presently focuses upon the teacher as a decision-maker. The benefit of this orientation as presented by Ward is that:

. . . if a student can learn to seek and select environmental data and to base his instructional decisions on the important characteristics of the problem situation, he will develop a versatile and useful teaching skill. He will begin to adopt a systematic habit of using observations about what is in planning his teaching moves and evaluating the outcomes of his actions. Thus, he can profit from success and failure. Exciting possibilities are opened up to us once we commit ourselves to a crisp definition of the basic behaviors we want in professional practices.⁷

3

7_{Ibid}.

Henderson⁸ has described the phases that Ward⁹ identified as being the essential parts of the clinical research cycle.

Arriving at the commitment level that Ward described is a task that requires a carefully integrated research program. Clinical research activities explicating instructional behaviors can be furthered in a much more meaningful and systematic manner when it incorporates Henderson's¹⁰ dimensions of clinical research (refer to Table 1).

Henderson's¹¹ conceptualization of the components of clinical research, initially identified by Ward, furthered the manner in which clinical research should be developed in actual practice. She recommended that a systematic, yet broad development of clinical research programs ought to be undertaken. This is necessary because of the highly integrated nature of each phase of clinical research.

This study of student teachers' perceptions of pupil disruptive behaviors was initiated so that clinical research in the area of pupil disruptive behaviors may be

⁹Ward, <u>op. cit</u>. ¹⁰Henderson, <u>op. cit</u>., p. 21 ¹¹<u>Ibid</u>., 15-23.

4

⁸Judith Henderson, "An Investigation of Practitioner Evaluation and Agreement Regarding Effective Language Arts Instruction," unpublished doctoral thesis, Michigan State University, College of Education, 1968, p. 16.
imbedded in a broad developmental research program emphasizing Henderson's Phase II: School and Community Context and Classroom Situations; variables referred to in Figure 1.

The Problem

Discipline has long been recognized by many educators as the most frequent and serious problem which will likely confront a student teacher during his field experi-Batchelder, ¹² Wingo, ¹³ and Ionnaccone, ¹⁴ who have ence. written books dealing with the topic of student teaching, indicate that a student teacher will undoubtedly face his most serious problems in this area. The usual remedy for such tribulations is a few statements that explicate rules or quidelines for the student teacher to follow. The student may receive such warnings as, "Be consistent," "Don't threaten pupils unless you can fulfill the threat," "Good planning and classroom organization is the key to discipline in the classroom," "Treat each pupil as an individual," "Treat the causes and not the symptoms."

¹²Howard T. Batchelder, Maurice McGlasson and Raleigh Schorling, <u>Student Teaching in Secondary Schools</u> (New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1956).

¹³Max G. Wingo and Raleigh Schloring, <u>Elementary</u> <u>School Student Teaching</u> (New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1960).

¹⁴Lawrence Ionnaccone and H. Warren Button, <u>Functions of Student Teaching</u> (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Health, Education and Welfare Research Project 1026, 1964).

	Phase II	Phase III	Phase IV
VA	RIABLE DESCRIPTION AND EXAMINATION	MODEL STUDY	IMPLICATION/ APPLICATION
Sci	hool and Com- nity Contexts	A. Model Building	A. Teacher Education 1. Behaviors appro-
1 .	Socio-economic make-up Physical plant	 Analytic tasks Language trans- formations 	priate to general and special teaching situ-
	equipment Organization.	B. Model Comparison	ations are explicated 2. Materials and strat-
4	rules	Activities	egies for preservice
;	biases	pirical charac-	
CL	assroom Situa-	terization models 2. With basic re-	B. Practice 1. Confirmation and/or
Ē	ons	search models	changes for prac-
÷	Substantive	3. With philosophical	titioner behaviors an
	dimensions a. Content of	and pedogogical models	explicated 2. Materials and
	study		strategies for in-
	b. Strategies		service programs are
2.	Behavioral		aeveroped
	dimensions		C. Research
	a. Learner		1. Cues for additional
	characteristics		and new basic researc
	b. Group climate		are explicated
	ence		
ë.	Environmental		
	dimensions		

6

ę

0

P

Figure 1. -- Clinical research -- studies of instruction

a. Organization b. Physical con-ditions c. Technologies

Phase I

POPULATION SELECTION

Subjective Criteria 1. Teachers Α.

×.

- Administrators
 Supervisors
 Pupils
 Parents

- B. Objective Criteria 1. Pupil achieve-ment of objec-

в.

- tives
 Pupil achievement of subsequent schooling
 Pupil achievement and success
 - in life

(Point at which values come into play)

Yet, despite all the advice from textbooks and other related media, student teachers continue to cite discipline as their greatest problem.

Research studies related to the student teaching experience support what many authors have intuitively identified as being the most serious problem in student teaching--discipline. Sharp,¹⁵ Deiulio,¹⁶ Bouchard,¹⁷ and Travers¹⁸ through studies which ascertained the main problems which confront student teachers during their field experience have arrived at similar conclusions--that discipline continued to be the most urgent and pressing problem during student teaching. Thus, the general literature and research are mutually supportive; however, it still remains that student teachers continue to be plagued by the anxiety associated with not being able to control a classroom of pupils.

¹⁶Anthony Deiulio, "Problems of Student Teachers," American Teacher, XLVI (December, 1961), 9-10.

¹⁷John B. Bouchard and Ronald E. Hull, "A Pilot Study of Problems and Practices in the Induction of Beginning Teachers," Paper presented at 1969 Meeting of Educational Research Association of New York State, Concord Hotel, Kiamesha Lake, New York, November 6, 1969.

¹⁸Robert Travers, <u>et al</u>., "The Anxieties of a Group of Student Teachers," <u>Educational Administration and</u> Supervision (October, 1952), pp. 368-75.

¹⁵Jack Sharp, <u>Off Campus Student Teaching</u>, Thirtieth Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching (Iowa: Association for Student Teaching, 1951), p. 118.

The problem, more specifically stated, is that many educators have recognized that student teachers have major problems with discipline. Few educators get beyond the level of globally recognizing the problem to that of identifying the specific kinds of disciplinary problems which confront a student teacher. Moreover, the problem of pupil disruptive behaviors is further compounded by the almost total lack of data about the student teacher and variables which include class size, academic subject matter taught, grade levels, socio-economic level of the school, and school organization schemes.

The Purpose

The purposes of this survey are as follows:

- To identify the pupil disruptive behaviors that student teachers perceive to be most frequent and serious.
- 2. To examine the relationship of sex of the student teacher, socio-economic level of the schools as perceived by the student teacher, size of classes taught by the student teacher, classes taught by the student teacher all day, special education classes taught by the student teacher, team teaching of which the student teacher is a member, and school types identified by the Michigan Department of Education to 132 specific forms of pupil disruptive behaviors.

Importance of the Study

Teacher education usually presents the topic of pupil disruptive behaviors within the context of methods courses. Discussions are vague and usually based upon the assumption that experienced teacher perceptions of discipline are applicable to a student teacher's eventual classroom experiences with pupil disruptive behaviors. The application of this assumption is usually achieved by advising the students to be fair, be natural, be consistent, change the pace, locate the pupil's problem. After providing a general set of guidelines, the student teacher is finally exposed in his student teaching assignment to the dynamic realities of a classroom of pupils. Another common approach of teacher education dealing with the problem of pupil disruptive behaviors focuses upon the practitioner relating his perceptions as to how a situation ought to be handled. In the student teaching situation, practitioner perceptions frequently act as the main vehicle for advising the student teacher how to deal with pupil disruptive behaviors. The result of both approaches is an all too frequent "bag of tricks syndrome," or frantic search for a method that applies to all situations.

The research to date suggests that approaches which are atuned to the above, do little to alleviate the student teacher's problem of not being able to control pupil disruptive behaviors. In a recent study (1969) by Frances Fuller, it is pointed out that no study supported the

notion that beginning teachers are basically concerned with "instructional design, methods of presenting subject matter, assessment of pupil learning, or with tailoring content to individual pupils, the areas often presented before student teaching in education courses."¹⁹ Instead, the findings indicated much agreement: they concluded that the student teacher's basic anxiety is related to "fear of inability to gain control of classes and fear of inability to gain pupils' emotional support."²⁰

Arriving at the stage where teacher education will directly attack the problem that student teachers face with pupil disruptive behaviors will not be easily accomplished. Because of the perplexity of pupil disruptive behaviors it becomes extremely important that research be conceived and carried out in a thorough and systematic manner that fits into a broad developmental research program. The major importance of this study is that it will contribute to teacher education by providing data about the frequency and seriousness of pupil disruptive behaviors as perceived by student teachers. Another importance of this study is that it contributes to a larger and similar clinical research effort undertaken by Learning Systems Institute of Michigan State University. The larger study concentrated upon

¹⁹Frances Fuller, "Concerns of Teachers: A Developmental Conceptualization," <u>American Education Research</u> <u>Journal</u>, Vol. VI, No. 2 (March, 1969), 210.

²⁰Ibid., p. 215.

experienced classroom teachers and pupil disruptive behaviors while this study concentrated upon the student teacher and pupil disruptive behaviors. Both studies will provide the data necessary to move to Phase III of Henderson's model of Clinical Research--Studies of Instruction.²¹ This particular phase emphasized the building of instructional models which will later have their application in teacher education, classroom practice, and further research efforts.

Assumptions of the Study

- That student teacher perceptions are a fair and adequate measure of the frequency and seriousness of pupil disruptive behaviors as they occur in classroom reality.
- That data regarding specific pupil disruptive behaviors is not only necessary but desirable to a relevant on-going teacher preparation program.
- That the 132 specific pupil disruptive behaviors cited on the two forms of the questionnaire are drawn from teachers in the public schools and have application to the student teacher.

²¹Henderson, op. cit., p. 16.

 That the survey method is a reliable means of collecting data from a population of 664 student teachers about 132 pupil disruptive behaviors.

Limitations of the Study

- The selected student teacher population is unique to Michigan State University's teacher preparation program.
- 2. The 132 pupil disruptive behaviors which appear on the questionnaire may be an adequate sample of the kinds of pupil disruptive behaviors that a student teacher may confront; however, there may be pupil disruptive behaviors that are serious and occur frequently that do not appear on the questionnaire and thus not measured or accounted for.

Definition of Terms Pertinent to This Study

<u>Student Teacher</u>. An elementary, secondary or special education student who is in the junior or senior year of college at Michigan State University. The student must have been assigned by the Office of Student Teaching to student teach in a classroom of the public schools located in the state of Michigan. <u>College Supervisor</u>. A member of a college staff who is responsible for the supervision of the student teacher.

<u>Pupil Disruptive Behaviors</u>. Any verbal or nonverbal behavior by the pupil that requires the classroom teacher and/or student teacher to provide a stimulus to terminate or alter the behavior according to social norm.

<u>Perception</u>. The interpretation by the student teacher of pupil behaviors that will be classified as disruptive in nature.

Experienced Teachers. Teachers employed by the public schools who are either tenured or non-tenured.

<u>Type 1 = Metropolitan Core</u>. One or more adjacent cities with a population of 50,000 or more which serve as the economic focal point of their environs.

<u>Type 2 = City</u>. Community of 10,000 to 50,000 that serves as the economic focal point of its environs.

<u>Type 3 = Town</u>. Community of 2,500 to 10,000 that serves as the economic focal point of its environs.

<u>Type 4 = Urban Fringe</u>. A community of any population size that has as its economic focal point a metropolitan core of a city.

<u>Type 5 = Rural Community</u>. A community of less than 2,500.

The rationale used in establishing community types was based on the factors of size (population) and economic focal point. The above definitions established the five community type categories. $^{\rm 22}$

Hypotheses Examined in the Study

Hypotheses for Perceived Student Teacher Frequency of Pupil Disruptive Behaviors

- Ho₁: There will be no significant difference between the student teacher's perceived frequency of pupil disruptive behaviors and the sex of the student teacher.
- Ho.: There will be no significant difference between the student teacher's perceived frequency of pupil disruptive behaviors and the size of the class taught by the student teacher.
- Ho.: There will be no significant difference in the student teacher's perceived frequency of pupil disruptive behaviors occurring in schools which a majority of pupils are viewed by the student teacher as being from the lower, middle, and upper socioeconomic levels.
- Ho₄: There will be no significant difference in the student teacher's perceived frequency of pupil disruptive behaviors in special education classes and non-special education classes.
- Ho₅: There will be no significant difference in the student teacher's perceived frequency of pupil disruptive behaviors occurring in team teaching and non-team teaching situations.
- Ho₆: There will be no significant difference in the student teacher's perceived frequency of pupil disruptive behaviors occurring in classes they are with all day and classes they are not with all day.

²² "Activities and Arrangements for the 1969-70 Michigan Assessment of Education," Assessment Report Number Two, Michigan Department of Education, December, 1969, pp. 10-11.

Ho7: There will be no significant difference in the student teacher's perceived frequency of pupil disruptive behaviors occurring in schools classified by the Michigan State Board of Education according to the degree of cultural and economic derivation.

Hypotheses for Student Teacher Attitudes Toward Pupil Disruptive Behavior

- Ho₁: There will be no significant difference in the perceived seriousness of pupil disruptive behaviors and sex of the student teacher.
- Ho₂: There will be no significant difference in the perceived seriousness of pupil disruptive behaviors and the size of the class taught by the student teacher.
- Ho₃: There will be no significant difference in the perceived seriousness of pupil disruptive behaviors occurring in schools which a majority of pupils are viewed by the student teacher as being from the lower, middle, and upper socioeconomic levels.
- Ho₄: There will be no significant difference in the student teacher's perceived seriousness of pupil disruptive behaviors occurring in special education classes and non-special education classes.
- Ho.: There will be no significant difference in the student teacher's perceived seriousness of pupil disruptive behaviors occurring in team teaching and non-team teaching situations.
- Ho:: There will be no significant difference in the student teacher's perceived frequency of pupil disruptive behaviors occurring in classes they are with all day and classes they are not with all day.
- Ho7: There will be no significant difference in the student teacher's perceived frequency of pupil disruptive behaviors occurring in schools classified by the Michigan State Board of Education according to the degree of cultural and economic deprivation.

Overview

In Chapter II the relevant research was reviewed with the intent of providing the reader with a background with regard to findings of other researchers who have looked at the topic of pupil disruptive behaviors. Chapter III provides the reader with a conceptual perspective of the sample used in the study, the instrument, the design, and the analysis procedures.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Gnagey¹ strongly supports the point that there has been little scientific research completed about the subject of discipline since the 1930's and early 1940's. Scientific research which related specifically to the classroom teacher and pupil disruptive behavior is skimpy as is scientific research relating specifically to the student teacher and pupil disruptive behaviors. Because of this problem it was decided to incorporate four dimensions in the development of this chapter: (1) a general discussion of approaches used by researchers in analyzing the problem of pupil disruptive behaviors, (2) an examination of the research done by Wickman² in 1927, a survey study which has particular relevance to this study, (3) an examination of findings of survey studies which have used Wickman as a

¹William J. Gnagey, <u>Controlling Classroom Misbe-</u> <u>havior</u> (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1965).

²E. K. Wickman, <u>Children's Behavior and Teacher's</u> Attitudes (New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1932).

basis, and finally (4) a summary of findings regarding pupil disruptive behaviors.

Basic Approaches for Examining Pupil Disruptive Behaviors

Approaches which have been used by researchers in attacking the problem of pupil disruptive behaviors fall into one of the following modes: the case study, the observation, the experiment, and the survey.

The Case Study Method

Berelson and Steiner stated,

The case study intensively examines many characteristics of one "unit" (person, work group, company, community, culture), usually over a long period of time. The goal of such investigations is to learn "all" about the area of interest for the one case involved.³

The work of Fritz Redl⁴ best typlified this approach. Redl's contribution to the area of pupil disruptive behaviors was a result of his experiences with severe cases of anti-social children. Information gathered from case histories has provided Redl with a vast abundance of knowledge from which he was able to suggest practical

³Bernard Berelson and Gary A. Steiner, <u>Human Be-</u> <u>An Inventory of Scientific Findings</u> (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1964), p. 27.

⁴Fritz Redl and D. Wineman, <u>Controls From Within</u> (New York: The Free Press, 1952); Fritz Redl, <u>When We</u> <u>Deal With Children</u> (New York: The Free Press, 1966); Fritz Redl and D. Wineman, <u>The Aggressive Child</u> (New York: The Free Press, 1957). techniques for handling anti-social children. Many of these techniques have been applied to behavior problems of pupils in public school classrooms.

The chief criticism of Redl's work as it applies to regular classes of pupils is that his views have been drawn from an extremely narrow and biased sample of pupils--those of severely anti-social children. Regardless of this limitation, Redl's pioneering work in classroom management has been of value in teacher education.

A practical application of the case study approach to pupil disruptive behaviors is the use of "critical incidents." An example of this approach is Corsini and Howard's belief that ". . . teachers can learn general principles of classroom leadership through the case approach and through discussions of cases by people who have special knowledge and special interest in good teaching."⁵ While Corsini and Howard's case approach has much to commend it, it has limitations. They have made the assumption that critical incidents gave teachers the greatest difficulty. However, there is the possibility that a variety of minor pupil disruptive behavior incidents may be more bothersome to a teacher than one critical incident. Another shortcoming of the case approach was the limited and perhaps biased sampling of cases of pupil

⁵R. J. Corsini and D. D. Howard, <u>Critical Inci-</u> <u>dents in Teaching</u> (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1964), p. v.

disruptive behaviors selected by Corsini and Howard to act as a representative sample of all critical incidents.

The Observational Method

Medley and Mitzel referred to observational technique as ". . . procedures which use systematic observations of classroom behavior to obtain reliable and valid measurements of differences in the typical behaviors which occur in different classrooms, or in different situations in the same classroom."⁶ Kounin and Gump⁷ in a 1958 study about the effect of teacher control techniques used a data gathering system and observers. It was in this study that the "ripple effect" (effect of a disciplinary action upon the children who are on-lookers) was investigated. Preliminary findings indicated that a teacher's control technique influenced the behavior of both the deviant and other pupils who were audience to the technique. Kounin and Gump also noticed that pupils who were strongly affiliated with the deviant and/or the disciplinary action taken by the teacher were more affected by the sequence of action than those pupils who had little or no relationship with the deviant or the control technique.

⁷J. S. Kounin and P. V. Gump, "The Ripple Effect in Discipline," <u>Elementary School Journal</u>, Vol. LIX (December, 1959), <u>158-62</u>.

^bDonald M. Medley and Harold E. Mintzel, "Measuring Classroom Behavior by Systematic Observation," in <u>Handbook</u> <u>of Research on Teaching</u>, ed. by N. L. Gage (Chicago: Rank <u>McNally & Company</u>, 1963), p. 250.

In one observation study, using video tapes, Kounin, Friesen, and Norton⁸ concentrated upon the disruptive behaviors of emotionally disturbed children as they participated in "regular" classrooms. Their research concern emphasized two areas: work involvement and deviancy rate. Because of the importance of this study the major findings are reported:

- 1. The highest degree of school-appropriate behavior for both emotionally disturbed pupils and non-emotionally disturbed pupils occurred in sub-group recitation periods (e.g., reading groups) and the lowest degree of schoolappropriate behavior occurred in seatwork situations.
- Emotionally disturbed children show less school-appropriate behavior than non-emotionally disturbed children.
- 3. Teachers who were successful in handling the behavior of non-emotionally disturbed children are relatively successful with emotionally disturbed children.
- Teacher "with-it-ness" techniques of handling group movement and programming for variety

⁸J. S. Kounin, Wallace V. Friesen, and A. Evangeline Norton, "Managing Emotionally Disturbed Children in Regular Classrooms," <u>Journal of Educational Psychology</u>, LVII, No. 1 (February, 1966), 1-13.

change in learning activities correlated with the behavior of children.

 Programming for variety change is a significant dimension of classroom management.

The implications of this study, drawn by Kounin, are also of importance and include the following:

- That analysis of teacher behavior according to personality factors may not be as valuable as that of analyzing concrete techniques of programming activities and initiating and maintaining movement within a program.
- That a higher priority ought to be placed on training for group management rather than studying individual children. This is usually the emphasis of many educational psychology classes.

The Experimental Method

Berelson and Steiner defined experiment as " . . . any investigation that includes two elements: manipulation or control of some variable by the investigator and systematic observation or measurement."⁹ The experiment in pupil disruptive behaviors was found in William Gnagey's¹⁰

⁹Berelson and Steiner, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 19.

¹⁰William J. Gnagey, "Effects of a Deviant Student's Response to Discipline," <u>The Journal of Educational Psy</u>chology, LI (February, 1960).

study of Kounin, Friesen and Norton's¹¹ preliminary findings with regard to the "ripple effect." Specifically, Gnagey was interested in the social power of a deviant and its affect upon a class when he was punished.

Four classes of fifth graders were measured before and after a ten minute showing of a film. A male classmate was selected and trained in secret to misbehave and have an altercation with the teacher. He, in effect, became the target for a control technique by the teacher. He was directed to react in a defiant but submissive manner. The main finding of this study supported Kounin and Gump's initial observation: that "the overt reaction of the male student <u>does have</u> some measureable effects on the perceptual behavior and learning performances of his classmates and that these effects are influenced by the social power of the deviant."¹²

The Survey: Questionnaire

The survey was identified by Kerlinger¹³ as being one of the most important means and/or tool for assessing characteristics of whole populations of people. The survey

> ¹¹Kounin, Friesen and Norton, <u>op. cit</u>., pp. 1-13. ¹²Gnagev, op. cit., p. 8.

¹³Fred N. Kerlinger, <u>Foundations of Behavioral</u> <u>Research</u> (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., <u>1967</u>).

method identified by Hilway¹⁴ included one or a combination of one of the following: interviews, questionnaires, and tests. The emphasis of this section is the questionnaire, a research method frequently used by educators. Wickman's¹⁵ questionnaire study regarding pupil disruptive behavior, because of its theoretical relevance to this study, was presented in greater breadth.

The Wickman Study and Subsequent Studies

The Wickman study,¹⁶ using a questionnaire approach, examined the problem of pupil disruptive behaviors. In the study (1927), 511 elementary teachers were asked to respond to fifty specific acts of pupil disruptive behavior they regarded as most serious. To obtain the information regarding the above objective, Wickman sought data about:

- The teacher's awareness of the various kinds of behavior problems. (This is similar to the "frequency" dimension of this study.)
- The distinguishing characteristics which identify a problem child to a teacher. This was obtained by analyzing behavior reports of children identified by teachers as behavior cases.

