DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 087 084 EA 005 710

AUTHOR	Sunshine, Phyllis M.
TITLE	Approaches to School Discipline. A Selected Review of the Literature No. 2. Reviews of Research.
INSTITUTION	Maryland State Dept. of Education, Baltimore. Div. of Research, Evaluation, and Information Systems.
PUB DATE	Oct 73
NOTE	39p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Behavior Change; *Child Psychology; *Discipline; Discipline Problems; Elementary Schools; Goal Orientation; *Literature Reviews; Models; Reinforcement; Secondary Schools; *Student Behavior
IDENTIFIERS	Adlerian Psychology

ABSTRACT

This pamphlet first describes the various ways in which discipline can be defined. Two models for dealing with classroom discipline are then presented. The first model--psychoanalytic--emphasizes the importance of understanding in dealing with discipline problems. In contrast, the second model--behavior modification--focuses on the various techniques; e.g., reinforcement and modeling; as procedures for classroom management. The ideas presented in this pamphlet are based both on scholarly opinion and on empirical investigation. (Author/JF)

ED 087084

Reviews of Research

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Harper & Row
pp 20-21
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Approaches to School Discipline

A SELECTIVE REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

No. 2 October 1973

EA 005 710

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Research, Evaluation, and
Information Systems
Friendship International Airport
Baltimore, Maryland 21240

MARYLAND STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Members of the Board		Year term ends
Jerome Framptom, Jr. *President*	Federalsburg	1978
Richard Schifter *Vice President*	Bethesda	1974
Lawrence Miller	Baltimore	1977
Mrs. Roger W. Moyer	Annapolis	1977
Mrs. William F. Robie	Fort Washington	1975
Ross V. Smith	Thurmont	1974
William G. Sykes	Baltimore	1976

Secretary-Treasurer of the Board and State Superintendent of Schools
James A. Sensenbaugh

Deputy State Superintendent of Schools
Quentin L. Earhart

Assistant State Superintendent in Research, Evaluation, and Information Systems
Richard K. McKay

Consultant in Research
James B. League

REIS. 3.1073. 7M

CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	4
Foreword	5
Introduction	7
Section I Definitions of Discipline	9
Section II A Psychoanalytic Model	12
Section III A Behavior Modification Model	23
Bibliography	38

PREFACE

Approaches to school discipline continue to be a concern of experienced as well as inexperienced teachers and school administrators. This publication is intended to bring together in convenient form a selective review of the literature on several approaches to school discipline.

We hope that educators will find the *Reviews* valuable. The Department also hopes that readers will suggest ways to make the series more useful and will recommend topics for inclusion in future issues.

JAMES A. SENSENBAUGH
State Superintendent of Schools

FOREWORD

The Division of Research, Evaluation, and Information Systems of the Maryland State Department of Education is pleased to present "Approaches to School Discipline: A Selective Review of the Literature," the second issue in the series *Reviews of Educational Research*.

The issue was written by Phyllis M. Sunshine with the assistance of Thomas Rhoades under the direction of James B. League, Consultant in Research.

We hope that the *Reviews* will be of use to members of the educational community in Maryland.

RICHARD K. McKAY
Assistant State Superintendent
in Research, Evaluation, and
Information Systems

Introduction

The *Reviews of Research* are prepared annually for educators by the Division of Research, Evaluation, and Information Systems of the Maryland State Department of Education. The first *Review*, "The Alienation of Youth," focused upon the effects of feelings of alienation on the psychological functioning of students. There are many other classes of variables, such as anxiety and feelings of dependency, which may be manifested in behaviors difficult for the classroom teacher to manage. Rebellion, aggression, and passivism are only a few of these behavior problems. And since teachers are by necessity behavioral managers in their classrooms, they are required to have within their grasp techniques that will "effect the controls necessary to the remediation of typical classroom behavior problems,"[1] when such problems are interfering with learning.

Unfortunately, classroom management is one of the most difficult and complex probelms confronting schools of today. This problem continues to be a concern of inexperienced teachers, as well as experienced teachers and school administrators. Indeed, the maintenance of adequate classroom discipline is a prerequisite to the physical and psychological well-being of students and to the achievement of instructional goals or objectives.

Students also express concern about the techniques of corrective discipline. Kaplan (1970), for example, noted that disciplinary practices influence not only student attitudes toward school, but also their learning efficiency. Parents, too, express considerable concern about the kinds and degrees of discipline employed in the school — with some parents contending that more severe and restrictive controls are necessary while others advocate more permissive methods.

[1] Herbert O. Morice. "The School Psychologist as a Behavioral Consultant: A Project in Behavior Modification in a Public School Setting," *Psychology in the School*, V, No. 3, (1968), 253-261.

If general classroom control is considered difficult for most teachers, the management of maladaptive students would probably rank as the most difficult of all teacher control problems — particularly for beginning teachers. In fact, Morse and Wingo (1969) contended that beginning teachers are very apprehensive about disciplining students who exhibit problem behaviors. Although administrators tend to concur with these findings regarding the beginning teacher, experienced teachers, too, complain that they are not prepared to deal with most problem students (Wiener, 1972).

Many teachers believe that most categories of problem children should be dealt with outside the conventional classroom. However, this belief may be unrealistic in light of Bower's (1961) assertion that the average class includes at least three children who could be classified as disturbed. Furthermore, the findings of Glidewell and Swallow (1968) indicated that 30 percent of the elementary school population present some problems of maladjustment. Finally, Clarizio (1971) reported that from 95 to 98 percent of emotionally handicapped pupils remain in regular classes. Therefore, even though many teachers would prefer not to teach problem children, present school conditions require teachers to assume the responsibility for dealing with all children, including the problem child.

The principal purpose of this issue is to present a selected review and synthesis of the literature on the concept of discipline. Section I describes the various ways in which discipline can be defined. Two models for dealing with classroom discipline are presented in Sections II and III. The first, a Psychoanalytic model, emphasizes the importance of understanding in dealing with discipline problems. In contrast, the second model, Behavior Modification, focuses on the various techniques such as reinforcement and modeling as procedures for classroom management.

It is important for the reader to remember that the techniques of discipline are varied and complex. The techniques presented in this volume, although promising, are still not firmly established. It is equally important to remember that the viewpoints presented here are based on scholarly opinion as well as on empirical investigation. Consequently, these ideas are tentative and need further testing and refinement. Inclusion here of any theoretical position should not be construed as an endorsement of this position by the Maryland State Department of Education.

SECTION I

Definitions of Discipline

The word "discipline" has been used with so many different meanings that any discussion of the concept of discipline should first attempt to establish a working definition. *Webster's Dictionary*[1] 1953) gives the following four definitions as the most common of six meanings for the term: (1) the development of mental faculties (i.e., mental discipline) by instruction and exercise; (2) training to act in accordance with established rules; (3) indoctrination to rule; and (4) training through suffering. While the first two definitions are relatively broad, they neither imply the imposition of one person's will upon another nor prescribe a specific method for imposing this will. "Development," "training," and "mental discipline" may or may not be compatible with the freedom and self-determination of the person undergoing training. However, the third and fourth definitions specifically call for subjugation of one person to the will of another through suffering or indoctrination and thus deny the individual his freedom. The several meanings given the word reflect the varying orientations and frequent confusion of educational theorists and practitioners in thinking about discipline.

Whatever the variant meanings for the word "discipline," teachers most often think of it as the degree of classroom order, as the strategy by which they have established order, or as a euphemism for punishment. Major misunderstandings could be avoided by making clear which of the following meanings is intended.

Discipline equals degree of order — Used in this sense, discipline refers to the degree of order established in a group. Thus, it may be said that Mr. Smith seems to have little discipline in his classes or that Ms. Jones certainly has a lot of discipline in her classes. In both of these examples, discipline is seen in a substantive sense — that is, as something to be possessed. This definition merely notes presence or absence of discipline in a setting and fails to indicate causative factors.

Discipline equals management techniques — In this sense, discipline refers to the methods teachers believe to be effective in establishing order. For example, teachers might comment on the type of discipline used by their peers in the following way: "Mr. Smith may have an orderly classroom, but I don't approve of the discipline techniques he employs." This remark makes a value judgment on the manner in which discipline is established and maintained.

Discipline equals punishment — In this sense, the word is used as a euphemism for punishment. Actually punishment is only one subcategory of the whole range of alternatives referred to in the techniques of management; but when used this way, such punishment strategies are seen as the sole means to maintain or enforce order. Depending on the legal framework of the school system, this punishment strategy can range from minor verbal rebukes to the infliction of corporal punishment.

Straight thinking about discipline requires bringing to the forefront precisely the way the term is being used in a given setting. The term "discipline" is characterized by Hayakawa (1949) as a conceptual amalgam — that is, a term having so many connotations of meaning it ceases to have any single identifiable meaning. Hopefully, in this publication, when the term discipline is used, the above qualifications will help the reader to understand which meaning is being employed.

