INFORMATION TO USERS

While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted. For example:

- Manuscript pages may have indistinct print. In such cases, the best available copy has been filmed.

- Manuscripts may not always be complete. In such cases, a note will indicate that it is not possible to obtain missing pages.

- Copyrighted material may have been removed from the manuscript. In such cases, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, and charts) are photographed by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each oversize page is also filmed as one exposure and is available, for an additional charge, as a standard 35mm slide or as a 17”x 23” black and white photographic print.

Most photographs reproduce acceptably on positive microfilm or microfiche but lack the clarity on xerographic copies made from the microfilm. For an additional charge, 35mm slides of 6”x 9” black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography.

Burton, Mary Alice Blanford, Ed.D.

University of Hawaii, 1987

Copyright ©1987 by Burton, Mary Alice Blanford. All rights reserved.
PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark √.

1. Glossy photographs or pages
2. Colored illustrations, paper or print
3. Photographs with dark background
4. Illustrations are poor copy
5. Pages with black marks, not original copy
6. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page
7. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages √
8. Print exceeds margin requirements
9. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine
10. Computer printout pages with indistinct print
11. Page(s) missing when material received, and not available from school or author.
12. Page(s) seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.
13. Two pages numbered. Text follows.
14. Curling and wrinkled pages
15. Dissertation contains pages with print at a slant, filmed as received
16. Other

University Microfilms International
THE DISCIPLINING OF AMERICAN SCHOOL CHILDREN: 1940–1980

AN HISTORICAL STUDY

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE DIVISION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION IN EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS

MAY 1987

By

Mary Alice Blanford Burton

Dissertation Committee:

Ann M. Keppel, Chairperson
Melvin Ezer
Ralph Stueber
Stephanie Feeney
Richard Rapson
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the members of my committee for their continued support throughout my master and doctoral programs. Special recognition must be given to my committee chairperson, Dr. Ann Keppel, for her reading of innumerable drafts of this work and for her perceptive insights, comments, and suggestions.

I would also like to thank the Hawaii State Retired Teachers' Association and the retired teachers who so generously responded to my questionnaire.

In addition, a personal thank you is extended to Irene Oka of the Educational Foundations Department who patiently kept me on track through all of the nitty gritty details of getting a doctoral degree, and to my fellow student and friend, Linda Logan, who helped me keep a sense of humor.

Last, I must add a most inadequate mahalo to my husband, Gordon, without whom this project would never have been undertaken and certainly never would have been completed.
ABSTRACT

Purpose: The purpose of this dissertation is three-fold. The first purpose is to document the changes that have occurred in the writings in the professional literature on school discipline during the period 1940 to 1980. The second purpose is to place those changes within the broader historical context of general social, political, and economic changes in American society. The third purpose is to examine the changing attitudes toward children as reflected in this study of school discipline.

Thesis: The social, political, and economic changes which American society has undergone in the period 1940 to 1980 have resulted in a shift in the professional educators' concerns and interests in school discipline. The professional literature indicates that educators have replaced their former concern for the purpose of discipline with a heightened concern for developing methods of controlling behavior in the classroom. This shift in emphasis from purpose to means is a result of the inconsistency between the changes which have occurred in the dominating characteristics of the general society and the professed goals and objectives of educators in the schools. In the period between 1940 and 1980 American society changed from a predominately producer society to that of a predominately consumer society. The professed goals of the school, however, have remained
those of a producer society, but discipline policy and practice has been influenced by the ideas and social behaviors of a consumer society.

**Method:** The method of investigation involves three parts. The first part is a review of the professional literature on elementary school discipline from 1940 to 1980. The second part is an historical survey of general social, political, and economic changes for this same period. The third part is an analysis of the relationship between these two inquiries. An historical survey of retired teachers in Hawaii is also included as a means of adding a dimension of validity to the conclusions drawn from the professional literature.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS</td>
<td>ix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREFACE</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER I</strong>  <strong>INTRODUCTION: RATIONALE FOR STUDY, DEFINITIONS, METHODOLOGY.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why This Study</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Public Child</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why History</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why the Study of Discipline</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What Is Discipline</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What Has Been Written</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding An Historical Theory</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of Study</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER II</strong>  <strong>THE SEARCH FOR A NEW DISCIPLINE: A BACKGROUND HISTORY OF SCHOOL DISCIPLINE BEFORE 1940.</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Search for a New Discipline</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Century of the Child</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Industrialized, Institutionalized Society</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theories of School Discipline</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New Discipline: Philosophy</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New Discipline: The Science of Human Behavior</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New Discipline: The Mental Hygiene Movement</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER III</strong>  <strong>THE SEARCH FOR SECURITY: REVIEW OF THEORIES AND ASSUMED PRACTICES RELATING TO CLASSROOM DISCIPLINE AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO GENERAL HISTORICAL CONCERNS: 1940-1965.</strong></td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World War II</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post war Years</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline in the Classroom</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Group as Controller</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camelot Built By Science</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Search For a Scientific Theory of Discipline</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>LIBERTY AND EQUALITY FOR ALL: REVIEW OF THEORIES AND ASSUMED PRACTICES RELATING TO CLASSROOM DISCIPLINE AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION: 1960'S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The End of Consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The New Social Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Science of Human Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Children's Liberation Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>CONTROL AND CONTAINMENT: REVIEW OF THEORIES AND ASSUMED PRACTICES RELATING TO CLASSROOM DISCIPLINE AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO GENERAL HISTORICAL TRENDS: 1970'S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Age of Despair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Violence and Despair in the Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Crisis in School Discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discipline By Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Conflict Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Last Resort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cook Book Discipline: A Psychological Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>DISCIPLINE AND ATTITUDES TOWARD CHILDREN: SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF ATTITUDES TOWARD CHILDREN AS REVEALED IN THE LITERATURE ON DISCIPLINE IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Discipline and Social Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three Periods of Childhood: An Historical Misconception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Producers and Consumers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Consumer Child: A Conflict in Means and Ends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX A</td>
<td>SUMMARY OF SURVEY OF RETIRED TEACHERS IN HAWAII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Chart

5.1 Strategies of Discipline 164

Table

A.1 Data on Questionnaire 199
A.2 Data on Respondents 200

Figure

A.1 Philosophies: Pre-1940 Agree 202
A.2 Philosophies: Pre-1940 Partially Agree 202
A.3 Philosophies: Post-1940 Agree 204
A.4 Philosophies: Post-1940 Partially Agree 204
A.5 Goals of Discipline: Pre-1940 207
A.6 Goals of Discipline: Post-1940 207
A.7 Factors Influencing Discipline: Pre-1940 210
A.8 Factors Influencing Discipline: Post-1940 211
A.9 External Influences on Discipline 219
A.10 Perceptions of Discipline: Pre-1940 222
A.11 Perceptions of Discipline: Post-1940 222
A.12 Was Discipline a Problem? 228
When I began this study I was searching for a way of understanding the changing place of children and the changing attitudes toward children in our society. I chose the topic of school discipline because I thought that discipline would serve as an excellent subject in which to illuminate the changing and conflicting behaviors that seemed to be exhibited toward children. It was my strong belief that the best way to understand attitudes toward children was to look at what people did, and not just at what they said. As you will find in reading this dissertation my faith in behavior as the primary means of understanding human attitudes has been challenged by my own research. Equally important to behavior is why particular behaviors are taking place. This we can only begin to understand by what people say. The rhetoric of what we say about children may be as revealing as the behavior. I have not rejected the assumed importance of behavior, but I have tempered my belief that it is the only path to understanding.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION
Rationale for the Study, Definitions, Methodology

WHY THIS STUDY

The question of the place of the child in our twentieth century society and consequently society's attitude toward children is a complex, sometimes contradictory, and always emotionally charged topic.¹ This century is replete with literature on the child which has expanded with each succeeding decade. It includes writings on the young child, the gifted, the retarded, the aggressive, the hyperactive, the delinquent, the depressed child, the only child, the urban child, the deprived child, ad infinitum.

This study is not that of the child per se, but of the relationship between the ideas and behaviors which society has applied to children as expressed through the practices and theories of discipline in the schools. It is hoped that an examination of these public theories and practices will illuminate society's attitudes toward children.

THE PUBLIC CHILD

Government cannot indiscriminately abandon to the intelligence and prejudices of fathers the education of their children, as that education is of still greater importance to the State than to the fathers; for according to the course of nature, the death of the father often deprives him of the final fruits of education, but his country sooner or later perceives its effects.

Jean Jacques Rousseau 2

Parental childrearing practices and school disciplinary practices are easily linked together, and rightly so. Many of the concerns about how to control children occur in both the home and the school. Many writers who have advised parents on childrearing have extended their expertise to the teacher. Conversely, many educators have not been averse to sharing their professional knowledge with parents, i.e. Frederich Froebel and Jacob S. C. Alcott in the nineteenth century and Haim Ginott and William Glasser in the twentieth century.

Even though one could find parallel disciplinary behaviors taking place in the home and the school at particular points in history, it is not my purpose to explore the subject of childrearing and parental disciplinary practices. Nor is it my purpose to explore the personal attitudes of parents toward their individual children, nor to examine what those behaviors and attitudes tell us about the general societal attitude toward children. Such a study involves an examination of the

family and the role of the "private child" in that family.\(^3\)

By contrast, this work is focused on "the public child," the school child. The school is a public institution established to reflect and serve the needs of the society as a whole. As such, the child in that institution takes on a different role and a different meaning. William Goldstein points out the problem that arises when the parent of the "private child" meets the educator of the "public child," school discipline becomes something for "some one else's kid."\(^4\)

The professional educator, unlike the parent, is first of all a representative of the community, the state, and the society at large. Therefore, when we attempt to understand society's attitudes toward children as revealed in school discipline we must keep in mind that we are looking at a distinctly different picture than that which would be found by an analysis of behaviors in the home and by the parent.


WHY HISTORY

History is philosophy teaching by example.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus\textsuperscript{5}  
\textit{De Arte Rhetorica}

The discipline of history provides a unique framework for an understanding of the history of discipline. History can give insight into the child in American society by establishing a basis of comparison and contrast over time. Unfortunately historians have only begun to increase our understanding of children in our century. Interestingly, the best and the most extensive works on the history of children have been concerned with Colonial America. The twentieth century historiography of childhood is, however, both sparse and lacking in theory.\textsuperscript{6}

Ray Hiner does suggest that good historical studies of childhood can give insight into a broader understanding of not only children, but the impact of childhood on adult lives and consequently the historical process itself. He proposes four questions which any historical work on childhood should attempt to address: 1. What have been the attitudes of adults toward children and childhood?


2. What are the conditions which helped shape the development of children?  
3. What has been the subjective experience of childhood in the past?  
4. How have children and childhood influenced adults? 
This work should address all four of these questions.

The life of the twentieth century child has been influenced by many social institutions other than the family. Therefore, historical research which focuses on an understanding of the changes in the life and role of the child should not be confined to just a study of the family and the parent-child relationship. Most particularly, the institution of the school and the behaviors, theories, goals, ideologies, and dynamics of the classroom have not been recognized as important factors in developing an understanding of children in twentieth century society. Hence, this study.

In 1960 Bernard Bailyn implored American historians of education to place the history of education in a larger social framework than just the progress of the public school. This study attempts to place

---

7Hiner, ibid., p. 15.

8Major exceptions to this emphasis on the family as the source of understanding the child has been Anthony Platt's The Child Savers: The Invention of Delinquency (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1969); and Walter Trattner, Crusade for Children: A History of the National Child Labor Committee and Child Labor Reform in America (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1970).
the study of classroom discipline in such a context.\textsuperscript{9} I believe that an analysis of the policies and practices in the schools can serve as a vehicle in understanding American culture and more particularly the attitudes toward and relationships of children within that society.

WHY THE STUDY OF DISCIPLINE

There are occasions and causes why and wherefore in all things. \textit{Henry V}\textsuperscript{10}

The school is both a contributing institution of society and a reflection of that society. Therefore, a study of particular practices within the schoolhouse provides a unique understanding of historical change. The American public has declared discipline to be the major problem in the public schools in ten of the eleven Gallop Polls between 1969 and 1980.\textsuperscript{11}

\textsuperscript{9}Bernard Bailyn, \textit{Education in the Forming of American Society: Needs and Opportunities for Study} (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1960). This goal should be viewed in contrast to historical studies which have seen the school and educational theories from an intellectual and philosophical perspective unrelated to the social and political milieu in which they existed. Similarly, this study should be contrasted with the revisionist historians who have tended to see the school and the child only as tools in a struggle for control of the social and economic structure.

\textsuperscript{10}Henry V V. i. 3-4.

\textsuperscript{11}John G. Taylor and Richard H. Usher, "Discipline," in \textit{Encyclopedia of Educational Research}, 5th ed., ed. Harold E. Mitzel (New York: The Free Press, 1982), p. 447. It should be noted that 1969 was also the first year of such a poll and therefore one might question whether a similar poll at other periods in history might not have reflected similar opinions.
Even the President of the United States, speaking before the National Association of Secondary School Principals, called school discipline the key to solving the nation's educational problem. This is not a new problem; what school discipline is and how to achieve it have plagued educators, and more particularly classroom teachers, for centuries.

What American educational historians seem to have agreed on is that in theory there are two classifications of school discipline. The traditional, formal, or authoritarian discipline which stressed punishment and total teacher control predominated in the schools from the Middle Ages until the twentieth century. The rise of the new democratic, child-centered discipline paralleled the expansion of the American public school. First espoused by Horace Mann, and sometimes referred to as the Pedagogy of Love, it reached its fruition during the Progressive Era after 1900, with such spokesmen as Francis Parker and John Dewey. Paralleling and intertwining with this new discipline was the growth of child study led by G. Stanley Hall, and various psychologies espoused by such diverse men as William James, R.L. Thorndike, and John B. Watson, and psychotherapy under Sigmund Freud and Carl Jung. Interestingly, the contradictions and confusion resulting from this presumed merger of ideas have never really been resolved.

A cursory examination of contemporary school theories and practices seem to support this picture of a duality in disciplinary practices. For example, it is generally believed that the new discipline is entrenched in educational theory in this the Century of the Child. Corporal punishment is thought to be frowned upon by educational theorists. On the surface, Dewey's aim of self-discipline by the child versus control by the teacher has been generally accepted as a goal in educational writings. The integration of interest and learning as part of the process of achieving self-discipline versus the separation of academics and the control of children (or discipline per se) is a given in teacher training theory. In addition, the concept of children's rights espoused in the 1970's may appear to some to have gone beyond the early progressive thinkers' concepts of child-centered and democratic schools in reflecting a concern for the needs of children.

However, things are not always as they seem. The conflicts and contradictions surrounding children can also be seen in some disciplinary practices which are less than the idealized "new discipline." This assumed acceptance of the tenets of the new discipline must be balanced by a look at the influence of the tenets of formal, authoritarian discipline which are intertwined in our

thoughts and actions toward children. Corporal punishment may be frowned upon, but it has certainly not been eliminated, nor has the idea of rewards and punishments as a means of external control. If anything, the popularization of the theory of behavior modification may have shifted emphasis from self control to techniques for teacher control.\textsuperscript{14} If interest and learning are theoretically seen as the key to self-discipline, beginning teachers are still keenly aware of the need to have the appearance of controlling their classroom. Last, the Back to Basics movement of this decade belies the espoused needs of child philosophy. Thus the clear dichotomy between old and the new, good and bad, as well as the picture of steady progress in improved and more caring attitudes toward children is not readily apparent in a study of school disciplinary policies and practices.

\section*{WHAT IS DISCIPLINE}

Control...means only an emphatic form of direction of powers, and covers the regulation gained by an individual through his own efforts quite as much as that brought about when others take the lead.

\begin{flushright}
John Dewey\textsuperscript{15}
\end{flushright}

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{14}Gnagney, \textit{ibid.}, pp. 78-99; Taylor and Usher, \textit{op. cit.}
\end{thebibliography}
The word "discipline" is not easily defined. It provokes a variety of images and ideas. Peter Olivia found twenty-five uses of the word from talking with only fourteen people.16

The Random House Dictionary defines discipline as:

1. Training to act in accordance with rules, drill.
2. Instruction and exercise designed to train to proper conduct or action.
3. Punishment inflicted by way of correction and training.
4. The training effect of experience, adversity.
5. Behavior in accord with rules of conduct; behavior and order maintained by training and control.

By these definitions "discipline" includes training for a behavior, the behavior itself, as well as the consequences of the behavior, i.e., punishment. Herein lies the difficulty in establishing a single definition. Discipline is a goal and at the same time a means to achieving a goal. As Dewey wrote:

If you have the end in view of forty or fifty children learning certain set lessons, to be recited to a teacher, your discipline must be devoted to securing that result. But if the end in view is the development of a spirit of social co-operation and community life, discipline must grow out of and be relative to this.17

In this light discipline is a demonstration of the way we perceive or think about children as well as learning.


In the final analysis, however, discipline must be equated with control. When we make this equation we must be conscious of several important questions. First, what is the purpose of that control? Is the control an end in itself? Who or what is the controller? What are the methods or means of control? Most important for an historian, have the answers to these questions changed over the period under consideration? It is only when we recognize the importance of control as the key aspect of school discipline that we can begin to understand the relationship between society's attitude toward children and classroom disciplinary practices.

These questions about control take on special meaning in our quest to understand school discipline when we contrast the "definitions" of discipline over a thirty year period from 1950 to 1980. In keeping with the general consensus of a duality of old and new discipline, The Encyclopedia of Educational Research in 1950 described only two theories of discipline:

Schools which follow the old concept that control is to be maintained by authority attempt to maintain order by rules and regulations governing pupils' behavior and impose penalties for violation of these rules. This method of administering control is now regarded as educationally and psychologically unsound and is found only in old-fashioned schools in more primitive communities. The modern concept of control recognizes the developing psychology of adolescence and regards control as a process of learning by which the pupil is guided in the development of self-control and recognition of his responsibilities to the group consonant with good citizenship in a democratic society.\(^\text{18}\)

By contrast, in 1982 an updated version of this same source cited thirteen current "strategies" for classroom discipline, each reflecting different goals and methods, as well as different attitudes about children. The marked change in these two entries seems to represent a change from an emphasis on a "philosophy of discipline" to an emphasis on various "means of discipline" which appear to be void of general educational aims or a philosophy.

This change in perception over a period of three decades would appear to mean that there have been constantly changing theories and practices in regards to school discipline and not just two basic theories. If this is true then the methods of discipline and their related goals may have become definitions in themselves, as the old-fashioned discipline was supposedly replaced by the new, and the new has become a melange of strategies and techniques seemingly devoid of a theory or a philosophy.

Further questions then arise. For example, is this asserted replacement of theories by strategies in itself indicative of the American people's confusion concerning our attitude toward children? Are children purposeless beings which just must be dealt with in some strategic manner? Most important, if discipline is primarily control, has there been a change in the reasons why children are disciplined or controlled as well as a change in the methods of control?

19Taylor and Usher, op. cit., pp. 448-449.
WHAT HAS BEEN WRITTEN

Among all the many problems that confront the historian, none... is more serious than that of the necessity of constantly rewriting history.

Lucy Maynard Salmon

Almost all general histories of educational thought are to some degree histories of school discipline and attitudes toward children in as much as they reflect broad philosophical trends of thought. That a work is considered a "history of school discipline" is largely a matter of the degree that the author emphasizes the particular objectives, theories, and practices of how students are controlled.

There are only two histories of school discipline which have concentrated on the twentieth century. The first is Regina Jones' dissertation, "An Inquiry Into the Classroom Legacy from the Progressive Education Movement" (1981). Jones relates the ideas of the progressive educators concerning theories and practices of school discipline and then attempts to prove that the same tenets still dominate educational theory today. The second work is an article by Daniel Duke, "Two Decades of Discipline" (1984). Duke gives a

---


21Jones, op. cit.

history of school discipline from the perspective of someone who has been personally involved in the changes in educational research from 1965 to 1984 and the strengths and weaknesses of this research in addressing the problems of school discipline.

Quincy Adam Kuehner's 1913 dissertation, "The Evolution of The Modern Concept of Discipline," as well as Leonard Buyse's "School Discipline: Evolution of Theory and Practice with a Critical Study of Attitudes of a Special High School Class" (1954) are both good examples of the traditional theoretical history of discipline which relate a progressive history of changing philosophical ideas leading to the "new discipline."23 Alan Cummings's article, "Discipline: An Historical Examination" (1969) follows the same pattern of relying on the ideas of the great writers, but he does not necessarily see a pattern of steady progress.24

Enoch Drumm (1960) follows Kuehner's pattern in his history of discipline in America.25 Drumm applies general philosophies from the Bible to Freud to explain the changing concepts of discipline. He does, however, integrate these philosophies with the social and


cultural context of the family, the church, the state, and the school in an attempt to explain the "roots of discipline."

Pickens Harris's (1928) history of nineteenth century discipline theories is probably the most extensive and detailed work on school discipline. Harris gives a comprehensive analysis of the relationship between the many philosophies of education which emerged during that century and their relationship to disciplinary practices in the schoolhouse.26

Also covering the nineteenth century, Barbara Finkelstein (1970) looks at discipline from the perspective of practice, not theory. She extrapolates theories and attitudes about discipline and children from the writings by nineteenth century students and teachers about what actually happened in the schoolhouse.27

Roger Bybee and E. Gordon Gee (1982) give an excellent history of school discipline as reflected by Supreme Court and lower court decisions.28 As such, they place the history of discipline in America in three periods: the judicial laissez-faire period from 1630; the

---


period of growing state involvement from 1830; and the period of
federal court "reformation" from the 1920's.

With the exception of Daniel Duke's 1984 article on research and
Regina Jones' work on the impact of the progressives, none of these
histories deal directly with the post World War II period in America.
With the exception of Barbara Finkelstein's work (1970), none of them
attempt to analyze what actually happened in the classroom. Nor do
any of them address the question of whether children, or even
teachers, were forces for change in discipline theories and
practices. And most important, none of these histories attempt to
relate what went on in the classroom with the social and political
changes of the larger society.

FINDING AN HISTORICAL THEORY

History...is more than an aggregation of discrete facts; it
involves interpretation, meaning, and significance as well....
In the final analysis, it is the historian who imposes order
on the facts, not the reverse.

Gerald Grob and George Billias

It is my opinion that analyses of societal attitudes toward
children as expressed in discipline theory and practice have been
based on relative standards. Almost all of the historical works on
school discipline discussed in the previous section directly stated

29Gerald Grob and George A. Billias, "Introduction" in
Interpretations of American History: Patterns and Perspectives, II
that school discipline practices have improved over time (Jones, Harris, Kuehner, Cummings, and Drumm). The remainder at least implied such progress (Bybee and Gee, Finkelstein, and Duke).

Although there is not a specific label attached to the historiography of school discipline, this view of continuously developing "better" school disciplinary theories and practices can be placed within the context of the broader historiography of children. Within this field of study two current popular theories exist: the "modernization" theory and the "psychogenic" theory. The first theory purports that children's lives have improved as a result of "technological advances." The second theory purports that children's lives have improved as a result of the steadily improving psychodynamics between parents and children. Both of these theories, however, imply progress. It is this faith in progress in relationship to children and particularly progress in behaviors toward children which best describes the historiography of school discipline.30

Generally speaking historians of school discipline have contrasted three stages of "development" in American disciplinary practices. The first stage was the seventeenth century Puritan belief that the child was born in sin. The greatest fear of the parents and teachers of this generation was that their children's souls might be damned and lost forever. It was therefore the obligation of every parent and teacher to save that child's soul, even if it meant harsh discipline, physical pain, and the breaking of the child's spirit.

The second stage culminated with the enlightened nineteenth century when children were seen as becoming more of a concern of society, and love and indulgences were replacing harsh punishment. Autocratic, authoritarian discipline was more and more questioned and American children were allowed to more freely express themselves.

The third stage, beginning in the twentieth century, was the full realization of the psychological, social, and emotional needs of the child as the basis of school discipline, generally believed to be the foundation of modern discipline practices, which we shall explore in Chapter Two.

Proponents of this historical picture of disciplinary practices have seen a steady progress in America's changing attitude toward children. This "progressive" image of school discipline, however, has been concentrated on only one aspect of discipline: punishment, or more particularly physical punishment. Historians have viewed the progress or the lack of progress largely in terms of the amount and the severity of punishment inflicted on children. The search for a
"new discipline" was for many nothing more than a search for a discipline without punishment, or least without physical punishment.

Those who have countered this popular "progressive" picture have also concentrated on the role of punishment. The battle has long raged between those who have opposed physical and psychological abuse (or what they term abuse) of children and those who deemed it necessary and proper. The former group has argued that because children of today are still physically and psychologically abused and because the majority of schools still uphold corporal punishment we have not made progress in terms of our attitudes toward children. Those who uphold this view are also those who are the most active opponents of corporal punishment.31

Both of these theories serve an important function in our search for understanding America's attitudes toward children. Certainly an historical picture of the punishment aspect of discipline is a most important element in understanding the contradictions that society expresses toward children. But a concentration on punishment and abuse of children provides only one perspective. Punishment is only one aspect, one method of control.

If one had written a history of school discipline in America in the early 1950's a faith in progress might well have been justified. As Munroe pointed out, at that time there was a clear dichotomy between what was viewed as good and bad discipline, even if everyone did not know exactly how to achieve "good discipline." Ten years later the certainty of that dichotomy was in doubt. The social and educational changes which contributed to this loss of certainty are the focus of this study.

A second historical theory of school discipline which has gained popularity in the last half of this century is the "pendulum theory." It is commonly asserted that there has been a continuing swing of the pendulum between the "disciplined" right and the open, permissive left.

The problem with this theory is that the reformers who profess it consistently see their immediate past as representative of the period of permissiveness. For example, Melitta Schmidberg in 1949 and Margaret Mead in 1959 both saw society as emerging from a permissive era. In 1968 Jo Holt was again seeing a shift away from permissiveness. And in 1979 Kevin Walsh and Milly Cowles were making a similar analysis of changes in their society. All of these writers saw society shifting away from permissive discipline practices. For each

---

of these the shift had just begun and the new and more structured discipline was just ahead. Recognizing the rapid and frequent reoccurrence of this line of thought it becomes apparent that the "pendulum" has never really made a full swing. Instead, we have just thought that we were on the edge of answering the question of how to discipline children.

A second problem with this theory lies with the lack of a definition for the term "permissive." For many it was synonymous with ill behaving children. For others, permissiveness was synonymous with anti-authoritarianism. As a result, the literature on discipline, especially in the forties and fifties, argued for and against "permissiveness." However, these arguments were more on the order of whether the glass was half full or half empty. Almost everyone called for more control, but when they described their method, it almost inevitably sounded like what the so called permissive or progressive educators were calling for.\(^{33}\) And the advocates of permissiveness often prescribed methods which could easily be equated with "strict discipline." For example both the advocates of permissiveness and its opponents stressed the importance of the teacher carrying through on a threat.\(^{34}\) At the same time both argued against the use of threats because they were ineffective.

\(^{33}\) The terms progressive and permissive were used indiscriminately in the popular literature, especially in the 1940's and 1950's. Mead, ibid; R.D. V. nittemore, "Poor Discipline," Clearing House, 34 (May 1960), p27.

A third historical perspective on discipline conveys the opposite point of view. Many laymen view discipline from the ever popular "when I was a child" perspective. Each adult sees the child of "today" as "undisciplined" and "indulged" as opposed to his or her own childhood when "things were tougher and stricter." The major problem with this theory is that it has been held in common by all adults regardless of age, be they eighteen or eighty, and may well extend to all ages of history.35

All of these historical perceptions have been based on relative standards. Discipline has been seen as either better or worse than it used to be, or more strict or more permissive than it used to be, or more harsh or more benign than it used to be. An attempt to resolve whether a certain discipline method is or was better or worse or more or less humane than methods at another point in history does not significantly increase our understanding of society's complex changing attitudes toward children. This is especially true when the terms of the debate are ill defined. It says nothing about the more complex relationships of discipline theory and practice and society's subtle, but changing attitudes and behaviors toward children and children's changing role in that society.

It is my belief that school discipline must be seen more as a refraction of society's needs than a reflection of any true

35John Williams, "Discipline in the Public Schools: A Problem of Perception?" Phi Delta Kappan, 60 (Jan. 1979), 385-387.
understanding of the needs of childhood. An understanding of society's changing attitude toward children as expressed in school discipline must be found in the link between the economic, political, and emotional needs of the general populace (of whom both educators and students are both participating and reactive members) and the school disciplinary policies and practices.

PURPOSE OF STUDY

For all we have and are,
For all our children's fate,
Stand up and take the war,
The Hun is at the gate!

Rudyard Kipling, 1914

Kipling's call to arms is an example of society's professed concern for children in justification of adult desires. This study of the disciplining of school children will examine the relationship between what we profess in our attitudes toward children and how we actually act toward them. Certainly this relationship can be confusing as well as contradictory. Discipline and the practices of "disciplining" reflect a multitude of behaviors and philosophies much more complex than simple dichotomies such as authoritarian versus permissive, soft versus hard, severe versus gentle, old versus new, or even good versus bad.

---

36Rudyard Kipling, "For All We Have and Are," in The Writings and Prose of Rudyard Kipling, 27 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1919, p. 18.
It is the major contention of this study that in order to understand the changing attitudes toward children as reflected in changing school discipline policies and practices, one must first understand the changing needs, concerns, and goals of the society at large. This study does not support the commonly held belief that the particular needs of children have been society's first concern in the development of school disciplinary policies and practices. Instead, school disciplinary policies and practices to control children have been simply the refraction of the perceived needs of the larger society. Policies and practices have not been imposed on children to meet their specific needs. They have been imposed to meet the needs of the general society. We shall find that increasingly disciplinary controls have been imposed to appease the general society's fears and expectations. The validity of that control can only be evaluated in terms of the validity of the goal or purpose of those practices. The changing attitudes toward children, as reflected in the professional literature on school discipline therefore bears a direct relationship to the changing needs of the society—political, economic, emotional, and technological.

Therefore the purpose of this study is to illuminate the relationship between the general historical trends in the United States between the beginning of World War II and 1980 and the changing policies and practices of school discipline. This study should place the question of attitudes toward children as reflected in the literature on school discipline in the context of a broad social
perspective, and hopefully, a more realistic perspective. We must ask: who is being disciplined, why they are being disciplined, and how they are being disciplined? We must place these questions within the context of the general historical changes. This effort should give insight into understanding our attitudes toward children, as well as our society as a whole.

METHODOLOGY

Though this be madness, yet there is method in it.

*Hamlet* 37

I. Research

A. *First Order Sources (Primary)*

In order to accomplish this task I will draw on a review of the professional literature on school discipline as catalogued under the headings of "discipline" and "school discipline" in the *Education Index*. This review of professional literature will be confined to the subjects of "discipline" and "school discipline" for two reasons. First, as mentioned previously, the changing use of the generic term "discipline" in itself reflects changing concerns and attitudes. Second, the study is confined to this topic simply as a means of limiting the scope of the study. Terms such as classroom management, punishment, and/or child-

---

37*Hamlet*. II. ii. 207-208.
rearing techniques are of course all related terms, but to include them could make the study too divergent without contributing significantly to its purpose.

Within the above mentioned topics, the study will be confined largely to writings and theories directly affecting elementary and intermediate age children and their teachers. This position is taken because theories about the discipline of children on the one hand and adolescents on the other have distinct differences. Second, if the generally accepted theory that basic character is formed in the early years is true, then discipline practices in childhood must be seen as important both to the individual and to society at large.

Finally, the time period 1940 to 1980 was chosen for two reasons: first, as mentioned previously, because of the lack of historical studies on this period; and second, because it represents a rapidly changing and varied historical period.

This review should serve to establish the popularity of contemporary theories and practices relating to classroom discipline. It should also establish historical trends and changes or lack thereof, in philosophies, theories, and practices relating to classroom discipline. More particularly this review of the professional literature will emphasize the writings and ideas which appear to have been most readily available to and reflective of classroom
teachers as the most meaningful interpretations of discipline and as the most likely to be expressed in the classroom.  

B. Second Order Sources (Primary)

Other sources of research will be popular writers on school discipline of this period, such as Fritz Redl, B. F. Skinner, and William Glasser.

C. Third Order Sources (Primary)

I will supplement the study of the literature with a brief questionnaire distributed to the members of the Hawaii State Retired Teachers Association. The questionnaire will include statistical information on each participant, i.e. gender, ethnicity, years in teaching, training and education, and exposure to literature. It will include general questions relating to their theories, ideas, and experiences on discipline and children. Access to the names of these teachers has been granted to me by the Board of Directors of this organization. I recognize that a selection of responses by teachers in Hawaii alone might reveal some social and ethnic biases because of Hawaii's geographical isolation.

38The differentiation of utilizing sources which are representative of educators generally as opposed to a study of philosophical thought is drawn from Richard Hofstadter's introduction to *The Age of Reform* in which he writes about his study of the progressive reforms, "[My theme] is not a study of high culture...My chief concern...is with the most characteristic thinking, with middle-brow writers..." Richard Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform: From Bryan to F.D.R.* (New York: Vintage Books, 1955), p. 6.
and unique social structure. If we can acknowledge that access to teachers for historical data is extremely difficult to obtain, then even this limited teacher input adds to the validity of the study. A summary and discussion of this survey is found in the appendix, as well as references to it throughout the writing.

II. Synthesis and Analysis

In conclusion I will analyze the interrelationship between general social trends and policies and practices of school discipline. This analysis should illuminate our understanding of changing American attitudes toward children which I find to be directly related to the general economic and social shift from that of a producer society to that of a consumer society.

III. Organization: The study is organized in five chapters.

A. Chapter Two is a background history of the "new discipline" that developed from the nineteenth century to the beginning of World War II.

B. Chapters Three, Four, and Five are organized to roughly correspond to the time periods 1940 to 1964; 1965 to 1970; and 1970 to 1980. Each chapter is introduced by an overview of the general historical trends of the period. This is followed by an analysis of the literature on school discipline.
C. The study concludes with Chapter Six which is the writer's personal interpretation of the underlying causes of the changes which have occurred in the professional literature.

D. An Appendix is added which relates the research analysis and conclusions drawn from the questionnaire of retired teachers in Hawaii.
CHAPTER TWO
THE SEARCH FOR A NEW DISCIPLINE
A Background History of School Discipline Before 1940

THE SEARCH FOR A NEW DISCIPLINE

There is one country in the world where the great social revolution...seems to have nearly reached its natural limits.

Alexis de Tocqueville, 1835

As a consequence of our development we have accepted as the basis of control in the family and school...a variety of doctrinaire beliefs often better fitted to the society that we hope will exist in 2098 than the society that actually exists in 1898.

Earl Barnes, 1898

Throughout history a reference to school discipline has implied one of two major concerns: 1. the development of the moral character of the individual child, and 2. the facilitation of academic skills through conformity and obedience to the teacher. Although the ideal was not always supportable in practice there has been an underlying assumption that the achievement of one goal directly contributed to the other, i.e. if the child's behavior were in conformity to the demands of the teacher, then the child would be of good moral character; conversely, if the child were of good moral character, then he/she would also behave in accordance with the demands of the teacher.

---


2Earl Barnes, "Corporal Punishment as a Means of Social Control," Education, 18, No. 7 (March 1898), 394.
Thus school discipline served two goals: maintenance of order in the classroom and the development of moral character. The question that has plagued educators has been how to best discipline children to achieve these two interrelated goals.

The late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries brought unparalleled social and political unrest to the western world. The American Revolution was the first of a series of revolutions which illustrated the changing conceptions of man vis-a-vis the established hierarchical, authoritarian social order. In 1831 the French nobleman, Alexis de Tocqueville, recognized that "the gradual development of the principle of equality [was] a providential fact." From our perspective of 150 years hence and indoctrinated in the principles of democratic equality it is difficult for us to question the legitimacy and worth of this social revolution. Tocqueville, however, was deeply concerned with its repercussions. "[T]he democratic revolution," he wrote,

has taken place in the body of society without that concomitant change in the laws, ideas, customs, and morals which was necessary to render such a revolution beneficial.

The American public school and the search for a "new school discipline" was the direct result of this need for new ideas and morals. In a society where each man was equal then each must be his

\[3\]Tocqueville, op. cit., p. lix.

own source of control. Similarly, Tocqueville's greatest objection to democracy was his fear of a "tyranny of the majority." If the majority were to rule then it also had to control itself. This need for control of the society by society became the new mandate for school discipline. The new mandate called for all classes and all ages to develop a degree of self-discipline necessary for a democratic, urban society. Whether this new mandate should have been set, how educators attempted to implement it, and whether the endeavor has been successful forms the basis for understanding the concept of the "new school discipline."

By the mid-nineteenth century three major trends were influencing the formation of the "new school discipline": 1. The increased importance of the child as a child. 2. The beginning of the shift from an agrarian to an industrialized and institutionalized society. 3. Concurrently, the development of formal theories of discipline and childhood behavior. These three trends will be discussed in the following sections.

---

5Formal education traditionally had been limited to those of wealth and prestige. Therefore the education for self control was generally limited to this small population. The belief was that both children and the lower classes were in need of external controls. See Phyllis Vine, "Preparation for Republicanism: Honor and Shame in the Eighteenth Century College," in Regulated Children/ Liberated Children: Education in Psychohistorical Perspective, ed. Barbara Finkelstein (New York: The Psychohistory Press, 1979), p. 58 for an example of the change in the use of honor to shame by the group to individual self-discipline as a means of control during the nineteenth century.
THE CENTURY OF THE CHILD

The child is the climax and culmination of all God's creations.

Francis Parker, 1890's

The first major trend leading to the "new discipline" was the increased importance placed on the child as a child. The child was important because his/her relationship to the positive "future expectations" of the society. The child was also important because the young symbolized the romanticism of the nineteenth century. The nineteenth century in America has been called the Century of the Child. The new nation which emerged at the end of the eighteenth century evoked enormous optimism in a land of expanding resources and opportunity. Similarly, the Americans were optimistic about their children's future. Richard Rapson explains the British perception of the nineteenth century American child:

"The Americans believed in their young ones in much the same way that they believed in their future. Let the youths' natural spirit triumph and they would not only participate in a grand future, but they would be the chief forgers of the future; the child was the future."

---


The "natural child" of Jean Jacques Rousseau was also the ideal of the nineteenth century American writers such as Henry David Thoreau, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Walt Whitman, and Catherine Beecher. The Puritan idea of the child as born in sin was rapidly giving way to the idea of innate goodness. Such a view of the child meant a new respect for childhood, and increasing indulgences in childish behavior. Jacob Abbott wrote in 1871:

Children ought to be given the greatest freedom of action... It seems to me that children are not generally indulged enough... as a general rule, the more that children are gratified in respect to their childish fancies and impulses and even their caprices when no evil or danger is to be apprehended, the better!9

The changing attitudes toward children meant developing new child-rearing practices. By 1880 change was clearly visible. Catherine Beecher who had advocated "submission; self-denial, and benevolence" as the three key tenets of childhood, by the Civil War was suggesting reward rather than penalties and "love and hope in forming the habits of childhood."10 In 1881 Mrs. Mattie Trippe advised that the child should "revel in an absolute sense of freedom feeling only the restraints of affection." Eight years later Mrs. F. McCready Harris suggested that:

---


10Cable, loc. cit.
Children should be permitted to slide down the bannisters because they will probably do it anyway. If you forbid them, in nine out of ten cases you teach them to deceive. Better coax them not to out of love and pity for you.11

The height of glorification of the child had been reached by 1890 when Francis W. Parker declared that "the child is the climax and culmination of all God's creations."12

Professor Barnes, comparing discipline practices in America and England in 1898, found America employing less direct physical punishment as a means of controlling children in the classroom. This phenomenon, he thought, was due to America's faith in the individual as a result of the nation's experience with the Revolution of 1776, the Civil War, the nation's ethnic diversity, and an unyielding faith in the future.13

AN INDUSTRIALIZED, INSTITUTIONALIZED SOCIETY

[Public education] has been applied in one of the greatest countries of the world, namely the North American States. The results of the application of this idea in America have been comparatively brilliant; nowhere has public education developed so fast and so universally.

Leo Tolstoy, 186214

11Cable, loc. cit.
12Parker, loc. cit.
13Barnes, op. cit., pp. 387-95.
The nineteenth century's rapid change from an agrarian to an industrial lifestyle with large corporations, factories, and cities constitute what I see as the second major trend influencing the new school discipline. As a result of this shift the family farm declined as the center of American cultural, social, and economic life. At the same time, religion as the sole basis of a controlling force in society was being usurped. Social reform was no longer just a matter of personal salvation through good works. Social reform was the result of man's ability to control his environment for the improvement of society as a whole. The natural vehicles for this reform were social institutions. The rise of institutions of social reform paralleled the rise of centralized and bureaucratized business and industrial organizations.

The most prominent institution to gain power during the shift to an institutionalized society was the school. The common school was the cornerstone of egalitarian democracy. More important, in answer to Tocqueville's concern, it was to provide the necessary moral training by which the majority were to set the social and moral standards. The school was the institution to achieve social control.

Horace Mann recognized the importance of social control through education early in the common school movement. In his first address to the Massachusetts Board of Education he blamed the lack of education for the ravages of the French Revolution and took warning from it: "The mobs, the riots, the burnings, the lynchings, perpetrated by the men of the present day, are perpetrated, because
of their vicious or defective education, when children."\textsuperscript{15} "Moral education," he wrote in his last report, "is the primal necessity of social existence." And public education was the new means to moral education for a democratic society. "Education," Mann concluded, "has never yet been brought to bear with one hundredth part of its potential force, upon the natures of children, and through them, upon the character of men, and of the race."\textsuperscript{16}

The faith in institutions to resolve the problems of social control expanded rapidly in the nineteenth century. Even if the school failed in this fundamental task, other institutions of correctional reform could be created to heal the wounds caused by social evils. These supplementary reform institutions ranged from the prison, the insane asylum, and youth reformatories to the child saving social welfare agencies.\textsuperscript{17}

Just as the economic center was shifting out of the home and into the business and industrial institutions so the responsibility for


moral control, education, and childhood discipline was shifting from the family to social welfare institutions, the most significant of which was the public school. According to Carl Kaestle, "Moral discipline, like other educational goals became increasingly associated with schooling," and "the state, through local school committees and fledgling state education agencies, strenuously asserted an increasing authority for teachers over children in competition with parents."\(^{18}\)

By 1890, David Tyack points out "that the community expected the school to be policeman as well as parent surrogate." One school principal of that period said that teachers accepted the notion that they were "responsible for what the child does out of school...How otherwise can the teacher ever know that her world counts in the life of the child?"\(^{19}\) A Statement of the Theory of Education in the United States issued by the U.S. Office of Education in 1874 and signed by dozens of leading educators makes the cause of this shift in responsibility very clear:

> The peculiarities [in America] of civil society and the political organization draw the child out of the influence of the family-nurture....In order to compensate for lack of

---


family-nurture, the school is obliged to lay more stress upon discipline and to make far more prominent the moral phase of education. 20

To what degree parents were willing to transfer the responsibility of moral education and childhood discipline to the school is still debatable. Barbara Finkelstein contends that parents willingly shared the responsibilities with the school teachers to enable parents to "satisfy a need for emotional distance from children, on the one hand, and on the other hand a desire to hold onto children by controlling their school experiences." According to Finkelstein, parents believed that

childhood was a precarious state and that teachers—by providing systematic and rigorous intellectual exercises—would help subdue the wild tendencies of youth and in the process maintain the cohesiveness of the community. 21

In contrast, Carl Kaestle does not see such a positive relationship between parents and school in the nineteenth century. Instead Kaestle sees a natural differentiation of roles between the family and schools due to the institutionalization process which permeated all of society. This process however was not smooth. "In general," he wrote,


21Barbara Finkelstein, "In Fear of Childhood: Relationships Between Parents and Teachers in Popular Primary Schools in the Nineteenth Century," History of Childhood Quarterly, 3, No. 3 (Winter 1976), 322.
parents...wanted schools to take custody of their children, and they wanted schools to train their children in basic skills and attitudes. The eventual price that they paid was the loss of authority and control over their children's education. The trade-off was made...[T]his...shift of authority to the school ultimately produced not just different, but substantially contrary goals.22

Nineteenth century Americans had made a clear shift in their recognition of the role of the public school as the means of controlling the public child for membership in society.

THEORIES OF SCHOOL DISCIPLINE

Moral Suasion's my theory, but Lickin's my practice.

Lucia Downing
Vermont Teacher, 1880

The third major trend that I see which influenced the search for a new discipline was the proliferation of new philosophical theories of school discipline which would be compatible with both democracy and the growing importance of the child. This does not mean that the schoolroom became an example of democratic living. The authority of the teacher remained the means of control. Exemplary of the expanding literature on school discipline was Jacob Abbott's The Teacher: or Moral Influences Employed in the Instruction and Government of the

22Kaestle, op. cit., p. 15. Also see Rapson, "American Child Seen by British Travelers, op. cit., p. 21.

Young. In it he made clear that even though the teacher should be gentle and forbearing the teacher must also be a monarch.24

The most prominent theories of school discipline in the early nineteenth century America were those of the Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education, Horace Mann. Mann placed his faith in the female teacher to establish a classroom discipline based on love and gentleness. Although he never advocated the elimination of corporal punishment Mann believed that good teaching, gentleness, emulation, and love might eventually make it unnecessary.25 The teacher gained control by loving the child, or through what Henry Barnard called, "the silken cord of affection."26 As Pickens Harris says,

It was the arbitrary requirement that teachers love their pupils...The affection of the child for the teacher was not to be gained for any value within itself or the moral values of the relationship, but in order that the child might thereby be more easily bent to the teacher's will.27


27Harris, op. cit., p. 102.
Theoretically, the result of "really and truly" loving the child was of enormous benefit to the female teacher in terms of controlling a classroom full of children. Idealistic young women teachers who traveled west at mid century to impart Christian virtues and morality were trained in discipline by love. They were, however, willing to resort to more direct means of control when the ideal method proved ineffective.²⁸

Horace Mann also stressed that discipline in the school should include self-discipline, as the school should be a training ground for self-government. However, Mann recognized that the great mass of children "scooped up from all places" and the condition of teachers made keeping the peace without punishment impossible.²⁹

Mann's ideas did have the advantage of being incorporated into the growing institution of the Normal Schools, which were designed to train young female teachers for the expanding public schools. They were thus subject to a wider dissemination and more likely to be put into practice by the young female graduates than were the humane ideas of earlier philosophers and educators. Methods of achieving classroom discipline may have become less physical under the regime of the female teachers in the common schools, but the same structure of fear


exists. As Pickens Harris points out, fear of physical pain was simply replaced by fear of loss of adult approval.30

A search for a theory of school discipline based on social morality rather than religious authority which would be in response to Tocqueville's concern for new morals did not emerge until the last quarter of the nineteenth century. In 1870 J.H. Hoose addressed the National Education Association Convention concerning "good" school discipline:

What is ordinarily called a good school is not necessarily a good place for good discipline. A school should be a place where pupils can live, and live well, cheerfully, happily, profitably; and til we make our schools such, we are not in the highest sense educators. We want a broader platform on which to work in our system of school discipline. I can not see why a school can not be considered as a small society, and governed upon the principles that obtain in society.31

The new "social morality" based on the needs of citizenship emphasized the habits of order, punctuality, obedience, silence, and industry which were viewed as permanent social values of both the institution of the school and of future adult life in the rapidly expanding industrial society.32 This approach came into focus in the Hegelian ideas of William T. Harris.33 Hegelian morality was based on

30Harris, op. cit., p. 77.
32Harris, op. cit., p. 133.
33Harris, ibid., p. 110.
a hierarchy of motives ranging from mechanical through social to religious; and teachers were to strive to "always try to make the children act from the highest possible motives."  

An understanding of the development of the new school discipline cannot be had without reference to two Europeans. The first one was Frederick Froebel, the German founder of the kindergarten movement. Froebel's impact on school discipline went beyond the influence of very young children. Froebel's two fundamental theories, "the development of the individual life as an organic unity endowed with activity...and its development through dependence and participation in the larger organism of Reality" influenced control in the elementary schools. As Harris explains:

[If] "the school is an organic spiritual unity" then "the law of the school was to arise from within," and the "real school, from which the law emanates is mind in effort to unfold mind." The school reduced itself to the spiritual unity of the child himself...Control in this view was a function of the "unity of the organism," which could be broken by either pupil or teacher.

Authority was based on the law of opposites, i.e. law and self determination; external compulsion and inner free will. The unity must not be broken and unity could not be had by simple submission to


35 Harris, ibid., p. 143, citing John Angus McVannel, "The Philosophy of Froebel," Teachers College Record, 4 (1903), 335-376.

36 Harris, ibid., p. 147, citing James L. Hughes, Froebel's Educational Laws for All Teachers, (1897), pp. 18-24.
the teacher's will by the child; children must also submit to their own will.

The child's self-activity, the basis of Froebel's practical application, was to be shifted from wrong to right, destructive to constructive, without endangering the respect for the personality of the child. It was believed that a thorough understanding of this faith in the harmony between control and spontaneity of the child's self-activity would eventually lead to the elimination of discipline in the schools. The basis of the control came from the child's love of activity for the sake of activity. Froebel's disciples provide us with the first introduction to the importance of self control through play and social relationships.

As a direct result of Froebel's ideas new subjects were being added to the curriculum such as physical education and nature study with the added justification that they contributed to moral control. The most important addition was the "tendency to employ a variety of forms of 'manual training'." Manual training supported the adage of "idle hands" and it was "not only interesting itself, but quickens a child's interest in many of his other lessons." Most important, manual training developed habits of order, neatness, accuracy, truth, perseverance, confidence, and self-reliance. These, of course, are the same objectives that William T. Harris was expounding in his

social morality of citizenship. 38

The second influential European was Johann Frederick Herbart. Herbart was significant as much for his continued support of a discipline of authority as for his contributions to change in behavior. More important, his contribution of a philosophical framework within which he developed his theory of discipline integrated for the first time the moral faculty with the other assumed faculties. Herbart built morality into the curriculum. In theory teachers could give direct instruction in morality similar to other academic subjects.

Herbart did not rely on children's activity as the basis of discipline, but proposed to "build disposition and self-control through properly presented ideas." 39 There should be developed a "pedagogy of will training." Then the "behavior in the school" would be "the idealized consequence of proper ethical interaction." "At the same time," writes the American disciple of Herbart, Charles DeGarmo,

in the common-school studies is found the concrete basis and antecedent condition of all subsequent practical, intellectual, aesthetic, and moral interests of mankind and hence the root of all rational volition. 40


39 Harris, ibid., p. 158.

The child's will, as with other aspects of mental life, came into being through defined laws of interaction between externally received ideas and existing mind content. The pleasure that accompanied the process was interest. Interest therefore was no longer something attached to the process of learning to make it palatable, but was integral to the process. Unlike William T. Harris, it was ideas, not habits, that formed the basis of control for the Herbartians. Even so, Herbart, like Harris and Froebel, stressed the importance of keeping children busy in well structured activities. In practice this often meant a return to the rigid control of external authority vested in the teacher in order to educate, or discipline the child as a moral citizen.

Direct moral instruction, as stressed by Herbart, was the most popular theory of discipline in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Moral instruction could be given through subjects as diverse as History, English literature, science, and manual training. The means of this instruction and all discipline education, however, remained obscure. As Lucia Downing, a Vermont teacher in 1880 put it, "Moral Suasion's my theory, but Lickin's my practice."

All of these nineteenth century theories were designed to provide a means of direct control of students by teachers for the smooth and

41 Harris, ibid., p. 160.
42 Harris, ibid., p. 169.
43 Downing, "Teaching in the Keeler 'Deestrict' School," loc. cit.
efficient running of the classroom. But, more important, they were to provide a means of developing moral and social traits in the students which would assure a moral and stable society in the future. Nineteenth century educators were not uncomfortable with a theory of discipline which had as its ultimate goal general social order and control. At the same time, they did not feel that direct, overt coercion, physical or otherwise, was necessarily the best means to that control. The search for a "new discipline" was a search for a discipline which would maintain social order with minimal use of punishment and direct control.

THE NEW DISCIPLINE: PHILOSOPHY

I believe that
--the school is primarily a social institution.
--education, therefore, is a process of living and not a preparation for future living.
--education is the fundamental method of social progress and reform.
--all education proceeds by the participation of the individual in the social consciousness of the race...
--education is a regulation of the process of coming to share in the social consciousness.

John Dewey, My Pedagogic Creed, 1897

The three trends of the nineteenth century described in the previous section (the increased importance of the child, the industrialization and institutionalization of society, and the varied development of theories of education) established the milieu of the "new discipline." Above all else the search for a new discipline was

a search for the replacement of external controls of any kind, be they fear, punishment, reward, or love by a reliance on self-discipline or self-control. Education for self-discipline was viewed as the essential ingredient in an urban democratic society whose morals and standards were set by the majority of the people. [The school], declared the educators in 1874,

"is obliged to train the pupil into habits of prompt obedience to his teachers and the practice of self-control in its various forms, in order that he may be prepared for a life wherein there is little police-restraint on the part of the constituted authorities." 45

The "new discipline" that Monroe had accepted as "good discipline" in 1950 was the product of two divergent theoretical ideologies: John Dewey's social philosophy and the rise of a science of human behavior as applied by psychologists, psychiatrists, and most of all mental hygienists. Let us begin with a discussion of the ideas of Dewey.

The "new discipline" was an integral part of the "new education." In its idealized form, the "new education" was the philosophy of John Dewey. A prolific writer, Dewey was concerned with detecting and stating "the ideas implied in a democratic society and to apply these ideas to the problems of the enterprise of education." 46 Dewey was not writing about democracy in the abstract. He was concerned with American democracy in the twentieth century, the development of the

experimental method, evolutionary ideas of biology, and industrial reorganization. He was concerned with the rapidly changing world and the development of a theory of education for that new world.\(^47\)

To say that Dewey was widely acclaimed does not mean that he was clearly understood. Most of those who taught in the name of the new education or as a disciple of Dewey may never have read his work, and even fewer have agreed on what he said. In my own survey of retired teachers in Hawaii John Dewey was by far the most widely recognized and accepted educator in terms of his ideas on school discipline among teachers educated before 1940.\(^48\) Dewey's emphasis on, and America's faith in, democracy as the key to understanding American education was picked up, interpreted, and reinterpreted by educators.

Not only did the new discipline place an emphasis on self-control as superior to external control, but it found the source of that control in the life of the child. As John Dewey wrote, "In critical moments we all realize that the only discipline that stands by us, the only training that becomes intuition, is that got through life itself."\(^49\) The life of the child, or more particularly the interest


\(^{48}\)See Appendix A, page 202.

of the child must be guided to achieve this discipline. "The ideal of discipline and morality," wrote Alan Cummings about the first half of this century, "[came] through the progressive experience of the children themselves, discreetly directed or guided."50 For John Dewey interest and discipline were "correlative aspects of activity having an aim." The two were inseparable as interest reflected personal involvement and thus was the essence of discipline. Self-discipline was to be found in the pursuit of purposeful activities.51 The "interest of the child" became the catchphrase of the progressive educators who proselytised the new discipline.

Closely linked to this essential relationship among self-control, interest, and discipline was the importance of society, or the community, as controller. With the decline of the agrarian community which had served as the social controller, Dewey envisioned a new community developing. Within this community the school situation itself was to be the new source of social control. For Dewey it was the relationship and the interest of the group that should serve as controller.52 It was thus the teacher's responsibility to "arrange conditions that [were] conducive to community activity and to organization which exercises control over individual impulses by the

mere fact that they all engaged in communal impulses." (emphasis added)\(^53\)

Although accepted in theory, Dewey's synthesis of self-control, interest, community, and discipline was never accepted in its totality on the practicing level in the classroom. Emphasis on specific aspects of his theory shifted with society's needs and the perspective of prominent educators. For example, William H. Kilpatrick, professor at Teachers College, Columbia University, and the foremost practicing interpreter of Dewey's ideology emphasized the interest of the classroom activity as the key to discipline in his now famous "project method."\(^54\) The educational process itself was the means to self-discipline.

Though Kilpatrick protested, his name was also connected with what has been termed the "child-centered movement" of the first quarter of this century. Criticized by Dewey and others, the child-centered schools, which were largely confined to schools for the wealthy and the "Bohemian" class, stressed the child's "creative expression" as the primary goal of education. As such, the child was the source of his own direction. It was the discipline theory (or lack of discipline theory as some claimed) in these child-centered schools


that drew the heavy criticism that continues to haunt the name of John Dewey and progressive education. "In many of these classrooms," wrote Lawrence Cremin,

license began to pass for liberty, planlessness for spontaneity, recalcitrance for individuality, obfuscation for art, and chaos for education—all justified in the rhetoric of expressionism. 55

With the economic depression of the 1930's the emphasis shifted to the concerns for community. George Counts, the foremost leader in the movement, deemphasized the importance of the child as his own source of control and instead appealed to educators to "openly strive to mold the child,...developing his tastes, shaping his attitudes, and even imposing ideas upon him." Even with these shifts in emphasis, Dewey's basic tenets remained the philosophical foundation of the new discipline for over half a century. 57


57Regina Jones argues that the discipline theories of John Dewey are still the basis of school discipline policy and practice.
THE NEW DISCIPLINE: THE SCIENCE OF HUMAN BEHAVIOR

It is the man of science, eager to have his opinion regenerated, his every idea rationalized by drinking at the fountain of fact, and devouring all the energies of his life to the cult of truth, not as he understands it, but as he does not understand it, that ought properly to be called a philosopher.

Charles Peirce, 1900

The second ideology that contributed to the new discipline was the result of the growing faith in a science of human behavior. By the beginning of this century the new "science of psychology" was rapidly replacing its parent, philosophy, as the discipline which provided the most comprehensive means of understanding the meaning of life.

John Dewey was rare in his early rejection of psychology and continued reliance on a philosophical approach to understanding the process of education. Americans' faith in science during the first two decades of this century gave strong evidence that psychology would dominate the quest for an understanding of children and learning.

G. Stanley Hall, the first American doctoral graduate in the new "science of psychology" built his career on the study of the child. By the turn of the century every aspect of childhood had been studied including physical measurement, death rates, stammering, hearing losses, memory, games, children in primitive cultures, secret


languages, emulation, home environment and punishment. The child study movement produced mounds of data, but built no real theories or analyses from the data collected. Hall himself expounded the evolutionary theory "ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny," but in the field of education it was short lived in acceptance.

More critical to the issue of the discipline of children was the growth of experimental psychology at the beginning of this century. Edward L. Thorndike's "Law of Effect" which said that all behavior was "stamped in" when it was rewarded and "stamped out" when it was punished made the old conflict between man as innately good vs. man as innately evil irrelevant.

John B. Watson rejected all philosophy. He specifically rejected the ideas of John Dewey, whom he described as incomprehensible. Instead, he favored a "scientific study of man." Watson argued that behavior, and only behavior, needed to be studied. Proper manipulation of the environment could result in complete control over the behavior of the child. Advanced science, it seemed to the Behaviorists such as Watson in 1920, would someday be able to solve the problem of school discipline.

Such a hope, however, was not to be realized for personal, professional, and social reasons. First, indiscretions in the life of Watson, the personable spokesman of Behaviorism in the first half of this century, made him persona non grata in the fledgling pro-
fession. His talents, however, were quickly and successfully transferred to the world of advertising where he replaced the study of rats and children with the study of the "consumer." More important than Watson was the status of the emerging profession of psychology. Applied psychology did not hold the prestige or the appeal of experimental research in the laboratory. As Robert Church points out, psychologists sought to create a hard science comparable to physics or chemistry. "Applied" psychologists were held in contempt by "pure" psychologists. Therefore direct application in the classroom was often relegated to a category known derogatorily as "experimental pedagogy." The most important factor in limiting the influence of experimental psychology on school discipline theory and practice was the fact that experimental psychology, especially Behaviorism, simply did not fit the thinking of the general society nor of educators in particular. Behaviorism did not address the broad social problems

---


which were seen as the major objective of the schools at that time. It did not support the progressive idea of purposive behavior and the child as a social being. In short it did not mesh with the generally accepted educational philosophy of John Dewey.

A psychological theory compatible with the philosophy of John Dewey did not influence American thinking until the winds of World War II were already blowing heavily over Europe. In 1932 the recognized Gestalt psychologist, Kurt Lewin left his homeland, Germany, to seek refuge in the United States. Lewin developed a theory of learning and human behavior compatible with the scientific principles of physics as well as the social philosophy of Dewey. Simply translated, Lewin's theory said that

the psychological activities of a person occur in a kind of psychological field or life space. The life space comprises all the events that may possibly influence a person—past, present, and future. From a psychological standpoint, each of these three aspects of life can determine behavior in any single situation. The life space consists of the needs of the individual as they interact with the psychological environment.

By 1941 Lewin's Field Theory was clearly in the forefront as an acceptable theory of human behavior. In keeping with Dewey and counter to the Behaviorists, Lewin's theory stressed the importance of motivation or need. Also in contrast to the Behaviorists, Lewin

---

63McDonald, op. cit., p. 18.


65Schultz, op cit., p. 302.

66McDonald, op. cit., p. 20.
stressed the importance of social psychology, the most significant aspect of which was the development of a study of group dynamics.\textsuperscript{67} The importance of understanding group behavior and the individual in the group would become a vital part of the Post World War II life.

Last, this refugee from Germany saw democracy as the only workable social structure. "I am convinced," Lewin is purported to have said, "that American ideals are the best ideals for human society."\textsuperscript{68} Lewin and his colleagues used their science to support their faith in the democratic system, especially as it was experienced in the school.\textsuperscript{69}

**THE NEW DISCIPLINE: THE MENTAL HYGIENE MOVEMENT**

Delinquency, mental disease, dependency, and school failure may in part be conceived as the waste products of our existing unstable social structure and processes.

George Stevenson, 1936\textsuperscript{70}

\textsuperscript{67}Schultz, op. cit., p. 303.


\textsuperscript{70}George Stevenson, "Historical Development and Modern Trends;" Review of Educational Research, 6, No. 5 (Dec. 1936), 464.
For the first half of this century the "science of psychiatry" served as a counter balance to the general philosophy of school discipline. The effect of this new field of medicine was not felt directly by the schools, but through its indirect influence on the powerful mental hygiene movement.

The mental hygiene movement founded by Clifford Beers in 1908 permeated the social reform institutions, especially the schools. Beers, a former asylum patient, launched a national concern for better treatment of the insane when he wrote his autobiography, The Mind That Found Itself. State Mental Hygiene committees sprang up across the country. The initial concern of these committees for direct aid to patients soon was replaced by a concern for prevention of mental problems. More specifically, the concern was for preventing crime and delinquency through efforts at detecting and aiding children who were classified as mentally defective or having behavioral or personality disorders.

The infant field of psychiatry and more particularly Sigmund Freud's study of neuroses and their origin in early childhood experiences provided a new way of viewing mental disorders. Mental disorders could be caused by the life experiences of the individual and were not necessarily just genetically determined, or an act of

---


God. If this were true then such mental problems could and should be detected, their causes determined and the means of correcting the cause initiated. This was the work of the mental hygienist.

The mental hygiene movement gave a common purpose to the new and varied professionals concerned with human behavior and social betterment: psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, and educators. Mental hygienists were eclectically drawing from the various fields of scientific research and applying these ideas to the concern for mental health and the individual's need to adjust to society.

Most important for the educator concerned with school discipline, mental hygiene gave a balance to Dewey's approach to classroom discipline. Unlike Dewey, the mental hygienists were directly concerned with the problems of misbehavior in the classroom; the child who was not interested, who did not get along with others, and who was not happy. Above all else the mental hygienists took the approach that there was a cause for all unsocial behavior. It was therefore necessary to find and to resolve the problem that was causing the unhealthy behavior. The cause could be unconscious, as proposed by Freud. It could be due to feelings of inadequacy as suggested by Alfred Adler. It could be found in social and religious experiences as advanced by Carl Jung. Or it could be the result of family or economic and social factors. In addition unsocial behavior could simply be the result of specific problems and interactions within the classroom. No matter what the cause of the problem, it was important
to recognize that something was wrong and that the cause must be found and corrected. This was essential for the emotional health of the child, his future mental health as an adult, and above all so that a human resource would not be lost to crime and delinquency.

Theoretically, it was no longer important to discover whether the child was good or bad, but whether he was adjusted. This could be accomplished through guidance and counseling. Thus a whole new profession interrelated with the school grew out of this movement in an effort to solve the problems of the child and resolve the discipline problems confronting the teacher.73

In brief the mental hygiene movement addressed those problems of school discipline that John Dewey had ignored. By the beginning of World War II the merger of the ideology of John Dewey (as it was now reflected in Kurt Lewin's scientific theory of human behavior) and the advice of the mental hygienists constituted the basic theory of school discipline which Walter Monroe in 1950 called "good discipline."

CHAPTER THREE
THE SEARCH FOR SECURITY

Review of Theories and Assumed Practices Relating to Classroom Discipline and Their Relationship to General Historical Concerns: 1940-1965

WORLD WAR II

To hold America in one's thoughts is like holding a love letter in one's hands—it has so special a meaning...The passionate love of Americans for their America will have a lot to do with winning the War.

E. B. White, Dec. 10, 1941

As this country entered the battle against totalitarianism at the end of 1941, Americans did not question the rightness of their belief in the power of good over evil. That fateful attack in the middle of the Pacific Ocean rallied a people who had been hesitant to withdraw from the protection of her isolated shores.

The commitment to war brought with it not only a need to examine what one was fighting against, but what one was fighting for. For the American people that question was easily answered with one word, democracy. Nowhere was this more true than in the nation's concern for educating its youth.

In 1944 Fritz Redl and George Sheviakov produced for the National Education Association a small book on classroom discipline for teachers. In a concise, but simplified form, Redl and Sheviakov brought together their own interpretations of the ideas of Dewey,

Lewin, and Freud in advice for classroom teachers on school discipline which was based on democratic principles.\(^2\)

"The principles of democratic living," wrote Sheviakov, "guide our practices as we help children grow toward self-discipline and self-direction." Democratic principles meant not only the worth and dignity of the individual but mutual cooperation and respect. Democratic living meant the sharing of decision making and planning as a means of understanding and resolving problems through "collective intelligence."\(^3\)

It was Fritz Redl, however, who took these principles and translated them into practical suggestion for the teacher. Fritz Redl, like Kurt Lewin, was a refugee from Naziism. Redl left his native Vienna in 1936 where he was already established as a psychoanalyst and a consultant to educators on problems of children. Redl demonstrated a faith in democracy, a faith in the tenets of mental hygiene, and as we shall see, above all a faith in the importance of an understanding of group dynamics.

Redl in an essay on "Mental Hygiene" had stressed the importance of an understanding for and appreciation of mental health. Our knowledge of mental health, he said, was only to be found by

\(^2\)Fritz Redl and George Sheviakov, *Education for Today's Children and Youth* (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, 1944, 1956). It should be noted that neither Dewey, Lewin, or Freud were referred to directly in this book.

\(^3\)Redl and Sheviakov, *ibid.*, pp. 9-15.
scientific research in the field comparable to the research being done in the other fields of medicine and science. As a psychiatrist and an avid supporter of the mental hygiene movement Redl was most concerned with finding the cause of the problem that was manifested by a discipline problem. Redl recognized that the "illness" of the "emotionally disturbed child" could be the cause of the problem. But the cause of the discipline problem was generally more complicated than just classifying a child as sick or, as was even more commonly heard in the literature, as "incorrigible."

It was not just an understanding of the individual that was needed to find the cause of discipline problems. Even if an individual child appeared to be the source of a problem, that child was part of and interacting with a group. The classroom, said Redl putting Lewin's theory to practical application, was not made up of "individuals in mid-air; school classes are groups." Therefore it was the group that


5For examples of the use of the term "incorrigible" see George V. Lascher, "Miss Betts Versus Her Pupils," Clearing House, 17 (April 1943), 490-491; Parker, "Good Ways With Discipline," ibid.

6Redl and Sheviakov, op. cit., p. 19
must be understood, the spirit of the group, the management of the
group, as well as the conflicts between individual concerns and those
of the group. Redl saw the condition and the structure of the group
as the source of the majority of school discipline problems.⁷

Redl did not, however, make any laws or rules about group
behavior. He recognized that a real understanding of group
management, as well as a true science of individual human behavior,
was not available. All that he could do in the end was to stress to
the teachers to be aware of the dynamics of the group and the
uniqueness of each situation. In conclusion he could only give
friendly advice on the worth and dignity of the teacher, the
importance of understanding the child, and the inevitability of human
failure. In 1944 Redl did not have an applied science of human
behavior to give to teachers. He did, however, recognize the
importance of attempting to find such a science. In the meantime he
could only encourage teachers to seek to understand their own
strengths and weaknesses and above all to understand the cause of the
discipline problems and the goals and objectives of their methods of
discipline.

⁷Redl and Sheviakov, ibid., p. 45. See also Fritz Redl, "Group
Dynamics in the Classroom, The Elementary School Journal, 45, (April
1945), 423-425.
World War II had brought a challenge to the ideals of democracy for the country as a whole. It was even more of a challenge for educators in the classroom. The goal of the school was to create adults who could contribute to and sustain the ideal democratic society which was being fought for overseas. As Redl so clearly pointed out, how to achieve this goal was not always apparent, but it was without question a critical concern in the literature on school discipline.

The disciplinary methods of the new education had stressed the importance and advantages of freer expression by the child as opposed to the strictness and severity of the imposed "old discipline". Even before the War everyone was not completely convinced that things had not been better in the "old days." Even Dewey had reacted against some of the liberties enjoyed by the young in some extreme "progressive schools."8

In contrast to the feared picture of too much permissiveness in school disciplinary practices, the American military had acted expediently to meet the challenge of December 7. Six weeks of boot camp was turning the children of the so-called "permissive era" into "disciplined" soldiers who were making an impressive showing in their

---

new roles as defenders of democracy. War tended to add a semblance of logic to the demand for stricter discipline. Army discipline seemed much more efficient to many teachers in overcrowded, understaffed schools. The ideal of self-discipline for a democracy was fine, but one should not forget that children needed a little "fiber" to prepare them for life. Army training, some felt, gave that fiber. Edgar Higbie called the school and the home to task for their lack of "discipline and hard work" as used by the Army. Citing the experiences of the "great Chaing Kai-shek" who was disciplined by his mother, Higbie felt that a bit more severity might well be the making of great men. In short, this was war and our national defense was dependent on obedience by our children.

---


10Frank N. Freeman, "Education, Training, and Discipline," School and Society, 61 (May 19, 1945), 321-324.


12Burton Fowler, "What Kind of Discipline?" Parents' Magazine, 17 (April 1942), 28-29. It should be noted that what constituted "military discipline" was never clearly defined.
Fritz Redl, even before Pearl Harbor, was speaking against the transference of military discipline to the schools. His greatest fear was that military discipline resulted in the individual becoming a means to an end and discipline itself becoming an end in itself. The so called "need for militaristic discipline" that some were advocating was attacked by Redl as only a manifestation of the excess aggression within some school structures. This could be better dealt with by finding the cause of the aggression than by trying to cover it with militaristic discipline.\textsuperscript{13}

Reflecting the increased awareness of the assets and liabilities of the warring nations, the second influence on school discipline during the war years came from those who were attempting to relate national character and philosophy with modes of school discipline. The principal at the Germantown Friends School was concerned with determining the difference in the discipline of the British and the French, the former, in the writer's opinion, having performed so courageously and the latter so ignobly.\textsuperscript{14} For most educators the concern centered on the need of a democratic society to have independent thinking citizens. The literature of the period often contrasted the German and the American philosophies of discipline.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{13}Fritz Redl, "Discipline," \textit{New Era In School and Home}, 19 (July-August 1938), 200-201.

\textsuperscript{14}Fowler, "What Kind of Discipline?" op. cit.

Germany was seen as placing order above the higher ideals: truth, beauty, and goodness. In the final analysis "democratic" discipline always won the argument.

Henry Hill, President of George Peabody College for Teachers, reflected the general tone of the debate. He was, he wrote, uncomfortable with the use of corporal punishment, but teachers should not lose the right to use it. He equated the reassurance of the hickory stick with the need for national "strength to negotiate with Hitler." At the same time he was even more concerned that reliance on stiff punishment could produce a nation of "goosesteppers." Hill resolved his dilemma by advocating a reliance on what he termed "individual initiative."17

In keeping with the new discipline, the most popular philosophical stance was to emphasize the teaching of self-discipline. Freedom in a democracy was the result of self discipline, but freedom also meant responsibility and control.19


Self discipline, as has already been discussed, is a nebulous concept that only takes on meaning when one examines the methods by which it was to be achieved. The goals of self-discipline were clear and directly related to the nation's major concerns. Only the means to achieving these goals posed a problem. Even so, the nation's goals and the general mentality gave insight into the means as well as the goals.

The war years gave to the American people a sense of unity of purpose. Propaganda stressed that winning the war was a national effort. Everyone had a part to play and a job to do. This sense of working for the good of the whole, the sense of being a part of the group and having a mutual goal was readily adapted to the classroom. 20

Where Redl advocated an understanding of group dynamics and group leadership skills by the teacher as a key to better classroom discipline, many educators saw the use of the group as a means of control. Using the group as the source of control was viewed as effective, efficient, and most important of all, democratic. Ordway Tread advocated the use of group control to achieve classroom

discipline as a compromise between dictatorship and a "free for all."\textsuperscript{21} Henrietta Holland suggested to her fellow elementary school teachers that they could achieve "an orderly and smooth running class" by "employing group control" while "encouraging self-control."\textsuperscript{22} The importance of Ms Holland's practical use of the group as the source of control took on even more complex and significant meaning as the war ended.

POST WAR YEARS

I think a good many people, here and everywhere, have a feeling in their bones that some sort of large-scale reawakening is in the cards for humanity. Intimations of this feeling are in the air—in the talk of the philosophers, in the speeches of the politicians, in the songs of the poets, in the wall charts of the economists. There is the vague feeling that after great evil comes great good; after trouble comes absence of trouble; after war peace. It is a mystical, rather than a logical presentiment. History does not offer any very impressive corroboration; flip over its pages and you are apt to find the disagreeable reminder that after trouble comes more trouble. Yet it is a feeling everyone must hold to.

E. B. White, Dec. 10, 1941\textsuperscript{23}

If one views the war and its aftermath from the perspective of twelve years of economic depression, then "a good many people" were accurate in their presentiment. The prosperity of wartime continued after the war was over. America was an anomaly in a world littered


\textsuperscript{22}Henrietta Holland, "Classroom Control," \textit{Instructor}, 53 (Sept. 1944), 33.

\textsuperscript{23}White, "Intimations," op. cit., p. 243.
with bombed-out cities, non-producing industries and farms, and starving children. A young mother in St. Louis at the end of the war was asked about her personal expectations, "'Oh things are great,' she bubbled, 'Harry has a grand job, there's the new baby'—Then she frowned, 'Do you think it is really all going to last?'"24 But it did last, and as "the decade ended, American society seemed to have discovered the secret of uninterrupted economic prosperity."25

The answer to economic security was met by a faith in increased production, even if that production had to be sustained by the "creation of want" through advertising and salesmanship.26 The Americans' belief in economic prosperity gave a new interpretation to their faith in democracy. The "good life" resulting from the rise of consumerism, the growing gross national product and the accompanying decline in unemployment became the definition, as well as the means, to a democratic society.27

However White's faith in history was to prove a more reliable predictor of the post war era than the feelings of the American


populace in 1941. The troubles came from two sources. The first was
the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. This vast country with an
ideology antithetical to that of the United States' was staking her
claim in the post war world. Immediately after the war America
wavered on her stance toward this threat to her new role as world
leader and its all important lagniappe, economic prosperity. As the
Christian Science Monitor phrased it in 1946, "Nobody seems to be sure
what is going to happen. And few are sure what should be done, no
matter what happens."28

The second trouble was, of course, the atom bomb. Russell Baker
reflecting on Hiroshima thirty-five years later was struck by how
little impact it had on the immediate lives of the American people.
At the time nuclear energy wasn't even worthy of discussion.29 Albert
Einstein who was more intimately involved, feared that "the release of
atom power ha[d] changed everything except our way of thinking."30

Both men were wrong. The destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki
was a symbol of what Martin Sherwin calls "the new American barbarism"
and an explanation of the origins of the cold war.31 By 1948 forces

28Quoted in Goldman, Crucial Decade, op. cit., p. 40.

29Russell Baker, Growing Up (New York: Congdon & Weed, Inc.,

30Speech to National Commission of Nuclear Scientists, May 1946,
Carl Seelig, Albert Einstein, chapter 4, cited in J.M. Cohen and M.J.
Cohen, A Dictionary of Modern Quotations (Great Britain: Penguin

31Martin Sherwin, "Diplomacy and Destruction," in his A World
were moving to combine the two sources of America's troubles, making the new trouble greater than the sum of its parts. The Berlin blockade, the fall of China, the invasion of South Korea, the fall of Greece, and the discovery of Communists within the United States government, combined with the Soviet's acquisition of atomic power gave a new meaning to America's fears. Henry Commager writing in 1950 expressed the doubts of his fellow Americans:

Although still persuaded that his was the best of all countries, the American of the mid-twentieth century was by no means so sure that his was the best of all times, and after the atomic age he could not rid himself of the fear that his world might not end with a whimper but a bang. His optimism, which persisted, was instinctive rather than rationalized, and he was no longer prepared to insist that the good fortune which he enjoyed, in a war-stricken world, was the reward of virtue rather than of mere geographical isolation. He knew that if there was indeed any such thing as progress it would continue to be illustrated by America, but he was less confident of the validity of the concept than at any previous time in his history.32

These fears changed American society in subtle but fundamental ways. In contrast to a traditional stereotype of the American as a rugged individualist, and in the apparent midst of plenty, the American of the mid-twentieth century, above all else, sought security.33 The post war Americans' seeking of security was the result of a mixture of historical, social, economic, political, technological, and psychological events which converged at mid-century.


The first source of insecurity, according to Erich Fromm, was the result of increasing freedom of the individual. Mid-twentieth century, said Fromm, witnessed the culmination of a sense of individual isolation and powerlessness which had grown out of industrialization and the ideas of the Reformation of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Americans, Fromm concluded, were attempting to compensate for this sense of insecurity, powerlessness, and isolation through conformity.34

Richard Hofstadter related the sense of insecurity to the Americans' uncertainty about his innate sense of belonging, status, and identity in a country which was constantly shifting its symbols of status. America was a country with shifting dominant ethnic groups, apparent economic and social mobility, and no structured class system. Hofstadter saw the radical reactions against the fear of communism in the post war period as a result of this insecurity.35

These assumed innate American characteristics were exacerbated by the pervasive sources of insecurity: Communist Russia and the threat of nuclear war. As Lawrence Wittner illustrates, "national security" became the byword which could only be met by uncritical patriotism and power.36 It was an insecurity derived from living in a cold war world. The war, as Martin Sherwin points out, was the result of


America's faith in science. Now the product of that faith, nuclear power, was the ultimate controller. As Fromm had predicted, the American at mid-century was attempting to find his security by conformity, social stratification, and membership in a group.

Although generally optimistic, Henry Commager in 1950 was deeply concerned about growing class consciousness and intolerance. David Riesman was aware of this changing national character which he labeled the new "other-directed" American. The growing need for security dovetailed with rising consumerism to make the peer group the standard for morality and taste, and above all the panacea for insecurity.

Nowhere can these changes be better understood than in how they affected the way society dealt with children. And nowhere can we better understand this relationship than in the ways children were disciplined. By the 1940's and 50's it was generally assumed that every elementary age child would be attending school. (The exceptions were some children of minority groups and the handicapped.)

What was advocated within the schoolhouse has largely been ignored even by educational historians, but its impact on children and consequently on the American culture is a vital part of understanding American history. Therefore we must explore how this new need for security and the growing importance of group acceptance intertwined with the twentieth century's emphasis on democracy to affect the philosophies of disciplining of American school children.

DISCIPLINE IN THE CLASSROOM

Teachers and other adults must be firm, fair, and consistent; yet understanding and caring.

Florence Wong, teacher

To understand the changing interrelationship of discipline, security, and group membership we must place it in proper perspective within the dynamics of the then current classroom disciplinary theories and practices as found in the educational literature on discipline. The ideal of educators was, as stated previously, one of self-disciplined children for a democratic society. The problem was one of methodology in achieving this goal.

By mid-century John Dewey and William Kilpatrick's belief that the interest of the child would serve as the sole source of self-discipline had generally been rejected by laymen, but educators were translating this philosophy into a demand for a more relevant curriculum and a rationale for keeping children busy, an idea inherent in the nineteenth century's diverse philosophies of Harris, Herbart, and Froebel.

39 Florence Wong, retired teacher in Hawaii, answer in response to questionnaire, see Appendix A, p. 225 (1946).

In keeping with the emphasis placed on the emotional health of the child and yet serving as a counter to the threat of too much permissiveness, mental hygienists advocated separating the expression of feelings from the expression of behavior. Children were to have freedom to express their feelings verbally. That did not necessarily mean that they could act those feelings out. You could say that you hated your baby brother and that you wanted to throw mud pies in his face. You could even draw a picture of your brother with mud pies in his face. But you could not really throw the pie.41

In order to be truly accepting of children's feelings teachers had to be objective. It is interesting to note that while children were given more freedom of expression, teachers were expected to show no emotions, and certainly never anger. Only rarely was the hypocrisy of a teacher spanking a child while he or she remained calm, cool, and unaffected ever questioned.42

There was a continuing controversy over rewards and punishments. The former was generally seen as better than its counterpart, but even

---


rewards were often perceived as a necessary evil. Punishment, especially corporal punishment, continued to be advocated only as a "last resort," but rarely was it ruled out completely.

Educational research contributed to the resolution of the ongoing debate over the repercussions from severe discipline versus permissiveness. The question was resolved, at least in the literature, by an emphasis on consistency. Whether a teacher or parent was a severe disciplinarian was not as crucial as whether he or she was consistent in his or her behavior toward the child. The golden rule of good discipline handed to most teachers was to be "firm, fair, and consistent." Retired teachers in Hawaii ranked consistency as one of the most important factors in a teacher's ability to influence classroom discipline.

---


46 See Appendix A, pages 210-211 and 225.
In addition to the motto "firm, fair, and consistent," there was a plethora of standard suggestions or "tricks of the trade" for teachers, especially beginning teachers, on ways to achieve order and control in their classrooms. These ranged from well established advice such as respecting and guiding the child and having a well organized class to such snappy ideas as using Aesop's fables to correct a child's behavior. Teachers were also given hints on how to give non-verbal messages and how to write on the board without turning their backs.47

In the final analysis teacher personality traits were consistently seen as the most important element in maintaining good discipline. Redl had placed teacher personality on a par with teaching skills, saying that it was difficult to tell where one began and the other ended. A sense of humor was regarded as essential to maintaining class control as was a modulated voice. Teachers were also advised on what they should do in their spare time and the advantage of a good perfume in creating a well disciplined class.48


SECURITY

We see them everyday—timid, nervous, bewildered youngsters. Most of us recognize that until we give them a feeling of security, we can give them little else.

Harold Shane, 1949

The trends discussed above were generally in keeping with adaptations of former theories and practices of discipline growing out of the "new education" of the last half of the nineteenth century and the mental hygiene movement. What was significantly different after the War was the increasing importance attached to the idea of security. This trend did not necessarily refer to a concern for physical security, nor a concern for economic security. It was instead a sense of personal identity and emotional security.

It is important to remember that security was not of such vital importance in the first half of this century. Even those educators and psychologists who were concerned with childhood repression did not relate it to a need for security. With World War II and especially after 1947 security became both a rationale for imposed control as well as a means to that control. This phenomenon rested on three assumptions.


50Shane, ibid, 497-498.

51This conclusion was arrived at after a review of the literature on child rearing such as John Sommerville, The Rise and Fall of Childhood, and Daniel Beekman, The Mechanical Baby, as well as the writings of Sigmund Freud, The Basic Writings of Sigmund Freud.
First, security was an essential need of every child. Security implied emotional security which was closely allied to love and affection. It was a natural right of childhood and the basis of mental health. The importance of security dovetailed with the ideas of those who advocated a separation of feelings and behavior. An adult could reject a child's behavior and still not threaten that child's sense of security.

Second, security was increasingly derived from a sense of belonging. For the young child it was to be found in the home and the family. As a child grew to school age security was to be found in a sense of belonging to a peer group or gang. This was viewed as a natural progression of moving from security derived from authoritarian

---


54 Ethel Kawin, "Freedom and Discipline in the Early Years," National Parent Teacher, 38 (Nov. 1943), 17-19
to democratic controls. "Wise parents," wrote a California educator, "know that it is more important that children gain security with their peers than that they unfailingly conform to standards which are acceptable to adults. Parents and teachers should adjust their demands in each new situation and avoid at all times placing children in conflict with their peers."

The third assumption was that a lack of security could result in maladjustment or "neurotic attitudes." Many believed, however, that discipline, defined in terms of controls and limits, could provide the needed sense of security.


THE GROUP AS CONTROLLER

Education is a social function securing direction and development in the immature through their participation in the life of the group to which they belong. In social situations the young have to refer their way of acting to what others are doing and make it fit in. The general features of education are the process by which social groups maintain their continuous existence.

John Dewey, 191659

From a philosophical standpoint the emphasis on membership in, and responsibility to, a group at mid-century could be seen strictly as an essential element in the broadest definition of education as articulated by John Dewey in the above quotation. It should also be noted that the concern for the individual was not totally neglected by educators in this new emphasis on membership in the group. One could view this period as simply representing a slight shift in the ever present game of balancing the needs of society against those of the individual.60 Certainly Redl saw this conflict as one of the most difficult aspects of school discipline faced by a teacher.61 Harold Benjamin, Dean of the College of Education at the University of Maryland, reflected the continuing need for a balance between the


individual and society. "True discipline," he wrote, "is always self-enforced. It is the foundation of the individual's freedom in society. The modern school provides discipline in the learning of patterned actions for the welfare of the child in the group."62

For a better understanding of the significance of the group in the literature on school discipline in the post war years, we must look at the way it was supposed to achieve classroom decorum. The simplest democratic group technique advocated by teachers was to let the students develop their own set of class rules or "codes of citizenship."63 More enthusiastic advocates of group control went a step further. If students could make their own rules, they could also administer them. Enforcement of school rules by students was to be done by establishing "democratic" student disciplinary committees. These could be on a school wide basis with a student council; more commonly they were confined to a classroom. Within the class the students could sit as a disciplinary committee as a whole, or they


63Ethel I. Miller, "Harmony in the Classroom: How to Achieve Good Discipline," Grade Teacher, 62 (May 1945), 40; and John R. P. French, "Two Things Our Schools Should Teach," Parents' Magazine, 21 (Feb. 1946), 18.
might select a subcommittee.  

A less formal, but more frightening, use of student group control was advocated by M. G. Paddington, the Assistant Supervisor for Education for the State of New York. When vandals attacked a school, wrote Paddington, the principal chose some of the more influential boys to repair the damage. They, said the principal, knew who did the damage and would make sure that it never happened again. The implications as to the method of assurance is, of course, left to the reader's imagination.

Such direct use of group control was not widely acknowledged. The more accepted means of student discipline was founded on the premise that security was to be found by membership in a group. If this were true then it followed that expulsion, or the threat of expulsion, from that source of security would serve as an ideal vehicle for control of unacceptable behavior.

---


65 M. G. Paddington, "Discipline, Diagnosis, Prescription, and Treatment," School Activities, 16 (April 1945), 299.

William Blatz's view satisfied the requirements for objectivity and acceptance of the child's feelings, as well as the requirement of being able to place behavior in a cause and effect relationship. The key to discipline, said Blatz, was learning that there are consequences to behavior, and knowing that belonging to a group yields security. The child "can either accept the restriction that the rule imposes or he can decide that conformity is not worth the sacrifice." Blatz's consequence for nonconformity was isolation; but, Blatz rationalized, the child had not been rejected, he himself had "chosen to withdraw from the group." However, retired teachers in Hawaii rejected the use of physical isolation from either the teacher or from the other students as an effective means of discipline. Isolation, apparently was social. The child who was not accepted socially was not necessarily physically controlled by isolation.68

The use of ostracism as a means of controlling misbehaving children was a measure sometimes employed by student disciplinary committees (with teacher approval). Ms Trigg praised her third graders for solving the problem of Billy Joe. The "citizen's committee" set up specific rules for the incorrigible Billy Joe. When he did not obey the rules he was ignored by his fellow class members. This proved more than the tough Billy Joe could bear, and he was soon

67 Blatz, "Does Punishment Pay?" op. cit.
68 See Appendix A, pages 210-211 and 213-214.
restored to full membership in the group under condition that he maintain good behavior. 69

Even though popular in use, such peer group control of individual behavior was never perceived as the best method of discipline. Ideally self-discipline was a desire to do right for its own sake, but as stated previously, no one knew exactly how to achieve this. So group control was recognized by many as the second best method. 70

There were, however, some who questioned the merits of this method. Celia Stendler was concerned that group control was becoming too powerful a socializing agent, and that children could use their power over their fellow classmates to vent their own hostilities. 71

In addition, teachers, in an ideal group-controlled class were seen as just a member of that group. As such they were in danger of becoming more concerned with their own popularity than with their role as educator. Edward Ladd drew on studies of group dynamics to raise

69 Ruth Trigg, "What Do Educators Say About Discipline," Education Digest, 23 (Dec. 1957), 32-33. For other examples of the use of student group discipline see Marion Nesbitt, "When a Different Child is Accepted," Childhood Education, 27 (Jan 1951), 214-220; Jent, "We Must Not Make It Seem Like Criticism," op. cit.; Reynolds, "Who Should Discipline?" op. cit.,. 457-465; and Glen Rasmussen, "Rewards for Misbehavior," Clearing House, 26 (Feb. 1952), 359-362.

70 Teachers in my own survey were rather ambivalent about the use of peer control, neither rejecting it nor accepting it, see Appendix A, pages 210-211. Also see Hart and Lela Puffer, "Lifting the Hush Hush From Discipline," Instructor, 66 (March 1957), 6; Harold Benjamin, "We Develop Discipline for Freedom," Childhood Education, 27 (Jan. 1951), 199; and A. D. Black, "Youth and Citizenship," Child Study, 19 (June 1942), 105-106.

the question of whether group cohesiveness could serve equally as well to jeopardize classroom order as to promote it.72

The power of the group, its relation to the teacher, and the consequential implications for an understanding of our attitudes and behavior toward children is nowhere better illustrated than by Elizabeth Pilant's recommended method of achieving class conformity. Using a standardized checklist, students and staff were to rate each student on his or her personality based on group conduct. If, said Ms Pilant, there is a conflict between the students' rating of an individual and that of a staff member's then the latter's must be rejected.73

During the Post War period particular social, political, and economic changes in the society brought new priorities to Americans and radically changed the meaning of democracy, bringing into telescopic view Tocqueville's fear of rule by the majority. Within the schools this could mean that instead of seeing the individual as working within a social group, the latter became controlled by that group. By a strange, but subtle, twist of emphasis a democratic procedure for controlling a group became a means of coercion. Even


more ironic, this methodological tool which was to aid the teacher in controlling the children became instead a means of student control over adult authority. As Richard Hofstadter saw it by 1962:

Conformity to arbitrary adult wishes has been diminished, but conformity to peers is now seen as a serious problem. The arbitrary authority of the teacher has been lowered, but a subtle manipulation, which requires self-deceit on the part of the teacher and often inspires resentment in the child, has taken place.74

Ironically, the use of group control within the school and the fear of expulsion from the group is, and has been, a basic tenet of Communist educational theory.75 American educators equated adult authoritarian control with Communism, just as they had formerly equated it with Nazism.76 Unknowingly, however, many American teachers were employing the very same techniques advocated by Communist educators in order to provide a sense of security and promote democracy. A sense of a united group purpose would reach its height as the country and education joined forces with advanced science and technology to defeat the enemy.

74Richard Hofstadter, "The Child and the World," Daedalus, 91 (Summer 1962), 525. Retired teachers in Hawaii who began their career before 1940 held respect for authority as a more important goal than did those who began teaching after 1940. See Appendix A, pages 207-208.


CAMÉLOT BUILT BY SCIENCE

We stand today on the edge of a new frontier...

John F. Kennedy, 1961

The combined fears of Russia and atomic war that had hung over American society since the end of World War II were to reach a climax in the early years of the seventh decade of this century. In 1957 the Russians launched the first flight into space. The launching of Sputnik was a clear and decisive threat to America's military and technological superiority. The spring of 1961 again found Americans looking inept and less than idealistic when the Cuban Bay of Pigs fiasco was revealed. These crises, however, seemed more to strengthen the American people in their conviction against the Russian nuclear threat. Gregory Bateson attributed this anomaly to an American characteristic. Americans, he said, need to have a single enemy and they need to see that enemy as strong and as constituting a great challenge. Communist Russia filled that need.

Sputnik rallied the nation behind a cry for better education, more and better scientists, and a multi-billion dollar space program. The new efforts brought forth dramatic achievements in science and technology, new vocabulary words, and a new breed of heroes—the astronauts.


The optimism of the times was personified in the nation's President. The media, especially television, helped Americans identify with John F. Kennedy. Speaking in the same month that the Cuban fiasco occurred, Walter Lippmann expressed the nation's exhilaration at the new era and the new President. "This is a most Presidential country," he told an interviewer,

The tone and example set by the President have a tremendous effect on the quality of life in America. Right now there is a curious exhilaration here in Washington. There is a new generation in charge, with a new style and a new seriousness. And people are beginning to feel that we can do things about problems after all-- that everything is possible.

Within the next two years America and its idealized President had stood face to face with its fears. In October of 1962 Kennedy once again faced the Russians on the threat of missile bases being built in Cuba. This time, however, as Dean Rusk put it, the United States had been eyeball to eyeball with the enemy and the other fellow blinked. The confidence gained over Cuba would aid in establishing the first nuclear test ban treaty. America had met her enemy.

More important than the sense of political and military security was the sense of economic security that was legitimized by the Kennedy administration. The fear of economic depression which had clouded the joy of prosperity in the immediate post war years was to be eliminated by the "new economics" which guaranteed continued prosperity through

---

79Hodgson, America in Our Times, op. cit., p. 152.

increased consumption and government regulation. The country felt safer and more confident. "1963," wrote Godfrey Hodgson, "seemed to confirm [the] promise of imperial splendor in the world, matched by tranquility and social progress at home."

THE SEARCH FOR A SCIENTIFIC THEORY OF DISCIPLINE

We are concerned not primarily with understanding how individuals learn to be self-disciplined, not with understanding how teachers can promote such learning, important as those are. We are here concerned to find a theory or theories through which we can better understand the special problems of keeping order in the public schools.

Edward T. Ladd, 1958

In keeping with an American tradition, the means of achieving "imperial splendor" as well as "tranquility and social progress" were to be found in public education. The challenge of Russian technological superiority was readily taken up by some of the nation's leading scientists. Most notably Vice-Admiral Hyman Rickover and James B. Conant saw the hope of American military superiority in advanced educational curriculum for talented youth, especially in the sciences. Congress and President Eisenhower responded with the National Defense Education Act in 1958 which for the first time provided federal funding for the study of the sciences, mathematics, and foreign languages.

---

81Hodgson, America in Our Time, op. cit., pp. 7, 77-79.
82Ibid., pp. 153 and 5.
A very important link between the university scholars and the question of curriculum and teaching methodology for children and youth was made in September, 1959 at Woods Hole, Massachusetts. Funded by the National Science Foundation, The Office of Education, the Air Force, and the RAND Corporation, the Woods Hole Conference brought together representatives from the fields of science, mathematics, technology, education and most significantly psychology. Ten of the thirty-one participants were psychologists. As Jerome Bruner wrote in his report on the Conference, psychology had not previously been a vital part of educational theory and development. Psychologists, it was hoped would play a new and increasingly important role.

The linkage of science to education was made on a more permanent basis as the faith in scientific research to solve social problems was expanded to the field of education. Until the 1950's little had been done in the name of educational research. In 1955 Congress passed the Cooperative Research Act and in 1956 appropriated $1 million for research programs to be carried on outside the U. S. Office of Education. In 1962 ten Educational and Resource Information Centers were established to disseminate findings. The interest of government, as well as private endowments in educational research was a major


impetus to the field of educational psychology. 86

The 1960's saw a major shift of support for and interest in educational psychology. Speaking of his profession during the period 1960 to 1975 John Feldhusen called educational psychology an "affluent, research based, theoretically independent, substantive discipline." 87

The concept of school discipline was affected by this renewal of interest in scientific research and psychology. In 1958 Edward Ladd of the Yale Graduate School of Education writing in the Harvard Educational Review called for a "body of theory" to be developed in the area of school discipline. Ladd argued that intellectual leaders in the first decades of this century had concerned themselves with the question of classroom control; but, he speculated, they had felt "guilty about concentrating on an aspect of teaching so frankly manipulative." 88

Ladd thought that this body of theory might develop from research being done in other fields such as political theory, group dynamics, and industrial sociology. Ladd's concern was for a scientific theory

---

87 John Feldhusen, "Educational Psychology and All Is Well," Educational Psychologist, 12, No. 1 (1976), 8.
of school discipline to replace the teachers' current reliance on "rules of thumb as expounded in teachers' rooms".89

David Ausubel also recognized the lack of scientific knowledge about school discipline. "Discipline today," he wrote in 1961, is much less a science than a matter of opinion. It not only shifts in response to various social, economic and ideological factors, but also manifests all of the cyclical properties of fads and fashions. Objective scientific evidence about the merits of different types of discipline is extremely sparse.90

But Ausubel questioned the validity of placing discipline on a scientific basis. "Whether or not particular disciplinary practices are appropriate," he wrote, "depends on the particular values, institutions, and kinds of personal relationships prevailing in a given culture." Discipline, therefore, could not be placed on a largely scientific basis.91

Fritz Redl, as we remember, was aware of the lack of a scientific understanding of both individual human behavior as well as group behavior as an aid to developing more effective teacher-pupil interaction for classroom discipline. Redl's stress on the importance of research in mental hygiene as the key to improving school discipline was not as popular by the early 1960's as it had been.92

89 Ladd, "Perplexities," ibid., 22.


91 Ausubel, ibid., 27-28.

92 John Feldhusen, "Two Views of the Development of Educational Psychology," Educational Psychologist 12, No. 3 (1978), 299.
But Redl's faith in scientific research to generate "practice-grown insights and criteria" for the teacher was heard and acted upon.\textsuperscript{93}

During the early sixties there was an increased concern with developing and adopting scientific, systematic means of controlling children's behavior in the classroom. The unending lists of tricks, techniques, and friendly advice which had filled the teacher magazines and journals for years seemed grossly inadequate in a day when science and technology seemed to be solving the nation's problems. American educators in their optimism saw no reason why this same scientific precision could not be applied to the problem of school discipline. Educators were calling for a "systematic construction" in the handling of classroom discipline.\textsuperscript{94} Both the renewed interest in educational psychology and the call for a scientific theory of discipline would be sharply changed by turbulent social changes which were making school discipline a pervasive social concern.

A theory of discipline as called for by Ladd was not a new idea. In fact, there were many theories of discipline in addition to the "old authoritarian" and the "new progressive" theories. Certainly Freud's psychoanalytic theory and the consequential mental hygienists' stress on finding the cause of a child's behavior constituted one theory of

\textsuperscript{93}Walter Doyle, "Are Students Behaving Worse Than They Used to Behave?" \textit{Journal of Research and Development in Education} 11 (1978), 13, citing Redl (1944), p. 21.

discipline. In direct contrast the behaviorist's theory as developed by Thorndike, Watson, and later B. F. Skinner was a well defined theory of discipline and control. The sociological or group dynamics theory as conceptualized by Fritz Redl was a popular and widely read theory of group control in the late 1950's and 1960's.\(^95\) The problem, as perceived in the early 1960's, lay not in the absence of theory, but, in the absence of a simple working system of control which could be utilized in the classroom by the teacher.

The answer to this need came in the form of a multitude of "atheoretical models" or systematic techniques of discipline.\(^96\) Jacob Kounin's study of "desist" techniques which was published in 1970 was the first major research grant directly related to the study of classroom discipline.\(^97\) Kounin's work marked a major shift in emphasis from the goals of classroom discipline to the means of classroom discipline.

Like Fritz Redl, Kounin was concerned with what teachers did which contributed to maintaining appropriate behavior. Beginning in the late 1950's Kounin and his associates at Wayne State University conducted extensive studies which involved detailed analyses of teacher and

\(^95\)See Irwin Hyman "Discipline in American Education: Overview and Analysis," Journal of Education, 61 (Spring 1979), 51-69. Also see Doyle, "Are Students Behaving Worse?" op. cit., 3-16 for his discussion of the five theories of discipline: mental hygiene, psychology of learning, group process, behavior modification, and classroom skills.

\(^96\)Hyman, ibid.

student behavior both by in-class observers and by the use of videotape machines. Traditional cliches connected with the literature on discipline such as "friendliness," "patience," "interest," and "love of children," were not part of Kounin's advice to teachers. Instead he created new terminology such as "over-dwelling," "anti-satiation," and "flip-flops." Kounin dealt strictly with teacher and student behavior and ignored motivation, personalities, goals, objectives, and feelings. In brief, Kounin worked to replace the list of teacher "tricks of the trade," which had so long dominated professional writing on school discipline with empirical studies of behavior. Kounin simply wanted to validate what worked.98

Kounin's work was, however, only a study of behavior. Even though it offered some "tricks of the trade" that young teachers were asking for it did not satisfy the need for a "simple working system of control." Those "systems" were eventually to be developed. In fact, a multitude of systems were eventually developed, but by the time they were in full vogue both the populations of the schools and the goals and objectives were as diverse as the systems.99


99See Pat Hockstad, "Classroom Discipline," **Education**, 82 (March 1962), 410-415, for an example of the beginning teacher who is decrying the Colleges of Education for not giving the new teacher some of the "tricks of the trade" in regards to classroom discipline; and Donald Barnes, "Analysis of Remedial Activities Used by Elementary Teachers in Coping With Classroom Behavior Problems," **Journal of Educational Research** 56 (July 1963), 544-547 for a discussion of the lack of relationship between a child's behavior and the teacher's method of resolution.
CHAPTER FOUR

LIBERTY AND EQUALITY FOR ALL

Review of Theories and Assumed Practices Relating to Classroom Discipline and Their Relationship to the Social Revolution: 1960's

THE END OF CONSENSUS

That change, very simply, is the loss of a working consensus, for the first time in our lives, as to what we think America means.

Hedley Donovan, 1969

By 1965 the splendor of America was already frayed and within the decade it would be torn and shattered. The President who had symbolized the nation had been killed by an assassin's bullet and assassination of national leaders would sadly become commonplace by the end of the decade.

The clearly defined enemy that had generally united the people no longer existed. The "war" that Americans were now fighting seemed less and less to be a clear question of democratic freedoms versus totalitarian communism. The "enemy" increasingly appeared to be only poor villagers; men, women, and children in the remote, unknown, small, Southeast Asian countries of Vietnam and Cambodia. The people who had seen themselves as in the right became ambivalent and uncomfortable with a war with ill defined objectives and a poorly chosen enemy.

The enemy was more and more to be found at home. For the first time since the Second World War, wrote Walter Lippmann of Lyndon B. Johnson's first inaugural address, the President was "not fixed upon the dangers abroad, but on the problems and prospects at home."2

Most important, prosperity itself brought its own destruction. The acceptance of the ideology of a welfare state which had begun under Franklin Roosevelt was not as widely accepted as was believed by some. The election of 1964 appeared to be a decisive clash of perspectives and priorities rare in American politics.3

President Johnson's dream of a Great Society based on an ever expanding economy produced secondary effects never before imagined. First, the post war prosperity had produced a new mentality among a large portion of the nation's population. The Protestant work ethic seemed irrelevant in a society whose strength was built on consumption. "Instead of striving, planning, saving, 'uptight' man, [the new counter-culture] preferred the 'cool' passive, self-indulgent personality."4 More important, prosperity and the increased emphasis on consumption over production had itself destroyed the basis of social control. Friedrich Nietzsche had explained the relationship between work and social control nearly a hundred years before. "Behind the glorification of work," he wrote,

---


4 Hodgson, op. cit., p. 313.
and the tireless talk of the "blessings of work" I find the same thought as behind the praise of impersonal activity for the public benefit: the fear of everything individual. At bottom, one now feels when confronted with work—and what is invariably meant is relentless industry from early till late—that such work is the best policy, that it keeps everybody in harness and powerfully obstructs the development of reason, of covetousness, of the desire for independence. For it uses up a tremendous amount of nervous energy and takes it away from reflection, brooding, dreaming, worry, love, and hatred; it also sets a small goal before one's eyes and permits easy and regular satisfactions. In that way a society in which the members continually work hard will have more security; and security is now adored as the supreme goddess. And now—horrors!—it is precisely the "worker" who has become dangerous. "Dangerous individuals are swarming all around us." And behind them, the danger of dangers: the individual.\(^5\)

By the mid 1960's it seemed that an interest in work in and of itself as proposed by John Dewey could no longer be assumed to be the means of self-discipline.

Tocqueville, a hundred thirty years before, had been concerned that the liberties of the individual would be subsumed in the Americans' democratic faith in majority rule. That threat appeared to many to be a reality in the post war years. By the mid-1960's the balance had sharply swung in favor of individual rights and liberties.

One of the first and most decisive displays of individual rights was begun in response to the desire of a black child in Topeka, Kansas, to attend school near home, the desire of a middle-aged black woman to sit in the front of a public bus, and the desire of a group of black young men to eat at a Woolworth's lunch counter. Confined to

the deep South until the 1960's the question of the rights of Blacks seemed to most Americans a clear case of legitimate individual rights. By the end of the decade integration of schools, busing of school children, affirmative action plans in the work place, the question of equality of opportunity as opposed to equality of results and Black power was affecting every community and every citizen, often resulting in displays of hatred, brutality, and violence. In addition, this same concern for the power and rights of other minorities was being extended to groups as diverse as American Indians, Chicanos, Asians, women, gays, disabled persons, and eventually children and youth.

THE NEW SOCIAL CONTROL

The elementary school has long been protected from criticism and has been relatively immune to charges of failure, to meet the needs of its students...For only rarely does one of its pupils get uncontrollably out of hand, and only infrequently do dropouts occur...Yet the seeds of insecurity, discontent, and self-degradation are often sown in these early years by indifferent or overzealous teachers.

Martin Luther King, Jr. 6
Birmingham, Alabama, 1958

What has sometimes been termed the social revolution of the 1960's had direct impact on both educators' and laymen's perceptions of school discipline. The end of consensus meant the end to a consensus in the general philosophical aims of school discipline that had existed in the 1940's and 1950's, i.e. self-discipline for a

---

democratic society. To understand what happened and why there was a change in theory and practice it is helpful to set this change in a comparative historical perspective.

The last half of the nineteenth century witnessed a large migration of Europeans to the United States, especially from Eastern and Southern Europe. The rising diversity of the national population gave an extra meaning to the need for a means of social control in a society which held each man responsible for his own self discipline. The public school was the natural vehicle for that control.

The critical aspects of the need for control waned with the decline of the immigrants after the 1921-24 Immigration Act which virtually brought to a halt the tidal wave of European immigrants to this country. The resulting decline in ethnic and social diversity as a result of the assimilation of these peoples into the American "way of life" made the role of the public school as social controller less crucial. This de-emphasis on controlling alien populations made possible the use of group membership as an acceptable means of classroom control by the mid-twentieth century.

The new demographic changes culminating in the 1960's resulted in a social and economic revolution equal to the social changes which had occurred in the last half of the nineteenth century. These changes directly affected the theories and practices of school discipline.

---

7See Barry Franklin, "Education for Social Control," History of Education Quarterly, 14, No. 1 (Spring 1974) on the importance of social control in Educational Sociology between 1900 and 1920 and the declining interest in the subject after 1930 until the Revisionist Historians took up the subject in the 1960's.
The social and economic changes in the life of the Black community, as well as the subsequent Civil Rights Movement, brought a new and greater threat to the stability of the society. Beginning with the economic prosperity of World War II, the Blacks who, for the most part, had been safely contained within the rural cotton-tobacco culture of the South began moving to the cities, and most particularly the Northern industrial cities in search of work and a better life.

The Black immigrants from the rural South were a direct threat to the social consensus built on an expanding economy and a faith in the creation of a unified society providing security through membership and loyalty to its participants. The social and economic, as well as cultural conflicts that the Blacks brought to this secure society were especially felt within the schools, which had long been held as the cornerstone of social cohesion as well as individual economic growth. School disciplinary practices and procedures as the major instruments of social control were profoundly affected by this new threat to the status quo.

Three major conflicts arose which undermined the then current popular faith in security through group membership as a means of discipline for membership in a democratic society. The first conflict was discussed in Chapter Three. Teachers and educators, as well as laymen, were already questioning the validity of a control system which stressed conformity and which could lead to children having control over adults.
Second, a reliance on group membership as a means of control could only be effective within a relatively homogeneous group where threat of expulsion left the isolated member with no other resources of support. In a social structure where individuality was gaining a foothold as a source of power this approval was bound to lose its effectiveness. This was most apparent in the schools with diverse minority student populations where homogeneity was not easily acquired and membership in a "sub-group" was itself a source of security. In like manner the threat to a teacher as being the isolate in a so called democratically controlled classroom which was made up of a majority of students of a different social, economic, and cultural background was probably unacceptable to most teachers.

Last, but most important, there existed an ambivalence as to whether the middle class truly wanted the new rising minority to be members of the established group. Certainly there were conflicts within the Black population, as well as other rising ethnic and racial groups, i.e. Chicanos, Native Americans, and Asians, as to whether they wanted to be as homogenized as the nineteenth century immigrants.

By the early 1960's it was believed that the question of schooling as well as school discipline should be examined from an entirely new frame of reference, or as Goodwin Watson called for "a different set of

---

assumptions.9 This period marked the "discovery" of a second American culture, the "culture of poverty" as Michael Harrington in his consciousness raising book called the lifestyles of the poor whites of Appalachia, the Blacks and Puerto Ricans of New York, and the migrant workers of the Southwest.10 It was not, however, just the recognition of poverty that shocked America. It was first of all the recognition of such vast poverty in a country of such unequaled economic prosperity. Second, and more critical, it was this culture of poverty which posed a threat to the stability and security which Americans had increasingly come to expect in the Post War years.

The cornerstone of that secure society was the school. James Conant, however, was warning the people that it was the school or more particularly the "slum school" that was the source of "social dynamite."11 The new enemy at home was poverty and social discontent. And as Martin Luther King had pointed out, it was the elementary school that was the seedbed of "insecurity" and "discontent." By 1965 President Johnson and Congress had declared a "War on Poverty," and the major battleground, in the true American tradition, was the schoolhouse.

If Harrington's book had been the rallying cry against poverty, Frank Riessman's *The Culturally Deprived Child* told the American people, and more particularly, the American educator, how this battle could be won. The implications of this new war had direct impact on school discipline. The general acceptance of the existence of a "different culture" which had to be defeated, or at least reformed, called for a different kind of discipline for school children. Indiscriminately referred to as "culturally deprived," "educationally handicapped," "culturally handicapped," underprivileged," "children of the ghetto," "children of the slums," or just plain "lower class," these children were viewed as significantly different. A teacher, Jenny Gray, described them as "coming from a different world." That different world, the "slum subculture," as Herbert Foster wrote,

> Provides disadvantaged children with a "frame of reference" or code of behavior that is different from the middle-class or dominate culture....[T]he disadvantaged child's lower-class life is violent, hostile, aggressive, anxious, and unstable.

Allan Ornstein stressed this difference of the ghetto children by pointing out that they were unable to cope with change, could not

---


tolerate waiting, and had a "voracious appetite for excitement."15

These different children from a different culture needed a different kind of education, a different kind of teacher, and above all, a different kind of discipline.

Discipline problems and cultural deprivation were rapidly being seen as inseparable. "Discipline" was the major problem for most slum school teachers. As Ornstein described the situation:

In the slum school, we usually judge the teacher's success by the way he handles or disciplines a class. Since the problem of discipline is perhaps the number one problem for most slum school teachers, its function often replaces teaching as the major task. For example, according to Deutsch's findings in a study of urban school classrooms, the time devoted to discipline takes up as much as 80% of the teacher's time. It is no surprise, then, that if the teacher is unprepared, or unable to maintain good discipline, each day is likely to end in emotional exhaustion, compounded by resentment and fear of the students, anxiety, and the ruin of his ego.16

With the impetus of federal funding from the Elementary and Secondary School Act of 1965 school districts and colleges of education across the country sought a second "new discipline," along with a second "new education," to meet the needs of the children of the culture of poverty. It was to be a discipline which was geared to children who, it was believed, lacked self-discipline and respect for


authority;\textsuperscript{17} who were not motivated by a pursuit of learning for its own sake; who wanted respect, not love;\textsuperscript{18} and who were oriented to physical punishment, aggression, and violence.\textsuperscript{19}

In contrast to the goals of emotional security and self-discipline by and through democratic living which had been so generally accepted for American children in the 1950's, the goal of discipline for the culturally disadvantaged children in the 1960's was a feeling of physical security and self-worth through a structured environment and direct physical control.\textsuperscript{20}

Frank Bazeli explained that although group self-discipline through a sense of belonging was an eventual goal of discipline, the reality of the "sub-culture" first required a discipline based on the status of the disciplinarian. In short Bazeli felt a need to add an extra step to the long process of achieving self-discipline. "The child," he wrote,

must conform to the demands of someone who occupies a position of power, and who will exercise that power punitively when necessary.

\textsuperscript{17}Cody, op. cit., 1.

\textsuperscript{18}Riessman, op. cit., pp. 12-14, 46-47.

\textsuperscript{19}Foster, op. cit., 173.

\textsuperscript{20}See "Violence in the Schools: Some New Solutions," American School Board Journal, 162 (Jan. 1975), 27-37 for one teacher's views on the culturally deprived child's special need for security. This perspective was also expressed by a retired teacher in Hawaii who said that "limit setting" was more important for children who were unloved and unwanted, see Appendix A, pages 221-222 and 224-225.
In a culture, he continued, where physical strength, cunning and daring are prized, where ganging for protection and exploitation is appropriate behavior, and where a challenge to authority brings status, the teacher must be skilled in status control.  

Bazeli was unique in his support of at least the long term goal of group self-discipline. Direct, authoritarian discipline akin to the "old discipline" that had been condemned by 1950 was more often advocated for the children of the other America. Riessman had found that "it [was] the old-style, strict, highly structured teacher who appear[ed] to be the most popular and effective with underprivileged children." Riessman advocated parts of Dewey's theory that emphasized learning by doing and the use of the concrete experience centered learning. But progressive education needed to be tempered by the traditionalist. "The traditionalist," Riessman added, "contributes structure, rules, discipline, authority, rote, order, organization, and strong external demands for achievement." A survey of the reactions of teachers of culturally disadvantaged children to Riessman's ideas supported this faith in the "old discipline." The majority of teachers said,

---


22 Riessman, op. cit., p. 72.
strong demands, and firm, unyielding rules are needed from a
definite and authoritative teacher, who sets up a highly
structured classroom with strict routine and order.23

Allan Ornstein stressed that the teacher of ghetto children must
have control of the classroom. Children must be "trained" precisely
how to enter the classroom. Students should stay in their seats and
keep busy to the end of the class. "The successful ghetto teacher,"
continued Sidney Trubowitz in this same vein, "clearly defines limits
and shows his respect and liking for the children by insisting that
they maintain standards...[The teacher] sets up routines carefully."

"These teachers," he added,

recognizing the value of firm structure, work with children
on routines for entering the room, using the pencil sharpener,
walking through corridors, distributing materials, checking
homework, and changing seats for small group instruction.25

In a rare protest Wilmer Cody questioned whether so much emphasis
on "systematic behavior" and rules and regulations was not as much the
cause as the cure for lack of discipline among lower class children.
It appeared to him that the pressure from the teacher was often met by
passive resistance from the students.26

23Patrick F. Groff, "Culturally Deprived Children: Opinions of
Teachers on the Views of Riessman," Exceptional Children, 31, No. 1
(Sept. 1964), 63.

24Ornstein, "Techniques and Fundamentals for Teaching the
Disadvantaged," op. cit. Also see Thomas J. Pickering who cites work
on the success of the "highly structured approach" with "economically
depressed children. "Discipline and Freedom in Childhood Education,"

25Sidney Trubowitz, "How to Teach in a Ghetto School," Today's
Education, 57, No. 7 (Oct. 1968), 26, 28.

26Cody, op. cit., 2-7.
This new emphasis on a different discipline for the different child can better be understood when it is contrasted with the discipline theory of Clara Osorio who was trained in the Hawaii Normal School in the 1920's. Mrs. Osorio was a strong advocate of the progressive ideas as translated by the teachers at the Kawananakoa Experimental School. Early in her career Mrs. Osorio was given a class of what was commonly known as young "incorrigibles." She employed the progressive ideas of group decision making, rule setting, and planning, as well as the "activity program." All of these methods were then advocated for "normal children." But Mrs. Osorio saw no reason not to use them with her class and found them to be most successful.27

Many teachers in a 1968 survey of school discipline linked the major problems of classroom discipline as being related to the "culturally deprived." "Physical punishment," some said, "is what these children understand best."28 In keeping with this perceived need for greater external control there was an increased use of police in the schools not only for immediate control and protection of the students, but to "spot incipient delinquents."29

27Interview with Mrs. Osorio, June 23, 1986.

28"Discipline, Not the Worst Problem," op. cit.

Other educators looked for a solution to the problem of discipline by employing a special education model. The use of a special education model had been effective in the first half of the century in dealing with the problem of retardation and the conflict over social versus academic promotion. Instead of simply applying "stricter, more physical discipline," the "culturally deprived" students were in need of special treatment, just as the mentally retarded child had been. \(^{30}\) Lawrence Vredevoe saw this special need in terms of the anger and hate felt by Black students in desegregated schools. \(^{31}\) Some retired teachers of Hawaii reflecting back on their experiences in the late 1950's and 1960's found their greatest frustrations in dealing with children whom they saw as special education children. These were children who were seen as academically "lower" or who "culturally" did not value education. \(^{32}\)

Even some advocates of a therapeutic model based on mental hygiene stressed physical control. They promoted the use of special classes as well as interventionist teachers, social workers, and psychologists to work with the teachers and the students, in addition to human relations workshops for teachers. These mental hygienists saw the

---


\(^{32}\) See Appendix A, pages 218-219 and 231.
child as being sick as opposed to naughty or incorrigible. The most
widely accepted implementation of this idea was the use of Fritz Redl's
"crisis" or interventionist teacher. This special teacher could both
physically control the misbehaving child as well as give him
therapeutic help. The crisis teacher was to be trained in "life space
interviewing" techniques which Redl had employed with emotionally ill
children.33

The acceptance of external control as a valid end, as well as a
valid means, to school discipline set the stage for a resurgent
interest in behaviorist psychology. It was generally believed that
culturally deprived children simply were not motivated in the same way
as middle class children. Although the professional literature of the
1960's continued to support the ideas of democratic classrooms,
self-discipline, the expression of children's feelings, and the
general principles of mental hygiene, these ideals were not seen as
easily applied to disadvantaged children.

Romantics such as Jonathan Kozol and James Herndon were advocating
the permissive child centered theories of the 1920's for the ghetto

33Laurita, Raymond, "Good Discipline: Is It Possible?" Educational
Leadership, 26 (Oct. 1968), 126-127; Herbert Foster, "To Reduce
Violence: The Interventionist Teacher and Aide," Phi Delta Kappan, 53
(Sept. 1971), 59-62; "How Project ABLE Cools Hot Spots of Pupil
Behavior," American School Board Journal, 156 (Nov. 1968), 15;
"Violence in the Schools: Some New Solutions," op. cit. It might be
added that this is also the philosophy that this writer was trained
under as a graduate student in Special Education in 1968.
children of the 1960’s. And although these men were popular with educational theoreticians, they did not directly address the crucial question of classroom discipline.

Some educators recommended the use of initiating learning experiences of strong emotional impact which were directly related to the concrete experiences and concerns of the lower socio-economic child. But there is little doubt that such methods were difficult as well as very demanding of the time and talent of a teacher. As Riessman expressed it, commenting on the success of the New York pilot project, Higher Horizons,

We need to develop approaches [to educate culturally deprived children] that will be effective on a large scale in the every day school setting, where teachers are not working day and night and 14 Sundays per term.

For many, the most direct answer to both Riessman’s search for a more efficient means of teaching disadvantaged children and Ladd’s call for a general theory of discipline seemed to be found in the writings of B. F. Skinner. Skinner, a professor of psychology at Harvard, had not only kept alive the Behaviorist ideas of Watson, but had perceived the broad impact of behaviorist theory in terms of a philosophy for society as explained in his popular novel, Walden II.


36Riessman, op. cit., p. 104.
THE SCIENCE OF HUMAN BEHAVIOR

We need to make vast changes in human behavior. In trying to solve terrifying problems that face the world today we naturally turn to the things we do best. We play from strength and our strength is science and technology.

B. F. Skinner, 1971

Skinner stood in contrast to the growing belief that direct overt control was a "necessary evil" that sometimes had to be implemented in the pursuit of the higher goals of education. In keeping with the earlier progressives, Skinner said that control of human behavior was the goal of education. And it had to be properly achieved if society were to be preserved.

According to Skinner an individual's behavior was not the result of a free and autonomous being. It was, instead, the result of an organism responding to positive reinforcements or avoiding negative reinforcements. As such, all behavior, including all human behavior was directly controllable if one could only determine what constituted the particular individual's reinforcers. Although perceived by many as totalitarian in perspective, Skinner justified his theory as the only honest and realistic perception of human behavior. People were not truly free and could not be made free. They were controlled by

---


the reinforcers in their environment. But, he added, they could be made to have a "sense of freedom," which was more important than freedom itself.40

Skinner himself, like most behaviorists, began his studies with animals, largely rats and pigeons. The direct application of his theory, however, was widely accepted and experimented with in institutions for the mentally ill, the retarded, and prisons; in brief with deviant populations. And culturally deprived children readily fell into the category of a divergent population.

Skinner's behavior modification theory seemed to meet all of the criteria for a "new discipline" for the children of the "other America." First, behavior modification constituted an intact theory of human behavior, but most important, a theory of discipline and control.41

Second, behavior modification theory was based on scientific laboratory experiments. It was testable with rats, pigeons, and people.

Third, behavior modification theory, at least as it was presented by Skinner, rejected the use of punishment, not because it was inhumane, but because in the long run it had proven to be ineffective.42


41It is important to note that Skinner was not concerned with the development of a "theory," and shied away from that term. Frank Milhollan and Bill E. Forisha, From Skinner to Rogers, Contrasting Approaches to Education (Lincoln, Nebraska: Professional Educators Publications, Inc., 1972), p. 83.

42Technology of Teaching, op. cit., pp. 185-191.
Supporters of behavior modification could do more than just argue against punishment. Behavior modification could provide a viable alternative to punishment. Contingency management, or as it was called in the vernacular, control through manipulation of rewards, was the behaviorists' answer to punishment. Although educators had traditionally been leery of the use of rewards, they were almost always viewed as preferable to punishment.

Fourth, and most important, behavior modification was efficient and easy to implement as a means of control. Teachers could be easily trained in one or more behavior modification techniques. School counselors who had been hesitant to be identified as disciplinarians, as well as school psychologists, could train a teacher in the implementation of a behavioral control technique to be used with a single deviant child or with an entire classroom.43

Although Skinner was concerned with the practical application of his ideas, he concentrated his efforts on the question of motivation through the use of his teaching machine and programmed learning. Skinner saw behavior modification techniques as ultimately providing a means of "self-reinforcement" which would then free the student of the need for approval by teachers and others.44 He was less concerned with the problem of direct classroom maintenance. This, however, was

43Frank Bickel and Maude O'Neill, "Counselors and Student Discipline, Suggested Roles," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 57 (June 1979), 525-555.

44Technology of Teaching, op. cit., p. 173.
not true of those many followers who saw the more immediate practical merit of his ideas. Direct external control of children's behavior, especially culturally deprived children, was essential for the everyday maintenance of social order. Behavior modification was the key to that control.45

The implementation of behavior modification theory covered a wide range of methods. At one end of the spectrum behavior modification was nothing more than a scientific seal of approval on the use of smiles and praise as a method of teacher control, although this was exactly what Skinner had hoped to change. At the other end of the spectrum, and again counter to the teachings of Skinner, behaviorist experimenters utilized such divers "negative reinforcers" on their subjects as strapped chairs, electric shock, and rubber masks.46

The most popular outcome of the new acceptance of behavior modification theory, as mentioned earlier, was the increased use of rewards for appropriate behavior. Rewards ranged from simple teacher


recognition and praise to special privileges, tokens, and even material rewards such as money. A systematic, highly structured classroom with clearly defined behavioral objectives reinforced by a visible, controllable reward system for appropriate behavior by the child seemed to be the utopia that educational researchers were looking for. Experimental "pilot projects" funded by both the government and private foundations sprung up all over America to solve the problem of the disciplining of culturally deprived children.

That utopia never came. First it never came because by the early 1970's federal funds for research were rapidly drying up. Second, it never came because educators were soon questioning whether operant conditioning, or behavior modification, was really "the answer" to the problem of school discipline. Quickly taught in "mini-workshops" as a panacea to teachers who were "having discipline problems," the easy techniques did not prove to be a miracle drug for the problems of either the culturally deprived children or for the children outside the ghettos who seemed to be increasingly displaying the same characteristics of those children inside the ghettos.

Third, Skinner's ideas were never totally accepted by many who used the techniques associated with them. As Ernest Hilgard expressed it:

47See William B. McMillan, "The Effectiveness of Tangible Reward Systems," *Psychology in the Schools*, 10, No. 3 (July 1973), 378 on the continued reliance of behavioristic techniques with low socioeconomic status children. See Staats, op. cit., p. 25, on the use of "token reinforcers."
One can learn a great deal from operant conditioning and use it without becoming a devotee...

Skinner's learning theory does not satisfy our basic curiosities about man; it is, in that sense, nonintellectual and an oversimplification....Even though Skinner's theory is not the ultimate theory, it is a good theory for our purposes.48

What Skinner, along with the work of Jacob Kounin, did do was to give credance to the belief that a "system of classroom discipline" could be established. It was recognized, however, that a single system of classroom discipline or even a united goal for school discipline as was professed in the Post War Years was not achievable, nor even desirable—not for the children of the "other" America, nor for the children of middle America.

THE CHILDREN'S LIBERATION MOVEMENT

We seem unable to respond to our youngsters as both children with special needs and as people with equal rights.

Daniel Katkin, 197349

The revolution of the sixties did not stop with the discovery of the Blacks and the poor. The Black Revolution was only a catalyst for a whole series of movements which served to redefine the role of men, women, work, the family, society, and most important to our topic, children.


David Riesman, writing in 1950, described three historical stages in the evolution of American social character. The first, or traditional stage, was transformed at the time of the Renaissance and Reformation to the second stage of the more independent inner-directed person. The second transformation in American social character, according to Riesman, was the shift from the inner-directed person to the mid-twentieth century other-directed person. The nineteenth century inner-directed individual's source of direction, as described by Riesman, "[was] implanted early in life by elders and directed toward generalized, but nonetheless inescapably destined goals." In contrast, the source of direction for the mid-twentieth century upper middle class "other directed" individual was his or her contemporaries. The "other-directed" individual was dependent on paying close attention to signals from others and a psychological need for approval. This picture of society as the source of individual control is compatible with the picture of group oriented, security seeking school discipline in American schools at mid century.

Maxine Schnall, however, added a new dimension to this study of American character. Schnall saw the sixties revolution as a third social character transformation. "The real meaning of the "revolution" in the Sixties," she wrote,

---


51 Riesman, ibid., pp. 21-22.
was that the American social character, having changed from inner-direction to other direction in the Fifties, underwent still another transformation in the following decade and changed from other-direction to what I call youth-direction: Instead of taking their moral and social norms from their peers, the middle and upper middle class began to orient themselves by their children. This represented not merely an alteration in our social character but a seismic reversal of the whole socialization process. 52 (emphasis in the original)

Riesman himself, writing in 1969, supported the idea of a shift away from the insecurities of the other directed adult. Their sense of authority and legitimacy had been lost in the turmoil and upheaval of the sixties. 53

More directly, Charles Reich in his popular book, The Greening of America (1970) praised the rebelling youth of the sixties as having reached a higher level of consciousness than the adult society which had only succeeded in bringing about the present tragic state of society. The youth of America, he proposed, having now reached "Consciousness III" must "assume responsibility for their parents, their college teachers, their younger brothers and sisters, and on outward into society, to all those who seem to be enemies, but are only the deceived, the broken, and the lost." 54 This new attitude toward children should be compared with the slightly different nineteenth century idealization of children who were seen as having a special


53 Riesman, op. cit., p. xiv.

nearness to God and the hope of the future, but not necessarily having any great wisdom of their own.

If America were to find its source of direction for the future in its young then these young people must be given the freedom to accomplish the task. This faith in the liberation of youth was easily expanded to a belief in the liberation of all children. The Children's Rights, or Liberation, Movement (as it was interchangeably called) was as varied and splintered as any movement of this period. At one end of the spectrum were the more visionary radicals such as John Holt. Holt wanted children to be able to vote, choose their own guardians, use drugs and experience sexual freedom if they desired, as well as have legal and financial responsibilities among other activities and privileges traditionally reserved for the adult population. At the same time Holt spoke against the sentimental view of children as simply being cute or love objects. 55

At the other end of the spectrum participants in the Children's Rights Movement were primarily concerned with the protection of children. Marion Wright Edelman, a Black attorney for the NAACP and founder of the Children's Defense Fund best exemplifies those who believed that children, and especially the children of the poor, believed that children, and especially the children of the poor,

needed protection and special resources.  

Although advocates varied in their goals and their interpretations of the cause of problems, Daniel Pekarsky emphasized that all were united in at least one effort. "These factions," he wrote, "were united in the belief that the educational system deprived children of the exercise of fundamental rights and that this deprivation left them a powerless minority in the hands of none-too-trustworthy educators."  

Beginning in the sixties the Supreme Court and the lower courts handed down dozens of rulings on almost every aspect of school disciplinary procedures as well as on student's, teacher's, and administrator's rights.

As Pekarsky put it, "The First Amendment and Due Process Rights...at least in principle, protected the child's rights to be treated non-arbitrarily." (emphasis added) In so doing the relationship between teacher and student was radically altered. Drawing on the legal tools used by other equal rights movements, the advocates of

---


58For a concise analysis of the court decisions affecting school discipline see Eugene F. Conners, "Student Discipline and The Law," Phi Delta Fastback, No. 121, (1979), 7-60.

59Pekarsky, op. cit., 11.
children's rights employed the language which traditionally had been used to describe the relationship between the citizen and the state to describe the relationship between the child and the school. As a result, "child advocates," writes Pekarsky, "have tended to characterize children as a semi-autonomous political entity, as an interest group separate from and often at odds with those required to render them the service of education."60 The social unrest of the sixties coupled with the subsequent Children's Rights Movement radically changed the apparent image of the child vis-a-vis society, the source of authority, the school, and the teacher.

**SUMMARY**

The end of consensus in American thought meant an end to a belief in a single theory of "good" discipline. First there was the recognition of another America, the America of the poor, the Black, the different whose children did not seem to "fit into" the idealized homogeneous democratic group. As a result there was a new awareness of the need to provide overt control over children who were seen as a threat to the stability of the society.

On a broader social scale there was an assertion of individual liberties which had been suppressed as a result of the insecurity bred by years of economic depression, war, and the fear of nuclear annihilation. This renewal of faith in individual liberties was

60Pekarsky, ibid.
especially associated with the young who had experienced fully the prosperity of the Post War years with all of its economic and social ramifications. As such, children and youth, even more than Blacks, women, gays, the handicapped, or any of the diverse ethnic groups who had sought equality in the broader society, seemed to have gained a new position as a result of the social revolution.

By the end of the decade educators had to seek not just a theory of school discipline based on scientific theory, they had to find a theory or theories of discipline which would meet the new emphasis on individual liberties as well as the new image of the child. But above all else they had to find a method of discipline which would temper these new rights, privileges, and power of children in a society which more and more was faced with chaos, diversity, violence, and despair.
CHAPTER FIVE

CONTROL AND CONTAINMENT

Review of Theories and Assumed Practices Relating to Classroom Discipline and Their Relationship to General Historical Concerns: 1970's

THE AGE OF DESPAIR

This is a minor dark age.

Walter Lippmann, circa 1971

The eighth decade of this century found Americans preoccupied with overcoming the violence and social unrest that had characterized the previous decade. The upheavals and polarizations of the 1960's had not led to a complete revolution. Instead they led to fragmentation and despair. The violence and death of the "living room war," the Black protest marches of the South, the race riots of the cities, and the student protests marked a society in despair and out of control.

The year 1970 marked the last major protest demonstration with the tragic deaths of four students at Kent State University. That same year Richard Hofstadter in his "Reflections on Violence in the United States," was already predicting that the seventies would be marked by more immediate problems than the preoccupation with violence. And he was correct.

---


The military and psychological defeat resulting from the painfully slow withdrawal of American involvement coupled with the collapse of South Vietnam symbolized a failure of national purpose and weakening of the historic values that had welded Americans. As one frustrated veteran fumed, "It isn't peace. And there's no honor." ³

The oil embargo of 1973-74 and the rising national deficit reinforced the picture of a declining national strength. On a more personal level, Americans rated the fear of double-digit inflation as the nation's number one problem.⁴ The economic concerns were intimately linked with the Americans' awareness of the fragility of the ecosystem. It was increasingly recognized that the American way of life which had been based on unending resources and scientific advancement was finite and the inevitability of progress was not inevitable.

The Watergate affair only confirmed the nation's lack of confidence, not only in its political leaders, but in professional establishments generally, be they medicine, corporate business, the sciences, or education. The problem seemed to lay, not with individuals, but with "the system."

Both Walter Lippmann and Barbara Tuchman, writing at the beginning of the 1970's saw this time in terms of the "dark ages." Both, however, held out hope for the future. Tuchman found hope in the basic


⁴Carroll, ibid., p. 134.
faith that somehow, like our ancestors, we would "muddle through."
Lippmann thought that hope lay in solving the problem of the
"ungovernability of mankind;" man's only hope was to find a way to
govern himself.5

Even so, prompted by the ever growing dependence on commercial
television as the nation's major source of personal identification, as
well as entertainment and continuing education, the average American
retained his faith in "happiness through material consumption."6

VIOLENCE AND DESPAIR IN THE SCHOOLS

The United States is the clear leader among modern, stable
democratic nations in its rates of homicide, assault, rape,
and robbery, and it is at least among the highest in
incidence of group violence and assassination...It is
disfiguring our society-making fortresses of portions of our
cities and dividing our people into armed camps.

The National Commission on the
Causes and Prevention of Violence,
19707

The nation's preoccupation with violence was exaggerated in its
concern for the state of the schools. The topic of violence dominated
the literature on school discipline. As mentioned previously, by the
1970's the word discipline was rarely associated with ideals such as

5Barbara Tuchman, "History as Mirror," The Atlantic, 1973, 39-46;
Lippmann, op. cit., 593.

6Carroll, op. cit., p. 63.

7U. S. Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, To
Establish Justice, To Insure Domestic Tranquility; The Final Report
democratic living and self-discipline. It was more often equated with violence. The citing of the Gallup Poll's survey or a list of the number of murders, assaults, drop-outs, and suspensions were popular beginnings to many articles on discipline. Violence and vandalism were the key words in the 1975 Congressional Report on the status of the safety of schools.

Edward Wynne in his study of "steady long-range trends toward increasing disorder, anger, and despair among American adolescents" confirmed that laypersons used the term "discipline" to "articulate their sense that something [was] profoundly wrong with many children and adolescents." In brief, the literature of the seventies very often reflected a sense of things being "out of control." Dale Moffett, an elementary teacher from Maryland, best expressed this.
feeling when she ended her advice to fellow teachers on how to maintain classroom order by employing them not to "give up."\textsuperscript{10}

School violence had been an emerging problem since the early 1950's. F.B.I. reports indicated a steady increase of arrests of youths fifteen to eighteen years of age from 1953 to 1974. Retired teachers in Hawaii reflecting back on their years in teaching saw the fifties as a period of change in terms of discipline problems in some high schools. They indicated that there was an increase in student insubordination, lack of respect for authority, fighting, and the use of drugs.\textsuperscript{11} It was inevitable that juvenile crime would "invade school corridors." "The phenomenon of school violence continued to escalate in the early 1970's until it became a significant enough public issue to mandate Congressional investigation." The resulting Bayh Committee produced a series of studies on the extent of violence and vandalism in the schools, revealing "alarming statistics on

\textsuperscript{10}Dale Moffett, "All's Quiet on the Classroom Front...Or Is It?" Early Years, 9 (Feb. 1979), 56-57. Also see McGuire, "What Can We Do About Violence?" op. cit.; Dorothy Thompson, "Whose Boss These Days?" Instructor, 87 (Nov. 1977), 26; Thomas M. Donald, "Let's Talk Sense About Discipline," Clearing House, 50 (March 1977), 309-31; and Marilyn Whiteside, "School Discipline: The Ongoing Crisis," Clearing House, 49 (Dec. 1975), 160-162 on the problem of teachers' feelings of "hopelessness."

\textsuperscript{11}See Appendix A, pages 227-228 and 231-232. Some of these teachers moved from teaching high school to teaching in elementary schools to avoid these problems.
assaults, robberies, weapons, homicides, rapes, drugs, alcohol, drop-outs, and suspensions."12

The Safe School Act introduced in Congress in 1974 directed the National Institute of Education to undertake an in depth study of violence in the schools. The final report, Violent Schools-Safe Schools published in 1978 confirmed that the problem warranted serious attention. It also indicated, however, that even though violent acts in schools had rapidly increased through the 1960's and early 1970's they had leveled off by 1972. Francis Ianni pointed out that "despite research indications to the contrary, the public continues to believe that school crime is escalating at an alarming rate."13

12 Roger Bybee and E. Gordon Gee, Violence, Values, and Justice (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1982), pp. 101-102. Some of the reports which came out of this investigation include:


13 "Violence In the Schools, Symposium," Today's Education (1980), op. cit.. It is interesting to note that the majority of the writings in the professional literature on the problems of violence in the schools did not appear in the years of rapid change (the 1960's), but after the problem had become "established" and publicly recognized. In short, educators were writing about violence after the Bayh reports of the mid-seventies.
The long held faith that the school could serve as an agent of social control that had dominated the literature on school discipline for culturally deprived children in the sixties was now being broadened to a national concern, the control of all children and youth. The "problems" that in the 1960's had been associated with "urban ghetto schools" were now a concern throughout the country. As Bybee and Gee explain:

The percentage of schools affected by violence increases with community size. In rural areas 4 to 6 percent of schools are affected; in urban areas this increases to 15 percent. There is another way to view this problem: while the probability of a school's having a serious crime problem is higher in urban areas, the majority of schools with serious crime problems are in suburban and rural areas. Therefore, the problem includes all schools, not just those large schools in urban centers.14

It should also be remembered that the concern over school violence and vandalism was largely concentrated on high schools and junior high schools which are not the focus of this paper. Even so, this does not mean that elementary schools were not affected, either by the problem or by the proposed "solutions."

THE CRISIS IN SCHOOL DISCIPLINE

National polls one after another tell us that people are very concerned about the discipline in the schools. We have heard this message for one decade—not curriculum, not quality instruction, but discipline is what Americans say they care most about.

Ellen Jane Hollingsworth, 197915

14Bybee and Gee, op. cit., pp. 103-104.

The crisis in school discipline that caught the public's notice in the late seventies was not just a concern about increased violence and vandalism in the schools. As pointed out earlier, these problems had been growing concerns throughout the Post War years. And if the statistics of the Safe School Study are correct, the threat of violence in the schools had actually leveled off by the time the professional literature was addressing the problem.

The crisis in school discipline was, more precisely, the result of the impact of changing social needs on the philosophy and practices of school discipline. These changes affected all levels of institutionalized education from the very young to the university student. I shall, however, concentrate on the elementary school.

The first social change that affected school discipline was the abandonment of a single philosophical goal for the discipline of all children. The "new discipline" which had been associated with John Dewey was generally criticized for being too theoretical and not very practical. Retired teachers in Hawaii agreed with Dewey, but they felt that practical knowledge acquired from student teaching, supervisors, fellow teachers, and most of all from their own experience was much more important than the study of a philosophy of discipline.  

What the "new discipline" had provided was a frame of reference for what ought to be, a set of goals or ends which melded with the

---

16 See Appendix A, pages 201-205 and 223-226.
nation's idealized hopes. Self discipline for membership in a democratic society was clearly the goal of school discipline for all children. And an inherent faith in the human desire to learn was the ideal means to that goal.\textsuperscript{17} That is not to say that the idealized form of discipline was always achieved. As mentioned before, a major criticism of Dewey's philosophy was its perceived lack of direct practical application.

As we saw, the solution to this problem in the forties and fifties was two-fold. First, the teacher could improve his/her teaching skills by employing innumerable "tricks of the trade" on how to achieve classroom discipline which were shared in the professional literature. He/she could also resort to less than idealized forms of discipline such as punishment, rewards, or group coercion.

The second solution to a "discipline problem," as advocated by the mental hygienists, was to insure the mental, or emotional health of the child. This was essential for the present and for the future life of the child. The cause of that problem had to be found in order to resolve the problem. The cause of the child's problem, however, might be found in many sources. It might come from the immediate environment, i.e. the teacher or the class structure. It might come from the broader context of the home, family, or community. Or it could be inherent to the child himself. Ideally the plan was to find the source of the problem and resolve it. Again, reality did not always meet the ideal.

The important point is that the rhetoric of the ideal permeated the literature on school discipline. Educators in 1950 could clearly distinguish between what was considered good and poor discipline. That is not to say that general acceptance of any idea necessarily makes it right, but in a so called democratic society it is probably the best indicator of the validity of an idea. But rhetoric certainly does not guarantee that the ideal was achieved!

Ironically, it was the quest for equal rights by Blacks, the poor, and children within that same society that finally terminated the
emphasis on a philosophical theory of discipline based on membership for all in a democracy. The recognition of the rights of children of poverty was tempered by the fact that it was widely believed that the philosophy of discipline accepted in 1950 for all children was not applicable to these children of a different culture.

A parallel situation occurred as a result of the general societal change in the attitude toward children derived from the social unrest of the sixties and the Children's Rights Movement. The legal and moral rights of children were generally recognized. But, like the rights of the poor, the rights of children had to be tempered.

The crisis in school discipline was the conflict between the recognition of the new status of children, the increased emphasis on individuality, and the belief that children must be directly controlled at the present time for the sake of the larger society. The resolution to this crisis, at least as revealed in the professional literature, was sought by a merger of America's faith in two academic disciplines: the law and psychology.

DISCIPLINE BY LAW

Scarcely any political question arises in the United States which is not resolved, sooner or later into a judicial question.

de Tocqueville\textsuperscript{18}

The social revolution in the schools began in the courts and a reliance on judicial decisions steadily replaced America's former reliance on philosophy as the basis of determining school discipline policies and practices. A local educator recently defined the NEA's philosophy of discipline as: "Whatever is determined by the law." This shift from philosophy to law as the basis of school discipline illuminates the shift from a belief in a long term goal for school discipline to that of the immediate concern for the child and, most important, the immediate concerns of the adult society. The reliance on law has resulted in two significant changes in classroom practices which will be discussed in the following sections. First it has changed the relationship between the student and the educator. Second it has substituted a philosophical basis for discipline with a legal basis. The new basis of discipline is determined by courts and legislators, not educators.

THE CONFLICT MODEL

A tangled web of interactions—based on competing ideologies, rhetoric, intents, and purposes—characterize everyday life in the school. Cliques, factions, pressure groups, and circles of enemies daily compete for power and fate in these social worlds.

Norman K. Denzin, 1971

---

First, the reliance on legal interpretations of school discipline policy has changed the teacher-student relationship. As Pekarsky pointed out, the relationship of student to school and teacher was now equated with the relationship of citizen to state.

Before this change in the status of the child, the school was viewed from the perspective of either an authoritarian-paternalistic model, or, in the twentieth century, from a democratic model. The new relationship required that the school be viewed in terms of a conflict model. In such a model the goal of discipline policy became the equalization of power. 20

In this model the child and his/her parents were seen as in direct conflict with the educators. Justice systems, student advocacy, ombudsmen, and student involvement, as well as a reevaluation of what constituted acceptable behavior for an educational milieu, were all attempts to equalize power. 21 One result of this new formal, legal conflict model of discipline was a de-emphasis on teacher personality and teacher-student-group interpersonal relationships as the basis of student control. Control in the classroom was to be achieved through a balance of power. And the amount of power accorded both to the teacher and the child was to be determined by law.


The reliance on legal rights as it related to teacher personality is illustrated by the ideas of Andrew Robinson and Frank Bickel. They believed that the problem of school discipline lay in the inability to discriminate between a "real discipline problem" which is the infringement on the freedom of either the teacher or other class members and a "perceived discipline problem" in which "the teacher in a very real sense is the cause because he/she perceives a problem where in fact there actually is none."22 (emphasis added)

A second result of this formal, legal conflict model was the placing of power in the hands of the child in order to resolve the behavioral problems within the school. This action could be viewed simply as a means of stressing the importance of student responsibility. Retired teachers in Hawaii, most of whom had already left the profession by this period, had also ranked "a sense of responsibility" by students as the most important goal of classroom discipline.23 Child psychiatrists such as William Glasser and Rudolf Dreikurs emphasized the importance of children taking responsibility for their actions. The difference lay in the perception of responsibility.


23See Appendix A, pages 206-207.
By the 1970's student responsibility was viewed as a balance to student rights and freedom. This new perspective on responsibility and freedom for students might best be understood by contrasting it with the writings on freedom in the 1940's and 1950's. In those War and Post War years, "freedom" as discussed in the professional literature was seen as the outcome of self-discipline. Freedom could not be given, it could only be developed in a child by his/her own self-discipline. This philosophy fit well with a nation which was "fighting for freedom." Thirty years later, responsibility and freedom were viewed as separate phenomena which countered each other. A child's freedom was a given right, but must be tempered by responsibility.  

In its more complex form, the concept of the child taking responsibility for maintaining school discipline resulted in concrete displays of assuming control and power. Iris Schulman writing of her elementary school's concern for school discipline typifies the idea of children taking responsibility. Schulman writes that her school developed a survey among teachers, parents, and students to determine responsibility.

priorities. All agreed that the first priority was to eliminate the practice of urinating on the bathroom walls. It was, however, the children, who had to find the means by which this task was to be accomplished. The students' plan was to increase punishment with each offense, a method, it should be noted, diametrically opposed to the anti-punishment philosophy of much of the literature of the "new discipline."25

Herbert Kohl also advocated student responsibility in his example of a class trial to determine the guilt or innocence of two boys who had been accused of breaking a microscope. Kohl saw the trial as a lesson in the criminal justice system. He ignored, however, that the role of judge is traditionally associated with wisdom acquired by age and experience and that lawyers are not just good talkers and investigators, but the product of years of study. Kohl seems to have been quite comfortable giving these roles and responsibilities to his fifth graders.26

The recognition of the child as a controller added an important dimension in understanding school discipline. Verne Peters exhorted the ideas of Ray Becvar as a theory of human control. Becvar asserted that one could only change one's own behavior, and not another person's behavior, thus one must simply let other persons "be


26Herbert Kohl, "Crime and Punishment," Teacher, 97 (Jan. 1980), 8, and (May/June 1980), 12. These incidences should be contrasted with the idea of students simply helping to set classroom rules.
themselves." Peters applied this new insight to his classroom management procedures by the teacher simply leaving the room when he felt he was "losing control." Thus the students could "be themselves" and he could "be himself." Richard Kindsvatter thought this perspective was the key to understanding the historic discipline dilemma when he wrote "in the final analysis the students determine their own behavior....Therefore the unruly conduct of students is a possibility the teacher constantly lives with." Discipline for both of these men was seen as simply the act of balancing the power and the control of the student and the educator. The professional literature generally reflected the belief that this distribution of power and control was best determined by the law, or as we shall see, at least by well defined rules.

RULES

[T]he principal shall meet with his/her faculty at the beginning of the school year...for the purpose of presenting and discussing with the faculty the guidelines for student behavior.... A copy of the guidelines will be given to each teacher, student, and parent(s).

Hawaii State Teachers Agreement, 1973-1987

---


29State of Hawaii Board of Education and Hawaii State Teachers Association, Agreement Between, July 1, 1985 - June 30, 1987, pp. 85-86. Original date of implementation of this article provided by Joan Husted of the Hawaii State Teachers Association.
The reliance on written rules constituted the second major change resulting from the new legal basis of discipline. Written rules were seen as the best way to formalize and balance the power relationship within the school. Previous to the new emphasis on the legal basis for disciplinary practices educators had been hesitant to place too great a reliance on rules. Thelma Macon's advice to teachers in 1962 was to have few rules, but to make sure they were enforced. Myrtle Gustafson had made her only classroom rule to simply show "courtesy and respect." The lack of importance attached to written rules before the 1970's reflected a general consensus and a mutual understanding and acceptance of behavioral standards. School board policies, as opposed to specific rules and consequences, were popular in the first three quarters of this century. Howard Spaulding had advocated written policies by the school board, but their worth, as he had seen it, was ultimately dependent on the integrity of the superintendent.

With the impact of the Student Rights Movement general policies seemed inadequate. First, they were inadequate because they were not specific enough. In 1979 Ellen Jane Hollingsworth cited a good code

---

30 Thelma Christy Macon, "Classroom Control," *School and Community*, 49 (Sept. 1962), 7.

31 Myrtle Gustafson, from Questionaire to Retired Teachers.

as one such as developed for the Pennsylvania Department of Education
which itemized specific unacceptable behavior, distinguished them by
seriousness and outlined the range of penalties.\textsuperscript{33} Robert Andree was
even more specific in wanting to establish a central core of criminal
acts within the school thus removing the power of the educator from
being both "prosecutor and detective."\textsuperscript{34}

Second, school board policies were inadequate because they were
written by educators who held too great a discretionary power and who
were too concerned with order and their own sense of power and
authority.\textsuperscript{35} Joseph Licata tied the problem of school discipline
directly to the question of conflict of power within the school.
Licata related how the authority "system" was used by the student in
what he termed "brinkmanship" to undermine the authority of the school
and still avoid negative sanctions. It was the rule system itself,
according to Licata that created the power play between the student
and the teacher.\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{33}Jane Ellen Hollingsworth, "Exploring Remedies From Within,"
Education and Urban Society, 11 (August 1979), 515.

\textsuperscript{34}Robert Andree, "Delinquents and the Law," Clearing House 43
(Nov. 1968), 131-134. George Barbour cautioned teachers on developing
codes which could be declared unconstitutional, "Dealing With
Discipline: The Erie Program," Pennsylvania School Journal, 124 (March
1976), 115-116.

\textsuperscript{35}Chesler, Crawford, and Bryant, "Organizational Context of
School Discipline," op. cit., 497; and Michael Manley-Casmir,
1-2 (1977-1978), 84-100.

\textsuperscript{36}Joseph Licata, "Student Brinkmanship and School Structure,"
Educational Forum, 42 (March 1978), 345-350.
The apparent answer to this problem as expressed in the literature was to have specific rules which were written and formally agreed to by the students. As Conners wrote in reaction to the increased influence of the courts in school discipline:

Written rules are powerful means of controlling student discipline...even in elementary schools... [The] courts will be very reluctant to strike down a rule if it was created by the students themselves. 37

Daniel Duke saw the "crisis in discipline" as essentially the result of ineffective and inconsistent practices connected with rules. Although he did not call for more rules, he did advocate that students participate in their making. 38

Closely related to the emphasis on rules was the growing use of another "legal" procedure, contracts. Richard Churwin derived the ultimate "fair" legal system for establishing school disciplinary procedures. Churwin advocated a social contract within the classroom based on three kinds of rules: teachers' rules for students, students' rules for the teacher, and students' rules for themselves. The rules were to incorporate a hierarchy of positive and negative consequences. The contract was then to be placed on a one month trial basis and the students were to be given an examination on the contents


of the rules and the contract. At the end of the month the contract was apparently renegotiated and made complete.39

The reliance on legal contracts and rules was also advocated as a means for teachers to gain power. The most popular method was for teachers to negotiate in their union contracts for actions and policies that would improve the climate of discipline, or more particularly teacher control, in the classroom. These ranged from committees for studies and recommendations to listing specific offenses and types of punishments. From the teacher's perspective, however, the recommendations for factors contributing to classroom discipline were so interrelated with other aspects of the educational process as to be difficult to delineate. Even so, some teachers did feel that discipline codes would equally assure teacher "command in the classroom."40

Ironically, the two most criticized practices of school discipline in terms of children's rights did not significantly change as a result of the emphasis on the legal rights of children: the denial of the


right to education as a result of suspension from school, and more important to our concern with the elementary school age child, the utilization of corporal punishment.

THE LAST RESORT

As for inflicting punishments, even upon the meanest and worst of children, it should ever be the most unwilling piece of work that a master can take in hand; and therefore, he should not be hasty to punish any fault whereof the scholar has not been premonished, except it be such a notorious crime as a boy can not but know beforehand that he ought not to have done it.

Charles Hoole
English Schoolmaster, 1659

The Supreme Court decision Brown vs. The Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas, in 1954, calling for desegregation of the schools was based largely on the importance of education in our modern society. The opportunity to education, said Chief Justice Earl Warren, "is the right which must be made available to all on equal terms." The confirmation of the right to education, as opposed to the older assumption that education was a privilege, changed attitudes as well as disciplinary practices. In its new status as a right, education


could not be denied an individual without due process of law.\footnote{John E. Glenn, "Schools Role in Control of Pupils Dress and Conduct," \textit{New York State Education}, 53 (Dec. 1965), 19.}

One of the most widely discussed changes stemming from the Children's Rights Movement was the re-examination of the well established and generally accepted practice of student suspensions.\footnote{For an example of the acceptance of suspension as a beneficial means of discipline see Roger Chapman, "School Suspension as Therapy," \textit{Personnel and Guidance Journal}, 40 (April 1962), 731-732.} According to a 1975 Supreme Court decision the removal of a student from school constituted a denial of the child's right to an equal education and therefore could not be implemented without right to due process.\footnote{Goss \textit{vs.} Lopez 419 U S 565 (1975) and Wood \textit{vs.} Strickland 73-1285 (1975). Also see John Walden, "Administrators Liability in Pupil Discipline Cases," \textit{National Elementary School Principal}, 54 (July 1975), 104-106. Also Jonathan Howe on special rights of handicapped children against suspension, "How to Discipline Handicapped Kids," \textit{American School Board Journal}, 167 (Feb, 1980), 20.}

The legal complexities implied in such a decision gave impetus to a search for alternatives, remedies, and disciplinary practices. These alternatives included special counseling, behavior modification programs, reward incentives, time out rooms, and a host of other plans. The most popular "solutions," however, were the creation of "alternative" schools and in-school suspensions. In addition to skirting the legal requirements of due process implied in a formal suspension, alternative schools and in-school suspensions helped maintain daily attendance counts which were critical in determining
most school funding in a period of declining school enrollments. In addition, as pointed out by Senator Birch Bayh, alternative schools and in-school suspensions helped protect the community from vandalism and crimes committed by students not in the schoolhouse.46 The highest priority remained immediate control of children and youth for the immediate "good" of the general community, even if that control resulted in greater restrictions on children and youth in the name of legal rights.

It should be added, however, that by 1980, according to Francis and Elizabeth Ianni, suspensions were still the most common action taken even though few felt that they were effective.47 In addition, the wisdom of the new solutions were also being questioned. Ellen Jane Hollingsworth was concerned that we were diverting students into programs which we had no means of assessing.48 Similarly, David Wiles and Edward Rockoff compared in-school suspensions to prison hospitals


which were both non-rehabilitative and in conflict with the goals of education.49

School suspension, however, as a means of controlling students has been largely a concern of junior and senior high schools. For example, a study of suspensions in Milwaukee Public Schools reported only 15 to 20% of the suspensions were in elementary schools.50 Very often when suspensions did occur with young children they were not "official." Speaking of his ideal plan for school discipline, Roland Barth referred to "keeping the child home" as he did not like to use the word "suspension."51

More important, young children were seen as smaller and weaker and therefore easier to control.52 Thus the ultimate control or punishment employed with younger children had not been suspension but corporal punishment. A survey in Pittsburg reported that the highest incidence of corporal punishment was in grades one through four.53 A 1974 survey in California found that 95% of the corporal punishment


52Barth, ibid.

punishment cases occurred below the high school level. Historically corporal punishment of school children has been viewed as the "last resort." Even the early Puritan fathers who have been best remembered for their belief in not "sparing the rod" were probably much less prone to its use than is commonly believed. In like manner, nineteenth century American school children were viewed as subject to much less physical punishment relative to their English counterparts.

Many felt that with the coming of the so called "new discipline" in the twentieth century corporal punishment would soon be a relic of the past. Throughout the post war years there was a continual protest against any form of physical punishment as being demeaning, a sign of weakness, and having secondary effects on the child. The debate for and against corporal punishment has been going on for centuries, and although one might argue that there has been milder punishment inflicted on children in this century, others would argue

54 Adah Maurer, "All in the Name of the 'Last Resort': The Abuse of Children in American Schools, Inequality in Education, No. 23 (Sept. 1978), 22.


differently. Strong opponents of corporal punishment, such as Adah Maurer, argue that the assumption that corporal punishment is used "rarely" and as a "last resort" is only a "dearly held illusion."\textsuperscript{58} As a recent \textit{Science News} article pointed out, there simply is not any proof on either side.\textsuperscript{59} Likewise, it is not the purpose of this paper to debate the pros and cons of the issue, but to reflect the changing trends and ideas. The general guidelines, however, at least in the literature, have been that corporal punishment should be a last resort and that it should be administered without anger or any display of emotion.\textsuperscript{60}

The ambivalent feeling of not entirely advocating corporal punishment and yet not wanting to give up the right to employ it has been reflected in teacher surveys. A 1956 survey showed that only 77% of the teachers believed they should have the authority to administer

\textsuperscript{58}Maurer, "Last Resort," op cit., p. 21.


corporal punishment even though 86% of them already had that right.\textsuperscript{61} In like vein, a 1968 survey in Pittsburgh showed that 60% of the teachers had hit a child at least once during the year and that the same percentage felt that they should have the right to use corporal punishment at their own discretion. At the same time, the teachers' lack of confidence in the benefits of corporal punishment was revealed in the fact that 66% of them felt that teachers needed training in "more effective ways of dealing with problem children."\textsuperscript{62} A 1974 survey found only 55 to 65% of the school officials advocating "corporal punishment as an effective technique."\textsuperscript{63} Mary Levine concluded from her survey of teachers in Indiana that teachers were becoming more humane. Even though only one-third of the teachers opposed corporal punishment, 46% approved it only in case of bodily assault.\textsuperscript{64} My own survey of retired teachers indicated that they found physical punishment of any kind to be the least effective means of classroom discipline.\textsuperscript{65}

The Supreme Court 5-4 split decision of 1977 [\textit{Ingraham vs. Wright}, 97 S Ct. 1401 (1977)] reflected the same ambivalence about the question

\textsuperscript{61}"Opinion Poll," \textit{Nation's Schools}, 58 (July 1956), 57-58.

\textsuperscript{62}Hyman and Wise, \textit{Corporal Punishment}, op. cit., p. 12.

\textsuperscript{63}Hyman and Wise, ibid., p. 17.

\textsuperscript{64}Mary Ann Levine, "Are Teachers Becoming More Humane?" \textit{Phi Delta Kappan}, 59 (Jan. 1978), 353.

\textsuperscript{65}See Appendix A, pages 210-211 and 213. In contrast to this opinion Hawaii teachers opposed the 1974 regulation that made Hawaii one of the few states which completely forbade corporal punishment.
of corporal punishment in the schools. It declared that corporal punishment did not constitute cruel and unusual punishment, even though the justices did add that the severity of the punishment might constitute child abuse and thereby violate some state statutes. 66 Unlike suspension, the high court ruled that no formal due process was necessary before inflicting punishment on a child, but it did provide for some general guidelines on due process which reflected the same general attitude toward punishment that had been most common in the literature on discipline. As delineated by Conners the following due process drawn from Baker vs. Owen 423 U S 907 (1976) was affirmed by the Supreme Court in Ingraham vs. Wright: 1. Corporal punishment, generally, should not be used in a first offense. 2. The students should be aware of what misbehaviors could lead to corporal punishment. 3. Another adult witness should be present during the administration of corporal punishment. 4. The student should be told (in front of an adult witness) the reason for the punishment. 5. Upon request, the disciplinarian should inform the student's parents of the reasons for such punishment. 67

One might draw two observations from a comparison of the different reactions to the practices of suspension and corporal punishment. First, it appears that the Children's Rights Movement, at least as it applied to the ultimate school control procedures, produced little change in the status or attitude toward young children in terms of

66 Conners. op. cit., p. 12.

67 Conners, ibid., p. 10.
according them more legal rights.

Second, one could also conclude that the guaranteeing of the rights of children and youth was not nearly as critical a concern as controlling them. The "solutions" to expulsion and suspension from school, i.e., alternative schools and in-school suspensions, provided even more restraints upon the student in terms of having to remain within the structure of the school for the protection of society, nor with all the studies and admonitions did the use of suspensions decline.

SUMMARY

Law as expressed in court decisions and formalized rules established the framework and guidelines within which the teacher and students were to function within the school and the classroom. As we saw, the emphasis on law as the basis of school discipline did not necessarily change behavior toward children. Nor did it provide a theory of discipline.

The shift from philosophy to law as the guide to discipline meant a shift from viewing classroom discipline from a perspective of what ought to be to a perspective of what could be done or what was "allowable" by the teacher, the school, and the student. Unlike philosophy, this reliance on law as the cornerstone of school discipline did not provide a structure on which to build theory and practice. It only set the limits of behavior within the schoolhouse. For an answer to how discipline was to be achieved in the classroom we must return to the field of psychology.
In theory, we already know what good education is. We have all the concepts. Unfortunately, we cannot educate children on conceptions. Children present problems which do not disappear, even when the teacher believes in democracy, love, respect, acceptance, individual differences and personal uniqueness. They are like a thousand-dollar bill—good currency, but useless in meeting mundane needs such as buying a cup of coffee, taking a cab, or making a phone call. For daily life, one needs coins. For classroom commerce, teachers need psychological small change.

Haim Ginott, 1972

With the new emphasis on social diversity and individuality, it was generally recognized that the search for a single theory of school discipline was futile. The end of consensus in national objectives was reflected in the literature on discipline by a decline in long term social and moral objectives. A review of the professional journal articles after 1965 revealed a marked decline in concern for the importance of character development and self-discipline for a democratic society.

The long held assumption that there was an inseparable relationship between united social goals, moral teachings, and the disciplinary practices of teachers in the classroom no longer seemed vital. Daniel Duke pointed out that by the late sixties there was no agreement on national priorities either among professionals or the public. Priorities shifted from a concern for student unrest, then to a concern for violence, and eventually to a concern for unproductive "off task behavior." Similarly, principals, teachers, and students disagreed as to which behavior problems were the most serious. "Self-interest," he wrote, "seems to dictate the priorities, as administrators rank absenteeism, teachers rank disrespect and classroom disruption, and students rank fighting and theft as their 'most serious' concerns." With the increasing emphasis on individual liberties, the schools, wrote Donald Flicker, could not stress social values, but must instead give the "tools to determine social values."

In the place of discussions of the purpose of discipline, the means of immediate control became the most crucial issue in the professional literature not only for children of the ghetto as we saw in the sixties, but for all children. By 1979 Eric Haralson reflected this emphasis on immediate control in his definition of discipline as the "sum of all decisions and actions school people take to maintain

---


some semblance of institutional order and continuity through the school day and year." 72 Even in the early sixties Donald Willower was seeing control as having a higher priority among junior high school teachers than instructional objectives. 73

By the late 1970's what "worked" was clearly the criteria of evaluation of classroom discipline theory. 74 Haim Ginott whose Teacher and Child was a best selling book on discipline and teacher-student relationships balked at the former emphasis on theoretical understanding. "At the moment of truth," he wrote, "only skills save." 75 Within the limits imposed by the law, control within the school became an end in itself.

The old "tricks of the trade" that teachers had shared continued to be viewed with disdain. However the only scientific theory of discipline, behavior modification, as pointed out by Hilgard, had not met the needs of the educators either. Something else was needed beyond theory, but something more scientific and professional than


73Donald Willower and Ronald Jones, "When Pupil Control Becomes an Institutional Theme," Phi Delta Kappan, 45 (Nov. 1963), 107-109. In a later study Willower ranked educators in terms of their control ideology and elementary teachers were found to be just slightly less concerned about custodial care as opposed to interpersonal relations than were secondary school principals, "Counselor and the School as a Social Organization," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 46 (Nov. 1967), 228-234.


75Ginott, op. cit., p. 38.
just teacher tricks, common sense, and "firm, fair, and consistent."
By the early seventies the race was on to fill this gap. The next ten
years saw a Pandora's box of "how to discipline" books emerge from
which teachers and educators could pick and choose.

As we have seen, the literature on discipline before 1965 was a
mixture of philosophical thoughts on the aims of discipline interposed
with teachers "tricks of the trade" and theories on the psychological
needs of the child to assure his/her mental and emotional well being.
The late fifties and sixties found educators searching for a
scientific theory of discipline. With the recognition of the limits
of a single theory of discipline educators sought other means of
achieving classroom control. By the seventies the search for a
scientific theory of school discipline gave way to a myriad of
"strategies of discipline" usually devised by educational
psychologists or psychiatrists. Daniel Duke described the era as one
in which

the attention and skills of both researchers and
practitioners and the resources of school systems,
governments, and private foundations [were] trained on a
pervasive social concern...student behavior.76

The application of disciplinary systems for the immediate control
of children in the classroom and amenable to the individual concerns
and needs of educationists, school boards, researchers, parents,
principals, and most of all teachers and children became ends in
themselves. The key words in the professional literature on school

discipline were "behavioral control," "classroom management," as well as "violence."

During the 1970's, according to John Taylor and Richard Usher, at least thirteen different popular discipline "strategies" were developed and introduced to teachers via books, journal and magazine articles, college courses, and in-service workshops. Taylor and Usher delineate those "strategies" which they say lie between the two extremes of "no control" and "complete control." The former, they say, was best represented by A. S. Neill in his book, Summerhill. The later is best represented by the use of drug therapy. 77

Taylor and Usher place their thirteen strategies of "normal discipline" on a continuum from lesser to greater control. 78 Another way to view these strategies is in terms of communication skills versus direct behavioral control, although these are not always clearly separated as we shall see. [See chart 5.1, page 164.]

Let me briefly review some of these strategies:

77Drugs have become an increasingly popular method of student control, and their use should not be ignored. But their use, at least in theory, has been confined to children who have been "diagnosed" as having a physical or mental disability, and therefore does not fall within the range of "normal disciplinary procedures." Since the purpose of this writing is to discuss the professional literature on "discipline" which ignores the use of drugs it is not included in this study. For a discussion of the impact of this trend see Peter Schrag and Diane Divoky, The Myth of the Hyperactive Child and Other Means of Child Control (New York: Pantheon Books, 1975) and James J. Bosco and Stanley S. Robins, eds., The Hyperactive Child and Stimulant Drugs (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979).

1. Beginning with the least controlling strategy, the Self-Concept approach suggests that conduct and achievement were best improved as a result of a more healthy and positive self-concept. The teacher should be trained in listening skills, especially listening for feelings, and should engage in activities that enhance the child's self-concept.

2. Closely allied to the self-concept approach was Haim Ginott's communication theory. Opposed to punishment, Ginott, like the mental hygienists before him, called for firm limit setting on behavior, but not on feelings.

3. Rudolph Dreikurs' *Natural and Logical Consequences* was based on the psychoanalytic school of Alfred Adler. Misbehavior, according to Dreikurs, occurs because a child has developed faulty beliefs about himself/herself. The teacher should help the child work through the faulty belief and use natural and/or logical consequences for misbehavior, thus stressing individual responsibility.

4. The fourth approach of discipline listed by Taylor and Usher was Values Clarification. According to this approach, misbehavior is the result of unclear values or a conflict in values by the student. Strategies of value clarification include games, structured communication, and questioning skills which help the student clarify his own values.

5. Like Ginott's method, Thomas Gordon's *Teacher Effectiveness Training* was a communication model. It stressed active listening by the teacher and responding to the feelings and content of behavior. It also stressed responsibility or what Gordon calls the "ownership of the problem," as well as negotiation and problem solving.

6. Also employing communication skills was Transactional Analysis. Based on Eric Berne's popular book, *Games People Play*, TA attempted to explain how teachers get hooked into playing games. TA emphasized that teachers should stay in the rational thinking Adult Ego State in order to maintain the classroom.

7. One of the most popular, and one of the earliest, models in the professional literature was William Glasser's Reality Therapy which was first published in 1965. Schools, according to Glasser,
should attempt to eliminate student failure, and increase student involvement, relevance, and thinking. Glasser gave ten steps to discipline in the classroom.

8. The National Teachers Association's approach, called LEAST is an acronym for the five steps to discipline: L- Leave it alone. E- End the action. A- Attend more fully. S- Spell out directions. T- Track the students progress.

9. Project TEACH developed in 1976 was an eclectic approach that combined skills in behavior modification, verbal and non-verbal communication skills, assertiveness, and natural and/or logical consequences.

10. Assertive Discipline developed by Lee Canter emphasized teacher control. Canter used systematic behavior modification principles which involved the writing of names on the board as a means of negative reinforcement and placing marbles in a jar as a means of positive reinforcement.

11. Taylor and Usher also listed Behavior Modification as one of the thirteen approaches. They add that it was not really an intact system as were the others.

12. Like Canter, James Dobson's Dare to Discipline named the teacher as the "locus of control." He told teachers that they should be the BOSS from the first day to prevent children testing limits.

13. Somewhat similar to the basic tenets of Dreikurs and Values Clarification, Albert Ellis' Rational Emotive Education asserted that student behavior was contingent on the teacher being able to help the student change his/her irrational beliefs into more rational ones. Then the student would exhibit better behavior.
Daniel Duke, an educational researcher in the field of school discipline, voiced three major concerns about what had happened since the mid-1960's concerning the search for a theory of school discipline.80 His first concern was the lack of widespread agreement among educational researchers on "ways to manage classrooms, prevent behavior problems, or coordinate school discipline." Duke cited as an example the split between those theories which upheld the use of punishment and those which stressed communication between teacher and student and thus down-played the utility of punishment.81

Duke's second concern is more important to our understanding of the historical shift in school discipline. With all of the research and study that had gone into the problem of school discipline in the last quarter of a century, not only did researchers not agree on how to achieve classroom discipline, but they did not even agree on what they were trying to achieve. Educational researchers, or at least the "developers of classroom management approaches," as Duke called them, "even disagree on the primary goals of classroom management." The

80Besides those strategies listed by Taylor and Usher, Duke and Jones categorized the following classroom management approaches into "models," "paradigms," and "systems:

MODELS: Reality Therapy; Logical Consequences; Teacher Effectiveness Training; Assertive Discipline
PARADIGMS: Behavior Modification; School Effectiveness; Teacher Effectiveness; The Quality of School Life
SYSTEMS: ITIP; Project TEACH; Systematic Management Plan for School Discipline; Comprehensive Classroom Management.
See Duke and Jones, op. cit., 27.

81Duke and Jones, ibid., 29.
absence of consensus concerning the goals of classroom management," said Duke, poses problems for educators interested in coordinating school discipline and eliminating inconsistency. Some approaches seek to minimize the likelihood of irresponsible student behavior. Others strive to maximize the likelihood of responsible student behavior, while still others focus on responses to disruptive behavior. The strategies required to achieve one may be quite different from those necessitated by the other. 82

Duke's third major concern was the growing commercialization of and competition among developers of "packaged approaches," to discipline. The most important motivation for the development of these "packaged approaches" was to simplify discipline practices for the classroom teacher. 83

The classroom teacher no longer had to be concerned with the complex philosophical and psychological questions surrounding school discipline. Simple, systematized answers could be purchased in a book, a workshop, or a university classroom.

These "discipline packages" constituted a system of classroom control which usually consisted of a series of precise chronological steps laid out for the teacher to follow to achieve control of the children in his/her classroom. As early as 1962 Russell Harrison had called for a list of exact procedures for new teachers in case of discipline problems much as a school prepared for an emergency fire

82 Duke and Jones, loc. cit.

83 Duke and Jones, loc. cit.
Ten years later the most popular "step system," at least as reflected in the literature, was William Glasser's ten steps. Step one was to make a list of what you are going to do with the child. Step two was to analyze the list. Step three was to show the child that he/she is special, but to stay calm and persistent in your behavior toward him/her. Step four comes in when there is a specific problem. The teacher is to ask the child, "What are you doing?" When the teacher gets an answer, he/she is to say "Please stop it." Step five continues the questioning, "Is that against the rule?" What should you be doing?" Step six is a repeat of step five to which the phrase "We will have to work this out" is added. Then the student and the teacher are to make a short term plan on how to solve the problem. If that does not work then step seven involves sending the child to "time out." Failing that, step eight is an "in school suspension," but again the student is given the opportunity to return to class when he/she has written a plan. Steps nine and ten are the old stand-bys suspension and expulsion. The teacher behavior was not new, but it was systematized for control.

Lee Canter's Assertive Discipline involved only four steps and seems to have evolved from the old teacher technique of writing the names of misbehaving children on the board with particular sequential

---


steps for each mark beside the name.86

The LEAST system described earlier was developed by R. R. Carkhuff and A. H. Griffin under the auspices of the NEA. They used its acronym to give the teacher a mnemonic crutch to help him/her remember what to do to solve a discipline problem. LEAST was surely the ultimate fire drill plan.87

By the late seventies Frederic Jones had developed a four step system of discipline, but those four steps were so detailed as to give the teacher exact instructions as to how to place his/her hands, mouth, and feet, as well as exactly what to say and with what intonation.88

These writings were not void of theory in terms of their authors' beliefs about human behavior. Many of them had well defined theories of discipline just as Edward Ladd had called for in 1959. It was not, however, the theory of discipline that was critical, it was the system. In the final analysis practitioners as well as researchers did not concern themselves with the underlying assumptions of these theories. Instead, they were first of all concerned with whether the system worked. A local teacher exemplified this attitude when she

shared her "philosophy of discipline" with me. "I use assertive discipline. I don't know where it came from, but it works." Despite the profusion of workshops, conferences, and literature, few teachers were ever "systematically trained" in any one classroom model or system.\(^{89}\) Nor was there any scientific proof that any one system or model was more effective than another. In addition, it was felt that because of the differences among students, schools, teachers, subjects, and grade levels no one approach was appropriate at all times and with all students, even by a single teacher.

By 1980 teachers were being encouraged to pick and choose from the various approaches to create their own eclectic system of school discipline.\(^{90}\) By telling teachers to simply pick and choose what worked discipline practices became completely divorced from any general social purpose or goal. In reality a child within a single school could have a teacher in the first grade who practiced the communication skills of Haim Ginott, only to move to a second grade teacher who employed behavior modification with one child and Dreikur's logical consequences with the rest of the class, and so on throughout his/her school life.

An argument could be made that what had happened was that teachers were simply continuing to utilize the same old "tricks-of-the-trade"

---

\(^{89}\)Duke and Jones, op. cit., 30.

that dominated the earlier professional literature on school discipline. However, an important difference exists between 1940 and 1980. In 1940 the "tricks-of-the-trade" were simply means to an end. The long range goal or social purpose of discipline of full membership and responsibility in a democratic society, whether achieved or not, was still the expressed purpose of school discipline. School discipline was part of the general aim of society, and children had a place in that society, or more particularly they were preparing for a place in that society.

In contrast, the implementation of systems meant a replacement of means over ends. Teachers after the sixties were encouraged to choose "what worked." And if different systems worked for different children, one must assume that there were different goals and different expectations for those children, or perhaps more accurately, there were no recognized goals and expectations for those children.
INTRODUCTION

My original purpose in undertaking this study was to use the history of school discipline as a vehicle for understanding changing attitudes toward children. Upon completion of the historical research presented in the preceding four chapters I was faced with two somewhat overwhelming questions: 1. What was the pattern of events and perspectives in our society that resulted in the shift in the professional literature from an emphasis on ends to an emphasis on means? 2. What does this study of the professional literature tell us about children in our society?

To find the answers to these questions it seemed only reasonable to begin with an analysis of the use of the term control as it has been applied to the education and discipline of American school children. As we shall see, the question that then developed was: How does this picture of control fit (or not fit) into the general historiography of attitudes toward children? The answer was that the general historiography of children was not supportive of the historical picture presented by the professional literature on school discipline. My quest to find the reasons for this contradiction led me to search out the general underlying pattern of change in the period 1940 to 1980.
The explanation for this contradiction seemed to be found, at least in part, in the change in the dominating characteristics of American society from that of a producer society to that of a consumer society. It was the growing assurance of economic prosperity in the post war years that increasingly became translated into the "true" meaning of democracy. The ideals of the Kennedy era in the sixties were based as much on the belief that continued economic growth could be guaranteed as they were on a faith in political and social equality. And, ironically, it was the raised doubts of prosperity with increased inflation and unemployment in the seventies that brought the greatest sense of despair to the American people. As we saw in the preceding chapters, the answers to the nation's economic concerns, as well as to the social and political uncertainties increasingly became a reliance on acquisition and consumption of material goods. My process of analysis and rationale for my conclusions are presented in this remaining chapter.

SCHOOL DISCIPLINE AND SOCIAL CONTROL

The schooling of the young is a long-headed device to promote order.

Edward A. Ross, 1901

Throughout this study I have equated school discipline with control. The construction of this equation raised several questions.

What is the purpose of the control? Who is being controlled? Who or what is the controller? What are the methods and means of control? And how have the answers to these questions changed over time? The question to address is "what is the purpose of the control?"

Hopefully, in answering this critical question, we shall also address the other questions.

Control in the most positive sense is the process of bringing about order. The word "control" brings forth negative images only when associated with specific means, i.e., inflicting pain, or more important, specific ends. If we are to understand America's changing attitudes toward children as revealed through a study of school discipline, we must first analyze the relationship between school disciplinary practices and the objectives of those practices.

The critical issue in our discussion of school discipline is the relationship between control for the general long term benefit of society and the immediate short term control of children in the day to day basis for order and structure in the classroom. Historically these have been seen as interrelated, one supporting the other. Conformity to the standards of the classroom meant a benefit for the child, the teacher, and most of all, a long term benefit for society. This was true, at least in theory, if not always in practice. The seventeenth century Puritan teacher or parent could take up the birch stick against a child with the hope that not only might the child behave better in the short term, but more important, the act might well contribute to the child's soul resting in Heaven instead of Hell.
The link between the long term and short term objectives of school discipline became even more critical with the rise of democracy and rule by the majority. Horace Mann in the nineteenth century could reluctantly condone the use of physical punishment by teachers because of the importance society attached to equality of opportunity for all students no matter what their background. "Now all these dispositions," he wrote in 1845,

which do not conflict with right more than they do with each other, as soon as they cross the threshold of the schoolroom, from the different worlds, as it were, of homes, must be made to obey the same general regulations, to pursue the same studies, and to aim at the same results.²

Mann recognized that punishment must, however, never be for the immediate end of control alone. Closing his treatise on punishment, Mann emphasized the long range objective of any disciplinary action:

[T]he object of school is to prepare for the duties of after-life, it follows that the school is made for the world, and not the world for the school; and hence, however much any course may seem to promote the present good appearance or intellectual advancement of the school, yet, if it tends to defeat the welfare of the future men and women, composing the school, its adoption is shortsighted and suicidal.³ (emphasis added)

Fifty years later John Dewey and the progressives were still directly concerned with achieving long term social objectives through school discipline. Their methods, however, were more sophisticated, and more covert than were those of Horace Mann's. They hoped to

³Mann, "Lecture VII," ibid, p. 367.
achieve a stable, but progressive, society through the use of community membership and the teaching of self-discipline in the schools. Dewey and the progressives supported this philosophy as the best way to maintain social order in a rapidly changing urban industrial society.\textsuperscript{4} The progressive educational sociologist, Charles Horton Cooley in 1918 explained the relationship between the means of self-discipline and the ends of societal control:

Since the school environment is comparatively easy to control, here is the place to create an ideal formative group, or systems of groups, which shall envelop the individual and mold his growth, a model society by assimilation to which he may become fit to leave the rest of his life. Here if anywhere we can insure his learning loyalty, discipline, service, personal address, and democratic co-operation, all by willing practice in the fellowship of his contemporaries.\textsuperscript{5}

Although not so readily apparent, even the discipline theories of the 1940's and early 1950's which stressed emotional security and democratic group living were intimately linked to maintaining a social order which stressed adjustment to a society which had reached its golden era as economic, military, and social leader of the free world.

Within the American democratic society the short term and long term objectives of disciplinary practices in the schools have traditionally been directly linked to the long range societal need for social order


and maintenance. Barry Franklin emphasized that public education in America has long been an instrument of social control, adding however, that Americans since 1930 have been hesitant to look at the school in such a way. As part of the liberal American tradition we as a people have been especially uncomfortable with the idea of overt control.  

This historical pattern of relating school discipline to the long term goal of social order has become marked by change in recent American history. As shown in this study the post 1950's witnessed a shift in emphasis in disciplinary theory from general social control as a long term objective of the school to emphasis on the immediate control of children. As the review of the literature on school discipline revealed, the search for a practical theory of discipline shifted in focus from an emphasis on purpose to a search for means. This shift in disciplinary objectives marked a distinct change in society's attitude toward children and the role of children in that society.

To better understand this change and to place it in historical perspective, I shall first contrast three different historical periods which have been generally accepted in the historiography of childhood. Then I shall propose a reinterpretation of these periods which I believe to be more realistic and more in keeping with the history of school discipline.

---

THREE PERIODS OF CHILDHOOD: AN HISTORICAL MISCONCEPTION

Family and school together removed the child from adult society.

Philippe Aries, 1960

In 1960 the French historian Philippe Aries published L'Enfant et La Vie Familiale Sous L'Ancien Regime. Aries' work was translated into English as Centuries of Childhood (1962) and helped to revolutionize thinking about children, especially American children. Aries' thesis was that before the seventeenth century traditional Western society's concept of the child as we perceive it today did not exist. As Aries explained:

Society before the year 1700 concerned itself little with the child, even with the adolescent. "Childhood" was a period when the child could not yet provide for himself. Once the child reached the age of seven to nine years, he found himself among adults, participating in their work and in their games. Education, the transmission of values and of knowledge, was supplied and supervised not by the family but rather by the system of apprenticeship. The child quickly withdrew from his parents into a larger group and learned by helping adults do what had to be done—even if it meant going to war.

This period before 1700 was also the least concerned with finding effective ways of disciplining children, especially school children. This was true in large part because there were so few school children,

---


and secondly because children, as early participants in society, were in little need of special training for the future. The means and the end of control were the same as those applied to adults and were for direct, immediate control, and often physical in nature.

The second period of childhood in Aries' view began to emerge in the seventeenth century. In part a result of Catholic and Protestant reformers' attitudes toward children began to change. Children were isolated from the larger community as formal institutionalized schooling became more and more popular. At the same time the family became more child centered. Parents became more interested in their children. This social revolution in the concept of childhood, sometimes referred to as the "sentimental revolution," culminated in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Education and training were for the child's future role in society. With the coming of an urban, industrialized society parents and teachers were more interested in what the child would become than in his immediate role in that society. The development of the child's character, independence, resourcefulness, and inner potentials were major concerns in educating him/her to some day assume his/her proper place in society.10 This post 1700 view of the child is the one with which we are the most familiar, and the one with which we are the most comfortable. It is this concept of childhood that stimulated a search for more appropriate school disciplinary practices -- from the

Renaissance humanists through Horace Mann, John Dewey and even the mental hygienists.

However, this image of the child whose worth lay in the future became increasingly incompatible with the prosperous post World War II American society which found its strength and security in consumerism, immediate gratification, and individual freedom. As Christopher Lasch describes the post 1960's in America, a concern for self had replaced both religion and politics, "to live for the moment is the prevailing passion—to live for yourself, not for your predecessors or posterity." 11

If society had changed, the image of the child, as well as behaviors toward the child, in that society also had to change. Certainly the image of a child whose importance lay in the future and whose education and discipline was for his future role in society was not in keeping with a society that stressed the desires of the present. From this third historical perspective the Children's Liberation Movement may best be seen as a search for a new image of the child which would be compatible with this new society and which would replace the image of the child created by the sentimental revolution. 12


12See Paul Goodman Growing Up Absurd (New York: Random House, 1960); Edgar Friedenberg, Coming of Age in America (New York: Random House, 1963), and John Holt's Escape From Childhood for examples of post war attempts to find a new understanding of the child's place in society.
Ironically, the answer to that search seemed to have been found in Aries' historical work. As Aries himself stated, *Centuries of Childhood* took on a life of its own, especially in the United States where psychologists and sociologists applied it to the problems of contemporary American youth. The reforms of the past two hundred years which had been seen as a steady improvement in the life of children were no longer accepted as a positive influence. The sentimentalized child of the nineteenth and early twentieth century who had been separated from the privileges and rights of the male adult world was incongruent with the "present" oriented society. Within the Children's Liberation Movement this state of the child was seen as an unnatural isolation. Like the pre-seventeenth century child, children in the twentieth century should take their natural, rightful place in society now, not in the future. The child was to be freed from the restraint and control of the isolating, institutionalized school, as well as the repression of the child-centered, uptight suburban, female dominated home. At the same time the child was not to be dependent on sentimentality. He was to be accorded the legal rights of his adult colleagues.


14See Kessen, op. cit., pp. 264-265.
The "liberated child," however, never really emerged. First, the complete revolution to this new image of childhood never took place because as historians by the mid-1970's were pointing out, the children of the pre-seventeenth century were not as well off as the idealistic picture first presented by Aries might have led one to believe. Three hundred years of sentimentalizing childhood had made an impression and the return to a less idealistic side of the "natural" status of children, which included child mutilation infanticide, and debilitating child labor, was not in keeping with the American liberal mentality.

Second, the complete revolution never took place because in a society which values power, children have never possessed the resources or access to real power. The child's lack of power and lack of immediate worth was even more glaring in a society which was dependent on highly advanced technological skills.

Last, and most important to our topic, the liberated child never emerged because the forces to liberate the child were counter-balanced by increased means of direct control. The fact that the "liberated


child" never became a reality, however, does not mean that a new role for children was not created in the post war years.

It is, in part, this misconception about the historically changing image of the child which has distorted our understanding of the American attitude toward children as revealed in school disciplining practices and theories. Not only has Aries' thesis been questioned by other historians, but for our purposes this periodization does not fit with the recent historical trends in the literature on school discipline. To put in better perspective the place of school discipline and the historical picture of the child we must re-examine the shift from the so-called "sentimental child" to that of the so-called "liberated child."

In particular, the historiography of children, especially as it relates to discipline, has ignored the question of purpose. To understand the changing trends in school discipline one must understand the changing trends in society's perception of the child's role in that society.

In reviewing the historical trends in Chapters Three through Five we could easily draw parallels between the general concerns of society and the professional literature. For example the debate over "military" discipline was directly related to a country that was at war. The emphasis in the 1950's on security and group membership can easily be linked with the threat of Communism and the nuclear bomb and a reaction to years of economic depression and war. Similarly, the divergence in thought on what constituted "good discipline" for the children of the poor in the 1960's can be understood in light of the
conflicting goals of a search for personal liberty and fear of social upheaval. Last, the personal autonomy coupled with the general social disillusionment of the 1970's made an emphasis on methods a reasonable approach to the fear of violence in the schools.

However, specific links to specific periods can also be seen as indicators of a general social trend. It is my conclusion, as stated earlier, that the underlying shift that best explains the change in the professional literature is the social, economic, psychological, and moral shift from being a producer nation to that of a consumer nation, which we will now examine.

PRODUCERS AND CONSUMERS

The change in [economic] theory is itself a reflex of a social change which is hardly less than revolutionary. I do not mean that I think that the "new economy" is firmly established as a fact, or that the endless chain of speeding up mass consumption in order to speed up production is entirely logical. But certain changes do not go backward.

John Dewey, 1930\textsuperscript{18}

In contrast to the accepted historical picture of the majority of mankind living in dire poverty, the nineteenth century Western society, especially in America, was caught up with the idea of progress and prosperity through increased production. Nineteenth century America was pre-occupied with industrialized society and the basis of production. "The society itself," wrote Paul Nystrom,

becomes industrialized. It develops its own ideals of life and puts its high stamp of approval on such virtues as working efficiency, special working ability, industry, thrift, and sobriety. Respect and honor are paid to the principles of industrialism. These are the characteristics of a true industrial society.19

These characteristics of society listed by Nystrom were also the qualities sought in the children who were someday to be part of that society. Horace Mann saw the "wheels of production" directly linked to the education and discipline of school children. Schools would be the place where the values and behavior patterns conducive to a production society would be inculcated.20

Again, on a more sophisticated level, Dewey and the progressives recognized the need for the qualities of discipline which would result in production oriented citizens. The discipline for the education of a "producer" called for setting goals for the future and working toward those goals. In a democratic society it required the building of self-discipline. The education and discipline of a "producer" meant developing a sense of satisfaction in the process of learning and doing in the absence of immediate external gratification.

By the middle of the twentieth century this faith in production, according to the economist John Kenneth Galbraith, had become the "conventional wisdom."


We are regularly told—in the conventional wisdom [production] is the most frequent justification of our civilization, even our existence—that the American standard of living is the 'marvel of the world.' To a very considerable extent, it is.\textsuperscript{21}

This faith in production, however, was founded on the creation of an ever rising standard of living. The economic prosperity of World War II which followed America's greatest economic disaster could not be sustained once the basic human material needs were fulfilled without creating a reason for sustained increased production. Mass production called for mass consumption.

As we shall see, the necessary characteristics for a consumer society are incompatible with those necessary for a production society—efficiency, thrift, sobriety, delayed gratification, and satisfaction in the process of work. A desire, or, more accurately, a rationalization for consumption by the majority of the population had to be created. This was the task of the new profession, advertising. By the twentieth century the major task of advertising was to "create a demand" for consumption.\textsuperscript{22}

Creating a consumer society to sustain production was the major objective of advertising as early as the 1920's. However, the principles and behaviors of consumerism were antithetical to the Puritan ideals and to the ideals of the work oriented immigrants who made up the working class in the first half of this century. This


conflict of ideals coupled with the small percentage of middle and upper class workers who could indulge in mass consumerism stifled social change until after World War II.\textsuperscript{23}

For a nation which had been the giant economic sustainer of the free world throughout the Second World War, by 1963 the United States was exporting only four percent of its gross national product.\textsuperscript{24} By the 1970's consumption had clearly replaced production as the major characteristic of American society.\textsuperscript{25} By the 1980's the United States had become a debtor nation, consuming more than it produced.\textsuperscript{26}

Americans had become dependent on consumption as a measure of security and worth in the same way that they had once been dependent on production.\textsuperscript{27} As Dewey predicted, this change from production to consumption was a major shift in the social norms after mid-twentieth century.\textsuperscript{28}

\textsuperscript{23}Captains of Consciousness, op. cit., pp. 58-59.


\textsuperscript{25}Galbraith, "The Bill Collector Cometh," in Affluence for a discussion of the relationship between personal debts and consumerism.


\textsuperscript{27}Linden, op. cit., p. 132; and "Are You What You Own?" USA Today, 114 (April 1986), 14-15.

\textsuperscript{28}John Dewey, Individualism, loc. cit.
Americans do not rest easy with this image. Not only is consumption as a *raison d'être* counter to the traditional Puritan and immigrant's beliefs and standards, but consumerism itself creates anxieties and conflicts. Advertising's primary technique is to create personal anxiety. Unlike a production society in which the objective is to satisfy people's basic wants, the consumer society is dependent on continually creating new dissatisfactions. In brief, the more one has, the more one needs. Second, the consumer society creates anxiety because advertising, especially the "best" advertising, appeals to the psychological, emotional, moral, and religious needs of the consumer. It then attempts to "satisfy" these needs with material goods, leaving a psychological void between the "real thing" and a consumable substitute.

A consumer society, unlike a producer society, is concerned with neither the past nor the future. It is only concerned with present gratification. As Eugene Linden describes it, "[In a consumer society] when we exhaust one particular view of the consumer interest and the resources that support it, we blithely move on to a new era." Novelty, not continuity or stability, is the arhythmic pattern of a consumer society.

29 Linden, *ibid.*, p. 123.


31 Ewan, op. cit., p. 189; Linden, op. cit., p. 134.

32 Linden, op. cit., p. 130.
Even more critical to our particular interests, a consumer society creates a different way of perceiving. Jules Henry termed this new way of perceiving a "pecuniary" philosophy. This "pecuniary" philosophy is built on "pecuniary" truths which are founded in the "irrational need to sell." This new philosophy is counter to the traditional American philosophy which was built on verifiable truths based on a God, or its equivalent. 33

The traditional and consumer philosophies are also different in their emphasis on self and others. The traditional philosophy emphasized concern for others and charity. A consumer society places the self first. 34 The contemporary narcissistic individual concerned with image and self-realization described by Christopher Lasch is the backbone of a consumer society. 35 Last, the consumer society, as opposed to the producer society, "unhinges the impulse controls." 36 In a consumer society self denial and self control do not serve a higher function. Jules Henry clearly relates this relationship between the immediate gratification of consumerism and the traditional American emphasis on self discipline:

Man in our culture has always bargained his impulses against higher goods—he has always sought to trade one day of abstinence against economic gain or against an eternity of supernatural blessings. But when the sacrifice of impulse

34 Linden, op. cit., p. 137.
35 Lasch, loc. cit.
36 Henry, op. cit., p. 20.
release no longer assures rewards either on earth or in
heaven he will no longer keep his cravings under control
unless he is punished.\textsuperscript{37} (emphasis added)

THE CONSUMER CHILD: A CONFLICT IN MEANS AND ENDS

Whereas the child culture of the bourgeois nineteenth century
had a strictly moral orientation toward roles in the adult
world, the commercial mass culture for children in the
twentieth century is becoming pure entertainment, oriented
toward the immediate gratification of wishes. This amounts
to a transition from impulse control to affective outlet,
from production morality to consumer permissiveness.

Rita Liljestrom, 1981\textsuperscript{38}

Traditional American school discipline theories and practices from
the Puritan schoolmasters through John Dewey and the mental hygienists
were clearly allied with a production oriented society. The image of
a child who is being disciplined for production whether by the rod, by
love, by group control, or by a multitude of other teacher strategies
and techniques is clearly in keeping with the aims of that society.
The discipline of the so-called sentimentalized child of the nineteenth
and early twentieth centuries is better understood when we think of
him/her as a child of production.

The primary role of the contemporary child is no longer that of a

\textsuperscript{37}Henry, ibid., pp. 21-22.

\textsuperscript{38}Rita Liljestrom, "The Public Child, the Commercial Child, and
Our Child," in The Child and Other Cultural Inventions, eds. Frank S.
producer, but of a consumer. The contemporary child is not a "liberated" child. His or her social participation extends only to the fact that he/she is an active participating consumer. The reality of the importance of children as a critical link in the maintenance of a consumer society is easily documented by a glance at Saturday morning television.

The so-called "liberated" child is part of society, but only to the extent that he/she assumes the role of a consumer. Therefore the discipline of the "liberated child" must by definition be the discipline for a child in a consumer society. Reflecting on our description of the characteristics necessary to maintain a consumer society I will offer the following seven characteristics that appear to me to be essential to the discipline of a member of such a society:

1. The consumer must experience some uneasiness or dissatisfaction with him/herself based on a comparative social image.

2. The consumer must be able to find at least partial satisfaction in the accumulation of material goods.

---

39Viviana A. Zelizer in her Pricing the Priceless Child (New York: Basic Books, 1985) documents the changes in children from producers to consumer items from 1890 to 1930. She emphasizes that American parents have been more concerned with children's allowances as a means of children learning how to spend than they have been with children learning how to work, pp. 3-4.

3. The consumer must be more concerned with the present than with understanding the past or planning for the future.

4. The consumer must desire change, novelty, and diversity.

5. The consumer must be comfortable with a flexible standard of truth.

6. The consumer must see him/herself as of primary importance.

7. The consumer must be accustomed to immediate gratification of needs.

The objectives and practices of discipline for a producer and discipline for a consumer are obviously in direct conflict. Discipline for the so called "liberated child" is really discipline for consumption. Traditional American school discipline has been discipline for production. Herein lies the "crisis" in school discipline. The educator today is asked to "discipline" children for two socially conflicting goals.

Historically in America, we have assumed that we were educating producers, as the future contributing members of a democratic society. We have maintained our belief in that assumption even as the goals and demands of our society have changed. Emphasis on the long term societal objectives of school discipline steadily disappeared from the literature. They were increasingly replaced with descriptions of "methods" or "systems" which were designed to achieve immediate control.

We can only understand this change by recognizing the conflicts and contradictions between disciplining children in a producer versus a consumer society. The characteristics of discipline for a producer society are familiar to us all, i.e., responsibility, hard work,
self-control, ability to work with others, diligence, patience, etc.. They are what teachers have expected in the classroom and industry expected in the workforce.

The characteristics of discipline for a consumer society are not in keeping with our traditional objectives, but these characteristics permeate, one might even say dominate, our society. These are largely characteristics which began to also permeate the means of discipline in the classroom, i.e., psychological manipulation, behavioral control techniques, material rewards, and emphasis on making a child "feel important."

We were, however, uncomfortable with the idea of a goal of education being discipline to promote consumption. Therefore we have "assumed" that we all knew what the goals of school discipline were, or we have simply ignored the question of goals. Pre mid-twentieth century literature on discipline might have had conflicts over the "means" of discipline, but it was rare to find a conflict over the objectives of discipline. By contrast, the literature on school discipline between 1965 and 1980 rarely attempted to address the long term social objectives of school discipline.

Furthermore, we must recognize that a society which demonstrates the qualities of consumerism quickly becomes dependent on those qualities. This dependence is the very rationale for increased consumption. But a society which is founded on personal anxiety, novelty, half truths, continued ego enhancement, and immediate gratification is also in need of direct immediate control to maintain social stability. This is the scenario of contemporary American society.
Discipline for a consumer society, unlike traditional discipline for production, does not have built into it the goal of self-discipline, i.e. delayed gratification, orientation towards others and society, the security of recognized truths, and social stability as inherent controllers. As Nietzsche said, in a production society, work is the controller.

Ironically, the so-called contemporary "liberated" child is highly controlled; perhaps more than any child in history. First of all, as an active participant in society he/she is controlled by the demands of the consumer society. Second, within the confines of the school he/she is controlled by a variety of punishments, manipulations, and "systems" which were designed to balance the "sense of freedom" accorded the child as a participant of a consumer society.

Historically in America, the public schoolchild has been disciplined for some future social purpose. The contemporary child is disciplined for immediate control. At the same time it is believed that the child must also be accorded at least a "sense of freedom." That freedom, however, must be kept in balance by direct control. Both of these tasks fall within the responsibilities of the school.

Incongruent to this whole scenario, the objectives and the structure of the school are still designed to create production oriented students. It is an understanding of the incongruity between the assumed objectives of the school and the objectives and mentality of the general society that seem to me to be essential to an understanding of the relationship between the changing American attitude toward children and school disciplinary theory and practice.
A society which demonstrates the characteristics of consumerism quickly becomes dependent on them. At the same time people who demonstrate these characteristics are also the greatest threat to social stability. Their tolerance level for postponement of gratification has been significantly reduced. As such, a consumer society which has become dependent on immediate gratification is in much greater need of direct, immediate control. The pattern then becomes one of increased gratifications and increased control, with consumer gratification and manipulation serving as the reason for the control, and often even as the means of that control.

For educators today the conflict in school discipline is much more complex than a simple debate over means, i.e. the pros and cons of corporal punishment, behavior modification, permissiveness, or "child psychology." The challenge for educators today is to find a sense of purpose in our society and to be able to relate that purpose to the goals of behavior within the classroom.

The conflict lies in the fact that the structure, the system, and the goals of the American school were established in a period when Americans had an unyielding faith in production. That faith in production is still praised and still held as a goal of the public school. But the practices of having and consuming have steadily usurped the practice of producing.

As revealed in the professional literature, educators have for the past twenty-five years attempted to resolve the conflicts between the ideal and reality by emphasizing the "means" or techniques of school discipline, the "small change," as Haim Ginott termed it. As a result,
we as educators have moved further and further away from addressing the underlying conflict and have similarly failed to attach any real sense of purpose to our role as disciplinarians.

We, as educators, must find a meaning in our society and in our culture, the American culture, with all of its diversity and all of its conflicts, which is worth the education of all of our children. We must find purpose in ourselves as a people and in our children which goes beyond individual competition, the gross national product, and the superficial dreams created for us by Madison Avenue.

"Interest and discipline are correlatives of activity having an aim," wrote John Dewey seventy years ago. What that aim, or purpose, is will determine the quality and the character of the discipline in our schools. And what that aim, or purpose, is will determine our attitude toward all the children in our society.

---

APPENDIX A

Summary of Survey of Retired Teachers in Hawaii

DISCUSSION OF SURVEY

In March of 1984 I obtained access to the membership list of the Hawaii State Retired Teachers Association from its Board of Directors for use in a historical survey. On June 1, 1986, I mailed 370 questionnaires to the members of the Oahu Retired Teachers Association. In an attached letter I requested the return of the questionnaire if the recipient did not want to complete it. This request was added both in the hope that it would encourage recipients to respond and as a means of keeping a better record of responses.