¹⁵Wickman, op. cit. ¹⁶Wickman, op. cit.

¹⁴Tyrus Hillway, <u>Handbook of Educational Research</u>: <u>A Guide to Methods and Material</u> (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1969).

- 3. The personal feelings of teachers to specific forms of behavior problems. This was obtained by asking teachers to judge the seriousness of specific behavior problems. (This is similar to the "seriousness" dimension of this study.) The basic findings of Wickman's¹⁷ study related to the frequency of pupil disruptive behaviors were:
 - Child behavior problems which were responded to the most frequently were those that relate to the school situation, (e.g., infraction of classroom rules and routine, failing to submit school work promptly).
 - That personal problems of the child seem to be subordinated to the problems of classroom management and teaching. Aggressive behavior problems which were more recognizable than problems "inner" oriented, were reported more frequently because they interrupted the purpose of teaching.
 - Behavior problems of boys characterized by their aggressiveness were recognized more frequently than problem behaviors of girls which were identified as being more sublimated.

¹⁷Ibid., pp. 26-50.

The findings of Wickman's study¹⁸ related to the seriousness of pupil disruptive behaviors are best pre-

In summary, Wickman's findings suggest:

. . . that teachers' reactions to the behavior problems of children are determined in direct relation to the immediate effect of behavior upon the teachers themselves. Those problems which transgress the teachers' moral sensitivities and authority or which frustrate their immediate teaching purposes are regarded as relatively more serious than problems which affect for the most part only the welfare of the individual child.¹⁹

The Wickman study has been cited as classic by Stoffer,²⁰ Schrupp and Gjerde,²¹ and Hunter.²² However, Goodwin Watson²³ noted limitations in Wickman's type of research. One of the most serious cited by Watson was item ambiguity (e.g., "stubborness"--sometimes stubborness is a form of independence). In short, Watson finds these items offensive in that they are not situational. The second

¹⁸<u>Ibid</u>., p. 115. ¹⁹<u>Ibid</u>., p. 116.

²⁰George A. Stouffer, "Behavior Problems of Children As Viewed by Teachers and Mental Hygienists: A Study of Present Attitudes as Compared with those Reported by E. K. Wickman," Mental Hygiene, XXXVI (1952), 271-85.

²¹Manfred H. Schrupp and Clayton M. Gjerde, "Teacher Growth in Attitudes of Children," <u>The Journal of</u> Educational Psychology, 203-14.

²²E. C. Hunter, "Changes in Teachers' Attitudes Toward Children's Behavior over the Last Thirty Years," Mental Hygiene, 3-11.

²³Goodwin Watson, "A Critical Note On Two Attitude Studies," Mental Hygiene, 59-64.

Stealing Untruthfulness Disorderliness in Domineering Cheating Classroom Attracting atter Sex Problems Lack of Interest Sulleness Disobedience Lackof Interest Interrupting Interrupting Carelessness Meddlesomeness Offinance Unreliableness Meddlesomeness Disordence Careles	Than T	serious han
Untruthfulness Disorderliness in Domineering Cheating classroom Attracting atter Sex Problems Lack of interest Sulleness Disobedience Carelessness Meddlesomeness Definance Unreliableness Meddlesomeness Emper Unreliableness Unreliableness		
Cheating Cheating classroom classroom Attracting atter Sex Froblems Lack of interest Sulleness Sulleness Lack of interest Sulleness Lack of therest Sulleness Carelessness Meddlesomeness Definance Laziness Unreliableness Meddlesomeness Interveting Meddlesomenes Interveting Meddlesomeness Int	cderliness in) Domineering	Shyness
Cheating Inattentiveness Attracting atter Sex Problems Lock of interest Sulleness In work Sulleness Lin work Interrupting Interrupting Interrupting Interrupting Interrupting Defiance Laziness Meddlesomeness Defiance Unreliableness Meddlesomeness Interrupting Interr	assroom	
Sex Problems Lack of interest Sulleness Disobedience Lack of interest Sulleness Inwork Interrupting Defiance Laziness Meddlesomeness Defiance Unreliableness Meddlesomeness Emember Unturst	centiveness Attracting attentic	n Unsocialness
Disobedience in work Interrupting Impertinence Carelessness Meddlesomeness Sefiance Laziness Meddlesomeness Empor Unreliableness Meddlesomeness Impdence	of interest Sulleness	Fearfulness
Disobedience Carelessness Interrupting Impertinence Laziness Meddlesomeness Defiance Unreliableness Meddlesomeness Pemper Outburst	work >	~
Impertinence Laziness Meddlesomeness Defiance Unreliableness Meddlesomeness Empedence	Lessness Interrupting	Suspiciousness
Defiance Unreliableness Temper Outburst Impudence	Meddlesomeness	Imaginative Lying
Temper Outburst) Impudence Defance	liableness	Dreaminess
Impudence		
01.40x0cm		
VUUEILESS		
Truancy		

11 1 H groups lation becomes:

srious	Withdrawing, recessive personality and behavior traits traits
More Se Tha	traits
More Serious More Serious Than than than than than than than the second	Extravagant, aggressive personality and behavior
	Violations of: orderliness in classroom application to school work
	mmoralities ishonesties ransgressions against authority

Figure 2.--Wickman's classification and interpretation of serious pupil disruptive behaviors

criticism was directed at a phase of the Wickman study which compared the teacher attitudes to mental hygienists. In order to accomplish this, each group was asked a different question. Watson stated:

The teachers were asked what offenses cause serious upset in the school situation. Quite rightly, they noted sex offenses, which would bring a whole community up in arms; stealing, which is likewise socially dangerous; truancy, which defeats every objective of school work; and give larger weight to other disturbances in the organized life of the group. The mental-hygienist, free from any obligation to think about class and community morale, were asked only to pick the symptoms that point toward probable mental disorders in adult life. . . After we made allowances for the unreliability of the answers within each group, and take account of the difference in form of the questions set, there remains very little disagreement to be accounted for.²⁴

Regardless of the cited weaknesses in the Wickman study, it is still regarded as an excellent questionnaire study.

From the research undertaken since Wickman's study, similar studies have attempted to find whether there has been a change in teacher attitudes toward the frequency and seriousness of pupil disruptive behaviors.

George Stouffer²⁵ in 1953 replicated the Wickman study by testing 481 male and female elementary school teachers. His major findings indicated that (1) problems related to sex, honesty, truancy, and classroom order and application to school tasks were rated as most serious of

²⁵Stouffer, <u>op. cit</u>., pp. 271-85.

²⁴Ibid., p. 62.

the fifty Wickman pupil disruptive behaviors. This was consistent with the original Wickman study. (2) Problems related to withdrawal behavior, recessive personality traits (depression, unhappiness, unsociability, and withdrawing) were progressively becoming more important to teachers.

Schrupp and Gjerde²⁶ in a similar study found that elementary and secondary teachers tested in 1952 were more aware of and concerned over recessive pupil disruptive behaviors. Their major findings were in agreement with Stouffer. They found elementary and secondary teachers as a group were still mostly concerned with pupil disruptive behaviors that were anti-orderliness and morality; they were less concerned with traits that were related to withdrawal behaviors.

Hunter's (1955) study²⁷ revealed that the ten problems rated most serious in his study were also rated as most serious by Wickman teachers. Hunter concluded that teachers still believed that frequent and serious pupil disruptive behaviors were characterized by annoying, aggressive, and irresponsible behavioral patterns. His findings also showed that teachers were moving closer to fuller awareness of withdrawing or recessive behaviors as being of greater or of equal importance as aggressive

²⁶Schrupp and Gjerde, <u>op. cit.</u>, pp. 203-14.
²⁷Hunter, op. cit., pp. 3-11.



pupil behaviors. Hunter's remarks summarized the general tendencies of teachers perceiving pupil behaviors identified as recessive (not aggressive).

. . . it appears that today's teachers are definitely showing more concern about non-agressive traits and behavior suggesting mental health problems than did the teachers in 1926.28

Stouffer²⁹ identified the serious pupil disruptive behaviors of masturbation, smoking, and profanity as having taken a significant drop from their original ranking in the Wickman study.

Studies by Schrupp and Gjerde,³⁰ Hunter³¹ also provided support for this observation. Table 2.1 shows the decrease in perceived seriousness of masturbation, smoking, and profanity.

Wickman's classification system of pupil disruptive behaviors placed masturbation, smoking, and profanity in the area of "Violations of General Standards of Morality and Integrity." The change of these behaviors to a lesser degree of seriousness is most difficult to affix to any one reason; however, greater educational emphasis and understanding about the nature of these problems may have contributed to their decrease in importance to a teacher.

²⁸<u>Ibid</u>., p. 11.
²⁹Stouffer, <u>op. cit</u>., pp. 271-85.
³⁰Schrupp and Gjerde, <u>op. cit</u>., pp. 203-14.
³¹Hunter, op. cit., pp. 3-11.



TABLE 2.1

SIGNIFICANT DECREASES IN THREE ORIGINAL WICKMAN SERIOUS PUPIL DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIORS

	Masturbation	Rank			
1927	Wickman	3			
1952	Schrupp and Gjerde Stouffer	23 26			
1955	Hunter	28			
Smoking					
1927	Wickman	18			
1952	Schrupp and Gjerde	41			
1953	Stouffer Hunter	37 49			
Profanity					
1927 1952	Wickman Schrupp and Gierde	15 40			
1952	Stouffer	32.5			
1955	Hunter	29			

In summary, the general findings of studies based upon the Wickman study have been consistently supportive of the following statements: Pupil disruptive behaviors perceived as most frequent and most serious to teachers are:

1. . . those relating to school requirements, infractions of classroom rules and routine and failure to meet school requirements. The personality problems of the children are subordinated to problems of classroom management.³²

³²Leigh Peck, "Teachers' Reports of the Problems of Unadjusted School Children," <u>The Journal of Educational</u> Psychology, Vol. XXVI (January-December, 1935), 123.



2. . . that behavior which offends the teacher's moral standards and challenges their authority and which interferes with classroom routine is regarded as relatively more serious than personality problems which affect the general welfare of the child, and that aggressive behavior is considered more serious than regressive behavior.³³

Another significant point is that teachers are becoming more cognizant of the frequency and seriousness of pupil disruptive behaviors that are related to personality problems.

Specific Areas and Findings

After reviewing studies which relate to pupil disruptive behaviors the following areas have been recognized as being factors which may have relationship to the frequency and seriousness of pupil disruptive behaviors. The identified factors are: degree and teaching experience of the teacher, sex of the teacher, sex of the pupil, race, low-achieving pupils, and grade levels.

Degree of Teacher and Experience

One study, Sparks,³⁴ addressed the point of teaching experience, degree held, and their relationship to pupil disruptive behavior. Sparks' main finding was that amounts of teaching experience had little or no effect upon the attitudes of teachers toward pupil behavior

³³Ibid., p. 124.

³⁴J. N. Sparks, "Teacher Attitudes Toward the Behavior Problems of Children," Journal of Educational Psychology, XLIII (1952), 284-91.



problems; however, the amount of education did affect their ratings. Teachers with education beyond the bachelor's degree tended to perceive pupil disruptive behaviors as being highly related to non-aggressive, withdrawing behaviors. Teachers of lesser education tended to look at pupil disruptive behaviors as annoying, aggressive and generally irresponsible.

Race

James E. Greene and Frances Gatesky³⁵ tested the hypothesis that black and white high school teachers and pupils would not differ significantly in their perceptions about aspects of school discipline and morale. One of his major findings was that teacher-pupil differences occurred with much greater frequency among whites than among blacks. The determination of specific types of pupil disruptive behaviors showed that black teachers reported greater frequency of the following behaviors: working unsatisfactorily, talking, cutting class, chewing gum and tardiness. White teachers' primary identification of pupil disruptive behaviors were: carelessness, disobedience, impertinence and over-activity. It should be noted that both white and black teachers in this study did not consider pupil withdrawal or recessive behaviors as important.

³⁵James E. Greene and Frances Gatesky, "Discipline and Morale," <u>Journal of Teacher Education</u>, Vol. XII, No. 4, (December, 1961), 437-47.



Greene and Gatesky's study, then, was supportive of Wickman, Stouffer, Schrupp and Gjerde, and Hunter's premise that aggressive pupil disruptive behaviors occurred more frequently and were perceived as being more important than recessive, non-aggressive pupil behaviors. Black teachers reported the following significant pupil behaviors: cutting classes, talking, tardiness and working unsatisfactorily. White teachers reported the following pupil behaviors as significant: disobedience, inattention, impertinence, and over-activity.

One major limitation of using Greene and Gatesky's study for this purpose was the small sample of pupil disruptive behaviors and vague pupil disruptive behavior categories. Perhaps racial and ethnic factors should be given further consideration as it may provide another area of information that at present is most limited.

Lower Ranges of Intelligence

Research studies to date have indirectly pursued low I.Q. pupils (70 and below) and pupil disruptive behaviors. Those that have, are indeed, few in number. Two studies, Julius Yourman³⁶ and John Levy³⁷ used Wickman's

³⁶Julius Yourman, "Children Identified by Their Teachers as Problems," <u>Journal of Educational Sociology</u>, Vol. V (September, 1931-May, 1932), 334-43.

³⁷John Levy, "Quantitative Study of Relationship Between Intelligence and Economic Factors in the Etilology of Children's Behavior Problems," <u>American Journal of</u> Orthopsychiatry, I, 2 (January, 1931).


behaviors as the basis for their studies. Yourman's conclusion was: "70 per cent of the problem children were retarded as against 24 per cent of the non-problem children."³⁸

Yourman summarized his findings with a rather sweeping and negativistic list of behaviors identifiable with the less intelligent. He stated that problem children were identified as: ". . . less intelligent, inattentive, indifferent, lazy, over-active, and over-talkative, selfasertive, rude, defiant, dishonest, impatient, excitable, negativistic, and moody."³⁹

John Levy⁴⁰ in another study specifically directed at intelligence and pupil disruptive behaviors found that a marked tendency existed for children's behavior problems to shift with increased intelligence. Conduct problems identified as aggressive forms of anti-social behaviors were characteristic of the lower ranges of I.Q. (75 and below). Levy also pointed out that personality problems of withdrawing and evasive misbehaviors were characteristic of higher ranges of I.Q. pupils.

³⁸Yourman, <u>op. cit</u>., p. 337.
³⁹Ibid., p. 337.
⁴⁰Levy, <u>op. cit</u>.



Grade Levels

A recent study (1967) by Eaton, <u>et al</u>.,⁴¹ examined grade levels and occurances of pupil disruptive behaviors. The basic concerns of the study were: types of problem behavior from grade level to grade level, types of problem behavior that occurred most frequently among boys and girls. From Eaton's study it was found that pupil disruptive behaviors in school increased from grades one to six and ten to twelve. Another revealing, although not too surprising finding, was that problem behavior in outof-school situations increased the greatest between grades seven and nine and ten to twelve. In reviewing the entire study by grades, 1-6, 7-9, and 10-12, the following major behaviors were descriptive of each general grade level (Table 2.2).

Each major pupil disruptive behavior is marked with a plus or a minus to indicate whether a behavior has increased or decreased from the preceeding grade level groupings.

In a study undertaken by Dorothy Mutimer and Robert Rosemier (1967) 42 455 boys and 456 girls in grades 7-12

⁴¹Merrill T. Eaton, Louis D'Amico and Beeman N. Phillips, "Problem Behavior In School," <u>Journal of Edu</u> cational Psychology, Vol. XLVII (October, <u>1956</u>), <u>350-5</u>7.

⁴²Dorothy Mutimer and Robert Rosemier, "Behavior Problems of Children As Viewed by Teachers and Children Themselves," Journal of Consulting Psychology, Vol. XXXI, 6 (December, 1967), 583-87.



	• •
TABLE	2.2

DESCRIPTIVE PUPIL DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIORS FOR GRADE LEVELS 1-6, 7-9, and 10-12

Grades				
1-6	7-9	10-12		
Carelessness in work	Carelessness in work (-)	Carelessness in work (decreased in frequenty) (-)		
Inattention	Inattention (-)	Cheating (-)		
Cheating	Restlessness (+)	Smoking (-)		
	Whispering, note- writing (+)	Stealing (+)		
	Unexcused absences (+)	Unexcused absences (+)		
	Interrupting (+)	Swearing (+)		
		Drinking (+)		



and their fourteen female and twenty-six male teachers were asked to complete Wickman's questionnaire. The major findings were:

- Violations of classroom work and behavior requirements constituted 73 per cent of the problem behaviors which occurred in grades one-to-six.
- Violations of classroom work and behavior requirements constituted 77 per cent of the problem behaviors which occurred in grades seven-to-nine.
- Violations of classroom work and behavior requirements constituted 28 per cent of the problem behaviors which occurred in grades ten-to-twelve.

Another major finding summarized by Mutimer was:

. . . data indicates that most types of problem behavior varied in frequency from grade level to grade level. Such problem behavior as carelessness in work, inattention, lying, and vandalism decreased in frequency from grades one to six to ten to twelve. Other problem behaviors such as smoking, unexcused absences, stealing, swearing, drinking, and illicit sex activities increased in frequency from grades one to six to twelve. Still other problem behaviors such as restlessness, interrupting, smartness, whispering and notewriting, and disorderliness occurred most frequently in grades seven to hine.⁴³

⁴³Ibid., p. 354.



George Stouffer's⁴⁴ study of secondary school teachers and pupil disruptive behaviors treated grade lines in a more global manner: grades 7-12 were called secondary; grades 1-6 were labeled elementary. Stouffer's findings showed behavior problems considered most serious by secondary teachers to be more extroversive in nature. Specific forms of extroversive behaviors are: impertinence, destroying school material, interest in opposite sex, disobedience, profanity, and inquisitiveness. Withdrawing tendencies (shyness, sensitiveness, suspiciousness) were not noted by secondary teachers to be most serious. It is interesting to note that elementary and secondary teachers agreed on all but one of serious behaviors-destroying school materials. In this case, secondary teachers rated this more serious than elementary teachers.

To summarize Stouffer's study, the agreement by elementary and secondary teachers over pupil disruptive behaviors was likely due to their moral sensitivities being collectively violated and that maintaining an orderly classroom was necessary for establishing an environment for learning.

Sex of the Teacher

Stouffer's⁴⁵ finding, although limited, may provide preliminary information regarding sex of the teacher and

⁴⁴Stouffer, <u>op. cit</u>., pp. 271-85.

⁴⁵Ibid., pp. 271-85.



pupil disruptive behaviors. Seriousness of pupil disruptive behaviors identified by male teachers were compared to the total population used for this study. Stouffer believed that finding forms of pupil disruptive behaviors that groups of teachers considered "less serious" may provide a measure of a sex difference. The following "less serious pupil disruptive behaviors" were identified by male teachers.

- 1. Hetero sexual activity
- 2. Masturbation
- 3. Physical coward
- 4. Smoking
- 5. Impertinence, definance
- 6. Unrealiableness
- 7. Disobedience
- 8. Temper Tantrums

In reviewing the less serious pupil disruptive behaviors it can be found that they fall into three of Wickman's pupil disruptive behavior classifications-violations of general standards of morality and integrity, transgressions against authority, and violations of school work requirements. Although the data is limited, the cited pupil disruptive behaviors may not be important or serious to male teachers.



Sex of the Student

Eaton, D'Amico, and Phillips'⁴⁶ findings about sex of the student and occurance of disruptive behaviors is in agreement with Wickman⁴⁷ and Epstein.⁴⁸ There is agreement about the following findings: (1) more boys than girls were involved in every type of pupil disruptive behavior. Exceptions to this statement were high increases of frequency in smoking and illicit sex activities of girls. (2) the difference between boys and girls (in favor of boys) was greatest at the senior high level (10-12); the least amount of difference between boys and girls was at the junior high level. (3) disruptive behaviors equally distributed between boys and girls were carelessness in work, inattention, restlessness, and interruption. (4) disruptive behavior reached its peak for girls in grades 7-9 and boys in grades 10-12.

One study, however, contradicted Eaton, <u>et al</u>., and Epstein's findings. Hildreth's⁴⁹ data indicated a decrease in the percentage of male disruptive behaviors

⁴⁶Eaton, <u>op. cit</u>., pp. 350-57.

⁴⁷Wickman, <u>op. cit</u>.

⁴⁸Leon Epstein, "An Analysis of Teachers' Judgments of Problem Children," <u>The Journal of Genetic Psychology</u>, LIX (1941), 101-07.

⁴⁹Gertrude Hildreth, "A Survey of Problem Pupils," Journal of Educational Research, Vol. XVII (June, 1928), 1-14.



at the senior high level. This contradiction may be suspect as Hildreth's findings were based upon thirty-nine high school pupils of superior intelligence and economic background.

Summary

Reviewing the literature and research regarding pupil disruptive behaviors, four factors become apparent. First, little research about this topic has been undertaken since the 1950's. Second, the research on pupil disruptive behaviors completed to date has in a very limited way concerned itself with sex of the teacher, sex of the student, socioeconomic levels, years of teaching experience, subject matter areas, grade levels, school organizational patterns, community types, class size, and time spent with students. Third, research using the Wickman instrument of fifty pupil disruptive behaviors may be limited as the instrument was constructed and field tested in 1926. Fourth, research about the student teacher and specific pupil disruptive behaviors was most limited.

Major Findings Summarized

 Control techniques exerted by the teacher affected learning performances of classmates to the degree of the social power of the deviant being punished.



2. That teachers tended to be more concerned about controlling pupil disruptive behaviors that were related to the classroom work situation.

3. Aggressive pupil disruptive behaviors were reported more frequently. Inner directed behavior problems of students were subordinated by teachers to controlling pupil disruptive behaviors related to classwork.

4. The seriousness of pupil disruptive behaviors was largely viewed in the light of transgressions of the following types: immoralities, dishonesty, acts against authority. Violations against classroom order and school work were also viewed as being very serious. On the other hand, pupil disruptive behaviors that constituted withdrawal or recessive personality and behavior traits were considered by teachers the least serious.

5. Limited research showed: teachers with education beyond the bachelor's degree tended to look at pupil disruptive behaviors as being highly related to recessive personality behavior traits and withdrawal behaviors.