Changing Views of Discipline

Discussions of discipline must deal not only with definitions of the concept, but also with the historical antecedents which influence present thinking about it. In American education, two conflicting sets of attitudes toward discipline, which have influenced thinking on this problem to this day, began to emerge in the early Nineteenth Century. One point of view maintained that the teacher's primary disciplinary task was to keep order, silence, and decorum in the classroom. Advocates of this position affirmed that, "It is not a question of influencing the thinking of the pupil, nor the emotional reactions of the pupil, but solely of securing the desired behavior [which is important]" (Rich, 1925, p. 296). The management of discipline was seen as a prerequisite to the proper educational growth of students. At the present time, educators advocating this view have urged recourse to the "old-fashioned" discipline of authority, with prompt obedience in response to commands.

The opposing point of view called for teachers to place primary importance on developing a sense of personal worth and a sense of inner-control for the children in the classroom. Advocates of this position affirmed that ". . . character effects are most important, not whether noise continues or stops" (Kilpatrick, 1925, p. 317). Today, educators taking this same view have insisted that proper guidance of unrestrained human action constitutes the essence of the educative process.

Over the years, many variables — social, religious, economic — have contributed to the relative popularity of one view of discipline over the other.

Two Models of Discipline

The next two chapters present two models for dealing with classroom discipline. The first model, a Psychoanalytic one, emphasizes the importance of teacher attitudes, understanding, empathy, and acceptance of problem behavior. In contrast, the second model, Behavior Modification, focuses on the modification procedures for general classroom discipline problems and individual deviant behavior. This approach places less emphasis on the teacher's understanding of the underlying causes of aberrant behavior than on the teacher's need to control and direct the classroom environment of the misbehaving student.

It should be noted that the discussions of both models are necessarily brief and incomplete. They are not intended as direct bases for practical implementation. Their purpose is to stimulate thinking, and the reader who wishes to know more about either approach should consult an appropriate source in the bibliography.

SECTION II

A Psychoanalytic Model of Discipline

Proponents of psychoanalytic models of discipline claim that teachers must understand a child's motivational system (i.e., his inner drives and needs) before they can either guide student learning or change undesirable behavior (Dreikurs, Grunwald & Pepper, 1971). According to these psychoanalysts, teachers must understand that a child's behavior is purposive. That is, all behavior is goal directed and indicates the ways in which the child has adapted to his environment. Thus, the child misbehaves because he has failed to develop correct ideas concerning how to adapt.

Psychoanalytic models of discipline are based on analytic models of Man. Such models have been proposed by the analysts Freud, Jung, Adler, Fromm, Rogers, and Sullivan, among others. Although these models have commonalities, each places emphasis on somewhat different assumptions and concepts. For example, Freud and Jung regard Man as a complex energy system which maintains itself by means of transactions with the environment. These transactions make possible the survival and propagation of the species, and the ongoing evolutionary development of Man. Later theorists such as Adler, Horney, Fromm, and Sullivan regarded Man as a social creature who could only be explained in terms of social variables. To illustrate the analytic model of Man, only Adler's theory and its implications for disciplinary practices in the school will be discussed here.

Six Major Concepts

Six major concepts are central to Alfred Adler's theory of personality: (1) fictional finalism; (2) striving for superiority; (3) inferiority feelings and compensation; (4) social interest; (5) style of life; and (6) the creative self. These concepts and their implications for teaching and classroom management will be explored in the following subsections.

Fictional finalism — According to Adler (1930), Man is motivated more by his expectations of the future than by his experiences from the past. Present behavior is motivated largely by ideals, strivings, and beliefs which Adler characterizes as the "final goal." Thus, future behaviors are not determined by some predestined design involving instincts and impulses. Rather, the *final goal* alone can shape Man's behavior. If someone believes as a final goal, for example, that evil acts are always punished, this belief will be the organizing force on behavior. Such final goals are characterized as "fictional," since they may be impossible to attain in reality. Nonetheless, it is indeed fictional goals which motivate Man and which also explain his behavior. Adler (1930) further believed that well-adjusted persons can free themselves from the influences of these fictional goals and face reality when the situation demands it.

A child's misbehavior probably does not result from deficiency in character as some insist, but from holding a wrong fictional goal. As long as we accept the premise that the child's behavior is purposive — that is, goal-directed — methods may be employed to change goals. Attempts to modify goals are different from attempts to modify character deficiencies. A character deficiency explanation makes it easy to attribute educational failures to a student's inherent laziness and irresponsibility, with the implication that little progress can be expected through corrective efforts. On the other hand, by taking the approach that the child has adopted erroneous fictional goals, the teacher can help him discover better goal alternatives.

Just as important as the goals themselves are the means of reaching them. When means of reaching the goals are antisocial, then the teacher must help the child find acceptable alternative routes. The child may not be consciously aware of his goals or of the strategies he is using to attain the goals. The trained observer, however, can often perceive the underlying intentions behind the child's actions. His behavior may be based on faulty assumptions about life, but his actions reflect his conviction that this behavior is the only possible way for him to be successful.

One reason the child may develop erroneous fictional goals is that he cannot necessarily be expected to perceive reality as it is. The way the child looks at life, at others, and at himself depends on his private logic. The trained educator is aware that the problem child does not know why he does what he does, and realizes that he must help the child understand himself, his goals, and his private logic. Parents and teachers can also help the child develop this understanding by establishing guidelines for dealing with life. These guidelines help the child learn under what conditions he can be sure to attain appropriate fictional goals.

As long as a child's fictional goal permits him to behave according to established standards, effective teaching can take place. But there is no question that children who do not behave according to the established standards also must be taught and that parents and teachers must arrive at some appropriate form of discipline in dealing with them. Some educators feel that this control can be achieved by a system of rewards and punishment.

Adlerians (Dreikurs *et al.*, 1971), however, contend that discipline by rewards and punishment is appropriate only in autocratic settings. In democratic settings, discipline must be maintained by internalization of controls. They believe that without such internalization most educational influences tend to undermine, rather than enhance the development of the child.

Striving for superiority — For Adlerians, the final fictional goal toward which all men strive is superiority. Superiority does not mean social distinction, leadership, or a pre-eminent position in society. Rather, it is a striving for perfect complet[illegible] similar to Goldstein's (1939) principle of "self-actualization," and [illegible]v's (1954) "being." Adler (1930) maintained that striving for superiority lies:

> . . . at the root of all solutions of life's problems and is manifested in the way in which we meet these problems. All our functions follow its direction. They strive for conquest, security, increase, either in the right or wrong direction. The impetus from minus to plus never ends. The urge from below to above never ceases. Whatever premises all our philosophers and psychologists dream of — self-preservation, pleasure principle, equalization — all these are but vague representations, attempts to express the greatest upward drive (p. 398).

According to Adler, the striving for superiority is innate and remains part of life. From birth to death, the striving for superiority carries the person from one stage of life to another. There are no separate drives, he maintains, for all drives are either derivative of or a manifestation of the striving for perfection.

Inferiority feelings and compensation — Feelings of inferiority determine how the striving for superiority will manifest itself. For example, a young child motivated by feelings of inferiority strives for a higher level of development. Having reached the new level, he begins to feel inferior to the next level of development, and, again, continues to strive upward. Adler (1930) asserted, that feelings of inferiority are not abnormal — that in fact, they are the cause of all Man's improvements. If, on the other hand, inferiority feelings have been exaggerated by special conditions of pampering or rejection, then either an abnormal inferiority complex or a compensatory superiority complex may ensue (Adler, 1930). Under normal conditions, however, feelings of inferiority or incompl[illegible]ss are the forces which drive Man.

One of the greatest obstacle[illegible] [illegible]he development of appropriate behavior comes from discouragement [illegible]ed by abnormal feelings of inferiority — from doubt in one's own ability. Children are too often confronted with a series of discouraging experiences in which they are either overprotected or punished. In either case, the child is deprived of the opportunity to build his own inner strength. By disciplining with fear, parents and teachers can also unintentionally create discouraging experiences for children. However, increasing degrees of rebellion and defiance are being demonstrated by children of today. This form of discipline by fear no longer seems to reduce the child to total submission as it did in the past. In fact, both in the home and in the classroom, children are showing mounting distrust toward unquestioning cooperation with adults. The Adlerian view supports the position

that children will continue to compensate (misbehave) for abnormal feelings of inferiority until we learn to encourage and not discourage them.

Social interest — Adler (1930) was an advocate of social democracy and social justice. He asserted, therefore, that all men ultimately strive to attain the goal of a perfect society through social interest. "Social interest is the true and inevitable compensation for all the natural weaknesses of individual human beings" (Adler, 1929, p. 31). Social interest, according to his definition, includes such concepts as empathy, interpersonal social relations, and identification with a group.

Adler believed that from the moment of birth Man is placed in a social context and is constantly involved in networks of interpersonal relations which shape his personality and provide outlets for his strivings of superiority. As these strivings become socialized, Man ventures toward a perfect society to replace personal ambition and selfish gain. Man thus compensates for his individual weaknesses by working for the common good.

Adler felt that schools unfortunately discourage the development of social interest. By requiring intense competition which pits friend against friend, schools make the individual unsure of himself, thus driving him to be more concerned with his own needs and his own advantages than with the needs of others (Dreikurs *et al.*, 1971). For this reason, the excessive ambition we encourage in children does not, according to Adlerians, provide a sense of security for either the children who succeed or those who fail (Dreikurs *et al.*, 1971).

