DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 341 690 SP 033 601

AUTHOR Wesley, Donald A.; Vocke, David E.
TITLE Classroom Discipline and Teacher Education.
PUB DATE Feb 92
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators (Orlando, FL, February 15-19, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information Analyses (070) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Techniques; *Discipline Problems; Early Childhood Education; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Literature Reviews; Methods Courses; *Preservice Teacher Education; Program Descriptions; School Catalogs; *Student Teachers; Surveys; Teacher Education Curriculum
IDENTIFIERS Delaware; District of Columbia; Maryland

ABSTRACT

The study described in this presentation was conducted to survey the status of classroom discipline within the professional teacher education curriculum and to ascertain the perceptions of preservice teachers towards addressing discipline problems. Classroom discipline is examined in the following ways: (1) an analysis of contemporary literature; (2) an examination of selected national college and university catalogs to determine the availability of separate discipline courses; (3) an intensive survey of teacher training institutions in Delaware, Maryland, and Washington, D.C.; and (4) a poll of preservice teachers (N=250) who had just completed 14 weeks of student teaching. Results indicate that student teachers want more time to be spent on discipline maintenance during preservice training (various theories and methods are discussd); however, planning and methodology were found to supercede discipline in actual teaching. Four appendices include: (1) college and university catalogs examined; (2) institutions in the Maryland, Delaware, and Washington, D.C. survey; (3) a student teacher questionnaire; and (4) participants' responses. (LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED341690

CLASSROOM DISCIPLINE AND TEACHER EDUCATION

A Paper Presented at the Association of Teacher Educators
Annual Meeting
February 15-19, 1992 - Orlando, Florida

by

Donald A. Wesley, Professor

&

David E. Vocke, Assistant Professor

College of Education
Towson State University
Towson, Maryland 21204

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Wesley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP033601

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PRESENTATION OVERVIEW

This presentation will consider the status and trends of classroom discipline instruction in preparing pre-service teachers. The importance of classroom discipline will be examined from the following perspectives:

1. an analysis of the contemporary literature
2. an examination of selected national college and university catalogs
3. a more intensive survey of teacher training institutions in one region
4. a poll of student teachers at a state-supported teacher training institution

The presentation will consider whether there is a need to provide additional courses emphasizing classroom discipline in the professional teacher education curriculum.

The literature on the topic of classroom discipline as it relates to the training of pre-service teachers will be examined. This review will concentrate on the topic within the current teacher education curriculum.

To determine the availability of separate discipline courses, a review of selected college and university catalogs will be examined. The presence of the words "discipline", "control", "management" or similar designations in course titles was used as an indicator of "classroom discipline" content.

The status of discipline as a separate course is also reflected in a survey of 27 teacher institutions in the Maryland, Delaware, and Washington, D.C. area. This study will be compared to a similar survey of comparable institutions made at Towson State University in 1981.

Discipline has been called the bane of student teachers, but is this so, or is it merely a misnomer? Do prospective teachers need more instruction in the topic of classroom discipline? The presenters polled approximately 250 student teachers at Towson State University in May 1991, in attempt to answer these questions. These pre-service teachers, representing early childhood, elementary, and secondary education programs, just completed fourteen weeks of student teaching.

The presenters will offer conclusions based on the data collected during the course of this study. Session participants will be invited to offer their perspectives on the information presented.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this study is to survey the status of the topic of classroom discipline within the teacher education curriculum and to ascertain the perspectives of preservice teachers towards classroom discipline. Education journals are replete with articles addressing the topic of classroom discipline as it applies to practical applications in the K-12 classroom, but we were interested in learning whether or not teacher education programs, in general, considered the topic important enough to offer it as a separate course of instruction within the pre-service education curriculum. We also wanted to ascertain student teachers' perceptions about their experiences with classroom discipline during their student teaching experience, their perceptions about the training they received in classroom discipline during their teacher education courses prior to the student teaching experience, and their recommendations for enhancing the teacher education curriculum with regards to the topic of classroom discipline. By reflecting on the feedback provided by students who have just completed this capstone experience of their preservice education, the teacher education program can perhaps be adjusted to meet the perceived needs of its students.

A data base search of ERIC, utilizing descriptors such as "discipline", "classroom management", and "classroom techniques", turns up literally thousands of journal articles and documents. As mentioned earlier, the vast majority of these articles deal with expounding on various theoretical bases for developing classroom discipline strategies or provide practical advice for handling discipline problems in the K-12 classroom. When the descriptors "teacher education" or "preservice teacher education" are combined with the previously mentioned terms, the number of 'hits' are reduced to approximately fifty.

The articles and documents identified through this search were examined to provide a global picture of what is being done in teacher education programs to teach preservice teachers about classroom discipline. Unfortunately, the picture that results from this exercise can best be described as incomplete.

A common assertion that is made in the literature related to classroom discipline and preservice teacher education is that discipline is a definitely a problem in the public schools of the United States. The Phi Delta Kappan annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward Public Schools is cited numerous times to illustrate the public's perception that a lack of discipline is one of the top two most frequently mentioned problems facing local schools (Barrett & Curtis, 1986; Bryant, 1991; Reed, 1989; Wright, O'Hair, & Alley, 1988). Elam (1991) notes in the report of the

most recent Gallup Poll that the "public is thoroughly consistent in its perception that ... students ... lack discipline..." (p.56). {It is interesting to note that "use of drugs" has supplanted "lack of discipline" as the top problem in the last six Gallup polls (Elam, Rose, & Gallup, 1991).}

In addition to the public's perception that a lack of discipline is a problem in the schools, several authors cite studies which contend that experienced classroom teachers see discipline related incidents as an impediment to their ability to effectively deliver instruction. Horn, Davis, and Hilt (1985) report that a sample of experienced teachers in rural schools in Kansas rated "controlling discipline" as the most important item for success in teaching from among a list of seventeen items. Barrett and Curtis (1986) cite studies which indicate that "teacher frustration concerning discipline matters is widespread" (p.53). Reed (1989) cites a report by Hall that found that teachers describe students as more difficult to deal with than they were just five years earlier. Student misbehavior is the "most universal reason teachers felt pressure" according to Feitler and Tokar (Wright, et al, 1988, p.86). Elam (1991), however, seems to challenge these contentions about teachers and discipline when he states, "teachers ... usually perceive discipline problems to be much less serious than parents' lack of interest and support, lack of proper financial support, and pupils' lack of interest and truancy as major problems" (p.56).

If classroom discipline is perceived as a problem for experienced teachers, it is relatively safe to assume that it is a cause for concern for student teachers as well. Rickman and Hollowell (1981) surveyed cooperating teachers and university supervisors of student teachers and found that both groups agree that problems with classroom management and discipline have become more complex in recent years and that these problems lead all other categories in contributing to student teacher failure. Reed (1989) notes that problems with discipline "create the greatest anxieties in student teachers" (p.60). Other works contend that discipline caused student teachers their greatest difficulty during student teaching (Barrett & Curtis, 1985) and that student teachers acknowledged that they felt deficient in dealing with students in this area (Goodlad, 1990, p.248).

While it is easy to find support for the idea that discipline problems challenge classroom teachers and student teachers during their quest to effectively deliver instruction, there appears to be less evidence in the education journals to suggest how preservice teachers acquire their knowledge about the topic of classroom discipline. Perry and Taylor (1982) seem to most accurately describe the place of discipline in the teacher education curriculum: "A majority of colleges of education or teacher training institutions subordinate or include discipline as a <u>minor</u> subject area in courses such as educational psychology and

curriculum" (p.417). In other words, attention to the topic of classroom discipline has been characterized as "bits and pieces of good counsel ... received in methods classes" (Goodlad, 1990, p. 248) or as a patchwork of methods for controlling children (Burden, 1983). In a study of 32 colleges and universities in Texas, Newlin, Jones, and Webber (Barrett & Curtis) found that on average, "less than two hours of classroom time was devoted to classroom management in the professional education courses examined" (p.53). No other studies were uncovered that discussed actual time devoted to classroom management or discipline in the teacher education curriculum.

A few authors (Bryant, 1991; Reed, 1989; Fox & Singletary, 1985) did describe covering the topic of discipline in a seminar format in conjunction with field experiences or student teaching. There seemed to be consensus that preservice teachers found this forum for studying discipline more helpful than the traditional textbook/lecture coverage of the topic, but it is unclear how widespread such practices are.

While it appears that studying discipline in the teacher education program is not given high priority, there is evidence in the literature to suggest that preservice teachers would like more attention given to the topic. Goodlad (1990) reports that secondary education certification candidates wondered why no comprehensive course was offered in the area. Purcell and Seiferth's (Barrett & Curtis, 1986) survey results suggest that student teachers feel inadequately prepared for dealing with discipline problems. Concurring with these views, Perry and Taylor (1982) contend that "in discussions with student teachers and inservice teachers, and looking at surveys that span a half a century, they [student and inservice teachers] almost unanimously agree that the area of classroom management or discipline is where they feel least prepared" (p.417).

If discipline problems are indeed becoming more complex, and if the perception is correct that student teachers (and in some cases teachers in general) are inadequately prepared to handle these problems, what should be the response of teacher training programs? Not surprisingly, the literature is full of pleas for more training in the area of classroom discipline (Brophy, 1988; Doyle, 1985; Wright, et al, 1988). But how should this additional training be delivered? The development of a separate course dealing with discipline issues is seen as a necessity from some perspectives (Purvis & Leonard, 1984; Barrett & Curtis, 1986; Perry & Taylor, 1982). The rationale for a separate course rests on the assumption that a broad base of effective discipline strategies must be integrated in the student teacher's knowledge base in order for him/her to be successful in the classroom, and that this knowledge can only be gained through a separate course.

Other recommendations for incorporating classroom discipline in the teacher education program include a required seminar course in conjunction with student teaching (Fox & Singletary, 1985), greater infusion of the topic into existing courses (Page, 1987; Rickman & Hollowell, 1981), and seminars or workshops prior to the student teaching experience (Reed, 1989). These approaches imply that more attention must given to discipline than is currently provided.