6. Black teachers were primarily concerned with pupil disruptive behaviors that were related to violations of orderliness in the classroom. White teachers tended to be primarily concerned with pupil disruptive behaviors that were related to immorality, dishonesty and acts against authority.



7. Pupil disruptive behaviors in the lower ranges of intelligence (70 I.Q.) tended to be physical and aggressive in nature. The pupil disruptive behaviors in the upper ranges of intelligence tended to be reflective of withdrawal and recessive behaviors.

 Disruptive pupil behaviors which would be violations of classroom work increased at each grade level until grades 10-12 at which time these misbehaviors noticeably changed.

9. Grades 1-6 tended to be characterized by pupil disruptive behaviors of carelessness in work, lying, inattention, vandalism (behaviors were violations of dishonesties and disorderliness in class work). Grades 7-9 tended to be characterized by pupil disruptive behaviors of restlessness, interruptions, smartness, whispering and notewriting, and disorderliness (behaviors were authority directed). Grades 10-12 tended to be characterized by pupil disruptive behaviors of smoking, unexcused absences, stealing, swearing, drinking, and illicit sex activities. (Behaviors were violations of moral codes.)

 Limited data indicated that male teachers were <u>least</u> concerned with violations against general standards of morality and integrity, transgressions against authority, and violations of school work requirements.



11. Male students were more involved in every type of pupil disruptive behaviors than girls. Girls significantly gained in the area of smoking and illicit sex activities.

12. Pupil disruptive behaviors reached the peak for girls in grades 7-9; boys reached their peak in grades 10-12. It might be pointed out that the "peaks" coincided with the periods of rapid physical growth and development of girls and boys.



CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGY

The Introduction

Described in this chapter are the population, the design, communication and contacts, data collection, the instrument, and the analysis.

The Population

The population used in this study were student teachers from Michigan State University's Elementary and Special Education Department and Secondary Education Departments. The students were assigned by the Office of Student Teaching to student teaching during the 1969 Spring term. No sampling procedures were undertaken as the total student teacher population was used. It was decided that the total student teaching population was needed to provide an adequate sampling per background data area.

Student teachers assigned by Michigan State University's Office of Student Teaching usually are in their junior or senior year of college, and must also meet the following requirements ". . . must have at least 105



credits, a 2.0 all-college grade point average, a 2.0 average in the pre-student teaching education courses, a 2.0 average in the pre-student teaching education courses, a 2.0 average in the University college courses, a 2.0 average in . . . major field of study."¹ An additional screening device consists of obtaining approval by the University Health Service, by the Office of the Dean of Students, or by the faculty in the department of the student's teaching major.² These were the only entrance controls placed upon the population which was used for this survey.

Figures obtained from the Office of Student Teaching at Michigan State University in April of 1969 showed the breakdown on the following page of student teachers assigned for student teaching during the Spring term.³

The final totals of student teachers in this study varied from the totals indicated in Table 3.1 because of the following reasons:

²Hugo J. David, ed., <u>Handbook for Student Teachers</u>, <u>Michigan State University</u> (Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Book Company, 1964), p. 1.

³Figures obtained from Student Teaching Office, May, 1969.

¹Student Teaching: Questions and Answers for <u>Prospective Student Teachers</u> (East Lansing, Mich.: Michigan State University, College of Education, Student Teaching Office), pp. 3-4.



TABLE 3.1

STUDENT TEACHERS ASSIGNED BY MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY SPRING TERM 1969

Elementary Student Teachers	Special Education Student Teachers	Secondar Studer	y Education t Teachers
288	45	334	
		Totals	667

- Some student teachers may have withdrawn or have been dropped from student teaching by the final week of the experience.
- Some student teachers did not complete all the necessary pages of the questionnaire; these students were withdrawn from the study.

The Design

The design, which was descriptive in nature, called for the completion of a three-page questionnaire which contained sixty-six specific pupil disruptive behaviors and eleven personal background variables.* Questionnaires were administered by the college supervisors of the Michigan State University Student Teaching Centers to all student teachers at the final seminar in the Spring term. Each questionnaire was collected by the college supervisors and returned to the Office of Student Teaching at Michigan State University.

*See Appendix B.



Communication and Contacts

Initial formal permission was obtained from the Basic Program Council, a committee in the College of Education who function to screen, approve or reject research projects which would necessitate the use of any college student population.

After receiving permission to continue the study, a meeting was held with Dr. Henry Kennedy, Director of Student Teaching at Michigan State University to discuss the study, procedures for circulating, administering, and receiving the questionnaire. At this meeting, it was decided that there would be no necessity for a general orientation with the college supervisors as each supervisor was familiar with both the nature of the project and method of administering the questionnaire. The familiarity with the questionnaire was due to the participation of the supervisors in the similar project conducted in the 1968 Fall term by the Learning Systems Institute and College of Education.

It was agreed by the Office of Student Teaching to circulate the packets of questionnaires and related materials to each of the supervisors two weeks prior to the projected date of administration. The only contact with the supervisors was through letters of introduction containing the statement of purpose of the project, directions for administering and returning the



questionnaires, and sample copies of the questionnaire.* It would, however, be suggested that in a similar project where individuals administering the questionnaires have not received necessary background and other forms of instruction from the researcher, that careful attention be given to this aspect of the project as professional cooperation and enlightenment about the nature of a project is a vital component to its fruition.

Data Collection

A separate master list was kept which contained the Student Teaching Centers, the names of the college supervisors for each center, the names of each student teacher assigned to each center, and finally, the name of each school district, school, and supervising teacher.

A complete packet of materials was prepared for each student teacher. The packet contained a letter to the student teacher explaining the project and requesting his cooperation, questionnaire directions, and the three page questionnaire.**

On the outside and in the upper right hand corner of each packet a number and letter was assigned. The number on the packet corresponded to a similar number that represented a specific Student Teaching Center on the

^{*}See Appendix A and B.

^{**}See Appendix A and B.



master list. This aided in identifying the questionnaire with a specific Student Teaching Center. The letter assigned identified a specific public school in the Student Teacher Center.

Each college supervisor received a bundle of packets--one packet for each student teacher in the Center. The bundle of packets was forwarded two weeks prior to the actual date of administration.

It was agreed that the questionnaire would be administered once during the last seminar meeting held at the end of the student's student teaching experience. Upon completion of the questionnaire by the student teacher, the questionnaires were collected, checked, and placed in one bundle and returned to the Student Teaching Office. Each bundle of packets submitted to the Student Teaching Office was collected and tallied on the master list.

An identification system was used to keep each respondent's responses together. In the upper right hand corner of each page of the questionnaire, a code was assigned to the respondent in the manner shown on the following page.

> The top box was assigned any number, one through four if the form was red; any number five through nine if the form was green. It is important to remember that there were two forms.





- The second, third and fourth box from the top was assigned a sequence number which served to identify each subject's responses.
- The bottom box was allocated to identify the specific page of the questionnaire. The letter A, B, C was entered in the box which served to identify the specific page of either form.

The following is a review description of each page (A, B, C) of the questionnaire.

- A = The page of the questionnaire which had one through thirty-six pupil disruptive behaviors.
- B = The page of the questionnaire which had thirty-seven through sixty-six pupil disruptive behaviors.
- C = The page of the questionnaire which had the Background Data.

The "Background Data" areas of highest educational level completed, respondent's age, and number of years of


teaching experience were dropped for the student teacher study. The reason for dropping these areas was that they were not generally applicable to the student teaching population. One area was, however, added in place of the highest educational level: school districts, classified according to population and economic focal point. Five district classifications were substituted for five educational levels. This was accomplished by a secretary marking each respondent's district classification on the Background Data sheet.

Table 3.2 shows the percentage of .82 student teachers responded to the one administration of the questionnaire. There was no attempt to undertake the follow-up study of non-respondents or to increase the percentage of respondents by sending out further questionnaires. Because most student teachers attended the last seminar meeting, it was assumed that a representative number of respondents would be ascertained for completion of the study.

The Instrument

The survey instrument for this study was formulated by Learning Systems Institute for their study of pupil disruptive behaviors perceived by public school teachers. The instrument consisted of two forms (red-green)--each having three pages. The first page requested information regarding eleven demographic variables; the second and



TABLE	3.2	

PER CENT OF STUDENT TEACHERS RESPONDING TO OUESTIONNAIRE

Student Teaching Center	Questionnaires Sent	Questionnaires Received	Per Cent Returned
1	29	29	1.00
2	17	14	.82
3	20	17	.85
4	63	35	.56
5	44	41	.93
6	29	0	.00
7	24	22	.92
8	57	48	.84
9	23	18	.78
10	35	28	.80
11	42	38	.91
12	20	18	.90
13	69	55	.78
14	18	15	.83
15	54	51	.94
16	12	12	1.00
17	96	85	.89
18	12	11	.92
	Total 664	537	.82

Per Cent of Questionnaire Returned .82



third pages have sixty-six pupil disruptive behaviors written in behavioral statements. The respondent was expected to read each pupil disruptive behavior and answer the following two questions about the behavior:

- How often do you encounter this behavior? This question was rated on a six point scale-hourly to never.
- How do you perceive this behavior? This question was rated on a five point scale ranging from extremely serious to harmless.

In 1968 Learning Systems Institute of Michigan

State University at the request of the Michigan Education Association conducted a workshop on "Discipline." Discipline had been identified by the Michigan Education Association as a prime problem area for new as well as experienced classroom teachers. In an effort to focus the workshop topics a questionnaire was designed by Learning Systems Institute. It was approved and administered to classroom teachers by the Michigan Education Association. The guestionnaire requested teachers to check and write in pupil disruptive behaviors that gave them the most difficulty. As a result of the enthusiasm and interest generated in the "Discipline Workshop," Dr. Judith Henderson and Dr. Ted Word of Learning Systems Institute of Michigan State University decided that this problem should be considered in a more systematic and comprehensive manner.



The next phase decided upon was to adopt the pupil isruptive behaviors already identified by the workshop articipants and expand them to be more inclusive of lassroom disruptive behaviors that would occur in lassrooms of the public schools. Interviews were held ith all levels of beginning and experienced classroom eachers, graduate students of Michigan State University ith successful public school classroom teaching experince, and curriculum consultants. From the results of he interviews another questionnaire was constructed. here were 180 specific pupil disruptive behaviors which ere identified.

From this step directions were written and items ere eliminated if they overlapped and were ambiguous. his completed, the pupil disruptive behaviors now totaled 40. Four questions were posed per item. This specific uestionnaire was submitted to a group of graduate ssistants from Michigan State University who responded s if they were members of the sample. They were interiewed individually for item ambiguity. Changes were made n the survey based upon the graduate assistants recommendations.

The next phase consisted of administering the evised instrument to 180 teachers from the Lansing ublic Schools. Included with this phase was a fifteen tem background data sheet. As a result of this pilot



y three major changes were made: (1) it was decided to the survey into two forms (red-green) because the required to respond to the entire survey would likely ourage co-operation. The red and green forms shall after be referred to as Form One and Form Two;* (2) ections were clarified; (3) the number of questions ed about each behavioral item was reduced from four to . This was done because two of the questions were not criminating between items. The questions per item e identified with the <u>frequency</u> of pupil disruptive aviors and the <u>seriousness</u> of pupil disruptive beiors.

One major weakness of the questionnaire was related the limitation of the number of pupil disruptive beviors that the respondent may react to. The questiontre, because of the limited choice of pupil disruptive haviors, could act as an inhibitor towards ascertaining multiplicity of other pupil disruptive behaviors that e real to a student teacher. The interpretation and alysis of data must be kept within the bounds of only e 132 pupil disruptive that appear on the instruments. here may be many more behaviors of equal importance that o not appear on the final version of the questionnaires.

^{*}Please note that the questionnaire now shall be dentified as Form One and Form Two.



Analysis

The analysis of variance-repeated measures design seed to analyze the significant background data pendent variables) and pupil disruptive behaviors indent variables). The analysis of variance yielded a effect F score which was used to judge the acceptacy of the stated hypothesis. An interaction F score of independent variables and one dependent variable was used to further interpret the main effect. The ication of items F score indicated the manner in which wondents marked the items.

The level of significance for testing the null otheses was established at .01.

To identify the specific pupil disruptive behaviors t student teachers perceived to be most frequent and rious an MD STAT ROUTINE developed by the Agricultural perimental Station of Michigan State University was used. a score of main interest for this analysis was the mean ores.

Summary

The survey instrument which contained 132 specific orms of pupil disruptive behaviors was administered to the otal population of 664 Michigan State University student eachers during the Spring semester of 1969. The two surposes of this exploratory study were: (1) to examine supil disruptive behaviors and their relationship to seven



lependent variables, and (2) to identify the frequency I seriousness of pupil disruptive behaviors as perceived student teachers. To accomplish the statistical amination of purpose one, an analysis of variancepeated measures design was used. To accomplish the atistical examination of purpose two, mean scores were mputed for each pupil disruptive behavior.



CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS

Frequency of Pupil Disruptive Behavior Analysis

This chapter was organized into two major sections. This chapter was organized into two major sections.

Purpose one was: to examine the relationship of ex of the student teacher, socio-economic level of the chools as perceived by the student teacher, size of Lasses taught by the student teacher, classes taught by ne student teacher all day, special education classes aught by the student teacher, team teaching of which the tudent teacher is a member, and school types identified γ the Michigan Department of Education to 132 specific perms of pupil disruptive behaviors.

Purpose two was: to identify the pupil disruptive ehaviors that student teachers perceive to be most requent and serious.

Under purpose one, fourteen hypotheses were xamined. Each hypothesis was analyzed in light of (1) he dimensions--frequency and seriousness, (2) the specific uestionnaire--Form One and Form Two.



Under purpose two no hypotheses were posited as is area was designed for exploration.

The level of significance was established at .01.

The analyses that follow are all related to purpose e which was to: examine the relationship <u>of</u> sex of the udent teacher, socio-economic level of the schools as rceived by the student teacher, size of classes taught by e student teacher, classes taught by the student teacher l day, special education classes taught by the student acher, team teaching of which the student teacher is a mber, and school types identified by the Michigan Deartment of Education <u>to</u> 132 specific forms of pupil dis-

pothesis 1 Relating to Sex Student Teacher

There will be no significant difference between the udent teachers perceived frequency of pupil disruptive haviors and the sex of the student teacher.

The initial analysis of sex of the student teacher ad its relationship to the <u>frequency</u> of pupil disruptive shaviors (Table 4.1) was presented in greater detail to covide the reader with a base to understand the analyses hat are to follow.

Another way of presenting Table 4.1 can be found in Igure 3. The sex of the student teacher which has two ategories (male-female) will be used for the analysis.



ΤА	BI	ьE	4	.1	

field.					
irce	SS	df	MS	F	Р
oups	18.0551	1	18.0551	1.2812	N.S.
ms	11098.0154	65	170.7387	207.1357	>.01
ups					
Items or	205.4350 14894.8185	65 18070	3.1605 0.8243	3.8343	>.01

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BY SEX OF STUDENT TEACHER (FREQUENCY) FORM ONE

(Pupil	Disru	ptancies)
--------	-------	-----------

ms	1					66				
9	мl	м ²	м ³	м4	м ⁵	м ⁶ -	→Mean	Score	Across	Items
ale	мl	м ²	м ³	м4	м ⁵	м ⁶ —	⇒ Mean	Score	Across	Items
n Mean	Im	Im	Im	Si → It (n	igni cem nale	fica 1, 2 -fem	nce of , etc. ale)	Means and ca	Betweer	<u>n</u> es

Item 1, 2, etc. and categories (male-female)

re 3.--Organizational chart for main effect analysis of sex of the student teacher



From Table 4.1 the <u>main effect</u>, a statistical measure to determine the significance or non-significance of the null hypothesis, is labeled <u>groups</u>. The score of main concern was the F ratio. In this case the F ratio was 1.2812. When 1.2812 was computed from tables designed to show significance levels it was found <u>not to be significant</u> <u>at the .01 level</u>. The null hypothesis <u>failed to be</u> rejected.

To enterpret this finding and others to follow, the following figure may aid the reader. The main effect, it should be remembered, tests the significance between group means when all the means for each item are tabulated and an overall mean arrived at for all items. Each category (male-female) had a total mean score for all items. The researcher was testing the significance of the relationship of means. In short, how did male and female student teachers react to the questionnaire in its entirety? Another way of posing the above question is: Could one determine from the totals of item mean scores who was responding to the questionnaire? In this case, the answer to both questions was no as the F ratio of 1.2812 was not significant at the .01 confidence level. Figure 4 which shows just the main effect analysis would look like the figure on the following page.

The <u>second</u> area of primary importance on Table 4.1 was the Groups by Items. Again, the score of main interest





Figure 4.--Main effect analysis of sex of the student teacher and pupil disruptive behaviors

was the F ratio. In this case the F ratio was 3.8343. When computed to determine significance it was found to be significant at the .01 level.

To enterpret this finding and subsequent <u>Groups by</u> <u>Items</u>, Figure 5 may be of assistance. The <u>Groups by Items</u> tests the <u>interaction</u> of each specific pupil disruptive behavior and category (male-female). Group means for <u>each</u> item from the male and female categories were compared for the significance of their relationship. In this case, the <u>interaction</u> of items and the <u>independent</u> categories of male and female was significant at the .01 level.

The emphasis of the <u>Groups by Items</u> (<u>Interaction</u>) score is less gobal than the <u>main effect</u> score; it is geared to diagnose each item on an individual basis. The enterpretation of the above finding (<u>significant inter</u>action effect of sex categories and items) would be as





*Scores of interest are the group category mean scores for each item. A total mean score was computed (Mi--Mean interaction) to test for significant male and female responses to each individual item.

Figure 5.--Diagram of interaction analysis of sex of the student teacher and pupil disruptive behaviors

follows: that items, when considered individually, are responded to differently by sex of the student teachers. Apparently, the frequency of <u>individual</u> pupil disruptive behaviors are perceived differently by each sex. This analysis did not indicate, however, which specific pupil disruptive behaviors were related to the sex of the student teacher. It can be ascerted that the <u>Form One</u> <u>frequency</u> analysis significate interaction F ratio indicated that male and female student teachers responded in a significant manner to the items.

The <u>third</u> score reported on Table 4.1 was labeled "Items." For this analysis the score of interest was the



F ratio 207.1357 which was significant at the .01 level. A narrative explanation of the "Items" score will suffice for this area of analysis. Essentially, the "Items" analyzes how the respondents are replying to the items of the questionnaire. The analysis seeks to indicate whether the responses are all alike, nearly all alike or spread over the number of choices open to the respondent. In this case the "Items" or Replication Effect is significant at .01 confidence level. This indicated that the items were responded to by both male and female student teachers in a manner that showed a spread of choices over the frequency dimensions of: Hourly, Daily, Weekly, Seldom and Never. In short, the questionnaire's items and dimensions were causing each student teacher to react differently. The importance of the significant replication effects was that it supports or furthers the power of a main effect or interaction analysis. In this case, as an example, the respondents as a group were not all replying to the items in the same manner.

The following analyses will not have the thoroughness of <u>Frequency</u>-Form One (Table 4.1) as the intent was to provide a base for the reader to enterpret the ensuing analyses.

When <u>frequency</u> of pupil disruptive behaviors was considered from Form Two (Table 2.2), the null hypothesis was rejected at the .01 level. Form Two frequency



ΤА	BLE	4	.2	

Source	SS	df	MS	F	Р
Groups Error	69.2444 2012.8702	1 240	69.2440 8.3870	8.2562	>.01
Items	6614.1621	65	101.7563	134.7103	>.01
Groups by Items Error	371.0894 11783.7993	65 15600	5.7091 0.7554	7.5580	>.01

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BY SEX OF STUDENT TEACHER (FREQUENCY) FORM TWO

analysis showed that female and male student teachers as a group responded significantly different to pupil disruptive behaviors when considered across items. When the interaction of items upon female and male student teachers was considered, the above analysis was further supported at the .01 level. Again, the significance level of .01 of the replication of items showed a variability in the way the respondents marked the frequency of each item on Form Two.

Hypothesis 2 Relating to Class Size

There will be no significant difference between the student teachers' perceived <u>frequency</u> of pupil disruptive behaviors and the size of the class taught by the student teacher.

When the analysis of variance was completed on Form One (Table 4.3) for the enrollment of classes and frequency of pupil disruptive behaviors, the main effect



TABLE 4.3

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
Groups Error	109.2247 3825.9850	5 273	21.8449 14.0146	1.5587	N.S.
Items	11067.8525	65	170.2747	207.4102	>.01
Groups by Items Error	473.1156 14567.8647	325 17745	1.4557 0.8210	1.7732	>.01

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BY CLASS SIZE (FREQUENCY) FORM ONE

of groups showed no significance. Thus, the null hypothesis <u>failed to be rejected</u>. Turning attention to the interaction of the items upon the class sizes, there was significance at the .01 level. This suggested that the class sizes of 10 and under, 11-16, 17-20, 21-27, 28-34 and over 34 when considered jointly with items differ significantly. The replication of items indicated an F ratio of 207.4102 which was significant at the .01 level. Items were responded to by student teachers of varying class sizes in different ways.

When Form Two (Table 4.4) was examined in light of frequency of pupil disruptive behaviors and class size an F ratio of 0.7297 was arrived at for the main effects. This was not significant. Thus, the null hypothesis <u>failed</u> to be rejected at the .01 level. When the sixty-six disruptive behaviors were interacted with the varying class sizes a significant F ratio of 1.9071 was reached. This



ΤА	B	LE	- 4	•	4
----	----------	----	-----	---	---

Source	SS	df	MS	F	Р
Groups Error	31.6841 2049.5613	5 236	6.3368 8.6846	0.7297	N.S.
Items	6613.4651	65	101.7456	133.5895	>.01
Groups by Items Error	472.0709 11683.3855	325 15340	1.4525 0.76163	1.9071	>.01

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BY CLASS SIZE (FREQUENCY) FORM TWO

indicated, however, that the frequency of items varied from one class size to another. Again, the replication of items F ratio 133.5895 was significant at the .01 level.

Hypothesis 3 Relating to Schools of Varying Economic Status

There will be no significant difference between the student teachers' perceived <u>frequency</u> of pupil disruptive behaviors occurring in schools which a majority of pupils are viewed by the student teacher as being from the lower, middle, and upper socio-economic levels.