Style of life — The most distinctive feature of Adler's psychology is the principle which explains the uniqueness of Man (Adler, 1929, 1931). Since everyone pursues the same ultimate goal of superiority, various life styles only indicate how each man strives for this goal differently. Ways of learning and perceiving are formed very early, and by the age of four or five, the child begins to assimilate and accommodate all his experiences according to his unique style. Attitudes, feelings, and even mode of dress become fixed and virtually impossible to change at early ages (Adler, 1931). Although a person can acquire later in life new ways of expressing his style of life, these are merely further instances of the same basic style established earlier.

Adler (1930) also believed that style of life does not appear spontaneously, but must be developed through guidance and training. He held that a newborn infant is a social being concerned with physical needs and the social atmosphere around him. The infant reacts and responds to the totality of training influences surrounding him in the environment. When he finds (long before conscious awareness) that crying brings forth a more receptive environment, he has learned an important lesson — the benefit of crying. It does not take the infant very long to learn when crying will be beneficial and when it will not. While it may work very well with the mother, it may annoy the father. The child soon learns to modify his behavior according to its consequences.

Since the child's style of life is influenced by the nature of parent-child interactions, and since the child has a need to belong and has a need to

strive for superiority, he will do whatever he believes to be necessary to achieve these (fictional) goals. As long as he feels a sense of belonging and is not discouraged excessively, he will respond positively to the demands of the situation. However, if he perceives that he cannot achieve his goals through appropriate means, he becomes discouraged and misbehaves. Adler emphasizes in his theory of fictional finalism that parents and teachers should remember that misbehavior is purposive. Even very young children seem to be fully aware when they have done something wrong although they may not consciously know why. The Adlerians suggest that the endless explanations parents and teachers use to admonish misbehaving children will actually reinforce the reluctance to behave. Adults do not cause the child's deviant behavior; they merely reinforce his decision to misbehave or behave through compliance with his unconscious plans.

Therefore, in summary it can be said that the life style of the child is based on the opinions which he forms about himself, on his opinions about others, and on the goals which he sets for himself. As noted previously, the Adlerian view emphasizes the importance of the present, refuting the assumption that the child is the victim of past experiences. That is, the basis of the child's behavior is what he thinks, believes, and intends to do today. The environment in which he is born is less important than the nature of the transaction he has with the environment. This view is fundamentally optimistic, for it supports the notion that adults can help the child modify his style of life through establishing new and appropriate goal-setting activities.

The creative self — According to Adler the creative self helps determine the individual's style of life. It mediates between the environment impinging upon the individual and the behavior exhibited in response to that environment. The creative self is the catalyst, the dynamic and unifying principle which makes all men unique. According to the doctrine of the creative self, Man makes his own personality. He constructs it out of his experiences and hereditary endowment.

> Heredity only endows him with certain abilities. Environment only gives him certain impressions. These abilities and impressions, and the manner in which he experiences them — that is to say, the interpretation he makes of these experiences — are the bricks which he uses in his own 'creative' way in building up his attitude toward life. It is his individual way of using these bricks, or in other words his attitudes toward life, which determines this relationship to the outside world (Adler, 1935, p. 5).

The creative self gives meaning to life; it creates the goal, as well as the means to the goal.

In summary, the Adlerian psychoanalytic model of Man is a humanistic theory. According to this model, Man is endowed with such qualities as altruism, humanitarianism, cooperativeness, creativity, uniqueness and awareness. In place of the materialistic picture created by Freud, Adler offered a portrait of Man which was more satisfying, more hopeful, and far more complimentary.

The Four Goals of Misbehavior

According to Adlerian psychoanalysts, there are four possible goals of misbehavior. These aberrant goal possibilities result from interactions among the behaviors explained by the six major concepts of Adlerian psychology discussed above — fictional finalism, striving for superiority, inferiority feelings and compensation, social interest, style of life, and the creative self. In order for educators to correct these aberrant or erroneous goal possibilities, they must understand the reasons behind such goal choices. In this subsection, the four erroneous goals and their significance for educators will be described; and in the following subsection, means for correcting such goals will be examined.

The four goals of misbehavior are attention getting, power seeking, revenge seeking, and assumed disability. According to Dreikurs *et al.* (1971), the child may

> . . . try to get *attention*, to put others in his service, since he believes that otherwise he would be lost and worthless. Or he may attempt to prove his *power* in the belief that only if he can do what he wants and defy adult pressure can he be somebody. Or he may seek revenge: the only means by which he feels significant is to hurt others as he feels hurt by them. Or he may display actual or imagined *deficiencies* in order to be left alone: as long as nothing is demanded of him, his deficiency, stupidity or inability may not become obvious; that would mean his utter worthlessness (p. 17).

Whichever of these four goals he adopts, his behavior will be based on the conviction that this mode of behavior is the only one he can use to be significant. His goals may change with varying circumstances (e.g., he may seek to attract attention at one moment, and to assert power at another). He uses a great variety of behaviors to obtain his goals; and, conversely, a particular behavior may serve different purposes. Even though manifestations of aberrant goals may be observed in all age groups, they are most frequently seen in children up to age ten.

Attention-getting — Young children most frequently choose the erroneous goal of attention-getting. This type of behavior characteristically occurs in societies that provide few opportunities for young children to establish their social positions through useful contributions — where, for example, household duties usually are performed by adults or older siblings. Seeing no chance to gain status through constructive contributions, the child seeks attention, affection, and gifts as proof of his acceptance. If these alternatives do nothing to increase the child's self-reliance, he will seek additional proof of his own strength through attention-getting misbehavior.

At first, he will try to achieve satisfaction through acceptable means, but if those means fail, the child will resort to unacceptable means to use others and to get attention. Whether or not he is punished does not matter as long as he succeeds in getting attention.

Power seeking — When parents and teachers try to stop the child from demanding attention, the situation often only worsens because the child

counters with increased resistance to their control. He finds security only when having his way. Adlerians (Dreikurs *et al.*, 1971) consequently suggest that adults not be drawn into a struggle for power since in most instances the child will win. Even if he loses the struggle, the child remains convinced that power is what counts in life. This gives the child a false picture of society as being autocratic.

Revenge seeking — For children who have lost faith in themselves and others and who now feel totally rejected, the problem of gaining a sense of personal worth cannot be solved merely by attention-getting or power-seeking behaviors. Such children resort to revenge-seeking behavior. Unfortunately, in revenge-seeking situations something like a self-fulfilling prophecy operates. Once the child begins to play the revenge seeker, he learns that he is quite capable of evoking from adults the kind of treatment which in turn justifies his need for revenge. He senses which of his opponents he can hurt the most and takes direct advantage of their vulnerability in the belief that this is the only satisfactory role he can play. Children who behave in this way only derive satisfaction from the belief that they are powerful enough to genuinely hurt others.

Assumed disability — The discouragement resulting from the struggle between adult and child for superiority may be manifested in full retreat from social participation, as with the child who assumes a disability. A child with this behavior pattern becomes passive and retreats into assumed deficiency in order to get special attention. Once he reaches the point where he is completely convinced he is a failure, he no longer tries at all and only wants to be left alone. By hiding behind a wall of imagined or real inferiority, the child attempts to avoid embarrassing situations.

According to Adlerian theory, there are no rules to predict which of the four goals of misbehavior a child will employ. Sometimes a misbehaving child shows goal ambivalence, and may, for example, exhibit both attention-getting and power-seeking behavior at the same time. Cause for even greater concern to parents and teachers is the child who exhibits goal fragmentation — that is, a child who pursues one of the erroneous goals at home, another at school, and yet another with his peers. In order to deal with such a child, teachers and parents must recognize which erroneous goal the child is pursuing in each situation.

Discipline or Punishment

According to the analytic view, discipline is not equivalent to forms of punishment such as isolation, removal, denial of privileges, or corporal punishment (Dreikurs *et al.*, 1971). In fact, punishment is viewed as a poor form of discipline since it stresses only what not to do rather than teaching what to do. According to Adlerians, discipline should not be imposed by an outside authority, but by the individual himself and by the group of which he is a member. As the child experiences acceptance in his relationships with others, his acceptance of himself gradually increases. Self-approval is probably the most effective form of self-control. When considered in this way, discipline no longer need be seen as a negative force; it becomes in-

stead a source of inner authority that permits freedom of choice.

Self-discipline needs to be established by parents early in the child's training through a process of limit setting. As the child grows older, there will be an increasing number of situations where self-discipline will be influenced by adults other than parents. For example, once the child has entered school, he will be expected to develop behavior patterns conducive to learning. One way to accomplish this objective is to allow the child to experience the consequences of his misbehavior. Adlerians believe that if the child knows that he must face the consequences of his misbehavior, he will be less likely to disobey the rules. Another method for developing self-discipline is to provide experiences through which the child can discover the world, express his feelings, and develop his own ideas. Toward this end, the classroom teacher should provide many opportunities for problem solving and cooperative planning.

The Role of Discipline in the Teaching Environment

Attempts by the teacher to develop the child's self-discipline ought more properly be seen as the enhancement of a process of inner control that has hopefully already begun in the home. If the parent does not help the child to acquire self-control, then later the teacher will need to spend excessive effort and time correcting him. Adler points out, however, that nagging and other forms of negative correction only cause feelings of discouragement. Instead, teachers should use a positive approach to guide children toward developing a sense of responsibility and consideration for others.