I recognized that the questionnaire was a lengthy one requiring more than just marking multiple choice questions and therefore the number of respondents would be limited. I had, however, hoped to receive 75 completed responses from the original 370 questionnaires sent. Unfortunately, as Table A.1 shows, I fell short of my goal.

The information that was acquired, however, proved most interesting. It was generally supportive of the historical picture of school discipline and teacher practices found in the professional literature on discipline. However, the information and ideas put forth by the teachers also raised some new concerns and questions which will be discussed in the following analyses of the questionnaire.
Table A.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires completed*</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire complete but without data on respondent</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses by phone</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires returned due to death, illness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or inappropriate respondent**</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned questionnaires not completed</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return to sender</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (accounted for)</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DATA ON RESPONDENTS

To analyze the questions I grouped the respondents into two categories, those who were educated and began their teaching careers before 1940 and those who began after 1940. This categorization was made to facilitate the recognition of trends provided by the limited data source. The date 1940 was chosen for two reasons. First, it was chosen because of the changes that were occurring at this time in education. Second, this date was chosen because it seemed a good dividing line between those respondents who would have been ending their careers at the time of social change in the mid to late sixties and those who were still deeply involved in the changes occurring in ideas about discipline, as discussed in Chapter Five. Table A.2 provides a profile on the respondents in each group.

*10 were also signed
**2 were sent to "non teaching" school personnel
## Table A.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRE-1940 GROUP</th>
<th>POST-1940 GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO. IN GROUP</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEX</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVERAGE YEARS TAUGHT</strong></td>
<td>36 years</td>
<td>30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ETHNIC IDENTITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANALYSIS OF QUESTION ONE

I. Identify with the letter which best describes your understanding of these educators' ideas on discipline.

A. Strongly agree with his/her ideas
B. Strongly disagree with his/her ideas
C. Partially agree with his/her ideas
D. I have only heard of this person
E. I have never heard of this person

William Bagley___ John Dewey___ Fritz Redl___
Dorothy Baruch Miller___ Johann Pestalozzi___ Haim Ginott___
Frederich Froebel___ William Glasser___ Jacob Kounin___
Horace Mann___ Alfred Adler___ Lee Canter___
Wm. Kilpatrick___ B. F. Skinner___ Edward Pino___
Rudolf Dreikurs___

Please name any other educator(s) and/or person(s) who influenced your thinking on classroom discipline:

Figures A.1 and A.2: Figure A.1 [page 202] gives a percentage breakdown of the answers provided by the respondents educated before 1940 in terms of which educators they believed they could "strongly agree with." The influence of John Dewey is readily apparent. There is also a strong consensus of opinion among respondents in terms of their agreement with the ideas of popular educators.

Figure A.2 [page 202] denotes those educators with whom respondents only partially agreed. In comparing these two graphs it should be noted that respondents who chose Dewey as "only partially agreeing with his ideas" did not choose anyone else as someone with whom they "strongly agreed."
FIGURE A.1 - This graph shows those educators with whom the Hawaii retired teachers who began their professional careers before 1940 said they strongly agreed.

FIGURE A.2 - This graph shows those educators with whom the Hawaii retired teachers who began their professional careers before 1940 said they partially agreed.
Categories D and E of question one were not tabulated as they revealed little significant information about the respondents.

**Figures A.3 and A.4:** Looking at these two graphs [page 204] which represent the post 1940 respondents we find a much more diverse, as well as a more even, distribution of educators with whom respondents either strongly or partially agreed with in terms of their ideas on school discipline. The most striking change is the increased importance of B. F. Skinner and William Glasser. The post 1940 respondents would have been quite involved in their careers in the 1960's when the ideas of these two men were just becoming popular. Although six respondents at least partially agreed with one or both of these men, two respondents "strongly agreed" with both Glasser and Skinner.

**General Comments on Question One:** The respondents in both groups also listed their own teachers at the university and the normal school, as well as teachers in the earlier grades as significant in helping them to form their own ideas on discipline. Principals and supervisors were also mentioned as influencing thoughts and practices. One teacher stressed the impact that Glasser had on her teaching even at the very end of her career. And one primary teacher listed Maria Montesorri as being most significant in influencing her ideas on discipline. It should also be noted that many of the forms were not completed, with a note that the respondent remembered the names, but not the ideas of these men and women.
FIGURE A.3 - This graph shows those educators with whom the Hawaii retired teachers who began their professional careers after 1940 said they strongly agreed.

FIGURE A.4 - This graph shows those educators with whom the Hawaii retired teachers who began their professional careers after 1940 said they partially agreed.
Only four respondents "strongly disagreed" with any of the philosopher/educators. One pre-1940 respondent strongly disagreed with William Bagley. This respondent, however, is himself an educational historian who received his doctorate from New York University about the same time that Bagley was ending his career. Three other respondents were opposed to John Dewey's ideas. The first two gave no reason for their opposition. However, one did strongly support Adler and Horace Mann's ideas and partially supported Skinner. The second strongly supported Glasser and partly supported Skinner and Adler. The fourth respondent was adamantly opposed to the ideas of Dewey. As she explained to me in a telephone conversation she was opposed to Dewey and "humanism," which she saw as the source of all the "discipline problems." The only common denominator among these three opponents of Dewey was that they were all Chinese-Americans. But to draw an ethnic distinction would be very risky as other Chinese-American respondents highly favored Dewey.

Generally speaking the distribution of ideas of individual philosopher/educators who influenced the thinking of teachers on school discipline as expressed in this survey of retired teachers in Hawaii is reflective of the general historical trends revealed in the professional literature on school discipline. The most striking anomaly from the general literature might be the steady influence of Horace Mann.
ANALYSIS OF QUESTION TWO

II. Choose from the following list the three (3) ideas that you feel are most important for a child to achieve as a result of the disciplinary process. Circle the words:

democratic living       equality     sense of achievement
self actualization       security     individual expression
individual rights       freedom      being a part of the group
sense of responsibility respect for authority
other_________________

Figures A.5 and A.6: In comparing the results of the pre and post 1940 respondents' answers to question two, four trends become readily apparent [page 207]. The first trend is the persistence of "responsibility" as the primary goal of school discipline. One could easily conjecture that teachers today would still stress this goal, possibly to an even greater extent than the teachers in our survey.

The second trend that is apparent is the shift away from group or external goals (democratic living, being a part of the group, and respect for authority) and a shift toward individual goals (self actualization, freedom, and individual expression). This trend is certainly in keeping with the general social trends of the sixties and seventies. One might also note, however, that this trend did not include a marked emphasis on "achievement" as part of the growing individualism.
FIGURE A.5 - Goals of the disciplinary process chosen by Hawaii retired teachers who began their professional careers before 1940.

FIGURE A.6 - Goals of the disciplinary process chosen by Hawaii retired teachers who began their professional careers after 1940.
The third trend to be noted is the decline in "respect for authority" as a goal of school discipline. This is again in keeping with a society which was increasingly stressing the freedom of the individual.

This decline in respect for authority and the decline in group cohesiveness might give a clue to understanding the fourth trend: the increasing emphasis on security. One might conjecture that as the society as a whole and teachers in particular felt less confident in their own sense of authority as well as in the authority of the group they were increasingly concerned about what source of security the child (and possibly themselves) could turn to. One respondent from the pre-1940 group stated that "the insecurity of the children during the war protesting years" constituted the most difficult aspect of school discipline. This shift to a concern for security is not in keeping with the general literature on school discipline which stressed security in the forties, fifties, and early sixties.
III. Listed below are twenty-four factors applied by teachers that are said to influence classroom discipline. Please circle the five (5) that you think are the most important. Cross out the five (5) that you think are the least important:

1. the teacher's use of eye contact and body language
2. the teacher's personality
3. teacher's use of peer control
4. material rewards
5. physical punishment
6. isolation from the teacher
7. isolation from the other students
8. isolation from a learning activity
9. classroom rules
10. consistency in teacher behavior
11. the teacher's love of the students
12. the teacher's display of respect for the student
13. teacher-student contracts
14. the teacher's ability to create student interest
15. the teacher's organizational abilities
16. the teacher's knowledge of subject matter
17. the teacher's use of verbal reprimands
18. the use of after class or private conferences
19. teacher's use of parental involvement
20. referral of student to principal
21. referral of student to school counselor
22. denying the student recess or free time
23. keeping the student after school
24. special privilege rewards
25. others

Figures A.7 and A.8: There is a clear delineation between those disciplinary methods that the respondents saw as effective and those methods that they saw as ineffective [pages 210 and 211]. There is also a general consistency of opinion about the effectiveness of disciplinary methods between the pre and post 1940 groups, with one significant exception, teacher personality.
FIGURE A.7 — This graph represents the factors which teachers who began their careers before 1940 chose as the most and least important in influencing classroom discipline.
FIGURE A.8 - This graph represents the factors which teachers who began their careers after 1940 chose as the most and least important in influencing classroom discipline.
An analysis of the choices for both groups of respondents resulted in three generally distinct categories: 1. methods they strongly favored, 2. methods they strongly disfavored, and 3. methods which generated little reaction.

Methods Strongly Favored: For the most part those methods which were strongly favored by both groups were the more general preventive approaches which established the tone or milieu of the classroom, i.e. consistency, love of the students, respect of the students, interest, organizational skills and knowledge of the teacher.

The one exception to a consistent support of these methods was the decline in the belief that teacher personality is of importance in classroom discipline. In the pre-1940 group 11.2% of the respondents found teacher personality an effective means of discipline as opposed to only 4.8% of the post-1940 group. A look at item A (the use of eye contact) may give us a clue to this decline in the importance of the teacher’s personality.

With the popularization of the work of Skinner and Kounin in the 1960’s there was a greater emphasis on “techniques.” In the pre-1940 group only 3.5% of the respondents thought that the use of eye contact was effective. But in the post-1940 group 7.1% found it an effective method. This is almost a reversal of the two groups’ opinions of the importance of teacher personality. Although admittedly this is scanty evidence, it does raise the question as to whether the increased emphasis on "techniques" did not serve to undermine the more traditional belief that the personality of the teacher (including
possibly his/her moral character) was a distinct and important factor in classroom discipline.

**Methods Strongly Disfavored:** The second distinct group of methods consists of those that the respondents found to be clearly ineffective. The most striking feature of this group was the respondents' clear dislike for the use of physical punishment. Respondents also clearly rejected the use of denial of recess and after school detention, as well as verbal reprimands and sending the student to the principal. All of these methods were considered punishments and the respondents' rejection of them as ineffective is generally supported in the early literature, as much by lack of discussion as by direct condemnation.

The respondents' opposition to the use of isolation is not as closely in keeping with the professional literature on school discipline. The respondents, with one exception, consistently opposed the use of any kind of isolation (from the teacher, from other students, or from the learning situation). By contrast, the literature especially after 1959 supported the idea of isolating the misbehaving child as both an effective and widely used method of maintaining classroom discipline.¹ It was not until 1978, after a

controversial case of a child who was isolated in a cardboard box that a more critical look at isolation was found in the general professional literature on school discipline. ²

Similarly, respondents opposed the use of rewards, either material rewards or special privileges. (The use of just verbal praise unfortunately was not given as a choice on the questionnaire and no respondent added it.) Again, the use of rewards before the 1960's was highly controversial in the professional literature, although the use of rewards was generally looked upon as slightly better than punishment. ³

---


For examples of those who recommended caution in the use of rewards see: Margaret S. Mahler, M.D., who equated the withholding of a reward as being equal to a punishment, "Discipline and Punishment," Child Study, 26 (Summer 1949), 69-71; Robert W. Edgar "Discipline and Purpose," Teachers College Record, 57 (Oct. 1955), 8-14; Percival M. Symonds who saw rewards as only slightly better than punishment in "Classroom Discipline," Teachers College Record, 51 (Dec. 1949), 147-150; Anna W. M. Wolf who said that both punishment and rewards could be used "occasionally" in "Discipline: The Role of Punishment and Reward," National Parent Teacher, 45 (Dec. 1959), 11-13.
The literature after the 1960's was much more supportive of the use of rewards, although they were now more often referred to as "positive reinforcers."⁴ Such a change in attitude is not reflected by the respondents in this survey. The respondents in the post 1940 group continued to reject the use of rewards. This response may be because these teachers were already well established in their own ideas and methods by the time the change in attitude about rewards became popular. Several respondents had indicated that they were influenced by Skinner in question one, but it was apparently not the behaviorist's use of rewards that impressed them.

Methods Which Generated Little Reaction: The third category consists of those methods that the respondents neither strongly supported, nor strongly opposed. These methods include the use of rules, peer control, after class conferences, teacher-student contracts, parent involvement and referral to the school counselor.

---

The respondents reflect the 1940-1950's professional literature in their ambivalence about rules. They did not oppose the use of rules, but neither did they place great importance on them. The one exception was the teacher who had been an avid follower of Glasser.

This same ambivalence is reflected in their response to the use of peer control. Like the general literature, they neither totally accepted, nor rejected its use.

In contrast, the use of contracts, was a "new" method of discipline which was not part of the professional literature before the emphasis on the legal rights of students and the importance of law as a basis for discipline in the late sixties and seventies. The growing acceptance of the use of teacher-student contracts is probably reflective of the experiences of those respondents who were still teaching during the 1970's.

The change in the two groups to parental involvement is best understood by some of the respondents' comments. Several respondents stressed the importance of parental concern for education and for discipline especially among the Orientals in the early years of their teaching careers. One respondent specifically noted a decline in parental involvement as the major change in his methods of discipline during his career (1944-1978).

The lack of recognition of the use of the school counselor as an effective means of discipline is reflective of the ambivalence in the professional literature on the role of the counselor in discipline. School counselors were an integral part of the Mental Hygiene Movement,
but their exact role in terms of discipline procedures and practices was continually debated in the literature for the entire forty year period. The most popular idea was that the counselor should "explain" and help the child who had problems, but should not administer punishment.5

Comments: Overall the survey is supportive of the general trend found in the professional literature on methods of school discipline. The survey, however, does not tell us how these respondents employed these various methods or why. Just because a teacher said that consistency and interest were the most important factors in discipline does not necessarily mean that he/she was either consistent or interesting. In like manner, a respondent may have stated that the use of withholding recess is an ineffective means of discipline because he/she employed such a method for ten years before abandoning it. These things we simply do not know.

What we do know is that most of these respondents recognized, desired, and worked toward the effective use of consistency, respect, love, interest, and their own knowledge as the most effective means of achieving the goals of classroom discipline. As such, these ideas are highly compatible with the respondents' support of the philosophies and ideas on discipline as presented by Horace Mann and John Dewey as indicated in question one.

5The articles abound on this topic but the best review is a grant supported study in which all of the literature on the subject is reviewed: Frank Bickel and Maude O'Neill, "Counselor and Student Discipline: Suggested Roles," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 57 (June 1979), 522-555.
ANALYSIS OF QUESTION FOUR

IV. Listed below are eleven factors that are said to influence classroom discipline. Circle the three (3) that you feel are most significant in influencing classroom discipline.

1. class size
2. general school atmosphere
3. school rules
4. socio-economic background of the students
5. school principal
6. school supplies
7. physical conditions of the school
8. family stability of the student
9. national concerns, i.e. war, riots, elections
10. curriculum
11. community problems
12. other

Figure A.9: In ranking factors outside the control of the teacher which influenced school discipline the two groups were consistent in ranking the stability of the family, the general atmosphere of the school, and class size as the most important influences [page 219].

The emphasis placed on the family as the single most important factor in discipline was continually reemphasized in the respondents' comments on the parents' interest in education as well as the problem of children whom the respondents saw as unloved or unwanted.

The most significant changes in the rankings of the two groups were in their opinions of the importance of the socio-economic backgrounds of the children. Ironically, respondents in the pre-1940 group ranked this factor as significantly more important than did the post-1940. The basis of this shift is not easy to determine, but an analysis of the socio-economic backgrounds of the teachers in the two
FIGURE A.9 — This graph represents a comparison by retired Hawaii teachers who began their careers before 1940 and after 1940 of external factors influencing classroom discipline.
groups as compared to the student populations at each time might contribute to our understanding. It should also be noted that this decline in importance of the socio-economic background of the child is not in keeping with the general literature on discipline which began stressing socio-economic concerns after 1960.

By contrast, the post-1940 group placed the curriculum as a more important factor than the socio-economic background of the child. Again, it is difficult to determine the cause of this shift as curriculum was a major concern among educators in Hawaii in the pre-war years. It apparently was not such a concern among the teachers in the classroom.

7This conclusion was drawn from a review of the Hawaii Educational Review (1900-1939).
ANALYSIS OF QUESTION FIVE

V. From the list below circle the three (3) phrases that you feel best complete the following sentence:

"Classroom discipline is..........

A. a problem of teacher organizational skills.  
B. a problem of human relations.  
C. a problem of setting limits.  
D. a problem of power and authority conflicts between teacher and student.  
E. a problem of helping children with emotional problems.  
F. a problem of good teaching skills.  
G. a problem of establishing rules and regulations.  
H. a problem of assuring students rights.  
I. other__________________________

Figures A.10 and A.11: Both groups of respondents were consistent in their emphasis on teacher organization, teaching skills, and human relations as the most important aspects of classroom discipline [page 222]. There was, however, a slight shift in emphasis on setting limits, rules and regulations, and power conflicts in the post-1940 group. This pattern is in keeping with the methods of discipline which the respondents of the two groups found to be effective and ineffective in question three. This shift by the post-1940 group also supports the general trend in the literature toward a greater emphasis on direct control as opposed to the earlier belief that discipline was best seen as a part of the learning experience.
FIGURE A.10 — This graph shows how retired Hawaii teachers who began their professional careers before 1940 perceive the problem of classroom discipline.

FIGURE A.11 — This graph shows how retired Hawaii teachers who began their professional careers after 1940 perceive the problem of classroom discipline.
ANAYSIS OF QUESTION SIX

VI. Please tell what you consider to be your "philosophy of discipline."

All of the respondents did not give a philosophy of discipline. Nor is it possible to determine any precise trend or change in the ideas of the respondents in terms of their philosophies of discipline. This conclusion is due largely to the variety of interpretations that the respondents attributed to the idea of a philosophy of discipline. I have therefore listed by chronological order the philosophies that were presented by the respondents with the hope that this will best give a picture of the varieties, the changes, as well as the continuities in the respondents' ideas and philosophies of discipline:

1926

"Make sure the students understand I am there to help them learn. I want them to feel free to ask for help if they have problems and I will make it a point to have them feel that I am their friend."

"We must practice leadership to be able to work with them [students]. We must have the art of organizing to work with students or people — Believe in freedom and practice true democracy. Good discipline comes from the desire to accomplish your job."

"Discipline must not be the goal of education. Only correctional schools should have this thrust. Children and adults grow thru [sic.] meaningful activities and self motivation."

8Year respondent began teaching
"I believe good discipline is the result of [an] inner desire on
the part of the individual to function cooperatively in a group
situation. There are many factors that affect the individual in
the classroom. Good classroom organization and teaching manner
and skills are very important. A child from a home situation in
which there is love and empathy among the members will likely
respond well to most classroom situations. But a child from a
home in which he feels unwanted and unloved will likely be a
discipline problem even in the best classroom organization. Such
a child may need 'setting limits,' rules and regulations, strong
control by [the] teacher."

"Before learning can be achieved the teacher must have full
attention of the student. The teacher must impress this on the
minds at the very first week of class. Be sincere in telling the
class that the main concern of schooling is to achieve subject
matter and character development. State a few simple rules and be
consistent in follow-up."

"Each child should have the education to meet his needs and
abilities in a democratic society. This calls for responsible
citizenship as an individual and as a group. No one student or
group of students should be permitted to disrupt the learning of
others."

"Children must understand the 'why' of discipline.
Children must understand the rules and regulations.
Children must understand that 'limits' are fixed and not
expandable.
Children must like themselves, have friends, and find school and
learning more rewarding than any outside activity."

"Love and respect of your students."

"Students respecting the rights of other students."

"I soon discovered philosophies and theories go down the drain
when faced with so many individual discipline problems. Each
problem needs to be worked out between the student and teacher.
Learn the hard way."

"Establish rules and regulations to be observed by all in the
classroom. Deviations to be handled between teacher and student."

"1. Discuss the school rules.
2. Discuss the class rules.
3. Follow Dr. Glasser's philosophy of discipline."
1941
"To assist a child in developing to his full potential and helping [a] child to develop self respect."

1942
"As much as possible help the student in self-discipline, that you are interested in him, that you care; he is important. Does he love himself[?]"

"Helping children to learn to be independent without encroaching on the rights of others."

1943
"I think a variety of ways of dealing with discipline is healthy. Each situation needs its own design—depending on the circumstances—There really is no ONE way to discipline."

1945
"Maintaining good discipline is definitely a talent—some teachers 'have it'—some teachers learn the tricks—some never acquire disciplinary skills. Student teaching in the university training school under the tutelage of a MASTER teacher was my most valuable experience in college and the lessons learned by DOING stayed with me throughout my career (long after I'd forgotten the philosophy of education of the people of your first question) Advice and suggestions from older experienced teachers during my first years of teaching helped me more than anything else I can think of—except of course KNOWING my subject and loving to teach and really caring about my students' learning something, not just keeping them quiet, just having discipline."

"Try to plan and organize to avoid confusion, plan well to keep students interested in activities. Allow enough freedom but set limits (Develop consideration for others) and help children understand 'whys' of the rules and regulations (but be prepared to make exceptions depending on the situations)."

1946
"The key to successful discipline:
  1.) Consistency
  2.) Fairness
  3.) Understanding and care
Accept children as they are. Help them to develop self-discipline by setting limits, helping them to understand that they are responsible for their behavior in developing self-control and respect for others. Teachers and other adults must be firm, fair, and consistent, yet understanding and caring. Mutual respect between children and adults is imperative."
"Creating a setting which allows for maximal freedom, security, and creativity, with minimal controls."

"Discipline becomes less of a concern if the student is positively motivated, shown proper respect, is fairly treated, and steps are taken to avoid negative behavior by anticipating situations which would tempt students to behave negatively and make adjustments to prevent those conditions."

"When I first started teaching an old pro told me and I quote, 'Without discipline there is no learning, and you won't be able to teach.' I think, in teaching, discipline should be the primary goal—without it there wouldn't be an ideal environment that could be conducive to learning."

"A child should be given love and understanding to deal with his problems. Then [the] child will learn self-discipline and not depend on external authority."

"Every teacher has a right to teach. Every student has a right to learn. No student has a right to disrupt the teaching and learning in the classroom."

"Students interested and actively participating in the school work do not create disciplinary problems."

"The teacher must be able to maintain discipline in class so that students who want to learn can learn, and the students who do not want to learn at least behave."
ANALYSIS OF QUESTION SEVEN

VII. Circle the answer with which you feel most comfortable.

1. Did you consider "discipline" a problem when you taught?  yes  no

2. Did discipline become "more of a problem" or "less of a problem" the longer that you taught?  
more  less  no change

3. Do you think that your methods of discipline or your attitudes about discipline changed over the years that you taught?  Please explain

Was Discipline a Problem? A significantly larger number of respondents in the post 1940 group saw discipline as a problem than in the pre-1940 group [Figure A.12, page 228].

Did Discipline Become More/Less of a Problem? Similary, more of the respondents in the pre-1940 group believed that discipline had become either less of a problem over the years that they taught or there had been no change in disciplinary problems [Figure A.12, page 228]. This is not a true statement if we consider only those who believed that discipline had become "less of a problem." However, no respondent in either group who indicated that they had viewed discipline as a problem also indicated that there had been "no change" in discipline problems over the years that they taught. Three, or 18%, of the respondents who said that they had had problems in discipline also indicated that the problems had gotten worse over the years. Fortunately, 72% said that the problem had improved over the years.
FIGURE A.12 — This graph represents a comparison of retired Hawaii teachers who began their professional careers before 1940 and after 1940 to the questions: Did you consider discipline a problem when you taught?, and if so, Did it become more or less of a problem?
One respondent indicated that the problems of discipline became worse when she had moved from elementary to high school teaching. Similarly, another resolved her high school disciplinary problems in the fifties by moving to elementary teaching. However, a third respondent found that the teaching of children with reading problems in elementary school (for which she was not trained) created disciplinary problems far in excess of any she had encountered in the high school.

**Changing Attitudes:** Respondents who believed that discipline had become less of a problem very often commented that they had also changed in their attitude about discipline. They usually became less authoritarian, more relaxed, less defensive, less strict, or as one respondent phrased it, "more mellow." These kind of comments were expressed by respondents in both groups. This change in attitude was attributed to a sense of feeling secure and confident in their own abilities as opposed to any external changes, either in society, the students, or the educational process. No one indicated that he/she had become more authoritarian or more strict during their career.
ANALYSIS OF QUESTION EIGHT

VIII. What do you consider to be the most difficult aspect of school discipline in the years that you taught?

Responses to this question were rather varied. Therefore I shall just cite them. Generally they fall into two categories: those that deal with special problems of children, and those that deal with problems in relation to administrators and parents. A third category was the problem of class size.

1917
As principal a few problem teachers, not students."

1920
"Class size. I often had as many as 180 students in five classes. It was impossible to give as much individual help as I wished."

1926
"Lack of cooperation from principal and parents."

"The most difficult aspect of school discipline in the years that I taught is when the family set up is not wholesome. This problem sometimes will come to the classroom as well to the school. Fortunately I got along well with the parents."

"The individual student with emotional and personal problems."

1927
"Principals lacking to back teachers."

1928
"In rare cases a somewhat rebellious attitude."

"Working with children from homes in which there was little love and empathy was probably the most difficult."

1929
"The insecurity of the children during the war protesting years."

"A weak, permissive principal."

9Year respondent began teaching
"When there is no common understanding among student, teacher, principal, and parent."

"Seeking the assistance of parents when problems arose."

"Vandalism in restrooms—smoking also."

"Too large a class for a teacher to handle."

"Maintaining student interest. You may have good relationship with students you will still have problems if they get bored."

"Trying to keep the attention of students in a subject that was not interesting. Some students were problems because of reading skills. There were too many non readers who were passed through."

"Teachers needed more help from the counselors and principal so they would have more time to teach."

"Lazy teachers. Non resourceful teachers."

"Too many students in a classroom."

"Increase in number of children from emotionally unstable homes."

"Dealing with emotionally disturbed children. Dealing with large classes with a wide range of abilities."

"Working with children who have had years of failure, children whose parents have unrealistic goals, children who come from families which culturally there is no respect for education and who do not consider 'book learning' that important."

"Not interested in learning—or indifferent—and disrupting the class."

"Lack of administrative know how and common sense when dealing with human relations. Perhaps it had something to do with the cultural background of the administrator."

"There wasn't anything very difficult. Its just that during my last few years of teaching many students were less serious about getting their homework assignments done."
"Discipline was not a great problem until we began to have more children from one parent families and when more children began to be involved in drugs."

"Working with children with emotional problems; especially those who came from broken homes."

"Lack of consistency "backing" by administration on referrals for major school infractions—ex: paint sniffing."

"Lack of support from the principal in "backing you up" in the discipline of the students. The principal tend[s] to believe the student's version of the incident that led to your disciplinary action."

"Complete disregard for learning—taking challenging attitude toward instructor, with physical abuse in mind."

"The most difficult aspect was when one or two individuals were constantly causing disruptions. They really wore you down. Sometimes often wishing they would not come to school. It really made a difference to a class when these individuals were not there."

"Use of foul language."

"1.) Classroom discipline difficulty when have a few non-achievers who needed more attention—and no classroom aides. 2.) Taught in 3on2 systems as well as HEP, saw students becoming less motivated, goof off when can."

"Since I was teaching in the industrial arts area, I had to see that the students behaved themselves enough so that no one is injured."
The material included in this dissertation has been categorized as Primary Sources and Secondary References.

Primary Sources
Primary sources include two major sections, Professional Journals and Questionnaire of Retired Teachers.

Professional Journals: The first section is a listing of all of the professional journal articles found in the Education Index under the headings "Discipline" and "Discipline, school" between the years 1940 and 1980. From these articles I selected only those which I felt were generally applicable to, or concerned with, public elementary school students. I disregarded all articles which dealt exclusively with high school students, parochial school students, and students outside of the United States.

In the years between 1940 and about 1960 there were many articles which addressed the topic of disciplining children at home. I only utilized those articles that were, at least, partially related to school discipline. Access to articles listed was also limited by their availability at either Hamilton Library, University of Hawaii, Manoa or State of Hawaii Library. I did not attempt to gain access to articles not available at either of these places.
I must add the sad commentary that my major determent was that all too frequently articles on school discipline had been ripped out of the University library's collection. This commentary on our educators and our students may say more about the problem of school discipline than all of my wordy efforts.

In all I reviewed about 475 professional journal articles 234 of which are cited in this dissertation. For the convenience of the reader I have grouped these articles in ten year segments: 1940 to 1949; 1950 to 1959; 1960 to 1969; and 1970 to 1980.

**Questionnaire of Retired Teachers:** The second section under the Primary Source category is a brief summary of the questionnaire which I sent to the retired teachers in Hawaii. The more general analysis of the results of this questionnaire is found in Appendix A.
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