When Form One (Table 4.5) lower, middle, and upper socio-economic means were viewed across the sixty-six pupil disruptive behaviors the null hypothesis <u>failed to be</u> <u>rejected</u> at the .01 level. When the lower, middle, and upper socio-economic areas were interacted with the items a significant F ratio of 2.1442 was obtained. This pointed out that although there was no significant difference in



TABLE	4		5	
-------	---	--	---	--

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
Groups	77.7083	2	38.8542	2.7896	N.S.
Error	3858.1115	277	13.9282	• •	
Items	11098.8408	65	170.7514	206.7527	>.01
Groups					
by Items	230.2130	130	1.7709	2.1442	>.01
Error	14869.8374	18005	0.8259		

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BY PERCEIVED SCHOOLS OF VARYING SOCIAL, ECONOMIC STATUS (FREOUENCY) FORM TWO

the means of the socio-economic levels when considered in isolation that significance did exist when the levels were interacted with the items. Replication of items showed an F ratio of 206.7527 which was significant at the .01 level. Student teachers from the lower, middle, and upper socioeconomic levels discriminated among the items.

Form Two (Table 4.6) analysis of variance of social economic levels showed a main effect F ratio of 9.6098 which was significant at the .01 level. The null hypothesis <u>was rejected</u>. The interaction of independent variables upon items showed an F ratio of 1.9637 which was significant at the .01 level. The strength of the rejection of the hypothesis was increased when items responded to by student teachers in differing socio-economic levels reflected an F ratio of 131.4780 which was significant at the .01 level.


Source SS df MS F Ρ 155.0429 2 77.5215 9.6098 >.01 Groups Error 1919.9373 238 8.0670 . . Items 6589.3048 65 101.3739 131.4780 >.01 Groups by Items 196.8284 130 1.5141 1.9637 >.01 11927.8905 15470 0.7710 Error . .

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BY PERCEIVED SCHOOLS OF VARYING SOCIAL, ECONOMIC STATUS (FREQUENCY) FORM TWO

Hypothesis 4 Relating to Special Education

There will be no significant difference in the student teachers' perceived <u>frequency</u> of pupil disruptive behaviors in special education classes and non-special education classes.

TABLE 4.7

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BY SPECIAL EDUCATION (FREQUENCY) FORM ONE

Source	SS	df	MS	F	Р
Groups Error	34.6114 3900.9583	1 278	34.6114 14.0322	2.4666	N.S.
Items	11099.1575	65	170.7563	207.1011	>.01
Groups by Items Error	201.0622 14898.8370	65 18070	3.0933 0.8245	3.7517	>.01



Analysis of Form One (Table 4.7) for the special education hypothesis indicated a main effect F ratio of 2.4666 which was not significant. The null hypothesis <u>failed to be rejected</u>. Further analysis indicated a group interaction of special education and non-special education student teachers and items. An F ratio of 3.7517 was obtained. This was significant at the .01 level. This indicated that special education and non-special education student teachers have specific forms of pupil disruptive behaviors that differ. An examination of items showed that student teachers responded differently to the items.

ΓA	BJ	LE	4	•	8
1 1	101		-	٠	0

Source	SS	df	MS	F	Р
Groups	1 7/35	1	1 7/25	0 2012	NC
Error	2079.4911	240	8.6646	• •	N.D.
Items	6613.5166	65	101.7464	133.1172	>.01
Groups					
by Items	231.7531	65	3.5654	4.6647	>.01
Error	11923.6604	15600	0.7643	• •	

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BY SPECIAL EDUCATION (FREQUENCY) FORM TWO

Form Two (Table 4.8) analysis indicated an F ratio for main effect of 0.2012. This was not significant. The null hypothesis <u>failed to be rejected</u>. When special education teachers were interacted with items an F ratio of 4.6647 was obtained. This was significant. Although

72



student teachers in groups did not significantly differ, the interaction suggested that individual items yielded significant differences. A replication F value of 133.1172 was significant at .01 level which indicated that student teachers were not marking the pupil disruptancies in the same manner.

Hypothesis 5 Relating to Team Teaching

There will be no significant difference in the student teachers' perceived <u>frequency</u> of pupil disruptive behaviors occurring in team teaching and non-team teaching situations.

TABLE 4.9

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
Groups Error	109.1025 3827.5368	1 278	109.1025 13.7681	7.9243	>.01
Items	11097.5399	65	170.7314	205.3954	>.01
Groups by Items Error	78.7329 15020.3745	65 18070	1.2113 0.8312	1.4572	N.S.

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BY TEAM TEACHING (FREQUENCY) FORM ONE

Form One (Table 4.9) <u>frequency</u> analysis of student teachers who were in team teaching and non-team teaching situations showed a significant F ratio of 7.9243. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected at the .01 level. Further



analysis of interaction of items and the two independent variables indicated a non-significant F ratio. This suggested that the subjects were not responding significantly to each item. The non-significant F ratio offered some question as to the credence of the rejected null hypothesis. The replication of items ratio which was significant showed that the respondents were responding in a different fashion to each publi disruptive behavior.

TABLE 4.10

Source	SS	df	MS	F	Р			
Groups Error	21.5734 2059.7996	1 240	21.5734 8.5825	2.5137	N.S.			
Items	6613.8429	65	101.7514	131.0642	>.01			
Groups by Items Error	44.2582 12111.0247	65 15600	0.68090 0.7764	0.8771	N.S.			

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BY TEAM TEACHING (FREQUENCY) FORM TWO

Form Two (Table 4.10) main effect of student teachers who were in team teaching and non-team teaching situations yielded an F ratio of 2.5137 which was not significant. The null hypothesis <u>failed to be rejected</u>. The support of the above finding was furthered by a nonsignificant F ratio for groups by items. Apparently, team teaching and non-team teaching situations and frequency of pupil disruptive behaviors vield no significant



differences. The replication of items was significant at the .01 level. This indicated that the respondents were not marking the items all in one dimension.

Hypothesis 6 Relating to Teaching Same Group All Day

There will be no significant difference in the student teachers' perceived <u>frequency</u> of pupil disruptive behaviors occurring in classes they are with all day and classes they are not with all day.

TABLE 4.11

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR TEACHING SAME GROUP ALL DAY (FREQUENCY) FORM ONE

Source	SS	df	MS	F	Р
Groups Error	6.5589 3938.0509	1 278	6.5589 14.1297	0.4642	N.S.
Items	11099.9693	65	170.7688	208.7895	>.01
Groups by Items Error	322.1405 14779.4406	65 18070	4.9560 0.8179	6.0594	>.01

Form One (Table 4.11) <u>frequency</u> analysis of student teachers who were with classes all day and those who were not showed a non-significant F ratio of 0.4642. Thus, the null hypothesis <u>failed to be rejected</u>. Further analysis indicated a significant interaction effect of 6.0594. This indicated that student teachers significantly responded to items when the two independent variables were



interacted. A replication of item F value (208.7895 was significant at the .01 level) which suggested that the student teachers responded to the items in differing degrees.

TABLE 4.12

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR TEACHING SAME GROUP ALL DAY (FREQUENCY) FORM TWO

Source	SS	df	MS	F	Р
Groups	50,2909	1	50.2909	5,9402	N.S.
Error	2031.8775	240	8.4662		
Items	6613.5315	65	101.7466	136.9778	>.01
Groups					
by Items	567.6106	65	8.7325	11.7562	>.01
Error	11587.6308	15600	0.7428		

Form Two (Table 4.12) main effect of student teachers who were with classes all day and those who were not yielded an F ratio of 5.9402 which was not significant. The hypothesis <u>failed to be rejected</u>. Although the main effect was not significant, interaction of groups by individual items showed an F ratio of 11.7562 which was significant at the .01 level. Again, individual pupil disruptive behaviors apparently were significant when interaction was considered rather than means across items. The significant replication analysis F ratio of 136.9778 further strengthened the interaction results.



Hypothesis 7 Relating to Population and Economic Focal Point

There will be no significant difference in the student teachers' perceived <u>frequency</u> of pupil disruptive behaviors occurring in schools classified by the Michigan State Board of Education according to the degree of cultural and economic deprivation.

TABLE 4.13

Source	SS	df	MS	F	Р	
Groups	106.7981	4	26.6995	1.9105	N.S.	
Error	3829.1745	274	13.9751	۰.		
Items	11065.8053	65	170.2432	204.8254	>.01	
Groups						
by Items	238.0553	260	0.9156	1.1016	>.01	
Error	14802.9997	17810	0.8312	• •		

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SCHOOLS CLASSIFIED BY POPULATION AND ECONOMIC FOCAL POINT (FREQUENCY) FORM ONE

Form One (Table 4.13) main effect analysis indicated an F ratio of 1.9105 which was not significant. The null hypothesis <u>failed to be rejected</u>. Interaction of the five levels of school types upon each item yielded a significant F ratio of 1.106. Student teachers in each of the five levels of schools perceived significant specific forms of pupil disruptive behaviors. This was further supported by a replication F value of 204.8254 which was significant at the .01 level.



Source	SS	df	MS	F	Р
Groups	9.8589	4	2.4647	0.2821	N.S.
Error	2070.4804	237	8.7362		
Items	6613.7664	65	101.7503	131.1379	>.01
Groups					
by Items	204.0342	260	0.7848	1.0114	>.01
Error	11952.7818	15405	0.7759	• •	

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SCHOOLS CLASSIFIED BY POPULATION AND ECONOMIC FOCAL POINT (FREQUENCY) FORM TWO

Frequency of pupil disruptive behaviors (Table 4.14) occurring across each of the five levels of school types yielded individual means with a non-significant F ratio of 0.2821. The null hypothesis <u>failed to be rejected</u>. Interaction of the five levels of school types upon each item showed a significant F ratio of 1.0114. There were specific forms of pupil disruptive behaviors that were significant when different levels of schools were interacted with the specific forms of pupil disruptive behavior. Again, the replication of items F ratio (131.1379) was significant at the .01 level. This suggested that student teachers in each level were responding differently to the specific forms of pupil disruptive behavior.



Seriousness of Pupil Disruptive Behavior Analysis

Hypothesis 1 Relating to Sex of Student Teacher

There will be no significant difference in the perceived <u>seriousness</u> of pupil disruptive behaviors and sex of the student teacher.

TABLE 4.15

Source	SS	df	MS	F	Р
Groups	1 0030		1 0030	0 1169	NS
Error	2385.6088	278	8.5813	• •	N.D.
Items	6932.9885	65	106.6614	190.7628	>.01
Groups by Items	99.4394	65	1,5300	2,7361	>.01
Error	10103.4942	18070	0.5591		

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BY SEX OF STUDENT TEACHER (SERIOUSNESS) FORM ONE

Form One (Table 4.15) showed the main effect of sex upon <u>seriousness</u> of pupil disruptive behaviors as not significant. The hypothesis <u>failed to be rejected</u>. Upon further examination of the results, interaction of sex (male-female) upon the items indicated an F ratio 207.1357 which was significant at the .01 level. This suggested that while sex across all items was not a significant factor that sex interacted with each pupil disruptive behavior was. When the items were considered for replication, a significant F ratio of 207.1357 was obtained.



This gave more support to the interaction significance in that student teachers of each sex were marking each item in a different manner.

TABLE 4.16

Source	SS	df	MS	F	Р
Groups Error	13.4217 2048.8771	1 240	13.4217 8.5370	1.5722	N.S.
Items	5130.7664	65	78.9349	120.8136	>.01
Groups by Items Error	77.9569 10192.4288	65 15600	1.1993 0.6533	1.8356	>.01

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BY SEX OF STUDENT TEACHER (SERIOUSNESS) FORM TWO

Form Two (Table 4.16) indicated that the main effect of sex across all of the items was not significant. The F ratio for groups across items was 1.5722. The null hypothesis <u>failed to be rejected</u>. The interaction of sex upon each item was significant as the F ratio is 1.8356. The replication F ratio for items of 120.8136 was significant. This indicated that both sexes were responding differently to each of the pupil disruptive behaviors.

Hypothesis 2 Relating to Class Size

There will be no significant difference in the perceived <u>seriousness</u> of pupil disruptive behaviors and the size of the class taught by the student teacher.



Source	SS	df	MS	F	Р
Groups	57.2487	5	11.4498	1.3496	N.S.
Error	2316.0543	273	8.4837		
Items	6903.2972	65	106.2046	189.3427	>.01
Groups					
by Items	220.2029	325	0.6779	1.2085	>.01
Error	9953.3803	17745	0.5609		

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BY CLASS SIZE (SERIOUSNESS) FORM ONE

Form One (Table 4.17) analysis of class size and pupil disruptive behaviors yielded an F ratio of 1.3496 which was not significant. Thus, the null hypothesis <u>failed to be rejected</u>. The interaction of varying class sizes upon each item showed a significant F ratio of 1.2085. This indicated that class sizes of 10 and under, 11-16, 17-20, 21-27, 28-34 and over 34 have specific forms of pupil disruptive behavior that differ. The replication of items revealed a 189.3427 F ratio which was significant at the .01 level. Items were responded to by student teachers of varying class sizes in different ways.

Form Two (Table 4.18) examined in light of the <u>seriousness</u> of pupil disruptive behaviors and class size showed an F ratio of 1.1151 which was not significant. The null hypothesis <u>failed to be rejected</u>. Again, the interaction F ratio of 1.1701 indicated that class sizes do have specific forms of pupil disruptive behaviors that



Source	SS	df	MS	F	Р
Groups Error	47.5898 2014.4446	5 236	9.5180 8.5358	1.1151	N.S.
Items	5131.1031	65	78.9401	120.8175	>.01
Groups by Items Error	248.4744 10022.8894	325 15340	0.7645 0.6534	1.1701	>.01

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BY CLASS SIZE (SERIOUSNESS) FORM TWO

are different. The replication F ratio of 133.5898 was significant at the .01 level. This showed that student teachers from the different class sizes responded to the pupil disruptive behaviors in different ways.

Hypothesis 3 Relating to Schools of Varying Economic Status

There will be no significant difference in the perceived <u>seriousness</u> of pupil disruptive behaviors occurring in schools which a majority of pupils are viewed by the student teacher as being from the lower, middle, and upper socio-economic levels.

Form One (Table 4.19) analysis of <u>seriousness</u> of pupil disruptive behaviors in lower, middle, and upper socio-economic schools reflected a main effect F ratio of 0.6634. Because the F ratio was not significant, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected. The interaction of



. 1	.9
	• 1

Source	SS	df	MS	F	Р
Groups Error	11.3734 2374.6234	2 277	5.6867 8.5727	0.6634	N.S.
Items	6932.5822	65	106.6511	189.7045	>.01
Groups by Items Error	80.7666 10122.7210	130 18005	0.6213 0.5622	1.1051	>.01

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BY PERCEIVED SCHOOLS OF VARYING SOCIAL, ECONOMIC STATUS (SERIOUSNESS) FORM ONE

independent categories (lower, middle, and upper socioeconomic levels) upon each item related a significant F ratio of 1.1051. This suggested that while there was no significant relationship of main effect that in the specific pupil disruptive behaviors there was significant relationship of the three categories within the socioeconomic independent variable. When the subjects responding to the socio-economic levels were measured, a significant F ratio of 189.7045 was reached. This ratio reflected that subjects marked each of the sixty-six items discriminately. This added further support to the meaning of the interaction measure.

Form Two (Table 4.20) analysis of <u>seriousness</u> of pupil disruptive behaviors in lower, middle, and upper socio-economic schools showed a main effect F ratio of 0.1106. The F ratio was not significant. The null



Source	SS	df	MS	F	Р
Groups Error	1.9149 2060.1076	2 238	0.9575 8.6559	0.1106	N.S.
Items	5094.0199	65	78.3695	119.9655	>.01
Groups by Items Error	118.7553 10106.0480	130 15470	0.91350 0.6533	1.3984	>.01

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BY PERCEIVED SCHOOLS OF VARYING SOCIAL, ECONOMIC STATUS (SERIOUSNESS) FORM TWO

hypothesis <u>failed to be rejected</u>. The interaction of independent categories (lower, middle, and upper socioeconomic levels) upon each item related a significant F ratio of 1.3984. This made a clear-cut interpretation of the null hypothesis more difficult. The significant interaction suggested that the specific pupil disruptive behaviors when interacted with the three categories of socio-economic levels yielded a significant relationship. There were specific pupil disruptancies which were significant to each of the three categories of socio-economic levels. Further support of this analysis was ascertained when the replication F ratio of 119.9655 was significant at the .01 level.



Hypothesis 4 Relating to Special Education

There will be no significant difference in the student teachers' perceived <u>seriousness</u> of pupil disruptive behaviors occurring in special education classes and nonspecial education classes.

TABLE 4.21

Source	SS	df	MS	F	Р
Groups Error	4.8889 2381.6942	1 278	4.8889 8.5673	0.5707	N.S.
Items	6933.1830	65	106.6644	189.8838	>.01
Groups by Items Error	52.3762 10150.5478	65 18070	0.8058 0.5617	1.4345	>.01

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BY SPECIAL EDUCATION (SERIOUSNESS) FORM ONE

Form One (Table 4.21) analysis of <u>seriousness</u> of pupil disruptive behaviors in special education and nonspecial education classes related a main effect F ratio of 0.5707 which was not significant. The null hypothesis <u>failed to be rejected</u>. The interaction of independent categories and each item (pupil disruptive behaviors) indicated a significant F ratio of 1.4345. This, again, suggested that there were specific forms of pupil disruptive behavior which were significant. Further power was added to the interaction effect when a significant F ratio of 189.8838 was reported for replication of items.



TAB	LE 4	۱.	22

Source	SS	df	MS	F	Р
Groups Error	11.8549 2051.1176	1 240	11.8549 8.5463	1.3871	N.S.
Items	5130.5028	65	78.9308	120.7748	>.01
Groups by Items Error	75.0949 10195.1826	65 15600	1.1553 0.6535	1.7678	>.01

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BY SPECIAL EDUCATION (SERIOUSNESS) FORM TWO

Form Two (Table 4.22) analysis of <u>seriousness</u> of pupil disruptive behaviors in special education and nonspecial education classes indicated a main effect F ratio of 1.3871 which was not significant at the .01 level. The null hypothesis <u>failed to be rejected</u>. The interaction of independent categories upon each specific pupil disruptancy showed a significant F ratio of 1.7678 at the .01 level. This indicated that there were specific forms of pupil disruptancies which were significant to the categories. When the replication of items F ratio (120.7748) was added to the interaction one can be assured that the respondents were replying in a discriminate manner to the specific forms of pupil disruptive behaviors.



Hypothesis 5 Relating to Team Teaching

There will be no significant difference in the student teachers' perceived <u>seriousness</u> of pupil disruptive behaviors occurring in team teaching and non-team teaching situations.

TABLE 4.23

	Concertain and a provide the				
Source	SS	df	MS	F	Р
Groups	0.3822	1	0.3822	0.0445	N.S.
Error	2386.0823	278	8.5830		
Items	6933.3192	65	106.6665	189.7142	>.01
Groups					
by Items	43.0154	65	0.6618	1.1770	N.S.
Error	10159.8215	18070	0.5622	• •	

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BY TEAM TEACHING (SERIOUSNESS) FORM ONE

Form One (Table 4.23) main effect analysis indicated an F ratio of 0.0445 which was not significant. The null hypothesis <u>failed to be rejected</u>. Interaction of the items upon team teaching and non-team teaching situations showed that it was not significant. Replication of items F ratio 189.7142 was significant. This indicated that the respondents from team teaching and non-team teaching situations, while not differing significantly in their perceptions of pupil disruptive behaviors, showed variability in the way they marked the seriousness of each item on Form One. When the three factors of main



effect, item interaction with groups, and replication of items of Form One were considered together, they lended further support to the observation that team teaching and non-team teaching situations may not be a significant variable where pupil disruptive behaviors are concerned.

TABLE 4.24

		-			
Source	SS	df	MS	F	Р
Groups Error	0.8051 2061.4570	1 240	0.8051 8.5894	0.0937	N.S.
Items	5130.1748	65	78.9258	120.3057	>.01
Groups by Items Error	36.0361 10234.2804	65 15600	0.5544 0.6560	0.8451	N.S.

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BY TEAM TEACHING (SERIOUSNESS) FORM TWO

When the <u>seriousness</u> of pupil disruptive behaviors was considered from Form Two (Table 4.24) the above hypothesis <u>failed to be rejected</u>. Form Two showed that groups of student teachers from team teaching and nonteam teaching situations did not respond significantly different. Further support of the above observation was added when replication of items yielded a significant F ratio of 120.3057. This connoted that the student teachers from each group marked the items differently. Form Two <u>seriousness</u> of pupil disruptive behaviors supported the view that team teaching and non-team teaching


situations which had student teachers involved did not differ in their perceptions of the seriousness of pupil disruptive behaviors.

Hypothesis 6 Relating to Teaching Same Group All Day

There will be no significant difference in the student teacher's perceived <u>seriousness</u> of pupil disruptive behaviors occurring in classes they are with all day and classes they are not with all day.

TABLE 4.25

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR TEACHING SAME GROUP ALL DAY (SERIOUSNESS) FORM ONE

Source	SS	df	MS	F	Ρ
Groups Error	3.4091 2382.6464	1 278	3.4091 8.5707	0.3978	N.S.
Items	6933.7649	65	106.6733	190.0746	>.01
Groups by Items Error	62.1340 10141.2104	65 18070	0.9560 0.5612	1.7034	>.01

Form One (Table 4.25) analysis of <u>seriousness</u> of pupil disruptive behaviors in classes student teachers were with all day and classes they were not reflected a main effect F ratio of 0.5707 which was not significant. The null hypothesis <u>failed to be rejected</u>. When the items were viewed across the two categories the relationship of group means suggested that there is no difference in the



way the two groups looked at the seriousness of pupil disruptive behaviors as a whole. The interaction effect gave further insight as to the specific relationship of independent categories and each pupil disruptive behavior. The F ratio for interaction effect was 1.7034. This was significant at the .01 level. When specific pupil disruptancies were viewed individually there was significance in the way student teachers perceived them. The replication of items F ratio (190.0746) was significant at the .01 level. Thus, student teachers from each category were responding to the specific forms of behavior in different ways.