In order for this to occur, the learning climate should be warm and accepting. Teachers should remember that the child develops in one direction if something is done *to* him, but in another direction if something is done *with* him. Children feel involved, committed, and responsible when they have been consulted about what they are doing. As Dreikurs *et al.* (1971) noted, teachers need ". . . to be willing to share the responsibility of developing plans with the class and give support and approval in carrying out the plans (p. 24)." In a climate where teachers and children plan together, children are more likely to respect the rules and regulations established by the school.

In summary, Adlerians view discipline essentially as a form of training. In other words, discipline means teaching the child that there are certain rules in life to live by, and that he is expected to adapt to and internalize these rules for himself. According to this philosophy, the primary goal to be striven for is self-discipline, and one of the best ways to insure it in children is to help them discover mutuality. When a child knows that his classmates are concerned about him and that they are his friends, he does not have to show off or seek attention. Where such cooperation exists in a classroom, the teacher can enlist the children as allies against the offender when isolated cases of misbehavior occur.

No matter how carefully a teacher may plan, behavior problems are still likely to arise. To offset such problems and to foster self-discipline in children, the teacher should:

1. Provide learning activities which allow the child to think, to correct mistakes, and to develop understanding.
2. Provide a positive, nonthreatening teaching environment.
3. Provide opportunities for children to find joy, happiness, and enthusiasm.
4. Set behavioral limits to help children develop self-control.
5. Provide opportunities for children to help in the planning of school activities.

Adlerians believe that if children are to become self-disciplined then teachers must encourage problem-solving activities, independent views, and independence in carrying out assigned tasks.

The Do's and Don'ts of Discipline

To create a cooperative climate where self-discipline can develop, the teacher must know what to do as well as what not to do in a given situation. According to Dreikurs *et al.* (1971, pp. 27-30) a list of "Don'ts" includes the following:

1. A preoccupation with one's authority may provoke rather than stifle defiance and resistance to discipline. The teacher should not be concerned with her own prestige.
2. Refrain from nagging and scolding as it may fortify the child's mistaken concept of how to get attention.
3. Do not ask a child to promise anything. Most children will promise to change in order to get out of an uncomfortable situation. It is a sheer waste of time.
4. Do not give rewards for good behavior. The child may then work only in order to get his reward and stop as soon as he has achieved his goal. What's more, this will only strengthen his belief that he must be paid every time he acts civil or makes a contribution.
5. Refrain from finding fault with the child. It may hurt his self-esteem and may discourage him.
6. Avoid double standards, one for the teacher and another for the student. In a democratic atmosphere, everybody must have equal rights. This includes the chewing of gum, swearing, tardiness, unnecessary visiting and talking with members of the faculty in class when the children are working, sitting when the class pledges allegiance, checking papers or doing any kind of work that prevents the teacher from looking at the child when he is talking to her.
7. Do not use threats as a method to discipline the child. Although some children may become intimidated and conform for the moment, threats have no lasting value since they do not change children's basic attitudes.
8. Do not be vindictive; it stirs up resentment and unfriendly feelings.

Adlerians list the following as effective measures:

1. Because problem behavior is usually closely related to the child's faulty evaluation of his social position and how he must behave in order to have a place in the class group, the teacher's first concern must be to understand the purpose of his behavior. Only then will she be in a position to plan more effectively for this child.

2. Give clear-cut directions for the expected action of the child. Wait until you have the attention of all class members before you proceed in giving directions.
3. Be more concerned with the future behavior of the child than with the behavior he exhibited in the past. Refrain from reminding the child what he used to be or do.
4. As soon as a child misbehaves and tends to threaten the general atmosphere in the class, give him the choice either of remaining in his seat without disturbing others or leaving the classroom.
5. Build on the positive and minimize the negative. There is much good in every child, but if you look only for academic achievement, you may never find it.
6. Try to establish a relationship with the child built on trust and mutual respect.
7. Discuss the child's problem at a time when neither of you is emotionally charged, preferably in the regular class discussions.
8. Use natural consequences instead of traditional punishment. The consequences must bear direct relationship to the behavior and must be understood by the child.
9. Be consistent in your decision. Do not change it arbitrarily just because it suits your purpose at that moment. Inconsistency confuses the child about what is expected of him when a certain procedure is used.
10. See behavior in its proper perspective. In this way, you will avoid making a serious issue out of trivial incidents.
11. Establish cooperative planning for future goals and the solution of problems.
12. Let children assume greater responsibility for their own behavior and learning. They cannot learn unless we plan for such learning. Teachers who are afraid to leave the room because of what might happen prevent the children from taking responsibility. Responsibility is taught by giving responsibility. Be prepared for children to act up at first. Such training takes time.
13. Use the class community to express disapproval when a child behaves in an antisocial manner.
14. Treat the child as your social equal.
15. Combine kindness with firmness. The child must always sense that you are his friend, but that you will not accept certain kinds of behavior.
16. At all times, distinguish between the deed and the doer. This approach permits respect for the child even when he does something wrong.
17. Guide the individual to assume independence and his own self-direction.
18. Set the limits from the beginning, but work toward mutual understanding, a sense of responsibility, and consideration for others.
19. Admit your mistakes — the children will respect your honesty. Nothing is as pathetic as a defeated authoritarian who does not want to admit his defeat.
20. Mean what you say, but keep your demands simple, and see that they are carried out.

21. Children look to you for help and guidance. Give them this security, but make cooperation and eventual self-control the goal.
22. Keep in mind your long-term goal: an independent, responsible adult.
23. Children need direction and guidance until they can learn to direct themselves.
24. Close an incident quickly and revive good spirits. Let children know that mistakes are corrected and then forgotten.
25. Commend a child when his behavior in a situation shows improvement.
26. Work cooperatively with the children to develop a procedure for dealing with infractions of the rules.
27. Do unto others as you would have them do unto you.

Finally, if students understand what is expected, if they have been accepted as equal partners, and if teachers no longer feel threatened, then and only then, can self-discipline grow.

SECTION III

Behavior Modification

Clarizio and Yellon (1970) suggested that one of the merits of behavior modification stems from its applicability to anti-social youngsters as well as to withdrawn children. This approach has also been found effective with mentally retarded and normal children. (Peterson & Peterson, 1968; Hewett, 1967; Hall, Lund & Jackson, 1968). Behaviorists believe that with the proper modification procedures, every child can be taught desirable behavior.

Three general steps should be followed in the employment of behavior modification principles. During the first step, the specific behaviors to be modified must be clearly and explicitly identified. This statement of problem behavior should also include the exact steps and subgoals which are to be implemented. Thus to implement a global objective (e.g., to get Jack to behave in class) it is first necessary to identify the specific behaviors comprising the objective (e.g., to stop calling out, to refrain from hitting other students, and to stop quarreling).

All too frequently, disciplinary objectives are so broad that they are difficult to implement. Practitioners of behavior modification assume that it is almost impossible to achieve a total change in the personality of a maladaptive student. Rather, they stress the necessity of changing behavior in small and exacting substeps. (Clarizio and Yellon, 1970). For best results, Clarizio (1971) recommended that only two or three behaviors be chosen for change at any one time. Although this molecular approach might appear to be only a small step towards a behavioral objective, users of behavior modification claim that this approach accomplishes far more in the long run than the global, undifferentiated approaches (Blackham and Silberman, 1971).

As soon as such specific behaviors have been selected for modification, students should be informed of them. Hunter (1967) has also found it desirable to report to the student the frequency of his misbehavior. Clarizio (1971) noted that the following activities should be carried out during the first step of behavior modification:

1. Select the exact and precise behaviors to be changed.
2. State the objective in behavioral terms.
3. State the criterion or standard for satisfactory performance of the behavior.
4. Specify the conditions under which the behavior should occur.
5. Record the rate, frequency, and duration of the behavior.

Once the specified behaviors have been identified, the procedures to weaken the undesirable behavior (step two), and the procedures to strengthen the desirable behavior (step three), must be implemented. Usually deviant behavior is weakened through the processes of extinction and punishment, whereas desirable behavior is strengthened through the processes of positive reinforcement and modeling. For example, positive reinforcement may be used to strengthen a behavior such as paying attention, which competes with unacceptable behaviors such as inattention. Another useful modification strategy is to observe what happens immediately before and immediately after misbehavior (Bandura and Walter, 1963). Clarizio (1971) emphasized that the use of such processes as positive reinforcement, modeling, and extinction and punishment will let the teacher analyze the events which trigger the maladaptive behavior and those which keep the misbehavior active. An example of such an analysis follows in Table I:

TABLE I

An Analysis of a Misbehavior Situation

Before	Behavior	After
Assignment too difficult to complete	Sally begins to talk to neighbors	Teacher reprimands Sally while peers laugh

By analyzing the problem situation suggested above, the teacher may be better able to prevent similar situations from arising. In the following subsections, the exact processes needed to modify behavior will be discussed.

Techniques to modify behavior are divided into two categories — behavior information techniques and behavior elimination techniques (Milton, 1969). Behavior information techniques include techniques not only for strengthening existing adaptive responses but also techniques for instilling new adaptive ones. Techniques for eliminating undesirable behaviors include extinction, punishment, and desensitization. The following selected glossary of behavior modification terms put forth by Becker, Thomas, and Carnie (1971) is presented to help the reader understand the subsequent discussion of these behavior modification techniques.