It should be noted that the above recommendations are based on conjecture of what might work to improve student teachers' abilities to handle discipline related issues, however, little information exists in the literature to verify the positive effects of discipline training on student teachers' classroom performance. Studies by Barrett and Curtis (1986) and Emmer (1986) do suggest that training in specific discipline approaches does make a difference in student teachers' and classroom teachers' ability to employ proper discipline techniques. This is definitely an area that begs for further study.

Although an abundance of empirical evidence supporting the effectiveness more training in discipline approaches for preservice teachers was not uncovered in this review of the literature, there did surface a number of common recommendations on how to emphasize discipline in the teacher education program, regardless of whether it be through a separate course, a seminar, or infusion into other courses. There seems to be common agreement that various concepts and strategies related to classroom discipline need to be covered in order to provide an examination of the theoretical framework of the different approaches that can be observed or applied in the classroom setting. Additionally, and more predominantly, preservice teachers must have early access to 'real life' classrooms in order to be able to observe and analyze the behaviors of teachers and students in relation to the theoretical knowledge that is studied (Brophy; Doyle; Perry & Taylor; Reed; Rickman & Hollowell; Wright et al.). It is emphasized that there must be an opportunity for teacher education students to reflect on their observations and to process the information gathered in a systematic way.

In addition to first hand observations, numerous recommendations are made for more active approaches that engage the prospective teacher in the study of classroom discipline. Simulations, role plays, videotapes, computer simulations, and case studies are suggested as ways to challenge student to reflect on the topic. Such opportunities may "help reduce the high levels of stress associated with discipline problems by student teachers" (Wright et al.).

In conclusion, there is a popular perception that more attention must be given to maintaining discipline in K-12 classrooms in schools in the United States. A review of the

literature suggests that student teachers are concerned about the lack of training in discipline they receive during their preservice training. As a result of such findings, the literature contains a number of recommendations for improving the way teacher education institutions currently teach prospective teachers about the topic of classroom discipline.

REFERENCES

Barrett, E. R., & Curtis, K.F. (1986). The effect of assertive discipline training on student teachers. Teacher Education and Practice, 3(1), 53-56.

Bryant, G. (1991, February). Teacher candidates' beliefs about discipline. Paper presented at the meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

Brophy, J. (1988). Educating teachers about managing classrooms and students. Teaching and Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies, 4(1), 1-18.

Burden, P.R. (1983). Classroom management guidelines for teacher education. Paper presented at the Mid-American Mini-Clinic of the Association Teacher Educators, Wichita, Kansas. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 237 507)

Doyle, W. (1985). Recent research on classroom management: Implications for teacher preparation. Journal of Teacher Education, 36(3), 31-35.

Elam, S. (1991). Views on discipline. Phi Delta Kappan, 73(1), 56.

Elam, S., Rose, L.C., & Gallup, A.M. (1991). The 23rd annual Gallup poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 73(1), 56.

Emmer, E.T. (1986). Effects of teacher training in disciplinary approaches. Washington, D.C.: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 316 927)

Fox, S.M., & Singletary, T.J. (1985). Some deductions about induction. Paper presented at the Association of Teacher Educators Summer Workshop, Wichita, Kansas. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 265 117)

Goodlad, J.I. (1990). Teachers for our nation's schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Horn, J.G., Davis, P., & Hilt, R. (1985). Importance of areas of preparation for teaching in rural/small schools. Research in Rural Education, 3 (1), 23-29.

Lasley, T.J. (1985). Classroom management: Perspectives for the preservice teacher. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 261 025)

Minier, J.E. (1985). Inservice education for professors: A second look at classroom management. Paper presented at the Annual National Conference of the National Council of the States on Inservice Education, Denver, Colorado. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 280 823)

Page, F. M., et al. (1987). Pre-service teachers' perceptions of discipline problems and methods of managing disruptive student behavior. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Mobile, Alabama. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 292 764)

Perry, F., & Taylor, H. (1982). Needed: A methods course in discipline for preservice teachers. Education: A Complete Index, 102, 416-419.

Purvis, J., & Leonard, R. (1984). Content for a student discipline course. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 252 521)

Reed, D. (1989). Student teacher problems with classroom discipline: Implications for program development. Action in Teacher Education, 11(3), 59-65.

Rickman, L.W., & Hollowell, J. (1981). Some causes of student teacher failure. Improving College and University Teaching, 29(4), 176-179.

Wright, R., O'Hair, M., & Alley, R. (1988). Student teachers examine and rate classroom discipline factors: Help for the supervisor. Action in Teacher Education, 10(2), 85-91.

CATALOG STUDY

Is classroom discipline important to institutions involved in teacher education? One method of ascertaining this is to examine course descriptions in college and university catalogs. A review of a total of 111 undergraduate catalogs in 39 states was undertaken with this in mind. (Please see Appendix A). They were selected on the basis of publication, date, (none were examined earlier than 1989), and availability. Because of these factors some states were well represented, while others were not. The catalog files of local colleges, universities, and community colleges were utilized in the survey.

Courses offered in colleges and schools of education and department of education were initially examined as to title. If such words as "discipline", "control", "behavior", "management", or closely related language, were included in the title then the descriptions were read in detail. Only those courses designed for preservice students seeking standard K-12 certification were considered. This eliminated the discipline courses associated with special education programs.

FINDINGS

Of the 111 catalogs, 30 or 27% contained course titles with the wording noted above, at either the early childhood, elementary, or secondary levels. Examples of these were "Discipline in the Classroom", "Managing Behavioral Problems in the Public School", and "Assertiveness Training". Another 11 or 9.9% used the term "management" in the title such as "Classroom Management", "Management Techniques", and "Classroom Organization and Management", but not all of these courses were sufficiently clear as to determining the treatment of discipline. Classroom management courses often include such topics as methodology, techniques, routines, and a variety of related subjects. Similarly, a course which was entitled "Classroom Survival Skills" included such topics as the educational reform movement, values, and ethics in education, and made no mention of discipline. If this second "questionable" category was included, the number of institutions offering courses on the subject of classroom discipline would be raised to 41 or 36.9%. Very few of this number were required courses.

CONCLUSIONS

Merely because two-thirds of the examined institutions lacked specific courses on the topic, does not mean, of course, that classroom discipline is ignored or omitted. Consistent with a review of the literature, it might be concluded that this subject is considered to be adequately treated in other education courses, and that a special course is not needed. As is commonly known, units on discipline or behavior are found in methods, curriculum, principles, and a variety of other courses.

1991 AND 1981 QUESTIONNAIRES ON THE AVAILABILITY OF COURSES ON DISCIPLINE IN SECONDARY TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN THE MARYLAND, DELAWARE, AND WASHINGTON D. C. AREA

In 1991, 27 secondary education programs were selected in the above geographic area to determine the status and availability of classroom discipline instruction. The instrument utilized forced response questions to determine the availability of separate discipline courses at each institution and a number of open-ended questions designed to determine why such courses were or were not offered. Open-ended questions were also posed to find where in the institution's program the topic of discipline was covered, and whether or not there was general satisfaction with the coverage of classroom discipline in the present education curriculum. This questionnaire, modeled after one utilized in a previous study by Westerfeld (1981), was sent to chairpersons and 19 responded. The replies were then compared with those of the earlier study. The total number responding in 1981 was the same, 19, but a few of the institutions were different. (See Appendix B). Questions and replies are below.

DOES YOUR TEACHER EDUCATION CURRICULUM FOR SECONDARY EDUCATION TEACHERS OFFER INSTRUCTION IN DISCIPLINE?

1991	Yes 17	No 2
1981	Yes 19	No 0

2. IS DISCIPLINE OFFERED AS A SEPARATE COURSE?

1991	Yes 3	No 15
1981	Yes 3	No 15

3. IF A SEPARATE COURSE IS OFFERED, IS IT REQUIRED?

1991	Yes 1	No 2
1981	Yes 2	No 1

4. REPORTED LENGTH OF TIME SPENT ON DISCIPLINE IN COURSES OTHER THAN IN A SEPARATE COURSE (IN WEEKS) (Number of replies in parentheses)

1991 Less than 1 week (4), 1 to 4 weeks (9)
5 to 8 weeks (1). 8 or more weeks (1)

1981 Less than 1 week (1), 1 to 4 weeks (10)
5 to 8 weeks (5), 8 or more weeks (0)

5. WHICH APPROACHES ARE DISCUSSED IN COURSES DEALING WITH DISCIPLINE?

1991 Glasser 15, Canter 14, Dreikurs 10, Gordon 9, others
1981 Behavior Modification 7, Gordon 5, Glasser 4, others

6. IF DISCIPLINE IS COVERED IN ANOTHER COURSE PLEASE STATE THE TITLE

1991 Principles, Educational Psychology, General and Special Methods, Curriculum, Teaching and Learning, Student Teaching Seminar, Foundations, Philosophy of Education, Introduction to Education, Urban

1981 All of the above plus Teaching Reading, Adult and Child, Human Growth and Development, Supervising Teaching, Individualized Education.

7. IF A SEPARATE COURSE IN DISCIPLINE IS NOT OFFERED, WHAT ARE THE REASONS FOR NOT OFFERING IT?

1991
- Incorporated, integrated, or infused elsewhere
- Students can not handle any more class hours
- Discipline is mainstreamed in the program
- Adding courses to the curriculum is very difficult
- Other topics are more important
- Taught as part of classroom management
- Handled effectively in other course or courses
- Inadequate time in the curriculum
- It is part of the total picture, related to school policies, field experiences, student teaching,by itself, is too technical, not related to the real world
- Discipline study is more naturally mainstreamed as performance abilities develop

1981
- Incorporated, integrated, or infused elsewhere
- Inadequate room in the curriculum
- Insufficient material for a separate course
- Offered at the graduate level
- Staffing limitations
- Competing demands for curriculum revision
- Better taught as part of other courses

8. DOES YOUR INSTITUTION PLAN TO EXPAND ITS OFFERINGS IN DISCIPLINE IN THE NEAR FUTURE?

1991	Yes 5	No 14
1981	Yes 2	No 15

9. REASONS GIVEN FOR NOT PLANNING TO EXPAND OFFERINGS

1991-Not necessary
- -Enough time or attention already allotted to it
- -Too many things currently in flux
- -Learned as part of their field experience
- -Adequate offerings at present
- -Graduates report satisfaction with current approach
- -Repetition of many comments given in Question 7

1981-Inadequate room in curriculum for expansion
- -Existing courses cover the subject adequately
- -Done at graduate level; not needed at undergraduate
- -Thorough training needed; brief instruction could be harmful
- -Traditional obstacles to expanding education program
- -Repetition of many comments given in Question 7

--1991 REASONS FOR EXPANDING DISCIPLINE OFFERINGS

- -General need based on nature of school population and the problem of violence in the schools
- -Disciplinary skills are essential to classroom success
- -Help to improve teaching skills
- -Need for behavior modification is a must today
- -Develop more simulations and case studies
- -Training in effective theory and practice is essential because too many teachers are very poorly trained and ill-prepared in this area

CONCLUSIONS

While most all institutions questioned in both surveys indicate that some kind of discipline instruction is offered, only 3 of 18 in each year have separate courses. In only half of those instances are they required. This is indicative of the lack of popularity of separate courses on discipline in this geographic area.

One to four weeks is the average amount of time spent on the subject, but this is not a helpful figure because of its generality. In some cases it may be an assumption by the chairpersons. However, if two weeks are taken as the average, that would amount to 13% of a 15 week semester allotted to discipline. Consider how small this percentage would be if computed over the entire teacher education program.

As far as disciplinary theorists or approaches are concerned, the 1981 results show Canter and Dreikurs receiving little or no attention, while the topic of behavior modification was quite popular. Glasser and Canter appear to be popular approaches in the 1991 survey. What theorists are covered

has much to do with instructor choice as well as the changing times.

It would seem that discipline is taught in many different courses whether or not the title is appropriate. At most institutions multiple coverage occurs despite the presence of a prime course addressing the topic.

The most common reason for not having a separate discipline course was the infusion or integration of that topic into existing courses, and that it was difficult to add such a course to the curriculum. Furthermore, it was thought to be effectively taught as part of other courses.

Plans to expand the offerings on discipline are limited. Only 5 of 19 in 1991, and 2 of 17 institutions in 1981 indicated this. The reasons given for not expanding are not all that much different from why separate courses in discipline are not offered. It is evident that general satisfaction exists with the way that it is presently handled. It can be concluded that the expansion of discipline training is not likely to occur in the future at these institutions.

STUDENT TEACHER SURVEY

In order to determine student teacher's perceptions about the status of discipline training in a particular teacher education program, the presenters surveyed 247 student teachers at Towson State University upon their completion of fourteen weeks of student teaching (May, 1991). These pre service teachers represented the following departments: Early Childhood (n=44), Elementary (n=110), Secondary (n=69), and combined (n=24). For this discussion only the Early Childhood (EC), Elementary (EL), and Secondary Education (SE) students' responses to the first 11 questions on the instruments were included in order to clearly distinguish the results for each of the traditional programs. All participants' responses were included for the last two items on the questionnaire. Of the 238 respondents in the sample who indicated gender, 31 were male.

The survey instrument consisted of thirteen items, almost all of which elicited a five point Likert response. Questions dealt with such topics as: perceived difficulties with classroom discipline, the importance of discipline compared to other teaching essentials; the amount of attention and class sessions devoted to discipline in education courses; whether that amount of time was ample; if a need existed for a separate course in classroom discipline; whether such a course should be required; when and where this instruction should be offered; and the best sources to learn about discipline. Respondents were required to indicate agreement with the Likert item statements on a range from "Very Much" to "None". For reporting purposes here, the five response items have been collapsed into three categories: (Very Much/Much), (Some), and (Little/None).

FINDINGS
(See Appendix C)

CONCLUSIONS

Question 1. "Did classroom discipline cause you any difficulties?"

Only 11% of the total group had much difficulty, with almost 50% stating little. However, since two-thirds of SE indicated difficulties, and of these, one-fifth noted much difficulty, that department stands out. Compare this to EC who said 9% experienced much difficulty as opposed to 57% who had little or none.

Question 2. "How much teaching time was used for discipline?"

EC, who indicated above that they had little difficulty with discipline, spent more time on it than SE. This raises the question as to whether discipline had a different meaning to EC, EL, and SE. However, less than 20% of the entire group spent much time on it, with 38% stating little time. SE again led the other departments in the high category.

Question 3. "How much attention was given to discipline in your education courses?"

Almost half of the total respondents indicated little or none, which is a strong indication of the lack of emphasis. SE led in this statistic, while EC appeared to give it much attention.

Question 4. "How much time would you estimate was spent on discipline in your education courses?"

EC had the highest percentages supporting their tally in the previous question. SE also was consistent with the last tally indicating 74% thought two hours or less. El was more similar to SE than to EC. Three hours or less was the opinion of almost 70% of the entire group.

Question 5. "Would you have liked more attention given to discipline?"

There is considerable consensus here that more time should be spend on it, (77%). EL supported it more than the rest (86%), with over half of the entire group wanting much more attention.

Question 6. "Is it important to offer a separate course in discipline?"

Three-fourths of all respondents thought so, EL being the leader, (82%). It should be noted that approximately 56% of the entire group felt strongly about a separate course.

Question 7. "Is it important to have this course required?"

Those favoring this very much outnumbered those opposed, 3 to 1. EC and EL led SE here. The numbers for the entire group strongly supporting this position was even little higher than the previous tally (58%).

Question 8. "Should it meet during student teaching?"

This was not as popular with half the total group showing little support for the idea. EC, by far, was the most in favor of it, (49%), while SE the least in favor, (55%).

Question 9. "Is it important to have periodic disciplinary trouble-shooting meetings during student teaching?"

The total group was very much in favor of this, almost 3 to 1. EL was the highest, 5 to 1. It appears that a forum to discuss problems is desired while student teaching.

Question 10. "Is it important to hold a course or such meetings at a public school?"

The response to this was evenly divided. It really did not appear to make much difference if these sessions were held in the schools or not. The teaching center concept would make this feasible, however.

Question 11. "Is it beneficial to hold a session on discipline just prior to teaching?"

This was extremely popular. Almost three-fourths of all respondents were very much in favor, with EC desiring it the most,(84%) Apparently, this was seen as a "Send off" review type of meeting.

Question 12. "Where do you think one learns best about discipline?"

According to the total group observing classroom teachers is the best way, with help from the cooperating teacher a decent second. Course work is a distant third, and observing other student teachers is apparently close to being regarded as "the blind leading the blind."

Question 13. "Which has the highest order of importance in your teaching?"

Discipline only comes in third, well behind planning and methodology. Are the student teachers saying that if one is well prepared and knows what to do and how to do it, classroom discipline is not a major issue? It would appear that this is a rejection of the idea that you must have order before you can teach anything

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

Student teachers indicated that although discipline was not a major problem they desired that more time be spent on it during their education. They favored a separate, required course, and/or periodic trouble shooting sessions, and/or a special disciplinary meeting just prior to commencing student teaching. The student teachers learned most about discipline from observing classroom teachers as well as their cooperating teacher. Finally, planning and methodology were more important to them than discipline in their teaching.

Student teacher responses about discipline should be considered in the light that their cooperating teachers were present during much of their teaching and this may have reduced or weakened disciplinary incidents.

DISCUSSION

The results of this comprehensive study confirm that prospective teachers are likely to learn about the topic of classroom discipline in courses that cover a wide range of topics - general methods courses, curriculum courses, educational psychology courses - and not in a separate course that deals specifically with discipline theories, strategies, or techniques. While our research indicates that this is currently the status of discipline instruction, it also suggests that this has been the case for at least the past decade and probably longer. Since the literature review reveals that a lack of student discipline is perceived as a major and growing problem for teachers and student teachers in the schools, the assumption may have been made that teacher training institutions might respond by adding more training in this area. We have not been able to verify that this is so.

The lack of additional coursework specifically addressing the topic of classroom discipline in the teacher education curriculum is also interesting considering the concern that prospective teachers have about the topic. Both the literature review and the results from our student teacher survey suggest that preservice teachers perceive that current training practices do not adequately cover the topic of discipline, and they would definitely like more attention given to the topic during their preservice training. More than 80% of the student teachers in the Towson State University survey supported requiring a separate course in discipline.

On the other hand, both the national catalog review and the local teacher training survey suggests that most teacher training institutions are satisfied with their coverage of the topic, and few have any plans for adjusting their current curricula to address the concerns of prospective teachers. It does not appear, however, that teacher education programs are refusing to offer more discipline training because they choose to ignore the needs of their students. The predominant justification for not offering a separate course in discipline centers on the contention that there is no room for another course in the current curriculum. Adding another requirement to the prospective teacher's program is not seen as feasible at this time.

With this dichotomy in mind, several suggestions can be considered. One approach is to update or modernize the existing treatment of classroom discipline in teacher education programs. This could be accomplished by emphasizing field-based experiences, especially controlled classroom observations and their analysis. Additional suggestions would be to incorporate field experience logs, practical films and videotapes, case studies, and simulations when covering the topic. A variety of disciplinary theorists should not only be studied, the various approaches should also be

demonstrated in the classroom. Ample time for visiting classroom teachers both prior to and during student teaching should also be provided so that prospective teachers have realistic expectations about life in the "real classroom".

Unfortunately, adding such components to existing content or courses is challenging, if not an impossible task. The alternative is to develop a specially designed classroom discipline course, either generic or within each department. The generic approach is utilized in the Master of Arts in Teaching program at Towson State University, and is required. The departmental course is used by a certain number of institutions as revealed in the above surveys. Finally, a final disciplinary session should be held prior to the commencement of student teaching. This might be treated as a refresher meeting and emphasize reminders and precautions.

APPENDIX A

CATALOGS EXAMINED

University of South Alabama
Arizona State University
University of Arizona
University of Arkansas
U. of California, Santa Cruz
University of Colorado
Central Connecticut University
University of Connecticut
University of Hartford
Wesleyan University
Florida International University
University of South Florida
Emory University
Georgia Southern University
University of Georgia
University of Hawaii
Bradley University
Illinois State University
Southern Illinois University
Ball State University
De Pauw University
Indiana State University
Valparaiso University
Iowa State University
University of Iowa
Centre College
Kentucky Wesleyan University
Kansas State University
Clark University
Northeastern University
U.of Massachusetts, Boston
Central Michigan University
Eastern Michigan University
Michigan State University
Wayne State University
Carleton College
U. of MIssouri, St. Louis
Washington University
William Jewell College
University of New Hamkpshire
Rider College
Mexico State University
Adelphi University
College of the City of New York
Ithaca College
New York University
Niagara University
University of Rochester
Morehead College
Univ. of North Carolina
North Dakota State U.
Baldwin-Wallace College
Bowling Green Univ.
Case Western Reserve U.
Cedarville College
John Carroll University
Miami University
Ohio University
University of Oklahoma
University of Oregon
University of Portland
Willamette University
Bloomsburg University
East Shroudsburg Univ.
Indiana Univ. of Penna.
Penn State University
Shippensburg University
Temple University
Washington & Jefferson
West Chester University
Widener University
Clemson University
College of Charleston
Univ. of South Carolina
Winthrop College
South Dakota State U.
U. of South Dakota
Memphis State Univ. U.
University of Tennessee
Vanderbilt University
East Texas State Univ.
Lamar University Wayne
Univ. of North Texas
U. of Texas, Arlington
Brigham Young Univ.
University of Utah
Utah State University
Johnson State College
Middlebury College
James Madison Univ.
Mary Baldwin College
Radford University
University of Virginia
Virginia Commonwealth
Virginia Tech Univ.
Washington State Univ.

University of Wisconsin, Green Bay
University of Wiscoonsin, La Crosse
University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh
University of Wisconsin, River Falls
University of Wisconsin, Whitewater
University of Wyoming

APPENDIX B

INSTITUTIONS IN THE MARYLAND, DELAWARE, AND WASHINGTON, D. C. SURVEY

1991

American University
Bowie State University
Catholic University
Columbia Union College
Coppin State College
Delaware State College
Frostburg State University
Gallaudet College
Goucher College
Howard University
Morgan State University
Mount St. Mary's College
St. Mary's College of Md.
Towson State Universitybia
U. of District of Columbiay
U. of Md., Baltimore County
U. of Md., College Parke
U. of Md., Eastern Shore
Washington College
Western Maryland College

1981

American University
Bowie State College
Catholic University
Columbia Union College
Coppin State College
Frostburg State College
Gallaudet College
George Washington University
Goucher College
Howard University
Morgan State University
St. Mary's College of Md
Salisbury State College
Towson State University
Trinity College
U. of District of Columbia
U. of Md., Baltimore County
U. of Md., College Park
U. of Md., Eastern Shore
Western Maryland College

APPENDIX C

STUDENT TEACHER SURVEY

1. Did classroom discipline cause you any difficulties? ___ Very Much ___ Much ___ Some ___ Little ___ None

2. How much of your teaching time was used for discipline? ___ Very Much ___ Much ___ Some ___ Little ___ None

3. How much attention was given to discipline in your education courses? ___ Very Much ___ Much ___ Some ___ Little ___ None

4. How much time would you estimate was spent on discipline in your education courses? ___ 12+sessions ___ 8+ ___ 5+ ___ 3+ ___ 2 ___ 1

5. Would you have liked more attention given to discipline? ___ Very Much ___ Much ___ Some ___ Little ___ No

6. Is it important to have a separate course on discipline? ___ Very Much ___ Much ___ Some ___ Little ___ No

7 Is it important to have this course required? ___ Very Much ___ Much ___ Some ___ Little ___ No

8. Should it meet during student teaching? ___ Very Much ___ Much ___ Some ___ Little ___ No

9. Is it important to have periodic discipline "trouble-shooting" meetings during student teaching? ___ Very Much ___ Much ___ Some ___ Little ___ No

10. Is it important to hold a course or meetings at a public school? ___ Very Much ___ Much ___ Some ___ Little ___ No

11. Is it beneficial to hold a session on discipline just prior to teaching? ___ Very Much ___ Much ___ Some ___ Little ___ No

12. Place these in order of importance as to where one learns best about discipline Use #1 as the highest.
    ___ observing teachers
    ___ a special course
    ___ cooperating teacher
    ___ other student tchrs

13. Place these in order of importance in your teaching Use #1 as the highest
    ___ Methods
    ___ Planning
    ___ Discipline
    ___ Child/Adolescent Psychology

APPENDIX D
STUDENT TEACHER SURVEY

Student teachers (n=247) from Towson State University responded to the following questions during the Spring Semester 1991.

Student teachers represented the following departments:
Early Childhood (n=44), Elementary (n=110),
Secondary (n=69),and combined (n=24).

Only the responses from the Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education students are listed for items one through eleven. All participants' responses are included for items 12 and 13.

1.] DID CLASSROOM DISCIPLINE CAUSE YOU ANY DIFFICULTIES?

	MUCH	SOME	LITTLE
EARLY CHILDHOOD	9.0%	34.0%	56.8%
ELEMENTARY	13.8	32.1	54.1
SECONDARY	19.7	47.0	36.3
AVERAGE	11.2	38.0	49.1

2.] HOW MUCH OF YOUR TEACHING TIME WAS USED FOR DISCIPLINING?

	MUCH	SOME	LITTLE
EARLY CHILDHOOD	20.5%	50.0%	29.5%
ELEMENTARY	11.0	48.6	40.1
SECONDARY	23.2	33.3	43.5
AVERAGE	18.2	44.0	37.7

3.] HOW MUCH ATTENTION WAS GIVEN TO DISCIPLINE IN YOUR EDUCATION COURSES?

	MUCH	SOME	LITTLE
EARLY CHILDHOOD	18.2%	45.5%	36.4%
ELEMENTARY	10.9	38.2	50.1
SECONDARY	7.2	36.2	56.5
AVERAGE	12.1	40.0	47.7

4.] HOW MUCH TIME WOULD YOU ESTIMATE WAS SPENT ON DISCIPLINE IN YOUR EDUCATION COURSES?						
	12+	8+	5+	3+	2	1
EARLY CHILDHOOD	2.4%	12.2%	34.1%	39.0%	1.3%	0.0%
ELEMENTARY	.1	12.5	16.3	26.9	27.9	15.4
SECONDARY	2.3	4.6	7.6	24.6	43.1	30.8
AVERAGE	1.6	9.8	19.3	30.2	24.1	15.4

5.] WOULD YOU HAVE LIKED MORE ATTENTION GIVEN TO DISCIPLINE?			
	MUCH	SOME	LITTLE
EARLY CHILDHOOD	45.2%	30.1%	23.8%
ELEMENTARY	52.3	33.9	13.8
SECONDARY	56.5	14.5	29.0
AVERAGE	51.3	26.2	22.2

6.] IS IT IMPORTANT TO OFFER A SEPARATE COURSE IN DISCIPLINE?			
	MUCH	SOME	LITTLE
EARLY CHILDHOOD	52.3%	27.3%	20.5%
ELEMENTARY	65.5	16.4	18.2
SECONDARY	50.0	18.3	30.9
AVERAGE	55.9	20.7	23.2

7.] IS IT IMPORTANT TO MAKE THIS COURSE REQUIRED?			
	MUCH	SOME	LITTLE
EARLY CHILDHOOD	61.4%	25.0%	13.6%
ELEMENTARY	60.0	21.8	18.2
SECONDARY	52.9	21.4	25.7
AVERAGE	58.1	22.7	19.2

8.] IS IT IMPORTANT THAT THIS COURSE MEET DURING STUDENT TEACHING?

	MUCH	SOME	LITTLE
EARLY CHILDHOOD	48.8%	4.9%	46.3%
ELEMENTARY	33.6	20.1	45.5
SECONDARY	27.5	17.4	55.1
AVERAGE	36.6	14.1	48.9

9.] IS IT IMPORTANT TO HAVE PERIODIC DISCIPLINARY "TROUBLE-SHOOTING" MEETINGS DURING STUDENT TEACHING?

	MUCH	SOME	LITTLE
EARLY CHILDHOOD	61.4%	25.0%	13.6%
ELEMENTARY	66.4	20.1	12.7
SECONDARY	43.5	23.2	33.3
AVERAGE	57.1	22.8	19.9

10.] IS IT IMPORTANT TO HOLD A COURSE OR SUCH MEETINGS AT A PUBLIC SCHOOL?

	MUCH	SOME	LITTLE
EARLY CHILDHOOD	26.2%	19.0%	54.8%
ELEMENTARY	44.0	30.1	25.7
SECONDARY	31.3	31.3	37.3
AVERAGE	33.8	26.8	39.3

11.] IS IT BENEFICIAL TO HOLD A SESSION ON DISCIPLINE JUST PRIOR TO TEACHING?

	MUCH	SOME	LITTLE
EARLY CHILDHOOD	84.4%	11.4%	2.3%
ELEMENTARY	70.1	18.4	11.0
SECONDARY	66.7	14.5	18.8
AVERAGE	73.7	14.8	10.7

12.] PLACE THE FOLLOWING IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE AS TO WHERE YOU THINK ONE BEST LEARNS ABOUT DISCIPLINE? (USE #1 AS BEST) {numbers represent average ranking}

	OBSERVING TEACHERS	SPECIAL COURSE	COOPERATING TEACHER	OTHER STUDENT TEACHERS
EARLY CHILDHOOD	1.90	3.07	1.76	3.27
ELEMENTARY	1.71	3.07	1.81	3.42
SECONDARY	1.67	2.88	1.94	3.55
AVERAGE	1.76	3.01	1.84	3.41

13.] PLACE THE FOLLOWING IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE IN YOUR TEACHING. (USE #1 AS THE HIGHEST) {numbers represent average ranking}

	METHODS	PLANNING	DISCIPLINE	CHILD / ADOLESCENT PSYCH.
EARLY CHILDHOOD	2.51	1.58	2.65	3.33
ELEMENTARY	2.25	1.76	2.76	3.15
SECONDARY	2.25	2.04	2.71	3.44
AVERAGE	2.33	1.80	2.71	3.31