TABLE 4.26

Source	SS	df	MS	F	Ρ
Groups Error	0.4774 2061.5876	1 240	0.47743 8.5900	0.0556	N.S.
Items	5131.0622	65	78.9394	120.9559	>.01
Groups by Items Error	89.5429 10181.0249	65 15600	1.3776 0.6526	2.1108	>.01

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR TEACHING SAME GROUP ALL DAY (SERIOUSNESS) FORM TWO

Form Two (Table 4.26) analysis of <u>seriousness</u> of pupil disruptive behaviors in classes they were with all day and classes they were not showed a main effect F ratio of 0.0556 which was not significant. The null hypothesis failed to be rejected. When the items were computed



across the two categories the relationship of group means indicated no significant difference in the way the two groups perceived the <u>seriousness</u> of pupil disruptive behaviors as a whole. The interaction of independent categories and each pupil disruptive behavior yielded a significant F ratio of 2.1108. This indicated that student teachers from each category significantly perceived different forms of pupil disruptive behaviors. The strength of this observation was increased with a significant F ratio of 120.9559 for item replication.

Hypothesis 7 Relating to Population and Economic Focal Point

There will be no significant difference in the student teacher's perceived <u>seriousness</u> of pupil disruptive behaviors occurring in schools classified by the Michigan State Board of Education according to the degree of cultural and economic deprivation.

When the analysis of variance was completed on Form One (Table 4.27) for the degree of cultural and economic deprivation and <u>seriousness</u> of pupil disruptive behaviors, the main effect of groups showed no significance in the mean responses of each group as a whole. Thus, the null hypothesis <u>failed to be rejected</u>. The interaction of the items upon the five types of schools was significant at the .01 level. This suggested that the school types when jointly considered with items differed significantly.



ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SCHOOLS CLASSIFIED BY POPULATION AND ECONOMIC FOCAL POINT (SERIOUSNESS) FORM ONE

Source	SS	df	MS	F	Р
Groups Error	19.0611 2354.4060	4 274	4.7653 8.5927	0.5546	N.S.
Items	6900.6020	65	106.1631	188.6498	>.01
Groups by Items Error	150.2335 10022.6185	260 17810	0.5778 0.5628	1.0268	>.01

The replication of items indicated a significant F ratio of 188.6498. Items were responded to by student teachers of different community types in different ways.

TABLE 4.28

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SCHOOLS CLASSIFIED BY POPULATION AND ECONOMIC FOCAL POINT (SERIOUSNESS) FORM TWO

Source	SS	df	MS	F	Р
Groups Error	54.5870 2007.9095	4 237	13.6468 8.4722	1.6108	N.S.
Items	5130.9365	65	78.9375	120.6634	>.01
Groups by Items Error	193.1513 10077.8823	260 15405	0.7429 0.6542	1.1356	>.01



When Form Two (Table 4.28) was examined in light of <u>seriousness</u> of pupil disruptive behaviors and degree of cultural and economic deprivation, the main effect of groups F ratio was 1.6108. This showed no significance in the mean responses of each school type. The null hypothesis, consequently, <u>failed to be rejected</u>. The interaction of the items upon the five types of schools yielded a significant F ratio of 1.1356. The replication of items indicated a significant F ratio of 120.6634. The student teachers responded to the pupil disruptive behaviors differently.

Analysis of Data For Purpose Two: Frequency and Seriousness of Pupil Disruptive Behaviors

General Overview For Frequency Interpretation

The identification of specific forms of pupil disruptive behaviors student teachers considered most frequent and serious was arrived at by reporting the computed mean values of each specific pupil disruptive behavior. To interpret the meaning of the <u>frequency</u> dimension the following system was used:

- The frequency dimension was divided into five areas: hourly, daily, weekly, seldom, never.
- 2. Each dimension was assigned a number value.

Hourly	Daily	Weekly	Seldom	Never
1.0	2.0	3.0	4.0	5.0



The mean value reported reflected the assigned number value of each dimension. Tables 4.29 and 4.30 will provide the reader with a general overview of the frequency means of all pupil disruptive behaviors on Form One and Form Two.

General Overview For Seriousness Interpretation

To interpret the meaning of the <u>seriousness</u> dimension the following system was used:

- The seriousness dimension was divided into five areas: positive, harmless, nuisance, serious, very serious.
- Each area was assigned a number value one through five.

Positive	Harmless	Nuisance	Serious
1.0	2.0	3.0	4.0

Very Serious 5.0

The mean value reported reflected the assigned number value of each dimension. Tables 4.31 and 4.32 will provide the reader with a general overview of the seriousness means of all pupil disruptive behaviors on Form One and Form Two.



MEAN SCORES FOR FORM ONE: FREQUENCY OF PUPIL DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIORS

1.	Showing disrespect for another student's	
	opinions.	3.1214
2.	Naively asking teacher personal questions.	3.6500
3.	Failing to follow directions for assignment.	2.2143
4.	Leaving desks or lockers messy.	3.0144
5.	Playing with toys, yo-yo's, etc. in class.	3.4571
6.	Leaving room before dismissal.	4.0857
7.	Throwing temper tantrums.	4.2464
8.	Girls wearing skirts too short.	3.6799
9.	Making allusions to sex (written or verbal).	3.8607
10.	Carrying cigarettes.	4.1000
11.	Pulling a student's hair.	4.3571
12.	Swearing at teacher.	4.5232
13.	Cheating on in-class assignment.	3.6857
14.	Failing to put away materials after use.	3.3047
15.	Throwing erasers, spitballs, paper airplanes, etc. in class.	3.7025
16.	Refusing to participate in class activities or assignments.	3.0609
17.	Gossiping among students.	2.7634
18.	Combing hair in class.	3.5964
19.	Having arms around each other outside of class on school property.	3.4803
20.	Possessing alcohol on school property.	4.8750
21.	Destroying or defacing another student's property.	4.0464



22.	Pulling prank against teacher.	4.2509
23.	Failing to complete homework.	2.9892
24.	Misusing class materials (e.g., turning Bunsen burner too high).	3.8607
25.	Talking out while class is working quietly.	2.3250
26.	Daydreaming in class.	2.5000
27.	Always asking to go to the bathroom or get a drink of water.	2.7642
28.	Wearing clothes too tight.	4.0072
29.	Holding hands in class.	4.4679
30.	Possessing firecrackers on school property.	4.8357
31.	Calling another student names.	3.1821
32.	Complaining about grades.	3.5214
33.	Turning in messy papers.	2.8750
34.	Forgetting notebooks, textbooks, or other classroom materials.	2.7464
35.	Whispering, or nonverbally communicating at inappropriate times.	2.1649
36.	Cutting classes or skipping school.	3.6286
37.	Displaying masochistic behavior to demand attention.	4.3107
38.	Failing to be adequately clean.	3.5250
39.	Looking up girl's skirt.	4.3893
40.	Reading or possessing obscene books or pornographic materials in class.	4.6321
41.	Verbally interrupting a student while he is talking to teacher or class.	2.8022
42.	Making passes at teacher or getting fresh with teacher.	4.5893



TABLE 4.29 (continued)

43.	Cheating on tests.	3.9429
44.	Throwing water.	4.3714
45.	Answering questions in humorous, disruptive way.	3.0321
46.	Sitting in wrong seat.	3.4000
47.	Using slang in class.	2.7097
48.	Chewing gum in class.	2.6237
49.	Kissing outside of class on school property.	4.4179
50.	Throwing things out window.	4.5750
51.	Stealing from another student.	4.2214
52.	Questioning teacher's opinion.	3.3309
53.	Under the influence of narcotics in class.	4.8244
54.	Deliberately dropping books or other objects in class.	4.0394
55.	Drawing pictures to poke fun at teacher.	4.5000
56.	Excessive belching in class.	4.5464
57.	Turning in false fire alarms or bomb scares.	4.8500
58.	Calling teacher by first name.	4.4929
59.	Writing on walls.	4.5071
60.	Slouching or otherwise sitting inappropriately in seat.	2.5536
61.	Making noise in the halls.	2.3214
62.	Soiling pants.	4.4893
63.	Possessing guns on school property.	4.9250
64.	Caring for fingernails in class.	4.2964
65.	Verbally interrupting teacher while she is talking.	2.7878
66.	Stealing materials from school.	4.4000



MEAN SCORES FOR FORM TWO: FREQUENCY OF PUPIL DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIORS

1.	Drawing picture to poke fun at another student.	4.4380
2.	Asking teacher personal questions to	4 3485
2	pulposety make her uncomfortable.	2.3405
3.	Doing wrong assignment.	3./645
4.	Failing to hang up coats, boots, etc.	4.3195
5.	Clicking pens, or making other similar noises in class.	2.7967
6.	Refusing to take lecture notes.	3.8340
7.	Crying in class.	4.2324
8.	Wearing inappropriate clothing, (e.g., low cut dresses, ripped, etc.).	4.0702
9.	Discussing sexual matters.	4.1494
10.	Smoking on school property.	4.4256
11.	Swearing at another student.	3.7303
12.	Arguing with teacher.	3.2603
13.	Cheating on homework.	3.9256
14.	Carelessly using materials (e.g., spilling paints).	3.8264
15.	Throwing erasers, spitballs, paper airplanes, etc., in class.	3.6183
16.	Complaining about class activities or assignments.	2.8967
17.	Spitting.	4.6818
18.	Putting on make-up in class.	4.3444
19.	Hugging or having arms around each other in class.	4.2066
20.	Under the influence of alcohol in class.	4.9380



TABLE 4.30 (continued)

21.	Throwing things at another student.	3.6281
22.	Pulling prank against teacher.	4.3884
23.	Failing to complete in-class assignment.	2.9091
24.	Misusing bathrooms (e.g., stuffing up toilets, throwing paper around).	4.2975
25.	Asking irrelevant questions (not pertaining to content being discussed).	2.9628
26.	Sleeping in class.	4.0000
27.	Excessive complaining about feeling ill (hypochondriac).	4.0620
28.	Boys wearing shirts outs.	3.3595
29.	Holding hands outside of class on school property.	3.4917
30.	Possessing brass knuckles, molotov cocktails, etc., on school property.	4.9212
31.	Making fun of another student.	3.1743
32.	Sassing or speaking rudely to teacher.	3.6860
33.	Plagiarizing.	4.2531
34.	Forgetting lunch money, permission slips or other non-academic materials.	3.4174
35.	Writing and passing personal notes in class.	3.7769
36.	Coming to class tardy.	2.9339
37.	Displaying masochistic behavior to demand attention.	4.4628
38.	Failing to have hair cut properly.	3.6446
39.	Making obscene gestures.	4.2727
40.	Possessing stolen goods (not stolen from school, teacher or students).	4.7355
41.	Laughing at another student's mistakes.	3.2125



TABLE 4.30 (continued)

42.	Inappropriate display of affection towards teacher.	4.4587
43.	Cheating on tests.	4.0372
44.	Throwing refuse on floor.	3.1405
45.	Whispering, or nonverbally communicating after teacher's request to stop.	2.3554
46.	Reading, writing, etc., while teacher is talking.	2.6612
47.	Pulling pranks (e.g., hiding things).	3.9050
48.	Chewing gum in class.	2.7521
49.	Petting outside of class on school property.	4.6074
50.	Starting fires.	4.8963
51.	Hitting, shoving, or tripping another student.	3.2810
52.	Pointing out teacher's mistakes.	3.5394
53.	Possessing narcotics on school property.	4.8347
54.	Putting notes on the blackboard when teacher isn't there.	4.1405
55.	Making fun of teacher.	4.3057
56.	Expelling gas in class.	4.4669
57.	Failing to leave building during fire drill.	4.9083
58.	Lying to teacher with the intent to deceive (not fantasy).	3.9339
59.	Writing on desk tops.	3.6818
60.	Putting books or papers away too soon.	3.2769
61.	Tattling.	3.2686
62.	Soiling pants.	4.6942



TABLE	4.30	(continued)
		(

63.	Possessing knives on school property.	4.7314
64.	Eating in class.	4.1901
65.	Stealing from teacher.	4.7510
66.	Stealing materials from school.	4.5868



MEAN SCORES FOR FORM ONE: SERIOUSNESS OF PUPIL DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIORS

1.	Showing disrespect for another student's	
	opinions.	3.5607
2.	Naively asking teacher personal questions.	2.3907
3.	Failing to follow directions for assignment.	3.4444
4.	Leaving desks or lockers messy.	2.8387
5.	Playing with toys, yo-yo's, etc., in class.	3.0429
6.	Leaving room before dismissal.	3.5556
7.	Throwing temper tantrums.	3.9571
8.	Girls wearing skirts too short.	2.5215
9.	Making allusions to sex (written or verbal).	2.9785
10.	Carrying cigarettes.	3.2929
11.	Pulling a student's hair.	3.2607
12.	Swearing at teacher.	3.9679
13.	Cheating on in-class assignment.	4.0250
14.	Failing to put away materials after use.	3.0612
15.	Throwing erasers, spitballs, paper airplanes, etc., in class.	3.4424
16.	Refusing to participate in class activities or assignments.	3.7679
17.	Gossiping among students.	2.9068
18.	Combing hair in class.	2.6786
19.	Having arms around each other outside of class on school property.	2.5393
20.	Possessing alcohol on school property.	4.3273
21.	Destroying or defacing another student's property.	4.3179



22.	Pulling prank against teacher.	2.9927
23.	Failing to complete homework.	3.6392
24.	Misusing class materials (e.g., turning Bunsen burner too high).	3.7857
25.	Talking out while class is working quietly.	3.3393
26.	Daydreaming in class.	3.1036
27.	Always asking to go to the bathroom or get a drink of water.	2.8857
28.	Wearing clothes too tight.	2.7384
29.	Holding hands in class.	2.8921
30.	Possessing firecrackers on school property.	4.2310
31.	Calling another student names.	3.5821
32.	Complaining about grades.	2.5321
33.	Turning in messy papers.	3.1619
34.	Forgetting notebooks, textbooks, or other classroom materials.	3.2222
35.	Whispering, or nonverbally communicating at inappropriate times.	3.9964
36.	Cutting classes or skipping school.	3.9964
37.	Displaying masochistic behavior to demand attention.	4.2186
38.	Failing to be adequately clean.	3.3393
39.	Looking up girl's skirt.	3.4158
40.	Reading or possessing obscene books or pornographic materials in class.	3.8357
41.	Verbally interrupting a student while he is talking to teacher or class.	3.5233
42.	Making passes at teacher or getting fresh with teacher.	3.7230



TABLE 4.31 (continued)

43.	Cheating on tests.	4.1362
44.	Throwing water.	3.4404
45.	Answering questions in humorous, disruptive way.	2.9143
46.	Sitting in wrong seat.	2.6964
47.	Using slang in class.	2.4194
48.	Chewing gum in class.	2.5893
49.	Kissing outside of class on school property.	3.0433
50.	Throwing things out window.	3.7122
51.	Stealing from another student.	4.3464
52.	Questioning teacher's opinion.	1.6043
53.	Under the influence of narcotics in class.	4.5663
54.	Deliberately dropping books or other objects in class.	3.3179
55.	Drawing pictures to poke fun at teacher.	2.9283
56.	Excessive belching in class.	3.2446
57.	Turning in false fire alarms or bomb scares.	4.4393
58.	Calling teacher by first name.	3.0036
59.	Writing on walls.	3.7518
60.	Slouching or otherwise sitting inappropriately in seat.	2.7643
61.	Making noise in the halls.	2.9571
62.	Soiling pants.	3.3669
63.	Possessing guns on school property.	4.6259
64.	Caring for fingernails in class.	2.9107
65.	Verbally interrupting teacher while she is talking.	3.4209
66.	Stealing materials from school.	4.4014



MEAN SCORES FOR FORM TWO: SERIOUSNESS OF PUPIL DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIORS

1.	Drawing picture to poke fun at another student.	3.1292
2.	Asking teacher personal questions to purposely make her uncomfortable.	2.8506
3.	Doing wrong assignment.	3.0417
4.	Failing to hang up coats, boots, etc.	2.6942
5.	Clicking pens, or making other similar noises in class.	2.9876
6.	Refusing to take lecture notes.	3.0336
7.	Crying in class.	3.6058
8.	Wearing inappropriate clothing (e.g., low cut dresses, ripped, etc.).	2.9333
9.	Discussing sexual matters.	2.2958
10.	Smoking on school property.	3.5579
11.	Swearing at another student.	3.5560
12.	Arguing with teacher.	3.0909
13.	Cheating on homework.	3.7510
14.	Carelessly using materials (e.g., spilling paints).	3.2282
15.	Throwing erasers, spitballs, paper airplanes, etc. in class.	4.4400
16.	Complaining about class activities or assignments.	2.7810
17.	Spitting.	3.6058
18.	Putting on make-up in class.	2.9582
19.	Hugging or having arms around each other in class.	2.9132
20.	Under the influence of alcohol in class.	4.3693



TABLE 4.32 (continued)

21.	Throwing things at another student.	3.7603
22.	Pulling prank against teacher.	2.9458
23.	Failing to complete in-class assignment.	3.4959
24.	Misusing bathrooms (e.g., stuffing up toilets, throwing paper around).	3.7676
25.	Asking irrelevant questions (not pertaining to content being discussed).	2.7355
26.	Sleeping in class.	3.2448
27.	Excessive complaining about feeling ill (hypochondriac).	3.3801
28.	Boys wearing shirts out.	2.3140
29.	Holding hands outside of class on school property.	2.2438
30.	Possessing brass knuckles, molotov cocktails, etc. on school property.	4.5601
31.	Making fun of another student.	3.6639
32.	Sassing or speaking rudely to teacher.	3.9835
33.	Plagiarizing.	3.9046
34.	Forgetting lunch money, permission slips or other non-academic materials.	2.8548
35.	Writing and passing personal notes in class.	2.9297
36.	Coming to class tardy.	3.0950
37.	Displaying masochistic behavior to demand attention.	4.2385
38.	Failing to have hair cut properly.	2.3843
39.	Making obscene gestures.	3.7231
40.	Possessing stolen goods (not stolen from school, teacher or students).	4.3071
41.	Laughing at another student's mistakes.	3.6946


TABLE 4.32 (continued)

42.	Inappropriate display of affection towards teacher.	3.4835
43.	Cheating on tests.	4.0455
44.	Throwing refuse on floor.	3.2149
45.	Whispering, or nonverbally communicating after teacher's request to stop.	3.3719
46.	Reading, writing, etc., while teacher is talking.	3.2033
47.	Pulling pranks (e.g., hiding things).	2.9627
48.	Chewing gum in class.	2.5620
49.	Petting outside of class on school property.	3.5909
50.	Starting fires.	4.5702
51.	Hitting, shoving, or tripping another student.	3.9793
52.	Pointing out teacher's mistakes.	1.6888
53.	Possessing narcotics on school property.	4.5537
54.	Putting notes on the blackboard when teacher isn't there.	2.7012
55.	Making fun of teacher.	3.1653
56.	Expelling gas in class.	2.8963
57.	Failing to leave building during fire drill.	4.2083
58.	Lying to teacher with the intent to deceive (not fantasy).	4.1157
59.	Writing on desk tops.	3.4545
60.	Putting books or papers away too soon.	3.0290
61.	Tattling.	3.0415
62.	Soiling pants.	3.4542
63.	Possessing knives on school property.	4.2176



TABLE 4.32 (continued)

64.	Eating in class.	3.1074
65.	Stealing from teacher.	4.4090
66.	Stealing materials from school.	4.4628



Interpretation of the Frequency and Seriousness Dimensions

Introduction

The focus of this section is upon the <u>frequency</u> dimensions of hourly $(1.0)^*$ and daily $(2.0)^*$ and the <u>seriousness</u> dimensions of very serious $(5.0)^*$ and serious $(4.0)^*$. The results are reported in terms of behaviors which were perceived as occurring most frequently and as being most serious. To implement this, an arbitrary mean value of 2.8 for the <u>frequency</u> dimension was established as a cut off point. Similarly, an arbitrary mean value of 4.0 for the <u>seriousness</u> dimension was established. The tables and interpretations that follow report pupil disruptive behaviors that have mean values within the established mean ranges:

Frequency (1.0--2.8); Seriousness (5.0--4.0)

Interpretation of Form One frequent pupil disruptive behaviors (Table 4.33) was derived by using mean values for the group as a whole. Each pupil disruptive behavior between 1.0 and 2.8 (between daily and weekly) was recorded as being a frequent form of behavior. To aid in the total meaning of the frequency means, each reported mean for the pupil disruptive behavior had its counterpart in the seriousness dimension. This was added

*Assigned number value.



FREQUENCY OF PUPIL DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIORS PERCEIVED AS OCCURRING HOURLY TO DAILY (FORM ONE)

Description of Disruptive Behavior	Mean Value Frequency	Mean Value Seriousness
Whispering in class	2.1649 (Daily)	3.2374 (Nuisance)
Failing to follow direction for assignment	2.2143 (Daily)	3.4444 (Nuisance)
Making noise in hall	2.3214 (Daily)	2.9571 (Nuisance)
Talking out while class is working quietly	2.3250 (Daily)	3.3393 (Nuisance)
Daydreaming in class	2.50000 (Daily)	3.1036 (Nuisance)
Slouching or otherwise sitting inappropriately in seat	2.5536 (Daily)	2.7643 (Harmless)
Chewing gum in class	2.6237 (Daily)	2.5893 (Harmless)
Using slang in class	2.7097 (Daily)	2.8857 (Harmless)
Gossiping among students	2.7634 (Daily)	2.9068 (Harmless)
Always asking to go to the bathroom or get a drink of water	n 2.7643 (Daily)	2.8857 (Harmless)
Forgetting notebooks, textbooks, or other classroom materials	2.7464 (Daily)	3.2222 (Nuisance)
Verbally interrupting teacher while she is talking	2.7878 (Daily)	4.4014 (Serious)



to help the reader obtain a more complete picture of the specific pupil disruptive behavior.

When the mean value of a frequency item is reported (e.g., "whispering in class" at 2.1649) the following interpretation may be made. Whispering in class is viewed as the most frequent pupil disruptive behavior (Daily). The mean seriousness value of 3.2374 indicated that while whispering in class was viewed by student teachers as most frequent it also was viewed as being a nuisance. The most outstanding interpretation of the frequency mean values reported in Table 4.33 was that the twelve most frequent pupil disruptive behaviors were largely viewed by student teachers as being either harmless or a nuisance. Another significant reported mean value was related to the pupil disruptive behavior: "Verbally interrupting the teacher while she is talking." Considered by itself, this disruptive behavior had little meaning until the seriousness dimension mean value of 4.4014 was added. This suggested that the only frequent pupil disruptive behavior that student teachers considered serious was verbally interrupting the student teacher while she was talking.

When Form Two (Table 4.34) mean values for frequency of pupil disruptive behaviors was analyzed with an arbitrary 2.8 cut off point, "Whispering in class" tended to be the most frequently occurring pupil disruptive



		فتحدثته والمفتح وتكريره
Description of Disruptive Behavior	Mean Value Frequency	Mean Value Seriousness
Whispering in class	2.3554 (Daily)	3.3720 (Nuisance)
Reading, writing, etc., while teacher is talking	2.6612 (Daily)	3.2033 (Nuisance)
Chewing gum in class	2.7521 (Daily)	2.5620 (Harmless)
Clicking pens, or making other similar noises in class	2.7967 (Daily)	2.9876 (Harmless)

FREQUENCY OF PUPIL DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIORS PERCEIVED AS OCCURRING HOURLY TO DAILY (FORM TWO)

behavior (DAILY). This behavior was also perceived as a nuisance behavior. The other identified frequent pupil disruptive behaviors were also regarded as either a nuisance or harmless.

When the serious pupil disruptive behaviors from the Form One (Table 4.35) were analyzed, the two behaviors of "Under the influence of narcotics" (4.5663) and "possessing guns" (4.6258) appeared to be most serious to student teachers as a group. The major trend of the item means indicated that the pupil disruptive behaviors perceived as most serious seldom occurred.

Form Two (Table 4.36) revealed item means that placed possessing narcotics, possessing brass knuckles



PUPIL DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIORS PERCEIVED AS BEING SERIOUS OR EXTREMELY SERIOUS (FORM ONE)

Description of Disruptive Behavior	Mean Value (Seriousness)	Mean Value (Frequency)
Possessing guns	4.6258 (Serious)	4.9250 (Seldom)
Under influence of narcotics	4.5663 (Serious)	4.8244 (Seldom)
Turning in false alarms, bomb threats	4.4393 (Serious)	4.8500 (Seldom)
Stealing materials from school	4.4014 (Serious)	4.4000 (Seldom)
Stealing from another student	4.3464 (Serious)	4.2214 (Seldom)
Possessing alcohol	4.3273 (Serious)	4.8750 (Seldom)
Destroying other student's property	4.3179 (Serious)	4.0464 (Seldom)
Possessing firecrackers	4.2310 (Serious)	4.8357 (Seldom)
Displaying masochistic behavior	4.2186 (Serious)	4.3107 (Seldom)
Cheating on tests	4.1362 (Serious)	3.9429 (Weekly)
Cheating on in-class assignment	4.0250 (Serious)	3.1214 (Weekly)



PUPIL DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIORS PERCEIVED AS BEING SERIOUS OR EXTREMELY SERIOUS (FORM TWO)

Description of Disruptive Behavior	Mean Value (Seriousness)	Mean Value (Frequency)
Starting fires	4.5702 (Serious)	4.8963 (Seldom)
Possessing brass knuckles, molotov cocktails	4.5602 (Serious)	4.9211 (Seldom)
Possessing narcotics	4.5537 (Serious)	4.8347 (Seldom)
Stealing from school	4.4628 (Serious)	4.5868 (Seldom)
Stealing from teacher	4.4091 (Serious)	4.7510 (Seldom)
Influences of alcohol in class	4.3693 (Serious)	4.9380 (Seldom)
Possessing stolen goods not stolen from school, teacher, students	4.3071 (Serious)	4.7356 (Seldom)
Displaying masochistic behavior	4.2384 (Serious)	4.4628 (Seldom)
Possessing knives	4.2176 (Serious)	4.7314 (Seldom)
Failing to leave building during fire drill	4.2083 (Serious)	4.9083 (Seldom)
Lying to deceive teacher	4.1157 (Serious)	3.9339 (Weekly)
Cheating on tests	4.0455 (Serious)	3.1405 (Weekly)



and/or Molotov cocktails, and starting fires to be the most serious pupil disruptive behaviors. When the serious pupil disruptive behaviors were viewed in terms of frequency, the general tendency was for student teachers to perceive them as seldom occurring.

Positive Perceptions of Pupil Disruptive Behaviors

The seriousness dimension which sought perceptions about how the student teacher felt about each behavior yielded only two pupil disruptive behaviors that were viewed as positive: (1) questioning teaching opinion (Form One), (2) pointing out teacher's mistakes (Form Two). When these behaviors were viewed in light of frequency, the mean values placed the rate as weekly.

Summary

The analysis of the hypotheses in the study were examined and the following results were found. A table of results provides a shortened version of the analysis completed.

Under the purpose: to identify the pupil disruptive behaviors that student teachers perceived to be most frequent and serious the following observations were made:

1. When the most frequent pupil disruptive behaviors were identified and compared to their mean score



SUMMARY OF FINDINGS OF HYPOTHESES REGARDING FREQUENCY AND SERIOUSNESS OF PUPIL DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIORS

	Hypotheses Regarding	Form One	Form Two
1.	Frequency of pupil disruptive behaviors and sex of student teacher.	Failed to reject at the .01 con- fidence level.	Rejected at the .01 confidence level.
2.	Seriousness of pupil dis- ruptive behaviors and sex of student teacher.	Failed to reject at the .01 con- fidence level.	Failed to reject at the .01 confi- dence level.
3.	Frequency of pupil disruptive behaviors and class size.	Failed to reject at the .01 con- fidence level.	Failed to reject at the .01 confi- dence level.
4.	Seriousness of pupil dis- ruptive behaviors and class size.	Failed to reject at the .01 con- fidence level.	Failed to reject at the .01 con- fidence level.
5.	Frequency of pupil disruptive behaviors and socio-economic levels.	Failed to reject at the .01 con- fidence level.	Rejected at the .01 confidence level.
6.	Seriousness of pupil dis- ruptive behaviors and socio- economic levels.	Failed to reject at the .01 con- fidence level.	Failed to reject at the .01 con- fidence level.
7.	Frequency of pupil disruptive behaviors and special edu- cation and non-special edu- cation classes.	Failed to reject at the .01 con- fidence level.	Failed to reject at the .01 con- fidence level.
8.	Seriousness of pupil dis- ruptive behaviors and special education and non-special education classes.	Failed to reject at the .01 con- fidence level.	Failed to reject at the .01 con- fidence level.
9.	Frequency of pupil disruptive behaviors and team teaching.	Rejected at the .01 confidence level.	Failed to reject at the .01 con- fidence level.
10.	Seriousness of pupil dis- ruptive behaviors and team teaching.	Failed to reject at the .01 con- fidence level.	Failed to reject at the .01 con- fidence level.
11.	Frequency of pupil disruptive behaviors and teaching the same group all day.	Failed to reject at the .01 con- fidence level.	Failed to reject at the .01 con- fidence level.
12.	Seriousness of pupil dis- ruptive behaviors and teaching the same group all day.	Failed to reject at the .01 con- fidence level.	Failed to reject at the .01 con- fidence level.
13.	Frequency of pupil disruptive behaviors and schools classi- fied according to cultural and economic deprivation.	Failed to reject at the .01 con- fidence level.	Failed to reject at the .01 con- fidence level.
14.	Seriousness of pupil disruptive behaviors and schools classi- fied according to cultural and economic deprivation.	Failed to reject at the .01 con- fidence level.	Failed to reject at the .01 con- fidence level.



for seriousness, the most <u>frequent</u> behaviors were considered by student teachers as a nuisance or as harmless.

2. When the most serious pupil disruptive behaviors were identified and compared to their mean score for frequency of occurrance, the most <u>serious</u> behaviors identified by student teachers seldom occurred.

3. The five most frequent pupil disruptive behaviors for the Form One were: whispering in class, failing to follow directions for the assignment, making noise in the hall, talking out while class is working, and day dreaming in class.

4. The most frequent pupil disruptive behaviors for the Form Two were: whispering in class, reading or writing while the teacher is talking, chewing gum in class, and clicking pens, etc., in class.

5. The five most serious pupil disruptive behaviors for the Form One were: possessing guns, being under the influence of narcotics in school, turning in false alarms and bomb threats, stealing materials from school, and stealing from another student.

6. The five most serious pupil disruptive behaviors on the Form Two were: starting fires, possessing brass knuckles and/or Molotov cocktails, possessing narcotics, stealing from school, and stealing from the teacher.



 The behavior that student teachers viewed to be positive from the Form One was "Questioning teacher's opinion."

 The behavior that student teachers viewed to be positive from the Form Two was "Pointing out teacher's mistakes."



CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Chapter V is organized in four sections. The first section is a summary of the study. Conclusions are discussed in the second section. Implications for further research are found in the third section with implications for teacher education in the final section.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to:

1. Examine the relationship <u>of</u> sex of the student teacher, socio-economic level of the schools as perceived by the student teacher, size of classes taught by the student teacher, classes taught by the student teacher all day, special education classes taught by the student teacher, team teaching of which the student teacher is a member, and school types identified by the Michigan Department of Education <u>to</u> 132 specific forms of pupil disruptive behaviors.

2. Identify the pupil disruptive behaviors that student teachers perceive to be most frequent and serious.



Fourteen null hypotheses were generated to test the first purpose. The second purpose was analyzed by using the mean scores of each item.

The questionnaire was comprised of two forms--Form One and Form Two. Each form contained sixty-six specific pupil disruptive behaviors and was administered and analyzed separately. The population used for this study was 664 student teachers assigned by the Office of Student Teaching from Michigan State University to student teach in area schools.

The analysis of variance-repeated measures design was used to analyze the hypotheses related to the first purpose of this study. The level of significance for testing the null hypotheses was established at .01. The second purpose of this study was analyzed by using an MD STAT Routine which yielded mean scores for each pupil disruptive behavior.

Conclusions

Within the limitations of this study the following conclusions were supported:

 Hypotheses for <u>frequency</u> and <u>seriousness</u> dimensions which stated no significant differences between pupil disruptive behaviors and class size, special education, teaching the same group all day, and population and economic focal point of communities that have schools



in which student teachers are placed, all <u>failed to be</u> rejected.

Furthermore, when the items were interacted with categories of the above background data, significant results were obtained. The significant interaction effects suggested that when <u>items were viewed individually</u> with categories there were differences in the way student teachers perceived the frequency and seriousness of pupil disruptive behaviors.

2. The null hypothesis for team teaching and the <u>frequency</u> of pupil disruptive behaviors for Form One was <u>rejected</u> while Form Two <u>failed to reject</u> the hypothesis. The null hypothesis for the <u>seriousness</u> of pupil disruptive behaviors and team teaching <u>failed to be rejected</u> on both forms. The interaction of items and team teaching categories was not significate for both the frequency and seriousness analysis. This finding provided enough support for doubting whether team teaching has much of an effect upon the frequency and seriousness of pupil disruptive behaviors for student teachers.

3. The examined null hypothesis for sex of the student teacher and the <u>frequency</u> of pupil disruptive behaviors found that Form One <u>failed to reject</u> the hypothesis while Form Two <u>rejected</u> the hypothesis. Both forms yielded significant interaction effects when items were jointly considered with female and male categories. The null hypothesis for sex and the seriousness dimension on both



forms <u>failed to be rejected</u>. There was, however, significant interaction results between the items and female and male categories. Thus, sex of the student teacher was not a primary significant factor in the way student teachers as a group responded to all of the pupil disruptive behaviors.

4. The null hypothesis which tested socio-economic levels (lower, middle, and upper) and <u>frequency</u> of pupil disruptive behaviors <u>failed to be rejected</u> on Form One and was <u>rejected</u> on Form Two. The interaction effects of the items jointly considered with the three socio-economic levels yielded significant results. The null hypothesis for the social economic levels and <u>seriousness</u> of pupil disruptive behaviors on both forms <u>failed to be rejected</u>. The interaction of items jointly considered with the three economic levels (lower, middle, upper) was significant.

In conclusion, socio-economic levels for <u>frequency</u> and <u>seriousness</u> of pupil disruptive behaviors had questionable affects upon the way student teachers as a group responded to all the pupil disruptive behaviors.

Under the purpose: to identify the pupil disruptive behaviors that student teachers perceived to be most frequent and serious the following conclusions were drawn:

 The most <u>frequent</u> pupil disruptive behaviors were considered by student teachers as a <u>nuisance</u> or as <u>harmless</u>.



2. The most <u>serious</u> pupil disruptive behaviors were considered by student teachers as <u>seldom</u> occurring.

3. Analysis of the most <u>frequent</u> forms of pupil disruptive behaviors for both forms were whispering in class, failing to follow directions for assignment, making noise in the hall, talking out while class is working, day dreaming in class, reading or writing while teacher is talking, chewing gum in class, and clicking pens, etc., in class.

4. Analysis of the most <u>serious</u> forms of pupil disruptive behaviors for both forms were possessing guns, being under the influence of narcotics while in school, turning in false alarms and bomb threats, stealing materials from school, stealing from another student, stealing from the teacher, starting fires, possessing brass knuckles and/or Molotov cocktails, and possessing narcotics.

5. The identified positive forms of pupil disruptive behaviors for Form One and Form Two were (1) questioning teacher's opinion, (2) pointing out teacher's mistakes.

Discussion

The "main effects" measure which reflected means for the groups on the entire questionnaire showed, in most cases, that the background variables as independent measures were not significantly related to the pupil



disruptive behaviors as a whole. The closeness of groups across the items suggested that student teachers from Michigan State University as a group, were guite homogeneous when the entire items (pupil disruptive behaviors) of the guestionnaire were considered. As an example, one would not be able to tell if a male or female student teacher responded to the guestionnaire when all the items were tabulated and mean scores computed. This finding, although important, may not be as important as the general finding of significant interaction of the independent variables when jointly considered with the specific forms of pupil disruptive behaviors. This finding related the point that when items were interacted with the different categories for each examined independent variable, they were significant. Individual items on the questionnaire were responded to by student teachers significantly different. This particular study did not pursue which specific items were significantly responded to when jointly considered with the independent variables. As an example, the individual means of population and economic focal point classifications were not significantly related. However, the interaction of the pupil disruptive behaviors and schools from communities in the metropolitan core, city, town, urban fringe, and rural community was significant. The meaning of this was that student teachers from each of these settings responded differently to each specific pupil disruptive behavior. This study did not undertake


to find which specific pupil disruptive behaviors were related to each of the five categories. It can, however, be reasonably ascerted that student teachers from Michigan State University who are placed in various settings responded differently to individual pupil disruptive behaviors.

Initial results from the similar study directed by Howard Teitlebaum of Learning Systems Institute, Michigan State University¹ indicated that public school teachers, as a group, responded significantly differently to each independent variable and pupil disruptive behaviors. Interaction of items and groups also showed significant results. This may indicate that student teachers as a group perceived pupil disruptive behaviors differently than public school teachers. If this, indeed, is the case, an interesting concept has begun to be formulated: that student teacher concerns over the frequency and seriousness of pupil disruptive behaviors may be related to their development as a professional.

If student teachers have the tendency to see behavioral problems in more of a global context than experienced public school teachers it would enhance our knowledge of this area to know when and how the global perceptions change to priority concerns for pupil

¹Information received from conference with Mr. Teitlebaum on June 9, 1970.



disruptive behaviors that are related to maintaining control over the learning situation. One possible reason for the existence of the global concerns of student teacher may be that they still perceive themselves as students and because of this view relate more to others in the same classification. Perhaps it is not until the "strings" are completly severed with the university or college do they begin to perceive themselves as a teacher. Further questions, however, could be asked: Does the first and second year public school teacher still have the global view? What specific professional activities or experiences are related to the change of the global view to the view of classroom related pupil disruptive behaviors? At any rate, the concept does furnish a base for future concerns that may be explored.

The frequency and seriousness of pupil disruptive behaviors identified by this study were further understood when Wickman's² original groupings of behaviors were added. Wickman's pupil disruptive behavior groupings consisted of:

Group I

Violations of General Standards of Morality and Integrity

Stealing, Dishonesties, Immorality, Profanity.

²Wickman, <u>op. cit.</u>, pp. 15-17.



Group II

Transgressions Against Authority

Disobedience, Impertinence, Refusing to do Things When Asked, Insubordination.

Group III

Violations of General School Regulations

Truancy, Tardiness, Destroying Materials.

Group IV

Violations of Classroom Rules

Disorderliness, Restlessness, Interruptions,

Whispering, Lack of Supplies.

Group V

Violations of School Work Requirements

Inattention, Lack of Interest, Carelessness,

Laziness.

Group VI

Difficulties With Other Children

Annoying Other Children, Tattling, Laughing at Others Mistakes, Interfering With the Work of Others, Fighting.



Group VII

Undesirable Personality Traits

Negativisms, Unacceptable Social Manners, Self-Indulgence, Arrogance, Diffidence, Evasions, Interferences, Lack of Emotional Control, Undesirable Mental States.

Further understanding of the reported most <u>frequent</u> behaviors (Tables 4.33 and 4.34) was extended when the behaviors were viewed in terms of Wickman's behavioral groupings. The behaviors identified by student teachers in Tables 4.33 and 4.34 were combined into one list and classified according to one of the seven Wickman groups of pupil disruptive behaviors.

As indicated earlier, the <u>frequent</u> pupil disruptive behaviors in Table 5.1 were viewed by student teachers as being either a nuisance or as harmless. The specific pupil disruptive behaviors identified by student teachers when grouped according to Wickman's schema, primarily reflected infractions of classroom rules and school work requirements. Pupil disruptive behaviors with mean values 1.0 to 2.8 were not found for the following Wickman categories: Violations of General Standards of Morality and Integrity, Transgressions Against Authority, Violations of General School Regulations, and Difficulties With Other Children. The extended analysis of the original <u>frequency</u> of pupil disruptive behaviors identified by student



TABLE 5.1

FREQUENT PUPIL DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIORS DERIVED FROM TABLES 4.33 AND 4.34 AND CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO WICKMAN'S SCHEMA

W	ickman's Classification		Pupil Disruptive Behaviors Classified	Mean Value*
I.	Violations of General Standards of Morality and Integrity	Ι.	None identified in Main Grouping From Tables 4.33 and 4.34	
II.	Transgressions Against Authority	11.	None identified in Main Grouping From Tables 4.33 and 4.34	
III.	Violations of General School Regulations	111.	None identified in Main Grouping From Tables 4.33 and 4.34	
IV.	Violations of Classroom Rules	IV.	Whispering in class Making noise in hall Talking while class is working quietly Slouching, sitting inappropriately Chewing gum in class Always asking to go to bathroom to get a drink of water Verbally interrupting teacher while she is talking Clicking pens, etc., in class	2.1649 2.3214 2.3250 2.5536 2.6237 2.7643 2.7878 2.7957
v.	Violations of School Work Regulations	ν.	Failing to follow directions for as- signments Reading, writing while teacher is talking Using slang in class Forgetting notebooks, textbooks, etc.	2.1549 2.6612 2.7097 2.7464
VI.	Difficulties With Other Children	VI.	None identified in Main Grouping From Tables 4.33 and 4.34	
VII.	Undesirable Personality Traits	VII.	Daydreaming in class Gossiping among students	2.5000 2.763 4

*For interpretation of the mean values for the <u>frequency</u> of pupil disruptive behaviors the following number values were assigned each area (amount of frequency):

Hourly	Daily	Weekly	Seldom	Never
1.0	2.0	3.0	4.0	5.0

Mean values reported in Table 5.1 reflect those behaviors that fall within a range of 1.0 (Hourly) to 2.8 (Daily). Thus, a mean value of 2.1649 (Whispering in class) would indicate that this behavior occurred daily.

The derived mean values used for classifying the most frequent pupil disruptive behaviors were taken from Chapter IV: Table 4.33 and 4.34.



TABLE 5.2

SERIOUS PUPIL DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIORS DERIVED FROM TABLES 4.35 AND 4.36 AND CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO WICKMAN'S SCHEMA

Wi	ickman's Classification		Pupil Disruptive Behaviors Classified	Mean Value*
I.	Violations of General Standards of Morality and	Ι.	Stealing from teacher Stealing materials	4.4091
	Integrity		from school Stealing from another	4.4014
			student Possessing stolen goods not from school, teacher	4.3464
			students	4 3071
			Cheating on tests	4 1362
			Lying to deceive teacher Cheating on in-class	4.1157
			assignments	4.0250
11.	Transgressions Against Authority	II.	None identified in Main Grouping From Tables	
	-		4.35 and 4.36	• •
III.	Violations of General	III.	Possessing guns	4.6258
	School Regulations		Starting fires	4.5702
			Under influence of	
			narcotics	4.5663
			Possessing brass knuckles, Molotov	
			cocktails	4.5602
			Possessing narcotics Turning in false alarms,	4.5537
			bomb threats Under influence of	4.4393
			alcohol in class	4.3693
			Possessing alcohol	4.3273
			Possessing firecrackers	4.2310
			Po ssess ing knives	4.2176
			Failing to leave	
			building during fire drill	4.2083
IV.	Violations of Classroom Rules	1V.	None identified in Main Grouping from Tables	
	Nu les		4.35 and 4.36	
۷.	Violations of School Work Regulations	۷.	None identified in Main Grouping from Tables	
			4.35 and 4.36	• •
VI.	Difficulties With Oth er Children	VI.	None identified in Main Grouping from Tables 4.36 and 4.36	
VII.	Undesirable Personality	VII.	Destroying other student	's
	114105		Displaying masochistic	7. J 1 / 7
			behavior	4.2384

*For interpretation of the mean values for the <u>seriousness</u> of pupil disruptive behaviors the following number values were assigned each area (degree of seriousness):

Positive	Harmless	Nuisance	Serious	Very Serious
1.0	2.0	3.0	4.0	5.0

Mean values reported in Table 5.2 reflect any value over 4.0. A value of 4.0(+) would indicate a serious behavior.

*The derived mean values for each pupil disruptive behavior reported in Table 5.2 were taken from Chapter IV: Table 4.35 and 4.36.



teachers added further support to Wickman findings. His findings showed that classroom teachers were more aware of disruptive behaviors that interfered with accomplishing the goals of instruction than they were with pupil disruptive behaviors that were related to the personality of the pupil. The same seemed to be true of this group of student teachers.

The <u>serious</u> pupil disruptive behaviors derived from Chapter IV: Tables 4.35 and 4.36 were also examined in light of Wickman's groupings. The behaviors listed in Tables 4.35 and 4.36 were perceived by student teachers as occurring <u>seldom</u> or <u>weekly</u>. Table 5.2 reflected the result of the combined findings for Form One and Form Two.

Pupil disruptive behaviors of the <u>seriousness</u> dimension were primarily identified by student teachers as <u>Violations of Standards of Morality and Integrity and</u> <u>Violations of General School Regulations</u>. The original Wickman study and subsequent studies have consistently identified serious pupil disruptive behaviors that were related to acts of immorality, transgressions against authority, violations of classroom, order and violations of school work requirements.

From this finding, student teachers agreed with Wickman and other related studies that <u>serious</u> pupil disruptive behaviors were highly related to acts of immorality. Behaviors that had associated personality problems were also sublimated by student teachers. <u>The most significant</u>



finding, however, was the student teacher's primary concern for pupil disruptive behaviors which were related to violations of school regulations. Other studies of public school teachers that used Wickman as a basis have not indicated this primary concern.

The nature of the pupil disruptive behaviors grouped under "Violations of School Regulations" seemed to be problems, when viewed within the context of the classroom and school, that are indeed complex. Pupil disruptive behaviors related to possession of firecrackers, narcotics, alcohol, Molotov cocktails, knives, and guns have far wider affiliation than the public schools; they are behaviors of some youth which are presently shaking the entire rubric of major institutions in the American society. The total lack of primary concern for serious behaviors related to classroom order and school work suggested that the student teachers tended to see pupil disruptive behaviors in a wider and more global fashion whereas public school teachers have tended to identify serious pupil disruptive behaviors closely related to running a smooth, efficient classroom and maintaining their authority or control over pupils.



Implications for Further Research

Henderson's³ clinical research model outlined phase two as describing and examining school and community contexts and classroom situations. This study of student teachers' perceptions of pupil disruptive behaviors concentrated upon exploring phase two: Variable Description and Examination. To move to Henderson's⁴ Model Study, from the findings of this study would be premature as much more attention needs to be given to describing variables as they relate to pupil disruptive behaviors.

The seven variables examined in this study are but a few among the many that relate to the school as it interacts with the community and society at large. The affect of the community and total societal variables upon the nature of pupil disruptive behaviors has yet to be given the attention it deserves. Research examining pupil disruptive behaviors that excludes major technological advances, major social issues, social change, and the role of the government in American lines is indeed short sighted and perhaps oversimplified. When the complexity of the community and societal variables are considered one is almost overwhelmed when the classroom situation is added. Major variables of content and

> ³Henderson, <u>op. cit</u>., p. 21. ⁴Ibid., p. 21



inquiry strategies, the learner, group climate, teacher personality, physical conditions, and technological advances in teaching all have a major influence upon the perceived frequency and seriousness of pupil disruptive behavior. In short, the identified pupil disruptive behaviors of this study are (1) only a few of the many forms of behaviors that may exist in our schools today, (2) not clearly understood until they are fully examined in terms of school, community, and societal variables and classroom dimensions. Any research treatment of the explorative findings of this study which precludes a thorough examination of the above variables is most risky at this stage of development.

Having stated the above concerns, the <u>major</u> implication of the study of student teacher perceptions of pupil disruptive behaviors is related to the <u>significant</u> <u>interaction effects</u> between <u>items</u> (pupil disruptive behaviors) and the <u>categories</u> of six of the seven variables examined in this study. Team teaching as a variable had no significant interaction and main effects and therefore would not be recommended for further study. The intent of further research could be to identify which specific pupil disruptive behaviors are related to the categories under sex of the student teacher, socio-economic level of the schools as perceived by the student teacher, size of classes taught by the student teacher, classes taught by



the student teacher all day, special education classes taught by the student teacher, and population and economic community and school types in which the student teacher is assigned. This study did not undertake the identification of the specific pupil disruptancies for each category; its main thrust was to determine if the main variables mentioned above were significantly related to pupil disruptive behaviors. The significate interaction effects of items and variables categories suggest that when items are viewed on an individual basis per category there is significance. The next step, then, would be to determine which items (pupil disruptive behaviors) are significantly related to each category under all the examined variables except team teaching. If this step were undertaken it would yield initial understanding of pupil disruptive behaviors as they occur in classes of varying size, schools and communities in different economic lands, in groups taught all day as opposed to part of the day, special education classes and non-special education classes, and male and female student teachers. This would be a significant but small step toward fuller understanding of pupil disruptive behaviors occurring during student teaching.

Further research could be undertaken to relate findings of student teachers as pre-professionals to findings of a similar Learning Systems Institute's study which used public school teachers as its population.



Related to this topic, the general finding that the perceived seriousness of pupil disruptive behaviors may be related to the development of the student from preprofessional experiences to professional activities provides an interesting starting point for further research.

A 1965 study by Kaoi and Schutz⁵ used a rotated factor loading analysis to examine disturbing behaviors which determined the following five factors: Physical Aggression, Peer Affinity, Attention-Seeking, Challenge of Authority, and Critical Dissension. The result of the study was the statistical formation of a classification system for pupil disruptive behaviors. The disruptive behaviors reflective of the five categories may be an indication of the various techniques and approaches for handling specific situations. Extended research which examines student teachers perceptions of pupil disruptive behaviors via a similar statistical method may provide teacher education with a consistent categorical system, sharper insights as to the relatedness of various pupil disruptive behaviors, and general indications as to how situations may be handled.

The questionnaire provides another major area for further research. The questionnaire is presently divided

⁵Beverly Y. Kaoi and Richard E. Schutz, "A Factor Analysis of Classroom-Disturbance Intercorrelations," <u>American Education Research Journal</u>, Vol. LVII (1965), 37-40.



in two forms: Form One and Form Two. To date there has been no thorough item analysis, validity, and reliability checks made upon the instruments; however, there have been attempts to eliminate items that were ambiguous or that were not responded to. Furthermore, it may be feasible to fuse the two instruments as some items, although worded differently, are examining the same behavior.

The <u>replication</u> results for all variables examined indicated that respondents answered the question for each item differently. One general indication at present, then, is that the instrument is functioning to the point where items are not being answered in a homogeneous manner. If the questionnaire is to serve Learning Systems Institute and other interested researchers in the future, the above recommendation needs foremost attention.

Finally, application of the results of this study to other student teacher populations from colleges having different teacher preparation programs and having varying sizes of student bodies could also be undertaken. This would help in ascertaining consistent and inconsistent results regarding pupil disruptive behaviors and various independent variables.

Implications for Teacher Education

The findings of this study and subsequent studies regarding pupil disruptive behaviors could be phased into



teacher education courses of the School of Teacher Education of Michigan State University. One way in which the **fin**dings related to the frequency and seriousness of pupil **dis**ruptive behaviors could be obtained is by teaming successful classroom teachers, educational psychologists, and teacher educators for the purpose of generating prescriptive teaching practices for dealing with the pupil disruptive behaviors. The prescriptive teaching practices **coul**d be designed to fit automated and paper-pencil simulation experiences. The intent of such experiences **coul**d be to individually prescribe pupil disruptive behaviors that would likely occur to a student if he were assigned to a school in a particular type of community, assigned in a particular academic discipline, and assigned at a particular grade level. The student, via the simulated experiences, then could practice making and analyzing decisions related to ways in which they could handle a **Particular situation.** The emphasis of such experiences **should** be upon the teacher as a decision-maker rather than the teacher as an accumulator of a "bag of tricks." Expecting pre-professionals to continually identify, **Attack**, evaluate, and re-counter problems related to pupil **disruptive** behaviors does not assume that there are "pat" Solutions to handling any of the disruptive behaviors. The attempt could be (1) a familiarization of techniques that would be most suitable to specific forms of pupil



disruptive behaviors, (2) a relating of pupil disruptive behavior and the corrective technique to educational theory and principles, and (3) a development of the habit of making educational decisions in light of available data.

Moving to the above description will not be accomplished without consideration of the following areas:

- 1. Students may not feel particularly anxious about pupil disruptive behaviors which are viewed as serious <u>but</u> seldom occur. Stated in another way, what responsibility does teacher education have to the student who perceives simulated or in-class experiences related to seldom occurring serious pupil disruptive behaviors as a waste of time?
- 2. Some students may be aware that some pupil disruptive behaviors will likely occur but they may not be anxious about them. Again, does teacher education have a responsibility for preparing students to handle situations they are not particularly bothered by <u>before</u> the field experience?
- 3. The above concerns (Points 1 and 2) stated in another way: what is the role of the learner in the process that is suggested above?
- 4. Until the above fundamental questions and other similar questions are answered regarding the "phasing in" of simulated experiences



related to pupil disruptive behaviors much misunderstanding and misuse could occur.

The move from model development to application in teacher education, then, is not without its problems and one should not be too hasty in pushing a concept until the fundamental questions and issues similar to the ones mentioned above have been settled.

A second and similar implication related to student teaching may be found in some of the student teacher's personal teaching experiences. If, for example, a student teacher has difficulty in handling a specific form of Pupil disruptive behavior, he may use the simulated experences for reviewing, finding new techniques, and further analyzing his handling of the situation.

The pupil disruptive behaviors identified in this study also offer a base from which discussions in student teacher seminar meetings may evolve.

In summary, teacher education at Michigan State University may eventually benefit from this study and Others to follow in that discussions of pupil disruptive behaviors could be initiated from a factual basis of the Pupil disruptive behaviors viewed by student teachers as Most frequent and serious. Further emphasis in education courses could also be given to the teacher as a decisionmaker.



BIBLIOGRAPHY



BIBLIOGRAPHY

- "Activities and Arrangements for the 1969-70 Michigan Assessment of Education." Assessment Report Number Two. Michigan Department of Education, 1969.
- Batchhelder, Howard T, McGlasson, Maurice, and Schorling, Raleigh. <u>Student Teaching in Secondary Schools</u>. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1956.
- Berelson, Bernard, and Steiner, Gary A. Human Behavior: An Inventory of Scientific Findings. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1964.
- Betts, George H. "Teacher's Diagnosis of Classroom Difficulties." <u>Elementary School Journal</u> (April, 1927), 600-08.
- Bond, Jesse. "Analysis of Observed Traits of Who Were Rated Superior in School Discipline." Journal of Educational Research, Vol. XLV (March, 1952), 507-16.
- Bouchard, John B., and Hull, Ronald E. "A Pilot Study of Problems and Practices in the Induction of Beginning Teachers." Paper presented at 1969 Meeting of Education Research Association of New York State, Concord Hotel, Kiamesha Lake, New York, November 6, 1969.
- Cookingham, Frank. "Critical Research: A Two-Way Street Between Research and Practice." Papers of the Institute No. 52, Learning Systems Institute, Michigan State University, June, 1967.
- Corey, Stephen. Action Research to Improve School <u>Practices.</u> New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1953.


- Corman, Bernard R. "Action Research: A Teaching or a Research Method?" <u>Review of Education Research</u>, Vol. XXVXVII (December, 1957).
- Corsini, R. J., and Howard D. D. <u>Critical Incidents in</u> <u>Teaching</u>. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1964.
- Deiulio, Anthony. "Problems of Student Teachers." <u>Ameri-</u> can Teacher, Vol. XLVI (December, 1961).
- Eaton, Merrill T., Di'Amico, Louis, and Phillips, Beeman N. "Problem Behavior in School." Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. XLVII (October, 1956), 350-57.
- Ellis, D. B., and Miller, L. W. "A Study of the Attitudes of Teacher's Toward Behavior Problems." Journal of Educational Psychology, XXVII (1936), 501-11.
- Epstein, Leon. "An Analysis of Teachers Judgments of Problem Children." Journal of Genetic Psychology, Vol. LIX (September, 1941), 101-07.
- Fuller, Frances. "Concerns of Teacher's: A Developmental Conceptualization." <u>American Education Research</u> Journal, Vol. VI (March, 1969), 207-26.
- Galvin, John P., and Quay, Herbert C. "Behavior Disorders." <u>Review of Educational Research</u>, Vol. XXXIX (February, 1969).
- Gnagey, William J. <u>Controlling Classroom Misbehavior</u>. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1965.
- _____. "Effects of a Deviant Student's Response to Discipline." Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. LI (February, 1960).
- Greene, James E., and Gatesky, Francis. "Discipline and Morale." Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. XII, No. 4, (December, 1961).
- Haggerty, M. E. "The Incidence of Undesirable Behavior in Public School Children." Journal of Educational Research, Vol. XII (September, 1925), 102-12.
- Henderson, Judith. "An Investigation of Practitioner Evaluation and Agreement Regarding Effective Language Arts Instruction." Unpublished Doctoral thesis, Michigan State University, College of Education, 1968.



- Hildreth, Gertrude. "A Survey of Problem Pupils." Journal of Educational Research, Vol. XVII (June, 1928).
- Hillway, Tyrus. <u>Handbook of Educational Research: A</u> <u>Guide to Methods and Material</u>. Boston: Houghton <u>Mifflin Company</u>, 1969.
- Hodgkinson, Harold L. "Advantages and Limitations of Informal Classroom Investigations." <u>American</u> Business Education Yearbook, 1961.
- Hugo, David J., ed. <u>Handbook for Student Teachers, Michi-gan State University</u>. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Book Company, 1964.
- Hunter, E. C. "Changes in Teachers' Attitudes Toward Children's Behavior over the Last Thirty Years." Mental Hygiene, Vol. XLIV (January, 1957).
- Ionnaccone, Lawrence, and Button, H. Warren. Functions of Student Teaching. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Health, Education and Welfare Research Project 1026, 1964.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967.
- Kooi, Beverly Y., and Schultz, Richard E. "A Factor Analysis of Classroom Disturbance Intercorrelations." <u>American Education Research Journal</u>, Vol. LVII (1965), 37-40.
- Kounin, J. S., Friesen, Wallace V., and Norton, A. Evangeline. "Managing Emotionally Disturbed Children in Regular Classrooms." Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. LVII, No. 1 (February, 1966).
- _____, and Gump, P. V. "The Ripple Effect in Discipline." <u>Elementary School Journal</u>, Vol. LIX (December, 1958).
- Levy, John. "Quantitative Study of Relationship Between Intelligence and Economic Factors in the Etiology of Children's Behavior Problems." <u>American Journal</u> of Orthopsychiatry, Vol. I (January, 1931).
- Mitzel, Harold E., and Medley, Donald M. "Measuring Classroom Behavior by Systematic Observation." <u>Handbook of Research on Teaching</u>. Edited by N. L. Gnge. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1963.



- Mutimer, Dorothy D., and Rosemier, Robert A. "Behavior Problems of Children as Viewed by Teachers and Children Themselves." Journal of Consulting Psychology, Vol. XXXI (December, 1967).
- Peck, Leigh. "Teachers' Reports of the Problems of Unadjusted School Children." Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. XXVI (1935), 123-38.
- Redl, Fritz. When We Deal With Children. New York: The Free Press, 1966.
- _____, and Wineman, D. <u>Controls From Within</u>. New York: The Free Press, 1952.
- _____, and Wineman, D. <u>The Aggressive Child</u>. New York: The Free Press, 1957.
- Schrupp, Manfred H., and Gjerde, Clayton M. "Teacher Growth in Attitudes of Children." Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. XLIV (1953).
- Sharp, Jack. Off Campus Student Teaching. Thirtieth Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching, Iowa: Association for Student Teaching, 1951.
- Sparks, J. N. "Teacher Attitudes Toward the Behavior Problems of Children." Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. XLIII, No. 5 (May, 1952).
- Stouffer, George A. "Behavior Problems of Children as Viewed by Teachers and Mental Hygienists: A Study of Present Attitudes as Compared with Those Reported by E. K. Wickman." <u>Mental Hygiene</u>, XXXVI (1952).
- <u>Student Teaching: Questions and Answers for Prospective</u> <u>Student Teachers</u>. East Lansing, Mich.: Michigan State University, College of Education, Student Teaching Office.
- Tolar, A., Scarpetti, W. L., and Lane, P. A. "Teachers' Attitudes Toward Children's Behavior Revisited." Vol. LVIII (1967), 175-80.
- Thompson, Michael L. "Identifying Anxieties Experienced by Student Teachers." Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. XIV (December, 1963), 435-39.



- Travers, Robert, Rabinowitz, M. W., and Nemovicher, Elinor. "The Anxieties of a Group of Student Teachers." Educational Administration and Supervision, XXXVIII (October, 1952).
- Ward, Ted W. "Professional Integration and Clinical Research." Learning Systems Institute, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1966.
- Watson, Goodwin. "A Critical Note on Two Attitude Studies." <u>Mental Hygiene</u>, Vol. XVII (January, 1933).
- Wickman, E. R. <u>Children's Behavior and Teachers' Atti-</u> tudes. <u>New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1932</u>.
- Wingo, Max G., and Schorling, Raleigh. <u>Elementary School</u> <u>Student Teaching</u>. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1960.
- Yourman, Julius. "Children Identified by Their Teachers as Problems." Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. V (February, 1932).



APPENDICES



APPENDIX A

DIRECTIONS AND QUESTIONNAIRES

(FORM ONE AND FORM TWO)



DIRECTIONS

It is very important for you to read the descriptions below before examining the questionnaire.

On the left hand side of the following answer sheets are lists of behaviors which may or may not be exhibited by various types of students. To the right of the behaviors, and at the <u>top of the page</u>, are two questions; each is explained in detail below.

QUESTION A. HOW OFTEN DO YOU ENCOUNTER THIS BEHAVIOR?

For this question, we are interested in how often you <u>personally</u> encounter this student behavior in your present teaching situation.

For each behavior listed at the left margin, there are five possible responses: hourly, daily, weekly, seldom, and never. To answer this question, consider first whether the behavior occurs <u>at least</u> once every hour in your classroom situation. If it does not, consider next whether it occurs at least once every day. Continue from left to right across the five choices until you determine which response is appropriate for your teaching situation. For example, if the behavior occurs every other day, you would mark the space in the weekly column; that means the behavior does not occur at least every day, but it does occur at least once every week. If the behavior does not occur at least once every week, mark the space in the column headed "seldom." If <u>you never encounter</u> this behavior, either because it does not occur, you are unaware of whether it occurs, or it is handled directly by the administration, mark the space in the column headed "never." Mark only <u>one</u> response to this question for each behavior.

QUESTION B. HOW DO YOU PERCEIVE THIS BEHAVIOR?

This question asks for your personal opinion as to whether the behavior under consideration is a positive behavior, a harmless behavior, or a serious problem. There are five possible responses to this question. <u>Read carefully</u> the following explanation of each of the response choices.

- POSITIVE: This is a <u>positive</u> behavior in my teaching situation. I try to <u>encourage</u> it.
- HARMLESS: This is a <u>harmless</u> behavior in my teaching situation. I usually ignore or fail to notice it.
- NUISANCE: This is a <u>nuisance</u>. It bothers me, but it may not bother other teachers. I usually try to discourage it.
- SERIOUS: This is a <u>serious problem</u> in my teaching situation. I try to <u>stop</u> it; but it may be attended to either when it occurs or at a later time.
- EXTREMELY: This is an extremely serious deviancy in my teaching situation.

SERIOUS: The behavior must be stopped immediately.

The third answer sheet asks for background data about you. The directions for responding to this sheet are at the top of the answer sheet.

Please remember:

- 1. Use a pencil. Make heavy marks. No pens or colored pencils.
- 2. If you wish to change an answer, be sure to erase thoroughly.
- 3. Do not staple or fold your answer sheets.

Thank you for your cooperation.



RINTED IN U.S.A.

BACKGROUND DATA

Jsin	g an ordinar	y per	icil, blacken	the sp	9999 (the-l	eft.of	the
iqqi	opriate resp	onse.	Forquestio	ns: 1 t	hroug	h-9; 1	you:sh	ould
marl	k=only one r	espor	ise for each	questi	on:Fo	r-que	stions	10:
thro	ugh=11-you	тау і	mark any nu	imber	of res	ponse	s	
₩ha	t-is-your-sex	?						
	= Male====							
	::Female:							
Alha	it is the high	est ec	lucational le	vel:yo	u:have	com	leted	?
	=:Doctoral	Degre	e					
	=:Education	nal Sp	ecialist					*****
	=:Master's [Degrei	9 22222					
	Some Col	lege						
	=: High Scho	o o t Đi	ed tes					
Wha	at is your age	?::::		*****				
-	=:21 or:und	er:::						
	22-25							
	== 26-30===							
	=:31-40===							
	-:41-50							
	51-60							
	::Over:60							

Ais o	of June 1969), wha	at will be the	e total	nemb	erof	years	
of t	eaching expe	erienc	e≕yonu will h	ave ha	d?::::			
	=:0=1 years							
	=:2:4 years							
	:::5-10 year	S:::::						
	:::11-20:yea	11:5 - : :						
	:: Over 20 y	ears						
Do	you teach to	the s	same group	ofistud	lents a	ill clay	?	
(Ex	clude extra-	curric	ular activitie	es):::::				
	¥es					*****		
2272	::f\to :::::							
wh	at is the aver	age st	udent enrol	iment	in the	classe	Street	
you	now teach?							
	== 10 and ur	nder:						
	17.00							
and the	21.27							
	29.24							
	40-34-== Outor 24							22022
	Uver 34							
Are	you present	ly:tea	m:teaching:					
	Y:es							

147 PLEASE DO NOT WRITE IN THIS BOX

0	1	2	3	.4	5	6		8	9	=
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	=
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	=
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	=
A	В	C								=
8. From	n:wha	t socio	-econ	omic class	are the	majo	rity:of			Ξ
stud	ents-y	ou:tea	ich?=							=
	Low	er								=
10000	Mide	dle:::								_
	Upp	er:::::								=
										=
9. Do	you:te	a <mark>ch:s</mark> p	eciał e	ducation o	classes?					=
	Yes									_
stone	No									=
										=
0.:Wha	t-grad	e(s) ar	e:you	presently	teaching	?:If:n	on-gra	ded;		=
:wha	t level	?								=
	::K:									=
										Ξ
	::2:									=
	::3:									=
	4-									=
	::5:									=
	6:									=
										=
	8-									=
	::9:									=
10000	- 10									=
10555										=
C5280	12									=
										_
1. In w	hich s	ubject	t matt	er:anea(s) c	io you r	now:te	each cl	asses?		=
=(Ele	menta	ry tea	chers:	be sure to	o m at ki a	all tha	t:appl	y)		=
	Art									=
	Busi	ness. E	ducat	iqn:::						=
	Fore	eign La	anguag	90						=
	:Heal	th:and	Phys	ical Educa	tion::::					_
	:Horr	ne:and	Eami	ly:Living						=
	:Hom	ne Eco	nomic	Se 2222						=
	:Hum	nanitie	S:::::							=
	Indu	istrial	Arts							=
	Lang	juage	Arts (i	including E	nglish)					=
	Libr	ary:=								=
	:Math	hemat	ics							=
	:Mus	iQ:::::								=
	Safe	ty/Dr	iver:E	ducation						=
19999	Scie	nce::								=
	-Seci	al:Stu	dies:							=
	Vec	ationa	I/Dist	ributive Ec	lucation					=
										-



					148	PLI	ASE	001	NUTW	RITEIN	IHIS	ROX			_
							2	2		-	0	7	0		=
							2	3			6		.0.	9	=
						1	2	- 1000	4		6	7	8	9	-
						1	2	3	4		6	7	8	9	Ξ
					A	В	C		7			23000			Ξ
					A How	often	do vou	encou	inter	B	How d		erceiv		_
					A. 11044	this	behavi	or?			this	behavi	or?	******	_
					- H- O	A	E	E	E	0	A	U N	E	× s	=
					R	L	÷Е- К	D	E		M	S	- 8-	FE BR	_
					Y	::¥:	Y	M	-:R=		E	N	Ü	MO	_
										Ĕ	S	Ĕ	- 5-	LS	_
															=
EXAMPLE					A										_
					A										=
Showing disrespect for another stude	nt's opinions				1										=
Naively asking teacher personal ques	tions.				2										=
Failing to follow directions for assign	ment.				2										=
Leaving desks or lockers messy.					4										=
Playing with toys, yo-yo's, etc. in cla	ss .				5										-
Leaving room before dismissal.					6										=
Throwing temper tantrums.					7										=
Girls wearing skirts too short.					8										=
Making allusions to sex (written or vi	erbal).				9										=
Carrying cigarettes.					10										_
Pulling a student's hair.					11										=
Swearing at teacher.					12										=
Cheating on in-class assignment.					13										=
Failing to put away materials after us	se.				14										_
Throwing erasers, spitballs, paper air	planes, etc. ir	class.			15										_
Refusing to participate in class activi	ties or assign	ments.			16										_
Gossiping among students.					17										_
Combing hair in class.					18										_
Having arms around each other outsi	de of class or	school p	property	Y	19										_
Postessing alcohol on school property					20										=
Pulling proph and teacher	int s property	ii			21. :::::										=
Failing to complete homework					22. :::::										=
Misusing class materials (e.g. turning	Bunsen burn	er too hi			23										_
Talking out while class is working out	ietly		gn).		24										-
Davdreaming in class					25				:::::						_
Always asking to go to the bathroom	or get a drir	k of wat	:::::: er.		26										Ξ
Wearing clothes too tight.					27										Ξ
Holding hands in class.					28. :::::										_
Possessing firecrackers on school pro	perty.				29										_
Calling another student names.	1111 III				30										=
Complaining about grades.					31										_
Turning in messy papers.					32. :::::										_
Forgetting notebooks, textbooks, or	other classro	om mate	rials.		33										-
Whispering, or nonverbally communi	cating at inag	propriat	e times		34										
Cutting classes or skipping school.					36										



149 PLEASE DU NUT WRITE IN THIS BOX														=	
								~		-	~	-	•	~	=
					7 0		2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	=
					3		2	30000	4	5	6	7	8	9	=
						30000-	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	=
					A	B	C					30005			=
					()	- 60000-	22222			 P	Howed		arcoiv		Ξ
					A. HOV	this	behavio	or?	uoner.		thist	pehavio	r?	·	Ξ
					H	D	-W-	S.	E N	P	H=	=N== U	-9 E	E S	Ξ
					-Ŭ- B	1	E	Đ	E	ŝ	R.	S	-R	RR	=
					Y	-¥-	Ϋ́Υ	M	- H	T	Ē	N	0	MO	=
										E	S	E	- S	LS	=
Displaying masochistic behavior to dem	and attentio	on.												¥	=
ailing to be adequately clean.					37				-103965						=
.ooking.up girl's skirt.					30						Manage of	-			=
Reading or possessing obscene books or	pornograpi	nic mate	rials in	class.	40							-			_
erbally interrupting a student while he	e is talking t	o teache	er or cla	ISS.	41		unter-					-			=
Making passes at teacher or getting fresh	n with teach	er.			42				College)				VIDEODEL		=
Cheating on tests.					43								-		=
Ehrowing water.					44							-1000			_
Answering questions in humorous, disru	ptive way.				45. ****	4000					-				Ξ
atting in wrong seat.					46		-90000-								Ξ
Using slang in class.					47						(Same				Ξ
Chewing gum_in_class					48										=
Kissing outside of class on school prope	rty.				49				interest		-				=
Throwing things out window.					50							-			=
Stealing from another student.					51				40007				-		=
Questioning teacher's opinion.					52	10000				eago:					=
Inder the influence of narcotics in class					53			-475281						1000	=
Veliberately dropping books or other of	ojects in cla	ss .			54				20002			1000			=
Prawing pictures to poke fun at teacher					55				26250-			-55809			=
Turning in false fire alarms or homb sea					56				-00092			group.			=
Calling togehow by first same					57				-260.02-						=
Writing on walls					58				-50090-		-Millio				Ξ
Slouching or otherwise sitting inapprop	riately in se	at.			59		00000					-10005.			Ξ
Making noise in the halls.					60	20030-						20020			=
Solling pants.					61	20000					200022				=
Possessing guns on school property.					62				-00000						=
Caring for fingernails in class.					64										=
Verbally interrupting teacher while she	is talking.				65							-			=
Stealing materials from school.					66		-04007						-		=
															=
PLEASE REMEMBER:															=
1. Use a pencil. Make hear	vy marks.	No per	s or co	olored	pencils.										=
2. If you wish to change a	in answer,	be sure	e to er	ase the	oroughly.										Ξ
3. Do not staple or fold y	our answe	sheet	5												Ξ
New															Ξ
*** **** **** ****															Ξ
**** ***** ***** *****															=
···· ···· ···· ····															=

149 PLEASE DO NOT WRITE IN THIS BOX

RINTED IN U.S.A.



PRINTED IN U.S.A.

BACKGROUND DATA

Using an ordinary pencil, blacken the space to the left of the													
appropriate response. For questions: 1 through: 9, you should													
-mark only one response for each question: For questions 10													
through=11=you may mark any number of-responses													
:Wħa	t fis your sex	2:::::											
	=Male====												
-	=:Female=												
₩ha	t-is-the-high	e st e d	ucational lev	et-you	.i=have	comp	leted?						
	Doctoral	Degree	9 20000					*****					
	=:Education	nal:Spe	ecialist										
	Master's D	Degree											
-	Some Col	lege:											
	High-Scho	o ot De	gree										

₩ha	t-is your age	2::::											
22032	=:21 or und	er:::											
	-:22-25:												
	::Over:60												
As c	of June 1969), wha	t will be the	total	namb	er of y	ears						
of te	eaching expe	rience	you will ha	ve had	2:00								
24020	=0-1 years												
	=:2-4 years												
	::5:10:year:	S=====											
	==11-20:yea	irs ===											
	=: Over: 20 y	ears											
Do	võu teach to	the si	ame group o	fistud	ents a	ll day							
:tEx	, clude extra-c	erricu	lar activitie	\$)									
	Yes												
	::No :::::												
₩ha	at is the aver	age stu	dent enroll	nenti	in the	classe:	S						
:: y ou	now teach?												
	= 10 and un	nder-											
-													
	::21-27 :::												
	::28-34:												
	Over 34												
7: Are	you present	ly:tear	n:teaching?										
	Yes												
-	::No :::::												

150 PLEASE DO NOT WRITE IN THIS BOX

a se se se

_

											-
-	0	1	2	3	.4	5	6	7	.8	.9	=
2	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	.7	.8	9	=
2	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	=
-	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	=
2	A	В	С			03996					=
2			89990								_
8	. Fron	n=wha	t socio	0-860U	omie class a	are the	major	ity:of			-
	stud	ents-y	ou-tea	ich?=							-
		-Low	er								=
	NSR .	Mide	dike:==								=
		:Upp	er								=
											=
9	. Do y	ou te	ach:sp	eciat e	descation cl	asses?					=
		:¥es									=
	10000	:No									=
											=
10	. Wha	t grad	e(s) ar	e:you	presently te	eaching	? If n	on-gra	ided;		=
	what	tievel	?								=
		::K:									-
		1									-
		-:2:									=
											=
		4-									=
		5-									_
											=
											=
											=
		0-									=
		9									=
											=
											=
	20096	:::1:2									_
											_
11	.=tn=w	hich s	ubject	matte	er:area(s) do	you r	now te	ach=cl	asses?		-
	=(Elei	menta	ry tea	chers:	be sure to	mark a	al l th a	t appl	¥3::::=		=
		Art									=
		Busi	ness-E	ducati	QET :::						_
		-Fore	ign:La	nguag	le						=
		Heai	th and	Phys	icat Educati	on:==					_
		Hom	e and	Famil	ly:Living						=
	1000	Herr	e:Eco	nomic	Second						=
		Hum	anitie	S=====							=
		:Indu	strial	Arts							=
		Lang	juage /	Arts:(i	neluding Er	(dailgr					=
		Libr	ary::								-
		Math	nemati	CS::::							=
		Musi	C								=
		Safe	tw/Dri	war Fr	impation						=
		Scie	DCP-=								=
		Soci	al Sto	dies-							=
		Noc	ationa	1/Diet-	ibutive Edu	cation					=
		. x 30C	ucrettid	17.0350	and tive COL	CHINDI					=



PRINTER	2 IN U. S.	~								151 PLEASE DO NOT WRITE IN THIS BOX										Ξ
										0	1.	2	.3	.4	5	. 6	.7.	8	9	Ξ
										5 0	.1	.2	.3	4		6	.7	8	9	=
										0	1	. 2	3	4	. 5	6	.7	8	9	=
										5 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Ξ
										A A	В	С								Ξ
										A. Ho	w ofte	n do ye	ou enco	ounter	E	. How	do you	perce	VB	Ξ
										::H:	:: D:	::W	:::S:	::N:	:: P .::	::H:	::N:	::S::	E	=
				c:::::						==U=	A	= E	E	E V:	s	R-		:R:	X S T E	Ξ
										- R	÷	ĸ	D	R		M	SA	0	R R E T	=
										. <u>Y</u>		Y.	M			ES	N C	s	MO	=
															E	S	Ē		L.S	=
EXA	MPLE																			=
JUMF	ING	OFF:SC	ноог	ROOF						A									-	=
																	-3885			=
Draw	ing pic	ture to	poke	fun at anothe	r stude	nt.				1,				-868R		40506-				=
Askin	ig teac	her per	sonal	uestions to p	urposel	ly make	e her u	ncomte	ortable.	2				10000			1007			=
Doing	wron	g assigr	nment.							3				275%s.			480*			=
Failin	ig to h	ang up	coats,	boots, etc.						4				allan			101000			=
CIICK	ing per	is, or m	naking	other similar	noises i	in class				5			annex			3839 m				=
Rerus	ang to	take le	ecture r	iotes.						6		-36570.				-12080				=
Woori	g in ci	355.	into ele	thing log lo				t ata l		7				Galifika.		30006		49807		=
Discu	esina s	evual	natters	Annig, te.g. to	w cor c	li esses,	npper	, etc.,.		8				-		10100				=
Small	issing s	exual I								9	-					obise				=
Swee	ring of	anothe	ar etude	ant.						10				design			state			=
Arou	ing wit	h teach	nor							11			48884	20040			18509			=
Char	ting of	home	work							12		10000			30086					Ξ
Carel	orely u	rion m	work.	in a milling	nainte)					13				atten				-		Ξ
Thro	wing e	asers	spithall	s paper airol:	anes et					14				1000						Ξ
Com	olainin	abou	t class	activities or a	ssionme	ents				15				'Siddate:				797942		=
Spitt	ina.									16		30309				3855				=
Putti	ng on r	nake-u	p in cla	155.						17				30000						=
Hugg	ing or l	having	arms a	round each ot	ther in a	class.				18. 82684							39996			=
Unde	r the in	fluenc	e of al	cohol in class						19				200805			20100			=
Thro	wing th	nings at	anoth	er student.						20				20086						=
Pullin	g pran	k again	st teac	her.						21								-		=
Failir	g to co	mplete	e in-cla	ss assignment						22										=
Misus	ing bat	hroom	s (e.g.	stuffing up to	ilets, th	nrowing	g paper	aroun	d).	24				-				-		_
Askir	ng irrele	evant q	uestion	ns (not pertain	ning to	conten	t being	discus	sed).	25				-			-			=
Sleep	ing in a	class.								26			-				-			=
Exce	ssive co	mplair	ning ab	out feeling ill	(hypod	hondri	ac).			27				GADER			10000-			=
Boys	wearin	ıg shirt	s out.							28				-		-				=
Hold	ing har	ds out	side of	class on scho	ol prop	erty.				29				4000		-				=
Posse	ssing b	rass kn	uckles	, molotov coc	ktails,	etc. on	school	prope	rty.	30				TRACTO					-	=
Maki	ng fun	of ano	ther st	udent.						31,			-					-		Ξ
Sassi	ng or s	peaking	rudel	to teacher.						32				14092				-		=
Plagi	arizing.									33				-					-	=
Forg	etting l	unch m	noney,	permission sli	ips or o	ther no	n-acad	emic m	naterials	34				-						=
Writi	ng and	passing	perso	nal notes in cl	lass.					35			-14500				-			=
Com	ing to c	lass tar	dy.							36			otitite				1000			=



										152 PLEASE DO NOT WRITE IN THIS BOX										Ξ
											1.	.2	.3	.4.	5	6.		.8.	.9	_
										5 0	.1	2	3	4		6	.7.	.8	.9	=
										0	.1	2	3	4	. 5		.7.	8	9	_
										0	. 1	2	3	4	5	6	.7	8	9	_
										A.A.	B	C								_
										A. Ho	ow ofte	n do y	ou enc	ounter	В	How d	lo you i	perceiv	e	_
										H-	this	behav W	ior?	-N-	P.	this I H	behavio N	r? S	E	=
										0	A	E	E	E	0	A	U	E	XS	=
										R	L	ĸ	D	E	1	M	S	1	RR	_
										Ŷ		Ŷ	м		1	E	N	U	мо	=
															E.	S	E	5	LS	=
Displ	aying r	nasoch	istic be	havior to dem	hand at	tention													Y	=
Failir	ng to h	ave hair	r cut pr	operly.						37.				-						=
Maki	ng obs	cene ge	stures.							38.				10000						=
Posse	ssing s	tolen g	oods (n	ot stolen from	n schoo	ol, teac	her or	studen	ts).	39.				10105						_
Laug	hing at	anothe	er stude	ent's mistakes						40.				20080						=
Inapp	propria	te disp	lay of a	affection towa	ards tea	cher.				41.										=
Chea	ting on	tests.								42.										_
Thro	wing.re	efuse or	n floor.							40.				1000						=
Whis	pering,	or non	verball	y_communica	ting aft	ter teac	her's n	equest	to stop.	44.			100034				30000			=
Read	ling, wr	riting, e	tc. whi	ile teacher is t	alking.					40.			ctelle.				49985			=
Pullir	ng pran	iks (e.g.	hiding	things).						40.				20000						=
Chew	ving gu	m in cla	BSS.							47.				2000						=
Petti	ng outs	ide of o	class or	school prope	erty.					40.				-						=
Start	ing fire	s.								40.				36942						=
Hitti	ng, sho	ving, or	r trippi	ng another stu	udent.					50.										_
Point	ting out	t teache	er's mis	stakes.						52			20525		26900-					=
Posse	essing n	arcotic	s on sc	hool property						53 ·····				20002						=
Putti	ng note	es on th	ne black	kboard when t	teacher	isn't th	nere.			54				-30000						_
Maki	ng fun	of teac	her.							55				19965						=
Expe	elling ga	as in cla	355,							56				10085						=
. Faili	ng to le	ave bui	ilding d	luring fire dril	II					57				200300						=
Lyin	g to tea	cher w	ith the	intent to dec	eive (no	ot fanta	isy),			58				.2000						=
Writi	ing on a	desk to	ps.							59				1000						=
. Putti	ing boo	ks or p	apers a	way too soon	•					60. *****				10.005						=
Tattl	ling.									61				-909						Ξ
Soilir	ng pant	s								62				10005						_
Posse	essing k	nives o	n schoo	ol property.						63				10004						=
Eatin	ng in cla	ass.								64				10038						Ξ
. Steal	ing fro	m teach	ner							65				9006:						=
Steal	ing ma	terials f	from sc	hool.						66				3/884						=
																				=
PLE	ASE	REME	MBER	R:																=
		1. Use	a pen	cil. Make he	avy m	arks, N	lo per	ns or c	olored	pencils.										=
		2. If y	ou wis	to change	an an	swer, I	be sur	e to e	rase tho	proughly.										=
		3. Do	not sta	aple or fold	your a	inswer	sheet	s.												=
																				=
																				=
																				=
																				_



APPENDIX B

COMMUNICATIONS



May, 1969

Dear Co-ordinator:

Maintaining classroom discipline has frequently been recognized as being a major importance for a successful student teaching experience. It seems fair to say that student teachers experience some of the most frustrating and trying moments when attempting to maintain classroom discipline.

Unfortunately, teacher training institutions have sometimes ignored their role in reckoning with specific discipline problems and specific techniques for handling deviate behavior. As a result, it has not been unusual to encounter student teachers having control problems.

The identification of serious and chronic problems in classroom settings will be part of a doctoral dissertation and research by the School of Teacher Education and Learning Systems Institute of Michigan State University. It is planned that such study will lead to the development of simulation experiences and subsequently more adequate preparation of student teachers before the field experience. The intent is to first identify the nature and severity of classroom discipline problems in schools of varied sizes containing pupils of different ages and socioeconomic backgrounds. The second is to create a team of educators from successful classroom teachers, educational psychologists, and teacher educators for the purpose of generating a series of prescriptive teaching practices for dealing with the deviances. The prescriptive techniques will include both preventative and corrective measures. The information will then be integrated into the preservice teacher training program at Michigan State University.

The following suggestions are forwarded to you for implementation of the questionnaire:

- Pass out the questionnaires during the May seminar meeting; have student teachers complete the questionnaire during an estimated time of 30 minutes. (Since the time will vary, I would recommend you allow 45 minutes).
- Circulate the questionnaire by having student teachers from the schools identified on the front of the brown packets pick up their own packet and complete it during the time allotted during the seminar meeting.
- 3. Collect the questionnaires. The questionnaires should be handed to you in the original brown packet in which they were circulated.
- 4. Return the questionnaire answer sheets by bringing them personally to the Student Teaching Office when you visit campus. Please try to return the questionnaires by June 13th.



The dissertation will <u>not</u> report or use any results to generalize about specific student teachers, student teaching centers, or schools. Generalizations will only be made on the basis of such demographic variables as the following: socio-economic status, elementary versus junior high versus senior high schools, self contained classroom versus team teaching.

The information regarding this study will be available to you hopefully by Fall term of 1969.

Thank you for your consideration and any inconvenience this may cause. It is hoped, however, that through these efforts future student teachers will be better prepared to cope with classroom management problems.

Sincerely,

tokent L. Driscoll

Robert L. Driscoll

RLD:s11

encls.

Page -2-



DIRECTIONS TO THE STUDENT TEACHER CO-ORDINATOR

1. Enclosed please find:

- a. individual brown packets of questionnaires, one for each student teacher in your regional center.
- b. separate all brown packets by the schools identified and give questionnaire to just student teachers assigned to the school.
- 2. Each student teacher in your center should be given one packet. A packet contains a letter explaining the purpose of the survey, two pages of directions to the student teacher, and three answer sheets - red and green; it make no difference which form the student teacher completes. After a student teacher completes the answer sheets, he is to replace <u>only</u> the red or green answer sheets in the original brown packet and give it to you.
- 3. Please have all answer sheets completed during the seminar meeting; it should take approximately 30-45 minutes for completing the survey.
- 4. When every student teacher has returned his packet of answer sheets to you, please return them to the Student Teaching Office when you visit the campus.

Please try to return the questionnaire by June 13th.

If you have any problems, please call 517-353-3796 OR 517-694-9508.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

Robert I. Driveale

Robert L. Driscoll

RLD:s11



May, 1969

Dear Student Teacher:

In an effort to find out more about the area of discipline, the valuable insights that you as a student teacher have gained over the past weeks in student teaching are being called upon. Experienced public school teachers throughout the state of Michigan have recently participated in a similar study; it is hoped that your experiences with discipline coupled with the experiences of public school teachers responses can serve as a meaningful starting point for examining this critical area. This study will not report or use any results to generalize about specific student teachers, student teaching centers, or schools. All responses will be kept anonymous.

The identification of serious and chronic problems in classroom settings will be part of an ongoing research by the School of Teacher Education and Learning Systems Institute of Michigan State University. Hopefully, such study will lead to more adequate preparation of student teachers prior to the field experience.

Given the results of the questionnaire, a team of educators consisting of educational psychologists, successful classroom teachers, and teacher educators will generate a series of teaching practices for dealing with the specified behaviors. The success of this study is completely dependent upon your cooperation in responding to this questionnaire.

It is estimated that it will take you about thirty minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire; yet the responses that you give will have a significant effect on the content of future teacher training programs at Michigan State University

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Robert L'Driscoll

Robert L. Driscoll

RLD:s11


TO: Coordinators of Student Teaching Centers

RE: Change in Background Data Sheet

Dear Coordinator:

Unfortunately, there was an important error on the Background Data Sheet accompanying the questionnaire which you have received.

On the question which asks for the highest educational level completed by the student teacher, the response "bachelor's degree" was omitted. Therefore, ask student teachers whose highest educational level completed is the bachelor's degree to blacken the response--"some college." Student teachers who are about to graduate this June are also directed to consider themselves as possessors of the bachelor's degree.

I would appreciate your announcing this change before the student teachers complete the questionnaire during the seminar meeting.

Sincerely, Robert Z. Diesen

Robert L. Driscoll