Extinction is said to occur when a usual reinforcer is withdrawn. First there is a slight increase of the behavior to be extinguished, followed by a decrease of the behavior.

Operant Behavior is said to occur when responses involving the voluntary muscle system are strengthened or weakened by the stimuli which follow the behavior to be modified.

Punishment is said to occur when the probability of a response is weakened by the subsequent presentation of certain classes of stimuli.

Reinforcement is said to occur when the probability of a response is strengthened by the subsequent presentation of certain classes of stimuli.

Positive Reinforcement

Positive reinforcement techniques constitute one category of behavior modification procedures. These techniques place emphasis upon the nature of the reinforcement administered to an individual's response and only minimal attention to the stimulus which has elicited the response. The teacher using this technique presents a reward to the child every *time* he emits the desired response. While teachers long have been cognizant of the value of positively reinforcing desirable behaviors, Bandura and Walters (1963) noted that many teachers unwittingly reinforce undesirable behavior. Similarly, Dreikurs (1969) believed that *all* behaviors must have some pay-off value or we would discontinue using them.

In order to implement positive reinforcement techniques, three other operant conditioning variables must be considered — the schedule of reinforcement, the interval factor, and the type of reward. The term "schedule of reinforcement" refers to either the particular time or the frequency with which reinforcement is administered. Moreover, the choice of schedule employed during the acquisition stage differs from the maintenance stage of behavior modification. In the acquisition stages, a continuous reinforcement schedule (i.e., reinforcement is administered every time the desired response is emitted) is most effective. In the maintenance stage, intermittent reinforcement (i.e., reinforcement is administered randomly when the desired behavior is emitted) is most effective. The term "interval variable" refers to the time delay between the emission of response and the presentation of the reward. Initially, the delay factor should be quite short. Step by step, the interval can be lengthened as the child acquires more adequate behavioral controls.

TABLE II

Examples of Tangible and Social Rewards

Tangible Rewards	Social Rewards
Candy	Approving statements (e.g., You are working so well; that was a good answer).
Balloons	Putting the well—behaved student's name on the board
Stars	Nonverbal social gestures (patting head or winking)
Checks	Asking principal or parent to sign good papers
Rubber stamps of animals	Appointing student to be play manager
Toy animals	Choosing student to be physical education coach
Tokens	Choosing student to be assistant referee
Money	Asking student to check equipment
Popcorn	Asking student to be attendance taker
Pretzels	Asking student to administer tests
Fruit	Asking student to be guest lecturer to other classes
The use of a punching bag	Making student a member of who's who
Ticket to the movies	Asking student to feed class pets
Use of a view master	Presenting student with citizenship award
Using colored chalk or paints	
Singing	
Playing a favorite game	
Comics	
The use of special materials (e.g., magic markers, staplers, and colored paper) in some personal project	
Going to a ball game, play, or dance	
Special passes	

Two categories of rewards — There are two categories of rewards, tangible reinforcement (i.e., physical or natural) and social reinforcement. Even though tangible rewards are used initially as reinforcement, this type of reward should be paired with some form of social reinforcement. As Quay (1963) noted, reinforcement systems gradually should be shifted away from concrete to symbolic forms of reward. Table II lists several examples of both tangible and social reinforcers. With respect to the choice of a particular reinforcer, it should be noted that the most appropriate reinforcer must be determined by the child's developmental level and socio-cultural background. For example, appropriate reinforcers for the 12-year-old may not be reinforcing for the 6-year-old. Furthermore, it is generally wise, when possible, for teachers to allow students to choose their own rewards. To this end, Addison and Homme (1966) devised a "reinforcement menu." This "menu" consists of a list of rewarding activities from which a student can choose once he has completed his assigned task. By allowing students to select their reward from the menu, one can be assured that the rewards which are

chosen will be reinforcing. An example of a reinforcement menu is presented in Table III. Homme (1969) also provided the following useful guidelines regarding reinforcement menus in the classroom:

1. Some activities on the menu should be entertaining while others should be educational.
2. Three criteria should be considered when choosing reinforcement activities: (a) the availability of the rewards in the school; (b) the noise level, and; (c) the attractiveness of the rewards to the student.
3. The reinforcement area should be separated from the work area if possible.
4. The amount of time spent on a reinforcement activity may be prespecified (e.g., five minutes) or may vary according to the difficulty of the task. Generally, the time limit should not be less than three minutes or greater than ten minutes.

TABLE III

A Reinforcement Menu: Elementary Class Level

Study other subjects
Make charts
Listen to stories on tape recorder
Go outside to draw
Choose your own seat in the room
Read a library book
Chew gum
Write a story on the typewriter
Read a comic book
Be a line captain

Specials

Monday:	Go to drinking fountain without permission
Tuesday:	Be class librarian for the day
Wednesday:	Have a note for good behavior sent to your parent
Thursday:	Make up a subject area quiz, administer it to the rest of the class, then be sure to grade it
Friday:	Read a story to the class

Shaping and positive reinforcement — One problem which may arise when positive reinforcement procedures are utilized is that the student may fail to display rewardable behaviors. In such cases, it is necessary to reward approximations of the desired behavior in an attempt to shape the specific desired behavior. The student is rewarded only as more and more steps in the direction of the desired behavior are performed. For example, at first a disabled reader may be rewarded merely for recognizing a letter in a given

word. Gradually, however, he will be rewarded for reading a word, then a sentence, then a paragraph, after that, a page, and, finally, an entire lesson. When attempting to shape behavior, a good rule to follow is ". . . to start small and to reward the first signs of appropriate behavior" (Clarizio; 1971, p. 34).

Rewards and rules — Since all teachers must use rules for classroom management, it is important for them to realize how to develop and utilize such rules. First, a rule is defined as either a task the student must perform or as a limitation on what he may do. Second, rules are most effective when (a) one or two specific rules to guide behavior have been specified; (b) they are reasonable; and (c) only rules which can be enforced through rewards and/or punishment are made.

Clarizio (1971) suggested that teachers have more difficulty with discipline if they set too many rules or unnecessary rules. He stated that only a few rules which promote significant academic and personal skills should be employed. Agreeing with Clarizio, Smith and Smith (1966) outlined several good reasons for using few rules. First, too many rules tend to antagonize students. Second, too many rules tend to make consistency of application difficult. If, for example, the teacher has previously enforced rules inconsistently and then attempts to enforce a new code of only a few rules, students will test these new rules more intensely than any rules made subsequently. Since this testing and limit-setting behavior will demand all the teacher's energy, it is easier to concentrate this energy on the enforcement of one or two rules rather than on many. Once a consistent enforcement pattern has been established, the enforcement of any additional rules will be easier.

Third, students tend to concentrate on violating established rules with a consequent lessening of other kinds of misbehavior. By selecting an enforceable rule, the teacher can be assured that its consequence can be implemented. Finally, there will be a general change in classroom behavior following the consistent enforcement of only a few rules. This change in overall behavioral activity will lessen the need for the large number of rules that earlier seemed necessary.

Madsen, Becker, and Thomas (1968) investigated the differential effects of rules, the effects of ignoring inappropriate behavior, and the effects of approving of appropriate behavior. They found that rules alone had little impact on student behavior. However, if teachers provided reinforcement for appropriate behavior and ignored inappropriate behavior, the use of rules played a significant role in classroom management. Madsen *et al.* (1968) recommend the following guideline for establishing rules — particularly at the elementary level:

1. The class should form the rules.
2. The rules should be brief and clear.
3. The rules should be positively stated.
4. The rules should be reviewed at times other than when someone has misbehaved.

5. The students need to know when different rules have been put into effect.
6. The teacher should record the number of times a rule is reviewed.
7. The rules should vary according to the nature of the activity.

Peers and rewards — The peer group can be a very influential agent of reinforcement — a fact which is often overlooked by the teacher. Usually, the influence of peers is weakest during the preschool years, reaches a peak during middle childhood, and diminishes during adolescence (Clarizio, 1971).

A study by Stravelli and Shirley (1968) demonstrated this peer group effectiveness. In this study, a class of educationally handicapped elementary school children formed a citizens' council which regulated their behavior by group pressures and positive rewards. Students met daily to vote on whether certain students had earned or lost their citizenship on the basis of their performance from the day before. This vote was based on a set of criteria unanimously decided upon by the class, teacher, and two aides. After a few weeks, group cohesiveness increased, students' frustration tolerance rose, and self-control improved. Although this experiment shows promise as a control strategy, one word of caution should be noted. Since peers tend to be very severe in setting standards, it is wise to allow a trial period for testing, changing, and refining the peer-established guidelines.

Modeling and Observing Learning

If the desired response is not in the repertoire of the student, positive reinforcement may not be the best modification technique (Franks, 1965). Rather, social modeling may prove to be a more effective technique for the incorporation of new behaviors (Baer, 1963; Ferster, 1961; Hewitt, 1964; Slack, 1960; Wolf, Risley, & Mees, 1964).

Modeling, imitation, and copying are all terms used to describe the behavior which occurs when a child's responses are similar to those of a model. Modeling processes are important, for children usually acquire social skills (e.g., talking, conduct) through imitation of, and identification with models. Parents and teachers both play important modeling roles. Unfortunately, this technique has been typically overworked as a form of behavior management although Bandura (1965) asserted that modeling may represent a more effective means of establishing new behavior than a positive reinforcement procedure. Moreover, a behavior pattern acquired through imitation is often maintained without need for external reinforcement.

Theories of modeling — Several theories of modeling or observational learning have been proposed. A classical conditioning conception of modeling was postulated by Holt (1931), who held that modeling behavior occurred whenever modeling stimuli and matching imitator responses occurred together within a short time span. Later, Miller and Dollard (1941) hypothesized that modeling occurs when a "motivated" observer is positively reinforced for imitating selected responses made by a model. Initially, all responses tend to be modeled on a trial and error basis with only those responses the reinforcer considers desirable rewarded. Consequently, later imitation behavior will reflect the reinforced behavior.

Bandura (1969) has suggested that there are two processes — imaginal and verbal — occurring during observational learning. Images of the model's responses are formed as a result of sensory conditioning. And even though perceptual images are transitory, they may be stored for retrieval at a later time. Subsequently, such retrieved images function as mediators to direct an observer's, that is, an imitator's activities. A second type of cognitive process, verbal coding, is also involved in observational learning. A type of verbal coding simultaneously occurs as soon as the observer forms a particular image.

The role of reinforcement in observational or modeling learning indicates that reinforcement is important for the *performance* of a modeled response, but not for its learning or acquisition (Blackham & Silberman, 1971). This reinforcement may be vicarious (observed), self-administered, or externally administered.

The learning effects of models — Modeling appears to have three principal effects on students: (1) the modeling effect (i.e., promoting acquisition of a new or novel response); (2) the inhibitory or disinhibitory effect (i.e., weakening or strengthening of a previously learned response); (3) the eliciting or response facilitation effect (i.e., evoking a response not often used).

The inhibitory and disinhibitory effects of modeling are demonstrated in a study made by Bandura (1967). He assigned children with fear of dogs into one of four experimental groups. Group One watched a child without fear of dogs interact with a dog in a party setting. Group Two observed a similar situation, except that the child and dog interaction occurred in a non-party setting. Children in Group Three watched a dog in a party setting without the presence of a child model. Group Four children were not exposed to a dog or child model. The results indicated that only children in Groups One and Two lost their fear of dogs.

In addition to human models, Bandura and Walters (1963) recognized a second category of models — symbolic models, which appear in films, television, and print media. Bandura (1965) demonstrated, for example that physical and verbal aggression can be strengthened through use of film-mediated models. In this experiment, one group of children observed an aggressive model being punished, a second group watched an aggressive model being rewarded, and a third group saw an aggressive model receive no consequences for the aggression. The results revealed that only subjects in the "rewarded and no-consequence groups" exhibited greater numbers of imitative responses.

In a follow-up experiment, all the groups were given rewards for imitating the model's responses. The findings indicated that the use of incentives completely eliminated differences in observed performance. That is, equal amounts of imitative behavior appeared to be learned by all groups — those who saw the model rewarded, those who saw the model punished, and those who saw the model experiencing no-consequences. Bandura thus concluded that imitative responses were learned as a result of modeling and not as a consequence of reward.

On the other hand, not all symbolic models appear to be as effective as real life models for producing learning. The use of nonhuman cartoon characters does not appear to produce such dramatic results (Bandura, 1965). Similarly, Baer and Sherman (1964) found that imitative behavior increased as a consequence of social reinforcement from a puppet, but that the increase was not as great when reinforcement was administered by a human.

Factors influencing modeling — Observer susceptibility to social models can be greatly influenced by three classes of factors: (1) the characteristics of the model; (2) the characteristics of the observer; and (3) the consequences associated with the modeling behavior. Concerning the first class, Bronfenbrenner (1970) concluded that influential characteristics of the model include such factors as:

1. The extent to which the model is perceived as demonstrating a high degree of status or competence.
2. The extent to which the model's behavior is perceived as supportive.
3. The degree to which the model is perceived to be similar to the observer.
4. The extent to which the model's behavior is a salient feature of the group to which the child belongs or aspires to be a member.

Finally, Bronfenbrenner indicated that the use of several models is more effective in producing changed behavior than the use of a single model.

Regarding the second class of factors influencing susceptibility to social models, a variety of investigations has been conducted. Investigators have shown, for example, that such factors as (a) the student's sex; (b) race; (c) socioeconomic level; and (d) personality characteristics such as dogmatism, dependency, and cooperativeness are important variables. In general, boys imitate aggressive behavior more readily than girls, and authoritarian students respond readily to aggressive models (Flanders, 1968).

As noted earlier, modeling outcomes or consequences are extremely important in determining the extent of imitation. That is, positive reinforcement has been shown to be a powerful contributing factor in eliciting a response learned from a model. In fact, Bandura (1969) found that positive reinforcement can usually override the effects of model attributes and observer characteristics.

Punishment

Punishment can be divided into two main categories — presentation of aversive stimuli and removal of reinforcement. Presentation of aversive stimuli (e.g., spanking, beating, slapping, berating) probably is the most commonplace disciplinary technique for discouraging undesirable behavior. However, Skinner (1953) contended that the withdrawal of a reinforcer can be just as effective as the presentation of painful stimuli. Both forms of punishment are discussed below.

Presentation of aversive stimuli — The effectiveness of aversive punishment depends on a number of variables, including the type of aversive stimulus administered and the manner in which it is administered (e.g., intensity, frequency, and schedule). Recent investigations have begun to shed light

upon the consequences of each of these variables although much research still remains to be done in this area.

Becker and his associates have investigated the effects of frequency of punishment. Twenty-eight middle-elementary school children, characterized as well-behaved, participated in a study of the effects of teacher criticism (Thomas, Becker, & Armstrong, 1968). The number of disapproving transactions a teacher had with the students was varied. Disapproving teacher behaviors consisted of physical contact (e.g., pushing students), verbal contact (e.g., "If you don't stop talking, you will have to stay after school."), and facial expressions (e.g., frowning). In one phase of the study, the teacher was required to triple the number of such interactions, with the result that disruptive behavior occurred in over 31 percent of the observed time period in contrast to an 8.7 percent baseline level established prior to the experiment. Two hypotheses were proposed to explain why the disruptive behavior increased. First, it is possible that peer support of misbehavior may have increased as the teacher made more disapproving transactions. Second, there is the possibility that disapproving transactions may actually increase misbehavior.

The effects of the intensity of punishment appear to vary for different children. A sensitive child may be extremely distraught if relieved of a classroom responsibility. Others who are less sensitive may be almost totally unresponsive to even more severe forms of punishment such as beatings (Clarizio, 1971). Furthermore, the effects of intensity appear to interact with factors of frequency, timing, and consistency. Bandura (1969) has found that intense punishments are required to suppress misbehavior (1) when punishment is only occasionally administered; (2) when the misbehavior is still highly rewarded; and (3) when the student does not display behaviors which the teacher can reward.

O'Leary and Becker (1969) investigated the effects of intensity of punishment in the classroom. Nineteen first-grade children participated in five experimental phases during their rest period. During Phase One, baseline data were recorded; Phase Two consisted of appropriate behavior being praised while inappropriate behavior was ignored; Phase Three involved quietly reprimanding inappropriate behavior; Phase Four consisted of audibly reprimanding disruptive behavior; and Phase Five repeated the same transactions as Phase One.

Some of the findings from this study seem to offer practical guides for improving classroom management. First, praising appropriate behavior and ignoring inappropriate behavior reduced the number of disruptive incidents. Even more important was the finding that quiet reprimands are about as effective as praise in controlling behavior. Loud reprimands increased disruptive behavior but quiet ones decreased such behavior. Loud reprimands seemed to insure peer attention to misbehavior while quiet reprimands precluded such peer group reward. Thus, this study indicated that teachers should try to praise acceptable behavior and should use *quiet* but *firm* reprimands when necessary. Further, the results of this study are consistent with an earlier one performed by Anderson and Brewer (1946), who observed

that teachers who use threats, shame, and blame as forms of punishment adversely affect children's adjustment. Under these conditions children tend to become negative and nonconforming.

Withdrawal of rewards — The formal definition of negative reinforcement includes the removal of rewards and the removal of noxious stimuli. When an aversive (i.e., noxious) stimulus is removed, its removal is considered to be negatively reinforcing. However, negative reinforcement is generally characterized as withdrawal of privileges, peer approval, or some other form of positive reinforcement. Reese (1966) has found that misbehavior can be decreased by the withdrawal of such positive reinforcements. Furthermore, ". . . an operating positive reinforcer is not the only reinforcement which may be withdrawn (Blackham & Silberman, 1971, p. 50)." Withdrawal of any positive reinforcement that is contingent upon the performance of the response may produce the desired effect. That is, withdrawal of any privileges (e.g., going to the movies) theoretically should reduce misbehavior.

Time-out — The technique known as "time-out" is a variant of the technique of withdrawal of reinforcement. Basically, time-out involves withdrawing an individual from a situation in which positive reinforcement is operating. Tyler (1965) used this method to control undesirable behavior exhibited by delinquent male adolescents as they played pool — for example, cheating and throwing cue balls. The study consisted of three phases. In Phase One (seven weeks duration), misbehaving students were immediately confined to a time-out area or room for 15 minutes. In Phase Two (13 weeks duration) misbehaving students were not removed to the time-out room, but were given various verbal warnings and threats. During this phase misbehavior increased rapidly. Finally, in Phase Three (20 weeks duration), the time-out procedure was resumed with a corresponding decrease in misbehavior. Tyler thus concluded that brief isolation to a time-out area (which may even be a screened off corner of the room) seems to be one useful technique in controlling behavior.

If a teacher is to effectively use the time-out method, two basic considerations should be noted. First, when a child is removed to a time-out area, all reinforcement previously administered for the misbehavior is terminated. Consequently, it is important that the child receive generous reinforcement for appropriate behavior when he is not in the time-out room, or the effect of time-out will be lessened. Second, the child should be assigned to the time-out area for a specific period of time. Usually, ten to fifteen minutes is a maximum for effectiveness.

Cautions — Whether or not punishment is effective depends on the objectives for correcting misbehavior in a given situation. As Blackham and Silberman (1971) noted, ". . . before we can say it [punishment] is useful we must ask whether we desire an immediate or a lasting effect, and at how high a price (p. 47)." When aversive stimuli are used as punishers they tend to suppress misbehavior only temporarily; then, when the punishment is withdrawn, the misbehavior rapidly regains strength. If the punishment is

more severe and given consistently, it may suppress behavior for a longer period of time (Skinner, 1953).

Unfortunately, aversive punishment may produce a considerable number of side effects such as aggression or avoidance behavior (e.g., lying to avoid punishment). Emotional reactions to punishments also can be generated which could generalize to other areas. (Skinner, 1953). Performance in areas such as reading, for example, may be inhibited by these generalized emotional reactions (e.g., anxiety). Clarizio and Yellon (1970) summarized the following disadvantages stemming from the indiscriminate use of punishment:

1. Punishment does not eliminate the response; it merely slows down the rate at which troublesome behaviors are emitted.
2. Punishment merely serves notice to stop certain negative behaviors; it does not indicate what behaviors are appropriate in the situation.
3. Aggressive behaviors on the teacher's part may provide a model for the pupil.
4. The emotional side of punishment, such as fear, tenseness, and withdrawal, are maladaptive.
5. Punishment serves as a source of frustration, which is likely to elicit additional maladaptive behaviors.

Despite the disadvantages, many psychologists now contend that if properly applied, aversive punishment can facilitate the elimination of specific rather than general misbehavior (Marshall, 1965). Ausubel (1957) has asserted that a child cannot learn what is unacceptable merely by knowing what is acceptable. In other words, punishment is necessary to teach a child what he cannot do. Another positive value which may accrue from the use of punishment is when it controls undesirable behaviors long enough to permit positive reinforcement of desired behavior.

Extinction

Extinction of a response (e.g., cheating) occurs when reinforcement is discontinued completely upon the initial occurrence of the response. This technique should be distinguished from withdrawal of reinforcement, which requires the performance of a response. In extinction, the reinforcing stimuli that maintain the performance of a response are withheld — that is, all reinforcement is stopped. For example, if a child makes unreasonable demands, the behavior will tend to decrease in strength when the parents discontinue yielding to (reinforcing) the demands.

Although unacceptable behavior can be weakened by the nonrewarded repetition of a response, extinction is most effective when used in cooperation with other techniques. One effective combination involves the utilization of both extinction and reward. For example, a teacher might ignore a child when he talks out of turn in class, but might comment favorably when he speaks out in ways that are consistent with the rules of the classroom. Clarizio (1971) recommends the reinforcement of desirable behaviors which are incompatible with and compete with undesirable behaviors. A child cannot, for instance, be both cooperative and uncooperative simultaneously.

The return of old misbehavior — Extinguished misbehavior is not really permanently lost; rather it is displaced. Further, if the original misbehavior is again reinforced, it is easily reinstated. This difficulty can be overcome by the use of additional periods of extinction training. For example, one teacher had eliminated tantrum behavior in Mark, a first grade student. However, the teacher found that after the Christmas vacation the tantrum behavior had returned. Nevertheless, the teacher again was able to reduce these episodes to a minimum by totally ignoring the undesired behavior.

One of the primary factors in the reappearance of undesirable behavior is occasional or intermittent reward. Intermittent reinforcement is one of the best ways to maintain a behavior, and, conversely, such occasionally reinforced behavior is the most difficult to extinguish. If, for example, a teacher is trying to extinguish a certain deviant behavior (e.g., talking out in class) but occasionally reinforces it, this behavior will increase in frequency or intensity.

This situation might arise if a given teacher is inconsistent in ignoring a certain behavior or if there are inconsistencies between teachers. This type of inconsistency can occur in the elementary school in team-teaching situations and in junior and senior high schools where students have several teachers. As Bandura (1969) noted, any reward given during the extinction process will increase the misbehavior.

Inability to ignore misbehavior — Hunter (1967) has found that although teachers have little difficulty grasping the value of extinction processes, they have considerable difficulty in implementing this strategy. One possible explanation for this difficulty is that maximum benefit results from extinction procedures only when certain undesirable behaviors are ignored. And Madsen *et al.* (1968) found that teachers have difficulty deciding which undesirable behaviors to ignore. Clarizio (1971) recommended the following guidelines:

1. Teachers cannot ignore behaviors which are injurious to self or to others, and there are certain inappropriate behaviors for which the teachers cannot remove the reward, such as self-rewarding behaviors and behaviors rewarded by the peer group.
2. Teachers cannot ignore misbehavior which occurs with a high degree of consistency. If the misbehavior occurs frequently and is of a long duration, such behavior either is being reinforced by social agents or is rewarding in and of itself. In such cases, extinction procedures may prove inadequate, and some form of punishment and positive reward system might therefore be needed.

Original misbehavior increases — During the initial stages of the extinction process, misbehavior will typically increase in frequency or in intensity. Mild temper tantrums may well increase in intensity and talking-out behavior may increase in frequency (Bandura, 1969). This initial rise in undesired behavior should not be considered as a discouraging sign. The systematic application of extinction procedures will help to prove that vigorous misbehavior is of no avail. Gradually, undesired behavior will dissipate, and alternative patterns of behavior will emerge.

In summary, the rate and effectiveness of extinction as an intervention technique are dictated by several factors. Among them are whether (1) the maladaptive behavior has been rewarded irregularly or intermittently; (2) the reinforcers of the maladaptive behavior are ignored; (3) the availability of appropriate modes of behavior; (4) the student's level of deprivation during the extinction process; (5) the extent to which extinction procedures are combined with other modification procedures; (6) the teacher's ability to ignore certain misbehaviors and (7) the teacher's ability to apply extinction techniques consistently and systematically.

Conclusions

Advocates of the behavior modification model and advocates of the psychoanalytic model often make recommendations which conflict in their underlying assumptions. White (1965) noted that the differences extend beyond assumptions to include values implied by the two models. For teachers who try to apply components of both approaches at the same time, role conflict may arise.

Given such differences, how is the educational practitioner to make a decision as to which model to choose? Aside from personal preferences of the user, there are some obvious advantages and disadvantages for each.

Few would deny that humanism is central to the psychoanalytic approach, and, indeed, this is its primary appeal for many. White (1965) summarizes the merits derived from using the psychoanalytic model as follows:

> It would be fair to say that the mental health movement [psychoanalytic] has rewarded warmth of feeling· spontaneity; insight; a high interest in others, particularly peers; the ability to communicate especially one's feelings; warm parents; freedom to exercise judgment; warm teachers and democratic classrooms. The same movement has been against: being compulsive; competitive striving; intellectualism; being either thing- or achievement-oriented; being emotionally unresponsive, as well as being angry or passionate; being a loner; not confiding in others; teachers who are curriculum-oriented; the regimentation of school life; group tests; red tape and vice-principals in charge of discipline.

Behavior modifiers view many of the alleged strengths above as weaknesses. For example, Clarizio (1971) commented that too often teachers become needlessly frustrated by attempting to implement the analytic model in the absence of clearly specified procedures. Teachers have asked for practical suggestions, Morse (1961) stated, only to receive vague, general guidelines. Admonitions to be accepting, cooperative, nonthreatening, and understanding of the child's needs may not be helping teachers to cope with misbehavior (Ausubel, 1961). Clarizio (1971) believed that analysts may be overlooking the following considerations when giving advice to teachers:

1. The teacher has been trained to work with groups, not to be a diagnostician with one child.
2. The primary goal of teaching is not to increase the child's personal insights, but to help him achieve certain academic objectives.
3. The role of the teacher is to inculcate the values of the culture; thus

permissive acceptance of misbehavior is wrong.

4. The teacher deals primarily with the conscious and possibly the preconscious processes of the child.
5. Finally, the teacher must manage current classroom problems and not hypothetical, textbook cases.

Behaviorists assert that the specific procedures which are lacking in the psychoanalytic approach are found in the behavior modification approach.

The methods of behavior modification — positive reinforcement, extinction, punishment, withdrawal of reinforcement, and modeling — should not be envisioned as panaceas. In fact, these five techniques probably should be regarded at best as approximations of techniques that will be refined with further testing and research. When used with understanding however, it appears that these management techniques do have advantages over other methods of discipline. Among these advantages, Clarizio (1970) noted the following:

1. The success of behavior modification procedures has been demonstrated in both laboratory and natural settings such as the classroom.
2. These techniques allow us to develop objective competencies among those responsible for maintaining classroom control.
3. The behavior modification procedures are consistent with the traditional teacher's role of transmitting the culture's values.
4. The modification techniques offer a variety of approaches to managing behavior; therefore, teachers need not rely on only one disciplinary strategy.
5. The behavior modification theory offers techniques which are both systematic and practical for use with classroom problems.
6. These techniques allow the teacher to focus on specific and realistic goals relative to the children in his class.

Thus, those same weaknesses of the psychoanalytic model become the strengths of the behavior modification procedures. Conversely, the strengths of the psychoanalytic model are seen as the weaknesses of the behavior modification approach.

Users of behavior modification have been criticized for being cyberneticians, manipulative programmers of human behavior (Woody, 1969). The basic argument usually made against behavior modification procedures runs as follows: "In a democracy, where individuality, freedom of choice, the right to self-determination, and dissent are highly cherished values, it is not 'right,' or may even be 'immoral,' to manipulate, change or control another's behavior (Blackham & Silberman, 1971, p. 9)." Certainly, most individuals can subscribe to some of the values in this challenge. However, it is also true that a person's ability to make choices and the freedom with which he can make those choices are always restricted by the environment and by other individuals. As Skinner (1966) suggested, behavior is always controlled by its consequences. Thus, behavior is normally restricted or controlled by physical laws, man-made laws, or the mores of social groups. Behavior modification procedures merely supply the means to enforce these already established controls.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Addison, R. M. The reinforcing event (RE) menu. *National Society for Programmed Instruction Journal*, 1966, 5, 8-9.

Adler, A. *The Science of Living*. New York: Greenberg, 1929.

Adler, A. Individual psychology. *Psychologies of 1930*. (C. Murchinson, Ed.). Worcester, Mass.: Clark University Press, 1930, 395-405.

Adler, A. *What Life Should Mean to You*. Boston: Little, 1931.

Adler, A. The fundamental views of individual psychology. *International Journal of Individual Psychology*, 1935, 1, 5-8.

Anderson, H. H. and Brewer, J. E. Studies of teachers' classroom personality, 11: Effects of teachers' dominative and integrative contacts on children's classroom behavior. *Applied Psychological Monographs*, 1946, No. 8.

Ausubel, D. *Theory and Problems of Child Development*. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1957.

Ausubel, D. A new look at classroom discipline. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 1961, 43, 25-30.

Baer, D. M. Social reinforcement and behavior change. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 1963, 591-633.

Baer, D. M., and Sherman, J. A. Reinforcement control of generalized imitation in young children. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 1964, 1, 37-49.

Bandura, A. Behavioral modification through modeling procedures. *Research in Behavior Modification*. (L. Krasner and L. Ullman, Eds.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1965.

Bandura, A. Behavioral psychotherapy. *Scientific American*, 1967, 78-86.

Bandura, A. *Principles of Behavior Modification*. New York: Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.

Bandura, A. and Walters, R. *Social Learning and Personality Development*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1963.

Becker, W. C., Thomas, D. R., and Carnine, D. Reducing behavior problems: An operant conditioning guide for teachers. *An Empirical Basis for Change in Education*. (W. Becker, Ed.). Chicago: Science Research Association, 1971.

Blackham, G. and Silberman, A. *Modification of Child Behavior*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1971.

Bower, E. *The Education of Emotionally Handicapped Children*. Sacramento, California: California State Department of Education, 1961.

Bronfenbrenner, U. *Two Worlds of Childhood: U.S. and U.S.S.R.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1970.

Clarizio, H. F. *Toward Positive Classroom Discipline*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1971.

Clarizio, H. F. and Yellon, S. L. Learning theory approaches to classroom management: Rationale and intervention techniques. *Contemporary Issues in Educational Psychology*. (H. Clarizio, R. Craig, and W. Mehrens, Eds.) Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1970.

Dreikurs, R. The scientific revolution. *Foundations of Guidance and Counseling*. (C. G. Smith and O. G. Mink, Eds.). Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1969.

Dreikurs, R., Grunwald, R. B., and Pepper, F. C. *Maintaining Sanity in the Classroom: Illustrated Teaching Techniques*. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.

Ferster, C. Positive reinforcement and behavioral deficits of autistic children. *Child Development*, 1961, 32, 437-456.

Franks, C. Behavior therapy, psychology and the psychiatrist: Contribution, evaluation, and overview. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 1965, 35, 145-151.

Gledewell, J. C. and Swallow, C. S. *The Prevalence of Maladjustment in Elementary Schools*. Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1968.

Goldstein, K. *The Organism*. New York: American Book Co., 1939.

Hall, V. R., Lund, D., and Jackson, D. Effects of teacher attention on study behavior. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analyses*, 1968, 1-12.

Hayakawa, S. *Language in Thought and Action*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1949.

Hewett, F. Educational engineering with emotionally disturbed children. *Exceptional Child*, 1967, 33, 459-467.

Hewett, F. Teaching reading to an autistic boy through operant conditioning. *Reading Teacher*, 1964, 17, 613-618.

Holt, E. B. *Animal Drive and the Learning Process*: Volume 1. New York: Holt, 1931.

Homme, L. E. *How To Use Contingency Contracting in the Classroom*. Urbana: Research Press, 1969.

Hunter, M. *Reinforcement*. El Segundo, California: TIP Publications, 1967.

Kaplan, L. *Mental Health and Education*. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.

Kilpatrick, W. H. *Foundations of Method: Informal Talks on Teaching*. New York: Macmillan, 1925.

Madsen, C. H., Becker, W. C., and Thomas, D. P. Rules, praise, and ignoring elements of elementary classroom control. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Analysis*, 1968, 1, 139-150.

Marsall, H. The effect of punishment on children: A review of the literature and a suggested hypothesis. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 1965, 106, 108-133.

Maslow, A. H. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper, 1954.

Miller, N. E. and Dollard, J. *Social Learning and Imitation*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941.

Milton, T. *Modern Psychopathology: A Biosocial Approach to Maladaptive Learning and Functioning*. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1969.

Morse, W. C. The mental hygiene dilemma in public education. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 1961, 31, 332-338.

Morse, W. C. and Wingo, G. M. *Psychology and Teaching*. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman, and Company, 1969.

Morice, Herbert O. The school psychologist as a behavior consultant: A project in behavior modification in a public school setting. *Psychology in the Schools*, 1968, 5 (No. 3), 253-261.

O'Leary, K. D. and Becker, W. C. The effects of the intensity of a teacher's reprimand on children's behavior. *Journal of School Psychology*, 1968, 7, 8-11.

Peterson, R. F. and Peterson, L. R. The use of positive reinforcement in the control of self-destructive behavior in a retarded boy. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 1968, 6, 351-360.

Quay, H. Some basic considerations in the education of emotionally disturbed children. *Exceptional Child*, 1963, 30, 27-31.

Reese, E. P. *The Analyses of Human Operant Behavior*. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown, 1966.

Rich, S. G. Is discipline useful? *Journal of Educational Method*, 1925, 4, 296.

Skinner, B. F. *Science and Human Behavior*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1953.

Skinner, B. F. Freedom and the control of men. *Control of Human Behavior.* (R. Ullrich and J. Mabry, Eds.). Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman, and Company, 1966.

Slack, C. Experimenter — subject psychotherapy: A new method for introducing intensive office treatment for unreachable cases. *Mental Hygiene*, 1960, 44, 238-256.

Smith, J. M. and Smith, D. *Child Management: A Program for Parents.* Ann Arbor: Ann Arbor Publishers, 1966.

Stravelli, R. S. and Shirley, D. T. The citizens' council: A technique for managing behavior disorders in the educationally handicapped class. *Journal for School Psychology*, 1968, 6, 147-153.

Thomas, D. R., Becker, W. C., and Armstrong, M. Production and elimination of disruptive classroom behavior by systematically varying teacher's behavior. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Analysis*, 1968, 35-45.

Tyler, V. O. Exploring the use of operant techniques in rehabilitation of delinquent boys. Paper read at the American Psychological Association Convention, Chicago: September, 1965.

Webster, N. *Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language, College Edition.* New York: The World Publishing Co. 1953.

White, M. Little red schoolhouse and little white clinic. *Teachers College Record*, 1965, 67, 188-200.

Wiener, D. N. *Classroom Management and Discipline.* Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1972.

Wolf, M., Risley, F., and Mees, H. Application of operant conditioning procedures to behavior problems of an autistic child. *Behavior Research and Therapy*, 1964, 1, 305-312.

Woody, R. H. *Behavioral Problem Children in the Schools.* New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1969.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Harper & Row

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

From pp. 27-30 in MAINTAINING SANITY IN THE CLASSROOM: ILLUSTRATED TEACHING TECHNIQUES by Radolf Dreikurs, M.D., Bernice Bronia Grunwald and Floy C. Pepper
Copyright © 1971 by Radolf Dreikurs, Bernice Bronia Grunwald and Floy C. Pepper
Reprinted by permission of Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc.