University of Louisville

ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

5-2007

Examining the empirical impact of teacher pupil control ideology on student outcomes : the classroom perspective.

Michael M. Brame
University of Louisville

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.louisville.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Brame, Michael M., "Examining the empirical impact of teacher pupil control ideology on student outcomes : the classroom perspective." (2007). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 140.
<https://doi.org/10.18297/etd/140>

This Doctoral Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. This title appears here courtesy of the author, who has retained all other copyrights. For more information, please contact thinkir@louisville.edu.

EXAMINING THE EMPIRICAL IMPACT OF TEACHER PUPIL CONTROL
IDEOLOGY ON STUDENT OUTCOMES: THE CLASSROOM PERSPECTIVE

By

Michael M. Brame
B.A., Eastern Kentucky University, 1984
M.A.Ed., Eastern Kentucky University, 1991

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of the University of Louisville
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Leadership, Foundations and Human Resource Education
University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky

May 2007

Copyright 2007 by Michael M. Brame

All rights reserved

EXAMINING THE EMPIRICAL IMPACT OF TEACHER PUPIL CONTROL
IDEOLOGY ON STUDENT OUTCOMES: THE CLASSROOM PERSPECTIVE

By

Michael M. Brame
B.A., Eastern Kentucky University, 1984
M.A.Ed., Eastern Kentucky University, 1991

A Dissertation Approved on

January 24, 2007

By the following Dissertation Committee:

Dissertation Director

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my parents,

Mr. Gordon R. Brame

and

Mrs. Mary A. Brame,

who love me and believe in me unconditionally.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank my dissertation chair, Dr. John Keedy, for his guidance, time, and support throughout this process. His is my mentor and my friend. I thank Dr. Paul Winter for his guidance with Chapter II. I thank Dr. Ellen McIntyre for her expertise in interpretive study and the advice she gave during the defense of the dissertation proposal. I also thank Dr. Thomas Reio for his words of encouragement and reassurances. I thank Dr. Freda Merriweather for giving my colleagues and me a voice in her classroom.

I thank Dr. John Strobe for his help designing my doctoral program. I also thank Dr. Jon Green and Ms. Jeanette Smith for serving as critical friends, community of practice, and member check for the dissertation. I thank Vicki Danser for her help with the figures. I thank Mr. Paul Smiley for sharing with me his beliefs about teaching, coaching, and administration, which I used to steer the review of the literature for this study.

I thank my wife, Teresa, for making sure that I made time to work, rest, and play. You have a heart of gold and whatever I achieve in life, I achieve because you are there to support me. I thank my children, Jessica and Andrew Brame for their love and support. I thank members of my family who also supported me: Gordon and Mary Brame, James and Joyce Thomas, Keith and Barbara Jones, Diane and John Harcourt, Ronald and Pamela Gleason, Joddie and Cindy Johnson, James Thomas, and Stacey McIver, Keeley Graves, and all their children.

ABSTRACT

EXAMINING THE EMPIRICAL IMPACT OF TEACHER PUPIL CONTROL IDEOLOGY ON STUDENT OUTCOMES: THE CLASSROOM PERSPECTIVE

Michael Brame

January 24, 2007

This study examined a hypothesized relationship among *teacher beliefs*, *teacher behaviors*, *classroom climate*, *student engagement*, and *student outcomes*. The researcher used teacher ($N = 6$) and student ($N = 12$) interviews, observations, and the mining of documents and material culture to collect data in a rural Midwest middle school struggling to meet the requirements of state and federal accountability measures. *Humanistic* teachers operated in an atmosphere of *student empowerment* and high levels of student engagement; *Custodial* teachers operated in an atmosphere of *student compliance* and low levels of student engagement. Outcomes, (grades, office referrals, and accountability scores) were more positive in humanistic classrooms than in custodial classrooms. The findings contributed to the knowledge base that will enable school administrators to address shortcomings in student achievement on high-stakes accountability tests.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
ABSTRACT.....	v
LIST OF APPENDICIES	ix
LIST OF TABLES.....	x
LIST OF FIGURES	xii
INTRODUCTION	1
Background.....	2
Research Problem	5
Purpose of the Study	6
Significance of the Study	7
Definition of Terms.....	8
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	14
Education Reform	15
Pupil Control.....	37
Teacher/Student Relationships.....	79
Statement of the Research Problem	129
METHODS AND MATERIALS.....	133
Study Design.....	134
Site Selection	135
Participant Selection	136
Data Collection	141

Data Analysis	149
Trustworthiness of the Data	151
Study Limitations.....	152
RESULTS	154
Format for Organizing the Study Findings	154
Research Question 1	159
Ms. Campbell, Sixth Grade Custodial Portrait	160
Ms. Elliot, Sixth Grade Humanistic Portrait.....	177
Ms. McNabb, Seventh Grade Custodial Portrait	195
Ms. Warren, Seventh Grade Humanistic Portrait	216
Mr. Carroll, Eighth Grade Custodial Portrait.....	235
Ms. Brandt, Eighth Grade Humanistic Portrait.....	256
Cross-Case Analyses of Custodialism and Humanism	276
Research Question 2	294
Office Referrals.....	294
Grades	296
CATS Scores.....	297
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	304
Study Purpose	304
Summary of Findings.....	305
Conclusions.....	315
Discussion of Study Findings	316
Implications of Findings	322

Recommendations.....	325
Suggestions for Further Research	331
REFERENCES	333
APPENDICES	341
CURRICULUM VITAE	358

LIST OF APPENDECES

Appendix A: Teacher Selection Protocol	342
Appendix B: Initial Teacher Interview Protocol.....	344
Appendix C: Classroom Observation Schedule.....	346
Appendix D: Teaching for Meaning	348
Appendix E: Flanders 10 X 10 Interaction Matrix	350
Appendix F: Initial Student Interview Protocol	352
Appendix G: Coding List and Definitions	353
Appendix H: The Rolling Hills School Code	354
Appendix I: Composite Classroom Observations, Manner by Grade	351

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Sixth Grade Custodial COS Activity Types	169
Table 2: Sixth Grade Custodial COS Instructional Setting	170
Table 3: Sixth Grade Custodial COS Interaction.....	175
Table 4: Sixth Grade Custodial COS Manner.....	176
Table 5: Sixth Grade Humanistic COS Activity Types.....	189
Table 6: Sixth Grade Humanistic COS Instructional Setting	189
Table 7: Sixth Grade Humanistic COS Interaction.....	194
Table 8: Sixth Grade Humanistic COS Manner	194
Table 9: Seventh Grade Custodial COS Activity Types.....	208
Table 10: Seventh Grade Custodial COS Instructional Setting.....	209
Table 11: Seventh Grade Custodial COS Interaction	214
Table 12: Seventh Grade Custodial COS Manner	215
Table 13: Seventh Grade Humanistic COS Activity Types.....	228
Table 14: Seventh Grade Humanistic COS Instructional Setting	228
Table 15: Seventh Grade Humanistic COS Interaction	233
Table 16: Seventh Grade Humanistic COS Manner	234
Table 17: Eighth Grade Custodial COS Activity Types.....	249
Table 18: Eighth Grade Custodial COS Instructional Setting	249
Table 19: Eighth Grade Custodial COS Interaction	255
Table 20: Eighth Grade Custodial COS Manner	255

Table 21: Eighth Grade Humanistic COS Activity Types.....	268
Table 22: Eighth Grade Humanistic COS Instructional Setting	269
Table 23: Eighth Grade Humanistic COS Interaction	275
Table 24: Eighth Grade Humanistic COS Manner	276
Table 25: COS Composite Activity Type.....	288
Table 26: COS Composite Setting.....	289
Table 27: COS Composite Interaction	292
Table 28: Office Referrals by Grade and Orientation.....	295
Table 29: Weighting Factors for CATS Index Calculation	297
Table 30: Seventh Grade Custodial Class Portfolio Index	298
Table 31: Seventh Grade Custodial Class On Demand Writing Index.....	299
Table 32: Seventh Grade Humanistic Class Science Index	299
Table 33: Eight Grade Custodial Class Reading Index	301
Table 34: Eighth Grade Humanistic Class Reading Index	301
Table 35: Eighth Grade Custodial Class Reading Index Adjusted	302
Table 36: Eighth Grade Humanistic Class Reading Index Adjusted.....	303
Table 37: Accountability Index for All Kentucky Schools	323
Table 38: Kentucky No Child Left Behind Adequate Yearly Progress – 2006.....	324

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Research Problem.....	131
Figure 2: Data Collection.....	142
Figure 3: Results Report Design.....	155
Figure 4: Within Case and Across Case Analyses.....	159
Figure 5: Sixth Grade Custodial Room Arrangement.....	172
Figure 6: Seventh Grade Custodial Room Arrangement.....	211
Figure 7: Seventh Grade Humanistic Room Arrangement.....	231
Figure 8: Eighth Grade Custodial Room Arrangement	252
Figure 9: Eighth Grade Humanistic Room Arrangement	271
Figure 10: Beliefs – Classroom Management Findings.....	307
Figure 11: Beliefs – Discipline Findings	308
Figure 12: Beliefs – Instruction Findings	308
Figure 13: Behaviors – Classroom Discipline Findings	309
Figure 14: Behaviors – Discipline Findings	310
Figure 15: Behaviors – Instruction Findings	311
Figure 16: Classroom Climate Findings	312
Figure 17: Student Engagement Findings.....	313

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Pupil control ideology is a conceptualized set of beliefs that define teacher orientations of classroom management (Willower, Eidell, & Hoy, 1967). To the layperson, the term “control” in the context of classroom management might imply the use of coercion to maintain order in the classroom. Woolfolk and Hoy (1990), however, claimed *pupil control* was a neutral, non-pejorative term referring to any mechanism by which teachers gain cooperation in the classroom (see e.g., Cusick, 1992). For any practitioner, control is necessary to avoid chaos (Jackson, 1968).

Pupil control ideology (PCI) encompasses this classroom reality for the need to control student behaviors. Teacher beliefs comprising PCI fall on a continuum from custodial to humanistic. *Custodial* control is the traditional model that stresses rigidity and strict control of student behavior. Custodial characteristics include impersonality, pessimism, punishment, and mistrust and are oriented toward teacher-to-student classroom interaction. *Humanistic* control is a socio-psychological model that stresses the importance of the individuality of each student. Humanistic characteristics include friendliness, optimism, behavior learning, and trust. Humanistic teachers encourage student-to-teacher and student-to-student classroom interaction.

This study examined the impact pupil control ideology had on the intermediate effects of teacher behavior, classroom climate, and student engagement and then drew conclusions about these effects based on student outcomes. Research in the area of student outcomes typically addressed “best practices” for pedagogies, class size, or

teacher qualifications (Lee & Wong, 2004). This study departed from that tradition and focused on the interactions among dimensions of a hypothesized relationship between pupil control ideology and student outcomes. The researcher informally hypothesized pupil control ideology had intermediate effects on teacher behavior, classroom climate, and classroom engagement. These intermediate effects subsequently had an impact on student outcomes. Custodialism would result in poorer student outcomes. On the other hand, humanism would result in higher student outcomes.

Human resource theory undergirded the hypothesis of this study. Mary Parker Follett (1926) posited obedience only occurred when previous patterns of behavior existed in the minds of the recipients. Middle school students wish to govern their own lives, yet teachers have the responsibility to keep order in the classroom. Many teachers interpret this responsibility as the “giving of orders” to their students. Many students interpret the orders as arbitrary. This tension causes conflict between teachers and students. Follett argued it was *not* the responsibility of the leader to force people to obey orders. Instead, it was the responsibility of the leader to discover order within the particulars of a situation. Custodial teachers would perceive “giving of orders” as a necessary part of instruction. Humanistic teachers would perceive the contextual discovery of order as a necessary part of instruction.

Background

Since the publication of *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), there was a shift in the collective responsibility for student outcomes from students to principals and teachers. A salient point of *A Nation at Risk* was for the first time in the history of the U. S., students in public schools would not perform as well

as the generation that preceded them. School administrators and teachers needed find ways to maximize the use of the time students spend in their classrooms.

At the time of the publication of *A Nation at Risk*, politicians and educators identified nine reform issues as crucial to success in U. S. Schools. These included smaller schools, safer schools, lower dropout rates, greater achievement in science and technology, higher achievement for minorities and the poor, stronger school administrative leadership, greater accountability for student achievement, more shared decision-making, and improved teacher attitudes (Guthrie, 1988). Schools in the U. S. were failing and voters wanted federal legislative action to stop education decline. During the 1980s, the citizens of the U. S. had lost faith in local accountability. The federal government became more involved in what was a long-standing responsibility of the individual states, the education of its children. More than 20 years have passed since this reform began, yet many classrooms across the U. S. continue to be boring places where teachers talk and students listen (e.g., McNeil, 1988).

It has been a legacy in the U. S. that schools are institutions where students put in time and are awarded credentials that reflect endurance and toleration rather than intellectual accomplishment (McNeil, 1988;Sizer, 1984). Reform efforts placed demands on schools to improve student outcomes, while providing broad curricula. As a result, administrators emphasized the efficient coverage of curricular material. When administrators emphasized order and efficiency, teachers responded by structuring their instruction to create efficiency rather than to maximize learning. McNeil (1988) found teachers used defensive teaching strategies to accomplish this efficiency. These include fragmentation (reducing information to its simplest form), mystification (shrouding

complex ideas in mystery), omission (leaving out complex, controversial or extremely current information), and defensive simplification (diminishing the complexity of work to improve student completion of assignments). The very strategies that teachers use to cover the broad curricula often resulted in diminished student outcomes, which became evident with the publication of accountability results. Teachers became so attentive to efficiency that they neglect the educational purpose of the school.

With the passage of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) act in 2001, the federal government called for a shift of the collective responsibility for academic outcomes from students to schools. New guidelines established requirements and standards for testing and accountability. By 2014, all schools must be proficient in the instruction of reading and mathematics (science will become a part of the accountability for NCLB in the 2006-2007 school year). In Kentucky, Proficient means scoring a 100 on the state Accountability Index. Schools not achieving adequate yearly progress toward proficiency will encounter sanctions that include the replacement of staff responsible for the continued failure of schools to achieve adequate yearly progress.

The passage of the Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA) in 1990 brought high stakes testing to Kentucky. The KERA called for world class standards for all students of the Commonwealth of Kentucky in response to years of financial and academic inequities (Strong & Sexton, 1996). The goal for Kentucky was student Proficiency across the state. This included improvements in academic and non-academic areas. Students had to demonstrate competence in core content knowledge and writing. Schools had to reduce the number of student dropouts and failures and improve attendance to achieve proficiency.

High stakes accountability, a primary component of both KERA and NCLB, underscored the need to improve student outcomes. The Kentucky Supreme court declared the common system of schools in the state was unconstitutional (Rose v. Council for Better Education, 1989). The resulting KERA legislation advanced the demand that all children learn at high levels. In 2002, President Bush reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (now the NCLB) demanding reductions in achievement gaps between advantaged and disadvantaged student demographic groups. The NCLB act required strict standards for all U. S. schools and all subgroups within those schools. Because of increased accountability, administrators and teachers must evaluate every component of their instruction to maximize learning in the classroom.

Research Problem

The increased emphasis on high stakes accountability underscored the importance of student achievement. All schools must achieve proficiency by the year 2014. How can this happen when many teachers continue to bore student with archaic pedagogies and restrict student expression of ideas with rigid control of student interaction and movement? Teachers must perform in ways that create positive learning environments and increase student engagement in classrooms.

Research using the Pupil Control Ideology (PCI) instrument (see Willower, Eidell, & Hoy, 1967) addressed effects of PCI on classroom climate and on perceptions and attitudes. Studies examining PCI were typically quantitative combining all the attributes of pupil control ideology into a single index ranging from 20 to 100. There had yet to be a study to address characteristics of pupil control ideology separately, nor had there been research to make a direct connection between pupil control ideology and

student outcomes. The research related to pupil control ideology demonstrated potential in grounding within authentic classrooms, the student-focused effects related with the humanistic end of the pupil control continuum.

The researcher hypothesized that pupil control ideology affected student outcomes and those students achieve higher outcomes with humanistic teachers. The need to understand the effects of pupil control on outcomes is vital to establishing classroom climates and student engagement that will result in maximizing student outcomes. The relationships that teachers establish with students provide a multitude of possibilities for this study. Pupil control is only one of many factors that affect student outcomes. It is, however, an import factor.

This shift in responsibility of achievement from the students to the administration and faculty has put educators on alert throughout the U. S. Schools not achieving adequately yearly progress face sanctions that ultimately include the replacement of those found responsible for the failure to achieve adequate yearly progress. The research problem grounding this study was a product of high stakes accountability resulting from state and national reform efforts.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to contextualize pupil control ideology within selected classrooms in a school struggling with satisfactory progress toward Proficiency on both the KERA accountability index and the No Child Left Behind measure of Adequate Yearly Progress. This study focused on a school with a high level of poverty (measured using free and reduced lunch status), struggling with Adequate Yearly Progress goals of the No Child Left Behind act, and struggling to meet the goals of the

Kentucky Education Reform Act. The researcher posited that pupil control ideology influenced student outcomes regardless of poverty level.

The reasons that this school was struggling to meet goals were varied; however, this study focused on the relationship between the pupil control ideologies of its teachers and the effect of pupil control on student outcomes. The two research questions for this study were:

1. In what ways do teacher beliefs about the craft of teaching impact teacher classroom behavior, classroom climate, and student engagement?
2. How do the intermediate effects of PCI on teacher classroom behavior, classroom climate, and student engagement affect student outcomes?

Significance of the Study

This study was significant for three reasons: (a) principals and teachers are under tremendous pressure to achieve an Accountability Index of 100 by the year 2014 (see Definitions of Terms later in this chapter), (b) administrators and teachers need more information about effective ways to maximize use of instructional time (c) findings can inform local, district, and state professional development organizers in the development of in-service opportunities for teachers and administrators.

The No Child Left Behind Act requires all schools in the U. S. to achieve a target of Proficient by the year 2014, which in Kentucky means a score of 100 for the Accountability Index. Those not meeting Adequate Yearly Progress requirements are subject to severe sanctions including in year three, replacing school staff responsible for the continued failure to make AYP, implementation of research based pedagogies, decrease of management authority, appointment of an outside expert to advise the school,

or reorganization of the school internally. The fourth year sanctions include replacing principal and staff, state takeover, and any other major restructuring of school governance required to achieve proficiency.

Teachers and administrators must respond to the demands of recent reform initiatives (e.g., KERA and NCLB). Reform in the U. S. shifted the responsibility of student outcomes from students to the principal and the teachers. Educators must apply effective strategies for maximizing the use of instructional time. These strategies must meet the needs of all students, regardless of economic status.

The results can assist those who plan professional development programs for state, district, and local education agencies. Over the years, funding for professional development increased for schools who meet the requirements for Title I status. Schools must justify additional funding with improved student performance. The Kentucky Education Reform act has made professional development (PD) a foundation of school reform. The findings of this study could assist planners with the development of PD opportunities.

Definition of Terms

An important component of any research is the consistent use of terms. Below are the definitions of the terms used consistently throughout this study.

Accountability Index

The Accountability Index is a numeric composite of student performance in Kentucky schools. The number reflects student performance on the Kentucky Performance Standards, the nationally norm-referenced test, and non-academic

indicators. The state uses the accountability index to identify schools in need of assistance and to reward successful schools (Kentucky Department of Education, 2005).

Adequate Yearly Progress

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) is a federally mandated and state defined set of criteria to meet the requirements of the No Child Left Behind act (NCLB). NCLB is the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) (P.L. 107–110, H.R. 1). All schools, Title I and non-Title I, must participate in the determination of AYP. States must establish goals for proficiency that schools must meet by the year 2014. Kentucky defines proficiency as achieving a school index of 100 on the Accountability Index. Schools must achieve incremental progress toward proficiency annually for all students and all subgroups of students in the schools. Subgroups include ethnic/racial groups, economically disadvantaged students, limited English proficient, and students with disabilities (US Department of Education, 2002).

Classroom Climate

Classroom climate is the physical structure and the ways people interact in the environment, which result in perceptions of the learning environment from the learner (Kushins & Brisman, 2005). The physical structure typically includes the seating arrangements, decorations on the walls, and other inanimate fixtures in the classroom. Interaction includes the ways people communicate, generate, and transfer information. The perceptions of the learning environment include perceptions of motivation, rigor, and student voice in the context of classroom.

Commonwealth Accountability Testing System (CATS)

The Commonwealth Accountability Testing System (CATS) assesses the progress of Kentucky Schools. The program is made of five parts: (a) The Kentucky Core Content Tests (b) writing portfolios (c) alternate portfolios (d) non-academic indexes, and (e) norm-referenced tests of reading, language arts, and mathematics. The Core Content Tests occur at grades 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, and 12. The writing portfolios occur at grades 4, 7, and 12. The non-academic indexes include attendance and retention at the elementary level; attendance, retention, and dropout rates at the middle school level; and attendance, retention, dropout rates, and successful transition to adult life at the high school level (Kentucky Department of Education, 2003).

Economically Disadvantaged

For the purpose of this study, economically disadvantaged means students who receive free and reduced lunch. The researcher acknowledges that there are students whose families qualify for free and reduced lunches who for one reason or another do not apply for the benefit. Kentucky, however, uses the free and reduced lunch status to determine poverty for its schools. It is common practice in research to use free and reduced lunch status as a variable for economic status (see e.g., Christle, Nelson, & Jolivette, 2004; Bickel & Howley, 2003)

Student Classroom Engagement

Engagement is the level at which students are involved in instructional activities (Lunenburg, 1983). Students are engaged in a lesson when they are either listening to or interacting with the lesson. Students are unengaged when they are not paying attention to

the instructional activities. This may mean that they are attending to non-instructional activities or that they are bored and inattentive.

Novice, Apprentice, Proficient, Distinguished (NAPD Descriptors)

The state uses NAPD descriptors to report student results for on-demand writing and portfolio performance within the CATS. NAPD is an acronym for the scores Novice, Apprentice, Proficient, and Distinguished. A score of Novice meant a student demonstrated limited or inaccurate knowledge, communicated ineffectively with little detail or evidence, and used inappropriate strategies to communicate. A score of Apprentice meant a student demonstrated basic knowledge, communicated reasonably with weak or incomplete evidence, and attempted appropriate strategies to communicate. A score of Proficient meant a student demonstrated broad knowledge, communicated clearly with relevant details and evidence, and uses appropriate strategies to solve problems. A Proficient score also indicated that a student used critical skills effectively. A score of Distinguished meant that the student demonstrated in-depth, extensive, or comprehensive knowledge; communicated concisely using sophisticated support, explicit examples, evaluations, and justifications; and used a variety of appropriate strategies. A Distinguished score also meant that the student demonstrated insightful connections with reasoning (Kentucky Department of Education, 2003).

Pupil Control Ideology

Pupil control is a social structure of the school organization that affects the social interaction patterns of students, teachers, and administrators (Vitagliano & Licata, 1987). Pupil control ideology consists of the norms that teachers hold that places them on continuum from custodial to humanistic (Willower & Eidell, 1967). Custodial teachers

are inflexible and highly regimented and concerned primarily with maintaining order. Custodial teachers stereotype students according to appearance, behavior, and family status. These teachers perceive school as an autocratic organization with a rigid pupil-teacher status hierarchy. Communication flow in a custodial environment is unilaterally downward. Teachers of the custodial orientation do not attempt to understand behavior. They perceive misbehavior as a personal affront. They are watchful and mistrustful of students and use punishment as a primary means of control (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1990)

Humanistic teachers are flexible and are primarily concerned with providing an atmosphere for students to learn in an interactive environment. Humanistic teachers view student behavior and learning in psychological and sociological terms. These teachers perceive schools as democratic organizations. Communication flow occurs from teacher-to-student, student-to-teacher, and student-to-student. The humanistic teacher attempts to create an atmosphere to meet the wide range of student needs and to understand behavior and teach appropriate behaviors as a primary means of control (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1990)

Student Outcomes

For this study, student outcomes are student performance on the CATS, student grades, and office referrals. Student performance on CATS includes student scores on multiple choice, open response, on-demand, writing, and portfolio performance. Grades are the cumulative report card grades. Office referrals are documented incidents of student misbehavior in the form of a report to the assistant principal in charge of disciplinary procedures. Office referrals document two types of information: (a) teacher time spent on discipline that diminishes instructional time and (b) student time spent away from classroom instruction.

Teacher Classroom Behavior

Teacher behavior is the actions of teachers to provide instruction or to maintain control in the classroom. Though behaviors such as planning and grading are important teacher behaviors, this study is only concerned with behaviors that occur during instructional time. These will include behaviors that the researcher observes directly and/or that teacher volunteer during interviews.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The topic for this research was pupil control ideology (PCI) in a reform environment and its impact on student outcomes. The No Child Left Behind act mandated schools achieve proficiency by the year 2014. The Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA) required proficiency in academic and non-academic indicators (703 KAR 5:020). The Kentucky Board of Education (KBE) defined Proficiency as scoring a 100 on the school accountability index (703 KAR 5:020). To achieve proficiency, schools must decrease the number of students scoring Novice and Apprentice levels on the Commonwealth Accountability Testing System (CATS). Schools must offset scores of Novice and Apprentice with Distinguished scores while minimizing the gap between advantaged and disadvantaged demographic groups. With emphasis on achieving proficiency by the year 2014, it was important to explore the impact of pupil control on student outcomes. It was unlikely that schools struggling with Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) would achieve proficiency in the uninviting climates of custodial classrooms.

Three areas of research framed the current study: (a) education reform (b) pupil control ideology, and (c) teacher/student relationships. The literature on reform identified the demands for improved educational practices in the U. S. and in the Commonwealth of Kentucky. Research in the area of pupil control ideology addressed the connection among pupil control, teacher behaviors, and classroom climate. Research on teacher/student relationships addressed: (a) student agency (authentic student input in the classroom) (b)

teacher trust of students, and (c) teacher pedagogical choices effecting student engagement.

Education Reform

Three education reform movements provided the backdrop for the context of this study: (a) *A Nation at Risk* (b) KERA, and (c) No Child Left Behind. These three reform movements established demands for improvements in the common systems of schools in Kentucky. The following subsections describe the demands that education reform put on districts, administrators, and teachers.

A Nation at Risk

On August 26, 1981, Secretary of Education T. H. Bell created the National Commission on Excellence in Education. Americans believed schools were failing to provide an adequate education. For the first time in history, schoolchildren in the U. S. would achieve less academically than their parents did. The purpose of the commission was to (a) report on the condition of schools in the United States in comparison to other schools in other nations and (b) make recommendations based on educational programs that result in student success. The commission included college professors, school administrators, teachers, politicians, and parents. The product of the commission was a report entitled *A Nation at Risk*. This report confirmed American beliefs about the state of the system of common schools in the U. S. and rekindled American commitment to quality education. The committee demanded meaningful changes in the common schools across the nation (The National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1984).

The commission reported findings in four areas: (a) *content* (b) *expectations* (c) *time*, and (d) *teaching*. Regarding *content*, the commission reported that curricula lacked

rigor and purpose and as much as 25% of the requirements for high school graduation were non-intellectual endeavors such as personal service classes, physical and health education, or remedial classes. The commission found *expectations* were low and that students received credentials for endurance rather than academic achievement. The commission found student experienced insufficient and meaningless homework, unchallenging instruction, and inadequate credit requirements for graduation. Examinations did not measure the content and skills associated with earning a diploma.

The commission found students spent too little *time* in the classroom. There were fewer days in class with an inadequate amount of time in well-planned and meaningful instruction. The lack of time spent in meaningful instruction led to undisciplined students with poor study habits. The findings regarding *teaching* uncovered unskilled reading teachers, inadequate teacher preparation programs focusing too much on “methods courses” while lacking in subject matter mastery, low teacher salaries, insufficient numbers of math and science teachers, and pervasive cases of teachers teaching content for which they were not certified. There were serious deficiencies in the systems of common schools across America.

The commission addressed these deficiencies with recommendations in five areas: (a) *content* (b) *standards and expectations* (c) *time* (d) *teaching*, and (e) *leadership and fiscal support*. The preparation of lessons needed to include appropriate *content* to satisfy diverse student backgrounds. There was a need to adapt instruction to meet varying levels of student competence. The commission-demanded that students give best efforts, regardless of background or aspirations.

The *content* recommendations included improvements in English, mathematics, science, social studies and computer science instruction. The committee called these content areas the “New Basics” (The National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1984, p. 70). In addition, there were recommendations for foreign language, performing arts, vocational education, and the curriculum for elementary and middle schools. All of the recommendations emphasized understanding and application of subject matter.

The committee recommended that schools make *standards and expectations* for student achievement more rigorous. They focused on four areas of standards and expectations grades, admission requirements, standardized tests, and textbooks and materials. Grades were to be consistent indicators of academic achievement. Universities and colleges would raise requirements by requiring specific coursework in high school and proof of competence for admittance. Standardized tests would: (a) certify student credentials (b) identify the need for remediation, and (c) identify potential gifted and talented students. There would be added emphasis on textbook selection to assure appropriate content and academic rigor.

To meet the demands of the “New Basics,” the committee recommended that students spend more *time* at school. To do this, school days would be seven hours long and school districts would extend the academic year to between 200 and 220 days. There would be an emphasis on increasing instructional time in the classroom to enhance content, study skills, and performance. Schools would maintain better discipline by developing firm and fair codes of student conduct. There would be incentives and sanctions for student attendance. Finally, student promotions would be dependent on achievement, not age.

The recommendations for *teaching* addressed making the job of teacher a more rewarding and respected profession. This would include increased salaries to make teaching a more financially rewarding job. The committee recommended career ladders and immediate interventions to address shortages in mathematics and science teachers. The recommendations for *leadership and fiscal support* addressed the role of administrators in schools. The focus for this recommendation centered on effective leadership practices and governance of schools.

The findings of *A Nation at Risk* created the demand for sweeping school reforms in the United States. It was not acceptable to minimize the standards for graduation at the cost of compromised education for the youth of our nation. To achieve this goal, the committee recommended schools and school districts focus on maximizing student potential. Schools would increase instructional time using materials of appropriate content. More important, instruction would emphasize curricular understanding and application of skills. This meant that teachers needed to find ways to make instruction meaningful while considering the diversity of their students. Teachers must use instructional pedagogies that enhance intellectual interactions in the classroom and improve the quality of student products of instruction.

Guthrie (1988) described the impact that *A Nation at Risk* had on the 1988 presidential campaign. Education in the U. S. was shifting from an individual states issue to a national issue. Politicians in the past addressed education with platitudes and promises while knowing that the federal impact on education was very small. Guthrie questioned this logic when schools in the U. S. were dealing with unsafe and overcrowded schools, poor performing teachers and administrators, insufficient

curriculum, high dropout rates, and low scores on achievement tests. Guthrie proposed that the federal government provide more support for schools. This would allow the U. S. to compete in a global economy and to provide a higher standard of living for American citizens.

Guthrie (1988) outlined nine issues that were most salient of the time. These included smaller schools, safer schools, lower dropout rates, greater achievement in science and technology, higher achievement for minorities and the poor, stronger school administrative leadership, greater accountability for student achievement, more shared decision-making, and improved teacher attitudes. Guthrie posited that teachers needed more satisfaction from their work, better working conditions, and higher salaries. He proposed that the teaching profession be elevated. He suggested performance pay and a national certification board. Guthrie also suggested that schools needed to expand youth services.

Guthrie's (1988) suggestions were a reflection of the dissatisfaction with the conditions of U. S. schools at the time. American citizens were demanding changes to stop what they perceived as declining conditions in schools. This was especially important in a growing global market. Americans feared if nothing changed in education, the U. S. would not be able to compete economically with other nations. Guthrie's position also identified a shift in American policy direction from local accountability to federal accountability for student achievement. There was dissatisfaction with teacher and school administrator performance. Americans believed there was a need to professionalize education and hold teachers and administrators accountable for failing student performance.

Hamilton (1986) examined the impact that *A Nation at Risk* had on global markets and economic competition for a competent workforce. He noted that in the U. S., young adults had a period of “floundering” after they graduated from high school. Students were not ready for the workforce when they graduated, so they would spend a few years engaged in meaningless jobs with no career future, or they would be unemployed. Employers complained young workers were not socially or intellectually mature enough to handle real work. He compared U. S. students to German students who were ready for the workforce when they graduated. This was because of the preparation the German students received in school. Students in middle school participated in cooperative activities with local businesses to teach social competence at work while the school focused on academic rigors. Young workers had authentic tasks that did more than mimic real life. Their work experiences were actual business operations.

The reason for this “floundering” period in the U. S. was that students were socially and academically unprepared when they graduated from school. Young U. S. workers could not read, write, calculate, follow instructions, come to work on time, or put in a full day of hard work. They were not reliable employees. Employers complained that young people were irresponsible and thus poor risks for jobs that require responsibility and money invested for training.

The results of the Hamilton (1986) investigation showed a need for students to graduate from school with both academic and social competencies. Students were unable to take on adult job responsibilities and were “floundering” until they matured. To compete globally, students needed to graduate the ability to handle authentic adult tasks that occur daily at work. The citizens of the U. S. placed demands on public schools to

produce students with academic skills that apply to everyday work and social competence. This was necessary to interact appropriately at work and can only occur if students have practice with academic and social work skills at school.

Reform efforts that occurred after the release of *A Nation at Risk* focused on making the U. S. competitive with other nations in the growing global economy. There was a fear that for the first time in history, children would be less prepared and less educated than their parents were. The U. S. citizenry demanded that schools strengthen their standards for graduation and improve the quality of student products. In addition, students needed to graduate with the social skills to acquire and maintain productive working relationships. It was not acceptable for students to “flounder” for the first years after graduation. Common schools needed to prepare students academically and socially so that they could be productive workers. Essentially, Americans were not getting what they paid for with their tax dollars they spent on public schools in the U. S. This was especially true in Kentucky where there was huge disparity in the funding and academic rigor among schools across the state. In the next subsection, there is an explanation of how the Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA) addressed the unconstitutionality of schools and defined the specifics for reform in the Commonwealth.

Kentucky Education Reform Act

Rose v. Council for Better Education (1989) was the landmark case that declared the entire education system of common schools in Kentucky unconstitutional under Section 183, the section calling for equal and equitable schools. The plaintiffs claimed that school financing provided by the General Assembly was inadequate, placed too much emphasis on local school boards, and resulted in inadequacies and inequalities

throughout the state. The relief sought was for the court to find that the Commonwealth funding formula for common schools was unconstitutional.

The Circuit Court declared the Kentucky school funding formula unconstitutional. Two plaintiffs, Senate President Pro Tempore John Rose and Speaker of the House Don Blanford appealed. The district court affirmed the lower court and, in an unusual move, declared the entire system of common schools in Kentucky unconstitutional. This meant that the funding formula and the programs of education were no longer in compliance with Section 183 of the Kentucky Constitution.

This Kentucky General Assembly responded to the case with two programs. Support Education Excellence in Kentucky (SEEK) addressed the funding inequities and the Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA) addressed the inadequacies of Kentucky education. The focus for this study is on reform; however, that does not minimize the importance that SEEK provides essentially equal funding to schools regardless of the levels of minorities or poverty in student populations of schools in Kentucky (Picus, Odden, & Fermanich, 2004). This section addresses the reliability of KERA accountability measures (Strong & Sexton, 1996), and the effect of accountability on teacher pedagogies and student work (Foster, 1991; Berryman & Russell, 2001; Wolf & McIver, 1999).

Strong and Sexton (1996) addressed the issue of using test scores for school accountability in a study comparing the results of Kentucky high schools on Kentucky Instructional Results Information System (or KIRIS, now modified and called the Commonwealth Accountability Testing System or CATS) scores to ACT scores on the same students. The measure of accountability went through periods of improvement since

1990. This is because in the early 1990s, there was much criticism of the exclusive use of open response items to assess student achievement. The purpose of Strong and Sexton was to assess the accuracy of the reading subtest of the KIRIS test with a nationally norm referenced test of proven validity and reliability measures. There were questions about scoring practices, validity, and reliability of measures at the time. The researchers also cited problems with the high cost of administering the KIRIS test.

The researchers posited through previous data, that there should be no significant differences between percentages of students scoring Novice, Apprentice, Proficient, and Distinguished (NAPD) on the KIRIS tests and similarly grouped scores on the ACT. According to the authors, the KIRIS applied “world class standards” to the Proficient and Distinguished levels of performance. Below these standards were the Apprentice and Novice levels. Subjective evaluations of short essay items by a trained contractor operationalized the categorical assignment of students to these NAPD categories.

The researchers collected data from 22 counties in the state. Approximately one-third of the data came from each of the Western Kentucky, Central Kentucky, and Eastern Kentucky regions. The researchers received complete data sets from 2668 subjects from the 1993 senior class. The researchers used descriptive statistics and performed a Chi-square analysis to the data. The researchers used ACT score ranges of 1-19, 20-23 and 24-36. They noted that 51.52% of the students scoring either Novice or Apprentice on the KIRIS test had an ACT reading score of 20 or above. At the same time, 11.89% of students who scored in the Proficient and Distinguished ranges scored below 20 on the ACT. Chi-square analysis indicates that there were significant

differences in scores for categories of the KIRIS test and similarly grouped scores on the ACT test for students taking both tests ($\chi^2 = 43.68, p < .001$).

Accountability testing system in Kentucky went through some “growing pains” since the passage of the KERA. The CATS test did improve on statistical reliability and the standardization of scoring procedures of open response questions. It was still unclear, however, if these changes address differences along racial and socioeconomic strata. It was important, therefore, to understand that disadvantaged students took the same accountability measure that advantaged students took.

This research addressed the need for reform measures to reflect reliable and valid measures. However, it also intrinsically addressed new questions about what teachers of disadvantaged students do to prepare their students to do well on the CATS test. There was no built-in, tangible motivation for students to do well on the CATS because its intent is to measure school progress, not student progress. The state judged teachers of disadvantaged students on the performance of students, not on the rigors of their work. This sent a signal to educators that demographics could not be an excuse for poor performance of minorities and economically disadvantaged students. Educators must find ways to be effective with all students so that students reflect their potential in the products of education. The next study addresses the pedagogical choices that result in authentic writing and student work that connects core content to real-world situations.

Foster (1991) examined the role of the accountability component of KERA on Kentucky schools. Because of the KERA, improved student outcomes were a constitutional obligation of the public schools. The Kentucky Supreme Court and the General Assembly made accountability a significant issue for reform in Kentucky. Prior

to the KERA, schools expected percentages of students to fail academically. An important tenet of KERA was the idea that all students could learn at high levels. Acceptance of failure for any students was no longer an acceptable practice.

The state established the Council of School Performance Standards to recommend to the legislature what all Kentucky students should know. The Council recommended that all students should: (a) use basic communication and mathematics skills in real life situations; (b) apply core concepts of mathematics, science, art, humanities, and social studies to real life; (c) become self-sufficient people; (d) become responsible members of family, work groups and community and demonstrate community service; (e) think and solve problems the encounter in life; and (f) connect and integrate experiences and new knowledge from all subject matter to build on past experiences. In addition, the Council determined that student assessment should include complex tasks to demonstrate objectives in an interactive context. The state defined school success in terms of the proportion of students who are successful. Schools would have to maintain improvement over previous academic benchmarks while keeping attendance high and dropout rates low.

The KERA also would have an impact on instruction. Since student evaluation included the performance of tasks, students would need to perform tasks and create quality school products. Pedagogical choices would focus on students learning to solve problems rather than covering curricular scope and sequence. There was a shift in interest from knowing what a group of students was doing on average to all students learning at their highest levels possible. Schools not meeting their obligations were “in crisis” and

subject to outside intervention. Students in such a school would have the opportunity to transfer to a school of the superintendent's choice.

The academic indicators of the CATS accountability formula include a holistic scoring component for writing. Each year, Kentucky 4th, 7th, and 12th graders complete a writing portfolio. Berryman and Russell (2001) investigated the effects of portfolios on assessment and instruction at Paul Laurence Dunbar High School in Lexington, KY.

Dunbar scored the highest on the CATS assessment among urban schools in the Fayette County school district and fifth overall urban high school in the state (Roeder, 2001). The researchers did not attempt to generalize these findings to any other schools. There were, however, findings that indicated the staff at Dunbar eventually grasped the purpose of portfolios to meet the demands of the Kentucky accountability system. One researcher, an English teacher at the school, provided a memoir of the evolution of portfolios at the school to establish the context for the investigation. The other author collected qualitative data from interviews of 26 teachers teaching in all curricular areas. Using the memoir to ground the study, the researchers reported the findings in three themes: (a) professional development through whole school assessment (b) curriculum development and whole school assessment, and (c) teachers learning together—collegiality for a change.

The researchers described the portfolio creation and assessment in the memoir. The 12th grade portfolio consisted of six writing pieces including a table of contents, a letter from the student to the reviewer, a personal experience piece, a literary piece, and two transactive pieces. Transactive pieces included writing to communicate with a specific real-world audience with an authentic purpose and included feature articles, position papers, lab reports, brochures, abstracts, multimedia presentations, and

instruction manuals. Teachers used a holistic scoring guide and the NAPD descriptors to assess the quality of the portfolios. The portfolio accounted for 14% of the accountability index score for the school (later 11%). The index score had an impact on rewards and sanctions for the school; however, they had little or no consequential impact on the students.

Professional development on whole school assessment stressed the purpose of the portfolio was to improve instruction through writing. Teachers in all academic disciplines had to redesign instruction to include writing in their lesson plans. Initially, the content area teachers made little effort to understand the characteristics of the various portfolio pieces. Through professional development, content area teachers became more efficient with writing the writing processes. A concern for many teachers was compromising content. Most teachers, however, recognized that writing did not require teachers to limit content scope.

Curriculum development findings focused on how students use writing as a tool for learning. Teachers taught writing processes using the following pattern:

- (1) Read and assess sources of information
- (2) Decide on a topic and writing genre
- (3) Research the topic
- (4) Pre-write and draft
- (5) Peer review.

Authentic purpose and real world audience were characteristics of student writing. Most importantly, students were developing critical thinking skills by becoming engaged in the

topics they studied. Students made connections between their real life experiences and the writing assignments.

In the area of *teachers learning together—collegiality for a change*, teachers learned together by engaging critically each other and with students about the content. There was a new emphasis on developing a common writing language among the staff members. English teachers found common ground with teachers from other departments through writing. Teachers across curricular areas developed a new level of collegiality with a common cause of improving student writing. Of the 26 teachers that the researchers interviewed, 24 reported that student writing improved through the portfolio process. There was a critical mass of teachers engaged in similar writing endeavors to have a positive impact on writing instruction.

Creating quality original writing pieces requires students to engage in critical thinking and to ‘grapple’ with content (seeSizer & Sizer, 1999). Berryman and Russell (2001) found portfolios forced teachers to rethink their instructional pedagogies for children to produce quality writing. Portfolios reflected school performance with little impact on student advancement through school. Demands to perform shifted from students to teachers. Teachers, consequently, must find ways to engage students in intellectual discourse and use teaching strategies that promote student grappling of ideas. In addition to the higher thinking skills, the KERA demanded that students learn the process of writing. Traditional teaching of lecture and recalling meaningless facts is antithetical to higher thinking levels. If teachers did not find ways to engage students intellectually, then accountability scores would suffer.

Wolf and McIver (1999) examined the impact of three writing evaluations of the CATS accountability score; (a) the portfolio (b) on-demand writing, and (c) open response questions, on an exemplary writing teacher. The researchers used a single case study of an effective writing teacher in rural eastern Kentucky to learn how the writing assessment of CATS affected perceptions of day-to-day teaching of authentic writing to students. According to the investigators, portfolios and on-demand writing measured student quality of writing in various genres. The difference between portfolio and on-demand writing was process. Portfolio writing employed a pre-write, draft, revise, edit, and publish process while on-demand writing did not allow students the opportunity for feedback and revision. The open response writing measured how clearly students communicate knowledge using writing. The researchers argued that the portfolio was adaptable to authentic writing process while on-demand and open response were contrived.

Wolf and McIver (1999) reported their findings in three themes: (a) teaching portfolio writing process (b) teaching on-demand and open-response process, and (c) writing “whirligigs.” The researchers used descriptions, vignettes, and analysis of student writing samples to report their findings. The teacher used questioning techniques and metaphors as a means of interacting with the students. The teacher used a cheeseburger metaphor to illustrate characteristics of good writing. The bun of the burger was the topic and the ingredients between the buns were substance. He would interact with the students asking them questions about their writing rather than giving the students answers. The purpose of the interactions was to encourage students to think about their topics and grapple beyond what might sound like good writing. The teacher encouraged students to

think about and to rationalize their writing. Students discovered deeper meaning to their work and improved their ideas through revisions and editing. Often, the inquiry process evolved into conversations with the students. Students often included information from these conversations in their writing.

To teach open response and on-demand writing, the teacher used a four-column method to organize student thoughts. The headings for the columns were: (a) know (b) do (c) examples, and (e) connections. For the heading *know*, the students asked themselves what they need to know to answer on-demand question. The heading *do* meant that the student identified what the question was asking the student to do. The *examples* heading provided the student with space to list examples of question topic. The heading *connections* reminded students to make connections between the writing prompt and real-life situations. Open-response and on-demand writing forced students to balance creativity and the need to respond correctly. Open-response and on-demand writing challenged students because they have little time to develop responses and they cannot conference with their teachers and peers to revise and edit their work.

The researchers defined writing whirligigs as non-academic benefits and hurdles of including authentic writing as a part of the portfolio process. The teacher reported satisfaction knowing that there was an evaluation that validated his writing instruction. There was, however, consternation about meeting the strict deadlines of KERA. In eastern Kentucky, snow days often made meeting portfolio deadlines challenging. Regardless, the pressures of meeting portfolio deadlines diminished in comparison to the authentic and meaningful student writing products.

The findings of Wolf and McIver (1999) indicate that the writing demands of the CATS accountability index provide schools with opportunities for higher levels of learning. Authentic work from students involved “grappling” with the topics. Students learned from the intellectual interaction with their teachers. By including information from this interaction in their writing, students demonstrated ownership of their writing. This is a departure from coerced writing of five-paragraph essays, which in the past became a forum for plagiarism and meaningless work done for nothing more than meeting the requirements of the assignment. The portfolio, on-demand writing, and open-response writing requirements provide connections to the real world in a different way. These types of writing require the students to focus on the accuracy of content without feedback from teachers or peers.

The KERA assessment process went through some growing pains, improvements in accountability resulted in reliable measures of student writing and applications of core content to real life situations (Strong & Sexton, 1996). The CATS made schools accountable for student achievement through authentic measures of core content. Students needed to demonstrate self-sufficiency through problem solving and applying previously learned knowledge to new situations (Foster, 1991). Teachers needed to promote higher levels of thinking. High levels of thinking do not occur when students do not have opportunities to make decisions about their behavior or interact with teachers and students to grapple with new ideas. The No Child Left Behind Act further addressed the need for teachers to provide genuine learning opportunities. The next section addresses the demands of NCLB.

No Child Left Behind

The *No Child Left Behind* act was the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (P.L. 107-110). Petersen and Young (2004) speculated No Child Left Behind (NCLB) would have an influence on current and future district leaders. The purpose of this article was to examine four critical areas of the bill (a) assessment and accountability (b) parental choice (c) resource flexibility, and (d) quality teachers. The authors described a brief history and salient characteristics of the NCLB act and the expertise required to carry out the requirements of the NCLB act. Finally, the authors addressed the emerging responsibilities for college leadership programs that prepare school district leaders.

The researchers cited the fact that all children must achieve proficiency by 2014 as grounding for this research. Schools must make adequate yearly progress toward that goal. High stakes testing, an economy of performance based rewards and sanctions, and public opinion created pressure to raise student outcomes at school, district and state levels. Sanctions for failure to make adequate yearly progress, shrinking state budgets, and external pressures from school “report cards” caused districts to rethink strategies to educate and close achievement gaps of disaggregated groups whose performances were lagging. Schools not achieving goals risked losing local control. In extreme cases, schools could face reorganization including changes in leadership.

Under the NCLB act, districts must provide parents with data about school performance. Parents of disadvantaged students who attend schools that did not meet performance goals could transfer their children to better performing schools and school districts would be responsible for transportation costs. Disadvantaged students at low

performing schools also qualified for supplemental educational services at district expense. A variety of factors surrounding supplemental programs resulted in few of them being successful. The researchers suggested districts should reallocate resources toward parental outreach efforts and education so that parents can better understand their choices.

The ESEA required strict compliance with expenditure of Title I funding. The NCLB act allowed districts to assess needs and allocate funds based on needs identified at the school level, providing districts with greater flexibility for use of Title I resources. The NCLB also authorizes \$3.175 billion for “highly qualified” staffing of schools. However, federal regulations required school districts identified for corrective action to reserve 20% of their Part A, Title I funding for parents of students who exercise an option for choices related to transportation and supplemental educational services. Title I funds could also pay expenses to replace staff of failing schools. New educational leaders needed knowledge of resources available through the district and state to assist low-performing schools to help defray costs for assistance, corrective action, and technical assistance.

The NCLB act required students to have highly qualified teachers. Teachers needed to possess full state certification, successfully pass a state licensing exam, or meet requirements of the state public charter school laws. States must inform parents of the professional qualifications and licensing status of its teachers. In addition, teacher assistants in Title I schools must become highly qualified by January 2006. This was a problem, especially in states with large landmasses and widely dispersed populations. Defining “high quality” based on credentials was problematic. It required superintendents

to scrutinize teacher qualifications more closely and removes the option of employing uncertified teachers under authorities to act. Superintendents had to assure federal officials that current teachers used research-based pedagogies and continue to develop teaching strategies through professional development.

Petersen and Young (2004) identified three areas of university leadership programs needing attention because of the NCLB act. The act required universities to rethink recruiting efforts and actively recruit educators with proven classroom success. Preparation of future leaders needed to address the new requirements of the NCLB act. Finally, universities needed to provide professional development opportunities for practicing teachers.

Petersen and Young (2004) described the demands from the NCLB act that legislators perceived would result in higher student achievement. Missing from the act are specifics of student achievement and teacher pedagogical knowledge. The requirements that teachers hold proper credentials coupled with the requirement of adequate yearly progress toward proficiency necessarily created a demand for quality teaching and placed serious sanctions on schools unable to achieve progress goals. The focus for NCLB was to address the needs of all children and reduce the achievement gap between advantaged and disadvantaged students. Compliance with the NCLB required school districts to identify underachieving demographic groups and address their needs. The Kentucky Board of Education (KBE) defined Kentucky's approach to compliance with the NCLB. Next is a summary of the meeting of the KBE where it reported how Kentucky would comply with the NCLB.

The Kentucky Board of Education (KBE) met on August 7, 2003 and reported on plans for Kentucky to comply with the No Child Left Behind act. The KBE adopted a plan to use data from CATS to compute annual Adequate Yearly Progress for schools and districts for the No Child Left Behind act requirements in reading and mathematics. Further, the board defined proficient to mean the same as Proficient in CATS, which is a 100 on the accountability index. Schools would have to show progress on the academic index at the elementary and middle school levels or demonstrate progress toward a graduation rate of 100% by 2014 at the high school accountability level. The state would measure district accountability using the same formulae for schools but applied to the district as a whole. Kentucky does not adjust accountability scores based on school demographics (Kentucky Department of Education, 2003). Kentucky recognized adjusting accountability scores based on demographics is the equivalent of lowering standards for the educationally disadvantaged.

One of the most debated issues of the NCLB act is the definition of a highly skilled educator. Lewis (2005) posited that current policies focus too much on content knowledge and not enough on knowledge of effective instructional practices. She noted that the definition of teacher competence in the NCLB does not include performance standards. Each state has a unique definition for highly qualified. This resulted in public confusion and mistrust according to the investigator. She suggested that research-based policies, union protections, and statutory definitions of teacher quality had no impact on instruction. Teachers must become diagnosticians of student learning styles and address them with competent teaching. Because there were demands for outcomes based on a

system of common standards, teachers would have to change what they do in classrooms to achieve outcome goals.

According to the U. S. Department of Education (2004), all highly qualified teachers must have a bachelor's degree, full state certification or licensure, and prove they know each subject they teach. In addition, middle and high school teachers must: (a) major in the subject they teach; (b) have credits equivalent to a major in the subject; (c) pass a state-developed test; (d) comply with *High, Objective, Uniform State Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSE)*; (e) have an advanced certification from the state, or (f) have a graduate degree. The HOUSSE provision allows states to develop an additional way to allow current teachers to demonstrate highly qualified status through years of services, professional development, and knowledge in the subject garnered over time in the profession. Nothing in the law requires knowledge of effective teaching practices.

Summary of Education Reform

Education reform in America signaled a need for changes in public education. The ultimate goal for any reform movement is to improve student achievement. Seeley (1981) posited that educators could no longer assume that equal inputs will result in equal outputs. It was no longer acceptable to blame demographics for low achievement. The U. S. needed to question its education system and change the inputs. *A Nation at Risk* focused attention on rigorous curriculum, meaningful homework, and challenging instruction. There was a paradigm shift from achieving minimum goals to maximizing student potential. In Kentucky, the KERA focused on providing equitable and adequate education. The unit of measure for success was the school. Schools became accountable for student outcomes through a series of academic and non-academic indicators. The goal

of KERA was for students to demonstrate competence in applying core content, gaining self-sufficiency, solving real world problems, and becoming responsible group members. The primary goal of the NCLB act was to narrow the achievement gap between disadvantaged and advantaged students while keeping standards and expectations high. Schools had greater flexibility of spending Title I money (U. S. Department of Education, 2004). To achieve reform goals, teachers must maximize their instructional time using research based pedagogies. Students must believe that the work they do is interesting and meaningful and this must take place in a humanistic environment. The next section is describes pupil control.

The purpose of the next section is to explain how teacher choices of control can enhance or inhibit student learning. Schools must address teacher beliefs and classroom behaviors to meet the demands for student achievement that reform places on them. There is a need to maximize the time that students spend engaged with their teachers in instructional activities. Problems exist when teachers spend too much time managing their students using “custodial” choices that prolong or possibly escalate the engagement in disciplinary actions instead of managing behaviors so that instruction can resume. The next section addresses how teacher beliefs influenced teacher classroom behavior and learning climate.

Pupil Control

This section examines the impact that pupil control has on learning. Glasser (1986) grounded control theory in the classroom within the broader concept of *control theory*. Glasser described effective classroom environments where students learned through interaction in learning groups and teachers acted as coaches. This was consistent

with pupil control ideology research, which examined the teacher choices that placed them on a continuum from custodial to humanistic (Willower, Eidell, & Hoy, 1973). The first subsection below examines control theory in the classroom. The next subsection will explore the perceptions and attitudes that influence pupil control choices that define pupil control ideologies of teachers. Finally, the last subsection will describe the impact that pupil control ideology has on classroom climate and interaction.

Control Theory.

Glasser (1986) examined the broad concept of control theory in the narrow context of the classroom. Students were not doing quality work in school and many management techniques for organizations that would work in schools to improve student work were largely ignored in educational administration circles. Students would find work more satisfying if it was meaningful to them if teachers provided authentic educational experiences in classrooms.

Glasser posited that control theory explains student behavior much more accurately than other theories of why and how students behave. Traditional systems of managing students based on rewards and punishments resulted in continued drops in student performance. Student control was external because teachers believed students were not capable of doing quality work unless they closely supervised student activities. Teachers complained that students were not doing quality work. Students complained that schoolwork was meaningless and boring.

Glasser (1986) suggested that teachers should use cooperative learning in place of lecturing and individual seatwork. This would empower students because the work would be more meaningful. In addition, Glasser persuaded teachers to abandon boss-

management as a means of classroom control. Teachers should lead students by making work important in student contexts. Effective teaching meant all students doing high-quality work so there was no need for separating students into tracks.

According to Glasser (1986), if teachers manage students less, students are more willing to engage in school work. The U. S. was at a disadvantage because strong support for education was not prevalent as it was in other countries whose cultural support of education resulted in higher levels of parental support. In addition, achievement has become a political issue. Efforts to reform schools have led to focus on superficial teaching that lead to higher test scores. Competent teachers were in an impossible situation. In the past, teachers who encouraged students to think critically and challenge students to defend their ideas were troublemakers among their faculties.

Glasser (1986) identified four essential elements of lead-management. The first element was for leaders to engage workers in a discussion of work quality and to consider worker inputs. The second was for the leader to model the job for the workers who are to perform the work. The third was for leaders to ask workers to inspect or evaluate their own work for quality and for the manager to listen and provide expertise. The final was for the leader to facilitate by showing what needs done and providing the tools to complete the job. Glasser posited that boss-managers failed to understand motivation. Motivation comes from within the individual. Boss-managers believed they could coerce people into doing what they want done. Glasser (1990) pointed out that this often resulted in resentment and sometimes sabotage. The lead-manager understood that human beings are born with five basic needs; survival, love, power, fun, and freedom. Workers are most satisfied when they are doing meaningful work.

Students often mentioned sports, music, and drama as activities that satisfied their need to feel important. Conversely, they most often described required academic classes as boring and meaningless. Because of this, much of what students did in classrooms was low quality work. Those who found meaning in academic work were rare and often disparaged for their efforts. It was a serious mistake to assume that high quality work means passing scores on non-quality achievement test. Quality work came from students feeling good about their schoolwork because it had meaning to them. Often, this meaning was from quality teaching that promoted complex learning. Students recognized quality teaching and responded with quality work. A quality teacher would provide encouragement and tools for students to explore and learn.

Much of what Glasser (1986) wrote about pupil control aligned with the earlier work of Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967). The next subsection addresses pupil control ideology (PCI). Pupil control ideology is a set of teacher beliefs about classroom management on a continuum from custodial to humanistic beliefs for classroom management. Custodial teachers see misbehavior as a personal affront and seek control through punitive measures. In a custodial classroom, the teacher maintains strict order using downward teacher-to-student directives. The emphasis is on maintaining order. Custodial teachers mistrust students. Communication in a custodial classroom is typically unilateral teacher-to-student. Humanistic teachers perceive misbehavior in psychological and sociological terms, not moralistic ones. These teachers foster self-discipline through interaction in a democratic atmosphere. Humanistic teachers perceive the school as a learning community. They choose pedagogies that increase self-determination and two-

way interaction in the classroom. The next subsection will address perceptions and attitudes that lead to teacher beliefs about control in the classroom.

Perceptions and Attitudes

Vitagliano and Licata (1987) examined two phenomena within a residential school for the deaf in the Southern United States: (a) pupil control ideology, and (b) pluralistic ignorance. The sample for this study was a group of teachers ($N = 118$) from a residential school for the deaf in the southern United States. The sample consisted of 34 hearing impaired teachers and 84 hearing teachers. There were 32 male and 86 female teachers. The researchers examined differences in pupil control ideology (PCI) for the informal groups of deaf and hearing teachers. They also studied the existence of pluralistic ignorance (inaccurate perceptions of one subgroup about another within a population) for within informal group perceptions and out-of-group perceptions for the construct of pupil control ideology.

The independent variable for this study was the hearing status of the teachers. The researchers used this to measure three dependent variables in three separate statistical analyses: perceptions of self, perceptions of teachers within their informal groups, and perceptions of teachers outside of their informal groups. The researchers used interview and observation to establish the existence of informal deaf and hearing teacher groups. They used the Pupil Control Ideology (PCI) instrument (Willower, Eidell, & Hoy, 1973) to collect measures of teachers on a continuum from custodial to humanistic. The subjects also used the PCI to rate perceptions of their hearing and deaf colleagues.

The researchers worked under the postulate that there existed deaf and hearing informal group differences in perceptions of pupil control ideology for perceptions of

group and self. The researchers used descriptive statistics and the *t*-test to compare means. There were three hypotheses in this study. The first was that teachers would perceive the PCI of non-hearing teachers to be “more custodial” than that of hearing teachers. Results from a *t*-test indicated that hearing perceived deaf teachers as “more custodial” than their hearing counterparts (difference between means = 7.61, $p = .001$). Deaf teachers judged deaf teachers as “more custodial” than their hearing counterparts (difference between means = 10.91, $p = .001$). The second hypothesis stated that teachers would perceive the PCI of teachers in their school to be significantly “more custodial” than the teachers report themselves. Hearing teachers perceived both informal groups as “more custodial” than they perceived themselves (differences in the means hearing/deaf = 17.11, $p = .001$; difference between the means hearing/hearing = 7.06, $p = .001$). Deaf teachers perceived their own informal group as “more custodial” than they actually were. There was no significant difference; however, in deaf teacher perceptions of hearing teacher PCI scores and their actual PCI scores.

The third hypothesis stated that the association between teacher perceptions of teacher PCI within their informal group and their own PCI would be (a) positive and (b) stronger than their perceptions of PCI outside their informal group and their own PCI. The researchers performed a Pearson product-moment correlation for an analysis of PCI and then applied a dependent samples *t*-test for the correlation coefficients to test this hypothesis. The results supported this hypothesis for deaf teachers ($t = 7.1$, $p = .001$). However, the data did not support this hypothesis for hearing teachers ($t = 1.38$, $p > .05$).

Vitagliano and Licata (1987) concluded that there were differences of perceptions of pupil control ideology between the informal groups of hearing teachers and deaf

teachers. They used qualitative data to explain the differences. Deaf teachers had a specific purpose of preparing deaf students to become members of a deaf community. They were concerned that deaf student misbehavior would reflect poorly on “deaf culture.” Hearing teachers perceived deaf teachers as inflexible and too literal. Deaf teachers perceived hearing teachers as too lax and questioned their motives for teaching deaf students. The deaf teachers judged themselves as more empathetic and concerned for the welfare of students. Deaf teachers distanced themselves socially from deaf students more than hearing teachers did.

The researchers suggested that administrators be aware of the social phenomena of pupil control ideology and pluralistic ignorance. They suggested that facilities might want to examine the conditions that allow this construct to take place. More importantly, the results indicate that teacher beliefs were a reflection of what they thought was in the best interest of children. Deaf teachers perceived a moral obligation to be custodial to prepare deaf students to face adult life. Custodial teachers believe that custodialism is in the best interest of students. Hearing teachers believed deaf teachers were too strict and literal. Humanistic teachers believe that humanism is in the best interest of children. The results of this study suggest that there may be pluralistic ignorance in the broader groups of custodial and humanistic teachers.

Kottkamp and Mulhern (1987) examined teacher expectancy in a correlation study of expectancy motivation, school climate, and pupil control ideology. The researchers hypothesized that open school climates would correlate with high levels of teacher motivation. They also hypothesized that humanistic pupil control orientation would correlate with high levels of teacher motivation. The sample for this study

included teachers and administrators from 78 New Jersey public high schools. The schools had student populations that ranged from 250 to 2000 students. The socioeconomic status of the schools skewed slightly to represent higher economic levels.

The primary variables for the correlation were openness (climate), pupil control ideology, and expectancy motivation. Openness was a composite of principal supportive behavior, principal directive behavior, teacher-engaged behavior, and teacher frustrated behavior. The researchers performed correlations with these variables. Open climates were energetic and lively where there was an emphasis on meeting social and task achievement needs. Closed climates stress bureaucratic relationships between the principal and teachers. Characteristics of closed climates include close supervision and apathy and little emphasis on social or task achievement needs. The researchers defined humanism as the belief that schools were cooperative communities where learning occurs through interaction and cooperation. Custodial orientation suggested teacher emphasis on control and maintenance. Custodial teachers use moral terms to describe student misbehavior and see student misbehavior as personal affronts.

The researchers operationalized open-to-close climate (openness) using the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (Halpin & Croft, 1962). This instrument contains 100 4-point Likert-type items. The researchers also used this instrument to operationalize principal supportive behavior, principal directive behavior, teacher-engaged behavior, and teacher frustration behavior. The researchers used the Pupil Control Ideology Form (Willower, Eidell, & Hoy 1967) to operationalize pupil control ideology. The range of scores for this form was from 20 to 100 with higher scores associated with higher levels of custodial orientation. The researchers defined expectancy

motivation as subjective probability that effort results in specified levels of performance. They postulated that expectancy was a composite of valence (positive or negative attraction to a task) and instrumentality (receptivity of a task). They operationalized expectancy motivation using an instrument that Miskel, DeFrain, and Wilcox (1980) developed. The measure consisted of three subscales (expectancy, valence, and instrumentality) with seven, eight, and eight Likert-type items respectively. The researchers used the Pearson product-moment correlation to test the relationships of the variables. They established a level of $\alpha = .05$ to test the hypotheses.

The results of the correlations supported the relationship for climate (openness) and expectancy motivation ($r = .32, p < .01$) and pupil control ideology and expectancy motivation ($r = -.40, p < .001$). A negative value for the correlation of expectancy motivation and pupil control ideology indicated a positive orientation of expectancy with humanism (higher PCI scores indicate custodialism). This meant that as custodialism increased, expectancy that strategies would be successful decreased. There was also a significant relationship for expectancy motivation with the climate subtests teacher engaged behavior ($r = .27, p < .05$) and climate with teacher frustration behavior ($r = -.31, p < .01$). As expectancy motivation increased, teacher frustration decreased. There were no significant findings for correlations with the principal subtests of climate.

This study indicated that highly motivated teachers exhibited much higher levels of humanism. The students in humanistic classrooms were more engaged in lessons. The researchers linked these two conditions to a positive school climate. Teachers who were custodial were more frustrated and their students were less engaged in lessons. A possible explanation for the influence of teacher motivation on control beliefs might be teacher

attitudes toward their students and their confidence in their control strategies. Custodial teachers had less confidence in the success of their control strategies.

Traynor (2003) examined teacher perceptions of students and confidence in behavior interventions on teacher attitudes toward control. The researcher first reviewed and defined five behavior control strategies. These strategies were (a) coercive (b) Laissez-faire (c) task-oriented (d) authoritative, and (e) intrinsic. Coercive strategy meant the teacher intimidated or devalued the student. The laissez-faire strategy meant positive social interactions between the teacher and students. The task-oriented strategy meant giving students tasks when they misbehave. The tasks could be mindless and nonintellectual. The point was to keep the child busy. Previous studies indicated these strategies were ineffective because they were not intellectually stimulating and that coercion sometimes led to aggression. There were two strategies that researchers said were successful. These were the authoritative and intrinsic strategies. The authoritative strategy incorporated the use of rules in a positive environment with humane and consistent consequences. The intrinsic strategy involved quality engaging behavior instruction and rewards for students. Previous research had shown these strategies to be effective because they were intellectually stimulating for the student.

The research design was a qualitative comparison case study. Traynor (2003) chose subjects using the reputation technique to identify two teachers of extreme opposite beliefs. One teacher employed coercion as his primary strategy for pupil control. The other used both authoritative and intrinsic strategies for classroom control. The researcher triangulated data from interview, observation, and artifacts/documents mining and

reported information in thick description and vignettes. The researcher analyzed data for meaning and applied the findings to policy and practice.

The analysis of the coercive teacher showed a conflict within beliefs and a conflict between beliefs and actions. There was conflict between what he thought was effective and the way discipline should be in the ideal situation. When describing effective discipline practices, the coercive mentioned warnings, sarcasm, matching student rudeness with his own rudeness (saying, “shut-up” for example), and punitive actions. When describing the ideal situation, the same teacher mentioned showing concern and respect for children. He indicated that the ideal intervention is limited to what one can tolerate. When describing what he does, he mentioned posting the rules and showing early in the process that he intends to adhere to the rules.

The coercive teacher used warnings and sarcasm. He belittled students when he felt their questions were unjustified or if he had already covered the material. He often raised his voice. The salient features of his discipline style were sarcasm and raising his voice. He appeared agitated and expressed a fear of losing control. Documents showed this teacher had the more discipline referrals and fewer proactive interventions than the other teachers in the school.

The coercive teacher made disciplinary intervention choices based on: (a) belief that coercion was effective and (b) limited tolerance for student misbehavior. Coercion gave this teacher a sense of control. In addition, the teacher has expectancies of students that surpass the reality of the classroom. The coercive teacher believed the source of student disciplinary problems was with the students and did not accept that he was at least partially responsible for the inordinate time he spent disciplining students. He

believed students should have self-control, social skills, and be prepared upon entering the room.

Unlike the coercive teacher, the “authoritarian” teacher had no conflict within belief nor did his beliefs conflict with his pedagogical practices. He did not describe what worked and what did not work. Instead, he focused on student learning socially appropriate behaviors. He believed gentle warnings with a rationale for the intervention was important for students to learn appropriate behaviors. When strategies were unsuccessful, he would make statements about the expectations of proper behavior and direct the student to cease the inappropriate behavior. In rare situations, the authoritarian teacher would use the office referral process. This would only happen when he had exhausted several other means of redirect without success. When he did use the office referral process, he would write narratives that included context of the behavior and he continued to be a part of teaching appropriate behaviors. During the same period when the coercive teacher had 65 office referrals, the authoritarian teacher had only five. In all five situations, the authoritarian teacher had multiple interventions prior to using the office referral system.

The salient features in the classroom with the authoritarian teacher included rich intellectual discourse with students acting as participants in demonstrations and learning. He gave instructions with calm and patient demeanor. When students misbehaved, he gave gentle and respectful redirects. There was no evidence that the authoritarian teacher used sarcasm or belittlement to redirect behavior. Near the beginning of direct instruction, the authoritarian teacher wrote expectations for learning and behavior on the

board. After instruction, the students engaged in peer group discussions about projects. There was higher tolerance for noise during the peer group work.

The authoritarian teacher described two types of dysfunctional classrooms. The first was much like the one that the coercive teacher described. The other was when there was too much coercive control. He believed too much coercion led to teachers oppressing students, less time spent on instruction, and emotional responses to behavior. Teachers in this situation might have little control over their own emotions. The authoritarian teacher had the expectation of life-long learning. He saw teaching as fulfilling as opposed to enjoyable. He expected students to come to his class with varying levels of social skills. He was responsible for his students to learn the proper social behaviors in the context of the classroom. Because he expected students to come in with varying levels of behavior, he felt he had better control over how to handle situations as they emerge. The authoritarian teacher also chose his pedagogies based on convictions. These convictions, however, focused on meeting student needs instead of what worked. His expectation that students come into the classroom with varying levels of behavior skill helped him address new situations when they occurred in his classroom.

Traynor (2003) showed there are two salient factors influencing choices that teachers make for addressing student discipline: (a) expectancy of student social skills when they come to the classroom and (b) belief about the effectiveness that an intervention will succeed controlling student behaviors. Teachers who expect students to come to class with refined social skills had trouble dealing with students when they did not behave. Teachers who expected differences in student social skills and perceived student behaviors as symptoms of gaps in social learning are better able to adapt and

meet student needs. Beliefs about the affect of an intervention guided teacher choices. Teacher intervention choices had an impact on the climate in the classroom. The coercive teacher had greater conflict and many more office referrals in his class. The authoritarian teacher had less conflict and more intellectual interaction in his classroom. This study examined the motivation of individual teachers in relation to their behavior control strategies. The next study examined the influence of exposure to a critical mass of custodial faculty on the pupil control ideology of preservice teachers.

Hoy and Woolfolk (1990) examined the influence of student teaching experience on three teacher perspectives (a) orientations toward control (b) social problem solving, and (c) efficacy. The researchers grounded their research in cognitive evaluation theory, which posits that events have both a controlling and informational aspects. The researchers believed student teaching experience resulted in higher levels of custodial ideology, more controlling social problem solving orientation, and lower levels of teaching and personal efficacy.

The subjects in this study were 191 liberal arts majors enrolled in programs at Rutgers University. The researchers divided the sample into an experimental group and two control groups. The experimental group ($N = 59$) consisted university students of planning to become teachers and participating in their student teaching phase of their teacher preparation programs during the current semester. One control group ($N = 66$) was a group of university students planning to become teachers enrolled in education methods courses. The other control group ($N = 60$) consisted of university students enrolled in a psychology course, half of whom were starting their teacher preparation programs and half who were not planning to teach. The independent variable for this

study was student teaching experience. The dependent variables for this study were pupil control ideology, social problem solving orientation, personal efficacy, and teaching efficacy.

The researchers used the Pupil Control Ideology Form (PCI Form) to operationalized pupil control ideology (Willower, Eidell, & Hoy 1967). Personal teaching efficacy was teacher judgments of their capability to execute particular courses of action that worked as intended. Teaching efficacy was the belief about the influence of teaching to result in learning, even with difficult children. The investigators used the 16 questions from the Teacher Efficacy Scale (Gibson & Dembo, 1984), a series of questions employing a 6-point Likert-type scale, to operationalized teaching and personal efficacy.

The researchers measured social problem-solving orientation using the Problems in School Inventory (Deci, Schwartz, Sheinman, & Ryan, 1981). This was a series of vignettes with four possible responses to each vignette that the respondent rates using a Likert-type scale with anchors of very inappropriate to very appropriate. The statements represent four levels of social problem solving (highly controlling, moderately controlling, moderately autonomous, and highly autonomous). An algorithm results in a composite score with higher scores favoring more autonomy for children.

The researchers performed a multivariate test for Time $\times$ Group interaction to yield a Wilks' lambda (a measure of the equality of group means). They performed a series of Roy-Bargman step-down tests. The use of a step-down test or backward elimination is a regression analysis procedure used to determine the independent variables that were good predictors of the dependent variable to find the best fitting

equation or model. Finally, they performed a series of univariate *t*-tests to test hypotheses directly.

Statistical analyses confirmed three of the four major hypotheses of this study. First pupil control ideology of student teachers became more custodial after experiencing student teaching [$t(58) = 2.44, p < .01$]. The mean pupil control orientation for the students in the methods course control group remained almost identical. The mean pupil control orientation for the psychology class control group showed a tendency to become more humanistic. Second, the social problem solving of the student teaching group became significantly more controlling after completing student teaching [$t(53) = 2.76, p < .01$]. Neither control group became more controlling. The psychology students became significantly more encouraging of autonomy [$t(64) = 3.68, p < .01$]. Third, the general sense of teacher efficacy declined significantly for the student teaching group [$t(58) = 1.74, p < .05$]. Neither the methods class students nor the psychology class students changed beliefs about the general efficacy of teaching. Last, contrary to the researchers' hypothesis, the student teacher beliefs about personal efficacy did not decrease because of student teaching. Student teacher beliefs about personal efficacy increased significantly after their student teaching experience [$t(58) = 5.74, p < .01$].

These results suggested that there were two phases of organizational socialization. Prior to student teaching, students in education programs have a more humanistic pupil control orientation. When faced with a conflicting set of social problem solving events during their student teaching experience, these orientations shift to match the orientations of the organization. The investigators suggested that maintaining discipline, not teaching, becomes the measure of success for these students. Student teachers were unrealistically

optimistic about their abilities to overcome the effect that home environment has on their students. In addition, this study demonstrated that when humanistic teachers experience a critical mass of custodial teachers, they shifted their beliefs to align more closely with the critical mass. This did not have an effect on the perception of efficacy of preservice teachers. Preservice teacher perceptions of self-efficacy increased with exposure to the classroom. The next study showed that improved perceptions of self-efficacy and increased custodialism were unrelated. It was more likely that the improved sense of efficacy was due to exposure to actual teaching rather than exposure to the control beliefs of other teachers.

Woolfolk and Hoy (1990) studied the structure and meaning of efficacy for prospective teachers and related efficacy to beliefs about control and motivation. They addressed two research questions: (a) was the structure of efficacy for prospective teachers the same as has been found for experienced teachers, and (b) were prospective teacher beliefs about efficacy related to their orientations toward discipline, order, control, and motivation? The participants of the study were liberal arts students enrolled in a teacher preparation program in a state college on the East coast. There were 155 women and 27 men. Most of the subjects (70%) were between the ages of 20 and 30 and White (90%).

The independent variables for this study were teacher efficacy and personal efficacy. The researchers defined teacher efficacy as teacher outcomes expectations about the consequences of teaching based on how well they perform in a given situation. Personal efficacy was the personal ability to execute particular courses of action. The researchers operationalized these variables using selected and statistically identified items

from the Teacher Efficacy Scale (Gibson & Dembo 1984). The dependent variables for this study were pupil control ideology, motivational orientation, and bureaucratic orientation. The researchers operationalized pupil control ideology using the Pupil Control Ideology Form (Willower, Eidell, & Hoy, 1973). Motivational orientation was the belief that there were two dimensions of teaching, the controlling dimension and the informational aspect dimension. The investigators operationalized motivational orientation using the Problems in School Inventory (Deci, Schwartz, Sheinman, & Ryan 1981), a series of eight vignettes with four possible solutions for each situation. The solutions determine if a teacher was highly controlling, moderately controlling, moderately autonomous, or highly autonomous. Bureaucratic orientation was the individual's commitment to the set of attitudes, values and behaviors that were characteristically encouraged by bureaucracies. The researchers operationalized this variable using the Work Environment Preference Schedule (Gordon, 1970). This instrument yields a single score with higher scores indicating higher bureaucratic orientation of the respondents.

Woolfolk and Hoy (1990) performed a canonical correlation to determine relationships between linear combinations of both dependent and independent variables. They performed the stepwise multiple-regression analysis using the predictor variables of teacher efficacy and personal efficacy entered as a simple cross product. The researchers computed ΔR^2 to test individual contribution of each variable to the exclusion of the other predictor variables to the criterion variable in each question.

The results showed teacher efficacy accounts for 24% of the variance in pupil control ideology, [$F(1, 174) = 52.26, p < .001$]. Teacher efficacy accounted for 17% of

the variance of Bureaucratic orientation, [$F(1, 174) = 29.46, p < .001$]. There was a significant interaction between teacher and personal efficacy on pupil control ideology [$F(1, 174) = 4.16, p < .05$]. Teachers who scored high for both teacher and personal efficacy were more humanistic than teachers who scored high on teacher efficacy and low on personal efficacy did. Teachers who scored low on teacher efficacy and high personal efficacy were more custodial than teachers who scored low on teacher efficacy and low on personal efficacy.

Prospective teachers with high teaching efficacy were more humanistic in their pupil control ideologies. Prospective teachers with low teaching efficacy were more custodial. Teachers with high levels of personal efficacy believed they had the ability to make a difference in student achievement.

Measuring teacher efficacy was a complex issue. The researchers suggest that practitioners investigate beyond composite scores to identify high and low efficacy teachers when using multidimensional measures of efficacy. Mixed combinations of teacher efficacy and personal efficacy deserve further study. Teacher effectiveness increased with increased levels of humanism. Teachers who were more humanistic were more confident in their abilities to control and motivate their classrooms (Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990).

There was evidence of two levels of socialization of teacher candidates. Prior to exposure to students and faculties, teacher candidates were more humanistic. Teachers in the field persuaded preservice teacher beliefs about pupil control toward the custodial end of the pupil control continuum (Harty, Anderson, & Enochs, 1984; Hoy & Woolfolk,

1990). These increased levels of custodialism resulted in decreased levels of teacher self-efficacy (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1990).

In sum, teacher attitudes and beliefs had an impact on their choices of behavior strategies. Informal group membership, motivation, attitudes toward students, confidence, exposure to other faculty, and teacher efficacy all had an important role in beliefs about control. There was also a connection between beliefs and teacher behavior. Custodial teachers used sarcasm and raised voices to control student behavior and used pedagogical choices based on the belief of what might work rather than what students need. On the other hand, humanistic teachers used social learning and softer voices to control student behavior and used pedagogical choices that addressed student needs (Traynor, 2003). The next subsection deals with the influence of pupil control ideology on the classroom climate.

Classroom Climate

There are many pedagogical options for control that teachers have available. Why would a teacher choose options that waste instructional time and have negative effects on the learning climate? Lapointe (2003) examined the role of coercion as a part of *extended symmetrical escalation* (ESE), a phenomenon in classrooms where misbehavior escalates over time resulting in a dysfunctional learning climate. The model for the research was an escalation model from Walker and Walker (1991). Escalation occurs when there is mutual rejection. It happens when the teacher gives a command and the student refuses to obey. The teacher repeats the command coercively. The student refuses with greater emotion or determination. The researcher believed escalation events set the stage for

future escalations. When escalations are frequent and occur over time, it becomes ESE. Learning is limited during ESE because of wasted instructional time.

The researcher examined this phenomenon over time in the presence of the future escalations. The research was an attempt to fill a gap in a very problematic area of research. It is difficult to predict when ESE will occur. Studying negative events over time presents a dilemma. It would be unethical to allow the escalation to continue without intervention. The researcher, therefore, designed the study to analyze the situation and to, in a later study, propose a solution.

The researcher used qualitative measures to collect data in a single case study design. The design emerged from a comparative case study of two classes where ESE occurred. However, the teacher in one case resolved the escalation prior to data collection. The case for this study was a history teacher and his class of 12 girls and 16 boys. The history teacher had twenty years of teaching experience in history at the school. The classroom was in a French Canadian town. The researcher provided no other demographics about the class.

The researcher collected data through observation, interview, and survey and analyzed the data using a constant comparative analysis. The interviews were ethnographical and semi-structured. The researcher interviewed the teacher individually and the students in dyads. The purposefully selected dyads represented quiet students, followers, and disrupters. The observations took place in the classrooms. Two observers coded videotapes by means of a grid that the researcher developed for in-class observations. The coding categories were from Wolfgang's teacher behavior continuum (1999) which included three levels of teacher responses to misbehavior. These levels

were “light” (humor, nonverbal reaction, questioning), “direct” (specific instructions or announcing a consequence), and “coercive” (use of a consequence, displays of anger, angry tones or expelling the student from class). Class observations also allowed the researcher to categorize all the students in the class into quiet (does not encourage misbehavior), follower (encourages misbehavior, but rarely disrupts), disrupter (encourages misbehavior and sometimes disrupts), and troublemaker (often initiates classroom disruption). The correlations between observers for placement of students in these categories were between .79 and .87 ($p < .01$).

The researcher used two subscales of the *Questionnaire for Teacher Interaction* (Wubbels & Levy, 1993) to measure admonishing ($\alpha = .84$) and understanding ($\alpha = .88$). She used the *Learning Environment Inventory* (Anderson & Walberg, 1969) to measure group cohesion ($\alpha = .67$). Lapointe reported the results of the study using an overview of the characteristics of the ESE in the study and reports of findings in eight themes. These themes were: (a) teacher coercive behavior (b) student perceptions of teacher behavior (c) student misbehavior (d) teacher perceptions of student behavior (e) perception of the link between coercive behavior and misbehavior (f) previous information about the teacher (g) parental support, and (h) classroom belonging and cohesion. She also used a comparison of means to show the relationships between coercion and student cohesion for the months of September and October. She reported frequencies to compare teacher behaviors to student reactions.

For disrupters and troublemakers misbehavior started at the point of teacher coercion. In other words, teacher coercion triggered misbehavior. The teacher responded to student misbehavior with coercion. Both the teacher and the group of “trouble making”

students had their own perceptions of the other. Each group was unaware of perceptions from the other group. Coercive behavior most often occurred in response to student opposition. Nonverbal responses, questioning, and specific instruction stopped the misbehavior 78%, 57%, and 46% of the time respectively. This indicated that the more controlling the behavior was, the fewer times students responded with appropriate behavior.

Students who were quiet perceived the teacher's behavior as trying to be helpful. The misbehaving students described the teacher as the worst they had ever had. They indicated that they were responding to the anger of the teacher. Students said that they behaved more appropriately for other teachers because the other teachers did not get angry. These misbehaving students believed the teacher deserved their misbehavior because of his coercive style.

Most of the students in the class were misbehavers with 54% being disrupters or troublemakers. Misbehaviors included throwing objects, making noises, laughing, pushing, and commenting aloud. These behaviors are not different from other misbehaviors typically observed at school. The difference is the frequency in which they happened in this case study. The teacher indicated that he had no prior knowledge about the students in this class. He noted that he had tried to intervene, but that nothing worked to diminish the misbehavior. He believed the situation in the class was deteriorating.

Students believed no matter what they did, the teacher would respond coercively. They disapproved of the teacher interventions in the classroom. Sometimes they did not perceive that interventions were in response to their misbehavior. Misbehaving students

believed teacher coercive behavior caused student misbehavior. Quiet students were able to judge the teacher based on their own observations of teacher behaviors.

Students engaged in pejorative discussions with former students about the teacher prior to the start of the school year. The former students shared information about the teacher who called students names and threw objects when he became angry. The disruptive students could not distinguish between rumors and reality. Parents facilitated faulty beliefs about this teacher. Students reported unconditional support from their parents regarding this teacher. Students reported parents had prior knowledge of the teacher and based their support for their children on the reputation of the teacher. Cohesion is a sense of belonging to a group. In this case, cohesion was a second source of the facilitation of misbehavior. Surveys showed this class exhibited greater group cohesion than the other classes the teacher taught. Cohesion with one another gave students support for their misbehavior by making the teacher less threatening. In terms of the power struggle, the frequency of simultaneous misbehavior had an effect of tempering the authority of the teacher.

The Lapointe (2003) findings show that coercion diminished the intellectual discourse of the classroom. Teacher responses to misbehavior fell from light to coercive. Coercion was a less effective means of stopping student misbehavior than were lighter forms of correction. The results were important in understanding the factors that led to the chaos in this classroom. As teachers become more coercive, there was mutual rejection and the escalation of student misbehavior. This escalation takes time that the teacher should have used for instruction and the sharing of ideas. Students were honing skills in creative misbehavior rather than applying their efforts toward learning.

Lighter forms of correction were more effective for the reduction of misbehavior. Teachers must understand how students perceive the cause and effect relationship between teacher correction and misbehavior. Students did not perceive coercion as correction. Rather, they perceived coercion as a challenge to their wits and to their autonomy. Awareness of the student perceptions and communication of teacher perceptions of student behaviors help teachers to develop strategies for better classroom management. Skilled educators either learned or possessed an innate skill for non-confrontational communication with students.

In a follow-up research using the same escalation model and the same subjects, Lapointe and Legault (2004) studied the application of an intervention based on a theory of extrinsic reinforcement systems. The researchers posited that escalation sustained over time because of the cyclical nature of ESE and because there was contradiction between disruptive pupil and the teacher perception of the cause of the escalation. Extrinsic reinforcement systems allow both sides to replace faulty cause and effect beliefs with a more skillful processing of information to identify problem sources. Attribution theory and social cognitive theory provide the grounding for extrinsic reinforcement systems. This follow-up research is in response to a problem that occurred when the building principal intervened in response to complaints from quiet students. After the principal suspended two students and threatened the rest of the class with further punitive action, there was an ephemeral improvement in behavior followed by a continuation of the ESE.

The researchers used observations, questionnaires, and interviews to collect data. They analyzed the data using a constant comparative analysis. The interviews were semi-structured and ethnographical in format (Tierney, 1991). They used descriptive statistics,

frequencies, and a series of standardized *t*-tests to compare the situations before and after the intervention. The *Questionnaire for Teacher Interaction* (Wubbles & Levy, 1993) operationalized the dependent variables for this study. The dependent variables include helping ($\alpha = .90$), understanding ($\alpha = .88$), admonishing ($\alpha = .84$), and dissatisfaction ($\alpha = .85$). The independent variable was the intervention. The researchers reported their data using thick description and data displays (see Miles & Huberman, 1994). As in the related study, the researchers categorized teacher responses in three categories: (a) “light” (b) “direct”, and (c) “coercive.” The researchers also quantified student behaviors as (a) talking during instruction (b) opposition to the teacher, and (c) getting up out of seat during inappropriate time.

The investigators believed the punishment only provided a temporary measure that resulted in anger. They cited Hyman (1997), who posited the more adults used coercive behavior, the less cooperation there would be from adolescents. The researchers developed training sessions based on extrinsic reinforcement. The training session for the students included sharing a videotaped lesson with the students. They used a pitcher and cups of water to help the students visualize building emotional response from the teacher. Each time a student misbehaved in class, they poured a cup of water into the pitcher. Eventually, the pitcher overflowed. The researchers made the connection between the building emotions and the rising level of water. The point was to replace the previous belief that the teacher actions were unfounded with an understanding of how the teacher was trying to cope with misbehavior in the classroom.

Following the demonstration, students participated in a one-question survey. The question had three possible answers (a) the teacher was not very patient and when he got

angry, he could not control himself (b) the accumulation of disruptive behaviors of certain students made the teacher become more and more angry, and (c) other. Twenty-seven students of the 28 in the classroom responded to the survey. Three students responded the teacher was not very patient while 23 responded that the teacher became angry because of the accumulation of disruptive behaviors.

After watching the videotape, the teacher initiated physical and organizational classroom changes. He changed seating arrangement based on the desire to break up networks of students that he believed facilitated misbehavior. He gave students time at the beginning of class to organize and sharpen pencils. He established expectations in the class for appropriate behavior. The researchers did not include the teacher in the intervention process. The teacher made these decisions based on information gleaned from watching the videos. Perceptions of student behavior improved during the intervention as well. Students and teachers both perceived an increase in the number of quiet students. The followers (see Lapointe, 2003), increased as well, which one could interpret as a negative result. However, the increase in this category came from the decreased number of disruptors and troublemakers.

The data showed the students responded to the intervention. Their behavior improved in quality and there were reduced numbers of misbehaviors. Talking during instruction decreased by 34%, oppositional behavior decreased by 81%, and getting up at inappropriate times decreased by 33%. Teacher desist effectiveness increased from 41% to 62% meaning that students responded to the first desist 41% of the time prior to the intervention and 62% of the time after the intervention. Types of desists decreased in all

three categories of light, direct, and coercive with no coercive teacher reactions after the intervention.

Students stated after the intervention that they understood the relationship between teacher coercive reactions and the accumulation of student misbehavior. Student perceptions of teacher behaviors improved significantly from October to January in the areas of helping ($t = -8.18, p < .001$), understanding ($t = -7.76, p < .001$), admonishing ($t = 7.59, p < .001$), and dissatisfaction ($t = 7.24, p < .001$) with negative t values indicating increased means from October to January.

This study strengthened the argument that coercion inhibits learning. Not only did coercion result in increased escalation in the Lapointe (2003) study, escalation diminished when other strategies such as changing the seating arrangement, organizational classroom management techniques, and communication of expectations. This study also underscores the importance of understanding the conflicting perceptions of behavior causes. Students who realized that teacher perceptions of student behavior accumulate within the consciousness of the teacher and increases teacher stress were able to depersonalize teacher coercive responses to misbehavior. Students were able to make the cause and effect connection between student behaviors and teacher desist behaviors. Students did not necessarily come to school with that knowledge. Someone must communicate that knowledge to the students.

It was also important for the teacher to understand that coercive behavior is not effective. Student cohesion, prior knowledge of the teacher, and parental feedback were important factors in ESE (Lapointe, 2003). Coercion increased negative student cohesion. Parental feedback and prior knowledge of the teacher served to facilitate student

perceptions of the teacher and the continuation of student misbehavior. This study also raises the issue of coercion leading to the opposite of the desired effect. The next study examines the phenomenon of counter control.

Counter control is a phenomenon that has ties the custodial side of pupil control ideology and classroom management. Seay, Suppa, Schoen, and Roberts (1984) defined countercontrol as behaviors in opposition to intervention strategies. Countercontrol causes loss of instructional time and adverse student reactions resulting in withdrawal or acts of aggression. The purpose of this literature review was to (a) define countercontrol (b) identify variables that lead to the emergence of countercontrol, and (c) identify implications of countercontrol in educational and therapeutic settings.

The investigators speculated that there were five variables influencing the emergence of student acts of counter control. Students who were unfamiliar with the goals of intervention measures were more likely to engage in countercontrol. Students were more oppositional when classroom management was overly intrusive, unnecessarily directive or highly artificial. Student overexposure to rewards and incentives were more prone to countercontrol behaviors. When students believed adults were infringing on their freedoms, they were more likely to engage in countercontrol. The investigators believed when adults used modeling to alter child misbehavior, children tended to ignore or act out in defiance of the modeling. The researchers posited that warm, friendly requests were more effective than cold directive requests.

The investigators described implications that this study had for teacher control of student behaviors. They advanced the theory that changes in teacher behaviors and proper planning would reduce the presence of countercontrol behaviors. Teachers should plan

interventions based on knowledge of what works for individuals. There should be a hierarchy of interventions based on intrusiveness, giving options at the beginning that give students the opportunity to avoid consequences that are more serious. Teachers should disclose the purpose of interventions to the student fully. There should always be a way to reinforce positive behaviors.

For teachers to be effective with pupil control strategies they must plan for their responses to student misbehaviors. According to the investigators, there should be a systemic response to misbehavior. At least at first, teachers should deliver the response in friendly tones. Teachers who personalize consequences student and lack systemic planning will likely encounter countercontrol behaviors from students that waste instructional time and could result in student aggression or withdrawal. The findings indicated that coercion leads to escalation and countercontrol. There was a connection between pupil control ideology and student perceptions about the learning climate. The next study addressed the issues of the connection between pupil control ideology and the perceptions that students have of their teachers.

Lunenburg and Stouten (1983) examined the relationship between pupil control ideology and student projected feelings toward teachers. The researchers postulated that there would be higher levels of hostility and rejection toward “custodial” teachers than toward “humanistic” teachers. District personnel selected classes based on the description of being within the average range of academic functioning. Participants included 32 male and 99 female 4th through 6th grade teachers in 12 schools in three rural school districts in one Midwestern state ($N = 131$). The researchers also collected data from their students. The dependent variable used for this study was student projected rejection and hostility as

measured using the “Draw-a-teacher” procedure (Lemeshnik, 1971). The researchers employed three experienced school psychologists to judge student drawings. The inter-rater agreement for all drawings was .92. The independent variables were (a) teacher PCI ratings (b) teacher gender (c) student gender, and (d) student grade.

Teachers provided demographic data and responded to the Pupil Control Ideology Form (Willower, Eidell, & Hoy, 1973), which placed teachers on a continuum between “humanistic” (characterized by empowerment of students to make decisions) and “custodial” (characterized by directive control over student behavior and decision-making). The Pupil Control Ideology (PCI) scale measured teacher control ideology on 5-point Likert-type scales (1 = *strongly agree*, 5 = *strongly agree*). The PCI scale was a continuum with scores that ranged from 20 (humanistic) to 100 (custodial).

The researchers performed four separate statistical analyses using data from the two sources of data collection. These analyses were (a) the Pearson product-moment (b) the stepwise multiple regression analysis, (c) the *t*-test, and (d) the analysis of variance (ANOVA). The researchers used the Pearson product-moment to correlate the overall relationships among PCI rating, student projected rejection and hostility, teacher gender, and grade. The student hostility and rejection results were significant for overall ($r = .60$, $p = .001$), males ($r = .71$, $p = .001$), and females ($r = .54$, $p = .001$). The researchers performed a stepwise multiple regression analysis to determine the most significant predictor of student rejection and hostility. The results showed pupil control ideology was the strongest predictor ($\Delta R^2 = .36$, $p = .001$) followed by teacher sex ($\Delta R^2 = .22$, $p = .001$) and grade level ($\Delta R^2 = .10$, $p = .001$). The researchers then compared the mean rejection and hostility scores (dependent variable) with gender (independent variable) using the *t*-

test. The results indicated that boys (mean = 5.9, $sd = .98$) projected more rejection and hostility onto teachers than girls did (mean = 4.3, $sd = .93$) [$t(130) = 8.75, p < .001$].

Finally, Lunenburg and Stouten (1983) performed an ANOVA to test the independent variables grade, teacher gender, and student gender on the dependent variable projected rejection and hostility. The researchers found main effects for all three variables. Older students projected more rejection and hostility on their teachers than younger students did [$F(2) = 15.69, p < .001$]. Students projected more rejection and hostility on male teachers than on female teachers [$F(1) = 5.82, p < .05$]. Male students projected more rejection and hostility on their teachers than female students did [$F(1) = 22.71, p < .001$].

Students projected more rejection and hostility on custodial teachers than they did on humanistic teachers. Custodialism was a predictor of student alienation from school, pupil cynicism, and disrespect at school. Male students were more likely to project negativity than female students are. One can study pupil control ideology in terms of behavior or ideology. This research was limited to ideology. The researchers also noted limitations to the study regarding the use of the teacher-draw technique.

Boredom is a powerful and destructive force for classroom climate. When teachers disengage students from the learning process, the classroom climate is boring and uneventful. Students resent being bored and are more likely to project hostility toward the teacher whom they perceive is the source of boredom. On the other hand, excitement is a force that builds a positive classroom climate. Students who are engaged in learning are less likely to be bored and project less hostility toward their teachers.

Boredom and engagement are both factors of classroom robustness. The next two studies examine relationships between pupil control ideology and classroom robustness.

Satori, Bauske, and Lunenburg (2000) examined student perceptions of pupil control behavior, classroom robustness, and self-control in public and military secondary schools. The researchers wanted to determine if there were differences between public secondary school classrooms and military secondary school classrooms in relation to pupil control ideology, classroom robustness, and student self-control.

The participants in this study were 196 students from a large public school (3,500 students) and a large military school (2,600 students) in a southwestern state. The samples were in grades 9 through 12. There were 102 public school students and 94 military school students in the sample. The independent variable for this study was the secondary school type (public or military). The dependent variables were pupil control behavior, classroom robustness, and student self-control. Pupil control behavior was the extent that students rate their teachers on a continuum from humanistic to custodial. The researchers operationalized pupil control behavior using the Pupil Control Behavior Form (Hesel & Willower, 1974), a 5-point Likert-type (1 = *never*, 5 = *always*). Students completed the Pupil Control Behavior Forms. The researchers used the Robustness Semantic Differential scale (Osgood, Suci, & Tennenbaum, 1957) to operationalize classroom robustness. Students respond to 10 adjective pairs to determine if a class was robust (defined as interesting, challenging, thrilling, important, meaningful, action-packed, fresh, powerful, unusual, or active). Higher scores on the Robustness Semantic Differential scale indicate greater robustness. Pupil self control for this study was pupil emotional control, physiological responses, problem solving, and the ability to delay

immediate gratification. The researcher used the Self-Control Scale (Sosenbaum, 1980) to operationalize this variable. The scores range from 34 to 204 with higher scores representing higher levels of self-control.

The researchers used the Pearson product-moment to correlate relationships among pupil control behavior, classroom robustness, between pupil control behavior, and classroom robustness. They performed an ANOVA on the independent variables pupil control behavior, environmental robustness, and self-control on the dependent variable school. Finally, they used three stepwise multiple regression analyses to determine the most significant predictors of pupil control behavior, classroom robustness, and self-control.

The results of the Pearson product-moment correlation showed significant relationships for pupil control behavior and student perceptions of their classrooms as being robust overall ($r = -.41, p < .0001$). Robustness was also significantly associated with student self-control overall ($r = -.32, p < .0001$). Students who reported their teachers as humanistic also had increased levels of self-control ($r = -.23, p < .001$). The results of the one-way ANOVA resulted in a significant difference between public secondary school and military secondary school programs ($F = 59.54, p < .0001$). Students in the public secondary school ($M = 44.07$) perceived their teacher pupil control behavior as more humanistic than pupil control behavior of teachers in secondary military schools ($M = 68.26$).

The first stepwise multiple regression analysis measured the predictors for pupil control behavior. School type was the greatest predictor of pupil control behavior ($\Delta R^2 = .21, p < .0001$). Robustness ($\Delta R^2 = .19, p < .0001$), satisfaction ($\Delta R^2 = .04, p < .001$), and

years enrolled ($\Delta R^2 = .02, p < .01$). The second stepwise multiple regression analysis measured predictors of classroom robustness for all classrooms. There were three significant predictors for classroom robustness. These were pupil control behavior ($\Delta R^2 = .17, p < .0001$), school type ($\Delta R^2 = .09, p < .001$), and self-control ($\Delta R^2 = .04, p < .01$). The third stepwise multiple regression analysis measured predictors of self-control for all classrooms. There were two significant predictors for self-control. These were robustness ($\Delta R^2 = .10, p < .001$) and satisfaction ($\Delta R^2 = .04, p < .01$). The teachers at the military secondary school in this study were more custodial than the teachers in the public secondary school setting. There was no significant difference in student self-control between the two settings.

Behaviors of teachers are strong factors in establishing classroom climate. Students with humanistic teachers exhibited more self-control and perceived greater satisfaction in the classroom than students with custodial teachers did. Humanistic teachers had higher classroom robustness than custodial teachers did. This means their classrooms had higher interest, challenge, thrill, importance, meaning, action, freshness, power, uniqueness, and/or activity. Humanism would result in greater time spent on instruction because the students are engaged in interesting activities in an inviting environment while exhibiting greater self-control than in a custodial environment. The next study examines similar variables in the contexts of private and public schools.

Lunenburg (1991) examined the differences in pupil control ideology (PCI), pupil control behavior (PCB), and classroom robustness in the context of private and public schools. The sample for this study was teachers and their students in two school districts in a large urban/suburban city in a Midwestern state. The teachers were from 56 public

and 46 private schools. One hundred and four teachers participated in the study. The author cited a void in the research comparing public and private schools. He hypothesized that there would be no differences between public and private schools for PCI, PCB, and classroom robustness. He also hypothesized that the relationships between PCI and classroom robustness and PCB and classroom robustness would be the same for public and private schools.

The researcher collected demographic data on the teachers. He operationalized pupil control ideology using the Pupil Control Ideology Form (Willower, Eidell, & Hoy, 1967) and pupil control behavior using the Pupil Control Behavior Form (Hensell & Willower, 1974). The researcher operationalized robustness using the Robustness Semantic Differential (RSD) Scale (Osgood, Suci, & Tennenbaum 1957), a set of ten 7-point scale of adjective antonym pairs. The researcher collected usable PCB data from 2,606 students and usable classroom robustness data from 2,591 students. The researcher used mean classroom scores to calculate PCB and classroom robustness. The main independent variable for this study was school (private or public). Teacher education level, teacher gender, subject taught, school, and age were also independent variables for this study. The dependent variables for this study included PCI, PCB, and classroom robustness scores.

Lunenburg (1999) performed three separate analyses of variance for PCI, PCB, and classroom robustness. He performed the Pearson product-moment correlation for all PCI, PCB, classroom robustness, school, teacher age, teacher gender, education level, and subject taught. Finally, he performed three series of stepwise multiple regression analysis

to determine the strongest predictors of classroom environmental robustness for all classrooms, private school classrooms, and public school classrooms.

The main dependent variable in this study was type of school (public or private). Private schools were more humanistic in their pupil control ideologies than public schools were ($F = 10.74, p < .01$). There was no statistical difference for pupil control behavior or classroom robustness between private and public classrooms. Pupil control behavior scores correlated significantly in a negative direction with classroom robustness for all schools combined ($r = -.56, p < .001$), for public schools separately ($r = -.59, p < .001$) and for private schools separately ($r = -.52, p < .001$). This means that as pupil control behavior scores increased (toward the custodial), robustness decreased.

Results of the stepwise multiple regression showed overall, pupil control behavior ($F = 49.37, p = .001$) and school ($F = 3.81, p = .05$) to be the only statistically significant predictors of classroom environment robustness. Pupil control behavior ($F = 30.44, p = .001$), education level ($F = 5.86, p = .05$), school ($F = 5.02, p = .05$), and subject taught ($F = 4.85, p = .05$) were significant predictors for classroom environmental robustness in public schools. Pupil control behavior ($F = 18.03, p = .001$), and school ($F = 12.30, p = .001$) were significant predictors for classroom environmental robustness in private schools.

The investigators concluded that when teacher beliefs and behaviors were humanistic, the students reported classroom life as more interesting, challenging, meaningful, and “action-packed” (more robust). Conversely, when teacher control beliefs and behaviors were custodial, students reported classrooms as boring, dull, meaningless, and uneventful (less robust). A surprising finding of the study was that there was no

difference in the teacher control behaviors and classroom environmental robustness between public and private schools. The investigators suggest that this might be because of pupil control expectations of parents of students in private schools. This surprising finding suggested a difference in expectations and cultural acceptance of custodialism in private schools that was not present in public schools. In a less robust environment, students are unengaged because of the boring and meaningless work. In the next study, the researcher investigated levels of control and student alienation.

Hoy (1972) examined the effects of pupil control ideology and school climate characteristics on student alienation. He postulated that schools with custodial pupil control orientations would have higher levels of student alienation. Conversely, he believed schools with open climates would be less custodial and have lower levels of student alienation. The sample for this study included 45 New Jersey schools stratified to obtain a sample with demographic diversity. The sample included the teaching and administrative staffs and students from 10 schools. The researchers sampled 10% of students at the schools. The samples had the approximately the same demographic representations of the socioeconomic and racial backgrounds as the schools from where they drew the students.

For this study, teacher behaviors included disengagement, hindrance, esprit and intimacy. Disengagement for this study meant teacher inability to understand the task or tendency of a teacher to be unenlightened. Hindrance for this study meant teacher beliefs that the principal encumbered the teachers with too many routine and trivial duties. Esprit was the school morale. Intimacy was the teacher enjoyment of social relations with one-another. Principal behaviors for this study included aloofness, production emphasis,

thrust, and consideration. Aloofness meant principal behaviors characterized by formal and impersonal adherence to rules. Production emphasis meant the degree of principal supervised teacher effect on student outcomes. Thrust meant efforts of the principal to move the organization through motivation. Consideration meant principals' attempts to treat teachers humanly.

Student variables included normlessness, powerlessness, and meaninglessness. Normlessness meant student inclination to engage in socially inappropriate behaviors to achieve given ends. Powerlessness meant student expectancy that his own behaviors have little influence on outcomes. Meaninglessness meant a state of alienation where there was little expectancy that one could predict the state of future affairs.

The dependent variables were meaninglessness, normlessness, and student alienation. The researcher operationalized student sense of alienation using the Pupil Attitude Questionnaire (Kolesar, 1967). The instrument is a 60-item questionnaire measuring three subsumed categories: (a) normlessness (b) powerlessness, and (c) meaninglessness. The Likert-type items (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*) produce a scale score with higher scores indicating higher levels of orientation. The researcher operationalized school climate characteristics using the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (Halpin & Croft, 1963). This instrument uses 64 Likert-type items to measure items in eight subtests: (a) disengagement (b) hindrance (c) esprit (d) intimacy (e) aloofness (f) production emphasis (g) thrust, and (h) consideration. The items employ 4-point Likert-type scales (1 = *rarely occurs*, 4 = *often occurs*) with higher scores representing a more open and accepting classroom climate.

The researcher performed two separate stepwise multiple regression analyses on the variables. In the first analysis, he regressed aspects of student alienation and school characteristics (pupil control and school climate) to predict overall student alienation. In the second analysis, he regressed demographic characteristics of schools, climate characteristics, and pupil control to predict each dimension of alienation. The results of the first analysis showed disengagement and custodialism ($R^2 = .319, p < .01$) were the best predictors of normlessness. Custodialism, hindrance, esprit, and intimacy were the best predictors of powerlessness ($R^2 = .342, p < .01$). Custodialism and aloofness were significant predictors of lower levels of student meaningfulness ($R^2 = .276, p < .01$).

The results of the second analysis showed disengagement, custodialism, and equalized valuation per student correlated positively with normlessness ($R^2 = .390, p < .01$). Custodialism and equalized valuation per student positively related to powerlessness while type of school (urban or non-urban) and thrust were negatively associated with powerlessness ($R^2 = .398, p < .01$). Smaller percentages of minority students and urban school type combined to produce greater levels of meaningfulness for students ($R^2 = .468, p < .01$).

Closed school environments and higher levels of custodialism were causes of higher levels of student alienation. Students in custodial classrooms showed higher levels of disengagement and normlessness. One confounding finding was that high levels of custodialism and aloofness resulted in lower levels of student meaningfulness. Hoy (1972) explained that operational definitions of alienation needed further research and that meaningfulness might not be an accurate factor for alienation. The overall effect of custodialism, however, was a chilling effect on the climate and a reduction of the

intellectual interaction associated with learning. The next study addressed the effects of intellectual interaction on student self-concept as a learner.

Lunenburg (1983) examined the relationship between pupil control orientation of schools and student self-concept as learners. The research was an attempt to fill a gap in the research connecting pupil control to student self-concept. Unlike previous studies, the unit of analysis for this study was school. The researchers operationalized PCI using the PCI form (Willower, Eidell, & Hoy, 1967). Self-concept was student self-concept in relation to measures of motivation, task orientation, problem solving, and class membership. The investigators operationalized self-concept using the Self Concept as a Learner (SCAL) scale. The instrument has 50 Likert-type 5-point questions indicating various levels of agreement with the statements. Higher scores indicate a higher self-concept.

The researcher performed the Pearson product-moment coefficient for the variables PCI with motivation, task orientation, problem solving, class membership, and total SCAL. The results showed significant negative correlations for motivation ($r = -.51$, $p = .01$), and Overall Self Concept ($r = -.31$, $p = .05$). There were no other significant correlations. Lunenburg (1983) concluded that there existed a relationship between pupil control ideology and pupil motivation. Students in classes with humanistic teachers were more motivated than students with custodial teachers were. Further, overall self-concept correlates with PCI. Custodialism accounted for approximately 26% of the variance in student negative self-concept. Schools with a humanist ideology have students with higher levels of self-esteem. Though student self-esteem is not a specific characteristic of learning climate, it is an indicator of student responses to the climate conditions.

Summary of Pupil Control

The reason students did not engage in their schoolwork was because they were doing mundane and meaningless tasks (Glasser, 1986). Student control based on rewards and punishment caused a drop in student performance. The use of learning teams and authentic work would increase student engagement. Students who are constantly under close control are less likely to be engaged in work. Glasser believed good work meant that students were engaged in work and satisfied with their work products. The learning was long lasting because it was meaningful. Like adult work, when students were bored, they would become disengaged. Some students sabotaged their own learning rather than engage in mundane tasks. Glasser believed applying the concepts of total quality management would improve student attitudes about their work.

Teacher perceptions and attitudes were driving forces in choosing strategies for pupil control. Membership in informal groups and misinformation about rival informal groups (pluralistic ignorance) influenced pupil control ideology (Vitagliano & Licata, 1987). Highly motivated teachers were more humanistic and had interaction that is more intellectual in their pedagogical repertoire than teachers with low levels of motivation (Kottkamp & Mullhern, 1987). Teachers who had positive attitudes about their students also had confidence in their ability to control students using reasoning instead of coercion. Teachers who did not trust students to be autonomous used coercion. Coercive teachers expressed conflict between their behavior control choices and the effectiveness of those choices (Traynor, 2003). Highly coercive teachers had more conflict and chaos in their classrooms than humanistic teachers did.

If there were conflict between belief about an intervention and the choice of the intervention, then how would one explain the choice of coercion over a more humanistic approach to pupil control? One explanation was critical mass. When preservice teachers student-taught in schools where the faculty was custodial, the preservice teachers became more custodial (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1990). This was despite the findings that teachers with higher levels of efficacy were more humanistic (Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990). Another explanation was that teachers were unaware of pupil perceptions of their behavior (Lapointe, 2004).

Pupil Control Ideology had a profound impact on classroom climate. Coercion led to student cohesion in opposition to the teacher (Lapointe, 2003; Lapointe & Legault, 2004; Seay, et al, 1984). Students in classrooms with custodial teachers projected hostility and rejection toward their teachers (Lunenburg & Stouten, 1983). In humanistic classrooms, instruction was more robust and students exhibited higher levels of self-control (Satori, Bauske, & Lunenburg, 2000; Lunenburg, 1991). In addition, students in humanistic classrooms exhibited higher levels of engagement and more positive self-concept as learners (Hoy, 1972; Lunenburg, 1983). The characteristics of humanistic and custodial teachers can affect the teacher student relationship. The next section examines the influence of teacher-student relationships on the school experience and the achievement of students.

Teacher/Student Relationships

School reform and pupil control ideology can influence the interaction that occurs between teachers and students. The following section examines the teacher-student relationship in the classroom. There are three areas of research for this section: (a) trust

(b) student agency, and (c) student voice. Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967) found control and lecture were characteristics of custodial environments while autonomy and interaction were characteristics of humanistic (trusting) environments. In the studies that follow, *trust* refers to the amount of autonomy and interaction in the classroom. *Agency* is the extent to which students have legitimate authority to have input into classroom interactions (Sizer & Sizer, 1999). *Voice* is the freedom that students have to express themselves in ways that allow students to determine their futures (Grandmount, 2003). These definitions guided the categorization of studies into the subsections below. The first subsection addresses trust.

Trust

Reis, Colbert, and Hébert (2005) examined diverse students from Urban High Schools to address why some students overcome obstacles to learning while others do not. The investigators grounded the research in the demands of *A Nation at Risk* and in resilience theory, the ability to adjust to negative life events. The researchers used a comparative case study design to answer two research questions: (a) what factors do high achieving students in an urban high school identify as contributing to their resilience, and (b) what factors contribute to the inability to display resilience in underachieving students placed at risk in an urban high school?

The researchers collected data on 35 urban high school students identified as high achieving in previous school years. Additional data came from school personnel and parents of the research subjects. The researchers used observation, interview, and artifact mining to collect data. They analyzed the data in regular meetings with the researcher partners to critically question findings, create new questions, and to perform constant

comparative analysis of the data. To address trustworthiness of the data, the researchers used rival hypotheses testing, a critical friend, and data auditing. Tape-recorded interviews, field notes, and photography provided clarity for information during the analyses sessions. Researchers also kept journals of fieldwork and checked information for accuracy. The researchers further checked accuracy of interpretations using interviews with informants.

Reis, Colbert, and Hébert (2005) found achieving students believed in themselves. They learned to ignore drug dealers and refused to join gangs. The experiences of an urban setting made them stronger and better able to cope with life and provided them with a more realistic view of the future. Students identified as achievers surrounded themselves with a network of people who supported them through school. These students trusted high achieving peers, strong family members, and supportive teachers.

Underachieving students had series of family issues that inhibited their success. They had difficult relations with families, minimal parental academic encouragement, and inconsistent monitoring of their behaviors. These students also reported inappropriate early curricular experiences that included absence of opportunities to develop schoolwork habits, negative interactions with teachers, and absence of challenging and meaningful work.

These results underscore the importance of trusting interactions between students and teacher. Successful students had supportive teachers as part of their support networks. This study did not address how the teacher and student developed a trusting relationship. It did address, however, the importance of having a positive relationship with a teacher for overcoming adverse life conditions. Underachieving students reported

negative experiences with their teachers. There was an absence of challenging and meaningful work in their school experiences. Teachers who engaged students were more likely to have positive relationships that students need for higher outcomes. The next study examined the extent that teacher support effects interaction and achievement.

Klem and Connell (2004) investigated the relationships among teacher support, student engagement, and achievement. The researchers grounded the study in the Reduction Self-System Process Model (Connell, 1991). The model illustrates that experiences from teachers in the form of (a) involvement (b) support for autonomy, and (c) structure lead to student engagement, which in turn leads to improved student outcomes. The population for the study was 1,846 elementary and 2,430 secondary students. The researchers used longitudinal survey data from the Research Assessment Package for Schools (RAPS) to collect data for (a) teacher report of engagement (b) student report of engagement, and (c) teacher support. All survey items used 4-point Likert-like items combining truth scales (1 = *not true at all*, 4 = *very true*) and importance scales (1 = *not at all important*, 4 = *very important*). The academic achievement data came from the *Student Performance and Commitment Index* (SPCI), a commercial package that the district used to track student performance and behavior.

The researchers used “threshold analysis” to examine the data. Threshold analysis is the process of establishing standards for significance based on a known population. In this case, *optimum performance* and *risk level* were the thresholds at which student chances for success increased or decreased most significantly. The optimal levels for elementary students using the SPCI included: (a) attendance of 97% or higher and (b) a reading percentile score of at least 70% or a math percentile score of 80% or higher. The

optimal levels for secondary students using the SCPI included: (a) attendance of 93% or higher and (b) a reading percentile score of at least 70% or a math percentile score of 65% or higher. The risk level for elementary students was attendance below 89% and reading percentile score below 35%. The risk level for secondary students was attendance rate below 79% and reading percentile score below 25%.

There were no minimal math scores for risk thresholds. The optimal level of student reports of engagement using the RAPS was 3.75 for both elementary and secondary schools. Risk levels for student reports of engagement were 3.25 or less for elementary students and 3.00 or less for middle school students. Teacher reports of engagement were optimal for scores of 3.6 or more for both elementary and secondary students. Teacher reports of engagement were at-risk for scores of 2.6 or less for elementary students and 2.3 or less for secondary students. Threshold levels for optimal teacher support were 3.50 and at-risk was 2.50 for elementary and secondary students.

Approximately 35% of elementary and 31% of secondary students reported themselves as at-risk for levels of engagement. This indicates that students were disengaged at school. Teachers rated 40% of elementary students and 17% of secondary students as at-risk for engagement. Elementary school students reporting high levels of engagement were 44% more likely to do well on the SPCI. Elementary students with low levels of self-reported engagement were 30% more likely to do poorly on the SPCI. Secondary students with high levels of engagement were 71% more likely to do well on the SPCI. Secondary students with low levels of engagement were 28% more likely to do poorly on the SPCI. The results of the support survey for elementary students showed 51% of the students reported themselves as optimally engaged and 11% reported

themselves as at-risk. The students who reported getting low levels of support from their teachers were 40% more likely to receive a disengaged rating from their teachers. Results indicated 8% of the secondary students who self-reported at-risk levels of teacher support. These students were 71% less likely to engage with schoolwork.

This study is important because it shows a connection among teacher support, engagement, and achievement. The greater the teacher support, the more students engaged in school activities, which resulted in greater student achievement. Teacher trust may be a consequence of control ideologies. There may be external factors that influence teacher trust as well such as parent cohesion (Lapointe, 2004). This study related trust to engagement. The next study examines demographic variables with trust and achievement.

Goddard, Tschannen-Moran, and Hoy (2001) examined the relationships between trust and three variables: (a) socioeconomic status (b) race, and (c) achievement. The purpose of the study was to investigate trust as a critical element of the relationships in the school context that facilitated school success. The research addressed (a) the association between teacher trust and school membership (b) the relationship between trust and unequal distribution of school success, and (c) the extent trust predicted differences between and within schools in school achievement. The researchers believed trust would be a social feature that strongly influences success of urban students.

Two questions that drove this study addressed (a) the extent trust varied within and among schools and (b) the extent that demographics and school size explained variations in trust. The researchers hypothesized that teacher trust would relate positively and significantly to differences among urban elementary schools in student academic achievement. Trust meant the social feature that enables group members to achieve

common goals. The sample for this study included 52 randomly selected urban schools in a Midwest City in the United States. Of the 52 selected schools, 49 schools agreed to participate in the study and 47 schools returned sufficient data for inclusion in the study. A power analysis indicated that the researchers needed a sample size of 44. The researchers collected academic and demographic data on 2,536 4th grade students and survey data from 452 teachers.

The academic data included mandatory state achievement test scores for mathematics and reading in 3rd and 4th grades (Kuder-Richardson formula 20 reliability scores were .88 for mathematics and .86 for reading). Because of the large sample, the researchers threw out scores for students not taking the achievement test for both 3rd and 4th grades. The researchers used a survey to operationalize the trust variable. The survey included 15 6-point Likert-type items (1 = *strongly disagree*, 6 = *strongly agree*). A power analysis of the survey produced factor-loading values from .600 to .947 with only one item less than .760. The alpha coefficient of reliability was .97 for the sample.

Because the researchers analyzed data at two levels (within schools and across schools), they analyzed variables using hierarchical linear modeling. Results for reliability for the school means was strong ($\lambda = .902$). The results indicated that trust values varied slightly more among schools than within schools (*between school* = .20045, *within school* = .29345). The characteristics that explained this difference were proportion of African American students and socioeconomic status. School size was not a significant predictor of this variance.

The researchers adjusted student achievement means of the schools for student demographics using grand-mean centering of the variables. The findings showed student

achievement was significantly and negatively associated with both minority status and disadvantaged socioeconomic status. Prior achievement had a significant positive effect. Gender significantly related to reading achievement but not mathematics.

Several studies described trust as a tenet of humanistic control and lack of trust as a tenet of custodial control (Willower, Eidell, & Hoy, 1973; Hoy, 1972; Kottkamp & Mulhern, 1987; Satori, Bauske, & Lunenburg, 2000; Lunenburg, 1991; Lunenburg 1999; Lunenburg & Stouten, 1983; Lunenburg, 1983; Harty, Anderson, & Enochs, 1984; Hoy & Woolfolk, 1990). In Goddard, Tschannen-Moran, and Hoy (2001), trust was a predictor of student academic success and of teacher perceptions of race and socioeconomic status. It therefore makes sense that student outcomes are higher in a humanistic context with teachers that trust students.

Ashton and Webb (1986b) addressed the teacher pedagogical choices in terms of teacher efficacy. The researchers assumed that personally efficacious teachers use student centered pedagogies. The purpose of this study was to differentiate between general teacher efficacy (the belief that all students can learn when teachers use effective pedagogies), and personal teaching efficacy (the confidence one has in his ability to teach). To address findings of a separate ethnographic study on teacher efficacy, Ashton and Webb (1986b) examined the effects of general and personal teaching efficacy on classroom climate, student behavior and student achievement.

The sample for the study included basic skills teachers ($N = 48$) in mathematics and communications from four high schools in the southeastern U. S. The teachers taught grades 9 through 12. The researchers collected complete data from 45 teachers. They used the three incomplete sets of data for analyses where appropriate. The variables for

this study included: (a) student achievement (b) teacher attitudes of efficacy (c) classroom climate (d) climate of control (e) teacher practices, and (f) student engagement. State accountability test records provided the scores for student achievement. Two questionnaires developed for this study provided the information on teacher attitudes for general and personal efficacy. The Climate and Control System (Soar & Soar, 1980) and the Florida Climate and Control System (Soar, Soar, & Ragosta, 1971) operationalized teacher control strategies. The procedure included coding on two different forms using a matrix for coding.

Observation provided data about teacher practices. The researchers used the Teacher Practices Observation Record to observe teacher behavior. The observation instrument includes 62 items that describe traditional and direct approaches to teaching. Finally, the researchers used a method of counting students engaged at regular intervals to operationalize student engagement. The researchers reduced observation data to frequencies and used factor analysis to determine the sets of factors that represented a paradigm of classroom learning environment. This resulted in four independent dimensions of classroom behavior: (a) emotional climate (b) teacher management of pupil behavior (c) teacher management of learning tasks, and (d) teacher management of thinking processes. The researchers estimated reliability of process measures using intra-class correlations that treated both teacher variability from occasion to occasion and differences between observers as error. They used intra-class correlation coefficient to estimate reliability.

The researchers calculated Pearson product-moment correlations for all the variables. They used stepwise multiple regression analysis for the dependent variables

mathematics achievement and language achievement. In addition, the researchers calculated partial correlations for teacher attitude, classroom process variables, and reading achievement. They calculated partial correlations for classroom process variables and personal teacher efficacy and reported results in two categories, teacher efficacy and classroom process.

The results indicated that teacher efficacy was a significant predictor of mathematics achievement ($\Delta R^2 = .24, p = .01$). Teacher efficacy accounted for 24% of the variance in mathematics achievement. Every 1-point increase in teacher efficacy yielded a .77-point increase in mathematics achievement. Teacher efficacy accounted for 31% of the variance in language ($\Delta R^2 = .31, p = .01$). Every 1-point increase in teacher efficacy yielded a 1.37-point increase in language achievement. There were no other significant predictors for mathematics or language.

Variables for classroom process and reading produced only one significant relationship. Teacher use of narrow one-answer questions correlated negatively with student reading scores ($r = -.69, p = .03$). This means that increased use of narrow questions resulted in decreased student reading achievement. Significant correlations for teacher attitude and classroom process factors were few, but in the expected direction. Teachers who felt greater responsibility for pupil achievement had less pupil negative affect ($r = -.35, p < .05$). Teacher stress correlated in a positive direction with moderating pupil control ($r = -.33, p < .05$). Higher stressed teachers used greater levels of behavior moderation.

Teacher sense of self-efficacy correlated with eight variables of classroom process. These were (a) teacher makes pupil the center of attention ($r = -.41, p = .01$) (b)

teacher makes something center of pupil attention ($r = -.45, p = .007$) (c) teacher involves pupil in uncertain situation ($r = .33, p = .05$) (d) teacher withholds judgment of pupil behavior or work ($r = .33, p = .05$) (e) teacher directs without reason ($r = -.36, p = .03$) (f) teacher reminds or prods student ($r = -.34, p = .04$) (g) teacher positive facial feedback ($r = .41, p = .02$), and (h) uses posture to indicate patience ($r = -.37, p = .03$). Teachers with higher levels of self-efficacy were more likely to withhold judgment, involve the student in an uncertain situation, use positive facial feedback, and demonstrate patience. Teachers with lower levels of self-efficacy were more likely to draw attention to students, make something the center of pupil attention, direct without reason, and prod an uncertain student.

There was an association among personal efficacy, general efficacy and student achievement. Teachers with higher levels of personal efficacy were more successful with mathematics, reading, and language instruction. Adding variables of general efficacy, the confidence that teaching techniques will be successful, conformed this finding. Teacher efficacy also had an impact on the learning environment. Ashton and Webb (1986b) argued that high teacher efficacy promotes the development of a comfortable and secure classroom atmosphere. Higher levels of personal and general teaching efficacy would be characteristics of teachers who provide positive feedback and are patient.

Teachers with high self-efficacy can trust students to grapple with information to find answers, were more likely to withhold judgment, involve the student in an uncertain situation, use positive facial feedback, and demonstrate patience. This undergirds the argument that effective teachers had stronger relationships with their students. This study covered students in the general population. The researchers made connections between

teacher efficacy and student outcomes. There was not a direct connection in this study between pupil control and student outcomes.

When students experience trust from their teachers, they experience success in the forms of belief in self and resilience. They are more engaged in the lessons and have higher levels of achievement because students believe they have authentic control over their own learning. This characteristic is the salient characteristic of *student agency*, the topic of the next subsection. Student agency research explores student input into classroom interactions.

Student Agency

There has been considerable speculation reflecting best practices for teacher and student interactions. Moral education means to equip students with the knowledge and ability to understand and model characteristics of civil behavior.Sizer and Sizer (1999) posited that moral education required intellectual discourse infused throughout an entire school. Students should feel a sense of voice and agency and moral education should reflect a process that engages students in moral debate. Many students are powerless in the one institution that strives to give them agency. They believed the real purpose of schooling was “to equip himself [sic] to be of use both to himself and others” (p. 186).

Sizer and Sizer (1999) explained student hope and sense of agency depended on the value others have of the knowledge, skills, and talents offered. When students feel valued, they are able to transform the knowledge, skills, and talents into meaningful moral debate in the classroom. Students lacked skill because they did not have ample life experiences to consider the complexity of moral problems. Schools provide a natural forum for students to experience and absorb moral complexities.

Sizer and Sizer (1999) suggested that students “grapple meanings” of civil behavior to bring meaning to their opinions and decisions. Grappling meant searching for meaning through thoughtful intellectual discourse grounded in carefully scrutinized literature. This would require curriculum that promotes intellectual discourse and respect for student opinions, no matter how naive. The curriculum would be rich in content and promote sensitive living in a thought provoking context. Teachers who believed that grappling is beyond students underestimated them. Most children naturally grappled in situations outside of school. Schools must believe that such a curriculum is possible.

Sizer and Sizer (1999) outlined steps to creating such a curriculum. Grappling required students first consider literary, historic, and scientific examples. Students participated in a variety of assignments to develop knowledge. Next, students learned the related literature and transform information into graphs, photographs, essays, and statistics. Students then participated in moral debate to develop an understanding of the complexity of the information. At this step, students also scrutinized the sources of information at this point. Finally, students reported using testing or final performance.

The difference between grappling and other learning practices was students owned the questions and the answers. Teachers took interest in student responses for depth and bias and help students develop the complexity of their communications. Students provided added information, unique opinions, and additional skills in the process. Sizer and Sizer (1999) warned that loose structure in the classroom might intimidate students and suggest that teachers create a balance between structure and chaos for grappling. The next study described students who grappled with school policy issues while serving on school councils.

Kaba (2001) conducted an interpretive case study of student participation in the Chicago Local School Councils. These 542 councils were a product of the Chicago School Reform act. The study offers an “empirical analysis of student representatives’ perception of their participation in these decision-making bodies” (p.22). The researcher posited the existence of conflicting subjective and objective consciousness. She cited studies that indicated students who have voice and agency in the administrative decisions for schools experience ownership in the schools. In addition, when students participate in the decision-making process, student behavior and school climate improves.

Kaba (2001) used interview and observation to collect data for this case study. The researcher checked validity of data with the use of an inductively produced survey. She organized, described, analyzed and interpreted the data. The researcher parsed the data into four themes: (a) demographics (b) rationales (c) feelings of equality, and (d) objective conditions. The first theme provided demographic information about the research subjects. There were 12 males and 36 females ($N = 48$) in the sample. The students represented a diverse population in terms of ethnic backgrounds. In addition, the students participated in a number of other extra-curricular activities. Rationales was a theme that meant student rationales for participation in school decision-making. Students did not indicate that there was specific value in participating in the local school councils. Instead, they indicated that this participation was “a right.” Some students indicated that they had insights into school life that were valuable to the decision-making process.

Feeling equal was also a theme. The researcher described this as a subjective consideration because it dealt with how students perceived their roles on the councils. Students indicated that the adults on the councils valued their opinions. They described

feelings of membership and agency. Some likened their local school councils to being a “family” where they felt respected and heard. They also noted that like family, adults had more legitimate decision-making authority than they did.

The final theme was the objective conditions or the actual condition of being and equal member of the council. Students noted internal conflict between what they perceived was important about their participation and the actual conditions of their participation. They recognized adults, especially adult staff members, had the most influence on the councils. They were sometimes disappointed because they were unable to sway the minds of adult members on issues they perceived as trivial.

The researcher concluded that it was unclear to what extent student participation in decision-making was meaningful. Adults on the councils in this study often relegated students to subordinate positions. Regardless of limited influence, students participating on councils resulted in feelings of student agency, value, and respect. This study showed students gained agency when they contributed intellectually in moral debate in an authentic context. The next study had similar findings in relation to democratic discipline.

Grandmount (2003) did a case study of the democratic discipline process coined “Judicious Discipline” (Gathercoal, 1997), a system where students participate in the establishment of classroom rules and rules of discipline were contextualized in a balance of student civil rights and compelling state (class) interests. The Gathercoal model defines compelling school interests as (a) property loss or damage (b) legitimate educational purpose (c) threat to health and safety, and (d) serious disruption of the educational process. The goal of Judicious Discipline was to teach students rights and responsibilities in a real life model that approximates life when students leave school.

The researcher used nomination criterion selection to select a public high school using democratic discipline on a school-wide basis for at least three years. The subject for this case study was a high school in south central Minnesota. The school had 960 students and a staff of 60 professional educators. The students in the school were primarily White and middleclass.

Grandmount (2003) triangulated five sources of data: (a) personal interviews (b) focus group interviews (c) direct observation (d) documents mining, and (e) follow-up survey of 23 students. The researcher analyzed data using constant comparison and checked data across sources. He also supplied drafts of data reports to school staff to member check the data. The findings of this study fit into two categories of attitude for three groups within the community of the study. The attitude categories were: (a) difficulties and (b) benefits of Judicious Discipline. The three groups were: (a) students (b) teachers, and (c) administrators. Below are descriptions of the primary benefits and difficulties for each group.

Grandmount (2003) found one primary benefit for students was that students felt that staff listened to them when responding to disciplinary confrontations. In addition, students had choices for the establishment of procedures in the classroom and for responding to situations within varying school contexts. The most significant finding, however, was about student self-determination and autonomy. Students were internalizing rules based on the balance of their rights and the school's interest rather than the perceived capriciousness of school rules.

There were problems with students participating in the establishment of rules. The researcher described "difficult students" who developed rules outside of the context of

the balance of rights and school's interests. In addition, the researcher found this approach was not effective for students with chemical dependency or behavior disorders. Teachers reported an advantage to Judicial Discipline was they could depersonalize actions against students because they were able to use the compelling interests as a basis for their actions in civil rather than moral terms. Because teachers were able to depersonalize discipline, they had fewer confrontations with students. They also reported lower levels of stress.

Teachers, conversely, complained about balancing instructional time with time spent on discipline. The processes of establishing rules for the classroom and addressing discipline issues took much longer than before. In addition, because of teacher turnover, there was concern for having a critical mass of teachers addressing discipline issues consistently. One assistant principal did most of the discipline in the school. She reported that applying Judicial Discipline reduced her stress when dealing with student discipline. She was able to depersonalize disciplinary referrals and address students using civil language. Judicial Discipline helped her decide to continue in the field of education when prior to the program, she considered changing professions.

The assistant principal reported two major problems with the program. When she was overwhelmed with work, she would make decisions of discipline based on traditional disciplinary efficiency. This was a source of frustration after the fact, knowing that she had not listened to the student and consequently, lost an opportunity for the teaching moment. There was not enough time to meet with parents. Parent conferences were an important tenant of Judicial Discipline. Because of the large student population at the

school, the assistant principal did not have enough time to conference with parents enough.

There were several implications for practice for this study. A major finding of this study was the use of non-moralistic tones and discipline based on the best interest of the state meant that teachers were less confrontational with their students. Students who participated in their own management learned the intent of rules was to balance the interests of schools with individual civil rights. When students understood that rules have a purpose and when they could express their perceptions, they had a more positive perception of the disciplinary process. Students were less confrontational and they developed an approximation of self-discipline and autonomy. The researcher provided evidence that efforts to increase student voice in disciplinary issues required a critical mass of staff buy-in to have a positive influence on student behaviors. Teacher turnover and teachers who resisted change posed a barrier to student voice efforts.

When administration and faculty applied judicious discipline techniques, students perceived the adults listened to them. Participation in the process of judicious discipline resulted in students feeling a greater sense of self-determination and autonomy (Grandmount, 2003). Studies showed disaffected youth felt that rules were too strict and that they were unreasonable. They reported teachers that humiliate or talk down to them and that school was boring. The adults at school did not listen to them. This research was important because it identified the relationships between student agency and their perceptions of school. Students must feel that the adults in their school listened to them.

Denton (2003) examined a high school's approach to creating and maintaining a school code of conduct. The purpose of the study was to describe the goals and

implementation of the student code of conduct. The researcher further examined the outcomes of student participation in the development of a student code of conduct.

Kingston (pseudonym) was a high school in an industrial town in New York with 2,300 students and 100 full-time teachers. The student population was predominately White with 25% of the students qualify for free lunch. The school adopted a policy of democratic discipline using “Jeffersonian” principles. Students participated as equal members on the “Jefferson Committee” to develop the student code of conduct. The Jeffersonian characteristics of the program included rules of order, equal participation in the process (all members identified as “Citizen”), and majority votes. The purpose of the committee was to involve students in the creation and yearly revisions of the school code of conduct. The staff members wanted students to learn about the process of writing rules while conducting themselves properly in the context of a meeting. They established criteria for creating quality rules. These criteria were that rules must be (a) equal for all, (b) understandable, (c) relevant and legitimate for educational purposes, (d) specific, (e) lawful, and (f) reasonable and enforceable.

The researcher collected qualitative data through interview, observation, and documents mining. She analyzed the data using a constant comparative analysis, comparing data between sources. She addressed trustworthiness of the data by submitting draft reports to research subjects for member checking. The researcher reported the data using thick description, vignettes, and analyses of themes. In addition to describing the process of the Jefferson Committee, the researcher reported additional findings of this study in three themes. These themes were purpose of the committee, expectations of behavior for the committee, and a theme entitled, “Does the committee work?”

The Jefferson Committee had expectations of behavior for all members. All members took turns; no one talked until the chair recognized them. All members used the proper civil meeting language. When students were unsure of the proper language, teachers coached them. When teachers or students confronted members of the group with differing opinions students used the phrase, “I hear and respect what you were saying,” prior to offering a differing opinion.

The researcher reported ways the Jefferson Committee improved the student experience at the school. Students gained skills and knowledge to express viewpoints vividly, disagree calmly and respectfully, compromise, and understand and defend their own rights. The experience provided a model that simulates skills for problem solving in student lives when they leave school. Students and faculty agreed that the product, the code of conduct, was fair. Because students participated in the process, they felt that they had both agency and ownership of the code.

A byproduct of buy-in was reduced student misbehaviors. The students created the rules and thus were more willing to abide by them. The program had obstacles. Communication was an issue for many students and teachers. Many students and a few teachers were unaware that the Jefferson Committee existed. The author posited that many students were apathetic about the process. Teacher turnover was the reason for lack of awareness for faculty members.

The researchers found student participation in democratic discipline improves student behavior. There was also evidence that the efforts must be school-wide for the program to work. A critical mass of teachers must support the effort for the program to succeed. Giving students the opportunity to participate in democratic discipline also gave

students a voice in their governance. For students to have agency, teachers must allow them to participate in classroom discussions. The next study explores teacher domination of the talk in the classroom.

Moguel (2004) examined the influence of a teaching methods course on teacher candidate beliefs about teacher-student interaction. Sociocultural theory undergirded the study. The researcher wanted to find out: (a) why teachers talk so much during instruction; (b) what were better alternatives to excessive teacher talk; and (c) if educating, preparing, and training new teachers in different and better ways makes a difference in the development of teachers own theories and practice.

The sample for the study included six teacher candidates from an enrollment of 30 in a linguistic anthropology and discourse analysis class for prospective teachers. The content of the course stressed reduction of the typical teacher *initiation*, student *response*, and teacher *evaluation* cycle of classroom discourse (IRE). Instead, perspective teachers learned to ask authentic questions, limit recitation and lecture, encourage students to facilitate instruction, and allow students to summarize course content. Responding to literature indicating that university programs use traditional lecture and IRE methods, the instructor used the methods that he taught.

The researcher conducted a series of three structured, open-ended interviews, at the beginning, midcourse, and end of the course. He analyzed the research questions based on two research questions: (a) what did the candidates say about how teachers and students should participate in the classrooms, and (b) how did the candidates actually participate in the course of the three conversations? He also observed the students during

instruction to compare student claims of theories with their behaviors as class facilitators and as participants in the class.

The results of the study showed the course content and presentation influenced teacher candidate behaviors as participants. Teacher candidate personalities were a greater influence on behaviors as facilitators. Aggressive students touted the importance of student involvement in interactions while they dominated classroom interactions and suppressed the interactions of the other students in the class. Passive student beliefs aligned with their own participation in class. The results also showed the course instructional methods were a greater influence on student beliefs than the reading material and course package that supported the instructional methods.

Subjects in the study also admitted that they were uncomfortable with class discussion throughout the entire course. They explained that though the experience helped them create a climate of respect toward each other and openness toward different perspectives, that they prefer some variance in instructional delivery. They added that the use of authentic questions instead of “test” questions and allowing more time for students to answer questions were important concepts for improved instructional practices.

This study provided valuable insight to the source of teacher-student interactions. Teacher candidates tend to teach the way their teachers taught them. However, there is an additional component of teacher personality. This study found teachers with stronger personalities tended to dominate conversation in the classroom. These teachers were uncomfortable with interaction and discussion. The course addressed this by modeling the same teaching methods that the instructors expected the teachers to use in practice.

The researcher suggested that teachers evaluate their beliefs about their instruction by comparing these beliefs with their behaviors.

Teacher colleges, though espousing the idea of student-centered pedagogies, were not overwhelmingly concerned with the influence of their own teaching methods on their student beliefs. The research indicated that course instructional methods were a greater influence on the candidate beliefs than were the course package and required readings. As a result, the overwhelming instructional practice in schools remains lecture and IRE.

Teacher beliefs that encouraged interaction in this study included the use of authentic questions instead of test questions and giving students more time to answer questions. Authentic questions ask for thoughts, opinions, and beliefs. Knowledge happens inductively. Teachers provided an emotionally safe atmosphere for the student by allowing more time to answer questions. This reduced student stress. Asking authentic questions fostered an environment where students can explore disagreements and differences in their opinions.

Research on increasing student talk in the classroom indicated that students need an emotionally safe environment to take the risks associated with perceptions of peer judgment of incorrect answers. Allowing students to discuss concepts in small groups and then reporting out in larger groups was a successful strategy in an honors Literature class (Connolly & Smith, 2002). Using authentic questions and increasing time for students to respond was also an important feature of student talk. The use of teacher initiation, student response, and teacher evaluation was a method that teachers overuse. Questions that focus on meanings and opinions were more effective than “test” questions for classroom discussions.

Gibson and Dembo (1984) developed an instrument that addressed the differences between personal and general teacher efficacy. The purpose of the study was to (a) determine what dimensions construct teacher efficacy (b) differentiate constructs of “teaching efficacy” and teacher “self-efficacy,” and (c) determine whether differentiated patterns of teacher behavior related to success in the classroom. The researchers cited previous studies that related efficacious teachers had stronger academic focus in the classroom and spent more time on instructional activities that led to greater student success. These teachers provided extensive coverage of topics and used specific questions. Effective teachers demonstrated more willingness to work with struggling students through difficult problems. The problem for the researchers was that there was no valid instrument that measured “efficacy.”

Gibson and Dembo (1984) first developed a pilot instrument that included 53 sample items based on previous research and observations. They administered the pilot instrument to 90 teachers. The researchers used factor analysis to eliminate items with poor variability and maintain only items that loaded clearly on one of the substantial factors. The researchers revised the remaining items to clarify ambiguities and assure proper item construction. The resulting instrument contained 30 questions with 6-point Likert-type agreement scales (1 = *strongly disagree*, 6 = *strongly agree*).

The researchers then validated the instrument. In the first phase of the validation process, the researchers administered the instrument to 208 elementary school teachers from 13 schools grades kindergarten through six. The sample was primarily female (75%) and included a wide range of teaching experience. The researchers used the factor solution of the Statistical Package of Social Sciences (SPSS) to perform a factor analysis

of the data. They loaded two factors representing teaching efficacy and teacher self-efficacy. In addition, they performed both oblique and orthogonal rotations to compare item loadings and degree of correlations between factors. The results showed the items correlated only moderately ($r = .19$) and therefore yielded independent constructs. Factor loading for personal teaching efficacy fell in the range of .46 to .61 and for general teaching efficacy fell in the range of .45 to .65. Items below a factor loading value of .45 did not appear in the final instrument. This resulted in nine items for teacher self-efficacy and seven items for general teacher efficacy. Internal reliability measures resulted in coefficient alpha levels of $\alpha = .78$ for teaching efficacy, $\alpha = .75$ for teacher self-efficacy, and $\alpha = .79$ for the total 16 items.

In the second phase of the study, the researchers established content validity using discriminate analysis. The researchers collected three sets of trait data (teacher efficacy, verbal ability, and flexibility) using two response methods (closed ended and open-ended). Graduate students in education served as research subjects. There were positive correlations between open ended and closed ended measure of all three traits ($r = .41$, $p < .001$). The researchers assessed validity in two steps. The first step was to determine whether the correlations between different methods of measuring the same trait exceed correlations between that trait and the other traits. The second step was to determine whether the correlation between different methods of measuring the same trait exceeded correlations between that trait and other traits that have method in common. The researchers then compared patterns of correlations. The results of the discriminate analysis supported the convergence of teacher efficacy when measure by two different approaches and discriminability from similar constructs already in use.

In the third phase of the research, Gibson and Dembo (1984) determined if high- and low-efficacy teachers exhibit differential patterns of teacher behaviors in the classroom related to academic focus, feedback, and persistence in failure situations. The researches used observation data of eight teachers used in the pilot phase of the investigation. They transformed raw data into descriptive interpretations (qualitative data) and quantified the interpretations for of time spent performing the task variables. The academic time variables included whole class instruction, small group instruction, and checking seatwork. The nonacademic time variables included daily rituals, transition, preparation/paperwork, intellectual games, unfocused small talk and recess.

The researchers reported the means and standard deviations for time variables. They then performed the independent samples *t*-test to compare means of teachers who scored high efficacy with those who scored low efficacy. There were few significant differences between high and low efficacy teachers for most of the nonacademic and academic variables. High efficacy teachers spent significantly more time on intellectual games than low efficacy teachers did. There were significant differences in small group instruction as well with high efficacy teachers spending significantly more time on small group instruction than low efficacy teachers did.

There are differences in teaching efficacy and teacher perceptions of self-efficacy. This construct of efficacy in research on pupil control described in an earlier section indicated that low efficacy teachers exhibit more custodial forms of pupil control (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1990). Ashton and Webb (1986b) suggest that low efficacy teachers are less able to relate to students personally and their students achieve less in reading, language, and mathematics. Gibson and Dembo (1984) suggest that high efficacy teachers spend

more time on instruction and intellectual interaction than low efficacy. From this, questions of impact of efficacy on disadvantaged students surface. Are administrators rewarding effective teaching with higher performing class assignments? What effect would this have on the achievement gap between disadvantaged groups of students and those who are not disadvantaged?

In sum, when intellectual discourse, moral debate, and grappling of ideas were characteristics of instruction, there was student agency (the perception that one has legitimate influence on the group). This led to higher levels of transfer of knowledge, ownership of ideas, development of life skills, and student buy-in. This is more likely to happen when teacher efficacy is high. With these tools, students can voice their opinions legitimately. The next subsection explores student voice. Without a voice in the classroom, authentic control of learning would be impossible.

Student Voice

Mirta (2004) examined how student voice opportunities appear to contribute to youth development outcomes in young people. The researcher grounded this study in sociocultural and situative perspectives. This means that we learn and become who we are by interaction with others. The investigators postulated that learning was a social activity that occurred because of interaction with people, not an individual process. The researchers addressed student voice in the context of school reform. The author believed when students worked with teachers and administrators, that reform efforts could create buy-in from the students and meet developmental needs of students. The article analyzed how student voice activities increased student sense of agency (influence and power),

belonging (meaningful relationships with others in the school), and competence (being appreciated for one's talents).

The study took place at a northern California school that served first generation immigrants from Latin America and Asia and working-class African-Americans and European-Americans. The school, part of the Bay Area School Reform Collaborative, received a share of \$112 million to fund reform efforts in the school. The researcher selected this school based on the depth to which the school involved students in its reform initiatives. Mirta (2004) collected data from two student groups involved in the school reform. The Pupil-School Collaborative (PSC) was a group with the goal of improving education for Latino students. The sponsor of the group was a university professor and local activist. The group recruited students informally through hallway encounters and word-of-mouth.

The Student Forum was a select group of students participating on focus groups with the goal of improving academic success of ninth graders. The group sponsor was a fourth-year English teacher. The sponsor selected members to represent a cross section of race and gender. The group consisted of an equal mix of Latino, Asian, African-American, and White students. The researcher collected data over a two-year period using interview, observations of meetings and conversations, and mining of documents. The researcher conducted at least two interviews with school administrators, each of the adult advisors and each student subject. There were students who participated in only one interview. However, because the research traced student development, the researcher discarded data from students interviewed only one time.

The researcher also collected data from teachers and students who did not participate in the reform groups. There were over 70 semi-structured interviews with student group members and adult advisors and interviews with school administration, teachers, and students not involved in the groups. The researcher conducted over 50 observations of formal meetings and informal conversations. She collected data before and after meetings, and with groups in classrooms, offices, and in hallways. The researcher reduced data by breaking it down; conceptualizing it and putting it back together in thematic categories. She used a qualitative software package (QSR Nud*ist) for data coding and analysis. The author used three colleagues to compare codes and look for themes in the raw data. This provided internal reliability and the opportunity for new themes to emerge.

Mirta (2004) found involving students in reform efforts had positive effects on youth development outcomes. Students involved in the Student Forum developed a sense of agency. Students increased their ability to articulate opinions to others and perceived themselves as empowered to create change. Because of this empowerment, students developed skills that aided them in taking on leadership roles. The results showed the Pupil-School Collaborative group was not as involved in the reform efforts. This was because the primary purpose was to improve services for Latino students. Another problem with the Pupil-School Collaborative group was consistency. Group membership for some was ephemeral. The researcher suggests some friction between the administration at the school and this group. Regardless, students developed a sense of belonging.

Adults in the school environment cared about them and were able to establish meaningful relationships with the teachers they perceived as caring. Students improved interactions with their teachers and developed attachments to their school. Students developed competence that helped them to analyze their environment honestly. Through the group processes, students developed social competencies that enhanced their public speaking skills and their abilities to get along with one another. Students developed skills to solve problems and facilitate solutions. Mirta (2004), however, indicated students lacked the skills to recognize the context of the problems.

Student voice in reform activities created opportunities to meet the developmental needs for youth. Students in this study engaged in moral debate that gave them a voice in the operations of the school. Efforts to increase student voice influenced youth development by increasing confidence, building connections with adults in the school and building skills that improved student abilities to communicate with others. Mirta (2004) indicated the need for further research to explore the connections between “achieving individual changes through meeting developmental needs in students and the potential for organizational changes in school culture.”

Student participation in policy setting had a positive influence on their social development and maturity. Specifically, students were able to build confidence, communicate better, and were able to better connect with adults (Mirta, 2004). In the Chicago City Schools, students believed participation was a right and that some adults were patronizing about their roles in policy decision making despite the fact that student participation was a part of district policy. Still, students in the study reported increased perceptions of equality, agency, value, and respect. Students who participated in creating

and revising rules improved their behaviors and reported greater acceptance of the rules. The next article explores the impact of efficacy on voice in classrooms.

Ashton and Webb (1986a) advanced the theory that for teacher efficacy to have an impact on student achievement, there needs to be a critical mass of teachers of high efficacy in the building. The researchers based their study on literature from five areas: (a) school climate (b) job satisfaction (c) teacher stress (d) Teacher commitment to teaching, and (e) teacher role perception. The research occurred in two phases. The questionnaire phase focused on the impact that school climate has on teacher efficacy. The microethnography stage explored school characteristics that effected teacher attitudes.

The investigators cited research that associated factors such as strong academic emphasis, high expectations, student incentives, and continual monitoring of student progress with creating a positive school ethos. Further, positive school ethos contributed to school-level influences that led to higher levels of student achievement. However, teachers in general had low levels of job satisfaction because of (a) limited upward mobility (b) public perceptions of the profession, and (c) low salaries. The researchers associated job satisfaction with teacher stress, commitment to teaching and role perceptions.

In the first phase of the study, the investigators used a survey to collect data from 29 middle school teachers and 20 junior high teachers. The middle school incorporated collaborative teaching teams that combined disciplines and the junior high school used departmentalized with a highly individualized structure. The teachers were mostly White, females ages 25 to 35. There were seven males and nine African Americans included in

the sample. The participants received a cash incentive to complete a lengthy survey measuring eight variables.

The survey included Likert-type items, listing, and short response items. Teacher Sense of Efficacy included two Likert-type items. The teacher expectation variable used two measures from previous research, each consisting of five Likert-type items ($\alpha = .61$). A six item subscale of the School Survey (Ellett & Masters, 1977) measured collegial relations ($\alpha = .84$). Student Conflict included eleven items that measured teacher perceptions of various student aggressions ($\alpha = .59$). The researchers used one 7-point Likert-type item for job satisfaction and one 5-point Likert-type item for teacher stress with item specific phrases. Commitment to teaching used three 4-point Likert-type importance measures (1 = *extremely important*, 4 = *not important at all*). Teacher attribution measure included a single response designed to indicate if teachers attributed student failure to themselves or to their students. Finally, to measure teacher role perceptions, participants listed what they perceived as their 10 most important responsibilities as teachers.

The researchers used descriptive statistics and performed a one-way ANOVA to report their results. Results of the ANOVA indicated no significant difference in teacher efficacy for the two schools ($\alpha = .05$). There was significance in teacher behavior favoring the middle school [$F(1, 46) = 2.28, p < .10$]. Middle school teachers had higher expectations of their students than junior high teachers did ($F = 6.18, p < .05$) and that middle school teachers had fewer difficulties with collegial relations ($F = 8.24, p < .01$). The researchers attributed the later finding to the highly individualistic structure of the junior high school. The middle school teachers were much less likely to attribute poor

academic performance to students. Only 14% of the teachers in the middle school blamed students for academic failure. This compares with 35% of the high school teachers attributing poor academic performance to student shortcomings.

There were some sharp contrasts between middle and junior high schools in terms of teacher role perceptions. In the middle school, 38% of the teachers listed instruction as an important responsibility compared with 65% of the junior high school teachers. In the middle school, 17% indicated adaptation to student needs as an important role compared with 50% of the junior high school teachers. The researchers posited these two findings reflect the organizational make-up of the middle school (team concept, multi-aged and multi-ability grouping) and the junior high school (departmentalized, traditional grade and ability grouping). Another finding that supported this position was 41% of the middle school teachers listed “develop personal relations with students” as an important role as a teacher. No teachers from the junior high school listed personal relations with students as a role of teaching.

The second phase of this research involved microethnographic investigations of the middle school and junior high schools. The researchers observed teaching and its contextual determinants. They interviewed teachers to analyze complex meaning systems and their perceived roles as teachers. They analyzed data using discussion and hypothesis building. The goal of this phase was to produce an ethnographic account of teacher perspectives and practices in the two schools and to discover cultural themes that connected the attitudes to actions. The researchers observed each teacher at least 12 times and interviewed each teacher at various times throughout the year. The teacher selection criteria included two or more years of experience, previous experience at another school,

willingness to participate, identified as “good classroom managers”, and same team or same department membership depending on the school site.

The researchers used word-for-word accounts, thick description and interpretation in three themes. These themes included (a) conceptions of teaching: an exalted or burdened profession (b) teacher role perceptions: student development versus academic instruction, and (c) organizational features of the schools and teachers’ sense of efficacy. The researchers then synthesized the findings from both phases of the research. The results showed teacher conceptions of teaching were sharply different at the two schools. Middle school teachers perceived that they had an important and demanding job, felt frustration, and despite daily hardships, found deep satisfaction with being in an exalted position. The middle school teachers valued efficacy as making a significant contribution to student achievement. Middle school teachers expressed a belief in personal responsibility for student achievement.

Junior high school teachers liked their work, but dwelled on the burden of a trying profession. Teaching was a way to alter the erroneous paths of student lives. Their zeal for teaching had essentially faded. They had minimal power to improve student academic performance and less power over student choices. They saw teaching efficacy as opportunities for student to achieve grades and not an influence on student emotional and social development.

Teacher role perceptions differed as well. In the middle school, teachers believed their role for instruction was secondary to helping students develop students socially and emotionally. Because they worked collaboratively, they believed team contribution was an important role for achieving goals. Middle school perceptions of teacher role reflected

a belief in the school as a socially oriented organization that develops the entire child, academically, socially, and behaviorally. Junior high teachers defined their roles as teachers in terms of responsibilities of the job. They identified planning of instruction, grading, and classroom management as primary roles. Junior high teachers viewed themselves primarily as agents of curriculum. They were responsible for dissemination of knowledge. They relied heavily on homework, quizzes, and tests to measure their accomplishments.

The organizational features of the schools differed as mentioned above. These differences led to differences in efficacy. The relationship of teaming, in the middle school gave teachers the opportunity to share responsibility, resources and supplies. This also gave the teachers the opportunity to share ideas and decision-making. Teachers felt a sense of empowerment because they could analyze situations and had significant agency in the decisions of the school. The middle school teachers developed personal relationships with their students and were concerned with the social and emotional development of their students. They did not perceive a conflict between the socialization of students and effective teaching practices.

The junior high school promoted individualism. There was little evidence of teamwork. Teachers had to fend for themselves when analyzing problems. Planning occurred in isolation and there was little sharing of expertise or opinions. Decisions primarily came from the administration. The investigators concluded that differences in organizational structures had an impact on teacher efficacy. This structure also had an impact on the instructional and management activities of the teachers. Junior high students believed their job was more about delivery of instruction and the paperwork

involved in reporting student progress rather than guiding the social development of their students. High levels of structure in schools can have a chilling effect on the development of relationships between teachers and students and the voice that teachers give students in their classrooms.

The salient differences between the schools in this study were organizational structure and student grouping. There were marked differences in teacher perceptions of roles, teacher attitudes, and school climate. The effects of collaboration in this study supported the idea that schools need a critical mass of high efficacy teachers working in groups to accomplish learning on both academic and social levels. Consequently, the collaboration of the middle school teachers increased the social interaction and student voice in the classroom.

Crawford (2005) studied the various ways students communicate knowledge of science. The purposes of the study were to (a) identify the locally negotiated literate practices that defined ways of communicating information and knowledge across the curriculum, and (b) illustrate how teachers construct a learning environment with varying discourses (how students communicated results) to address various means of student communication of competence. Crawford (2005) defined literate practice as a socially constructed phenomenon contextually defined and redefined within and across social groups. In a science classroom, literate practice was a means of communicating the nature of science using language that reflected language of “scientists.” Previous studies indicated that communication of science fell into four categories: (a) verbal (b) written (c) demonstration, and (d) proof via convincing evidence. The researcher incorporated interactional ethnographic perspective as the grounding theory for this qualitative study.

The researcher observed the environment through an “ethnographic lens.” This meant that phenomena surrounding the experience served as data to perceive and interpret. The researcher built on the collected data to guide the emerging design and for constant comparison. The researcher analyzed language using discourse analysis.

The education setting for this study was a classroom in a public elementary school with a population of 320 students. The students varied in academic abilities, ethnic backgrounds, and socioeconomic status. The classroom was a multi-level fourth/fifth grade class. Data collections included observations, interviews, artifact analysis, and extensive field notes and theoretical memoranda. The researcher reported the results of the study in three themes of linguistic discourse and description of an example case. The researcher used thick description and visual displays to report the findings.

Communication requirements were associated with the norms and expectations of the teacher. In the first three weeks of the data collection, there were 15 instances where the teacher required written discourse. On 65 occasions, the teacher required either visual or oral forms of discourse for the demonstration of knowledge. Oral communication included 5 instances of explaining visual representations, 25 instances of individual/group sharing, 5 instances of dramatic interpretation, 11 instances of taking the role as teacher, 9 instances of role-playing, and 14 instances of problem solving. Visual forms included two instances of drawing illustrations, one instance of constructing models and five instances of creating graphs/diagrams. The written forms included taking tests (three instances), writing stories (seven instances), and exercises/drills (six instances).

The teacher was able to check students for understanding of processes using all categories of discourse. In addition, the teacher often combined discourse to check for understanding. An example of this would be a student turning in a display with a scrapbook explaining the display and the reasons for choosing the means for constructing the display. By varying the discourse choices, the teacher was able to check for understanding of students of varying abilities providing a wider access to her ability to assess student knowledge while providing students with wider access to learning.

To confirm the findings of the overall classroom interaction, the researcher selected a single class to analyze. The researcher chose a participant based on easy access for video and audio recording equipment to identify a group of students and then chose a student within the group that based on information from the teacher, struggled with written discourse. The researcher chose a group project because (a) it occurred at the end of the academic year and (b) the project was a culminating performance that the student presented to demonstrate knowledge when given a variety of discourse choices.

The data collection included audio and video recordings, word for word transcripts of the data, and artifact analysis. The intent of the analysis was to determine discourse choices and semantic intent without consideration of the accuracy of student statements. The analysis of data followed interactional sociolinguistic theory and discourse analytic procedures. This meant to identify semantic intent of discourse through an analysis of connected iterations and identifying the possible purposes of the actions and the words. The researchers then compared the demonstration and oral explanation of the project with the student written report.

When the student had discourse options, the student was able to demonstrate scientific knowledge necessary to explain scientific procedures. Writing alone did not provide a forum for the student to demonstrate the extent of his knowledge of the subject. The student was able to make use of multiple discursive strategies to interact with his instructor and his peers when allowed to make communication choices. Through demonstration, the student was able to supplement language with actions. The student confronted his challenges and was able to analyze problems and adjust procedures to solve the problems. In the written form, there was no evidence that this student had functional knowledge of the phenomenon.

The role of intellectual discourse and student voice in learning is important for students to have the opportunity to voice learning outcomes. Had the student not had the opportunity to engage in interaction with his teachers and peers, one might have concluded that the student had no working knowledge of his project. The discourse led to further understanding of the problem, the ability to evaluate the sources of information, to respond to challenges about the findings, and to supplement missing lexical knowledge with actions. Having this opportunity allowed the teacher to evaluate the missing lexical and logical knowledge to assist in future planning. This study addressed voicing opportunities in the context of science instruction. The next study examines the influence voice has on achievement in literature.

Connolly and Smith (2002) examined the norms of dialogic interaction in two freshman honors literature classes. The researchers wanted to understand if teacher instruction influenced student conceptions of classroom interaction and if they could bring norms of dialogic interaction into high school classroom discussions of poetry. One

of the researchers acted as participant/observer. He was the instructor in the classroom. The researchers grounded the study in socio-cultural theory. The subjects in the study were students in a ninth grade honors literature class. The investigators did not identify the demographic information of the participants. There were 23 students in one class and 18 in the other. The instructor in the classroom was a graduate student using methods he learned in a graduate course. The instructional practices that the instructor used included reading poetry selections, small group discussions, and report-outs to the class.

Connolly and Smith (2002) used interview and observation to collect qualitative data. They also collected data from the instructor's journal reflections and student written responses to open-ended questions. They categorized the data into identifying content units (segments of discourse designed to make a single point). To check internal validity, they compared categories between observers and compared data across sources. The data fit into four themes. These themes were: (a) who gets to speak (b) in what manner (c) about what, and (d) in what format.

The findings indicated that despite their efforts to portray the instructor as a participant/coach, students did not view the instructor's role as authentic. The students still looked to the instructor for answers and did not always participate up to the level of equal contributors to the classroom instruction. In one class, only five of 16 students present participated in the discussions. Often, students did not substantiate their opinions in literary terms. The instructor felt that at times, students used "agreement" to avoiding thoughtful discussion of the topic.

Despite these shortcomings, students expressed the importance of voicing opinions in an emotionally safe environment. Students learned from the ideas of other

students. Students in the class affirmed each other, which made the class environment more engaging and encouraged them to participate more. Students noted that they could have fun and be productive at the same time. They were not bored with the class.

Students felt comfortable with disagreement.

Students engaged more in learning when their teachers gave them voice in the classroom. Students in this study were not accustomed to equal roles in the classroom because there was not a critical mass of teachers using similar student-centered practices. Students expected teachers to behave in more traditional lecture modes. This was the cause of some confusion. When students engaged in small group discussion, they were able to interact in an emotionally safe environment.

Riley and Docking (2004) examined the importance of listening to young people voice their views about their education experience. The article described two separate studies that when combined, addressed disaffected pupils responses, pupil relationships with teachers, support from parents and interest in school. The researchers address three primary questions related to students having greater voice and agency in school decision-making. These three questions were: (a) what would students say if given the opportunity (b) what were the issues about which they feel positive, and (c) what in particular were the views and experiences of disaffected students? The subjects for these studies included 3,291 students in grades 6, 8, and 10. The sample included students from 44 primary and 20 secondary schools. In addition, 361 teachers (102 primary and 259 secondary) participated. The target schools were in areas of very high economic deprivation.

The researchers reported the first study to provide a framework for the second. The first study was a qualitative inquiry about frustration and mistrust between

disaffected students and their teachers. The findings indicated that students acknowledge that their behavior contributed to the build up of tensions in the classroom. Students also reported that they knew they needed to change, but were unsure of what to do to stop the downward spiral patterns of behaviors.

The researchers developed a questionnaire to gather data on perceptions of school life and work. The researchers also developed a mirrored survey that they administered to the teachers. They pilot tested the questionnaires before they distributed them to teachers and students. The subtopics of the questionnaire included rules and discipline, teacher-student relationships, standards of student behavior, and support from parents. The questionnaire used 4-point and 5-point Likert-type items. An open-ended section allowed students to write about the things they liked and disliked most about their schools. The researchers reported data in percentage frequency distributions. They analyzed each questionnaire item using the chi-square procedure. After collecting the quantitative data, the researchers followed-up with focus group interviews.

Between 80% and 90% of the students stated that schoolwork was worth doing, that they were trying and making progress, and that their parents thought schoolwork was important. Teachers checked for their homework and made them work hard. There were significant differences in the responses for 10th grade students when compared to 6th or 8th grade students in schoolwork interest and strictness of disciplinary rules. Tenth graders perceived schools as more boring and stricter than sixth and eighth graders. Tenth graders also thought there were too many rules in school. In the broad category of aspects of school life, male students were more negative than female students are. However, there were no significant differences for relationships with teachers and support from parents.

Some students were disenchanted with school. They resented teachers who talked down to them, who suppressed their side of the story, or shouted at them or punished them in front of the class. Teachers punished the whole class for the misbehaviors of a few. Students complained about rules being unreasonable. The criticism was greatest when students could not connect the rule to effective learning. Examples cited in the research included rules about types of footwear, jewelry and make-up, and keeping shirts tucked in. The students in the focus groups indicated that teachers at Public Referral Units (similar to alternative schools) did a better job of listening to them than teachers in the mainstream schools did. They described the Public Referral Unit teachers as friendlier and more personable. They described the mainstream school as lacking interest and requiring too much conformity.

When teachers humiliated students with the goal of reducing problems and disrespect, they disenfranchised students. When schools did not allow students to voice opinions and effect change, they became disinterested and misbehavior increased. The researchers called for policies that were more inclusive. Students perceived school as boring because pupils became passive learners. Lessons lacked opportunity for interaction. Dialogue between staff and students helps schools achieve a culture of mutual respect.

Vaughan (2002) studied the effects of cooperative learning on students of color in Bermuda. He postulated that cooperative learning encouraged student interaction and resulted in positive attitudes toward school. He also believed students of color function and achieve better in heterogeneous cooperative groups. The sample for this study was a group of fifth grade students in Bermuda ($N = 21$). There were 18 Black students, 1

student of Indian descent, and 2 students from Azores. There was only one fifth-grade class in the school. The researcher chose this setting because in Bermuda, these students were not minorities.

The researcher used a single group, pretest-treatment-posttest design for the study. He used two separate one-factor ANOVA analyses using repeated measures design. The researcher hand scored the data collection instruments to obtain raw scores for use in the analysis. The dependent variables for this study were math achievement and math attitudes. The researcher used California Achievement Test, a norm referenced test to operationalize math computations and applications. He used Peterson's (1978) Attitude Toward Mathematics Scale, a 15-item Likert-type 5-point (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*) instrument to measure math attitudes. Higher scores on this instrument indicate more positive math attitudes. After cooperative learning, there was significant improvement in mathematics scores for computation [$F(3, 60) = 7.509, p < .0002$] and math applications [$F(3, 60) = 26.06, p < .0001$]. There was also a significant improvement in math attitude scale [$F(3, 60) = 5.325, p < .0026$].

Students benefited academically from instruction in cooperative learning groups. The research design presented a strong caveat for this study. Because the researcher did not compare academic gains in the treatment group with academic gains in a control group, the improvements might have been a result of something other than the treatment. One would expect mathematics achievement to remain the same in the absence of a treatment.

Keedy (1995) examined the extent to which teacher practical knowledge (TPK) was student-centered in three high schools nationally known for school restructuring. The

purpose of the research was to determine (a) if staff agreed upon student-centered pedagogy and (b) if TPK pedagogies were actually student-centered. The researcher selected three schools based on feedback from nominations from experts of schools meeting three criteria: (a) principal tenure of at least three years (b) willingness of district and school administration to participate in the study, and (c) school personnel awareness of the time and energy necessary to collect data. He selected three schools that met the criteria.

Smallwood High School had 200 students, 12 full-time teachers, 4 part-time teachers, and a teaching principal. The student population of Smallwood was diverse with 50% representing minority races. The focus of the reform efforts for Smallwood was student responsibility for learning through the use of learning contracts, journals, information gathering, media use, and reporting. Fairview High School was in a residential/suburban area of a southeastern city with 50 full-time teachers and 900 students. The student population of Fairview was diverse with 36% of the students representing minority races. The focus of the reform efforts for Fairview was the implementation of site-based management and shared decision-making. Bluehill High School had 2400 students, of whom 78% were White, 13% Hispanic, and 9% Asian. The campus, located in the Western United States, had 90 fulltime teachers. The campus includes 7 buildings, 14 trailers, an Olympic-sized swimming pool and a large stadium. The school was a National School of Excellence near the time of the study. The emphasis of the reform efforts at Bluehill was cooperative learning activities and the use of student-centered instructional strategies.

The researcher collected data using interviews, observations, and surveys. He designed his data collection and analysis to measure individual pedagogical items, to determine if teachers used these items school-wide, and to determine to what extent the pedagogies were student-centered. Students have more classroom voice in classrooms applying student-centered pedagogical choices. To collect TPK items, the researcher first interviewed ten select teachers from each school in focus groups to collect data identifying teacher self-reported behaviors of student-centered pedagogies. He then observed the classroom to confirm student-centered items. Finally, he surveyed the students in the students in the class to see if at least two-thirds of the students agreed that the pedagogies were indeed characteristics of the teachers.

To assess if teachers practiced TPK items school-wide, the researcher surveyed matched pairs of teachers to see if two-thirds of the students agreed teachers practiced the items in the classroom. He divided the respondents into college and non-college bound groups for two of the three schools (Smallwood did not track students into college and non-college bound groups). To determine if the TPK items were student-centered, the researcher developed a Quality Index of Student-Centered Pedagogy (QISCP). The instrument was a Likert-type scale (1 = *Teacher as dispenser of facts; student as recorder*, 5 = *student as worker/meaning maker*). A panel of experts rated the TPK items for item student-centeredness.

The findings of this study were disappointing. There were low degrees of student-centeredness and low school-wide agreement of pedagogical student-centeredness. Only Smallwood had a critical mass of teachers applying student-centered pedagogies. A critical mass of teachers agreeing on pedagogy did not improve the degree to which the

experts judged their practices as “student-centered.” Reform efforts at the schools in the study had little influence on student-centered pedagogies.

This study has three important implications. First, school reform is a difficult undertaking in an environment of constant changes. Second, for reform efforts to be successful there must be a critical mass of staff members agreeing to the changes. Finally, changes that occur do not guarantee that efforts will be student-centered and meaningful. Administrators must create buy-in, provide adequate training, and take steps to assure the changes were in the best interests of students. These changes must address the student-centeredness of the pedagogical choices that teachers use in classrooms.

Keedy, Fleming, Wheat, and Gentry (1998) investigated reform efforts that emphasized the importance of intellectual exchange in the classroom. The researchers framed their study with four concepts. The common school was the vision of the public school as a micro-political society with the purpose of preparing students for intelligent, responsible, and democratic citizenship. Constructivism was the concept that students construct knowledge intrinsically through interaction. Students constantly rearrange their understandings through interpretation and filtering of their experiences through pre-existing values and beliefs. Student perspective was a consistent view of one’s world. Moral debate meant the exchange of student perspectives in the context of civic capacity of US institutions to balance personal benefits and the common good.

Keedy et al. (1998) studied the idea of student as meaning-maker in the context of a US History class. They used purposive sampling to find a history teacher with a reputation of “teaching-for-understanding” (p. 623). The teacher (RG) had 12 years of teaching experience. RG was on an instructional mission to empower students to interpret

history intrinsically. She patterned her pedagogical choices to address “student-as-meaning-maker” using three questions: (a) why do you as a student think this way; (b) what is your source of information; and (c) is your source valid, given your classmates’ perspective?

The class was an advanced placement U. S. history class. The selection criteria for this class were: (a) above-average reading comprehension (b) willingness to complete assignments, and (c) enjoyment of reading. The class was diverse in terms of race and socioeconomic status. The researchers conducted 24 observations of this class. They interviewed nine students using four levels of questions: (a) questions to probe student attitudes (b) questions to elaborate on classroom interactions (c) specific questions to validate analyses, and (d) particular questions. The researchers used the emerging data from the observations and interviews to create a survey for the entire class.

The researchers analyzed the data using constant-comparative analysis and triangulation of sources. They compared data sources throughout the iterations at team meetings to confirm or reject emerging themes. They also systematically evaluated assertions among team members between meetings using theoretical memoranda. The researchers used student portraits, thick description, and a social interaction map to describe and interpret the findings. They addressed validity of data through the strength of their arguments.

Of the nine students in the class, seven students demonstrated identifiable perspectives. Students were able to transfer knowledge, but only one student grounded perspective in history while the others grounded perspective in contemporary issues. Moral debate was not a salient characteristic of this classroom. The researchers observed

only two moral debates during the school year. One problem with this approach was at this high school, there was not a critical mass of teachers whose pedagogical choices promoted students as meaning-makers in the classroom. The researchers noted that one could not overcome 11 years of teacher-centered pedagogies and then hastily debate moral issues from historically grounded perspectives.

The implications of this study address two important thoughts regarding school reform: (a) there needs to be a critical mass of teachers buying into reform measures for reform to be successful, and (b) student-centered instructional practice resulted in meaning making as a pattern of learning behavior. Diversity in teaching methods is a good thing so long as the pedagogies involve students having a voice in the classroom interaction. Diversity that allowed teachers to continue to disperse facts, and where students regurgitate facts on paper and pencil tests, facts that they soon forgot, was unacceptable in the new era of school reform.

Summary of teacher-student interaction

Trust is vital for establishing positive teacher-student relationships. When teachers showed trust for their students, they demonstrated belief in self and resilience (Reis, Colbert & Hébert, 2005). Students were more engaged in activities and had greater achievement in classrooms of greater support for autonomy (Klem & Connell, 2004). Disadvantaged students experienced lower levels of trust than their advantaged peers (Goddard, Tschannen-Moran, & Hoy, 2001; Ashton & Webb, 1986b). Trust was a critical ingredient for agency, the student perceptions that their input is valued within their group that gave students a sense of belonging.

Agency in schools was the perception of student belonging. For students to perceive agency, they must perceive that people listened to them and that adults in the school valued their opinions. In addition to trust, students must have exposure to intellectual discourse, moral debate, and grappling to have the necessary requisites for agency (Sizer & Sizer, 1999). Students experiencing higher levels of agency expressed perceptions of ownership and equality when they participated in school governance (Kaba, 2001). They also developed life skills, autonomy, and perceptions of self-determination when they participated in the creation of classroom rules (Grandmount, 2003). Students participating in rule making showed improved student behavior (Denton, 2003). When teachers gave students opportunities to interact in classroom discussions, student perceptions of respect and openness in the classroom rose (Moguel, 2004). Teachers with high levels of efficacy had more interaction in their classrooms and engaged their students in intellectual games and small group instruction (Gibson & Dembo, 1984). Authentic voice occurred when students had the trust of their teachers and experienced agency. When these two characteristics were present, students could express their opinions in meaningful discussions and moral debate.

Voice is the conduit that students use to express their ideas. Legitimate voice means that the student has the opportunity to express ideas and opinions with the expectation of respect. When students had legitimate voice in student forums, they developed important life skills. They were able to articulate their opinions and perceived empowerment (Mirta, 2004). Teachers with high levels of efficacy encouraged students to develop socially and work together (Ashton & Webb, 1986a). When students had the opportunity to communicate verbally what they learned, they were able to demonstrate a

transfer of knowledge that was not available to them when they only had the option to write answers (Crawford, 2005). Classrooms where dialogue was a salient characteristic had increased class participation. Students perceived their environment as emotionally safe. These conditions were optimal when there was a critical mass of teachers engaged in similar student-centered pedagogies (Connolly & Smith, 2002).

A lack of voice and agency resulted in student self-perceptions of disenfranchisement. Disaffected youth recounted experiences of devastation and humiliation at school. These experiences were more than personal conflicts. Students who learned in traditional lecture mode were bored in class and disaffected in school (Riley & Docking, 2004). Teachers who chose student-centered pedagogies had more student voice and intellectual dialogue in the classroom. Student-centeredness was a characteristic of teachers with higher levels of teacher practical knowledge (Keedy, 1995). When students were engaged in intellectual interaction in the classroom, they were able to demonstrate a transfer of knowledge. Years of teacher-centered pedagogies inhibited student abilities to engage in moral debate (Keedy, et al. 1998).

Statement of the Research Problem

A Nation at Risk, the Kentucky Education Reform Act, and the No Child Left Behind act placed demands for improvement on the system of common schools in Kentucky. Schools must focus on organizational practices that produce improved student outcomes. The most critical practices occur between teachers and students. Teachers must establish relationships with students and create a climate for learning in their classrooms for there to be meaningful interaction and the grappling of ideas.

Figure 1 illustrates the research problem. Educators face demands that resulted from reform movements U. S. schools. Recommendations from reform movements require accountability for student outcomes that filter down from federal, to state, to local levels. Schools must address the demand for student outcomes. Environmental and personal factors influence teacher orientation on the continuum of pupil control. The orientation establishes the learning climate in the classroom. Humanistic classrooms were more robust, had greater student self-control, and had more positive student perceptions of themselves as learners (Satori, Bauske, & Lunenburg, 2000; Lunenburg, 1983). Custodial control strategies resulted in (a) pluralistic ignorance (Vitagliano & Licata, 1987) (b) low teacher motivation and limited intellectual interaction (Kottkamp & Mulhern, 1987) (c) poor attitudes toward students and low confidence in control strategies (Traynor, 2003), and (d) lower teacher efficacy (Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990). Escalation of misbehavior, countercontrol, and alienation were all characteristics of custodial classrooms (Lapointe, 2003; Lapointe & Legault, 2004; Seay, Suppa, Schoen, & Roberts, 1984; Hoy, 1972). It is unlikely that teachers will satisfy reform demands in a custodial environment where teachers spend too much time guiding student activities and managing student behaviors. It is in humanistic classrooms, with socially skilled students engaged in intellectual interaction and moral debate, where teachers will overcome barriers to learning and achieve reform goals.

Figure 1. Research Problem

Custodial control was damaging to learning processes because it reduced student autonomy and classroom interaction. Custodial control limits student autonomy and results diminished student-centeredness. Humanism, on the other hand, fostered a climate that allowed intellectual activity and moral debate. Students became the meaning makers in the classroom. Students valued and retained information only when they believed it was useful. It is in the humanistic environment where teachers created conditions where they developed teacher/student relationships to make work meaningful for students. These relationships are critical in the reduction of the achievement gap between advantaged and disadvantaged students and for overall improvement in the quality of schools in Kentucky.

The research on reform provided the context for the study. Pupil control research addressed the ways that teacher beliefs and behaviors influenced classroom climate and teacher pedagogical choices. Research on teacher/student interactions addressed the impact of trust, voice, and agency on the student-centeredness of teacher pedagogies. The next chapter will address the methods and materials of this study.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND MATERIALS

The purpose of this study was to contextualize pupil control ideology within six classrooms in a Kentucky middle school. The researcher informally hypothesized that pupil control ideology has intermediate effects on teacher behavior, classroom climate, and classroom engagement. These intermediate effects subsequently would have an impact on student outcomes. For the teacher, pupil control ideology falls on a continuum from custodial to humanistic. The characteristics of *custodial* teacher behavior are strict classroom management and punitive, often angry discipline. Control of the classroom takes precedence over developing intellectual interest and skills for students. The custodial teacher often escalates student misbehavior through a series of emotionally charged responses to student misbehavior. The custodial teacher uses sarcasm in response to students who misbehave or give incorrect responses. The custodial teacher presents the curriculum through “frontal teaching” and lecture with a focus on memorizing facts. There are rigid procedures that the custodial teacher follows. The custodial teacher perceives deviations from these procedures as a disruption or personal affront. Students do not have the opportunity to engage in the curriculum because communication is downward from teacher to student. Theoretically, the result of custodialism is often poor academic performance, poor writing skills, lower grades, and more office referrals.

The characteristics of *humanistic teacher* behavior are flexible classroom management and classroom discipline grounded in behavior learning. This type of

teacher seeks out ways to praise students for correct answers or nearly correct answers and for positive displays of behavior. The humanistic teacher attempts to find resolution to problems in the classroom rather than escalate them. The climate in the humanistic classroom is robust, meaning that the activities are interactive and interesting. The humanistic teacher varies procedures to fit the learning situations: deviations from procedures in the humanistic class are natural occurrences that provide additional opportunities for learning. Students immerse in the curriculum because there is intellectual interaction and moral debate from teacher-to-student, student-to-teacher, and student-to-student. Theoretically, the result of humanism is often higher academic performance, better writing skills, higher grades, and fewer office referrals.

Study Design

The Pupil Control Ideology Form (Willower, Eidell, & Hoy, 1967) reduces the characteristics of teacher beliefs to a single index and therefore could reduce classroom complexities, particularly those centered on teacher-student interactions. By using the qualitative case study design, the researcher could study the dimensions of teacher beliefs in greater depth. Such a design enables the researcher to understand the phenomenon of the classroom experience, differentiated by teacher orientation on a continuum from custodialism to humanism, through studying the particulars of specific instances (Rossman & Rallis, 2003). The unit of analysis was the classroom in which the teachers interacted with their students.

The researcher designed the study to answer the following research questions:

1. In what ways do teacher beliefs about the craft of teaching affect teacher behavior, classroom climate, and engagement?

2. How do the intermediate effects of PCI on teacher behavior, classroom climate, and student engagement affect student outcomes?

The researcher collected pupil control ideology data to develop detailed portraits of teacher classroom management beliefs. Teacher behavior data allowed the researcher to compare beliefs to practice, which either confirmed or contradicted the teacher ideologies. The classroom climate data provided insight about student perceptions of their learning environments. Data on student engagement allowed the researcher to illustrate the patterns of intellectual interaction and social communication that occurred in the classroom. Finally, student outcomes data provided confirming or conflicting evidence of the hypothesis.

Site Selection

The site containing the six classrooms was a middle school in a school district adjacent to the largest school district in the state of Kentucky. This district had a combination of suburban and rural neighborhoods. Rolling Hills Middle School (pseudonym) was in a rural area about 25 miles south of a large metropolitan city and six miles south of the county seat. Rolling Hills was one of two middle schools that the district built in the early 1990s to replace an aging school in an area prone to flooding. The other middle school serves mostly students from the larger town while Rolling Hills serves a more rural and economically depressed student population. The building opened in 1993. It was in good physical condition and had up-to-date technological equipment. It had a percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunches of nearly 40%. This percentage qualified the school for Title I status.

Participant Selection

The researcher selected six teachers, one custodial teacher and one humanistic teacher from each of the sixth, seventh, and eighth grades at Rolling Hills. The six teachers all had four or more years of teaching experience. For each teacher, the researcher selected one class period to study. The researcher equated the classes as closely as possible for percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunch. The researcher selected two students from each selected period to include in the study. This included one economically advantaged and one economically disadvantaged student from each class. The researcher selected one student from each economic group so that no class period had only a low or high socioeconomic representation of student participants. Kolbert, Morgan, and Brendel (2002), for instance, used 6 faculty members and 18 students to examine student perceptions of faculty/student relationships. Below is an explanation of the selection process for the teacher and student participants in this study.

Teacher Selection

The researcher used the reputation technique to select the six teacher participants. The reputation technique is appropriate for purposive sampling to narrow the selection of participants to only those that fit a predetermined set of criteria. Narrowing the number of participants made the process of data collection reasonable and allowed for a more accurate analysis and report of the findings (Hunter, 1953). Custodial teachers: (a) conduct rigid and highly controlled classroom settings; (b) perceive students in terms of appearance, behavior, or parent social status; (c) perceive school as a highly autocratic organization with unilateral downward communication; (d) perceive students as undisciplined and in need of punitive sanctions; and (e) speak of misbehavior in moral

terms. Humanistic teachers: (a) conducted a flexible classroom setting allowing for student self-discipline (b) perceived students in terms of the educational challenge they present (c) perceived school as an interactive organization where communication occurs in many directions (d) perceived students having various levels of social skills and in need of social learning, and (e) spoke of misbehavior in behavioral learning terms.

Using a selection protocol that the researcher developed with the characteristics listed above (Appendix A), and after eliminating teachers with fewer than four years of teaching experience, the principal and assistant principal categorized the teachers into two groups, humanistic and custodial. The researcher selected one custodial and one humanistic teacher from each grade. Three teachers had a reputation for custodialism and three had a reputation for humanism. After the first round of interviews and observations, the researcher used collected data to confirm teacher selection. When validating the PCI Form, principals read descriptions of custodialism and humanism to select participants (Willower, Eidell, & Hoy, 1967). The researcher constructed the selection protocol using terms similar to those in the original PCI study. The protocol provided data about the individual characteristics of teachers and degree of custodialism or humanism. The following sections are the results of the teacher selection process. Pseudonyms are used throughout this study.

Ms. Campbell, sixth grade custodial. The administrators at Rolling Hills initially rated Ms. Campbell as a humanistic teacher. The Nationally Board Certified Teacher (NBCT) rated Campbell as custodial. The researcher met with the administrators and the NBCT separately to address this disparity in ratings. Both administrators explained their ratings based on Campbell's interactions with students in after school activities and

extended school services. The principal noted that Campbell was the Teacher of the Year in the district during the previous year. The Nationally Board Certified Teacher rated Campbell as custodial based on her observations in the classroom (see MEM – Sel 1). The researcher chose Campbell as the sixth grade custodial teacher based on the NBCT ratings. Initial observations and interviews confirmed her selection as the custodial sixth grade teacher for the study.

Ms. Elliot, sixth grade humanistic. All three raters judged Elliot as humanistic. The assistant principal rating was 27 and the principal rating was 26. These scores identify Elliot as an extreme example of humanism. The NBCT rating was 19. This score is not as extreme, but still places Elliot soundly in the humanistic side of the pupil control ideology continuum. Initial interviews and observations confirmed that Elliot was humanistic in her beliefs and behaviors.

Ms. McNabb, seventh grade custodial. There were contradictions among the raters about the perceived beliefs of McNabb. The principal and the NBCT both rated her as neither custodial nor humanistic (-1 and 2 respectively). The assistant principal rated her as humanistic (13). None-the-less, when comparing her with other seventh grade teachers with four or more years of experience, she rated the least humanistic. The researcher decided to do an initial observation and interview with the possibility of eliminating the seventh grade from the study altogether if there were no custodial teachers in the seventh grade. Initial interviews indicated that this teacher had a mixture of custodial and humanistic beliefs. Her beliefs about what was ideal for the classroom were humanistic. Her beliefs about her own capabilities were custodial. The researcher

decided to continue data collection with this teacher representing the seventh grade custodial teacher.

Ms. Warren, seventh grade humanistic. The three raters consistently rated Warren as humanistic. The assistant principal and principal both scored Warren as a 21 on a scale from -30 to 30 with positive scores being humanistic and negative scores being custodial. The principal rated Warren highest in the areas of approachability, friendliness, trust, and flexibility. The assistant principal rated Warren the highest in friendliness and approachability. The NBCT scored Warren a 20 with highest ratings in sincerity, friendliness, and approachability. Initial interviews and observations confirmed the selection of Warren as a humanistic teacher in the areas of classroom management and instruction and a mix of custodialism and humanism in the area of discipline.

Mr. Carroll, eighth grade custodial. Of the three custodial teachers in this study, Carroll had a reputation for being the most custodial. The assistant principal, the principal, and the NBCT all rated Mr. Carroll as the most custodial of all the teachers in the school that fit the criteria for selection. The assistant principal rated Carroll as only slightly more custodial than humanistic ($n = -3$). The principal and the NBCT both rated Carroll as much more custodial than humanistic ($n = -16$ and $n = -15$ respectively). The average of the three raters was approximately -11. This ranked Carroll as the teacher with the reputation for being the most custodial of all the teachers rated for this study.

Ms. Brandt, eighth grade humanistic. The assistant principal, principal, and NBCT rated Brandt as the most humanistic in this study. The assistant principal rated Brandt as a 21 with all of her ratings humanistic and the highest rating in the category of flexibility. The principal rated Brandt as humanistic in seven categories and custodial in

three categories. The principal rated Brandt highest in the areas of trust, sincerity, interaction, flexibility, and optimism. The NBCT rating of Brandt was 15. The NBCT rated Brandt as humanistic in eight categories with the highest ratings in optimism and perceptions of student behavior. The initial interview and observation of Brandt confirmed her selection as the humanistic eighth grade teacher for this study. The next section addresses student selection.

Student Selection

With the help of the counselor and the teacher participants, the researcher selected 12 students to participate in student interviews. The counselor compiled two class lists per teacher for each class included in the study. One set of lists included students who received free or reduced lunch (economically disadvantaged). The other set of lists included students who did not receive free and reduced lunch (economically advantaged). Christle, Nelson, and Jolivette (2004), for instance, used free and reduced lunch status to examine the disciplinary practices of middle school administrators. Likewise, Bickel and Howley (2003) used free and reduced lunch status to examine mathematics achievement in rural Kentucky schools. The researcher coded the lists to mask the economic status of the students.

The researcher then presented each teacher in the study with their two class lists to select potential students for participation in the study. Each teacher selected two students from each list based on ability to clearly articulate information about classroom interaction. The researcher contacted the students to ask if they were interested in participation and to obtain parent permission to participate in the study. From those who responded, the researcher selected one economically disadvantaged and one economically

advantage student from each of the six teacher participating in the study, identifying 12 students. The purpose of selecting students based on socioeconomic status was to maximize the likelihood that student data for the six cases reflected the conditions of classroom climate rather than the socioeconomic conditions of the students. During this study, one student moved away from the school and was unable to complete the study. The researcher was able to select a replacement from the subjects whose parents signed consent.

The selection procedure allowed two levels of data analysis, grade level and ideological belief. The researcher analyzed data for sixth, seventh and eighth grades within cases. He then examined custodialism across sixth, seventh and eighth grade cases and humanism across sixth, seventh, and eighth grade cases.

Data Collection

Figure 2 below illustrates how the study purpose connected to the data collection. Each study dimension is now detailed below. There were three methods of data collection: interview, observation, and mining of artifacts. Five dimensions grounded this study's hypothesis: (a) teacher beliefs about the craft of teaching (b) teacher classroom behaviors (c) classroom climate (d) student engagement in the curriculum, and (e) student outcomes. The researcher matched the data collection method to the intrinsic characteristics of the dimension. For *teacher beliefs* about the craft of teaching, the researcher interviewed teachers about their classroom management along the Pupil Control Ideology continuum beliefs. The researcher used observation to collect data on *teacher behaviors*. Student interviews and mining of artifacts provided *classroom climate*

Figure 2: Data Collection

data. The researcher used observation to collect data on *student engagement*. The researcher mined documents of *student outcomes* to determine if the effects of PCI on teacher behavior, classroom climate, and engagement had an impact on student outcomes.

Pupil Control Ideology

The researcher developed a set of semi-structured interview questions to collect data on pupil control ideology. Achenstein, Ogawa, and Speigman (2004) used similarly-worded questions in a study of the belief systems of new teachers about curriculum. The initial set of interview questions (Appendix B) were worded to gain knowledge critical to this study about teacher backgrounds, pupil control beliefs, pedagogical beliefs, and belief origins (see Glesne, 1999). The researcher used the data from these interviews to create portraits of the teachers (Keedy et al. 1998). The portraits allowed the researcher to examine the teacher custodial and humanistic characteristics individually rather than rely on a single composite index. This approach offered a greater understanding of the teachers than the numeric value from the pupil control ideology instrument.

Teacher Behavior

The researcher used observation instruments to collect teacher classroom behavior data. Using observation of teacher behaviors, the researcher was able to compare teacher beliefs with their actions for validation of pupil control ideology data. The observation data collected for teacher classroom behavior contributed to the teacher portraits. The researcher piloted three observation instruments to determine the one that gave the best data regarding teacher behavior. The pilot included two field tests with each instrument. These instruments included: (a) Classroom Observation Schedule (b) Teaching for

Meaning, and (c) Flanders 10 X 10 Interaction Matrix. A description of the piloted instruments follows.

Classroom Observation Schedule. Waxman and Padrón (2004) developed the Classroom Observation Schedule (COS) instrument to investigate effective teaching practices and to address concerns about the reliability of observation data. The COS is appropriate for measuring contextual conditions, teacher attitudes, teacher behaviors, or degree of program implementation. Interrater reliability for this instrument was high in previous studies ($r = .95$), and the instrument does not require extensive training to use. The instrument uses distinct categories that describe (a) teacher-student interactions (b) activity selection (c) activity type (d) setting (e) manner, and (f) language used (see Appendix C). The observer selects six students, one-at-a-time, to observe and focuses on classroom behavior in 30-second intervals. The observer checks the space for each category in the time interval. After observing all six students in the first round, the researcher cycles back to the first student for a second round of observations. This continues until the researcher observes each student in 10 time intervals.

Teaching for Meaning. The second pilot employed the Teaching for Meaning (TFM) instrument. This instrument measures student engagement, teaching for meaning, and focus of classroom activities. Knight and Smith (2004) found this instrument was appropriate for observation of classroom management, student engagement, and implementation of instructional activities. The Cohen's kappa, used to measure interrater reliability, for this instrument was .85 indicating that the instrument was reliable (Bakeman, 1997). To use this instrument, the observer conducts ten 1-minute scans at 5-minute intervals. During the 1-minute scans, the observer records the number of students

present and the number of students off task. Between scans, the observer records classroom processes and interactions with specific attention to TFM objectives. These objectives include: (a) increased engaged academic learning while decreasing time spent on external rewards and punishments (b) diagnostic and prescriptive teaching (c) instructional activities that focus on student perceptions of relationships among parts rather than discrete skills (d) complex academic content, and (e) integration of student cultural backgrounds. At the end of the observation, the observer responds to Likert-type items based on notes in the log. Appendix D shows the TFM instrument.

Flanders 10 X 10 Interaction Matrix. The final pilot instrument was the Flanders 10 X 10 Interaction Matrix (FIM), which appears in Appendix E (Flanders, 1970). This instrument allows the observer to understand the social interaction in the classroom. Flanders posited that the very nature of learning involves the interchange of thoughts and ideas. To use the FIM, the researcher records and transcribes a lesson. The transcription identifies the speakers as either a student or the teacher. The researcher codes the transcript in sequence and plots the sequence on the interaction matrix. The FIM, the researcher plots sequences of interaction on a 10 X 10 grid. The result is a visual representation of the interactions that provides insight to the types of interactions that occur in the classroom. The grid also allows the researcher to calculate rough percentages of teacher and student talk during instruction. This allowed the researcher to create a visual display of the interaction in the classroom and to analyze the salient interactions that occur during instruction.

The Pilot Study

The pilot study provided the researcher with the opportunity to test the observation instruments to find which instrument had the best fit for the data collection. Observation was the data collection method for *Teacher Behavior* and *Interaction*. The Flanders Interaction Measure (FIM) was a good fit for these dimensions; however, the method of recording conversations in the classroom and going back to code them later was useless when students engaged in small group instruction. The Teaching for Meaning (TFM) instrument provided strong information regarding the percentage of student off-task behaviors. Nonetheless, the use of percentages to estimate the percentage of time teachers use extrinsic rewards for good behavior became convoluted and meaningless, and the instrument did not provide adequate information about teacher behaviors. The Classroom Observation Scale (COS) provided information for teacher behavior and interaction/engagement from the perspective of the student. The COS provided the best fit for data collection for this study.

The COS did have some quantitative inconsistencies. For example, in the section for Activity Type, line 14 was *Not attending to task* and line 15 was *No activity/transition*. In the Manner section, line 1 was *On task*, line 2 was *Waiting for teacher*, line 3 was *Distracted*, and line 4 was *Disruptive*. One would expect the sum of the frequencies of lines 14 and 15 to equal the sum of lines 2, 3, and 4. Because of the dynamics of school, this did not always happen. For example, at the end of class, a student gathering books received a code of 15 because they are in transition waiting for class change. The same student received a code of 1, *On task*, because they were doing what they were supposed to do. Also, the COS measured interactions in the classroom in

this study. In the original research, Waxman and Padrón (2004) defined lines 2 and 6 as interactions with one of the six observed students. Had the researcher interpreted the interaction this way, it would have given an inaccurate picture of interaction that occurred in the classroom. Instead, the researcher interpreted interaction as a measure of the teacher interaction rather than the student. The activity type and manner combined to measure if the student was watching and listening, or if the student was unengaged in the lesson. When reporting results from the COS, the researcher used the term *classroom observation* for the 60-minute span that the observer sat in the classroom collecting data. *Observation interval* meant the 30-second intervals when the observer collected data on individual students (see Waxman & Padrón, 2004).

Classroom Climate

The researcher used student interviews and mined artifacts to collect data about the classroom climate. Each student participated in a semi-structured interview and follow-up interviews. Kushins and Brisman (2005) describe classroom climate as the physical structure and the ways people interact in the environment, which result in perceptions of the learning environment from the learner. The intent of the student interviews was to pull from students their perceptions about classroom environment. Material culture is the mute evidence in the form of documents and physical artifacts that one can interpret without the benefit of commentary (Hodder, 1994). Mining of artifacts provided information about the material culture regarding teacher policies, physical characteristics of the classroom, and visual displays in the classrooms.

Student Engagement

The researchers used observation to examine student engagement. The observations provided data regarding the patterns of interaction in the classroom. The researcher examined the three pilot instruments used in the data collection on Pupil Control Behavior. The researcher selected the instrument that gave him the strongest information on student engagement.

Student Outcomes

To investigate student outcomes, the researcher used mining of documents (Hodder, 2003). The outcomes used for this study included performance on the Commonwealth Accountability Testing System (CATS) assessment, student grades, and student office referrals. The information from the CATS test included (a) portfolio results (b) multiple choice (c) open response, and (d) on-demand writing. The portfolio is a collection of student writing pieces that middle school students complete in the seventh grade. Teachers trained in holistic scoring ascribe a descriptor score of Novice, Apprentice, Proficient, or Distinguished score (i.e., NAPD descriptor) to the portfolios. The multiple choice and open-response sections of the CATS test measure student knowledge of the Kentucky Core Content. Open-response questions receive a holistic score between one and four with four being the highest score. Multiple-choice questions receive a score of “+” for a correct answer and “-” for an incorrect answer. On-demand writing is a part of the CATS performance test where students respond to a writing prompt to produce a piece of the same genre as one of their portfolio pieces. On-demand writing receives an NAPD descriptor score from professional scorers at the state level.

The counselor used this same statistical software to compile grades for all of the students having teachers included in this study. The school administration used the Software Technology Incorporated Education Data Management (STI) software to store information about office referrals of the students from the six classrooms in the study. The assistant principal used the STI software package to compile a list of office referrals of students in the six classrooms included in the study. The researcher informally hypothesized that pupil control ideology indirectly influenced student outcomes. The collection of outcomes data enabled the researcher to make the connection between pupil control ideology and student outcomes.

Data Analysis

The unit of analysis for this study was the classroom in which the teachers interacted with their students in either a humanistic or a custodial climate; each classroom represented a case. There were two levels of analysis. In the first level, the researcher analyzed each classroom with a humanistic climate and each classroom with a custodial climate in terms of all of the data collected. In the second level, the researcher analyzed the data across the three humanistic classrooms and across the three custodial classrooms. The researcher used the NVivo qualitative research software package to analyze and organize data.

The researcher used constant comparative analysis to analyze the data. The continual analysis of data over several iterations is the key to producing grounded theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Constant comparison requires multiple iterations of questioning, data collection, categorization, organization of data into themes, and the development of new questions. After the first series of interviews, the researcher

transcribed the data and organized it into tentative categories according to properties that emerged. The researcher created a set of codes to identify the categories that organized and guided subsequent categorization. He looked for patterns and similarities in the data, which he transformed into an initial set of themes.

After considering tentative themes and missing data, the researcher created new questions for a second round of data collection. These were questions to: (a) fill gaps in the previous data (b) identify new categories and themes and (c) explain and/or modify existing categories and themes. After a second round of data collection, the researcher categorized data again and reorganized categories into themes. The researcher then modified the categories and themes based on a better understanding of the theory emerged. From this process, new questions emerged. This cycle continued until there was “saturation of the data” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Saturation occurs when all newly collected data fit neatly into the existing themes and categories.

During data collection, the researcher used field notes and “theoretical memos” to assist in the categorization and organization of data. A “theoretical memo” is the result of field notes, observations, and exposure to the field environment. Theoretical memos included descriptions of poignant events that occur in the field and descriptions of the contexts and possible codes for the events. Theoretical memos go beyond reporting events. They also help to tie together different emerging themes and assist the researcher in making coherent sense about what is happening in the field.

Another form of analysis was the use of visual displays (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Prior to data collection and analyses, it is impossible to predict which data displays will be appropriate for the emerging theory. There are, however, a number of

appropriate visual displays for within and across case displays. The researcher used a variety of matrices to display the phenomena that occurred in observations or emerge from interviews. Cognitive maps and flow charts were appropriate for the study when the data fit those formats.

Trustworthiness of the Data

In interpretive research, investigators are concerned with trustworthiness of the data in the same way that positivists are concerned with reliability and validity. Rossman and Rallis (2003) identified five methods to assure academic rigor required to achieve trustworthiness of the data: (a) theoretical grounding, (b) triangulation, (c) prolonged engagement, (d) member checks, (e) use of a critical friend, and (f) use of the community of practice.

The researcher grounded the study theoretically within the research on Pupil Control Ideology. For instance, he used the research of Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967) to ground theoretically of teacher beliefs: management, discipline, and instruction. He dissected the dimensions of a single index derived from the PCI into its separate content domains of beliefs about classroom management, discipline, instruction, perceptions of the organization, and perceptions of students.

Triangulation requires the use of three or more sources to either confirm or reconcile data. The researcher triangulated data within and across cases to assure accuracy of the analyses and interpretations. For research question one, the researcher used teacher behavior (observation), climate (student interview and documents mining), and student engagement (observation) merged to teacher statements about their beliefs (interview). For research question two, the researcher used and compared student

disciplinary reports, student grade transcripts, and CATS test results. Data collection for this research occurred over six months, enough time to assure the *prolonged engagement* required for adequate collection and interpretation of data. The researcher conducted 36 teacher interviews, 24 student interviews, 24 classroom observations.

A National Board Certified Teacher (NBCT) who worked at the school acted as *member check* for this study by periodically critiquing the teacher portraits which emerged from the data. For instance she pointed out several assertions made in the drafts which needed the support of the data. A former college professor acted as *critical friend*. He read and critiqued assertions made from data collected from field notes, transcripts, and theoretical memos. The researcher analyzed this data on two levels, by grade and by ideology. The researcher then compared the analysis to an analysis of student outcomes in three areas, office referrals, grades, and CATS accountability test results.

Study Limitations

There are limitations on the inferences that one can make from qualitative studies with limited population sizes. For this study, there were six cases. This made it difficult to generalize the findings. The characteristics of the teachers and the particulars of the cases provided grounding for theory based on teacher beliefs that could become the basis for a survey instrument. Researchers could use this instrument to make statistical inferences in future studies.

Student selection was a factor that limited the inferences that the researcher could make from the findings. The choice to allow the teacher to assist in student selection assisted the researcher in finding students who could clearly articulate information about their classrooms. Allowing teachers to help in the selection, however, may have allowed

teachers to select students who would speak favorably about their teacher. The researcher could have selected the student participants after observing the classroom. This would have allowed the researcher to select students that met the purposive selection criteria while avoiding any limitations that might have occurred as a result of allowing teachers to participate in student selection.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to contextualize pupil control ideology within selected classrooms in a school struggling with satisfactory progress toward Proficiency on both the KERA accountability index and the No Child Left Behind measure of Adequate Yearly Progress. This chapter has three major sections. The first major section describes the format for organizing the study findings. The second major section addresses the findings related Research Question One. The third major section addresses the findings for Research Question Two. In the second section, the side headings represent the dimensions of classroom included in the hypothesis. The paragraph headings represent the categories within these dimensions that emerged from the data. In the last major section, the side headings are office referrals, grades, and CATS results. These are the three data sets that the researcher used to analyze outcomes.

Format for Organizing the Study Findings

The researcher used a comparative case study design to answer two research questions:

1. In what ways do teacher beliefs about the craft of teaching impact teacher classroom behavior, classroom climate, and student engagement?
2. How do the intermediate effects of PCI on teacher behavior, classroom climate, and student engagement appear to affect student outcomes?

Figure 3 illustrates the format the researcher used to report findings. There were six cases in this study; each case was a classroom in which the teacher interacted with

Figure 3. Findings Report Format

students. The researcher formatted the data consistently among the six cases in the study.

The researcher used case portraits to address Research Question One. The researcher

described, analyzed, and interpreted (see Wolcott, 1994) four dimensions: *teacher beliefs*, *teacher classroom behavior*, *classroom climate*, and *student engagement*. The following is a description of how the researcher collected and reported the data for Research Question One. Below, the researcher describes the dimensions and categories that emerged from the data.

Beliefs included teacher descriptions of beliefs about the craft of teaching. The researcher interviewed the six teacher participants four times each. During these interviews, *Classroom management*, *Discipline*, and *Instruction* emerged as categories of Beliefs. Classroom Management included descriptions of teacher beliefs about the handling of the daily operations of their classrooms. Discipline included teacher statements about student misbehavior, how students ought to be disciplined, and what constituted major and minor disciplinary problems. Instruction was teacher descriptions of pedagogical choices and perceptions of what pedagogical choices the six teachers believed resulted in optimal opportunities for learning. Teacher perceptions of students emerged as a category of teacher beliefs that subsumed classroom management, discipline, and instruction. The researcher collapsed teacher perception of students with classroom management, discipline, and instruction.

Teaching behaviors included observed behaviors of teachers engaged in the craft of teaching. The researcher observed each classroom 4 times for a total of 24 observations. The categories of Teaching Behaviors that emerged from the observations included *Classroom Management*, *Discipline*, and *Instruction*. The researcher used observation notes to collect data for Classroom Management and Discipline behaviors. The researcher used observation notes and two categories of the COS to collect data for

Instruction. The COS provided *Activity Type* and *Setting* data. For activity type, the researcher selected a category description that best fit the type of activity that the occurred in the class during each 30-second observation interval. For Setting, the researcher selected one of four categories; whole class, small group, pairs, or independent work (see Appendix C) that described the instructional setting during each 30-second observation interval.

Climate referred to the descriptions of the extent that classroom environment contributed to student desire to engage in and persist at academic tasks (Patrick, Turner, Meyer, & Midgley, 2003). To collect climate data, the researcher mined documents and material culture and interviewed students. The document and material culture data included photographs of the classrooms, lesson plans, and sample letters to parents. The researcher interviewed each of the 12 student participants 3 times for a total of 36 student interviews. The dimension of climate included the categories of *Physical Climate*, *Motivation Climate*, and *Interaction Climate* throughout this study. The physical climate includes the arrangement of furniture in the room and the room décor. The Motivation Climate data included student descriptions of their perceptions of interest, comfort, and safety in the classroom. Communication Climate included student descriptions of their interactions with their teacher and peers in the classroom. The lesson plan and sample letter documents provided clarity for the researcher when students used vocabulary specific to their classroom contexts. Motivation Climate and Communication Climate categories resulted from collapsing eight categories with the university professor that served as the consultant from the community of practice.

The researcher used the 24 observations to collect *Student Engagement* data. Student Engagement was teacher-to-student, student-to-teacher, and student-to-student interactions in the classroom and the quantities of on-task and not on-task behaviors that occurred during the 24 classroom observations. To collect this data, the researcher used two categories of the COS instrument, *Interactions* and *Manner*. To collect interaction data, the researcher selected the category that best described the teacher and student interaction during each 30-second observation interval. For Manner, the researchers selected the category that best described the on-task and off-task behaviors of students in response to the lessons during each 30-second observation interval (see Appendix C).

To address Research Question Two, the researcher collected *student outcomes* data, office referrals, grades, and CATS accountability test results. The assistant principal provided the office referral data using a school database report. The researcher used the class lists for each case to pull and copy the report cards for each student in the classes participating in the study. The principal provided the CATS accountability test results for each student in the school. The researcher described, analyzed, and interpreted the outcomes data to determine if the outcomes were consistent with the hypothesized relationship among the dimensions of classroom included in this study (see Figure 2). Figure 3 outlines how the researcher reported the results of this study. Appendix G is a list of the categories that emerged from the data and their definitions. Below are the findings for the two research questions.

Research Question One: In What Ways do Teacher
Beliefs about the Craft of Teaching Affect Teacher
Behavior, Classroom Climate, and Student Engagement?

The researcher analyzed the data for Research Question One on two levels, within case and across case. Figure 4 illustrates the two levels of analysis for this study. The solid circles represent the individual cases that comprise the within case analyses.

Figure 4. Within Case and Across Case Analyses

The dotted lines represent the across case analyses. In the within case analyses, the researcher reported the findings for each case in isolation. In the across case analyses, the researcher contrasts the three humanistic cases with the three custodial cases.

For the within case analysis of Research Question One, the researcher used classroom portraits to report the data. Each portrait begins a brief description of the professional background for the classroom teacher. The portraits then include

descriptions of the findings for the four dimensions of Research Question One; *teacher beliefs*, *teacher classroom behavior*, *classroom climate*, and *student engagement*. The researcher summarizes each dimension with an analysis of where the teacher placed on the continuum from custodial to humanistic.

The cross case analyses have the same format as the within case analyses. Because this analysis involved the same dimensions as the portraits, the researcher used the same level headings for the portraits and the across case analyses. The following sections are the six portraits (within case analyses) followed by the cross case analysis.

Mrs. Campbell, Sixth Grade Custodial Portrait

Ms. Campbell was a sixth grade science teacher with 5 years teaching experience. Each of those years was at Rolling Hills. She had her bachelor's and master's degrees in biology. She started at Rolling Hills on an emergency certificate while she earned a Master of Arts Degree in Teaching. Before becoming a teacher, she worked as graduate assistant at a major southeastern university assisting non-major students in biology laboratory classes. She was also responsible for collecting marine specimens and caring for a 500-gallon salt-water aquarium. She was an educator at a museum providing programs to the public before moving to the area to become a middle school teacher. Campbell was very active in the school community. She sponsored the Beta Club and the Yearbook. She was the publisher for the school newsletter. She also led yearly spring break field trips where students studied marine life in the Gulf of Mexico.

Beliefs

The four interviews with Ms. Campbell confirmed her selection as the sixth grade custodial teacher. During the interviews, Campbell had to multitask to fit her interviews

into her busy schedule. She stated her beliefs confidently without hesitation. She often confused classroom management issues with discipline issues. The next sections address Campbell's beliefs about the craft of teaching.

Classroom management. Campbell relied on a regimented routine to manage her class. She believed good classroom management required consistency. She claimed she used humor in her classroom with brighter, more mature students because they were able to engage in humor and continue to sit still. Less mature students need more regimentation.

My second period is totally different than my sixth. My second period is more what you might term the brighter kids. . . . We joke, that class we can joke and get right back on. But it has something to do with the Science. We're trying to make it fun and so forth. My sixth period, I have to stand on them. There is no movement. There is nobody playing. Everybody get your book. Everybody open up your book to this page. It's very structured in how we have to do things versus we can be more laid back. (6CT – Int 1, ¶52)

One source that guided her implementation of classroom management was *The Essential* 55 (Clark, 2004). She also relied on experiences and observation of calm classrooms as models for her beliefs. Her ability to gain control of her classroom easily was her most important strength in the area of classroom management. Documentation of student violations of the classroom regimen was her biggest classroom management weakness. Part of her classroom management was recording student misbehavior. It was important to have records of student misconduct to rationalize and defend disciplinary decisions. Often parents would undermine her ability to control her classroom because they were not supportive of her management and discipline techniques.

When students entered Campbell's classroom, they should sit and copy notes into their agendas. She claimed she would permit students to get up to get Kleenex but not get

up to use the trash can. She stood in the front of the room and raised her hand to gain order. She chose one child as her “official paper-passer outer” (6CT Int-1, ¶49). Students organized all of their papers in a binder. She made contact with students individually to check if they completed their binders. She implemented a classroom management program known as CHAMPS to establish her expectations for student behavior. (CHAMPS is an acronym that teachers used to identify expectations for Conversation, Help seeking, Activity, Movement, Participation, and Special rules.) She regimented lab activities so that all groups of students did the same lab activities and arrived at the same results:

If we’re doing a group activity, I specifically say, “This is where the markers are. This is where the glue sticks are. This is your lab equipment. Get what you need.” . . . I give them a sheet that explains where they go to get it and they decide as a group. If I say one person from each group, they make that decision quickly, then that one person does it. (Will movement for the lab be written on the lab sheet?) That or I’ll give them the oral directions to start with. [Materials were] labeled with stations and done alphabetically. So they knew the directions and they just followed it. (6CT-Int1, ¶49)

In sum, Campbell’s beliefs indicated custodial classroom management. Though she allowed some student movement, she believed having most of the students in their seats and calm was the ideal instructional climate. She was wary of using humor with immature students for fear that she would lose control of the classroom. Consequently, freedom of movement and humor was something that students earned through self-discipline rather than something she taught. She wrote her laboratory instructions to control student movement, experimental procedures, and student findings. Student procedures were lockstep with her instructions or they were wrong. The next section addresses Campbell’s beliefs about discipline.

Discipline. When Campbell was a first year teacher at Rolling Hills, she sought discipline advice from two colleagues at the school. Campbell claimed that these teachers were “a godsend” (6CT-Int1, ¶33). Her descriptions of discipline techniques of the two colleagues were highly punitive and confrontational. She attributed her own disciplinary beliefs to the practices of her two colleagues. Students responded well to punitive action, fear, and guilt. She had high expectations for student behavior and stuck to them. She gauged minor and major offenses depended on the context:

Part I guess it's a day by day personal thing. Am I stressed already? I hate to say it, it depends on the kid sometimes. Have I had enough? It's one more straw. A lot of times, it's a personal thing with me or depending on how rushed we are. (6CT-Int2, ¶28)

Campbell believed it was helpful to explain why the offense was wrong in context of the school code (see Appendix H). Students should write the school code a prescribed number of times. She would indicate which part of the code the student violated as her rationale for punishing the student. All students should know to (a) be quiet and listen when an adult speaks (b) remain calm, and (c) be polite and show common courtesy. She was not averse to calling a student down for misbehavior in class except when offenses involved bullying, drugs, or sexual matters. It was important to vary her discipline techniques. She was exploring the use of humor to address student misbehavior. She relied on peers, co-workers, and the school administration for guidance on discipline.

The disciplinary techniques that Campbell believed were most effective included written punishments, documentation of misbehavior to report during parent conferences, and restriction of privileges. Campbell described consequences for coming to class unprepared:

When they couldn't come to class prepared . . . [students] carry their locker, carry all their books in a box and they carry it from class to class. It works amazingly well until the parents call and complain that we're humiliating their child. (6CT-Int1, ¶36)

Other punitive measures included immediate phone calls to parents, chastisement, removal from the classroom, and office referrals.

Campbell used some techniques that were proactive or therapeutic in nature. She used praise to reinforce appropriate behavior. There was value in sitting down with students and discussing their misbehavior to help the student understand why their misbehavior was wrong. When students were angry, it was appropriate to allow them some cool-down time.

Campbell's strength in disciplinary issues was in following through with threats of punitive action.

I follow through with what I say. If I tell them something, they know I'm serious. If I say I'm going to call your parent if you don't stop, and they do it again, I'll get up and we'll go make a phone call. That's one of the best things I ever learned. I'm not sure where all I got that, but being consistent and following through are the two big things. (6CT-Int1, ¶43)

Her weakness was in the area of documenting student misbehavior. She complained that despite her confidence in her abilities to gain student compliance, that there were outside influences such as parent complaints and administrative capitulation that undermined her ability to control student behavior. Her advice for teachers regarding discipline was for teachers to be consistent, be fair, and follow through on threats of punitive action.

In sum, Campbell's discipline beliefs fell in the custodial range. She believed the primary purpose of discipline was to stop student misbehavior so that she could continue teaching. She relied on punitive action to address student disciplinary issues. In addition to stopping behavior, she intended to send the message that she was in control and serious

about her intent to follow through on threats of disciplinary action. She admitted to personalizing student behavior and that her stress level often was a deciding factor for her to determine how to respond to student misbehavior.

Instruction. There was conflict in what Campbell believed was best for students and the pedagogy that the students would be able to handle given their maturity level. Students needed small group instruction and interaction. She tempered her use of small group instruction because students were not mature enough for small group instruction and interaction. She did not trust students to read independently. She enjoyed using humor to liven-up her classroom activities; however, most sixth grade students were too immature to handle humor in the classroom. She was the authoritative source of information in her classroom. It was important to her to check every problem on every homework assignment for every student. Answers were either right or wrong. When students failed during hands-on instruction, it was because they failed to think about what they were doing.

Her primary source for instructional material is the Kentucky Core Curriculum. Her goal was to cover the core content that would be on the CATS test and to teach her students strategies for improving their assessment performance. She assigned nightly homework because doing so improved student test scores. She varied her pedagogical choices based on students' needs and her background knowledge of content:

[It] depends on what the material is, if I'm comfortable with it. If I were teaching physics (laughter) a lot is going to be by the book. If I can come up with easy-to-use labs or activities then we'll do that. I try to go to the PDs and different trainings to get a variety of ideas whether it's kinesthetic, or just labs or you know what. It just depends on what we're doing with it. Sometimes it's straight lecture. Sometimes you have to, you know. I hate to say it but there is some boring stuff in Science. But you have to get through that to get to the exciting stuff. There's nothing you

can do exciting about it so you just got to talk about it and explain it.
(6CT-Int-1, ¶53)

Campbell described her strengths and weaknesses in terms of her knowledge base. Her strengths were in the areas of her background knowledge in life science and her ability to connect life science to the real world. Her weaknesses were in the areas of physical science and geology. Professional workshops and science journals were good sources of new ideas. She never reuses old lesson plans. She does not teach any content that is not a part of Kentucky Core Content. Teachers should stay current in their knowledge of their content areas, that they should attend content area professional workshops, and that they should do their homework before entering the classroom so they know their content. It was important to Campbell to be accurate when imparting knowledge to students.

The laboratory experience described in the section above illustrates her belief that she needs to control student interaction. Students were not allowed to think independently nor were they a part of determining the processes of science activities. She determined procedures using both written systematic instruction and oral directions. By controlling the procedure, she also controlled the outcomes. Obviously, this increased the chance of all students coming up with the same right answers. On the other hand, the lack of student voice in the procedure diminished the chance that students would develop independent thinking skills and the ability to analyze results based on errors in their procedures. Her custodial instructional belief that she must control the flow of learning supersedes pedagogical choices that may superficially appear to be humanistic.

In sum, Campbell was custodial in her beliefs about classroom management, instruction, and discipline. She possessed some humanistic characteristics; however, she

kept students under strict control. She was the informational and managerial authority in her classroom. She measured student performance in terms of accuracy of answers they provided rather than the learning that occurred. This need for control had an impact on her teaching behaviors. The next section is a description of results of observations of Campbell's teaching behaviors.

Teaching Classroom Behaviors

There were no blatant conflicts between Campbell's beliefs and classroom behaviors. She was teacher-centered. She was the source of information in her classroom. She controlled the movement and interaction of students in her classroom as determined by the analysis of observations of Campbell in terms of her Management, Discipline, and Instruction. The next sections address Campbell's classroom behaviors.

Classroom management. Campbell believed student interaction was important to student learning, but that sixth grade students were unable to interact intellectually because they lacked maturity. This was evident in the four classroom observations. Regimentation was the salient management characteristic during observations in Campbell's classroom. Students entered her classroom and sat down before the tone sounded to begin the period. As they entered, there were notes written on a whiteboard that included announcements such as "Test Friday – Study, Extra Credit due Friday, Binders Due (be organized)" and homework, "Review all Notetakers & Reinforcement, 273 & 274. Review p. 272, Do Study Guide, Know Vocab" (6CT – Obs1, p. 1).

During the four classroom observations, students walked into an organized classroom and wrote their assignments in their agendas. During this time, Campbell verbally reminded students of the daily routine. She checked each student folder and

chastised students who did not complete their assignments. For example, with one student she said, “Andy, you’re talking. You have none of your work and you wonder why you cannot work on your project” (6CT-Obs 1, #3). Campbell used the CHAMPS management procedure to set her behavior expectations.

Discipline. Moving students and using a terse voice were salient characteristics of Campbell’s disciplinary style during the four classroom observations. She resorted to sarcasm when chastising students. During an observation, she reprimanded a student for talking, “Both of us are talking, one of us is wrong” (6CT-Obs 2, #3; see also 6CT- Obs 2, #1; 6CT- Obs 2, #2; 6CT- Obs 3, #1; 6CT-Obs 3, #6; 6CT-Obs 4, #3; 6CT-Obs 4, #5). On another occasion, she moved them to areas of the room either nearer to her or isolating the students from peers for talking out of turn. She often combined student discipline and classroom management. Her use of critical language with students affirmed her belief that guilt and shame are effective means to stop student misbehavior.

Instruction. Her salient pedagogy was lecture followed by question and answer. Nearly every question started with the words, “Who can tell me. . .” or “What is” She praised correct answers. When answers were incorrect, she called on other students to respond. This pattern of statements, questions, answers, and evaluations centered on content knowledge without broad discussion. Because the emphasis was on the accuracy of student statements, the researcher classified this type of interaction as Lecture and Q & A. Further, when students attempted to engage Campbell in higher order thinking (application, analysis), she responded with her explanation and moved on to the next topic (6CT – Obs1, #5, for example). This type of interaction cycle is consistent with her

belief that she was the informational authority in the classroom. Students relied on her for information and feedback.

Table 1 shows the COS Activity Types data for the four classroom observations in Campbell's class. The values in this table illustrate how students responded to their

Table 1

Sixth Grade Custodial COS Activity Types

6C Activity Types	Obs 1	Obs 2	Obs 3	Obs 4	Total	Percent
1. Working on written assignments	0	10	11	0	21	8.75%
2. Interaction - Instructional	2	11	3	6	22	9.17%
3. Interaction - Social	1	1	9	11	22	9.17%
4. Watching or listening	19	4	6	12	41	17.08%
5. Reading	3	5	0	0	8	3.33%
6. Getting/returning materials	2	1	4	1	8	3.33%
7. Painting, drawing, creating graphics, etc.	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
8. Working with technology	14	0	0	0	14	5.83%
9. Working with manipulatives/equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
10. Viewing video/slides	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
11. Playing games	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
12. Presenting/acting	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
13. Tutoring Peers	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
14. Not attending to task	12	17	18	17	64	26.67%
15. No activity/transition	7	9	9	13	38	15.83%
16. Other	0	2	0	0	2	0.83%
Total	60	60	60	60	240	100.00%

teacher behavior. There were 240 observation intervals for each classroom observation. In 64 (27%) of the observation intervals, students were off task. Students were listening during 41 (17%) observation intervals. During 38 (16%) of the observation intervals, there was no activity or students were in transition. Instructional interaction occurred during 22 (9%) of the observation intervals. Social interaction occurred during 22 (9%) of the observation intervals. Teacher talk and comprehension checks dominated the activity

in this classroom. Students watched and listened twice as much as they interacted with the teacher.

Table 2 shows COS Instructional Setting data from the four classroom observations in Campbell’s classroom. Whole class instruction accounted for 169 (70%)

Table 2
Sixth Grade Custodial COS Instructional Setting

Setting 6C	Obs 1	Obs 2	Obs 3	Obs 4	Total	Percent
1. Whole Class	59	23	40	47	169	70.42%
2. Small Group	0	37	0	0	37	15.42%
3. Pairs	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
4. Individuals	1	0	20	13	34	14.17%
Total	60	60	60	60	240	100.00%

of the observation intervals during the four classroom observations. There were 71 (30%) observation intervals of individual work. There were no observation intervals of paired or group work during the four classroom observations.

To summarize, Campbell’s custodial behaviors were a reflection of her beliefs. Tables 1 and 2 confirm the custodial behavior of Campbell. Students spent most of their instructional time watching and listening to their teacher in whole class settings. Campbell was teacher-centered. The goal of her management was to control and manipulate student movement and interaction. She used discipline to stifle student interaction and as a means of demonstrating her authority in the classroom. She used fear and guilt to control student behavior. It was apparent from her instruction that her plan was to impart her knowledge to the students rather than to allow students to grapple with information. The majority of the time, she used lecture and Q & A to deliver instruction.

When Campbell allowed group settings, she structured her lessons and labs to control student movement and outcomes. She allowed students to dominate interaction when their answers were right. The next section addresses the climate in Campbell's classroom.

Classroom Climate

The climate for Campbell's class was a mixture of custodialism and humanism, perhaps due to recent interactions with Ms. Warren, the seventh grade humanistic teacher in this study. Campbell's classroom physical climate was open and interactive. There were indications that Campbell was starting to use pedagogies that encouraged some student-to-student interaction. Students, nonetheless, reported being bored and anxious in her classroom. The next sections describe the physical, motivational, and interaction climates in Campbell's classroom.

Physical climate. The physical climate of Campbell's classroom was the least regimented of the three custodial teachers. She arranged her desk in a large U-shape and sat students in groups of four to a table (See Figure 5). This arrangement facilitated both whole class and small group activities without moving tables. The walls of her room were busy with a mix of commercial and teacher prepared displays. The displays were of concepts and critical vocabulary that students would need to know for the CATS assessment in April. Her desk was near the front of the room in line and perpendicular with one end of the U-shaped table arrangement. There were shelves with teacher editions and resource books situated behind her desk. She had Accelerated Reader books (a reading comprehension series that the school uses as a part of its reading curriculum) on a shelf along the front wall and in a rack near the front corner. Her front door display was a commercial sign that read "Welcome!" She displayed student work above the

Figure 5. Sixth Grade Custodial Room Arrangement

lockers in the hall adjacent to her room. Campbell's room was colorful and inviting. Her custodial beliefs and behavior were not evident in the arrangement of artifacts in her room.

Motivation climate. The two student participants from Campbell's class reported that her class was often boring because she keeps them busy all the time with paperwork. Campbell required students to keep all assignments organized in a binder. The work that Campbell gave was a mixture of real world and contrived busy work. Occasionally, she did laboratory activities and demonstrations. Students worked in small interactive groups on rare occasions. These students explained that their primary motivation to do well in this class is grades. When asked why she is proud of the work she does in her class, one student reported, "Because I get good grades" (6C1-Int 3, ¶18). Campbell gave homework often. She convinced the students that additional homework improved their grades. Students claimed Campbell pressured them to do well because she keenly was interested in improving CATS scores.

Another motivator that students reported was to avoid punishment. Both student participants claimed that Campbell was quick to issue an office referral. One student reported that she appreciated Campbell's response to students who misbehave because it was uncomfortable for her when her peers misbehaved in class. Both students, however, mentioned that Campbell often raises her voice when she was aggravated and that raising her voice caused them anxiety, "It's just that she raises her voice and it's kind of (mouthed the word 'scary')'" (6C2-Int 2, ¶59).

Campbell's stern responses to students divided the climate in her classroom. The student participants reported a handful of students did not like Campbell. The students

who did not like Campbell ignored her during class. Differences in the motivation and emotion resulted in contradictory experiences for students in Campbell's classroom. Students willing to conform enhanced their experience in her classroom. The highly engaged students received praise for their correct answers to knowledge level questions. Those who did not conform chose to obscure their presence in the classroom to either socialize with peers or avoid the risk of being unprepared in a class that placed an emotional premium on correct answers.

Communication climate. In Campbell's classroom, students interacted intellectually with worksheets and computer software, but not with one another. Students guarded, rather than shared, answers to questions on assignments and tests. Occasionally, students work in groups or pairs. Campbell asked questions and allowed some discussion in her classroom. There were times, however, that Campbell wanted the students to listen and not interrupt. This typically occurred when she was lecturing or reading to them from the book. Campbell announced specifically when students may or may not ask questions. "You can't talk when she is talking or explaining" (6C1-Int 2, ¶ 38).

Students who were not on task engaged in non-academic social interaction. These students passed notes or talked quietly so Campbell would not notice them. These students would occasionally try to distract the students who were engaged in the lesson. This caused a dilemma for the engaged students. They had to choose between friends and the teacher. If they ignored their friends, the friends would isolate them socially. If they ignored the teacher, they might receive punitive consequences. This was a source of anxiety in Campbell's classroom.

In sum, Campbell was the authority for information in her classroom. Motivation to be in her class varied in relation to student ability to please her. She answered student questions; students rarely helped each other and could not share answers to assignments. When Campbell talked, lectured, or read to the class, she insisted that students listen. If she suspected a student was not listening, she asked questions, called on the suspected offender, and then chastised the student for not being able to respond or for not listening. Students were not sure if Campbell valued their input. Students interacted with her out of fear of being embarrassed and because they were motivated to make good grades. This section described the teacher-centered and sometimes-stressful interaction climate of Campbell's classroom. The next section addresses student engagement in Campbell's classroom.

Student Engagement

Table 3 shows the COS interactions data during the four classroom observations in Campbell's classroom. The dominant types of interaction for Campbell were teacher-

Table 3

Sixth Grade Custodial COS Interaction

6C Interaction	Obs 1	Obs 2	Obs 3	Obs 4	Total	Percent
1 None/independent	3	20	18	8	49	20.42%
2 Teacher instructional	45	12	23	33	113	47.08%
3 Teacher managerial	11	3	6	10	30	12.50%
4 Teacher social	0	2	0	1	3	1.25%
5 Support staff	0	1	0	0	1	0.42%
6 Student instructional	0	12	0	0	12	5.00%
7 Student social	1	10	13	8	32	13.33%
8 Other	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
Totals	60	60	60	60	240	100.00%

to-student and independent work. During 113 (47%) of the 240 observation intervals there was teacher-to-student interaction. There were 49 (20%) observation intervals of students working independently. There were only 12 (5%) observation intervals when students were engaged student-to-student instructional interaction. Campbell was the source of information in her classroom and that students do not share assignment answers in the form of intellectual interaction. Students answered during the question and answer sessions that accompanied her lectures. Students engaged in social interaction with one another nearly three times more often (32 observation intervals, 13%) than in intellectual interaction (12 observation intervals, 5%).

Table 4 shows the COS Manner data for the four classroom observations of Campbell. During instruction, there were 102 (43%) observation intervals of students on

Table 4

Sixth Grade Custodial COS Manner

6C Manner	Obs 1	Obs 2	Obs 3	Obs 4	Total	Percent
1. On Task	28	30	25	19	102	42.50%
2. Waiting for Teacher	16	5	10	18	49	20.42%
3. Distracted	14	24	22	20	80	33.33%
4. Disruptive	2	1	3	2	8	3.33%
5. Other	0	0	0	1	1	0.42%
Totals	60	60	60	60	240	100.00%

task. This meant that during the classroom observations, there were 138 observation intervals where students were either waiting for the teacher (49 observation intervals, 20%), distracted (80 observation intervals, 33%), disruptive (8 observation intervals, 3%), or other (1 observation interval, .5%) More than half of observations of this class

were students who were either waiting for the teacher or were distracted. When the teacher engaged students in lecture and Q & A, the engagement was inconsistent. Those students who studied and knew the answers were excited to respond to questions and dominated conversation. Those students who were unprepared or who did not know answers sat quietly while the others answered. Campbell's custodial behaviors created varying emotional experiences for students in her class. The divide was between those who liked Campbell and those who did not.

In sum, student engagement was fragmented in Campbell's classroom. For more than half the time, students were unengaged in Campbell's class. The researcher speculates that the purpose was Campbell's controlling behaviors. The teacher-centered pedagogical choices had a chilling effect on the intellectual interaction for those students who did not have an appreciation of the subject matter or who were otherwise unmotivated. Hence, there were students who endured the lessons or engaged in off task behaviors to keep themselves amused. The next section is the portrait of the sixth grade humanistic teacher in this study.

Ms. Elliot, Sixth Grade Humanistic Portrait

The sixth grade humanistic teacher, Ms. Elliot, was the only teacher in this study who did not earn her master's degree. She enrolled in college right out of high school and then dropped out after only three months. She returned to college at age 23 and attended part time for nine years to earn her bachelor's degree. She earned her rank II teaching certificate by completing a 30-hour program. She decided to become a teacher because, "I wanted summers off" (6HT – Int 1, ¶2). After working as a teacher for 8 years, she enjoyed her job as a teacher because of her fascination with the craft of teaching. The

planning and delivery of lessons and the personality of students captivated her. She stated that her job is never boring.

Elliot taught in two school systems. She started in a county adjacent to the Rolling Hills district. She resigned her position so she could complete her sixth year program. While in that first position, she taught in first, fourth, sixth, and seventh grades. When she returned to teaching, she joined the faculty at Rolling Hills and taught sixth grade Social Studies, Reading, and Language Arts. The class observed for this study was a Social Studies class. The emphases of the class were geography and culture.

Beliefs

The four interviews with Ms. Elliot confirmed her selection as the sixth grade humanistic teacher. Her beliefs centered on providing optimal learning climate. She understood she needed order in her classroom but trusted students to move and interact in her classroom. The following section addresses Elliot's beliefs about classroom management, discipline, and instruction.

Classroom management. Elliot believed the purpose of management was successful teaching. Students needed a predictable routine so that they can learn to manage themselves. Students had the sense to know when to get up to sharpen their pencils, get materials, and throw away trash. Elliot knew middle school students have short attention spans. To avoid boredom students sometimes need to get up from their seats and move around during class. "I don't expect them to sit still for hours and hours or read silently for an hour or work on a worksheet completely silent. I recognize they are kids, they need to talk, they need to squirm" (6HT – Int 3, ¶11).

There were certain times during instruction students needed to sit still and listen during lectures, tests, and when students present orally to their peers. During class discussions, students naturally raised their hands. Students sometimes chimed in without raising their hands. It was okay to chime in so long as students controlled their own behavior. During group instruction, Elliot allowed students to control the interactions in their groups but also believed group noise should not interfere with the other groups in the classroom.

In all contexts, students should take care of their own needs. Children should not suffer through a lesson while waiting to go to the bathroom or get a tissue after a sneeze. On the other hand, she knew that children did not always know needs from wants. She used the CHAMPS method because she thought it was useful to maximize instructional time while providing students the opportunity to monitor their own behavior and interactions. Elliot used CHAMPS to teach students to be self-sufficient. She had various places in her classroom where students turned in work, checked-out and returned materials, and obtained reference materials without the teacher directing movement. She set routines and kept her room organized to provide the opportunities for students to manage themselves.

Elliot was confident in her efficacy as a teacher. Elliot's most important attribute in terms of classroom management was that she set her boundaries clearly. Students understood her boundaries and respected them. "They [realize] how far they can go and not go. . . . They are generally respectful of me and their classmates" (6HT – Int 3, ¶11). She believed sometimes she was inconsistent in setting CHAMPS expectations and she thought she should communicate positive comments to parents more often. Her advice

for new teachers was to (a) have routines that empower students to act responsibly (b) be fair, and (c) vary instruction so that students do not become bored.

In sum, Elliot's beliefs about classroom management were humanistic. She chose to empower students to make decisions about self-management rather than to control their movement and interaction. By organizing her instruction and her learning atmosphere, she gives students the opportunity to learn skills needed for autonomy. The next section is a description and analysis of Elliot's beliefs about discipline.

Discipline. Elliot claimed student misbehavior was a phenomenon that occurs when students make bad choices in response to two things: (a) being unfamiliar with the context and (b) the emotional baggage that students bring to the context. Students must learn how to behave because students do not come into the classroom with an adult set of social skills. At first, Elliot learned about discipline through trial and error. She later gained insight about student behavior at an in-service on poverty in the classroom. She learned to talk students through making better choices using a technique that involves an overhead transparency with a series of questions:

This one child either hit or pushed someone down. I whipped out the transparency. . . . Why did you do it? He called me a name. I wrote it down. What did you want from him? I wanted him to leave me alone. . . . Then the third part was what you did, didn't work so what could you have done. I don't remember what they said but they generated a whole list. He told me and the whole class told me. There you go, next time you have that problem, you can fall back on one of these decisions. (6HT – Int 1, ¶45)

For Elliot, minor disruptions caused the misbehaving student to get off task. Major disruptions caused instruction to stop. She occasionally used punitive means to discipline students. She admitted to getting angry and “having a ‘hissy fit.’” (6HT – Int 2, ¶32) She sometimes lectured students and gave them consequences. When students

disrupted her instruction, she sent the disruptive student to the hall so that she could continue instruction. She used the office referral system. She contacted parents only after a student established a pattern of behavior. She believed that written punishments were ineffective because they distracted from student learning.

Elliot had better success using therapeutic means to address student misbehavior. Teachers must model and reinforce appropriate behavior. When students misbehaved, she diffused situations quickly and calmly. When students had difficulty behaving, she partnered that student with a peer who knew how to behave. She talked to students about their misbehavior if she believed she could change student behavior. When students came to the classroom with emotional baggage, she gave them time and space to cool down. When students were emotional, it was acceptable to postpone rather than escalate a situation.

Elliot was confident in her personal efficacy in disciplinary matters. Her advice to beginning teachers was to be consistent and not to threaten a punishment unless you can follow through with that punishment. One might interpret this statement as custodial. Elliot stated, however, that she disapproved of discipline measures that caused fear or embarrassment for students. Her strengths in discipline included fairness and being able to analyze student misbehavior. Allowing a student to miss instruction was a weakness. When students misbehave repeatedly near the end of the year, she admitted that she gave up on them:

I'm going to go on teaching and we're going to do what we need to do. I probably just drop some of them rather than tangle with them and that's probably not a good thing to do. I put the group before the one. That's probably something I could work on. (6HT – Int 3, ¶66)

In sum, Ms. Elliot's discipline beliefs were humanistic. Elliot claimed student misbehavior was a symptom of the youth and inexperience of middle school students. Some of her beliefs were custodial such as sending children out in the hall and using threats and sanctions for misbehavior. However, she taught students how to behave using the overhead transparencies. Children come to the classroom with an obfuscated understanding of how to behave and that student behaviors vary as their personalities vary. Home life, emotional baggage, and puberty influence student behaviors. Elliot claimed behavior is a symptom of erroneous behavior learning and not a personal affront. This corresponded with humanistic perceptions of students and effective discipline practices.

Instruction. Elliot claimed it was important to vary instructional pedagogies to help manage her classroom. This belief about management corresponded with her beliefs about instruction. Elliot differentiated the concepts of sources of curriculum and pedagogical choice. Her source for curricular content was the Kentucky Core Content. Her source for pedagogy was professional development and her interaction with other teachers. The core content did not limit her pedagogical choice. Instead, she varied instruction to match the content and to keep the interest of students. She organized the instruction with input from the students using a three-column KWL chart. KWL is an acronym meaning *Know*, *Want to Know*, and *Learn*. She used discussion to fill the K and W columns with what students tell say they know and want to know about a topic. During the unit, the class reported learning in the L column. KWL initiated intellectual interaction in her classroom. Elliot claimed there were interesting results from this exercise:

I do [KWL] often, [we] keep them until the end of the unit and we go back and part of their assessment is to fill out the L column. It's funny, on The Constitution, what they knew, what they put down as knew, many of those things were wrong. That was interesting to go back and fix it and correct it, even though they thought they knew. That's what I like to do, simple, gets them talking about it, and it ties to assessment. (6HT – Int 3, ¶21)

She believed there was no best way to teach any content. She used a variety of contexts including whole class, small groups, pairs, and individuals. She strived to match her methods of instruction to the content. She was reflective about her pedagogical choices and open to trying new techniques.

Elliot's beliefs about learning went beyond the content that students should learn. Her goal was also to teach children how to obtain and use resources. She believed it was important to tie various content areas to her subject. She created opportunities for students to learn by interacting with each other.

Elliot evaluated student progress in a variety of ways. Chapter and unit testing was not an effective way to evaluate students. Students showed competence through their work products. Oral presentation and group projects were much more effective to evaluate student progress. She acknowledged a problem in providing objective measures that can convert to a numeric grade when evaluating progress this way.

Elliot was confident in her personal efficacy as an instructor. Her ability to vary instruction and make the time spent in her class was her strength. Her weakness was giving grades. She had a negative attitude about assessment:

I don't value it very much, sorry. Sorry all you assessment people. I value more that they know how to find the answers and that they know . . . procedure rather than product. I don't put much weight in assessment. That's probably not exactly right. There are certain things you should know but I'm not for piddley [sic] different things. By the time you get out of sixth grade social studies, I believe you should understand some things like economics and different types of government. But it's not important

to tell me what government they have in Uganda. Maybe I need help in fine-tuning the assessment. (6HT – Int 3, ¶37)

Elliot valued process rather than student rote memorization of facts. That the school was under scrutiny for low accountability reflected in her words and her attitude about assessment. The pressure to cover a broad range of core content likely influenced her perceptions of her weaknesses in the area of instruction.

In sum, Elliot's instructional beliefs were humanistic. She empowered students to learn through interaction with one another and grappling with a variety of sources. She gave students a variety of means to demonstrate learning such as oral reports and group projects. Her goal was for students to work independently to search for answers and to report them to their peers through oral and written reports, student products, discussion and interaction, and tests. She valued instruction that taught students how to find answers rather than recall facts. The next section addresses Elliot's teaching behaviors.

In summary, the four interviews with Elliot confirmed that her management, discipline, and instruction beliefs were humanistic. Her goal in management was to engage students in successful instruction. Student misbehavior was a symptom of student need. Her goal for discipline was to stop disruption and to engage students in learning proper replacement behaviors. She planned her instruction to include intellectual interaction among students while she acted as the facilitator in her classroom. The next section addresses the teaching behaviors in Elliot's classroom.

Teacher Classroom Behaviors

Elliot's class was unique in comparison with the other classes in this study because of her management and instructional behaviors. The students took center stage in her class and she acted as coach and facilitator. Students worked as a whole class, in

pairs, in groups, and individually. They used various sources of information to discuss, evaluate, and create student products. It was a challenge to describe Elliot's teacher behaviors because she minimized attention to her while empowering students with opportunities to learn.

Classroom management. Elliot claimed students knew her boundaries and respected them. This was evident in Elliot's classroom management behaviors. She did little to manage her class. In four observations, however, there were high levels of student engagement. Students managed themselves most of the time. She greeted students as they walked into her classroom. She also used this time to remind students to bring materials and homework and to engage with students socially. She wrote the agenda for her class on the board. She varied her instruction both for pedagogy and group context (individuals, pairs, small group, and whole class). Elliot organized her classroom so that students knew where to get supplies and resources.

When working in large groups, Elliot shared the spotlight with her students. Students became teachers to their peers when they reported their findings to the class. During one of the four observations, she allowed a Hispanic student to judge student pronunciations of Spanish words. When students struggled with questions during discussions, Elliot would not allow other students to answer questions for the struggling student. Instead, Elliot would ask guiding questions to help the student grapple with the question to come up with answers. Students were not accustomed to this. During one observation, students tried to respond by waving their hands vehemently and crying out. "Oh! I know!" Elliot responded, "Don't say it. Give her a chance" (6HT – Obs 2, #3).

Elliot minimized time in transition from whole group to small groups and pairs. On one occasion, she chose groups at random. In later observations, students knew who their group members were and formed their groups without directions. During the four observations, Elliot used small group instruction to teach map skills and to conduct a geography simulation. Students knew where to get materials and resources for their group work. Elliot circulated around the room, stopping to work with groups. Occasionally, students socialized while Elliot was with other groups. During observations, when Elliot noticed unengaged students, she fixed the problem by walking to the group and engaging them with the work they were doing. On two occasions, students socialized briefly, then self-corrected and resumed their work.

There were occasions when students worked individually. During the four observations, students worked individually with vocabulary words. Elliot allowed students to use dictionaries and glossaries. Students used these resources to find the meanings; however, she required the students to convert definitions to their own words (see Instructional Behaviors below). When students worked individually, struggling students sought help from Elliot or from their peers. Elliot allowed students to help one another but stressed that students may not copy work from their peers.

Discipline Behaviors. The most notable observation regarding Elliot's behaviors to discipline students is that there were so few opportunities for her to discipline students. Students behaved in her class. She used concern, humor, and proximity to handle incidents of misbehavior. During one incident, a student received a handout and started working before she had finished explaining the activity. She looked at the boy and asked, "Are you okay, Joe?" The student responded, stopped working ahead, and waited for her

her explanation (6HT – Obs 1, #6). During a simulation activity involving travel to various countries, one student was off-task, trying to talk with peers. Elliot said, “If you don’t stop talking, one of us might send you off to another country without you knowing it.” The students laughed (6HT – Obs 3, #4).

On several occasions, when students were engaged in minor misbehaviors such as daydreaming, off-task whispering, or playing with materials, Elliot simply walked toward them. Her proximity was usually enough to stop the misbehavior. During one observation, she noticed that a student was off task because he had missed the instructions. She stood near the student, gave instructions, checked his work, and made an announcement to the entire class to clarify the instruction (6HT – Obs 4, #5). There were incidents of off task behavior that she did not notice in her classroom. During several of these occasions, students corrected their own misbehaviors.

Instructional Behaviors. Elliot varied her instruction. She claimed middle school students needed variation to stay engaged in the instruction. In the four observations of Elliot’s teaching behaviors, she used discussion and interaction, lecture, written work, construction, and a simulation activity. She did these activities in whole class, small group, paired, and individual settings. She gave students choices of how to complete their work. For example, during a map construction project, she provided a large map, atlases, and books to the class. She gave the students a list of the countries with latitude and longitude information for each country. Students chose how to create their maps. Students interacted with one another to determine if China was in Europe, Asia, or both Europe and Asia (6HT – Obs 1, #1). These maps became a part of a geography travel simulation that they used in later lessons. In the geography travel simulation, students

chose supplies to purchase for simulated journeys. Students earned bonus travel if they completed optional projects such as learning 10 words from a foreign language.

Students working in groups naturally economized time by dividing responsibilities among the group members. Students took on roles as leaders, followers, thinkers, recorders, and graphic artists. There were intellectual debates about how to spend money in the simulation game. Students interacted to create consensus about what buying materials. Buying too many or too few goods affected their success in the simulation. As students learned, they also reported what they learned to the class. They presented their findings in oral reports with graphics that they created. Students had choices about how to make their presentations more interesting to the rest of the class. Table 5 shows the activity types that occurred in the four observations of Elliot's classroom. In 62 (26%) of 240 observation intervals, Ms. Elliot and the students engaged in instructional interactions. Students were watching or listening in 36 (15%) observation intervals and were creating illustrations in 30 (13%) observation intervals. Eight (3%) observation intervals were students tutoring their peers. There was more student-to-

student tutoring in Elliot's class than there were in all three custodial classrooms. There were only eight (3%) observation intervals when students were off-task.

Table 5

Sixth Grade Humanistic COS Activity Types

6H Activity Types	Obs 1	Obs 2	Obs 3	Obs 4	Total	Percent
1. Working on written assignments	0	7	8	12	27	11.25%
2. Interaction - Instructional	5	7	22	28	62	25.83%
3. Interaction - Social	1	0	4	0	5	2.08%
4. Watching or listening	0	23	11	2	36	15.00%
5. Reading	0	9	5	1	15	6.25%
6. Getting/returning materials	4	3	4	7	18	7.50%
7. Painting, drawing, creating graphics, etc.	29	0	0	1	30	12.50%
8. Working with technology	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
9. Working with manipulatives/equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
10. Viewing video/slides	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
11. Playing games	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
12. Presenting/acting	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
13. Tutoring Peers	4	1	1	2	8	3.33%
14. Not attending to task	1	3	1	3	8	3.33%
15. No activity/transition	9	5	4	4	22	9.17%
16. Other	7	2	0	0	9	3.75%
Total	60	60	60	60	240	100.00%

Table 6 shows the setting of the observations in Elliot's class. In 101 (42%) of 240 observation intervals, there was whole group instruction. This included the

Table 6

Sixth Grade Humanistic COS Setting

6H Setting	Obs 1	Obs 2	Obs 3	Obs 4	Total	Percent
1. Whole Class	13	45	23	20	101	42.08%
2. Small Group	0	0	36	27	63	26.25%
3. Pairs	10	0	0	9	19	7.92%
4. Individuals	37	15	1	4	57	23.75%
Total	60	60	60	60	240	100.00%

observations when students were presenting to the class. There was small group instruction in 63 (26%) observation intervals and pairs in 19 (8%) observation intervals. There were 57 (24%) observation intervals of students working individually.

In sum, there were no contradictions between Elliot's beliefs and her behaviors. She was humanistic in her behaviors because she empowered students to make choices about their behaviors. Her management behaviors encouraged students to act autonomously. Students had internal motivation to engage in the daily activities of Elliot's class. This motivation extended to their conduct. Students self-corrected and there was little need for Elliot to spend instructional time with discipline issues. Elliot's instruction was student-centered. She gave the students the tools they needed and the freedom to interact. Students used a variety of sources to create products that represented their learning and then presented their findings to their peers. The next section addresses the climate in Elliot's room.

Classroom Climate

During the four observations, the climate in Elliot's classroom was friendly and relaxed. There was noise in her classroom. Elliot allowed students to talk while they were working. At the end of class during one observation, one student commented that it did not seem like he had just spent a full hour in her class. The time had passed more quickly. The physical, motivation, and communication climates that Elliot created support her beliefs and behaviors as a teacher. She provided a pleasant atmosphere for learning. The following sections describe the physical, motivation, and communication climates in Elliot's classroom.

Physical climate. Other than the walls and the permanent fixtures in her class, few objects stayed in the same place during the data collection for this study. The bulletin boards changed often because they were displays of student work. By the end of the class, desks were in straight rows. During the class, however, students moved the desks around to accommodate whole class, small group, pair, or individual work. Because of this, there is no floor plan illustration for Elliot's room. Warren displayed the obligatory district posters on her walls. Student work surrounded these posters. This room was once a computer lab. The plug strip across the wall on one side served as a makeshift shelf for resource books that students used for their projects. Warren claimed she organized her room to allow students access to a variety of resources. The physical make-up of her room confirmed her claim.

Motivation climate. Students reported that they enjoyed attending Elliot's class because of (a) hands-on activities (b) the variety of activities, and (c) working in groups. Students described Elliot as pleasant and fun. "She's not one of those grumpy people that if you do something wrong, you know she's not going to, just little things, she's not going to get mad at you" (6H2 – Int 2, ¶4). The students in Elliot's class also enjoyed group projects and presentations. They reported that she does not lecture often and that they have few worksheets to do. Most of the worksheets they had were not the same as those in other classes. They were information worksheets that help students with their geography simulation activity. Because the content was unique, student reactions to worksheets were positive.

Students perceived Elliot as a skilled teacher who was interesting and made learning fun. "We have a lot of hands on activities and it's really fun to do like the

projects we're doing now. . . . We have groups of four and we do projects and every week we have a new project" (6H1 – Int 2, ¶4). She also minimizes student emotional risk by addressing student mistakes with humor. "If we did something like on accident, she laughs about it with us" (6H2 – Int 2, ¶34). Being fun and interesting and using humor when students made mistakes made the climate in Elliot's classroom pleasant and conducive to learning.

The students said that some of their peers get off-task during Elliot's class. Neither student participant claimed off-task behavior was because of negative perceptions of Elliot. One student commented, "I haven't heard anyone say anything bad about her. Everybody likes her" (6H2 – Int 2, ¶22). The behavior that these students described coincided with observations of student who were off-task and either self-corrected or complied with gentle reminders or proximity clues from Elliot. There was no evidence from the interview data that there was a divided climate in Elliot's classroom.

Communication climate. During the observations, Elliot did very little talking. According to the student participants, this was typical in her class:

Well the teacher really don't. It's kind of more the kids doing, like we have a lot of projects and stuff in there to do. It's pretty much more of the 80% student and 20% teacher. The teacher pretty much explains what you need to do and the materials to do it and then the kids do it and then she grades it after that. (6H2 – Int 3, ¶6)

Elliot encouraged her students to talk and interact in small groups and to grapple with various resources. She then gave students a platform to present their findings to their peers.

Elliot encourages participation in her classroom. Students drew upon their own experiences and expertise to add to the learning in the classroom. A student from Eastern

Kentucky explained some of the dialectical differences between Central Kentucky dialects and Eastern Kentucky dialects. “When kids come in with interesting facts and stuff, she likes that. She smiles and says cool things and all that stuff. Then we get on a really long conversation about whatever they brought in” (6H2 – Int 3, ¶9). Students became the experts, and the center of instruction, in Elliot’s class.

In sum, Elliot created a climate in her classroom that provided motivation for students to do well and gave students a voice in their learning. She allowed students to move the tables and chairs in her room to suit their learning needs and provided students with a variety of information sources to explore and grapple with social studies. She used pedagogies that were interesting and engaging for students. She allowed students to interact in small groups and to become teachers in their classrooms. Students shared what they learned with their peers in whole class settings. By relinquishing her control in the classroom to her students, Elliot empowered her students with an authentic voice. The next section examines the interactions that the researcher observed in Elliot’s classroom.

Student Engagement

Table 7 contains the COS Interaction data from the four classroom observations in Elliot’s classroom. During 72 (30%) of 240 observation intervals, there was instructional interaction involving the teacher. Students worked independently during 68 (28%) observation intervals. This included the observations when students worked in groups and divided the responsibilities among themselves to economize time. Students interacted intellectually with one-another during 60 (25%) observation intervals. This high

percentage of student-to-student interaction further supports the researcher's claim that Elliot was a student-centered teacher

Table 7

Sixth Grade Humanistic COS Interaction

6H Interaction	Obs 1	Obs 2	Obs 3	Obs 4	Total	Percent
1 None/independent	33	10	10	15	68	28.33%
2 Teacher instruction	5	32	15	20	72	30.00%
3 Teacher managerial	4	14	6	6	30	12.50%
4 Teacher social	1	2	1	1	5	2.08%
5 Support staff	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
6 Student instructional	15	2	27	16	60	25.00%
7 Student Social	2	0	1	2	5	2.08%
8 Other	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
Totals	60	60	60	60	240	100.00%

.

Table 8 displays the COS data for Manner during the four classroom observations in Elliot's class. Students were on-task during 221 (92%) of 240 observation intervals.

Table 8

Sixth Grade Humanistic COS Manner

6H Manner	Obs 1	Obs 2	Obs 3	Obs 4	Total	Percent
1. On Task	53	56	55	57	221	92.08%
2. Waiting for Teacher	4	3	2	0	9	3.75%
3. Distracted	3	1	3	3	10	4.17%
4. Disruptive	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
5. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
Totals	60	60	60	60	240	100.00%

There were nine (4%) observation intervals when students were waiting for the teacher. During 10 (4%) observation intervals, students were distracted. Students were on-task and engaged in Elliot's lessons 92% of the time.

In summary, students were highly engaged in interaction and work while in Elliot's classroom. Students engaged in intellectual interaction in Elliot's class. The interaction was teacher-to-student, student-to-teacher, and student-to-student. Elliot planned her instruction to engage students in interaction with one-another. This was apparent from the observations of Elliot's lessons. Students learned and had fun. The work was exciting and consequently, students who occasionally strayed from instructional group to social activities either self-corrected or responded to Elliot's gentle corrections with little disruption of instructional time. The next section is the portrait of the seventh grade custodial teacher.

Ms. McNabb, Seventh Grade Custodial Portrait

Ms. McNabb was a veteran teacher of over 30 years and taught social studies and language arts at Rolling Hills. Prior to becoming a teacher, she was a social worker and an employee of Delta Airlines. She started her career in teaching when she returned to college to get her teaching degree. She took an elementary position in Louisiana where she worked in an economically depressed school district. She taught 27 years in Louisiana, 1 year in Oklahoma, and at the time of the study, had taught 3 years in Kentucky. She had degrees in education from four universities: Louisiana State University, Louisiana Tech University, Northeast Louisiana University, and Northwestern State University. She also attended Centenary College in Shreveport, LA, but did not earn a degree there. She has degrees in Special Education and Elementary Education with minors in Social Studies and Reading. She refers to herself as an "education junkie" (7CT-Int 1, ¶4). She was working on an additional Master's Degree at a local university during the time of this study.

She proudly shared a letter for her selection to *Who's Who Among America's Teachers*. This annual publication based in Austin, TX honors teachers whose students nominate them for inclusion in an anthology of teacher biographies. This is the firm that also publishes *Who's Who Among American High School Students*, *The National Dean's List*, *Who's Who Among American High School Students -- Sports Edition*, and *The Chancellor's List*. When sharing this letter with the researcher, McNabb stated that she felt honored because nominations come from students rather than faculty and staff.

Beliefs

McNabb stated her beliefs in terms that teetered between humanistic and custodial. This was because she was conflicted among what she thought was right, what she was supposed to do to meet the demands of reform, and what she believed she was capable of accomplishing with students. She claimed she cared for students and always tried to tailor her classroom practice to meet student needs. She cited the Kentucky Education and Reform act and the demands of adequate yearly progress in the No Child Left Behind Act as forces that limited her ability to teach in the classroom. She also cited personal weaknesses that limited her choices as a teacher. What was consistent in her beliefs was that she personalized student achievement and behavior in terms of pleasing or disappointing teachers. The following sections address Campbell's classroom management, discipline, and instructional beliefs.

Classroom management. McNabb obfuscated her beliefs about management with her beliefs about discipline by either unwillingly or unwittingly answering questions about classroom management with responses related to her beliefs about discipline. When asked about professional development in classroom management, McNabb responded,

“We’ve gone from paddling which I hated, I don’t like paddling kids, . . . standing in the corner in elementary school, and writing lines and not writing lines, I think I’ve gone full circle two or three times” (7CT-Int 1, ¶22). McNabb had extensive training and many degrees. Despite her training, she relied on peers for guidance in the area of classroom management. The purpose of management is to gain immediate control over the classroom. She did not believe that she has the necessary skills to keep control. She used her “smarter” students to help resolve this situation. “The smarter kids, for the most part, the well learned kid is anxious to help the one that needs help” (7CT-Int 4, ¶15).

Management requires organization, consistency, and good discipline. Teachers who allow students to get out-of-line will wear out and become ineffective. She advised new teachers to do set reasonable expectations that they would be willing to enforce, make expectations clear, and establish consequences for not meeting her expectations. It was important that she establish her expectations early in the school year. To improve in the coming year, she plans to emphasize coming to class promptly prepared for class.

McNabb did not think that she was successful in managing students working in small groups. She was not comfortable with the noise that students made and she believed the classroom was not conducive to interaction in small groups.

I probably [would use small group] if we [had small class sizes]. I find 29 to 30, 31 kids in our room. It’s wall to wall kids. It’s hard to have learning centers. It’s hard to set up where a stronger student helps a not so strong student with an activity. (7CT-Int 4, ¶15)

McNabb stated that when students walk into her room, she has a worksheet for them to fill time and keep students busy until she is ready to start class. She modeled the behavior that she expects from students. She interacted with students with rigid turn taking. When students raised their hands, she wrote down their names in the order that

she sees. She nodded to acknowledge students so they could put their hands down. As students finished talking, she checked her list and called on the next student. She used the CHAMPS classroom management technique when setting expectations for her students. When students were non-compliant with her expectations, she would give them a choice to comply or accept consequences.

In sum, McNabb's management style emphasized control. Her belief that management was to take immediate control of the class was a custodial trait. This was true also of the belief that management requires organization and good discipline. Humanistic teachers would recognize that noise is a consequence of interaction and would be comfortable with student noise. She was uncomfortable with noise in the classroom and she blames the small size of her room and large number of students in her class for her inability to organize her classroom effectively for small group learning. It is also a custodial belief to perceive classroom management through a Type-A lens. She needed to coerce students into compliance and that strict discipline and the threat of consequences was the most effective way of accomplishing good management (see McGregor, 1960).

Discipline. McNabb cited her mother as her primary source of disciplinary belief. She described this relationship in terms of respect and the desire never to disappoint her mother. One word that described McNabb best in terms of discipline is *guilt*. This was evident in her description of students who did not connect with her or who disappointed her:

I've had kids that I didn't have as close a bond would say later somewhere down the line they didn't think I liked them. That would always bother me so bad that I [said], "I'm sorry that I wasn't a better friend. I got on to you but it was out of I cared for you and I wanted you do your best." *Did*

students ever disappoint you? Yes, some did. How do you let them know? I tell them. I just say, “That disappointed me. I didn’t expect that coming from you.” (7CT-Int 1, ¶56)

Another feature of McNabb’s discipline beliefs was *bargaining*. She described “peddling time” and “peddling rules” as means of controlling student behavior. She could gain compliance during a confrontation by giving students 30-seconds to comply. If they complied within the time limit, they would avoid consequences. She also described flexible rules and “hard-core” rules (7CT – Int 3, ¶71). She bargained with students with the flexible rules, but not with the hard-core rules. Hard-core rules were school and district level rules (code-of-conduct). They also include rules that she believed do not require explanation or rules that apply to everyone. These were common sense rules such as not running in the hall or hitting other students. The only explanation she gave of the flexible rules was that they were not the hard-core rules and they were rules that do not apply to everyone.

Students should come to class already knowing good manners and right from wrong. Students should learn to behave at home. Students who misbehave come from families who did not model appropriate behavior and this lack of modeling at home manifested in student behavior at school. She modeled good behavior in her classroom because students who see her model good behavior are more likely to behave in her class. She avoided confrontation because she believes that confrontation begets confrontation. Students changed over the years; they no longer want to behave in school. McNabb claimed students lacked boundaries and she must maintain order through rules and consequences. The key to maintaining order is to be consistent with the application of rules.

McNabb believed that major disruptions to her class fell in two categories, student health issues and student behavior issues. Health issues included when students are sick or hurt in her classroom. Student behavior issues included behaviors that interfere with instructional time and disrespect. Minor disruptions included noise making and daydreaming. McNabb did not have faith in her ability to handle student disruptions. When asked to describe a time when she used a one-on-one discussion with a student who had misbehaved, she used an example where one female student believed she was getting into trouble because of her proximity to her friend. During the class, McNabb chastised this student then asked the student to go to the hallway. There, she discussed the misbehavior with the student. The student became emotional during the discussion and began to cry. Through the interaction with McNabb, the student decided it was best that she move to another seat. When asked if McNabb believed the intervention would have a lasting effect on the student's behavior, McNabb responded, "I don't know whether it will or not, probably not" (7CT – Int 2, ¶49).

McNabb believed in the use of a variety of punitive actions to redirect students who misbehaved in her classroom. She used a terse look to signal students of their misbehavior and "fussed" at students when they misbehaved. She also used written punishment, but had little faith in the effectiveness of written punishments. This was because she could not trust students with written punishments because they would have friends or siblings do the punishment for them. When students refused to comply with rules, she sent them to the hall to isolate them from their friends.

McNabb used therapeutic means to address student misbehavior. She had many one-on-one discussions with students where she asked why students misbehaved. During

these discussions, she believed in explaining the relationship between freedom and responsibility. The NBCT claimed she observed many of these one-on-one conversations and believed McNabb overused the technique. McNabb would cross student emotional boundaries, which resulted in students crying over minor problems. The way McNabb used one-on-one discussion in the hallway was more punitive than therapeutic. The NBCT stated that there was a significant loss of instructional time because of what she described as “overkill” when McNabb encountered minor problems in her classroom. In addition to the one-on-one conversation, McNabb also used modeling, praise and student self-correction as therapeutic ways of correcting student misbehavior.

McNabb believed her strengths in discipline included being fair and building trust with students. She recognized student attempts to annoy her and was able to avoid confrontation in these situations. Her inflexibility with some rules was a weakness. She recommended that new teachers (a) be flexible with some rules and inflexible with the major rules (b) understand that they do not have to explain rules that student should know from common sense, and (c) have an expectation that the administration would back your discipline choices.

In sum, McNabb stated beliefs about discipline that were humanistic. The use of interaction to address disciplinary issues in the classroom would certainly be a humanistic trait. Her core beliefs, however, were custodial. She described students using judgmental terms such as good and bad. She blamed parents for student misbehavior and perceived student misbehavior as student personal affronts. Her use of guilt and shame are custodial traits. She used judgmental terms such as “the good kids” or “the smarter kids” and perceived misbehavior as a personal affront. Though she used discussion with students to

address student misbehavior, her lack of boundaries with students made these discussions more of a punishment than a humanistic intervention. The expectation that the administration should back teacher discipline decisions suggests that she would make use of the office referral system. Office referral documents confirmed this; there will be further discussion of office referrals in the section addressing Research Question Two. The next section describes McNabb's instructional beliefs.

Instruction. McNabb perceived herself as the informational authority in her classroom. She took on the responsibility of finding out student interests and addressing these interests with related subject matter rather than letting the students find the information on their own. In addition, she had stories of the life of her mother that she would often share with her students. Her connection with her mother, who she stated was a famous anthropologist, would be interesting to students. It was her way of giving her lessons a personal touch:

I try to put a lot of personal, my own personal knowledge in an area, what I can add. Like when we study the Amazon. My mother took a trip down the Amazon in a dug out canoe to a head-hunter's village, really and truly. And she came back with a blowgun and darts and quills. It's now in the LSU Shreveport's archeological showcase that she donated after so many years of hauling it around. (7CT – Int 3, ¶36)

The source of instructional choices for McNabb was the Kentucky Core content. She did not believe, however, that the core content accountability test is a true measure of student progress. She relied on textbooks and commercial teacher resources for sources of curricular content and ideas for instructional delivery. She served on the Reading textbook selection committee. She praised the committee for their final choice, "It is outstanding. It is outstanding. There will be no excuse. It flows. It is so computer friendly. It does everything but talk for you!" (7CT – Int 2, ¶72). The number of

commercial products and resources in her classroom affirms her faith in commercial teaching materials. She complained that the library does not have enough resources and that the books in the library are not challenging enough for our students.

McNabb believed it is best for her to do the talking in the classroom. She attempted to make connections between what happened in history and what is happening in the world today. What she called *class discussion* was really lecture followed by question and answer session (lecture and Q & A). She often used the overhead projector to assist with her lectures. She wrote examples on the overhead, which she explained while she expected students to copy and follow the discussion. She asked knowledge questions or created incomplete examples that she expected students to know or complete based on her lecture. She stated that she often used commercially produced worksheets, workbooks, and activities to check for comprehension. She believed pop quizzes were effective for checking to see that students are studying.

McNabb rarely used small group activities. She would like to have done more, but she said that her room was too small and she has too many students to manage small group instruction effectively. She was not comfortable with the amount of noise that occurs during small group instruction. Consequently, she believed the conditions of her work and the core content forced her to teach primarily in large group settings. She used her large group settings to teach students what she believed would be on the core content test. She evaluated students with multiple choice tests and open response questions. In language arts, McNabb required students to finish the portfolio to pass her class.

McNabb strengths in instruction were her ability to relate her personal experience to her instruction, her years of experience teaching, and her knowledge base. Her

weaknesses were her ability to handle 30 students in a classroom, her reliance on facts, and her lack of variety such as offering students the opportunity to do outside projects. Her advice to new teachers included (a) be prepared with the knowledge of the subject (b) do not lose confidence if your lessons do not work, and (c) maintain discipline so that instruction can occur.

To summarize, there was conflict between what McNabb believed was best for students, and what she was capable of doing. In terms of teaching efficacy, she believed small group and intellectual interaction are best for student learning. She did not believe that she had the personal efficacy to use small group interaction effectively (see Gibson & Dembo, 1984). She was not comfortable with noise and she claimed her room was too small. While McNabb did not represent extreme custodialism in terms of instruction beliefs, she did have many custodial traits that would certainly tip the scales toward custodialism. Her personal knowledge was her teaching strength. She was the source of information, interest, and interaction in the classroom. She relied heavily on commercially produced resources for information and guidance for instruction and pedagogy. Her teacher behavior, described in the next section, confirmed her custodialism in terms of her behavior.

Teacher Classroom Behaviors

McNabb had beliefs that were both humanistic and custodial. Her teaching, on the other hand, was custodial. Students in this class wrote their portfolios for the CATS seventh grade writing assessment. She managed her class in ways that inhibited discussion and authentic student questioning. Her discipline was terse and at times, stifled students who were engaged in intellectual interaction. In regard to instruction, students

were left to learn by engaging with the material rather than with her or with one another. The following is a description of McNabb's classroom management, instruction, and discipline behaviors.

Classroom management. McNabb used CHAMPS in only one of the four observed lessons. In the other lessons, she communicated behavior expectations verbally. Raising hands was the norm for students who needed help with their work. On some occasions, she would reprimand students for not raising hands. On one occasion, she remarked sarcastically, "I didn't see your hand go up, but I do see you talking" (7CT – Obs 2, #2).

During three of the four observations, she divided the class into language arts instruction and portfolio groups. The language arts instruction group worked individually on a packet of handouts. She worked one-on-one with students who were having difficulty with the packets. When students were done with their packets, they put them in a basket for her to grade later. If students completed their work before the class time ended, they would read Accelerated Reader books (library books with tests that students used to earn points toward a grade) or work on homework from other classes. The other group went to the computer lab to type portfolios. This situation was necessary because there were only enough computers to accommodate about half of the students working on their portfolios during a class period.

During the final observation, McNabb actually taught a lesson. Students completed the portfolios by that time. She told the students that she was not going to start a new unit that day. She divided the class into three groups. One group was of students who were behind in their packets. They were given time to catch up. Another group read

the newspaper. The last group read Accelerated Readers. For about the first 40 minutes, students worked in their groups quietly. During this time, she allowed a few students to go to the library while she talked to another staff member in the hallway. With less than 20 minutes left in the period, she announced to the class that she was going to teach them about diagramming clauses. The impromptu lesson resulted in some incredulous remarks from students. After a few moments, the students became quiet and McNabb continued her lesson.

Discipline. McNabb used sarcasm and warnings of limiting privileges to control the behavior of her class. She also moved students away from each other. In one situation, two students were helping one another with their class work. McNabb, who at the time was engaged in a social conversation with a staff member standing just outside the hall, turned to tell the students to stop talking. One of the students protested, trying to explain that they had only been trying to help one another. McNabb explained that students must do their work without talking. The student rolled her eyes at McNabb. McNabb called the girl for a private conversation in the hallway. Upon returning, the other students teased the girl. She smiled at the teasing. Based on the reactions of the students, the researcher speculated the teasing was really sarcasm directed at McNabb, not sincere teasing (7CT – Obs 3, #1; 7CT – Obs 3, #6).

McNabb used shushing, raising her voice, and terse looks to quiet students when they became too loud for her comfort. Raising her voice led to escalation on three occasions during the four observations. On one occasion, she was able to de-escalate the situation by capitulating and moving on. During an incident when a student was sleeping,

however, the use of sarcasm and raised voice led to a verbal altercation. McNabb settled the situation with a note home to the parents of the students involved (7CT – Int 3, #6).

Instruction. McNabb used lecture and Q & A in three of the four observations. During the first observation, McNabb had no formal instruction. The principal put pressure on the Language Arts teachers to finish portfolios before spring break so that the school could address incomplete portfolios during the week when the students returned (the week prior to the final day that students could turn in their completed portfolios). During this observation, students who finished their portfolios worked on earning Accelerated Reader points or did work from other classes. The remaining students worked on their portfolios independently. The next two observations were similar to the first. During these observations, students edited their portfolios to prepare for the writing assessment. McNabb used lecture and Q & A during the next two observations. The Q & A consisted teacher contrived knowledge level questions, student responses, and *right* and *wrong* evaluations of the responses. She followed these lessons with worksheets that the students started in class. During the last observation, as mentioned above, she did an impromptu lesson with less than 20 minutes left in the class. She used the overhead projector to diagram sentences. She lectured as she did an example on the overhead. She gave the students a handout with sentences to diagram. There was no time to discuss the handout. The class ended and students left with their worksheets.

Table 9 shows the Activity Types during the four classroom observations in McNabb's room. In four classroom observations, there were only nine (4%) observation intervals when there was instructional interaction. There were 17 (7%) observation events with no activity and 69 (29%) observation intervals of students not attending to tasks.

During the first observation, McNabb spent approximately 30 minutes in one-on-one interaction with a student. This student was not the student selected as one of the six for this observation. Had he been, the researcher would have observed instructional interaction for 6% of the class time for the students he observed. McNabb managed her classroom. She gave students work packets to do and students worked on their packets quietly.

Table 9

Seventh Grade Custodial COS Activity Types

7C Activity Types	Obs 1	Obs 2	Obs 3	Obs 4	Total	Percent
1. Working on written assignments	9	18	23	3	53	22.08%
2. Interaction - Instructional	5	0	3	1	9	3.75%
3. Interaction - Social	0	0	1	7	8	3.33%
4. Watching or listening	2	8	2	6	18	7.50%
5. Reading	9	4	1	19	33	13.75%
6. Getting/returning materials	2	0	3	2	7	2.92%
7. Painting, drawing, creating graphics, etc.	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
8. Working with technology	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
9. Working with manipulatives/equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
10. Viewing video/slides	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
11. Playing games	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
12. Presenting/acting	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
13. Tutoring Peers	0	4	0	0	4	1.67%
14. Not attending to task	21	18	16	14	69	28.75%
15. No activity/transition	0	5	8	4	17	7.08%
16. Other	12	3	3	4	22	9.17%
Totals	60	60	60	60	240	100.00%

Table 10 shows the COS setting data from the four classroom observations in McNabb's room. The classroom setting data supported the claim that there was little

instruction in this class. During four classroom observations, there were no observation intervals of small group instruction or students working in pairs. There were 65 (27%)

Table 10

Seventh Grade COS Custodial Setting

7C Setting	Obs 1	Obs 2	Obs 3	Obs 4	Total	Percent
1. Whole Class	0	21	24	20	65	27.08%
2. Small Group	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
3. Pairs	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
4. Individuals	60	39	36	40	175	72.92%
Totals	60	60	60	60	240	100.00%

observation intervals of whole class instruction. Students worked independently during 175 (73%) observation intervals. The COS data and observation notes showed very little instruction occurred in the class. The teacher gave short lectures and students worked independently. The data from observations and student interviews showed when instruction is inadequate, students made choices among taking the responsibility to learn without adequate instruction, get help from others, mindlessly complete assignments, or not complete assignments.

To summarize, McNabb's teaching behaviors conflicted with her beliefs. Despite McNabb's claims of humanistic beliefs, her teacher behaviors were custodial. She managed her class by providing a quiet work environment and ample work to keep students busy rather than promoting student interaction. The goal of her discipline was to keep students quite. At times, she stifled students who were learning from one another. Her pattern of instructional behavior was to give short lectures using the overhead, provide worksheets for students, then to allow students individual time to work on their

assignments quietly by themselves. These behaviors contributed to a climate that bored students and suppressed student opportunities for learning. The next section addresses the classroom climate in McNabb's classroom.

Classroom Climate

McNabb kept her room in order. The first impression walking into her room was neatness. Order described the interaction in her classroom. McNabb stated that she was not comfortable with noise. This was obvious during the four classroom observations of her classroom. She stifled the student communication and intellectual interaction in favor of a quiet classroom. The climate in McNabb's classroom was a reflection of her beliefs and behaviors.

Physical climate. McNabb arranged the tables in four neat rows with two students seated at each table. There were two center rows situated close together forming isles between the first and second and the third and fourth rows. There was not enough space for students to walk between the second and third rows. All desks faced the front of the room. There were cabinets across the back wall of the classroom. There were bulletin boards and bookshelves across the walls on one side of the room. The other side was a blank wall that McNabb decorated with commercial and teacher made displays. There was a small bulletin board and a blackboard across the front of the room (see Figure 6). McNabb decorated her room with commercially prepared displays and neatly printed teacher-made signs. There were displays of vocabulary words from social studies and language arts. On one bulletin board was a world map. Beside that bulletin board was a commercially prepared bulletin board kit titled "Writing as a Process." Along the opposite wall were wall informational displays about portfolio writing including

organization of writing pieces, voice, and word choice. District prepared posters related to portfolio writing covered part of the blackboard in the front of the room. There were teacher-made displays of reading concepts on the doors of the cabinets in the back of the room. There were caricatures of insects and monster-like creatures displayed with each of the teacher-made signs. These caricatures had fingers that pointed to the signs and cartoon bubbles that read “cool” and “awesome.”

Figure 6. Seventh Grade Custodial Room Arrangement

Motivation. The two students who interviewed for this study had marked differences in their opinions of the climate in McNabb's classroom. One student described the class as boring. When asked, "Do you look forward to going to this class?" she replied, "No, not really, she does lecture a lot" (7C1 – Int 2, ¶4). In reference to the stories that McNabb tells about her family, she said, "Sometimes she tells us stories that she has that like has to do with our lesson or something. She has something going on in her family that has to do with what we're learning" (7C1 – Int 2, ¶7). The other student in the study said that he likes to go to class because, "sometimes she lets us read and get other stuff done in other classes while she does other stuff. If we get done with our work, she lets us do work for other classes" (7C2 – Int 2, ¶19). Both students agreed that the work in the class lacked rigor. One student said, "We get real easy worksheets like we did in elementary school I think won't help me when I go to higher grades" (7C1 – Int 3, ¶30). The other stated, "It's kind of easy" (7C2 – Int 3, ¶30). The former was concerned about coping with greater challenges in high school while the latter was pleased that he could complete his tasks with little effort.

Both students said that they felt comfortable in McNabb's classroom. One student believed McNabb was genuinely helpful and nice. The other said that McNabb looks at him and smiled when he told her about his life. He was not comfortable with other students in the room. He did not think that some of the students showed appropriate respect for McNabb. "They usually don't do anything. They don't even ask questions or tell her the stuff they did over the weekend or anything" (7C2 – Int 2, ¶31). Both students agreed that there is a divided climate in the classroom. There were students who did not engage in the class because they did not like McNabb. One student participant was

concerned about the lack of respect that they showed their teacher. The other believed the lack of respect was a natural consequence of the boredom that students suffered in class.

Communication climate. When there was instruction in the classroom, the communication pattern in McNabb's class flowed primarily from teacher to student. McNabb's primary pedagogical choice was to create a work packet for students or to use lecture and Q & A. Students rarely had the opportunity to interact with each other. When asked what ways she learns from her peers in the classroom, one student responded, "I kind of don't that much. I mostly [understand] everything that she gives us" (7C1 – Int 2, ¶14). The other said that he got help from peers informally and that a student helping another student was not a part of formal instruction in McNabb's class. Though intellectual interaction was not encouraged among students, McNabb did interact socially with students by listening to their stories about their lives at home and valued their social. This was not the case with their intellectual input in the class.

Both student participants from McNabb's class stated that they did work in pairs for one project during the year. The project was enjoyable and that they had learned from working with their peers. McNabb did not think the room was large enough nor could she handle the noise of group work. Consequently, the pedagogical choice that was most interesting and successful for students occurred in her class only one time during the year.

In summary, McNabb created a rigid climate in her class. Her room was orderly with no evidence of student work displayed on the walls. One student described her class as boring while the other liked going to her class because if he finished his work quickly, he could start on his homework from other classes. McNabb used her management to

suppress intellectual interaction in her classroom. Students who were helping one another with their work were told to stop talking. McNabb ignored students who were able to sit quietly unengaged. Because of this, the experience from the student point-of-view was varied in relation to their abilities to learn on their own or remain anonymous in the classroom. Students learned how to avoid the embarrassment being chastised in front of their peers. The climate for the student depended on their emotional or motivational relationship with McNabb. The next section addresses student engagement in McNabb's class.

Student Engagement

It was no surprise that the COS data for interaction (see Table 11) showed an inordinate amount of no interaction/independence. Nearly two-thirds (150 observation

Table 11

Seventh Grade Custodial COS Interaction

7C Interaction	Obs 1	Obs 2	Obs 3	Obs 4	Total	Percent
1 None/independent	50	30	34	36	150	62.50%
2 Teacher instruction	5	16	18	14	53	22.08%
3 Teacher managerial	2	9	7	4	22	9.17%
4 Teacher social	0	1	0	1	2	0.83%
5 Support staff	1	0	0	0	1	0.42%
6 Student instructional	1	1	0	0	2	0.83%
7 Student Social	1	3	1	5	10	4.17%
8 Other	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
Totals	60	60	60	60	240	100.00%

intervals, 63%) of the observation intervals were of students working independently, not interacting with their peers. There were 53 (22%) observation intervals when there was teacher instructional interaction and 22 (9%) observation intervals when the teacher was

managing her classroom. Students interacted socially during 10 (4%) observation intervals and interacted as part of the instruction during only 2 (1%) observation intervals. This means that students interacted most the time with the materials, not with other people. The person-to-person interaction was one-way, teacher to student. Most of the time, however, the classroom was void of any verbal interaction. It was quiet in McNabb's room.

Table 12 shows the COS manner data from the four classroom observations in McNabb's classroom. During 118 (49%) observation intervals, students were on task.

Table 12

Seventh Grade Custodial COS Manner

7C Manner	Obs 1	Obs 2	Obs 3	Obs 4	Total	Percent
1. On Task	27	32	28	31	118	49.17%
2. Waiting for Teacher	4	2	6	5	17	7.08%
3. Distracted	18	23	19	20	80	33.33%
4. Disruptive	3	0	0	0	3	1.25%
5. Other	8	3	7	4	22	9.17%
Totals	60	60	60	60	240	100.00%

This is less than half of the time. Students were distracted during 80 (33%) observation intervals. Students were not engaged in learning in McNabb's classroom. They finished their work early or filed their worksheets to take with them for homework. There were few disruptions (3 observation intervals, 1%); however, there were 17 (7%) observation intervals where students were waiting for the teacher to begin instruction.

Summary of student engagement. McNabb was teacher-centered in her beliefs and behaviors. Because of this, she did not allow students to interact freely in her classroom.

Her classroom was neat, tidy, and quiet and therefore, void of the intellectual interaction required for quality instruction. During the four classroom observations, there was no evidence of formative feedback to student work. Students engaged with their worksheets, not with one another and not with McNabb. When students engaged one another in intellectual interaction, McNabb chastised them for their misbehavior. The next section addresses the seventh grade humanistic teacher for this study.

Ms. Warren, Seventh Grade Humanistic Portrait

Ms. Warren was a 25-year veteran of middle school teaching. She has her Bachelor's degree from a regional Kentucky university and her Master's degree from a nearby urban college. When Warren graduated from high school, her father gave her a choice between work and college. She chose to become a teacher after working in a daycare and volunteering to work with struggling elementary school students. She recalled that she struggled as a student in elementary school because of her hyperactivity as a child.

I would have been the first child on Ritalin back then. I couldn't keep still; I couldn't stop talking. I wasn't bad. I was just me. I had a lot of energy and teachers didn't understand that. I always got marked down on conduct. It wasn't until I was in the fifth grade that I got a teacher that realized that [Warren] could only do this in the morning and in the afternoon, she's got to get up and move around. She would stack everything up and I was the "gopher" (go-for). I would go all over the school and run errands and I had a great fifth grade. (7HT – Int 1, ¶44)

Warren's experience with her fifth grade teacher helped her to identify her personal struggles. As a teacher, she identified best with the students who were as she was in elementary school. The researcher chose a class that Warren described as "average" to include in the study.

Beliefs

Warren was an interesting mix of humanistic and custodial beliefs. Her management and instruction beliefs were humanistic. On one hand, she was a very strict disciplinarian. On the other, she made it a point to make sure that students learn to behave in social situation so they can thrive in their adult lives. The sections below address the specifics of Warren's classroom management, discipline, and instructional beliefs.

Classroom management. The purpose of management for Warren was to achieve class goals. Students need a consistent learning environment so that they know what to expect. She also recognized that students this age are restless.

I understand you cannot sit still, be quiet, and on task all the time. I'm consistent with the things I need to be consistent with and I'm flexible with the things I need to be flexible with and as bizarre as it seems, that's my strength, I'm not sure that made sense. . . .The kids all know where I stand on certain things. (7HT – Int 3, ¶11)

Warren did not expect students to sit still and be quiet. She expected students to move about and work in ways that do not interfere with learning.

Warren started each class by identifying the materials that each student will need for the class:

The kid for middle school, if it's not consistent, and if everybody isn't doing the same thing, then you lose them. That's why I want all that crap off their tables, because they will play and fiddle and I lose them. I start my day off the same way every single period, even reading or science. This is what you need on your desk, everything off and we take it from there. That's just me. But I'm consistent, and that's what those kids need from me, consistence. (7HT – Int 1, ¶34)

Warren allowed students to move to where they are comfortable or where they can see well. She allowed students to sit on the floor to get a better view of the overhead projector. Warren used a sense of humor when addressing classroom management. She

acknowledged that on rare occasions, her class gets out-of-hand for a brief time. Yet she still defended her management style saying, “Maybe in some people’s eyes, I’m not as serious as I should be. But I also just do what I think is best for the kids” (7HT – Int 3, ¶14). Warren Modeled expected behavior. She established trust with students to enhance her ability to manage the students in her classroom.

Warren allowed her students to chime in during class discussions and lectures. She allowed students to move, as long as the movement was at appropriate times when there would be minimal disruption. During small group instruction, she allowed students to talk so long as the talking was on task and did not disrupt the other students. She allowed movement and noise provided that the students stayed on task. During student presentations, she expected students to refrain from private conversations. She required students to direct questions to the presenters, not to her. She did not allow movement during student presentations and she wanted the noise to come only from the presenters or from students asking questions.

The sources of Warren’s management style were her experiences as a student (see above), her teaching peers, and the school counselor. She was confident in her own management efficacy but lacked confidence in the administration to support or advise her in issues related to classroom management. Her strengths in classroom management were her consistency, flexibility, and her judgment. Her weakness was that she did not use CHAMPS, a program that was supposed to be school-wide. She said that CHAMPS was not natural for her and that students would know immediately if her interactions with them seemed contrived. Her advice for new teachers was to be consistent with the important things, flexible with the unimportant things, and to have a sense of humor.

Though Warren controlled the materials that students had on their desks when they started class, she was not custodial in her management beliefs. She allowed students to move to where they would be comfortable in the classroom. She allowed students to sit on the floor if they needed. Her goal for management was to provide a safe and comfortable environment for students to learn rather than to control student movement in a quiet environment. She established trust and used humor when managing her classroom. These are humanistic traits. Warren worked with socially and educationally difficult populations of students in the school. She recognized that these students needed visual cuing to start work. Having the right materials ready in this context was an issue of comfort, not control.

Discipline. Warren was at times, a harsh disciplinarian. The key to her discipline style, however, was that she explained to the students what they did wrong and why it was wrong. She also noted that she never held grudges. Once she was finished with her discipline, she addressed the confrontation. She said that she never walks away mad. She ends the discipline with a hug, and uses humor to make the students laugh.

Warren believed effective teachers were able to analyze the whole student including parents and home. Teachers must adjust discipline choices with various students based on their emotional states. She noted the number of students whose parents divorce during the middle school years. She described one student whose father became wheelchair bound.

This middle school child had to grow up fast. He had to push his father around in the small community where he lived. There are a couple of kids who remarked that we made their parents come in and we didn't make his parents come in. I don't think the kids realize how bad off things are at home for him. (7HT – Int 2, ¶46)

Warren's approach to discipline was holistic. She believed in stopping the behavior immediately and then talking students to help them understand their errors and to make better choices in the future.

Warren believed inconsistency with rules was frustrating to students. Students received mixed messages from home and from within the school. She did not always agree with the rules in the school; however, she enforced the rules consistently. She was loyal to the administration at the school. On the other hand, she perceived the administration as inconsistent with the rules, allowing some students to break rules while punishing others for the same violations. This frustrated Warren. She claimed the administrative inconsistency was grounded in fear. The administration did not have the leadership qualities to face parents who threatened to complain to the central office. She was unsure if the problem existed at the school or district level.

According to Warren, the difference between minor disruptions and major disruptions is the effect that it has on a classroom. She analyzed each situation and addressed misbehavior using her instincts rather than some set criteria. Warren used both punitive and therapeutic means to address student misbehavior. Warren believed sometimes it was necessary to be confrontational. Punitive disciplinary measures included verbal desists, sitting on the floor next to her, sending students to the hall, and calling parents. She mixed punitive and therapeutic discipline. When she sat students on the floor next to her, she called it "grounding" them. Humor was therapy. "I guarantee the child a good belly massage each day because laughing massages the internal organs" (7HT -- Int 3, ¶63). It was therapeutic to remove students from their audiences to talk to

them. It was important to propose questions to get students to think about their misbehavior and to develop proper replacement behaviors.

Warren was a tall woman and she believed towering over students helped her with her ability to handle students. She was confident in her ability to handle discipline issues. She said she was a strong disciplinarian because she used good judgment. She was consistent with the important disciplinary issues and flexible when the context allows her to be. She was supportive of the other teachers on her team. She could not think of any disciplinary weaknesses. Her advice for new teachers was to (a) discipline from the heart (holistically), (b) have a sense of humor, and (c) be consistent with the big things and flexible with the little things.

Despite Warren's confrontational style with discipline, she tipped the scales to the humanistic side of discipline. She believed in knowing the issues that influence student behavior. Though confrontational, she believed in making the confrontation a learning experience for the student. She taught the students why their behavior was wrong and how to make better behavior choices. After the confrontation, she believed it was important to deescalate the situation, make the child laugh, and give the child a hug. Though Warren was not an extreme example of humanism, she was more humanistic than custodial.

Instruction. Warren enjoyed the excitement she was able to create in her classroom. Her presentations were visual and she encouraged interaction. Students need visual instruction because children tend to believe what they can see. Once students see and interact about topics, they could then transfer knowledge independently when they write or respond to accountability assessments. She had transparencies that she used for

every unit that she taught. She used humor during instruction. “You got to laugh at some of the things those kids say or try to say. Teach visually, real life applications and with a sense of humor” (7HT – Int 3, ¶40). She said that she can tell if students are learning by watching their facial expressions. She evaluated student progress using a combination of student products and her judgment of student efforts and abilities. She believed interaction is better than student written tests for evaluating student progress.

Core content was the source of information in Warren’s class. It was not the source of her pedagogy. Warren used pretests to evaluate student knowledge of a topic before starting a unit of instruction. She then explored the textbook with the students:

What I do personally, when I start a new chapter or new topic, we walk through the chapter. We look at the pictures. We look at the headings. We whet our mouth as to what we are going to talk about and the kids in our loose conversation will say, “I know about this,” or “In someone’s class, we talked about this.” That kind of gives me an idea as to where I need to go. (7HT – Int 3, ¶22)

She then instinctually chose methods that she thought would best help students learn. Her salient teaching methods were visual aids and class discussions. She also searched for odd or interesting stories in print to spark student interest. She explained how she incorporates humor to spark student interest as well:

I’ll have the kids come up to the overhead and I give them the finger, my little plastic finger, they fight to get the finger, they all want Ms. Warren to give them the finger, “Oh can I have the finger, Ms. Warren?” (7HT – Int 3, ¶25)

Warren also believed that students learn when they interact. To facilitate this learning, Warren used small group instructions and student projects.

Warren was confident in her instructional efficacy. Her strength is her ability to work with the most challenging students in the school. She worked well with students

who have individual education plans for emotional or educational disorders. Her weakness was paperwork, including grading open response questions and putting grades in the computer database. She planned to teach more accountability test-taking skills next year. Her advice for new teachers was to teach visually, teach science in the real world, and to have a sense of humor.

In sum, Warren encouraged participation and input from students. Student prior knowledge was an important characteristic of Warren's instruction. Warren taught visually to help student understand the curriculum. Students learn best when they see and interact about subjects. As she did in her management and discipline, she infused humor in her instruction to hold student interest. These are all characteristics of humanism. Warren was clearly humanistic in the areas of management and instruction. She tipped the scales toward humanism in her beliefs about student discipline. The next section addresses Warren's classroom behaviors.

Teaching Behaviors

Warren's teaching behavior was consistent with her beliefs. She understated her use of varying pedagogies during each class period. She was an "entertainer" and usually the center of attention in the classroom. She was humorous in three of the four observations. Warren turned the class over to the students and did let students use "the finger" during two of the four lessons. Below are explanations and analyses of Warren's behaviors related to classroom management, discipline, and instruction.

Classroom management. As she stated in her beliefs, when class started in Ms. Warren's room, she told the students what materials to put on their desks. Students then moved around to get comfortable. She wrote the agenda on the board for students to copy

into their planners. Each class had a variety of activities. For example, during the first observation, the agenda included “Organizing, CATS talk, Discussion, Independent Work, Correct Work, Science World Magazine Article” (7HT – Obs 1, #1). During discussions, students blurted out answers without raising hands. Warren allowed spontaneous communication and the discussion flowed with interaction from teacher to student and student to teacher. During the first observation, students worked individually. They were not silent. Though the activity did not call for group work, students naturally formed groups within their tables and discussed answers with one another. The noise in the class increased. As the researcher surveyed the room, he noticed that the talk was on topic. Warren allowed the students to help one another.

Warren used visual and verbal cues to show transitions in activities. She dimmed the lights to alert the students that she would start using the overhead soon. During the third observation, she checked the clock and walked toward the door to alert students that one library group was due back and it was almost time for another group to leave. She used proximity and interaction to engage students who were not engaged. For example, she called on students whom she thought were not paying attention. During the third observation, she used instructional time to address a social skills issue. One student had misbehaved. This misbehavior escalated because other students in the class laughed at the student. Not wanting chaos in her room, Warren taught a mini-lesson on behavior science and the concept of positive reinforcement. She told the class that if they ignored the behavior, the student would stop misbehaving and get in less trouble (7HT – Obs 3, #1).

Warren obscured her management style. Her emphasis was on keeping the class flowing with instruction rather than spending time telling students what to do. Over time,

students learned Warren's boundaries and learned to use them to their advantage. Warren economized time by using time during group work to talk to students one-on-one about missing assignments. Students knew that when the lights dimmed, it was time for Warren to use the overhead projector. Students knew that they could move to places where they could see without a directive. When Warren gave a written assignment, students knew that they could get help from their friends. Warren had a high tolerance for noise. These are all humanistic traits. The next section addresses Warren's classroom discipline behaviors.

Discipline. During the four classroom observations, Warren addressed three incidents of overt misbehavior. In the first observation, one student came to class noticeably irritated. The boy postured in his chair, leaning back with his arms folded and a grimace on his face. His peers encouraged him to participate in the lesson. Warren interrupted, "He's having a bad day. Leave him alone." Later, she stood by the boy and whispered something in his ear. The look on her face was very serious. The boy laid his head down for several minutes, then rejoined the class activities (7HT – Obs 1, #2). During the second observation, a student attempted to make humorous comments about the discussion. When students did not laugh and after Warren asked him to stop, he continued to attempt humor. In a feigned motherly voice, Warren said, "Jimmy, honey, you need to know what 'stop' means" (7HT – Obs 2, #5). She smiled and the student stopped disrupting the class.

Warren showed her confrontational style in during the fourth observation. A boy came into the class with his pants sagging. Warren exclaimed, "Whoa Nellie!" and then commented that the crotch of his pants were between his knees. She was not smiling. Her

facial expression was very serious. The boy complied willingly to her unstated request within five seconds of her reprimand (7HT – Obs 4, #1).

Warren was humanistic with most of her disciplinary responses. In the three observations of disciplinary responses, Warren avoided confrontation in two of them. Warren believed she was capable of analyzing situations effectively and responding with the appropriate disciplinary measure. In these three observations, she demonstrated this. She saw that the child in the first observation was ready to explode emotionally and chose to allow him to cool down rather than confront it. In the second situation, she used humor to control a situation. In the final example, Warren chose confrontation. As she said in her beliefs, she towers over the students. Students do not intimidate her. She chose to be confrontational with this student and she guessed right. There were, however, no hugs after the confrontation. In approximately four hours of observations, Warren spent about four minutes engaged in disciplinary responses.

Instruction. Warren demonstrated her belief about making instruction visual with her classroom instructional behaviors. She used overheads, scholastic magazines, posters, maps, and student projects to interact with her class. She also stated that she believed students must to interact to learn. She allowed interaction in her classroom during individual, paired, small group, and whole class instruction. Warren was usually the center of attention when she spoke in her classroom. She used humor and dramatics during her instruction. During the first classroom observation, when a student used a vocabulary word they had recently learned, Warren exclaimed, “Oh baby! He used the vocab!” (7HT – Obs 1, #1) Students copied her behavior using similar exclamatory outcries when they learned.

Warren used primarily whole group instruction. She also used small group, paired, and individual work. Her lighthouse project included cross-curricular activities. Students learned about oceans, wind, light waves, and wave motion. They also learned geography when they located various lighthouses on maps. They learned about the arts and humanities when they constructed lighthouses from household materials. They learned language arts when they wrote poetry about their lighthouses. Students reported their projects to the class. They showed a picture of the actual lighthouse they chose and their model replicas. They shared information about the actual lighthouse. They then explained how they constructed their model. When students did not know what to say, Warren asked guiding questions to help them through the oral presentations. During a student interview, one boy said that he loved doing his lighthouse because he did it with his uncle and his grandfather (7H1 – Int 3, ¶18).

The COS revealed further that Warren was an “entertainer” in her classroom. Table 13 shows the Activity Types that Warren used during the four classroom observations. During 92 (38%) of 240 observation intervals, students watched and listened to Warren or to their peer presentations. Instructional interaction occurred during 56 (23%) observation intervals. Students worked on written assignments during 42 (18%) observation intervals. Warren allowed students to interact during the time they worked on written assignments. The COS requires the observer to pick the salient activity for

coding. If a student wrote for 16 or more seconds during the 30-second interval, then the observer coded the interval as working on a written assignment.

Table 13

Seventh Grade Humanistic COS Activity Types

7H Activity Types	Obs 1	Obs 2	Obs 3	Obs 4	Total	Percent
1. Working on written assignments	16	0	16	10	42	17.50%
2. Interaction - Instructional	14	8	8	26	56	23.33%
3. Interaction - Social	2	0	0	1	3	1.25%
4. Watching or listening	16	45	13	18	92	38.33%
5. Reading	4	1	10	1	16	6.67%
6. Getting/returning materials	1	1	4	2	8	3.33%
7. Painting, drawing, creating graphics, etc.	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
8. Working with technology	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
9. Working with manipulatives/equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
10. Viewing video/slides	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
11. Playing games	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
12. Presenting/acting	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
13. Tutoring Peers	0	0	0	1	1	0.42%
14. Not attending to task	0	3	3	0	6	2.50%
15. No activity/transition	7	1	2	1	11	4.58%
16. Other	0	1	4	0	5	2.08%
Totals	60	60	60	60	240	100.00%

Table 14 shows the Setting that occurred during the four classroom observations in Warren's class. As expected, there were 151 (63%) observation events when there was

Table 14

Seventh Grade Humanistic COS Setting

7H Setting	Obs 1	Obs 2	Obs 3	Obs 4	Total	Percent
1. Whole Class	38	60	31	22	151	62.92%
2. Small Group	0	0	0	4	4	1.67%
3. Pairs	0	0	1	30	31	12.92%
4. Individuals	22	0	28	4	54	22.50%
Total	60	60	60	60	240	100.00%

Warren tipped the scales toward the humanistic in her approach to classroom instruction. She was the center of attention in her classroom, yet she was an entertainer. The students joined in conversation with her. Her control of the materials that students placed on their desks was a cue for students, especially those with special needs, to get organized and get started. She claimed that when students started playing with superfluous materials on their desks, she would lose them. Her work with difficult populations in the school and with students with attention deficit disorders likely influenced her perceptions of students' ability to organize on their own. Regardless, her room was interactive. The next section addresses the climate associated with Warren's interactive classroom.

In sum, Warren's behaviors aligned well with her beliefs. She allowed students to manage their own movement so that they could accommodate their own learning. Students interacted in her classroom, taking turns during natural pauses in conversation. She made her instruction visual and engaged the students in interesting and humorous instruction. She allowed students to present to their peers and helped students present who were uncomfortable talking in front of a crowd.

Classroom Climate

Warren's classroom was exciting and interactive. The climate in Warren's classroom was consistent with her beliefs and behaviors. The next sections address the physical, motivation, and communication climates in Warren's classroom.

Physical climate. Warren was in a science lab with cabinets for storage of science supplies. She filled countertops and space above the cabinets with student projects, mostly lighthouses from present and past students. There were sand and shell specimens

that students brought back from family vacations on a shelf on one side of the room. Students wrote their names, places, and dates of the specimen collections on the containers. Along side these specimens was a human torso and head model wearing a Rolling Hills Middle School t-shirt. A combination blackboard and bulletin board spanned the front wall of the classroom. Warren displayed school pictures of students, fellow teachers, and her son on the bulletin board. Many of the pictures were of students she taught during previous years. Her calendar was on this board. Several strings of plastic beads hanged from the pushpin that held up the calendar. Warren displayed several greeting cards and comic strips on this bulletin board as well.

Warren arranged the tables in her classroom to face the front. The configuration of the desks was similar to that of a theater which was consistent with Warren's personality. There was a center isle with four sets of 2 desks on either side (See Figure 7). This configuration allowed students to interact in whole class settings. There were two students at each table, which accommodated pair work. During group work, the two groups of two students moved their chairs around two adjoining tables to facilitate small group interaction.

Figure 7. Seventh Grade Humanistic Room Arrangement

Motivation climate. Students in Warren’s room confirmed that the climate in her classroom was fun. One student commented that she looks forward to going to Warren’s class, “because she’s funny . . . and she’s hands-on. She knows what you’re about to ask and she’ll just say it . . . She’ll put up overheads and that helps me understand a little bit more” (7H1 – Int 2, ¶4). The students described Warren as fun, energetic, humorous, and interesting. She kept her instruction interesting, according to one student:

She keeps you guessing. One day, you might do something fun. The next day you might read in the textbook. The next day you might do overheads. You might do a science related movie. You might do worksheets and stuff like that. . . .You never know what she's going to say. (7H2 – Int 3, ¶7)

Both students said that Warren is almost never boring. She kept her classes interesting because she entertained the students. She found unique ways to teach such as using the Kenny Chesnic song “She Thinks My Tractor’s Sexy” to teach the “water cycle” (7H2 – Int 2, ¶34).

Student participants claimed most of the time, students listened to Warren, but there were times that students did not pay attention during class. They did not attribute this to a group of students who did not like Warren. One student remarked that some students occupied themselves with other things. As was the case in the sixth grade humanistic class, there was no indication that there was a divided climate in the classroom because there were no emotions attached to the inattention. Students attributed the inattention in this class to the lack of attention span of those students who were not paying attention.

Communication climate. Students had a voice in Warren’s room. One student participant claimed the students contribute as much as 50% of the interaction that occurs in class. Warren perceived being quiet as a problem. When students were too quiet, she would talk to them to find out what was wrong or to try to include them in the discussion. Both student participants said that they learned from and helped other students in Warren’s class. “I would help them out by showing them and talking to them and explaining what we did” (7H1 – Int 3, ¶27). Warren praised students for the contributions that they made to the interaction of the class. Mistakes were opportunities to laugh in Warren’s class. She laughed with her students at their mistakes and her own. Though

Warren’s students perceived her as an “entertainer” they also believed they had an authentic voice in her classroom.

In sum, Warren created a climate in her classroom that encouraged interaction and learning in comfortable surroundings. At first blush, Warren’s room arrangement resembled those one would expect in a custodial classroom. In this case, it was how Warren used the room furnishings rather than the actual arrangement that defined her physical climate. Students moved about the room to get to places where they could see. Students sat four to a table and worked in table groups as well. Students enjoyed Warren’s class because she was unpredictable and funny. She was an entertainer in her classroom. Students were also allowed to interact in Warren’s classroom. Students learned from Warren and from one another.

Student Engagement

Table 15 shows the COS Interaction data for the four classroom observations in Warren’s classroom. In 128 (53%) observation intervals, Warren was interacting with her

Table 15

Seventh Grade Humanistic COS Interactions

7H Interaction	Obs 1	Obs 2	Obs 3	Obs 4	Total	Percent
1 None/independent	23	1	26	7	57	23.75%
2 Teacher instruction	25	54	28	21	128	53.33%
3 Teacher managerial	10	1	5	8	24	10.00%
4 Teacher social	0	0	0	2	2	0.83%
5 Support staff	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
6 Student instructional	1	4	1	22	28	11.67%
7 Student Social	1	0	0	0	1	0.42%
8 Other	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
Totals	60	60	60	60	240	100.00%

students in instructional activities. This is consistent with her being an entertainer in her classroom. In 57 (23%) of the observation intervals, students were working independently. Students engaged other students in instructional interaction in 28 (12%) observational intervals. Warren managed her classroom in 24 (10%) of the observation intervals. There were very few instances of social interaction, indicating that Warren maximized the instructional time in her classroom.

Table 16 shows the COS Manner data for the four classroom observations in Warren's classroom. Students were on task during 223 (93%) of the 240 observation intervals. Students waited for the teacher during 5 (2%) observation intervals. Students were distracted during 7 (3%) of the observation intervals. This indicates that Ms. Warren

Table 16

Seventh Grade Custodial COS Manner

7H Manner	Obs 1	Obs 2	Obs 3	Obs 4	Total	Percent
1. On Task	57	55	52	59	223	92.92%
2. Waiting for Teacher	3	1	1	0	5	2.08%
3. Distracted	0	4	3	0	7	2.92%
4. Disruptive	0	0	4	0	4	1.67%
5. Other	0	0	0	1	1	0.42%
Totals	60	60	60	60	240	100.00%

was able to engage her students and keep them focused on the instruction in her classroom.

Student engagement summary. The COS Interaction and Manner data show that students were engaged with the instruction in Warren's class. Students enjoyed her class. Students looked forward to her stories and they perceived her instruction to be effective.

Students had a voice in Warren's class. Warren allowed students to interject their own thoughts and questions in an authentic communication environment. The next section is an analysis of the two seventh grade cases. The next section addresses the eighth grade custodial teacher.

Mr. Carroll, Eighth Grade Custodial Portrait

Mr. Carroll was a 26-year veteran teacher and football coach. He was with Rolling Hills prior to the time when the school moved from its former location in a building prone to flooding to where the building stood at the time of the study. Carroll became interested in teaching when he heard his seventh grade teacher talk about teaching and coaching. He coached basketball and track at the middle school level and coached football for the area high school football team. At the time of the study, he had resigned from coaching basketball and track. His master's degree was in elementary education with emphases in Social Studies and Reading. For his first 13 years, Carroll taught at the sixth grade level. Since that time, he has taught seventh and eighth grades. Carroll was proud of his reputation for being the teacher that others looked to when students were out of control in their classrooms.

Beliefs

Carroll had a no nonsense approach to teaching. During his four interviews, two recurring themes were fair treatment and traditional teaching. He believed that children should treat him the way he treats children. He often referred to his experience as a student to validate his beliefs as a teacher. The next sections address Carroll's classroom management, discipline, and instructional beliefs.

Classroom management. When stating his beliefs, Carroll often used the phrase, “I’m a firm believer” (see e.g., 8CT – Int 1, ¶25, ¶44, ¶55, and ¶64.). He did not attempt to differentiate the terms discipline and management. He firmly believed in rigid control of the behavior and movement of the students in his classroom. The key to discipline was to keep students busy and that the ability to conduct school depended on teacher ability to keep control of the classroom. According to Carroll, students took advantage of nice teachers. Carroll commented on teachers who capitulate in the area of classroom management:

Sometimes we think of it as being nice, well we’re going to cut them some slack. But what we don’t understand is that many of these children that they mistake niceness for weakness. If you don’t follow up consequentially with actions, especially the actions you said you would employ, they assume you can’t. Then you’ve lost it. (6CT – Int 1, ¶6)

To keep students from taking advantage of him, Carroll stated clear and rigid expectations that were consistent for every student. “I firmly believe that there has to be structure in the classroom that the kids understand on a day-to-day basis. . . . I think there has to be consistency” (8CT – Int 1, ¶32).

To manage a safe classroom, Carroll believed teachers must keep students busy. Students had short attention spans. To keep them in line, teachers should have 3 to 4 different activities during every class. Students should come to class with good manners. To teach students to meet his expectations, it was important to model good manners. He expected students to (a) treat him the same way he treats his students and (b) behave the way they would in church. While he recognized that management changed among various contexts, it was important to treat all students consistently within the varying contexts. All teachers should learn safe physical management of students because regular

education teachers dealt with behavior-disordered students (to subdue a student who is out-of-control).

The sources of Carroll's beliefs about classroom management were a former principal, observations of orderly classrooms, and his experiences raising his own children. His strengths were communicating expectations, honesty with students, and fairness. His primary weakness was that he had personality conflicts with some of his students. His advice to new teachers was to be fair, set the rules, and give students an opportunity to respond in ways that are acceptable in the classroom context. He was confident in his personal management efficacy. He was not confident in the organization to support his management choices. When he referred students to the office for refusing to comply with his management, the school administration did not respond strongly enough. He said that office referrals do not work because children do not fear them.

Carroll believed students should walk into his classroom, take their seats, and immediately start copying assignments written on the board in the front of his classroom. Every class should start with 10 minutes of copying and answering questions. He planned three to four activities and believed that these activities should be consistent so that they become routine. Students should get up only for emergencies and there was no such thing as, "emergency trash" (8CT – Int 1, ¶42). During discussions, students should remain quiet, raise their hands if they want to talk, and wait for him to call on them. When students did individual work, they should come to him for help. He admitted that there were some tense situations in his classrooms. When situations became tense in his room, the best action was to remove disruptive students from his classroom.

In sum, Carroll believed in strict control over his classroom. His strict control of student talk and student movement placed him on the custodial end of the pupil control ideology continuum with very little evidence of any humanistic characteristics. Three salient features of his management frame his beliefs (a) control of student movement (b) control of classroom interaction, and (c) regimentation of class procedures. His beliefs about classroom management overlapped with his beliefs about discipline.

Discipline. Carroll believed in strict and consistent discipline. He set high expectations for behavior and then stuck to them. Teachers are responsible for teaching students how to behave in social settings. Students would lie, deceive and pretend not to care if it served their purposes. He is the unquestioned authority of social behavior in his classroom:

If I asked a student to quit talking, and I still get that occasionally, you'll get the student that wants to tell you he wasn't talking. One of the things I try to point out to them is I'll remember the disagreement a whole lot longer than I'll remember you talking. If you just be quiet, if I correct you and I'm wrong I won't remember 30 seconds from now. But if I correct you and you turn it into a five minute argument, then I'm going to remember that. (8CT – Int 1, ¶51)

His sources of discipline beliefs were his grandfather, former teachers, and peers. His grandfather was the influence that he spoke of most. He believed in doing what worked on him:

My grandfather probably didn't get past the third grade. But he still taught me quite a bit as far as using tools and farmer and different things like that, not that I was a farmer, but when we talked about growing and planting and what time you did certain things, I remember him vividly telling me, "I'm not going to lie to you." And he told me one day that if I touch something, I can't remember now what it was, one of his tools, he was going to whip my rear end. And when I touched it, he said, "I won't lie to you," and he whipped my rear end. (8CT – Int 1, ¶51)

Carroll claimed that professional development was useless because the methods he learned were not natural for him. He said that students recognize when teachers are using contrived methods and misbehave. He believed he had to punish students in ways that were most commensurate with his personality.

Carroll claimed that he never let what a student become more important than what the class was doing and that he never let the punishment become more of a distraction than the original student offense. Punishment should not become more noticeable than offenses. Though Carroll admits that his classroom became tense when he punished students, he justified a strong response to student misbehavior with the belief of minimizing the time spent on discipline. If he made a strong statement at the onset of misbehavior, students would have a fear of repeating erroneous behaviors in the future. Mr. Carroll did not explain his perceptions of the balance between misbehavior and his response to misbehavior. It was clear, however, that he would act to prevent a student from being the center of attention in his classroom.

For Carroll, any disruption of instructional time was a major disruption. Irritating noises were minor disruptions. Effective punishments were ones that were inconvenient or took time from the student. He was consistent; if he repeated the same rationale to students often enough, eventually they would believe him. He was confident in his personal efficacy with discipline but not with the efficacy of the administration. He did not trust the administration to make sound decisions about discipline. Detention, in-school suspension, and office referrals became ineffective because of the inconsistency of the administration at the school. The administration was too easy on students. Students no longer feared the consequences of their misbehavior.

Carroll threatened students with punitive action and followed through with his threats. He emphasized the phrase, “I won’t lie to you” (8CT – Int 1, ¶59; 8CT – Int 4, ¶7). This meant that he was going to warn a student of misbehavior and that he was serious about what he would do if the student continued to misbehave. He admitted to being stubborn and loud. He stopped classes to address disruptions. He made general statements to the class reminding the students of the rules to warn students who were misbehaving. He believed in isolating students who were misbehaving. He was quick to take student property if the property was a source of disruptions, giving it back after at the end of class or at the end of the day. He removed students from class for one-on-one conversations. If that did not work, he would call parents. He did not use the office referral system often because he did not believe that it worked very well. His therapeutic approaches to discipline included talking to students, ignoring misbehavior (seeking self-correction), and explaining that compliance is easier than non-compliance. It was not appropriate to embarrass students. He did not believe that his actions to address student misbehavior were embarrassing for students.

In sum, Carroll was stern and inflexible with his disciplinary beliefs. Students behaved because they feared consequences. Students perceive nice teachers as weak. Carroll made a number of statements indicating that he did not trust students. He taught students that compliance is easier than non-compliance. These are characteristics of custodialism. He had few beliefs that were humanistic. He believed in talking to students about their misbehavior and in encouraging students to self-correct. When balancing his beliefs about discipline, however, Carroll was clearly custodial.

Instruction. There was overlap between Carroll's management and instructional beliefs. Carroll believed in keeping students busy. He believed one way to make sure students are paying attention is to call on them when they are not paying attention. According to Carroll, children had low attention spans. He acknowledged it was his job to keep students interested. On the other hand, "I'm not Big Bird. They have got to learn it's not entertainment. It's not a show. They have got to do something" (8CT – Int 1, ¶64). It was best to divide the day up into three to four activities. He preferred to teach using routine pedagogies so that students knew what to expect on a daily basis.

Carroll complained that the state accountability system had removed the teachable moment from instruction:

It's been a little tougher the last couple of years but that's because we've gone through some transition as far as, like I said earlier in the interview, we've moved away somewhat from what we're teaching, what we feel like we're supposed to teach as professionals to teaching what they've identified what we're to teach under a testing situation. We're trying to teach what we believe is going to be on the test and that's put everybody under a little bit more pressure and made it a little tougher to teach here. (8CT – Int 1, ¶17)

When students questioned him about information that was not in the Core Content, he alleged pressure to minimize the time spent on that content. Students do not do well on the CATS test not because of instruction, but because they have no consequences for not doing well. Students would only do well on standardized tests if they had external pressure or motivation to do well. He was incredulous about leaving information on the wall during testing, "I can remember in 1980 and 81 taking tests and covering stuff up on the walls, because I didn't want you cheating" (8CT – Int 1, ¶76).

Carroll was very traditional in his beliefs about the roles of teachers in the classroom. He was the source of information for the students in his class and he chose

how to teach students. He decided what to teach based on core content, textbooks, experience, and his knowledge of the topic. Teaching had not changed in the past 29 years and that the most effective use of his time was for him to talk and for students to listen. He believed his topic limited variety of pedagogy. “I think you can be a lot more hands on in science and a lot more hands on in math. Writing, which I’ve taught before, you’ve got to actually sit down and do the writing” (8CT – Int 1, ¶72). He admitted that he did not use hands-on pedagogies, but said that he might include a mock trial to teach American justice in his instruction in the future. The best way to evaluate student progress in his class was to test them. His tests usually included content recall, vocabulary, and open response.

Carroll was confident in his ability to teach. His strength was in his knowledge of his subject matter. His weakness was in his use of technology. He did not like to use technology for instruction nor did he appreciate the use of computers for time management, reporting of student grades, or communication. His advice for new teachers was to be prepared with knowledge and well written lesson plans and to check often for student comprehension.

Carroll claimed that his primary pedagogical choice was discussion. He was referring to sharing information and stories and then asking comprehension questions. This process is more commensurate with lecture and Q & A than it is with authentic discussion. He did allow students to ask questions and to state their opinions when it happened spontaneously in class. He did not plan for unprompted student input. Carroll believed it was the responsibility of the teacher to make connections between history, literature, and the real world.

Carroll recognized that having a mock trial was an effective means of teaching the American justice system. He also allowed students to write about colonies of their choice to create a colonial brochure. Despite having success using these two humanistic pedagogies, Carroll preferred to use teacher-centered pedagogies. His instructional behaviors kept students busy. Students interacted with work, not one other. The data confirmed that Carroll was custodial in his classroom management, discipline, and instructional beliefs. The next section addresses how these beliefs translated into classroom behaviors.

Carroll claimed he likes to plan for three to four activities and that these activities become a routine. This variety of pedagogies included bookwork, board work, handouts, and lecture. He expected students to take notes based on his lectures. He said that he taught vocabulary by assigning words for students to look up, find definitions, and use in sentences. The CATS accountability system required students to submit writing samples from the content areas. Consequently, Carroll assigned a colony brochure. Students selected a colony and use the book, handouts, and information from the library to create an informational brochure for tourists.

In sum, Carroll was a firm believer in strict classroom management and discipline. His purpose for classroom management was to keep students in their seats and quiet. He perceived student misbehavior as a personal affront and he responded strongly at the risk of escalation. His instructional role was to speak and it was the students' role was to listen. These are all custodial beliefs. The next section addresses the teacher classroom behaviors that emerged from these beliefs.

Teacher Classroom Behaviors

Carroll's behaviors were a reflection of his beliefs. He was the center of classroom attention and his students either complied or faced confrontation. The message he sent through his behavior was compliance. Students responded with compliance overall. He talked and students listened. The sections below address Carroll's classroom behaviors in the areas of management, discipline, and instruction.

Management. The word that best described Carroll's management behavior was "routine." In the four observations, Carroll used the same basic routine with only one difference during one observation. Students walked into the classroom, copied information in their planners and copied vocabulary and recall questions in their binders. The work they copied became their homework. Students worked silently on their vocabulary words while slower students continued to copy and he checked roll. He then circulated, occasionally asking for a show of hands of who had not completed the writing. When most or all of the students finished, the class traded papers to grade work from the previous day. Then, he assigned pages to read silently and a worksheet to answer while the students read. After about 15 minutes, he stopped the class. The worksheet became homework for those students who did not finish. Then, he lectured. During three of the four lessons, he called on students to read aloud from the book. During the lesson when he departed from this routine, he showed students a picture and directed them to respond to a prompt about the picture. He asked knowledge questions related to the reading. Students raised hands to respond. When the lecture and Q & A were done, there was a short time at the end of class for students to start working. Students who finished early read their Accelerated Reader books.

During the first observation, there were two situations when Carroll used sarcasm to address students who were off-task. On one occasion, he asked a student if there was a reason he was not doing his work. The student responded, “I am” (8CT – Obs 1, #2). This interaction had the potential for escalation. Carroll stared at the boy with a stern look on his face. The boy resumed his work. Later, one student asked if they were required to copy entire questions or if they could just write answers. Another student had asked the same question only moments earlier. He responded loudly, “I’m going to answer a second time, about what she (pointing to the other student who had asked earlier) just asked. Yes, you must write the question” (8CT – Obs 1, #5). These two occurrences confirmed Carroll’s belief that discipline and management are not discretely different concepts.

Carroll’s behaviors confirmed his custodial management beliefs. He was regimented and consistent with his daily routine. He strictly controlled student movement and interaction. He had to explain little of what students would have to do for the class because he familiarized the students to a daily regimen. He used sarcasm to respond to students question about the daily operations of his class. There was little difference between his beliefs about classroom management and classroom discipline. Below is an explanation of Carroll’s classroom behaviors related to discipline.

Discipline. The students in Carroll’s class were quiet. This does not mean that these students behaved. During the 240 rounds of observation, there were 49 observation intervals when Carroll ignored or overlooked student misbehavior. There were only eight observation intervals when Carroll addressed student misbehavior. On five occasions, Carroll used verbal warnings, one of those warnings being a threat to write an office

referral and another was a sarcastic remark. On one occasion, Carroll tapped a boy on the head to wake him and tell him to get back on task. On another occasion, he confiscated a note.

Carroll used humiliation to address student behavior that was unacceptable to him. A student had sharpened his pencil using a small pencil shaver. The boy swept the pencil shavings onto the floor with his hand and continued his work. Carroll chastised the student for getting pencil shavings on the floor. He then took the pencil from the boy and sharpened it using the classroom pencil sharpener that caught the shavings in a tray. He returned the pencil to the boy with a sarcastic look on his face, indicating to the boy non-verbally, there was a pencil sharpener in the room the boy could have used without making a mess on the floor. Carroll did not reinforce the student on task behavior.

The behaviors that Carroll overlooked included 10 observations of students sleeping and 8 observations of students staring off into space (student inattention). He also ignored students laying their heads on their desks, quiet social talk, and students attending to their personal appearance. Though there were students socializing during instructional or independent work time, students moved their mouths and read lips instead of using their voices. When Mr. Carroll circulated around the room, student behavior improved as his distance to the student decreased. Students nudged one another to warn of his presence. As Carroll walked away, compliant behavior declined.

One sarcastic remark that Carroll made was quite revealing. He said, "Excuse me Mr. Jones. She's going to miss some of the instruction because you're talking" (8CT -- Obs 2, #3). This set the stage for a divided climate in the class. Students knew that they could get away with a lack of work or effort as long as they did not bring attention to

themselves. Compliance or appearance of compliance was essential to avoid confrontation with Mr. Carroll. This emphasis on compliance indicated that Carroll's discipline style weighted heavily on the custodial end of the pupil control continuum. The instruction and climate sections below address the divided climate in Carroll's room further.

Instruction. Carroll managed his classroom systematically. He was teacher-centered in his approach to instruction. He did most of the talking and students listened. The questions that Carroll asked verbally and in writing (on the board for students to copy) were for the most part, to check knowledge. These included questions like, "What woke the baby," and "What was mother going to cultivate?" (8CT – Obs 3, #6). Carroll asked a question about an event in the novel *Johnny Tremain* (Hopkins, 1943). The question was, "How do you think that was received by people in the 1800's?" (8CT – Obs 4, #3) The class was quiet shortly, and then a student responded. He praised the student and immediately started lecturing. He used sarcasm to explain multiple meanings of the word, *sarcastic*. He said, "Sarcastic, disrespectful, nerving, like a lot of you are familiar with, curt as well, rude" (8CT – Obs 2, #1).

During the last observation, Carroll wrote a writing prompt on the board and stopped to explain it. The question read, "Pick a photo on pg. 641. Why do you like it? What do you think about the people in the photo? Pretend you are in the photo. Describe what you are thinking." As he explained the prompt, there was a visible shift in the room dynamics. Most of the students in the class were looking at the photo or writing a response to the prompt. The students engaged in this written assignment. Carroll did not

allow the students to engage with one another. When given the opportunity to be creative, however, most of the students were excited about their work.

Table 17 shows the COS Activity Type data from the four classroom observations. Students were watching and/or listening during 39 (16%) observation intervals, working on independent work during 40 (17%) observation intervals, and reading during 51 (21%) of the observation intervals. Students were off-task during 71 (30%) observation intervals. Because the observer records COS Activity Type by observing the student, it is likely that Carroll interacted with students for more than 1% of the time. The interaction data below show that he did interact with his class during the four classroom observations. The observer recorded interaction as teacher behavior. Activity Type, Manner, and Setting were student measures. This means that Carroll interacted with a small percentage of the class. The high number of misbehavior observations, the low number instructional interaction in the Activity Type data and the

anecdotal data recorded during classroom observations all showed a divided culture between those who listened and engaged with the lesson and those who did not.

Table 17

Eight Grade Custodial COS Activity Types

8C Activity Types	Obs 1	Obs 2	Obs 3	Obs 4	Total	Percent
1. Working on written assignments	9	15	16	0	40	16.67%
2. Interaction – Instructional	0	0	2	0	2	0.83%
3. Interaction – Social	0	0	4	1	5	2.08%
4. Watching or listening	3	6	12	18	39	16.25%
5. Reading	23	14	9	5	51	21.25%
6. Getting/returning materials	1	0	2	2	5	2.08%
7. Painting, drawing, creating graphics, etc.	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
8. Working with technology	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
9. Working with manipulatives/equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
10. Viewing video/slides	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
11. Playing games	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
12. Presenting/acting	1	0	0	0	1	0.42%
13. Tutoring Peers	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
14. Not attending to task	11	20	14	26	71	29.58%
15. No activity/transition	6	2	1	4	13	5.42%
16. Other	6	3	0	4	13	5.42%
Totals	60	60	60	60	240	100.00%

Table 18 shows the COS Setting data from the four classroom observations. There were no observation events of group work or students working in pairs. Students worked

Table 18

Eight Grade Custodial COS Setting Data

8C Setting	Obs 1	Obs 2	Obs 3	Obs 4	Total	Percent
1. Whole Class	0	21	24	20	65	27.08%
2. Small Group	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
3. Pairs	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
4. Individuals	60	39	36	40	175	72.92%
Total	60	60	60	60	240	100.00%

individually during 175 (63%) observation intervals and worked in whole class setting during 65 (37%) observation intervals. The Setting data confirmed the statements that Carroll was teacher-centered and strictly controlled the interaction in his classroom. There was contradiction between his belief that he allowed students to express opposing opinions and his observed behavior of asking knowledge recall questions that limited student responses.

In sum, Carroll's behavior in the area of instruction was custodial. He lectured and expected the students to listen and learn. He did not allow students to interact about the topics that he discussed in class. His primary mode of instruction was lecture and Q & A. When he was not lecturing or asking questions, students worked individually in a quiet, non-interactive atmosphere. It is clear that Mr. Carroll demonstrated custodial behaviors in the areas of management, discipline, and instruction.

Summary of teacher classroom behaviors. Carroll managed his class through predictable patterns of classroom instruction, strict control of student movement, and the use of questions that limited student responses, thereby limiting student discussion. He used proximity, loud desists, and sarcasm to address student discipline. Carroll claimed that he varied the activities in his classroom. Observations revealed that he varied instructional activities; however, other than the lecture and Q & A, the activities all involved writing. Students did the same activity on different worksheets or sheets of paper. The next section will address the climate in Carroll's classroom.

Classroom Climate

Mr. Carroll preferred order and quiet in his classroom. These beliefs contributed to a regimented classroom where students engaged with their worksheets and board

assignments much more than they did with one-another. The physical make-up of Carroll's room contributed to this order. There was evidence of a split climate in Carroll's classroom as well. He controlled interaction in his classroom making it quiet and orderly.

Physical climate. The physical make-up of Carroll's room sustained his belief in an orderly and structured classroom. He arranged the tables symmetrically in two-2 X 4 matrices so that all students faced the front. There was a center isle separating the two matrices. The teacher desk and a table stretched across the front of the room physically separating him from the students in the class (see Figure 8). The decorations in his room were minimal. District made posters draped the walls above the chalkboard. These posters were part of a CATS test preparation program called "Prep Rally". Teachers went from room to room reviewing information that would likely be on the CATS test. They used the posters to teach their lessons and displayed the posters in the room. On another wall, he displayed a commercially made world map and a U.S. History timeline. On the bulletin boards, he displayed district made posters with information about portfolio and open response writing. On the back cabinet, he displayed his rules, a CHAMPS poster, and district made signs that contained "power verbs" (words that students will likely see in the instructions of standardized tests).

Figure 8. Eighth Grade Custodial Room Arrangement

Motivation climate. There was evidence of this split climate in the class. Some students liked Mr. Carroll and some did not. As one student remarked:

I can't speak for others. I heard people say his class is boring and some say they like it. . . . Whenever we do talk about work, it's like not hard. It's not like something you have to mull over or get angry. The other

group, they are just the opposite, they do worry about the work and stuff. It's not real bad, I think it's fine. (8C1 – Int 2, ¶16)

Student subjects agreed that Mr. Carroll was interesting for some students and boring for others. They described a group of students who did not like Mr. Carroll who did not pay attention during Carroll's class. When Mr. Carroll sees inattentive students, he warns them to pay attention. Both students claimed Carroll does not give multiple warnings. He warns students about consequences one time. If students do not comply, he issues an office referral. Mr. Carroll motivates students with fear. He writes letters home to parents for them to read, sign, and return the next day. He threatens with office referrals.

Communication climate. Students described Carroll's class as still and quiet. Mr. Carroll tells stories that he relates to his subject matter. Sometimes, Carroll allows students to tell their own related stories. Most of the time, however, the climate in Carroll's class is subdued. He allows minimal communication and student movement. In the four observations, there were no observation intervals of students working in small groups or pairs. Communication was one-way, from teacher to student. When Carroll was not talking, the class was quiet. During Lecture and Q & A, students helped each other. When students did not know answers, Carroll called on other students to answer. On rare occasions, Carroll allowed students to help one-another with independent work.

Carroll allowed dissenting opinions in his classroom. Moral debate happened; however, it happened rarely. Moral debate was not part of Carroll's lesson plans. There were no moral debates during the four classroom observations. One student claimed that off topic discussions were enjoyable for some students. "Some kids will love his class. They will think it's cool because we'll go off topic and talk about other things" (8C1 – Int 2, ¶16). Observation data showed students in Carroll's class engaged in work

avoidance activities. The researcher speculated that moral debate was enjoyable for students because it was teacher-sanctioned work avoidance.

Carroll's beliefs and classroom behavior had a chilling effect on communication in his classroom. During the observations, the researcher could hear students interacting in adjoining classrooms because Carroll's class was quiet. Students listened to lectures, responded to comprehension questions, or worked independently. Carroll established a climate that was not conducive to interaction.

Summary of classroom climate. Carroll expected his students to behave for him the same way that students would behave in church. It is not surprising that the physical arrangement of his classroom resembled a church with the isle and pews on each side and the minimal adornments. Students who liked Mr. Carroll were motivated to be in his class. Those who did not like Mr. Carroll, found ways to obscure their presence in his class and simply endure the time there while avoiding confrontations with their teacher. During direct instruction, the primary voice in the classroom was Carroll's. While students engaged in independent work, the only sounds came from the rooms that surrounded Carroll's. The next section addresses student engagement in Carroll's class.

Student Engagement

Table 19 shows the COS interaction data from the four classroom observations. During 109 (47%) of the 240 observation intervals, students were working independently (not interacting with peers or the teacher). Teacher-student instructional interaction occurred during 107 (42%) of the 240 observation intervals. This data confirmed the

climate analysis. The students in Carroll’s class engaged in very little student-to-student interaction. Carroll was the interaction moderator in his class. Nearly all communication

Table 19

Eighth Grade Custodial COS Interaction

8C Interaction	Obs 1	Obs 2	Obs 3	Obs 4	Total	Percent
1 None/independent	25	39	35	10	109	45.42%
2 Teacher instruction	25	15	20	42	102	42.50%
3 Teacher managerial	6	5	3	4	18	7.50%
4 Teacher social	0	0	1	0	1	0.42%
5 Support staff	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
6 Student instructional	2	0	0	0	2	0.83%
7 Student Social	2	1	1	4	8	3.33%
8 Other	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
Totals	60	60	60	60	240	100.00%

flowed through him. During observations, there were no original student thoughts. There were recapitulations of information originating either from books or from his lecture. Most of the time, students interacted with the work, not each other.

Table 20 shows the COS Manner data for the four classroom observations in Carroll’s classroom. The lack of interaction resulted in students unengaged in lessons.

Table 20

Eighth Grade Custodial COS Manner

8C Manner	Obs 1	Obs 2	Obs 3	Obs 4	Total	Percent
1. On Task	38	35	37	25	135	56.25%
2. Waiting for Teacher	8	4	5	6	23	9.58%
3. Distracted	12	18	18	25	73	30.42%
4. Disruptive	2	0	0	1	3	1.25%
5. Other	0	3	0	3	6	2.50%
Totals	60	60	60	60	240	100.00%

Students were on task during 135 (56%) observation events. The Distracted data support the claim of a divide between students engaged in lessons and students who were not engaged in lessons. During 73 (30%) of the observation intervals, students were distracted. Distractions included students tending to their personal appearance, sleeping, staring into space, and rolling pencils. The student interview data showed there were students who perceived Mr. Carroll as a boring teacher. The off-task behaviors of the students in his class indicated that students were bored.

Summary of student engagement. There was a marked difference between teacher instructional interaction and instructional activity (see Tables 17 and 20 above). Many students were not engaged in the instructional activities of the classroom while Carroll was teaching. Recall that the researcher measured teacher interaction and student activity using the COS observation instrument. This allowed the researcher to detect discrepancies between how the teacher was interacting and how the student responded to the activity. High numbers of teacher instructional interaction and low levels of teacher instructional activity meant that the teacher was teaching but the students were not engaged in his activity. The next section addresses the eighth grade humanistic teacher in this study.

Ms. Brandt, Eighth Grade Humanistic Portrait

Ms. Brandt first became interested in teaching when she did an exploratory program during high school where she participated in a half-day student-aide program. From there, she attended a small private college in a Midwestern state. She later received her Master of Arts in Teaching from an urban research and health science campus in a large metropolitan city. She received her Rank I teaching certificate from a satellite

campus near her home. She first taught in a school system in a nearby state in a school serving a large population of students living in poverty. Later, she taught in the Catholic school system. She enjoyed her job there. She had many friends among the faculty. She built relationships with the people in the Catholic school by sharing time with her fellow faculty members, meeting for breakfasts and “grilled cheese” day in the cafeteria. When her husband died, the income in the Catholic school was not sufficient to support her family. She moved to Rolling Hills so she could continue her career as a teacher and support her family financially. She continued to build relationships with her fellow faculty at Rolling Hills, arranging after school encounters at restaurants and coffee shops. She perceived the time of this study to be among her most difficult times as a teacher because of the pressure to improve test scores.

Beliefs

Brandt’s beliefs reflected her passion for children. She moved from a large metropolitan city to a rural area within the Rolling Hills district. Her responses during the four interviews revealed her concern for the students who lived in the area. She sought understanding of the culture of students at Rolling Hills and adjusted her behaviors to meet student needs. The next sections address Brandt’s beliefs about classroom management, discipline, and instruction.

Classroom management. Brandt was consistent with her classroom procedures yet flexible enough to meet the varying needs of students. She believed teachers managed their classrooms best when they kept students interested and engaged in the work. To do this, she connected the curriculum to current events that the students talked about. She described a newspaper and current events activity:

Today they were all concerned about the tournament and who was going to get in the NCAA and where the coaches were going because we were reading the newspaper, which really fits . . . current events. Sometimes you have to let them be kids. (8HT – Int 1, ¶40)

She stressed being fair because, “fair at this age is real important to them” (8HT – Int 3,

¶8). Students learned social skills from one-another and home. Consequently, students learned erroneous behavior. They did not always know what to do when the context changed. Brandt taught students how to manage their classroom time using visual and verbal cues. She used CHAMPS and she raised her hand and waited for students to get quiet when she needed attention. She circulated around the students in her classroom and made some type of contact with each student in her class. She used verbal cues as she would with adults, “I’ll say I need to see everybody’s eyes and they will look at me. And I tell them what we are going to do next” (8HT – Int 1, ¶38).

Students should not be grouped with friends because they will not experience the ideas and interactions of students other than those to whom they naturally gravitate. She varied her small groups to force students out of their comfort zones. She noted sometimes students did not comply with the behavior expectations of her class and management issues became discipline issues. When this happened, she called parents. Sometimes the fear of punishment works with children and sometimes it does not. Teachers must be more creative than to rely on yelling or threatening. When all else failed, calling parents had a calming effect on students.

During class discussions, Brandt allowed students to take turns naturally. Sometimes they raised hands, sometimes students waited until a pause in conversations. During small group, she expected students to interact at a level that did not interfere with

other groups. Brandt was comfortable with student noise so long as students engaged with the activities and created quality work products.

The sources of Brandt's beliefs included interaction with professionals, the Boys Town Social Skills curriculum, and personal experience. She was confident in her ability to manage a classroom. Her strength in terms of management was that she visited with every student during a class period. Her weakness was that she was not able to say no to students. She was not mean enough at times. It takes time to learn classroom management. She advises new teachers to be willing to learn from their observations and mistakes and to not get discouraged:

They aren't going to learn everything they need to know in the first year. That comes with experience and learning from observation and things that work and things that do not work. They shouldn't get discouraged if the first year of classroom management is way off the wall. I don't think I've ever seen a first year teacher come in and master classroom management. That's probably the hardest thing a teacher has to do. (8HT – Int 3, ¶17)

In sum, Brandt focused her classroom management efforts toward engaging students in interesting learning activities rather than the use of fear and punishment to control student movement and interaction. This is a humanistic trait. She considered the learning and behavior needs of her students to determine what movement and interaction she would allow. She was comfortable with classroom noise. Her concern was not with making the means comfortable and interactive so that students had the best possible opportunity for successfully achieving the ends. The next section addresses Brandt's beliefs about discipline.

Discipline. Brandt had both custodial and humanistic beliefs about discipline. The purpose for discipline was to help students stay focused so they could learn. She used punitive techniques to address minor behaviors to discourage students from establishing

erroneous patterns of behavior. Second and third offenses resulted in consequences that were more punitive. Sometimes students did not respond to punitive measures until parents became involved. Brandt called parents when student behavior was serious enough or if student behavior patterns were interfering with their ability to learn.

Ranting and yelling, on the other hand, was not effective. Arguing with students is never acceptable even when the teacher is right. Teachers need to know the cultural norms of their students. Right or wrong, students will make choices based on the influences of their values. Brandt believed teachers should engage students in learning to make better choices. Brandt established relationships with her students both in and out of school. She attended the community activities in which her students participated. “I think I’m real involved with my student’s lives and interests, their academic achievements. I build friendships with them. I have students now bring me deer [meat]; they ride with me and do all kinds of things” (8HT – Int 1, ¶16). During an informal observation, the researcher overheard Brandt remind a student that Kentucky has hunting season every October. She smiled at the boy and told him that it would be sad if next October he was sitting at home while his buddies were hunting (MEM – 8H – Hunt).

Brandt believed teachers erroneously stifle student learning with discipline. She understood that many of her students lived in poverty or abusive environments. If students know that their teachers care about them, they may learn more in school. It was important for Brandt to talk to students about behavior to help them learn from their mistakes and to know that she cared about them. Teachers make mistakes when they do not listen to student responses to misbehavior. Students would repeat misbehavior if

teachers did not listen to them. Teachers also made a mistake when they tried to talk to students when they were not ready:

If you're not close to the student or if the student is really angry and doesn't want to talk, it doesn't help. You may get the student to calm down, but they're still angry. Until they're ready to talk to you, it's a waste of your time. (8HT – Int 3, ¶49)

For Brandt, minor disruptions included irritating noises that do not disrupt the learning in the class. Major disruptions included egregious behaviors and student patterns of behavior that prevent students or their peers from learning. Brandt used a variety of punitive and therapeutic means to address student misbehavior. Cross-team In-school Alternative Program was a program where students spend all or part of the day with a teacher on another team doing schoolwork. (Teachers at the school referred to this process as “cross-teaming.”) Brandt used *cross-teaming* to separate students from their peers when student misbehavior was so disruptive that she could not continue class. She used the office referral system and parent contacts to address major disruptions or repeated student misbehaviors that did not prevent instruction at the time, but likely would if she ignored the behaviors. She used written consequences occasionally. Written consequences should involve behavior learning. She ignored minor offenses as long as students were engaged in their work.

Brandt used proximity and gentle desists to address student misbehavior. This allowed the class to continue without losing instructional time and minimized opportunities for escalation. Overreacting to minor misbehaviors had a chilling effect on student interaction. Teachers should avoid stifling the excitement that students have when they are learning together. Positive comments about proper behavior were more effective than negative comments about student misbehavior.

Brandt was confident in her ability to effectively address student misbehavior. She could assess situations and adapted her interventions to meet student needs. Her strength was her non-confrontational style of student discipline. Her weakness was that she was inconsistent and that some interpret her inconsistency as showing favoritism. Her advice for new teachers is to know that they have the upper hand with students but not necessarily communicate that by arguing, sarcasm, or punishment. Having a seating chart sometimes helps the teacher identify where there are problems that they can address by rearranging students. If you make a threat, you are obliged to that threat. Think carefully before making any kind of threat about consequences for student misbehavior.

In sum, Brandt was a mix of humanism and custodialism in relation to discipline. She was custodial in her approach to handling minor problems using punitive means. She was humanistic in her approach to building relationships and teaching students proper behavior based on student norms. When discussing misbehavior with students, she encouraged students to make choices that were acceptable based on the norms of the organization without surrendering their own cultural values. Brandt referred to discipline in behavioral and cultural terms, not personal and pejorative terms. The next section addresses Brandt's beliefs about instruction. This set of beliefs is humanistic.

Instruction. Children learn by doing. Brandt believed the most important consideration for instruction is to create opportunities for students to engage in hands-on activities. Puberty makes it hard to sit still and students get off task unless they move around. Brandt compared student learning with adult learning:

People can tell us 100 times. Until we sit down and actually do it ourselves, it doesn't stay in our minds. . . .if you give them a test the next day, they can't tell you a lot of what went on in the lecture. But the things they do hand's on, they would. (8HT – Int 2, ¶56)

Students need reinforcement from their senses. Brandt used the overhead projector make her classroom discussions more visual. She taught using student-centered and hands-on pedagogies to provide opportunities for students to use their senses in the classroom. Students need to interact and provide input to their lessons for lessons to be successful. She used a variety of contexts including individual work, pairs, small group, and whole group for instructions. She allowed students to interact in groups so that they could learn from one-another. She set goals for her students to achieve and communicated the goals to her students.

Core content provided Brandt with the curricular content for her lessons. When faced with district and school administrative pressure to model her pedagogies after Madeline Hunter, Brandt defended her use of hands-on instruction in small cooperative student groups. She argued core content was to define the scope of instructional content, not to dictate pedagogy. She successfully defended her use of hands-on instruction. She adapted her evaluation to include multiple choice questions and open response questions. She did not rely solely on her tests for evaluation. When doing group projects, the book became one of many resources that students used when grappling with information. She used group projects that resulted in culminating products or performances that she also used to evaluate student learning.

The source of Brandt's pedagogy included experience, in-service, and peers. Though she believed what she does is best for children, she sometimes questioned her use of hands-on instruction because the accountability test scores were not what they should be at the school. Her strength was providing students with note-taking skills, something she believed students will need before they go to high school and college. Her weakness

was that she did not provide direct teacher to student instruction, something that the district was encouraging at the time. Her advice for new teachers was to make eye contact and listen to students, never lecture for more than 10 minutes at a time, and make children aware of behavior and academic expectations before starting lessons.

In sum, the four interviews with Brandt confirmed her instructional beliefs were humanistic. She believed in using hands-on and small group instruction. Her approach to teaching was student-centered. She used student presentations and products to evaluate student products. She resisted school and district administration pressure to decrease the time spent using hands-on instruction. This places her on the humanistic side of the pupil control ideology continuum. Her instructional beliefs were humanistic because they were student-centered and interactive. The next section addresses Brandt's classroom behaviors.

Teacher Classroom Behaviors

The eighth grade humanistic class included in this study was a reading class. Brandt's teaching behaviors were consistent with her beliefs in the areas of classroom management and instruction. Observation data could not confirm nor contradict Brandt's beliefs about discipline. There were very few minor incidents of student misbehavior. Her handling of these minor incidents, nonetheless, deserves mention as they compliment her classroom management. The sections below address Brandt's classroom management, discipline, and instructional behaviors.

Classroom management. In the four classroom observations, Brandt started her class the same way. She used the CHAMPS classroom management system and then shared the agenda with the students as they copied the agenda to their planners. During

three of the classroom observations, there were opening activities. These were discussions of the assignments from previous days. The discussions were about story plot and moral issues. She then led the class in reading and questioning activities. She then assigned writing prompts for the students. Students first discussed the written assignments in pairs and groups before working independently. Students did their writing in their “Reader’s Notebooks.” During one of these three lessons, with five minutes left in class, Brandt stopped the students and said, “You guys are great” (8HT – Obs 1, #6). She then announced that the last five minutes of class was free time for the students. During another, Brandt did a short lesson on what it meant to be an “active listener” (8HT – Obs 3, #1).

During the last classroom observation, Brandt took her students to the library. It was near the end of the school year and students had to earn Accelerated Reader (AR) points. There were other students working on assignments due in Brandt’s class the next day. Still others had completed their assignments. Brandt managed all these tasks during this period. She started by verbally giving students options based on their needs. For the students needing AR points, she stationed herself at the computer and assisted students with their AR tests. While students were at the computer, she also managed students sitting at the tables. She verbally reminded students of their choices and encouraged students to make wise decisions based on their circumstances. Near the end of the class, she directed the students to push their chairs in. She lined them up and returned to her class. As students walked in her room, the class ended. They retrieved their books and went on to their next classes.

Brandt did not bring attention to minor disruptions such as phone calls or students arriving late. Once, when Brandt answered a phone call, students continued the lesson while she talked on the phone (8HT – Obs 2, #2). There was not much movement during her classes. Students who needed help moved near students who could help them. Brandt did not tell students when they could work in pairs or small groups. The researcher speculated that the students knew when they were allowed to work in pairs or small groups because they were accustomed to the context rules. Brandt empowered students to make judgments about their own classroom management and the students responded responsibly.

In sum, Brandt empowered students to make choices about classroom behaviors. She informed students of her expectations using CHAMPS, engaged students in activities that encouraged interaction and creativity, and went about the business of teaching. Students went about the business of learning. These are humanistic beliefs about classroom management that connected well with her beliefs about discipline.

Discipline. During the four classroom observations, Brandt did not need to discipline students often. She treated the students like adults and students acted like adults. When there were minor disruptions, she used gentle desists and proximity to stop misbehaviors. There was an incident when a student who was off task during independent work in the library. This student had not completed his assignments. She asked another student who had finished all of his assignments to team up with him to help him get organized so he could complete his assignments. During a discussion, a student was trying to read the word doorman. Instead, he said the words “damn row.” The students

laughed. Brandt laughed as well. The disruption was brief and students soon returned to work (8HT – Obs 3, #5).

Brandt's students said that she did not need to discipline her classes often. Observations confirmed this to be true. Brandt did not allow minor disruptions to disturb the instructional flow of her classroom. She used gentle desists to stop student misbehavior. During the four classroom observations, there were no major disruptions. Her custodial beliefs did not emerge because the Brandt handled the problems in her classroom without resorting to punitive consequence. The discipline behaviors that did emerge were humanistic. The next section addresses Brandt's instructional behaviors.

Instruction. Brandt used a variety of activities including reading aloud, reader's notebook, visual aids, discussion, and moral debate. During the four classroom observations, she did not dictate where students sat nor did she plan activities that necessarily called for student movement. She simply moved from one activity to another and students adjusted accordingly. When students needed to share books or materials, they moved from place to place to do so. What made Brandt's pedagogy unique is she was able to put a twist on mundane tasks to make them more interesting. For example, instead of assigning a 40 word summary of a chapter to a story the students were reading, she told the students to write a summary of the reading selection for five cents per word. "You have two dollars that you may use" (8HT – Obs 3, #2).

Brandt had an interesting way of creating moral debate in her classroom. The students were reading *The Road to Memphis* (Taylor, 1992), a story about a young Black college student in Jackson, MS in the 1940s. The day before the first observation, she told students to create a symbol that represented what the students were reading. The day of

the observation, while students told what their symbols represented, it sparked a brief moral debate about racism. Students debated in the context of the current day. She asked the students to think of what they would say if it were the 1940s. Not every student had the opportunity to describe their symbol. She assigned the symbols again for the next day (8HT – Obs 1, #3; see also MEM – 8H – MD).

Table 21 shows the COS Activity type data for the four classroom observations in Brandt’s classroom. Students in Brandt’s classroom spent most of their time reading.

Table 21

Eighth Grade Humanistic COS Activity Types

8H Activity Types	Obs 1	Obs 2	Obs 3	Obs 4	Total	Percent
1. Working on written assignments	27	2	12	10	51	21.25%
2. Interaction - Instructional	3	1	4	5	13	5.42%
3. Interaction - Social	0	0	0	1	1	0.42%
4. Watching or listening	2	8	5	4	19	7.92%
5. Reading	18	45	28	21	112	46.67%
6. Getting/returning materials	2	2	3	4	11	4.58%
7. Painting, drawing, creating graphics, etc.	1	0	0	0	1	0.42%
8. Working with technology	0	0	0	8	8	3.33%
9. Working with manipulatives/equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
10. Viewing video/slides	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
11. Playing games	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
12. Presenting/acting	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
13. Tutoring Peers	0	0	3	0	3	1.25%
14. Not attending to task	6	2	1	4	13	5.42%
15. No activity/transition	1	0	3	3	7	2.92%
16. Other	0	0	1	0	1	0.42%
Totals	60	60	60	60	240	100.00%

There were 112 (47%) observation intervals of students reading. This included students reading aloud, silently while other students read aloud, and students reading independently. During the second observation, there was an inordinate amount of student

reading (45 observation intervals). The second most frequent activity was students working on written assignments (51 observation intervals, 21%). This included students working alone, in pairs, or in small groups. The frequency of instructional interaction appears low. This is because of the way that Brandt taught. Students read passages and she stopped and talked with them about the meaning of the passage.

Table 22 shows the COS Setting data for the four classroom observations in Brandt's class. Most of the time, Brandt taught to the whole class or allowed students to

Table 22

Eighth Grade Humanistic COS Setting

8H Setting	Obs 1	Obs 2	Obs 3	Obs 4	Total	Percent
1. Whole Class	23	58	34	1	116	48.33%
2. Small Group	0	0	2	3	5	2.08%
3. Pairs	0	0	5	1	6	2.50%
4. Individuals	37	2	19	55	113	47.08%
Total	60	60	60	60	240	100.00%

work individually. During 116 (48%) observation intervals Brandt did not dictate small group or pairs work. Students formed groups themselves. Occasionally, the students who paired up were not the six observed students. The frequency of paired settings (6) and small group settings (5) was low on the COS form in comparison to what happened in the class.

Brandt was humanistic in terms of instruction. The reading class in this study did not have the hands-on social studies activities that she mentioned in her interviews. There was, however, evidence from the material culture in her room that showed she used the

hands-on pedagogies that she mentioned in her interviews. Though her use of read aloud was a conventional pedagogy, her questioning was not. She used questions that required students to give answers that involved more than simple recall of facts. To answer Brandt's questions, students needed to analyze and synthesize information. Her hands-off approach to classroom management enhanced her style of using passages from a novel to spark discussions. Her unconventional way of assigning a written summary challenged the students to create a summary with 40 or fewer words. Using *five cents per word within two dollars* rather than *40-word* essay made the assignment more interesting for the students and resulted in higher levels of student engagement in written assignments (see below). The written assignments were not conventional worksheets. Instead, they were challenging written assignments that required recall of details and analysis and interpretation of story passages. The next section addresses the learning climate in Brandt's room.

Classroom Climate

The impression from the four classroom observations was of a classroom that was interesting and interactive. The select students agreed that Brandt was a good teacher; however, they differed on their opinion of Ms. Brandt's class. The students in the classroom appeared relaxed and on task. The seating arrangement was conducive to whole class, small group, and individual work. Students interacted about the novel they read. The use of *The Road to Memphis*, however, was problematic for one of the student participants in this study. The next sections address the physical, motivation, and communication climates in Brandt's room.

Physical climate. The desk arrangement in Brandt’s classroom was in the shape of a broken U. The break in the bottom of the U was to give Brandt and others access to the back of the room (See Figure 9). This was the smallest room in Rolling Hills. Students sat

Figure 9: Eighth Grade Humanistic Room Arrangement

around the outside and on the inside of the U-shape. There would not be enough space in the room to arrange the tables in rows and columns. The teacher desk butted against one

of the tables in the room to make space to move around behind the desk where the file cabinet was. There was a desk at the front of the room where Brandt kept materials for class activities.

Despite the crowded conditions and limited wall space, there was evidence of group work. There were displays of student work bearing the names of three to five students. Student work filled the walls, obscuring the obligatory district made CATS preparation posters. Students made mobiles; tatterdemalions of coat hangers, paper, and string; that Brandt suspended from the ceilings. On one wall, the Unified Arts (Physical Education, Art, Music, and Technology) teachers displayed district made posters during a core content review. She posted commercially made posters on the back cabinets. The posters were from a hands-on history curriculum. Brandt attended the training for this program and was using it for her history classes.

Motivation climate. The two student participants in this study differed in their opinion of the interest level of this classroom, but not their opinion of Brandt. One student described Brandt's class as boring. When the researcher asked if she was bored because of the teacher or because of the book, she responded, "It's not that I don't like the book. It's okay in some parts. But when the book is dragging, that's when I get bored" (8H1 – Int 2, ¶19). Despite this student finding the book boring, she stayed on task, as did the rest of the class. "Usually, we're pretty good because, even though the book is not that interesting, we usually all sit there and listen" (8H1 – Int 2, ¶45). She was proud of her contribution to the moral debate in Brandt's class:

The story we're reading, it's not real. But . . . it has to do with something that has happened that is real. Then we can take that and we can put it into our real life. We're reading about prejudice and there is still prejudice today. I know some. I can take how they felt into the book and I can put

that into how they could feel if they were discriminated against like the dude in the book did, because he was a good guy. . . .I have family who is black and when I hear somebody talk bad about black people, I tell them . . . I don't appreciate what you're saying right now and I don't think any other black person or other person does. So shut up or at least don't do it around me. (8H1 – Int 3, ¶36)

The other student participant described the class as fun. “It’s really good. I am not big on books generally, but this book is pretty good” (8H2 – Int 2, ¶4). Brandt gave clear instructions which made the class easy to follow. Understanding what to do was important to this student. She was nervous in her other classes because she was unsure of what teachers wanted.

The students perceived this class as rigorous, but not so difficult that it was frustrating for them. When describing assignments, one student said that the work was difficult, but proudly bragged about her work. She was proud of her work because she worked hard and tried to do quality work. The other student was relieved to be in a rigorous class. “It’s a good class, my funnest [sic] this nine weeks. We’re actually doing something. Most my other classes, we’re not doing anything” (8H2 – Int 2, ¶31). She was proud of her work because she was able to interact with students and grapple with information to form her own answers to the writing prompts in the class. “We all interact on the work so it’s not like we’re just doing it ourselves and don’t know what we’re doing (8H2 – Int 3, ¶18).

The student interviews showed students were motivated to be in class and satisfied with the academic rigor. The students had ownership of their work because they were allowed to interact with one another. This was only possible because the work of the class involves independent quality work (seeSizer, 1984). Students were proud of their

work because it was rigorous and worth doing. The next section addresses the communication environment of Brandt's class.

Communication climate. Students in Brandt's class talked to one another to get help understanding their work. Students know that they may confer with one another on individual assignments. In three of the four classroom observations, Brandt assigned summary sheets where students write about events of the passage that the students read during the class period. Each student must write their own summary. They are allowed, however, to talk to one another to discuss the plot before they write. Some students chose to do this. During the fourth observation, Brandt allowed students to interact about the books that they read. Some students chose to read alone.

In sum, Students had options in Brandt's class. When working in small groups, some students chose to work alone. One student participant preferred to work alone. She was uncomfortable when group members did not get along. "Personally, it's not my favorite. I'm a person who likes to do my stuff on my own. Half the people don't like what you're doing and then you get into arguments. Then the whole group goes down" (8H2 – Int 1, ¶44). Allowing students to choose the contexts of their own learning made the climate for this student more amiable. The other student took pride in her ability to help her fellow students. She boasted about how smart she was and how often students came to her for help. Working in informal groups and pairs made gave this student a sense of leadership. She enjoyed her role as classroom intelligentsia. Students felt comfortable because they were allowed to interact about their work and because they had the power to choose not to work alone if they preferred. The next section addresses how this interaction climate affected the actual interaction in Brandt's classroom.

Student Engagement

Table 23 shows the COS interaction data from the four classroom observations in Brandt's classroom. The greatest number of observation intervals, 102 (43%) were of students engaged in instructional interaction with other students. There were 92 (38%)

Table 23

Eighth Grade Humanistic COS Interaction

8H Interaction	Obs 1	Obs 2	Obs 3	Obs 4	Total	Percent
1 None/independent	33	3	14	42	92	38.33%
2 Teacher instruction	6	8	7	3	24	10.00%
3 Teacher managerial	0	3	3	11	17	7.08%
4 Teacher social	2	0	2	0	4	1.67%
5 Support staff	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
6 Student instructional	19	46	34	3	102	42.50%
7 Student Social	0	0	0	1	1	0.42%
8 Other	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
Totals	60	60	60	60	240	100.00%

observation intervals of students engaged in individual work. This confirmed the descriptions of the teacher behavior data. Students engaged in intellectual interaction with one-another and with Brandt, whether it was reading to the class, discussing the work with one another, or debating moral issues. During the four classroom observations, there was only one observation interval (<1%) of a student engaged in social interaction with another student. Students were engaged with the work they were doing in Brandt's class.

Table 24, the COS manner data from the four classroom observations in Brandt's class, confirmed students were engaged in the work. Students were on task during 225 (93%) observation intervals. Students were distracted during only 12 (5%) observation intervals. There were no observation intervals of students who were disruptive during the

four classroom observations and only two (1%) observation intervals of students who were waiting for the teacher. This shows that students were very much engaged in the instructional activities in Brandt's classroom.

Table 24

Eighth Grade Humanistic COS Manner

8C Manner	Obs 1	Obs 2	Obs 3	Obs 4	Total	Percent
1. On Task	56	58	55	56	225	93.75%
2. Waiting for Teacher	1	0	1	0	2	0.83%
3. Distracted	3	2	3	4	12	5.00%
4. Disruptive	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
5. Other	0	0	1	0	1	0.42%
Totals	60	60	60	60	240	100.00%

In sum, students were engaged in the interaction in Brandt's class. The distractions were minimal and the researcher speculated that these distractions are more likely the result of attention span rather than a lack of motivation or interest in the instruction. Students were on task and working. Recall that when the phone rang and Brandt answered it, students continued the lesson without her. The COS student instructional and the teacher instructional data show that communication flowed from student-to-student, teacher-to-student, and student-to-teacher. The next section addresses the cross case analyses of the six cases in this study

Cross-Case Analyses of Custodialism and Humanism

In the previous sections, the researcher reported study results separately for each case. In the next section, the researcher contrasted the findings of the humanistic teachers with the findings of the custodial teachers for the four dimensions of Research Question

One, Beliefs, Classroom Behavior, Classroom Climate, and Interaction. These findings reveal the widely varying experience for the students among the six cases.

Beliefs

The three custodial teachers differentiated themselves from the humanistic teachers in their beliefs. Teachers with custodial beliefs controlled student movement and interaction, emphasized punitive discipline, and used teacher-centered pedagogies. Humanistic teachers empowered students to make choices about movement and interaction, emphasized therapeutic discipline, and used student-centered pedagogies. The next sections contrast the classroom management, discipline, and instruction beliefs of the three custodial teachers and the three humanistic teachers in this study.

Classroom management. The custodial teachers emphasized control of student behavior, movement, and interaction. The goal of classroom management for the custodial teacher was keeping order. Humanistic teachers managed their classes with the purpose of facilitating instruction. A common theme related to discipline among the custodial teachers was to put an end to disruptions in the classroom. While this is a desirable end, the humanistic teachers also emphasized the use of discipline to teach behavior in a social setting.

Campbell (sixth grade custodial) believed the purpose of classroom management was to keep students quiet and keep her room organized. She required students to keep all of their work in a binder. She checked the binder regularly and chastised students for not keeping their binders organized. She used a daily regimen so that students knew what they must do to avoid confrontation. She organized her labs to limit student movement and to assure that students arrived at the same answer. Elliot (sixth grade humanistic)

believed the purpose of classroom management was to facilitate learning. She managed her class by engaging students in a variety of interesting activities. Students need to learn to manage themselves. She arranged her room and established her routines so that students had choices. This empowered students to develop independent social skills.

McNabb (seventh grade custodial) believed the purpose of classroom management was to take immediate control of the class and to keep students calm and quiet. To do this, she advised students of the rules and the consequences of breaking rules. Students needed to stay busy with worksheets. She would like to do small group and paired work, but the room was too small and she was not comfortable with the level of classroom noise. Warren (seventh grade humanistic) believed the purpose for classroom management was to achieve learning goals. She used a routine, yet allowed students to have a voice in her classroom and to make choices about movement. She admitted that her class was not as orderly as others. She believed the need for students to interact and learn outweighed the need quiet in her classroom

Carroll (eighth grade custodial) teacher firmly believed that one must have control of student movement and interaction to carry on the daily operations of school. He did this by establishing rigid routines in his classroom. He used a sequence of activities within one class period that he repeated day-to-day. Brandt (eighth grade humanistic) believed that the purpose of classroom management was to facilitate learning. She varied her instruction so that students did not become bored with the day-to-day routines of school. Students chose to work alone or get help from their peers. The next section addresses discipline beliefs across the six cases in this study.

Discipline. The custodial teachers expected students to behave and blamed parents when children misbehaved. The humanistic teachers expected students to misbehave and attributed misbehavior to erroneous thoughts and beliefs. To the custodial teachers, home environment varied, but was not an excuse for bad manners. They applied discipline consistently regardless of the surrounding circumstances. The humanistic teachers recognized that students came to school with varying home experiences that influence their behaviors. The humanistic teachers varied their discipline in consideration of the varying contexts and worked with students to understand them and help them deal with their issues.

Campbell believed the purpose of discipline was to stop disruptive behavior. She used fear and guilt to control student behavior. She admitted she was loud and that her voice was scary for sixth graders. She adjusted her responses to student misbehavior based on her level of stress. Elliot used discipline to teach students how to make better choices. She used an overhead to talk the students through their erroneous choices and to suggest better ways of handling future situations. Elliot made her disciplinary responses based on the context of the student misbehavior.

McNabb believed the purpose of discipline was to maintain order in the classroom so that she could teach. She crossed boundaries with students when she talked about their misbehavior which resulting in students crying and loss of instructional time. She used guilt and emotion to address student misbehavior and spend an inordinate amount of time conferencing with students about their misbehavior. Warren used discipline to minimize distraction from the classroom. She adjusted her discipline response according to her ability to analyze situations. She admitted that she towered over students and that her

physical size allowed her to be confrontational when she believed it was necessary. On the other hand, it was important to go back, explain to the student why it was important to behave, and to resolve the situation without anger.

Carroll believed the only way students would behave was if they feared the consequences for not behaving. He used his loud voice and threats of consequences to maintain student compliance. He always followed through with consequences because students perceive teachers who capitulate on threats of consequences as weak. Students will take advantage of weak teachers. Brandt believed that it is important to understand the culture and the emotional baggage that students encounter when considering discipline. She admitted that she used punitive consequences. She accompanied punitive consequences with social learning. Students need to understand changing contexts to make appropriate social choices. Because she understood the culture of the area, she was able to communicate with students in terms they understood. The next section addresses instructional beliefs across the six cases in this study.

Instruction. Custodial teachers used teacher-centered pedagogies and controlled the flow of information in their classrooms. The flow of interaction in the classroom for custodial teachers was from teacher to student. Students interacted with the teacher by answering knowledge level questions or by responding on a worksheet. There was minimal intellectual interaction among students in custodial classrooms. Humanistic teachers used student-centered pedagogies. The flow of interaction in these classrooms was teacher-to-student, student-to-teacher, and student-to-student. Intellectual discussions and moral debates drove the interaction in the humanistic classrooms.

Lecture and Q & A was Campbell's primary mode of instruction. She used group work for her labs. None-the-less, she controlled the outcomes of her labs by regimenting the lab instructions. Campbell complained that the latest version of the Kentucky Core Content (version 4.0 at the time of data collection) limited her instructional choices because her expertise was not included in that version. Elliot was the facilitator of instruction in her room. Students worked in groups and grappled with various sources of information to complete tasks. Students interacted at two levels within groups: (a) to plan and solve problems, and (b) to share learning. Elliot used the Core Content to determine curricular content and based her pedagogical choices on what she believed was the best way to address the subject matter.

McNabb used lecture and Q & A to discuss topics with her students. She believed group work was best for instruction but was not comfortable with the noise associated with group work. She believed that the Kentucky Core Content and her subject matter limited her choices in the classroom. Warren made her instruction visual and encouraged students to interact about the subject matter. She too believed that the Kentucky Core Content limited her scope. She overcame these limitations by preparing students for the CATS test and addressing instruction not included in the Kentucky Core Content after the CATS test. In her yearly lighthouse project, she was able to address concepts across curricular disciplines.

Carroll used lecture and Q & A to interact with children. It was his job to talk and the students' job to listen. He assessed students using worksheets, board work, and tests. Carroll complained that the Kentucky Core Content diminished his flexibility in the classroom:

I try to keep all the information, the reports the test taking, any of this stuff covered in my class currently, is fueled by the core content. The teachable moment is almost a thing of the past. You don't feel like you can take advantage of it because you've got core content to cover. (8CT – Int 2, ¶31)

Brandt taught using intellectual interaction and moral debate. Students learned best when they engage in hands-on activities. It was her job to facilitate learning in her class. The new Kentucky Core Content was a change in curriculum that did not require a change of pedagogy. When pressured from the administration to engage in more direct whole group instruction with the purpose of covering core content, Brandt defended the use of hands-on instruction and interaction to her principal:

At first I thought, I'm not going to be able to use this History Alive curriculum. I felt really in the beginning that they sent me to all these trainings and I developed all this hands-on stuff and now word came down was all they wanted me to lecture. Well I can't do that now. If you wanted me to lecture, you should have had me do that right out of college. Now you've sent me to all these trainings. So then I pulled all the History Alive curriculum and found it was aligned with our core content and gave that to [the principal]. (8HT – Int 2, ¶68)

In sum, data from the 24 teacher interviews indicated that the six teachers in this study differentiated their beliefs along the continuum of custodialism and humanism. Though there were differences in beliefs among the grades, there were common beliefs associated with custodialism that oppose beliefs of humanism. Custodial teachers controlled student movement and interaction, disciplined consistently without consideration of circumstance, and used teacher-centered pedagogies. Humanistic teachers empowered students with choices about movement and interaction, used discipline to teach behavior, and used student centered pedagogies. The next section is a cross case analysis of teacher behaviors.

Teacher Behaviors

There was sound alignment between the beliefs and behaviors for the teachers in this study. The management behaviors of custodial teachers emphasized control of movement and interaction in their classrooms. The management behaviors of the humanistic teachers facilitated learning. The discipline behaviors of the custodial teachers stopped disruption and at times, embarrassed students. The discipline behaviors of the humanistic teachers also stopped the misbehavior, but also created understanding between teachers and students. Humanistic teachers did not embarrass their students. The observations revealed that custodial teachers used worksheets and lecture and Q & A for instruction. Humanistic teachers used intellectual interaction and moral debate to instruct their students. The next sections address the classroom management, discipline, and instructional behaviors of the six teachers in this study.

Classroom management. Custodial teachers managed their classes using regimented routines and strict control of movement. The routines involved filling student time with tasks and worksheets so there was no time to misbehave. Humanistic teachers managed their classes by giving students choices to develop self-management skills and engaging students in interesting activities and discussions.

Both sixth grade teachers used CHAMPS to manage their classes. Campbell used the agenda and the student notebook to facilitate instructional organization. She emphasized organization of student papers, completion of tasks, and making sure students sat still during instruction. She managed student responses using lecture and Q & A. She used knowledge questions, which minimized the opportunity for discussion. Elliot organized her classroom so that students learned to manage themselves. She had places

for students to turn in work. She started the class with an agenda and an explanation of tasks. She had a variety of sources available for students to use. Her students worked in groups and assigned jobs to one-another to complete their tasks. The emphasis was on interaction and the learning process, not on right or wrong knowledge level questions.

McNabb organized her classroom using CHAMPS and providing work packets for students. She managed her classroom by not allowing her students to interact with one another. When she taught, she used lecture and Q & A. When students attempted to interact intellectually about their work, she used verbal desists. She did not differentiate between social talking and intellectual talking. During the observations, she did not allow students to work together in pairs or groups. Warren organized her class by telling students what they needed on their desks for their tasks. She gave students choices about where they sat in the classroom. During her overhead discussions, students could move to see well. They did not need to ask Warren for permission. When students worked individually, Warren allowed them to get help from peers.

Carroll organized his classroom according to strict regimentation. This regimen included strict control of movement and interaction but did not include CHAMPS. Students walked in his class and started writing. During the four observations, there was limited student movement. Interaction was either in response to a knowledge question or clandestine misbehavior. Elliot used the agenda and CHAMPS to start her classes. She managed her classroom using a variety of activities that kept students engaged. During intellectual interaction and moral debate, students took turns speaking. Some chimed in during natural pauses while others raised hands. The next section addresses the discipline behaviors of the six teachers in this study.

Discipline. The beliefs of the six teachers in this study influenced their discipline behaviors. During the 12 observations of custodial classrooms, custodial teachers used sarcasm and embarrassment to address student misbehavior. During the 12 observations of humanistic classrooms, humanistic teachers used gentle desists and proximity to address student misbehavior.

During the four classroom observations, Campbell used punitive means to address student misbehavior. She used sarcasm to address student incomplete work and moved students when they talked to one-another. When she corrected students, she made it clear what they did wrong, but did not offer suggestions on how to behave. She relied on her terse voice and student fear of consequences to correct student misbehavior. Elliot masked her responses to misbehavior. When a student was not listening, she restated the instructions for the entire class. She used proximity to stop student off-task behavior. As she walked around the room, she asked questions about the work. Her close proximity and engaging students in conversations about the work both restored order and brought the students back on-task.

During the four observations, McNabb used sarcasm, escalation, and a student conference to address student misbehavior. When students interacted intellectually about their work, McNabb called them down for talking. She also used the terse look that she described during her interviews to address student misbehavior. Warren used proximity, humor, gentle desists, and confrontation to address misbehavior in her classroom. She judged when a student was angry and needed other students to leave him alone. She waited for several minutes before quietly talking to this student and getting him back on task. She also judged when she could confront a student without escalating the situation.

Although Warren used sarcasm, she followed her remarks with laughter signifying that the remark was aimed at humor, not belittlement.

Carroll used sarcasm, threats of punishment, and proximity to address student misbehavior. His loud voice and no-nonsense approach to discipline was successful in keeping students quiet and still. His actions, on the other hand, did not encourage students to work. Students obscured their misbehavior by engaging in activities that did not draw attention to themselves. Brandt did not need to discipline her students often during the four classroom observations. When she did, proximity and gentle desists were enough to get students back on task. On one occasion, when a student was off task, she assigned another student to help with the work. When Brandt corrected behavior, students responded by resuming their work. The next section addresses the instructional behaviors of the six teachers in this study.

Instruction. The instructional behaviors of the teachers in this study aligned with their beliefs. Custodial teachers used teacher-centered pedagogies. The emphasis of the custodial teacher was on covering the Kentucky Core Content and guiding students to right answers. Humanistic teachers used student centered pedagogies. The emphasis of the humanistic teacher was to engage students in intellectual interaction about the content and on developing skills that lead to finding and reporting information.

The core activity for students in Campbell's class was keeping their notebooks orderly and complete. Interaction was teacher-to-student. She lectured her students about the information she taught then asked recall questions. Her questioning followed a pattern of initiation of a question, student response, and her evaluation of the student answer. Answers were either right or wrong. Students who knew the information were able to

dominate the other students with their answers. Those who did not know answers were able to obscure themselves. Elliot's primary activity was group work. She facilitated while students engaged in activities to find and share information. Elliot evaluated students based on their ability to create and share their work.

McNabb did very little teaching during the four observations of her classroom. Her primary method of instruction was to provide students with work packet. When she did interact with her class, it was in the form of lecture and Q & A. She did not allow students to interact about their work. Warren made her instruction visual. She used overheads, magazines, and student projects to promote student discussion about the content. When students did individual assignments, Warren allowed students to choose to get help from peers or to work alone.

Carroll used written assignments and lecture and Q & A to teach his class. He did the talking in his class and students only talked when responding to his questions or complying with his directives. Brandt engaged students in activities that promoted intellectual interaction and moral debate. She also used novel techniques that made common assignments more interesting.

In sum, the beliefs of the teachers in this study had an impact on their classroom management, discipline, and instruction behaviors. Custodial teachers managed their classes to control movement and limit interaction. Humanistic teachers managed their classes to enhance their instruction. Custodial teachers disciplined students using sarcasm and threats of punishment. Humanistic teachers disciplined students to teach social skills. Custodial teachers used teacher-centered pedagogies. Humanistic teachers used student-centered pedagogies.

To further illustrate the differences between custodial and humanistic teachers, the researcher combined the observation data for the three custodial and three humanistic teachers. Table 25 shows COS Activity Type data for the two ideologies addressed in this study. The instructional interaction was four times more frequent in the humanistic classrooms (131 observation intervals) than in the custodial classroom (33 observation intervals). This data shows the imbalance of interaction between custodial teachers and humanistic teachers. It supports the claim that custodial teachers in this study suppressed interaction in their classrooms. There were no observations of students painting, drawing, creating graphics, or otherwise constructing in the custodial classrooms. There were 31

Table 25

COS Composite Activity Type

7C Activity Types	Custodial	Humanistic
1. Working on written assignments	114	120
2. Interaction - Instructional	33	131
3. Interaction - Social	35	9
4. Watching or listening	98	147
5. Reading	92	143
6. Getting/returning materials	20	37
7. Painting, drawing, creating graphics, etc.	0	31
8. Working with technology	14	8
9. Working with manipulatives/equipment	0	0
10. Viewing video/slides	0	0
11. Playing games	0	0
12. Presenting/acting	1	0
13. Tutoring Peers	4	12
14. Not attending to task	204	27
15. No activity/transition	68	40
16. Other	37	15
Totals	720	720

observation intervals of constructing in the humanistic classrooms. These are activities often associated with group work or at the very least, noise. Student work noise that occurs in groups or during student construction of work products did not threaten the humanistic teachers. In 204 observation intervals in custodial classrooms, students were not attending to the task. In the humanistic classrooms, there were only 27 intervals of students not attending to the task.

Table 26 shows the COS setting composite data for the custodial and humanistic teachers. During the 720 observation intervals of custodial teachers, 384 observation

Table 26

COS Composite Setting

Setting	Custodial	Humanistic
1. Whole Class	299	368
2. Small Group	37	72
3. Pairs	0	56
4. Individuals	384	224
Totals	720	720

intervals were of students working individually. In the humanistic classroom, there were 224 observation intervals of individual work. Small group instruction occurred only in the sixth grade custodial classroom. There were 37 observation intervals of small group instruction in her class. There were nearly twice as many (72) in the humanistic classrooms. There were no observations of students working in pairs in the custodial classrooms. There were 56 observation intervals of pairs in the humanistic classroom. This data shows that custodial teachers spent more instructional time allowing students to work on assignments in class than they did actually instructing the class in whole class

groups. The numbers for the humanistic teachers were nearly the opposite of their custodial counterparts. Custodial engaged in less small group and pairs. The difference in small group and pairs settings likely contributed to the differences in classroom interaction discussed below. The next section contrasts the climate of the three custodial and three humanistic classrooms.

Climate

The beliefs and behaviors of the six teachers in this study affected the classroom climate. The climate in the custodial classrooms was divided between those who liked their teachers and those who did not. The climate was not divided in the three humanistic classrooms. The next sections address the physical, motivation, and communication climates in the six classrooms included in this study.

Physical climate. The physical climate of the custodial teachers, with the exception of the sixth grade, promoted regimentation. The materials on the walls were either district supplied or commercially produced classroom decorations. In the seventh and eighth grade classrooms, there were no displays of student work. In the three humanistic classrooms, the teachers arranged their furniture in ways to promote interaction. Humanistic teachers displayed student work in their rooms, on their walls, and hanging from the ceilings.

Motivation climate. A common thread among the custodial classrooms was the concept of a divided climate. Students in the interviews indicated that there were students in their classes that did not like their custodial teachers. The students who did not like their teachers did not engage in the lessons. They were bored and occupied their time in ways that did not enhance their learning experiences. These students were unmotivated.

In the humanistic classes, there were similar situations where students did not engage in the work. There were no data that suggested a connection between student perceptions of their teachers and disengagement in the humanistic classrooms. Instead, students attributed this behavior to the natural inattention of middle school students.

Communication climate. The salient characteristic of the custodial classroom was the lack of interaction among the students. Campbell emphasized content knowledge in her classroom. When students knew answers, they were comfortable sharing their knowledge. Students in McNabb's classroom were not allowed to interact with one another. They interacted with their worksheet packages. In Carroll's class, students interacted with their teacher but not with one another. Students were able to interact socially when they hid their interactions from Carroll. Brandt empowered her students to make choices. Students were comfortable communicating intellectually with their teacher and with one another. The next section addresses the student engagement for the six cases included in this study.

Student Engagement

There were more opportunities for the students to interact in the humanistic classroom than in the custodial classroom. Table 27 shows the interaction data for the combined custodial and humanistic classes in this study. In the custodial classroom, students worked independently nearly 50% more often in the custodial classrooms than in the humanistic classrooms. This is not taking into consideration that Warren allowed her students to interact when they were working independently. In the custodial classrooms, there were only 16 observation intervals when students were interacting instructionally

with one another. In humanistic classrooms, students engaged with one-another in instructional interaction during 190 observation intervals. The data support the claim that

Table 27

COS Composite Interaction

Interaction	Custodial	Humanistic
1 None /Independent	308	217
2 Teacher instructional	268	224
3 Teacher managerial	70	71
4 Teacher social	6	11
5 Support staff	2	0
6 Student instructional	16	190
7 Student social	50	7
8 Other	0	0
Totals	720	720

the behavior and climate of custodial teachers suppressed the interaction in their classrooms.

The COS Manner data in the section comparing ideology shows the differences between random inattention and divided climate. Appendix I shows six graphs of COS Manner data compiled from the four classroom observations of each of the six teachers in the study. Each graph contains the sequential compilation of the four classroom observations. The labels on the horizontal axis represent the classroom observation number and the observation round number. Each point on the graph represents an observation interval. The values on the vertical axis represent the manner that the observer recorded on the COS form. These values are: 1 = *On task*, 2 = *Waiting for teacher*, 3 = *Distracted*, 4 = *Disruptive*, and 5 = *Other*. In a classroom where students are engaged, most observation interval coding should be 1. The side-by-side comparisons of the graphs show that students were off task more often in the custodial classrooms than

they were in the humanistic classrooms. The custodial behavior of teachers resulted in students tuning the teacher out to occupy themselves with other things.

Summary of Findings for Research Question One

Teacher beliefs affected teacher behavior, classroom climate, and student/teacher interaction. The custodial teachers in this study engaged in teacher behaviors that controlled the movement and diminished the interaction of students in their classes. Students interacted with teachers and their teachers were the source of information flow. Students did not act or learn independently because their teachers did not allow intellectual interaction and moral debate. The humanistic teachers engaged in behaviors that empowered students to act and think independently. Intellectual interaction and moral debate was a part of the student experience in the humanistic classroom.

The climate in the custodial classroom was calm and subdued. Control over students led to obedience because students knew that they could avoid consequences by remaining unnoticed while in the classroom. The climate in the custodial classroom was divided. There were students who chose not to engage in the activities of their classes because they either disliked the teacher or they were bored. Students were occasionally off task in the humanistic classrooms. This occurred, however, with less frequency. There was no evidence that the off task behavior was associated with feelings of displeasure or boredom. Hoy (1972) found custodialism caused student disengagement. The results of the analysis of climate in the three custodial classrooms of this study echoed the findings of Hoy.

Custodialism had a chilling effect on the student engagement in classrooms. Students in the three custodial classrooms were passive participants in their classrooms.

They interacted most with their work rather than one another. They listened or found ways to avoid the attention of their teachers. In the three humanistic classrooms, the students interacted with the teacher and with one another. Interaction flow was from teacher-to-student, student-to-teacher, and student-to-student. The findings for the Research Question One supported the hypothesized relationship among teacher beliefs, teacher classroom behavior, classroom climate, and student engagement. The next section addresses Research Question Two, the impact that this relationship had on student outcomes.

Research Question Two: How Do the Intermediate Effects
of Teacher Beliefs on Teacher Behavior, Classroom Climate,
and Student Engagement Affect Student Outcomes?

The intermediate effects of teacher beliefs had an impact on outcomes in the areas of office referrals, grades, and achievement on the accountability index. Outcomes reflect differences in the classroom experience for students. Teacher beliefs, teacher behaviors, classroom climate, and student/teacher interaction influenced student time spent out of the classroom resulting from office referrals, student perceptions of achievement and rigor as reflected in the grades they achieved, and student achievement as measured on statewide accountability tests. The sections below address these outcomes.

Office Referrals

Table 28 shows the categories of office referrals and the frequency of each for the 2005-2006 school year at Rolling Hills. The three custodial teachers in this study issued 118 office referrals while the humanistic teachers in this study issued 64. Custodial

teachers issued 26 office referrals for defiance of authority and 27 office referrals for being unprepared for class. Humanistic teachers issued only 11 referrals for defiance of

Table 28

Office Referrals by Grade and Orientation

	6C	6H	7C	7H	8C	8H	Cust	Hum
Argumentative	0	0	2	1	3	0	5	1
Bullying	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	3
Classroom Disruption	3	1	0	0	1	8	4	9
Defiance of Authority	3	2	6	8	17	1	26	11
Disrespect	0	0	5	1	4	2	9	3
Excessive Talking	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	6
Fighting	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0
Failure to turn in Teacher Report	7	1	0	0	0	1	7	2
Forgery	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
Horseplay	0	0	6	3	1	1	7	4
Inappropriate use of Technology	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Incomplete Assignments	3	0	1	0	0	0	4	0
Intimidation/Threatening	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Lying	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
Minor Vandalism	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Out of Assigned Area	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	3
Profanity or Vulgarity	0	3	2	0	3	0	5	3
Sleeping in Class	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Student/Peer Conflict	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Theft	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Uncooperative	0	3	2	1	0	3	2	7
Unprepared for Class	21	1	6	0	0	4	27	5
Wasting Time	2	0	8	0	1	1	11	1
Totals	40	13	40	17	38	34	118	64

authority and 5 for being unprepared for class. Campbell and McNabb issued 40 office referrals each and Carroll issued 38 office referrals. Carroll issued the most office referrals for defiance of authority ($n = 17$). Campbell issued 21 of the 32 office referrals for coming to class unprepared. McNabb issued eight referrals for wasting time. She issued six office referrals for horseplay and six for being unprepared for class. Brandt

issued 34 office referrals, the most office referrals of the three humanistic teachers.

Warren issued 17 office referrals and Elliot issued 13. Eight of Brandt's referrals were for classroom disruptions and six were for excessive talking. Warren issued eight referrals for defiance of authority. Elliot issued three office referrals for profanity and three for uncooperative behavior. The next section addresses student grades.

Grades

The researcher calibrated final grades for each student in the participating classrooms according to final average (1 = *student highest grade*, 5 = *student lowest grade*). He then compiled frequency tables and calculated average class rank to analyze results to support or reject the hypothesis. Students had higher grades in sixth and eighth grade but not in seventh grade. The sixth grade custodial class ranked fifth for 12 students with an average rank of 4.16. The humanistic class ranked third for eight students with an average ranking of 3.00. For the eighth grade, the custodial class ranked fourth for six students and fifth for eight students with an average rank of 3.58. The humanistic class ranked fourth for nine students and first for seven with an average rank of 3.00.

For the seventh grade, the custodial class ranked first for seven students and second for six with an average ranking of 2.11. The humanistic class ranked third for 12 students with an average rank of 3.16. These results appeared contradictory to the hypothesized relationship between ideology and grades because student grades in the custodial classroom were higher than those in the humanistic classroom. McNabb, however, provided unchallenging work for her students. One student described assignments saying, "We get real easy worksheets like we did in elementary school, I think won't help me when I go to higher grades" (7C1-interview 3). Grades are

meaningful when they encourage students to embrace hard work (Tomlinson, 2001). The CATS results follow.

CATS Scores

The CATS results were inconclusive for the sixth grade. To analyze the CATS results for the seventh and eighth grades, the researcher calculated index scores using the same formula that the Kentucky Department of Education uses. The four main categorical scores are Novice, Apprentice, Proficient, and Distinguished. Novice and Apprentice were divided into subcategories of Low, Medium, and High. Each level has a weight factor ranging from 0 to 140. Table 29 shows a detailed list of the weighting

Table 29
Weighting Factors for the CATS Index Calculation

Score	Abbreviation	Weight
Novice Low and Blank Response	NL	0
Novice Medium	NM	13
Novice High	NH	26
Apprentice Low	AL	40
Apprentice Medium	AM	60
Apprentice High	AH	80
Proficient	P	100
Distinguished	D	140

factor that the state uses to calculate index scores for the various subjects included on the CATS test. The index score is the sum the scores of the category weight multiplied by the percentage of students scoring within the category (Kentucky Department of Education, 2006).

Seventh grade. In during the 2006 school year, Kentucky measured middle school portfolio results in seventh grade only. Fourteen students received a Novice rating on their portfolios and eight scored Apprentice. McNabb had no Proficient or Distinguished portfolios in the class for this study. The researcher used the CATS index formula to convert these results to an index score (see Table 30). Her class achieved an index score of 30.1. The school index was 38.8; McNabb's index was 8.7 points below the index for all seventh grade portfolio in the school. Students in Ms. McNabb's class did not embrace the efforts needed to achieve proficiency when they wrote their portfolios.

Table 30

Seventh Grade Custodial Class Portfolio Index

Score	Frequency	Percent	Weight	Percent X Weight
NL	0	0%	0	0.0
NM	14	64%	13	8.3
NH	0	0%	26	0.0
AL	0	0%	40	0.0
AM	8	36%	60	21.8
AH	0	0%	80	0.0
P	0	0%	100	0.0
D	0	0%	140	0.0
	22		Index	30.1

School Index 38.8

For on-demand writing, McNabb's class results included nine students who scored Novice, 12 who scored Apprentice and one who scored Proficient. The researcher applied the CATS index formula to calculate an index for McNabb's class for on-demand writing

(see Table 31). The index for her class was 42.6. The overall school index for On-demand Writing was 48.6. McNabb's scores were 6 points below the overall index for the school.

Table 31

Seventh Grade Custodial Class On-Demand Writing Index

Score	Frequency	Percent	Weight	Percent X Weight
NL	0	0%	0	0.0
NM	9	41%	13	5.3
NH	0	0%	26	0.0
AL	0	0%	40	0.0
AM	12	55%	60	32.7
AH	0	0%	80	0.0
P	1	5%	100	4.5
D	0	0%	140	0.0
	22	Index		42.6

School Index 48.6

Warren was responsible for the performance of her students on the seventh grade Science accountability test. Table 32 shows the calculation for of Warren's class index on the Science subtest of the CATS accountability test. Scores in Warren's class included

Table 32

Seventh Grade Humanistic Class Science Index

Score	Frequency	Percent	Weight	Percent X Weight
NL	0	0%	0	0.0
NM	0	0%	13	0.0
NH	3	14%	26	3.7
AL	5	24%	40	9.5
AM	6	29%	60	17.1
AH	3	14%	80	11.4
P	4	19%	100	19.0
D	0	0%	140	0.0
	21	Index		60.9

School Index 62.5

three Novice High, five Apprentice Low, six Apprentice Medium, three Apprentice High, and four Proficient for an index 60.9 class index on the CATS science subtest. The school index was 62.5. Warren's class scored 1.6 points below the school index.

The researcher followed up with the school counselor at the school with these data and asked the counselor if he had divided these classes according to their abilities. In the two seventh grade classes in this study, ability levels may have slightly favored the custodial classroom. Both classes, however, were average ability. Based on the fact that McNabb's students performed 8.7 and 6.0 points below the school averages in portfolio and on-demand writing subtests of CATS respectively, and that Warren's class performed 1.6 points below the school average in Science subtest of CATS, the researcher concluded that students in the humanistic classroom outperformed the students in the custodial classroom on the CATS subtests. In addition, the Portfolio and On-demand Writing scores did not reflect the grades that McNabb assigned to the students in her class. The grade average for McNabb's class was 82%. One would expect the CATS scores to be much higher based on this average. On the other hand, Warren's grade average was 78%. This is more in line with the CATS performance of her class.

Eighth grade. Mr. Carroll and Ms. Brandt taught reading in the classes selected for this research. Table 33 shows the results of the calculated index for Mr. Carroll's

reading class. The index score on the reading subtest for his class was a 55.4. This was 27.5 points below the school index of 82.9.

Table 33

Eighth Grade Custodial Class Reading Index

Score	Frequency	Percent	Weight	Percent X Weight
NL	0	0%	0	0.0
NM	5	19%	13	2.4
NH	2	7%	26	1.9
AL	7	26%	40	10.4
AM	3	11%	60	6.7
AH	4	15%	80	11.9
P	6	22%	100	22.2
D	0	0%	140	0.0
	27	Index		55.4

School Index 82.9

Table 34 shows the results of the calculated index for Ms. Brandt's class. The index score on the reading subtest for her class was 103.2. This was 20.3 points above the school index.

Table 34

Eight Grade Humanistic Class Reading Index

Score	Frequency	Percent	Weight	Percent X Weight
NL	0	0%	0	0.0
NM	0	0%	13	0.0
NH	0	0%	26	0.0
AL	1	4%	40	1.6
AM	1	4%	60	2.4
AH	1	4%	80	3.2
P	17	68%	100	68.0
D	5	20%	140	28.0
	25	Index		103.2

School Index 82.9

When checking with the school counselor, the researcher learned that there was ability grouping in these classes. Most of the students in both classes were “average” readers but some of the “best” readers in the school at the beginning of the year were on the class list for Brandt. Some of the students on Carroll’s class list struggled with reading, according to the counselor. The researcher removed the top five scores from Brandt’s class and the bottom five scores from Carroll’s class to adjust the scores for the outliers in the data.

Table 35 shows the calculated index from Carroll’s class less the five lowest scores. Removing the five lowest scores resulted in an 11 point boost in Carroll’s index. The adjusted index was 65.1. This was, nonetheless, 17.8 points below the school index.

Table 35

Eighth Grade Custodial Class Reading Index Adjusted for Ability Grouping

Score	Frequency	Percent	Weight	Percent X Weight
NL	0	0%	0	0.0
NM	0	0%	13	0.0
NH	2	9%	26	2.4
AL	7	32%	40	12.7
AM	3	14%	60	8.2
AH	4	18%	80	14.5
P	6	27%	100	27.3
D	0	0%	140	0.0
22		Index	65.1	

School Index 82.9

Table 36 shows the calculated index from Brandt’s classroom less the five highest scores. The adjusted index was 94.0, 11.1 points above the school index. Based on the amount of off-task behavior and the removal of extreme scores from the data set, the

researcher concluded that the students in the humanistic class outperformed the students in the custodial class on the eighth grade reading subtests of the CATS test.

Table 36

Eight Grade Humanistic Class Reading Index Adjusted for Ability Grouping

Score	Frequency	Percent	Weight	Percent X Weight
NL	0	0%	0	0.0
NM	0	0%	13	0.0
NH	0	0%	26	0.0
AL	1	5%	40	2.0
AM	1	5%	60	3.0
AH	1	5%	80	4.0
P	17	85%	100	85.0
D	0	0%	140	0.0
	20	Index		94.0

School Index 82.9

Summary of Findings for Research Question Two

Student outcomes of Humanistic classrooms out-gained those of Custodial classrooms. Humanistic teachers issued 54 fewer office referrals than custodial teachers did. When grades were meaningful, they were higher for the humanistic teachers. This was the case in the sixth and eighth grades. Students said that their work in McNabb's seventh grade language arts class was too easy. High averages did not translate to high performances on the writing subtests of the CATS assessment. Students in Warren's class said that they were proud of their work because they knew they had tried hard. The students in humanistic seventh and eighth grade classrooms had greater gains in achievement as measured by the CATS test in the seventh and eighth grade custodial classes.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter has seven sections; study purpose, summary of findings, conclusions, discussion of findings, implications of findings, recommendations, and suggestions for further research. The first section is a recapitulates the purpose of the study. The second section summarizes the four major findings for Research Question One and three major findings for Research Question Two. The third section includes the conclusions that the researcher made based on the findings. The fourth section discusses the findings related to past research. The fifth section discusses the implications of the major findings in relation to demands of the Kentucky Education Reform act and No Child Left Behind. The sixth section discusses recommendations for teachers, administrators, and researchers. The seventh section proposes suggestions for further research.

Study Purpose

The purpose of this study was to contextualize pupil control ideology within selected classrooms in a school struggling with satisfactory progress toward Proficiency on both the KERA accountability index and the No Child Left Behind measure of Adequate Yearly Progress. This study examined a school with a high level of poverty (measured using free and reduced lunch status), struggling to meet the requirements for the Kentucky Education Reform Act and the Adequate Yearly Progress goals of No Child Left Behind.

The researcher hypothesized that teacher beliefs affected four dimensions of the student experience in the classroom. These four dimensions included teacher beliefs,

teacher classroom behaviors, classroom climate, and student engagement. The researcher further hypothesized these four dimensions of classroom affected student outcomes and students achieve higher outcomes with humanistic teachers. It is vital to understand the effects of teacher beliefs in establishing classroom climates and student engagement that will result in maximizing student outcomes. The relationships that teachers establish with students provide a multitude of possibilities for this study. Pupil control is only one of many factors that affect student outcomes. It is, however, an import factor.

Summary of Findings

In Chapter Four, the researcher analyzed two classes from each of the sixth, seventh, and eighth grades at Rolling Hills Middle School. The unit of analysis for this study was the classroom in which the teachers interacted with their students in either a humanistic or a custodial climate; each classroom represented a case. The researcher analyzed the data at two levels: (a) within grade across belief, and (b) across grades and across beliefs (see Figure 4). Below is a summary of the four major findings within and across grade levels for Research Question One and three findings for Research Question Two.

Research Question One.

In what ways do teacher beliefs about the craft of teaching impact teacher classroom behavior, classroom climate, and student engagement? The first four major findings address Research Question One. These findings include the information that emerged for teacher beliefs, teacher classroom behaviors, classroom climate, and student engagement.

In the tradition of Huberman and Miles (1994) the researcher presented the findings using figures and description. The researcher created figures to represent continua from custodial to humanistic for each dimension of Research Question One using the characteristics that emerged from the data. The region on the left side of center represents custodialism and the region on the right side of center represents humanism. In a meeting with the Nationally Board Certified Teacher (NBCT), the researcher confirmed or rejected characteristics for each teacher in each dimension. The researcher accepted characteristics only if both he and the NBCT agreed that the characteristic was a fit for the case (see e.g., Keedy, et al. 1986). The researcher then positioned each teacher on the continua according to the number accepted characteristics. For each characteristic, the researcher moved the teacher placement one cell away from the center of the continua. The teachers furthest from center represent extreme examples of their orientations.

1. The six teachers in this study differentiated themselves between two patterns of *beliefs*, custodialism and humanism. Teacher beliefs and teacher behaviors fell into four of the same categories that Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967) used to describe type C and type H (custodial and humanistic) teachers when they developed the PCI form. These categories were classroom management, discipline, instruction, and perceptions of students. Figure 10 shows the findings for each teacher in relation to their beliefs about classroom management. The custodial believed in strict control of movement and student talk, had low tolerance for noise and used regimented routines to manage their classrooms. The

humanistic teachers believed in allowing student movement and interaction, had a high tolerance for noise, and varied their activities to keep students interested and

Note: The teachers are coded by grade and orientation (C = *custodial*, H = *humanistic*). Numbers in subscript represent the numbered characteristics in the lists below the continuum.

Figure 10. Classroom Management Beliefs Findings

engaged. Figure 11 shows the findings for teacher classroom behaviors. Custodial teachers used discipline to stop disruptions; used embarrassment, confrontation, and guilt; were punitive, and used pejorative terms to describe students.

Humanistic teachers used discipline to teach social skills, used light desists and interaction, were therapeutic and described students using behavior terms.

Discipline Beliefs

Grade	Most	Custodial ←			Least	Least	Humanistic →			Most
6	6C ₁₂₃₄							6H ₅₆₈		
7					7C ₄			7H ₅₇₈		
8	8C ₁₂₃₄									8H ₅₆₇₈
Number of Characteristics	4	3	2	1		1	2	3		4
	Custodial Beliefs 1. Purpose to stop disruption 2. Embarrassment, Confrontation, Guilt 3. Punitive 4. Pejorative terms to describe students					Humanistic Beliefs 5. Purpose to teach social skills 6. Use of light desists, interaction 7. Therapeutic 8. Behavioral terms to describe students				

Note: The teachers are coded by grade and orientation (C = *custodial*, H = *humanistic*). Numbers in subscript represent the numbered characteristics in the lists below the continuum.

Figure 11. Discipline Beliefs Findings

Figure 12 illustrates the findings for teacher beliefs about instruction. None of the custodial teachers claimed they believed lecture and Q & A was effective. All of

Instruction Beliefs

Grade	Most	Custodial ←			Least	Least	Humanistic →			Most
6		6C ₂₃₄								6H ₅₆₇₈
7		7C ₂₃₄						7H ₅₇₈		
8		8C ₂₃₄								8H ₅₆₇₈
Number of Characteristics	4	3	2	1		1	2	3		4
	Custodial Beliefs 1. Lecture and Q & A 2. Teacher centered pedagogies 3. Routine pedagogies 4. Worksheets, individual work					Humanistic Beliefs 5. Authentic discussion 6. Student centered pedagogies 7. Varied pedagogies 8. Projects, group work				

Note: The teachers are coded by grade and orientation (C = *custodial*, H = *humanistic*). Numbers in subscript represent the numbered characteristics in the lists below the continuum.

Figure 12. Instruction Beliefs Findings

the custodial teachers, however, believed in teacher centered pedagogies, routine activities, and used worksheets and individual work to teach. Humanistic teachers believed in using authentic discussion, student centered pedagogies, varied activities, and used projects and group work to teach.

2. In practice, *teacher behaviors* aligned with their beliefs. Custodial teachers controlled student movement and suppressed and/or controlled the interaction in their classrooms. Figure 13 illustrates the results for classroom management behaviors. Custodial teachers managed their classrooms by strictly

Classroom Management Behaviors									
Grade	Most	Custodial			Least	Least	Humanistic		Most
6		6C ₁₂₄							6H ₅₆₇₈
7	7C ₁₂₃₄								7H ₅₆₇₈
8	8C ₁₂₃₄							8H ₆₇₈	
Number of Characteristics	4	3	2	1		1	2	3	4
	Custodial Behaviors 1. Strict control of movement 2. Strict control of student talk 3. Kept classroom noise to a minimum 4. Regimented routines					Humanistic Behaviors 5. Free student movement 6. Encourages student interaction 7. Allowed students to make noise 8. Varied Activities			

Note: The teachers are coded by grade and orientation (C = *custodial*, H = *humanistic*). Numbers in subscript represent the numbered characteristics in the lists below the continuum.

Figure 13. Classroom Management Behaviors Findings

controlling student movement and talk, keeping noise to a minimum, and regimenting the routines in the classroom. Humanistic teachers managed their classroom allowing student movement and interaction, allowed students to make noise, and varied activities. Figure 14 shows the results for discipline behaviors.

Custodial teachers disciplined students to stop disruption. They embarrassed and confronted students and used guilt to stop misbehavior. They were punitive and used pejorative terms to discipline students. Humanistic teachers disciplined students to teach social skills. They were therapeutic in their approach to discipline. They used gentle desists and interaction to stop student misbehavior.

Note: The teachers are coded by grade and orientation (C = *custodial*, H = *humanistic*). Numbers in subscript represent the numbered characteristics in the lists below the continuum.

Figure 14. Discipline Behaviors Findings

They described students using punitive terms. Figure 15 below shows the results for teacher instructional behavior. Custodial teachers used primarily lecture and Q & A, were teacher centered, used routine pedagogies, and used worksheets and individual work to teach. Humanistic teachers used authentic discussion, were

student centered, varied their pedagogies, and used projects and group work to teach.

Note: The teachers are coded by grade and orientation (C = *custodial*, H = *humanistic*). Numbers in subscript represent the numbered characteristics in the lists below the continuum.

Figure 15. Instruction Beliefs Findings

3. Figure 16 shows the findings for *classroom climate*. There were differences between custodial climates and humanistic climates of the schools in this study. The physical climate of the custodial classroom promoted structure and routine. Students were bored and uncomfortable in the custodial classrooms. There was evidence of a divided climate in the custodial classrooms. In the custodial classrooms, communication flowed primarily from teacher-to-student. The physical climate of the humanistic teachers was open and inviting with desk arrangements that promoted team work and displays of student work in the rooms. Students were motivated in a robust and interactive environment. There was no

evidence of divided climates in the humanistic classroom. Communication flow was from teacher-to-student, student-to-teacher, and student-to-student.

Classroom Climate										
Grade	Most	Custodial			Least	Least	Humanistic			Most
		←					→			
6		6C ₂₃₄							6H ₅₆₇₈	
7	7C ₁₂₃₄								7H ₅₆₇₈	
8	8C ₁₂₃₄								8H ₅₆₇₈	
Number of Characteristics	4	3	2	1		1	2	3	4	
	Custodial Climate 1. Physical – Tables in rows, no student work displays 2. Motivation – bored or uncomfortable 3. Motivation -- evidence of divided climate 4. Communication -- teacher-to-student					Humanistic Climate 5. Physical – tables in groups or U-shape, displays of student work 6. Motivation – robust and comfortable 7. Motivation -- no divided climate 8. Communication -- all directions				

Note: The teachers are coded by grade and orientation (C = *custodial*, H = *humanistic*). Numbers in subscript represent the numbered characteristics in the lists below the continuum.

Figure 16. Classroom Climate Findings

- Figure 17 illustrates the findings for *student engagement*. There were differences in student engagement between the custodial and humanistic classroom environments. Custodial teachers had low percentages of student instructional interaction and high percentages of teacher instructional interaction and independent work time. Students in custodial classrooms were distracted more than 30% of the time. Humanistic classrooms had high percentages of student instructional interaction and relatively lower percentages of teacher instructional interaction and independent work time. Students in custodial classrooms were

distracted less often than 30% of the time while in class. For figure 17, the researcher chose the percentages to differentiate humanism from custodialism

Note: The teachers are coded by grade and orientation (C = *custodial*, H = *humanistic*). Numbers in subscript represent the numbered characteristics in the lists below the continuum.

Figure 17. Student Engagement Findings

With the natural divides that occurred in the COS data between humanistic and custodial teachers and the descriptions of custodialism and humanism from chapter two. For example, custodial teachers are teacher-centered and humanistic teachers are student-centered in regard to instruction (Willower, Eidell, & Hoy, 1967). Percentages of observation intervals for instructional interaction among the custodial teachers were 5%, 1%, and 1% for sixth, seventh, and eighth grades respectively (see Tables 3, 11, and 19). Percentages of observation intervals of instructional interaction among the humanistic teachers were 25%, 12%, and 42% for sixth, seventh, and eighth grades (see Tables 7, 15, and 23). Similar divides

consistently occurred for teacher instructional time, no work or independent work time, and students distracted data.

Research Question Two.

How do the intermediate effects of PCI on teacher behavior, classroom climate, and student engagement affect student outcomes? The findings for Research Question Two reveal the data collected from the mining of outcomes documents. The outcomes included office referrals, grades, and CATS test results.

1. Humanistic teachers wrote fewer *office referrals* than the custodial teachers wrote. Humanistic teachers wrote 64 office referrals. Custodial teachers wrote 118 office referrals. Custodial teachers wrote more than twice as many (26) office referrals for defiance of authority as the humanistic teachers did (11). Custodial teachers wrote over five times more (27) office referrals for being unprepared for class than humanistic teachers (5) did.
2. In the sixth and eighth grades, *student grades* were better in the humanistic classes. This was not the case in the seventh grade class. Grades were better for students in the seventh grade custodial classroom than in the seventh grade humanistic classroom.
3. Students in humanistic classrooms outperformed students in custodial classrooms on *CATS accountability measures* for seventh and eighth grades. The results for sixth grade CATS assessment were inconclusive. Seventh grader students in the custodial classroom scored an index of 30.1 for portfolio writing and 42.6 for on-demand writing. Seventh grade students in the humanistic class scored 60.9 on the science CATS subtest. Eighth grade students in the custodial classroom scored

65.1 on the reading subtest of the CATS when corrected for outliers. Students in the humanistic classroom scored 94.0 on the reading subtest of the CATS when corrected for outliers.

Conclusion

The researcher hypothesized that teacher beliefs influenced three dimensions of the classroom, teacher behavior, classroom climate, and student engagement. Research Question One asked in what ways teacher beliefs about the craft of teaching impact teacher classroom behavior, classroom climate, and student engagement. The hypothesized relationships among teacher beliefs, teacher behavior, and classroom climate were accurate in terms of effect. The hypothesized relationship was not entirely accurate, however, in terms of the direct connection between student engagement and teacher beliefs. In the original informal hypothesis, teacher classroom behaviors, classroom climate, and student engagement were on equal levels as dimensions of classroom. The findings imply that teacher beliefs about the craft of teaching are “emic” phenomena. Emic beliefs are internal structures of thought that emerge from teaching experiences. These beliefs manifest themselves in classrooms as teacher behaviors and elements of classroom climate. Student engagement, however, is an “etic” response. Etic refers to interpretations (see Pike, 1967). In this study, students interpreted and responded to teacher behaviors and classroom climate. The response was a level of engagement in the activities of the classroom, which included on task, distracted, and disruptive behaviors. Student engagement was an outcome indirectly related to teacher beliefs. Humanistic teachers had higher levels of student engagement than custodial teachers did.

There was a divide in the custodial climate between students who engaged in instruction and students who endured the time spent in class. Some students engaged in the class because they had other motivators; they liked the class, the teacher was a coach, they enjoyed the topic, or there was pressure to make good grades. Students without personal motivators endured the class and engaged to avoid conflict or embarrassment. This divide did not occur in the humanistic classroom. Student engagement was much higher in humanistic classrooms than in custodial classrooms. In most instances, students in humanistic classrooms who were off task quickly corrected their own behaviors or conformed to mild desists.

It is a basic tenet of the Kentucky Education Reform Act and No Child Left Behind that all students would perform to proficiency. No Child Left Behind requires a reduction in student achievement gaps. Students in humanistic classroom environments are more likely to contribute to both of these reform goals than student in custodial environments because of higher levels of student engagement. Students in custodial environments spent less time engaging in lessons. The custodial climate lacked motivation and communication. Custodial teachers referred students to the office more often, which necessarily resulted in reduction of time spent in class for these students. Students in humanistic climates spent more time in class engaged because their teachers created interest and made fewer office referrals.

Discussion of Findings

This section had three subsections. The first subsection connects the findings of this study to existing research. The second subsection connects the findings of this study

to current reform efforts. The third section addresses problems that occurred with this study.

Connections to Existing Research

In their original Pupil Control Ideology study, Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967) found custodialism resulted in closed structured classroom climates and humanism resulted in open interactive climates. Other researchers made the connection between climate and student outcomes (Hoy, 1972; Kottkamp & Mulhern, 1987; Lapointe, 2003; Lunenburg & Stouten, 1983). It was important to examine class climate from the student perspective in this study to understand how students perceived the learning environment. Students who throughout the year developed independent thinking skills and competencies performed proficiently on CATS tests. This did not happen in custodial climates where independent and creative thinking were diminished in a controlled environment.

Based on the index scores presented in the previous chapter, one might argue that the students in humanistic classrooms did not perform proficiently. Keedy et al. (1998) found schools need a critical mass of teachers engaged in student-centered pedagogies to achieve the ideals of the common school. The faculty at Rolling Hills demonstrated that there was not a common goal of intellectual interaction and moral debate. From a student perspective, going from closed to open or open to closed environments resulted in student confusion about the norms of classroom behavior and interaction (see Keedy et al., 1998).

The results of this study support Glasser (1985). The control beliefs of teachers affected teacher classroom behavior and classroom climates. Students responded to climate, choosing to engage or not engage in the activities of their classrooms. This

subsequently influenced student outcomes on accountability measures with the humanistic classrooms outperforming the custodial classrooms. When students worked in cooperative models with teachers facilitating instruction, teachers elevated student performance. Success on CATS accountability measures required complex independent thinking skills. Differentiated patterns of teacher beliefs was a factor in student outcomes (Gibson & Dembo, 1984). The humanistic teachers in this study provided the learning climate most conducive for the development of complex independent thinking skills.

In most cases, it is difficult to make connections between student grades and accountability assessments. Teacher assignment of grades is often arbitrary and has nothing to do with student mastery of skills measured on accountability measures (Brennan, R. T, Kim, J., & Wenz-Gross, 2001). This research was no exception. Tomlinson (2001) found that grades were meaningful to students when there was adequate rigor. Thomas Guskey (2006) identified three dimensions of grades that make grades meaningful: (a) performance, (b) product, and (c) progress. When classes were too easy, students perceived the class as unimportant. When classes were too hard, students became frustrated and gave up. As stated in Chapter Four, the sixth and eight grade students in humanistic classrooms received higher grades than those in custodial classrooms. The students in the seventh grade custodial classroom had higher grades than students in the seventh grade humanistic classroom.

The researcher speculates that the seventh grade custodial teacher inflated her student grades. Student products in the seventh grade custodial class were the portfolios. Despite the B-average in this class, 64% of the student performed at the Novice (lowest) level and 36% performed at the Apprentice (second-lowest) levels on their portfolios. For

on-demand writing, 44% of the students performed at the Novice level, 55% performed at the Apprentice level, and 1% performed at the Proficient level. One would expect a class with a B-average most students to score much higher than Novice and Apprentice on portfolio and on-demand writing measures. The disparity among performance, product, and grades indicated that the seventh grade custodial teacher inflated her grades. The grades in the humanistic class were commensurate with student performance on the CATS science test.

The finding related to office referrals is important because of the effect that the office referral system has on students. The office referral system necessarily requires students to spend time away from the classroom. Spending time away from the classroom means a suspension of instruction for the student. When students spend time away from instruction, they naturally fall behind academically. When students fall behind academically, they engage in more anti-social behavior (Mayer, 2001). This potentially spawns a cycle of misbehavior as students get further behind.

Connections to Current Reform Efforts

The Kentucky Education Reform Act and the No Child Left Behind Act require that teachers elevate student performance to proficiency. Teachers who embraced intellectual interaction in their classrooms were able to advance their students closer to the index score 100, the value that Kentucky used to define proficiency. The researcher speculates that when custodial teachers suppressed movement and interaction in their classrooms, students were unable to develop the independent thinking skills needed to demonstrate proficiency when in the controlled testing environment. Seales (2002) found patterns of interaction in classrooms necessarily operate to produce specific learner

outcomes and that improved student interaction results in improved problem solving abilities in students. Custodial classrooms were void of the patterns of interaction that would empower students to solve problems independently.

Each middle school student body is a sample of the population of middle schools across the U. S. Parenting and community necessarily influence the social and linguistic development of children. A linguistically and culturally deprived rural setting certainly produces barriers to student success. The demands of KERA and No Child Left Behind require teachers to embrace, not ignore, community and cultural influences that affect the skills students bring into the classroom. Meier (1995) chronicled the founding of Central Park East (CPE) Schools. Through community involvement, shared decision making, and high expectations, students attending CPE overcame the social and academic barriers of inner city Harlem and achieved success by empowering students with voice in their classrooms.

The Kentucky Education Reform Act and the No Child Left Behind Act require that teachers elevate student performance to proficiency. Teachers who embrace intellectual interaction in their classrooms are able to advance their students closer to the index score 100, the value that Kentucky used to define proficiency. The researcher speculates that when custodial teachers suppressed movement and interaction in their classrooms, students were unable to develop the independent thinking skills needed to demonstrate proficiency when in the controlled testing environment. Seales (2002) found patterns of interaction in classrooms necessarily operate to produce specific learner outcomes and that improved student interaction results in improved problem solving

abilities in students. Custodial classrooms were void of the patterns of interaction that would empower students to solve problems independently.

Problems in Design

The CATS results were inconclusive for the sixth grade. In Kentucky, sixth graders take a nationally norm referenced test in reading and mathematics. The teachers in this study taught social studies and science. None of the sixth grade reading or mathematics teachers at Rolling Hills met the study requirements of at least four years teaching experience. There was no way to attribute performance on the nationally norm referenced test to either of the teachers in this study. This was a weakness in the study design.

Perceptions of the organization was a dimension of teacher beliefs that emerged from the original pupil control ideology research (Willower, Eidell, & Hoy, 1967). The researcher was unable to use the data related to teacher perceptions of the organization. During data collection, the central office administration visited Rolling Hills to observe staff. A team of directors, assistant directors, and two assistant superintendents observed classrooms for 15 minutes and recorded their observations using an observation instrument. Several days later, the two assistant superintendents called a faculty meeting to rebuke the teachers based solely on the data they collected during the 15 minute observations. Two weeks later, the same team repeated the observation. Several days later, the two assistant superintendents called a meeting to report staff improvements. One superintendent presented the staff with a plaque to commemorate the improved performance. The district printed a story about the award in a district newsletter.

The staff believed that the rebuke was uncalled for because there were not sufficient repeated observations to make a judgment about the pedagogies used at the school. They believed the award was an attempt at appeasement and perceived the administrative behavior as patronizing. These events neutralized the data regarding perceptions of the organization. Elliot, for example, responded:

The spoon award was insulting. I didn't appreciate being told the morning of, not to worry about this; they're watching what's going on in the classroom, not us. I didn't appreciate the dressing down that we were given, the whole staff based on one observation, a half a day, 15 minutes for class. I didn't appreciate Madeline Hunter being waved in front of my face, the beyond all, she's a wonderful teacher and her lesson plan formats were great. I didn't appreciate assuming that I sit around with my feet up or at my desk, because I don't. I don't sit around waiting for my paycheck. (6HT – Int 1, ¶15)

Implications of Findings

This study has important implications for administrators confronted with reform realities of KERA and NCLB, where student outcomes must improve annually. Closing the achievement gap is vital to meeting the reform demands of No Child Left Behind. Evidence from this study suggests a possible effect that compounds the poor performance attributed to minority race, economic disadvantage, and disability. In the divided climate of custodial classrooms, the engaged students kept stride with the lessons while the unengaged students endured the boredom while they took on the task of learning individually. These students were literally left behind in the classroom. The three humanistic teachers had higher levels of student engagement. The humanistic climate provides the climate in which students are most likely to develop the independent thinking skills that they need to score the higher Proficient and Distinguished levels on the Kentucky accountability academic measures.

CATS scores for Kentucky schools started to stabilize from year to year at least as of 1999 as shown in table 37 below. Roeder (2001) found the correlation of CATS index

Table 37

Accountability Indexes for Kentucky Schools

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Elementary School Accountability Index	66.5	68.4	70.9	72.9	76.1	81.5	81.5	84.7
Middle School Accountability Index	64.0	65.8	67.8	68.7	71.5	74.1	75.8	77.0
High School Accountability Index	63.4	64.8	66.9	68.4	70.1	73.5	74.9	75.9
Combined Accountability Index	64.6	66.3	68.5	70.0	72.6	76.4	77.4	79.2

scores from 2000 to 2001 was very high ($r = .91$). This high correlation means that from year to year, the accountability index for Kentucky schools changes very little. Roeder's statistics included schools where index scores improved and declined. This is not good news for schools struggling to meet the requirements of CATS and No Child Left Behind. Kentucky for all schools in 2006 was 79.9. The middle school index for the state was 77.0 (Kentucky Department of Education, 2006a). This puts Kentucky in the progressing range. Progressing means the state is not meeting its academic goals, and is in a range that indicates the need for assistance.

The state of Kentucky met 19 of the 25 target goals for No Child Left Behind (Kentucky Department of Education, 2006b). Table 38 shows the 2006 No Child Left Behind results in Kentucky by student group. The Measurable Objective in the Kentucky for reading was 45.21 and for Math was 29.62 as measured using the CATS test and a nationally norm referenced test. The scores for students across the state of Kentucky fell below these indexes for African-Americans in reading and mathematics, for Limited

English Proficient in reading, for students receiving free or reduced lunch in Mathematics, and for students with disabilities in reading and math. The minimum annual measurable objectives rise to 53.04 in reading and 39.68 in math for the 2006-2007 school year and to 60.86 in reading and 49.73 for the 2007-2008 school year. By 2014, the minimum annual measurable objectives for reading and math will be 100. As time

Table 38

Kentucky No Child Left Behind Adequate Yearly Progress – 2006

Student Group	Met Annual Measurable Objective		Met Participation Rate	Other Academic Indicator
	Reading	Mathematics		
All Students	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
White (Non-Hispanic)	Yes	Yes	Yes	
African-American	NO	NO	Yes	
Hispanic	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Asian	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Limited English Proficiency	NO	Yes	Yes	
Free/Reduced Lunch	Yes	NO	Yes	
With Disability	NO	NO	Yes	

passes, it will become increasingly difficult to meet the requirements of the Commonwealth Accountability Testing System and the No Child Left Behind act.

The publication of *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1984) was a signal to the U. S. that its schools were failing to educate its citizenry. Continued failure would be a threat to the national economy and to democracy. Many students were graduating from schools in the U. S. lacking skills for work or post-secondary school (Hamilton, 1986; Guthrie, 1988). The authors of *A Nation at Risk* recommended additional time in class and homework. They did not recognize that poor

performance was a product of poor quality of the student experience, not the quantity of time spent in the classroom. This study showed additional instructional time was only effective when the time spent in class included authentic student voices engaged in intellectual interaction.

This study addressed the learning experience from the perspectives of teacher beliefs and student experience. Glasser (1985) posited the quality of student work was poor in U. S. Schools because teachers engaged in archaic teaching pedagogies that diminished student engagement and suppressed student interaction. The findings from this study showed humanistic teachers provided an engaging and interactive climate for students to learn.

Recommendations

This section connects the findings and the implications to meaningful practices in the field of education and research. There are three subsections. The first section addresses teacher practices including planning, pedagogy, and reflection. The second section addresses administrative management and hiring practices. The third section addresses recommendations for researchers.

Recommendations for Administrators

The School Level Performance Descriptors of the Kentucky Standards for School Improvement is a tool for schools to identify areas for improvement as a part of the planning and developing process for comprehensive improvement plans. *Standard 9* requires faculty and administration to evaluate school performance (Kentucky Department of Education, 2006c). As a part of this evaluation, administrators should use the data from the Kentucky Individual Performance Report, which lists the accountability

scores of each student individually, to calculate performance indexes for each teacher in the building. They could use these indexes to compare performance to the pedagogical choices, climates, and interaction in classrooms. This study showed that teacher classroom behavior was a better predictor of classroom climate, student engagement, and student outcomes than years of experience. Analysis of data must go beyond knowing how many points increase is needed to get the school wide academic index in the *meets goals* range on the Kentucky Individual Performance Report. School administrators might use student performance data to illustrate when teacher classroom behaviors result in closed climates and diminished student performance. Likewise, they should use the performance data to illustrate what innovative pedagogies result in improved student outcomes. Principals aware of the pedagogies in their school and the impact of these pedagogies on student performance can use this information to assist marginal teachers.

Administrators should use accountability data to make professional development decisions. In Keedy et al. (1998), there was not a critical mass of teachers engaging students in intellectual interaction and moral debate. Critical mass was outside the framework of this study. It makes sense, however, that schools with a critical mass of humanistic teachers create a learning atmosphere that is most conducive to the critical and independent thinking skills required to raise student accountability scores. District decision makers should plan in-service activities that promote open learning climates. Students did not know how to interact in humanistic classroom climates when the majority of their teachers suppressed interaction in their other classes. If there was a critical mass of teachers engaging students in interaction in their classrooms, then

students would be less confused about how to behave. Intellectual interaction should become the norm in the classroom.

When schools fill teacher vacancies, administrators could carefully design interview questions to address the beliefs and behaviors of candidates. Ms. McNabb, in this study, illustrated why this was an important issue. McNabb had many humanistic beliefs about management, discipline, and instruction. These beliefs did not, however, manifest in her classroom behaviors. Administrators could design interview questions inquire about beliefs and behaviors. Interview questions using the prelude “What do you think . . .” do not address teacher behavior. Administrators could design questions that ask about specific situations and how teachers responded to those situations in teaching or student-teaching contexts to discern teacher behaviors. Follow-up questions could be about rationale and self-evaluation of these behaviors. The rationale and self-evaluation responses could illustrate teacher beliefs along the continuum of custodialism and humanism.

Ms. Brandt illustrates why it is important for administrators to lead in ways that reflect how they want their teachers to lead in the classroom. Brandt’s beliefs were wavering at the time of this study because of pressure from the district administration to improve accountability scores. Administrators could structure their leadership styles to reflect the management and instructional styles they expect from their teachers. Faculty meetings could be interactive in incorporate teacher presentations and small group to large group activities. Principals and district administrators could facilitate, not dictate teaching. Teachers could have a voice in meaningful planning and decisions in the school.

Recommendations for Teachers

This research underscored the unique considerations for planning in a reform environment. The curriculum map or curriculum plan became an important part of planning because teachers were responsible for the information for which they are accountable. All of the teachers in this study anticipated the spring testing and addressed the core content during their instruction. The difference in ideologies of the teachers had an impact on the pedagogical choices that they made. Coverage of curricular content alone is not enough to elevate student performance on accountability measures. The evidence presented in this study indicates that teachers could plan a variety of pedagogies that engage students in intellectual interaction and moral debate. Communication should be from teacher-to-student, student-to-teacher, and student-to-student. Teachers could plan to have materials available that will allow students to grapple with information.

Teachers need to be aware of student engagement when they are teaching. Scanning the room and correcting the distracted students in the classroom may temporarily increase the number of engaged students. Teachers in this study engaged the greatest percentage of students when they were student-centered. Student engagement was highest when students worked in groups or pairs. The custodial teachers in this study complained that reform nearly eliminated the teachable moment and limited their choices of pedagogies. This was erroneous thinking. The humanistic teachers found ways to address the core content and still make their lessons interesting and engaging. It was the beliefs of the teachers, and not the core curriculum, that diminished the teachable moment and limited the pedagogical choices of the custodial teachers. The humanistic

teachers understood that they could apply sound, student-centered pedagogies to the core content. They did this using group projects, paired work, and engaging interaction.

Standard V of the Kentucky New Teacher Standards states that teachers should reflect and evaluate their teaching (Kentucky Department of Education, 2002). When reflecting about instruction, teachers should consider student engagement and divided climate. Teachers could adjust teaching to meet the cultural and educational needs of their students.

Recommendations for Researchers

Interpretive research provides the opportunity for the researcher to engage with the study participants. There are issues that emerge when conducting research with people. This study was no exception. People missed interview appointments, school assemblies interfered with observation appointments, and one student dropped out of the study causing the researcher to select from a pool of other subjects to replace the one that dropped out. These events are not unusual when collecting data from human subjects. This section addresses what the researcher learned about unexpected events beyond the control of the researcher, human subjects review, and the nature of collecting data from middle school aged subjects.

When entering the field as a researcher, the researcher is at the mercy of the events that occur during data collection. Doctoral students hear stories of the dissertations of predecessors whose survey data became tainted because of floods, tornadoes, or terrorist attacks. In the qualitative paradigm, the context is much more sensitive. As mentioned above, the administrative single use of a repeated measures observation tool to rebuke and then again to reward the Rolling Hills staff was an example of how an event

of even limited scope can contaminate data. By examining the research problem through a broad lens, the researcher was able to diminish the effect of the data loss. There is time to go back at another time or to other schools to examine perceptions of educational organizations. Researchers could design studies with broad scope so that they can overcome the effects of small scale events that taint data collection.

Human subjects protection programs became a necessary part of all research where involving data collection from people. There are many nuances that the research neophyte may overlook that cause red flags for those who review research proposals for the institutional review boards of universities. In this study, for example, the researcher did not initially specify the students in the study would not be students in his class. When a teacher or professor includes current students, there was a risk of coercion (P. K. Lietsch, personal communication, November 8, 2005). Students might have concerns about turning down the invitation to participate in a study because of the relationship that necessarily exists between teacher and student.

To include one's students, the researcher must prepare to defend that choice to a full institutional review. Through open communications with the chair of the *Behavioral/Social/Educational* human subjects protection program, the researcher was able to make adjustments to his research design and received approval through expedited review. Because the students involved in the study were minors, the research was not eligible for exemption from human subjects review. Researchers collecting data from human subjects could communicate with their institutional human subjects reviewers to expedite the approval process. It is also important to keep copies of all the submitted

documents and to check back with the human subjects protection program to make sure there are no missing documents and that any problems are addressed in a timely fashion.

Interviewing middle school aged subjects provided data that could not have collected in other ways. The information about classroom climate that these students provided was valuable to the descriptions, analysis, and interpretation of the classroom climate data. There are, however, some issues that the researcher could consider before engaging students in data collection. Two that emerged in this study were short answers without explanations and responses that contradicted researcher observations.

Researchers could craft their questions to avoid short answers. It helps to interact with students before the formal or semi-formal interviews to get comfortable with the students and to understand how the words that they use when interacting with one another.

During the interview process, researchers must be comfortable with quiet pauses to wait for more explanation. The researcher could plan on how to restate a question without changing the meaning of the question prior to the interview. When students make statements that contradict observations, it is tempting for the researcher to rebuke the answer. When dealing with children, however, it is better to give the participant an opportunity to explain. Questions prefaced by words such as, “Are we talking about the same thing as what I saw yesterday when . . . ?” give the student an opportunity to explain what they meant without suffering the embarrassment of making a mistake.

Suggestions for Further Research

Three reasons to enlighten the academic community are to “contribute to general knowledge, enhance understanding, [and to] offer heuristic insight” (Rossman & Rallis, 2003, p. 21). This study answered many questions and raised many more. There is a need

for further research into the effects the administration has on the teaching behaviors of its faculty. In this study, the central office administration displayed bureaucratic non-participatory leadership styles when addressing what they perceived was a shortage of direct instruction. It would be interesting to discover if administrative custodialism influences teacher beliefs.

Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967) developed the Pupil Control Ideology measure to reduce a set of beliefs to a single index. This study examined three aspects of *teacher beliefs, classroom management, discipline, and instruction*. The findings of this study revealed varying beliefs among the six teachers in these three aspects. There is a need to develop a measure that treats these aspects of pupil control as separate indexes. Such an instrument would allow the application of the theory developed in this study to larger contexts. There is also a need to develop measures of classroom climate including the *physical, motivation, and communication* aspects of climate. It would be important to discover the relationships between aspects of beliefs, climate, and student outcomes on a large scale.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, G. J., & Walberg, H. J. (1969). *The assessment of learning environments: A manual for the Learning Environment Inventory and the My Class Inventory*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Ashton P. T., & Webb R. B. (1986a). School organization and teachers' sense of efficacy. In P. T. Ashton & R. B. Webb (Eds.), *Making a difference: Teachers' sense of efficacy and student achievement* (pp. 91-123). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Ashton P. T., & Webb R. B. (1986b). Teachers' sense of efficacy, classroom behavior, and student achievement. In P. T. Ashton & R. B. Webb (Eds.), *Making a difference: Teachers' sense of efficacy and student achievement* (pp. 91-123). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Berryman, L., & Russell, D. R. (2001). Portfolios across the curriculum: Whole school assessment in Kentucky. *English Journal*, 90(6), 76-83.
- Bickel, R., & Howley, C. (2003). Math achievement and the development of poor, rural areas: Effects of contextual factors intrinsic to modern world. *Educational Foundations*, 17(4), 83-105.
- Brennan, R. T., Kim, J., & Wenz-Gross, M. (2001). The relative equitability of high-stakes testing versus teacher-assigned grades: Analysis of the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS). *Harvard Education Review*, 71, 173-216.
- Christle, C., Nelson, C. M., & Jolivette, K. (2004). School characteristics related to the use of suspension. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 27, 509-526.
- Clark, R. (2004). *The essential 55*. New York: Hyperion.
- Connolly, B., & Smith, M. (2002). Teachers and students talk about talk: Class discussion and the way it should be. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 46, 16-26.
- Cookson, P. W. (2006). The whole student. *Teaching PreK-8*, 37(2), 14-16.
- Crawford, T. (2005). What counts as knowing: Constructing a communicative repertoire for student demonstration of knowledge in science. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 42, 139-165.

- Cusick, P. A. (1992). *The educational system: Its nature and logic*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Denton, P. (2003). Shared rule-making in practice: The Jefferson Committee at Kingston High School. *American Secondary Education*, 31, 66-117.
- Ellet, C. D., & Masters, J. A. (1977, October). *The structure of teacher attitude toward dimensions of their working environment: A factor analysis of the school survey and its implications for instrument validity*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Georgia Educational Research Association, Atlanta.
- Follett, M. P. (1926). The giving of orders. In J. M. Shafrits & J. S. Ott (Eds.), *Classics of organization theory* (pp. 167-178). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Foster, J. D. (1991). The role of accountability in Kentucky's Education Reform Act of 1990. *Educational Leadership*, 48, 34-36.
- Gathercoal, F. (1997). *Judicious discipline* (4th ed.). San Francisco: Caddo Gap Press.
- Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. (1984). Teaching efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76, 569-582.
- Glasser, W. (1985). *Control theory in the classroom*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Goddard, R. D., Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W. K. (2001). A multilevel examination of the distribution and effects of teacher trust in students and parents in urban elementary schools. *Elementary School Journal*, 102, 3-16.
- Gordon, L. V. (1970). The measurement of bureaucratic orientation. *Personal Psychology*, 23, 1-11.
- Grandmount, R. P. (2003). Judicious discipline: A constitutional approach for public high schools. *American Secondary Education*, 31, 97-117.
- Guthrie, J. W. (1988). Campaign '88 and education: A primer for presidential candidates. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 69, 514-519.
- Halpin, A., & Croft, D. (1962). *The organizational climate of schools*. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago.
- Hamilton, S. F. (1986). Excellence and the transition from school to work. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 67, 239-242.
- Harty, H., Anderson, H. O., & Enochs, L. G. (1984). Science teaching attitudes and class control ideologies of preservice elementary teachers with and without early field experiences. *Science Education*, 68, 53-59.

- Helsel, A., & Willower, D. (1974). Toward definition and measurement of pupil control behavior. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 12, 114-123.
- Hodder, I. (1994). The interpretation of documents and material culture. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 393-402). London: Sage.
- Hopkins, E. F. (1943). *Johnny Tremain*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Hoy, W. K. (1972). Dimensions of student alienation and characteristics of public high schools. *Interchange*, 3, 38-52.
- Hoy, W. K., & Woolfolk, A. E. (1990). Socialization of student teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 27, 279-300.
- Hunter, F. (1953). *Community of power structure*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Hyman, I. A. (1997). *School discipline and school violence: The teacher variance approach*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Kaba, M. (2001). "They listen to me but they don't act on it": Contradictory consciousness and student participation in decision-making. *High School Journal*, 84, 21-34.
- Keedy, J. L. (1995). Teacher practical knowledge in restructured high schools. *Journal of Education Research*, 89, 76-88.
- Keedy, J. L., Fleming, T. G., Wheat, D. L., & Gentry, R. B. (1998). Students as meaning-makers and the quest for the common school: A micro-ethnography of a U. S. history classroom. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 30, 619-645.
- Kentucky Department of Education. (2002). *New teacher standards for preparation and certification: Interdisciplinary early childhood education standards birth to primary*. Retrieved November 13, 2006, from the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board Web Site: <http://www.kyepsb.net>
- Kentucky Department of Education. (2006a, September). *Commonwealth accountability testing system (CATS) Kentucky core content test content area indexes 1999 to 2006*. Retrieved October 20, 2006, from the Kentucky Department of Education Web Site: <http://www.education.ky.gov>
- Kentucky Department of Education (2006b, September). *No Child Left Behind adequate yearly progress report – 2006*. Retrieved November 6, 2006, from the Kentucky Department of Education Web Site: <http://www.education.ky.gov>

- Kentucky Department of Education (2006c, September). *School level performance descriptors for Kentucky's standards and indicators for school improvement*. Retrieved November 13, 2006, from the Kentucky Department of Education Web Site: <http://www.education.ky.gov>
- Kentucky Department of Education. (2003, August). *Summary of the Kentucky Board of Education's (KBE) decisions on No Child Left Behind (NCLB) act issues from the August 7, 2003 meeting*. Frankfort, KY: Author.
- Kentucky Department of Education. (2003, October). *2003 CATS interpretive guide: Detailed information about how to use your score reports*. Retrieved July 7, 2005, from the Kentucky Department of Education Web Site: <http://www.education.ky.gov>
- Kentucky Education Reform Act, Ky Acts 476 (1990).
- Klem, A. M., & Connell, J. P. (2004). Relationships matter: Linking teacher support to student engagement and achievement. *Journal of School Health, 74*, 262-273.
- Kolbert, J. B., Morgan, B., & Brendel, J. M. (2002). Faculty and student perceptions of dual relationships within counselor education: A qualitative analysis. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 41*, 193-206.
- Kolesar, H. (1967). *An empirical study of client alienation in bureaucratic organization*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton.
- Kottkamp, R. B., & Mulhern, J. A. (1987). Teacher expectancy motivation, open to closed climate and pupil control ideology in high schools. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 20*, 9-18.
- Kushins, J., & Brisman, A. (2005). A portrait of 695 Park Avenue. *Art Education, 58*, 33-39.
- Lapointe, J. M. (2003). Teacher-student conflict and misbehavior: Toward a model of the extended symmetrical escalation. *Journal of Classroom Interaction, 38*(2), 11-19.
- Lapointe, J. M., & Legault, F. (2004). Solving group discipline problems without coercion: An approach based on attribution retaining. *Journal of Classroom Interaction, 39*(1), 1-10.
- Lemeshnik, S. (1971). *Children's projections of rejection and hostility onto teachers assessed by the draw-a-teacher technique*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, New York.
- Lunenburg, F. C. (1983). Pupil control ideology and self-concept as a learner. *Educational Research Quarterly, 8*, 33-39.

- Lunenburg, F. C. (1991). Pupil control ideology and behavior as predictors of environmental robustness: Public and private schools compared. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 24, 14-19.
- Lunenburg, F. C., & Stouten, J. W. (1983). Teacher pupil control ideology and pupils' projected feelings toward teachers. *Psychology in the Schools*, 20, 528-533.
- Mayer, G. R. (2001). Antisocial behavior: Its causes and prevention within our schools. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 24, 412-429.
- McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *An expanded sourcebook of qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mirta, D. L. (2004). The significance of students: Can increasing "student voice" in schools lead to gains in youth development? *Teachers College Record*, 106, 651 – 688.
- Miskel, C., DeFrain, J. A., & Wilcox, K. (1980). A test of expectancy motivation theory in educational organizations. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 16(1), 70-92.
- Moguel, D. (2004). What does it mean to participate in the class? Integrity and inconsistency in classroom interaction. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 39(1), 19-29.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2002, 115 STAT 425, PL 107-110 (2002).
- Osgood, C., Suci, G., & Tennenbaum, P. (1957). *The measurement of meaning*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Petersen, G. J., & Young, M. D. (2004). The No Child Left Behind Act and its influence on current and future district leaders. *Journal of Law & Education*, 33, 343-363.
- Picus, L., Odden, A., & Fermanich, M. (2004). Assessing the equity of Kentucky's SEEK formula: A 10-year analysis. *Journal of Education Finance*, 29, 315-336.
- Pike, K. L. (1967). *Language in relation to a unified theory of structure of human behavior* (2nd ed.). The Hague: Mouton.
- Reis, S. M., Colbert, R. D., & Hébert, T. P. (2005). Understanding resilience in diverse, talented students in an urban high school. *Roeper Review*, 27, 110-120.
- Riley, K., & Docking, J. (2004). Voices of disaffected pupils: Implications for policy and practice. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 52, 166-179.

- Roeder, P. W. (2001). A report on KERA report cards. Retrieved July 7, 2005, from The University of Kentucky Web Site: <http://www.uky.edu/~proeder/keraweb.htm>
- Rose v. Council for Better Education, 790 S.W.2d 186 (Ky. Sup. Ct. 1989).
- Ross, S. M., Smith, L. J., & Alberg, M. (1998). *School Observation Measure*. Memphis, TN: The University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.
- Rossman, G. B., & Rallis, S. F. (2003). *Learning in the field: An introduction to qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Satori, M. A., Bauske, T., & Lunenburg, F. C. (2000). Pupil control behavior, classroom robustness, and self-control: Public and military secondary schools. *American Secondary Education*, 29, 10-18.
- Seals, G. (2006). Mechanisms of student participation: Theoretical description of a Freiren ideal. *Educational Studies*, 39, 283-295.
- Seay, M. B., Suppa, R. J., Schoen, S. F., & Roberts, S. R. (1984). Countercontrol: An issue in intervention. *Remedial and Special Education*, 5, 38-42.
- Seeley, D. S. (1981). *Education through partnership: Mediating structures and education*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Sizer, T. (1984). *Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Sizer, T. R., & Sizer, N. F. (1999). Grappling. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 81, 181-190.
- Soar, R. S., & Soar, R. M. (1980). *Climate and control system*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Florida, Gainesville.
- Soar, R. S., Soar, R. M., & Ragosta, M. (1971). *Florida climate and control system*. Institute for Development of Human Resources, University of Florida, Gainesville.
- Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Strong, S., & Sexton, L. C. (1996). Kentucky performance assessment of reading, valid? *Contemporary Education*, 67, 102-106.
- Taylor, M. (1992). *The road to Memphis*. New York: Penguin Young Readers Group.

- Tierney, W. G. (1991). Utilizing ethnographic interviews to enhance academic decision-making. In D. M. Fetterman (Ed.), *Using qualitative methods in institutional research* (pp. 7-22). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- The National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for education reform*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Traynor, P. L. (2003). Factors contributing to teacher choice of classroom order strategies. *Education (Chula Vista, CA)*, 123, 586-599.
- U. S. Department of Education. (2004, March). *New No Child Left Behind flexibility: Highly qualified teachers*. Retrieved August 29, 2005, from <http://www.ed.gov/print/nclb/methods/teachers/hqtflexibility.html>
- Vitagliano, J. A., & Licata, J. W. (1987). Hearing and deaf teacher pupil control ideology and pluralistic ignorance. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 132, 199-205.
- Walker, H. M., & Walker, J. M. (1991). *Coping with noncompliance in the classroom*. Austin, TX: PRO-ED.
- Waxman, H. C., & Padrón, Y. N. (2004). The use of the classroom observation schedule to improve classroom instruction. In H. C. Waxman, R. G. Tharp, & R. S. Hilberg (Eds.), *Observational research in U. S. classrooms* (pp. 72 – 96). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Willower, D. J., Eidell, T. L., & Hoy, W. K. (1967). *The school and pupil control ideology* (Pennsylvania State Studies Monograph No. 24). University Park: Pennsylvania State University.
- Willower, D. J., Eidell, T. L., & Hoy, W. K. (1973). *The school and pupil control ideology* (2nd ed., Pennsylvania State Studies Monograph No. 24). University Park: Pennsylvania State University.
- Wolcott, H. F. (1994). *Transforming qualitative data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wolf, S. A., & McIver, M. C. (1999). When process becomes policy: The paradox of Kentucky state reform for exemplary teachers of writing. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80, 401-406.
- Wolfgang, C. H. (1999). *Solving discipline problems: Methods and models for today's teachers* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Woolfolk, A. E., & Hoy, W. K. (1990). Prospective teacher's sense of efficacy and beliefs about control. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82, 81-91.

Wubbles, T., & Levy, J. (1993). *Do you know what you look like? Interpersonal relationships in education*. London: The Falmer Press.

APPENDICIES

Appendix A: Teacher Selection Protocol

The paired statements below describe characteristics of pupil control. The researcher will indicate verbally the teacher represented on this data collection sheet. Read each of the statement pairs. For each pair, select the statement that best describes this teacher. Then rate the teacher using the scale beside that statement. For each pair of statements, rate the teacher for one statement or the other, but not both.

Teacher Number: _____

Item 1	Trusts students	☐ Very Little ☐ Most Often ☐ Always
	OR	
	Distrusts students	☐ Very Little ☐ Most Often ☐ Always
Item 2	Sincere to students	☐ Very Little ☐ Most Often ☐ Always
	OR	
	Sarcastic to students	☐ Very Little ☐ Most Often ☐ Always
Item 3	Respectful to students	☐ Very Little ☐ Most Often ☐ Always
	OR	
	Disrespectful to students	☐ Very Little ☐ Most Often ☐ Always
Item 4	Friendly to students	☐ Very Little ☐ Most Often ☐ Always
	OR	
	Aloof to students	☐ Very Little ☐ Most Often ☐ Always
Item 5	Interaction teacher to student, student to teacher, student to student	☐ Very Little ☐ Most Often ☐ Always
	OR	
	Teaches from the front of the room with most communication occurring teacher to student	☐ Very Little ☐ Most Often ☐ Always
Item 6	Flexible	☐ Very Little ☐ Most Often ☐ Always
	OR	
	Regimented	☐ Very Little ☐ Most Often ☐ Always
Item 7	Optimistic	☐ Very Little ☐ Most Often ☐ Always
	OR	
	Pessimistic	☐ Very Little ☐ Most Often ☐ Always

Item 8	Describes student misbehavior using psychological and educational terms	☐ Very Little ☐ Most Often ☐ Always
	OR	
	Describes student misbehavior using moral and personal terms	☐ Very Little ☐ Most Often ☐ Always

Item 9	Approachable to students	☐ Very Little ☐ Most Often ☐ Always
	OR	
	Unapproachable to students	☐ Very Little ☐ Most Often ☐ Always

Item 10	Uses behavior learning to correct student misbehavior	☐ Very Little ☐ Most Often ☐ Always
	OR	
	Uses threats and punitive action to correct student misbehavior	☐ Very Little ☐ Most Often ☐ Always

Please stop. Thank you.

Researcher Use Only	HUM VL _____ X 1 = _____	CUST VL _____ X 1 = _____
	HUM MO _____ X 2 = _____	CUST MO _____ X 2 = _____
	HUM AL _____ X 3 = _____	CUST AL _____ X 3 = _____
	TOTAL	

Appendix B: Initial Teacher Interview Protocol

1. How did you decide to become a teacher?
 - Please describe your background in education.
 - Why did you want to become a teacher?
 - Why did you choose this school?
2. How do you feel about your job to date?
 - What is it like to work at this school?
 - Describe your relationships with parents, students, and administration at this school.
 - Describe your students.
3. What kind of professional development have you received in the area of classroom management?
 - Please describe any in-service training you received in classroom management.
 - What classes did you take in college to prepare you for classroom management?
 - To whom do you talk in the in the school to learn more about classroom management?
 - What kind of supports or professional development do you need in terms of classroom management?
4. What is the best way to manage the daily operations of your classroom?
 - How do you teach students to cooperate and behave in class?
 - How do you manage student movement during instruction?
 - How do you manage the teacher-student interaction in your classroom?
 - How do children best learn to cooperate and behave in class?
 - How did you develop these beliefs about classroom management?
5. What is the best way to handle disruptive students?
 - How do you handle discipline when you encounter misbehavior?
 - What kind of disciplinary measures have the most lasting effects on student behavior?
 - To what extent do your beliefs about student discipline align with those of the administration of this school?
 - How did you develop these beliefs about discipline?
6. What teaching strategies work the best?
 - What works for you in the classroom in terms of teaching strategies?
 - What classroom activities have you used that have a long lasting effect on student learning?
 - How do you evaluate student learning?
 - To what extent do your beliefs about teaching methods align with other teachers in the school?

7. What challenges do you face in achieving adequate yearly progress and proficiency by the year 2014?

8. Is there anything else you would like to add?

Appendix C: Classroom Observation Schedule

		School Name _____	ID# _____	
		Teacher Name _____	ID# _____	
Data Control No. _____	Grade _____	Student Name _____	ID# _____	
Subject: Reading Lang. Arts Math Obs# _____		Ethnicity: W B H A O Sex: M F		

A. INTERACTIONS (check one)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. No interaction/independence	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. With teacher - Instructional	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. With teacher – Managerial	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. With teacher – Social, Personal	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. With support staff	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. With other students – Instructional	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. With other students – Social, personal	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Other _____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
B. SELECTION OF ACTIVITY (check one)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Teacher assigned activity	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Student selected activity	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
C. ACTIVITY TYPES (check one)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Working on written assignments	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Interaction – Instructional (e.g., discussing)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Interacting – Social (e.g., talking)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Watching or listening	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. Reading	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Getting/Returning materials	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Painting, drawing, creating graphics, etc.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Working with technology	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. Working with manipulative material/equipment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. Viewing video/slides	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. Playing games	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. Presenting/Acting	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13. Tutoring peers	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. Not attending to task	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15. No activity/transition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16. Other _____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

D. SETTING (check one)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Whole Class	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Small Group	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Pairs	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Individuals	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
E. MANNER (check one)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. On task	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Waiting for teacher	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Distracted	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Disruptive	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. Other _____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
E. LANGUAGE USED (check one)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. English	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
2. Spanish	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Both English and Spanish	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Appendix D: Teaching For Meaning

Observer: _____ Date: _____ PRE-Obser: _____ POST-Obser: _____

Teacher _____ Grade: _____ Subject: _____ School: _____

I. Student Engagement

Scan 1-	Time: _____	Total number of students _____	Total number off-task _____
Scan 2-	Time: _____	Total number of students _____	Total number off-task _____
Scan 3-	Time: _____	Total number of students _____	Total number off-task _____
Scan 4-	Time: _____	Total number of students _____	Total number off-task _____
Scan 5-	Time: _____	Total number of students _____	Total number off-task _____
Scan 6-	Time: _____	Total number of students _____	Total number off-task _____
Scan 7-	Time: _____	Total number of students _____	Total number off-task _____
Scan 8-	Time: _____	Total number of students _____	Total number off-task _____
Scan 9-	Time: _____	Total number of students _____	Total number off-task _____
Scan 10-	Time: _____	Total number of students _____	Total number off-task _____

II Teaching for Meaning

Key: 1 = not observed/never (0%)
 2 = only observed occasionally (25%)
 3 = observed about half of the time (50%)
 4 = observed most of the time (75%)
 5 = observed all of the time (100%)

A. Students are engaged in discussion with the teacher or with other students in pairs, small or large groups.	1	2	3	4	5
B. Complex concepts/generalizations are the object of class and small group discussion and activities.	1	2	3	4	5
C. Skills are taught in context rather than in isolation.	1	2	3	4	5
D. Teacher uses extrinsic rewards and controls for behavior.	1	2	3	4	5
E. There is evidence of appropriate reference to culture of the students in class.	1	2	3	4	5
F. Teacher facilitates linkage of new content to prior knowledge or information that follows.	1	2	3	4	5
G. Teacher facilitates linkage of new content to other content areas.	1	2	3	4	5

Observer: _____ Date: _____ PRE-Obser: _____ POST-Obser: _____

Teacher _____ Grade: _____ Subject: _____ School: _____

Focus Comments: Topics of discussion; teaching strategies; teacher and student interactions; whether skills are taught and if so how; use of rewards and discipline; evidence of culture in content, speech, materials, bulletin boards, etc.; evidence of linkage to other content or to content that comes before or after current content.

Scan 1: Time:
Discussion:

Concepts:

Skills:

Rewards:

Culture:

Linkage:

Appendix E: Flanders 10 X 10 Interaction Matrix

		Teacher							Pupil		X	
	Cate- gory	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Tot
Teacher	1											
	2											
	3											
	4											
	5											
	6											
	7											
Pupil	8											
	9											
X	10											
	Total											
	%											

Category	Description
Teacher	
1	Teacher statements that accept and clarify an attitude or the feeling tone of a pupil in a non-threatening manner.
2	Teacher encourages pupil
3	Teacher comments that: (a) acknowledges pupil idea (b) modifies the idea or rephrases it (c) applies student idea (d) compares student idea or makes connection with the idea (e) summarizes student idea.
4	Questions to move the conversation to a next step or introduce a new problem
5	Lecturing, expressing opinions, giving facts, interjecting thoughts, off-hand comments
6	Desist statement (stop student misbehavior)
7	Directive statement (tell student to do something else)
Student	
8	Response or statement of conformity
9	Expression of ideas or embellishment of code 8
Other	
10	Pause, noise, confusion

Appendix F: Initial Student Interview Protocol

1. Tell me about your school.
 - Is this school preparing you for high school?
 - What does this school best?
 - What does this school do worst?
 - How do you feel about going to school here?
2. Tell me about you as a student.
 - What kind of grades do you make?
 - Please describe your study habits.
 - How do you do on tests?
 - What kind of writer are you?
 - How is your behavior?
3. Describe the characteristics of some of your favorite teachers.
 - How did these teachers control behavior in their classrooms?
 - How did these teachers conduct lessons?
 - Were you able to learn from these teachers? Why or why not?
4. Describe the characteristics of some of your least favorite teachers.
 - How did these teachers control behavior in their classrooms?
 - How did they conduct lessons?
 - Were you able to learn from these teachers? Why or why not?
5. Do you ever get into trouble with teachers?
 - When you do (if you were to) get into trouble, what could the teacher do to get you to behave?
 - When you do (if you were to) get into trouble, what might a teacher do that would make things worse for you?
6. Do you have anything to add?

Appendix G: Coding List and Definitions

Beliefs – Teacher descriptions of their beliefs about the craft of teaching

Classroom Management – descriptions of teacher beliefs about the handling of the daily operations of their classrooms

Discipline – descriptions of teacher beliefs about how students ought to be disciplined, and what constitutes major and minor disciplinary problems

Instruction – descriptions of teacher beliefs about their pedagogical choices and what pedagogical choices result in ideal learning opportunities

Teaching Behaviors – Observations of teachers engaged in the craft of teaching

Classroom Management – Descriptions of teachers observed engaging in managing the daily operations of their classrooms

Discipline – Descriptions of teachers observed engaging in disciplinary actions against students

Instruction – Descriptions of teachers observed engaging in instructional activities and the quantity of specific activity types and settings of these activities

Climate – Descriptions of the extent to which the classroom environment contributes to student desire to engage in and persist at academic tasks (Patrick, Turner, Meyer, & Midgley, 2003).

Physical Climate – the physical make-up of the classroom including the arrangement of furniture and the room décor

Motivation Climate – student descriptions of the interest and rigor of instruction

Communication Climate – student descriptions of their willingness to interact and their teacher's willingness to allow interaction with their peers and their teacher

Interaction – Quantities of teacher-to-student, student-to-teacher, and student-to student interactions in the classroom and the quantities of on-task and not on-task behaviors as observed using the COS observation instrument

Outcomes – the measures of teaching results in the areas of Office Referrals, Grades, and CATS accountability testing

Appendix H: The Rolling Hills School Code

I am respectful.

I am responsible.

I am here to learn; therefore, I will preserve the right of the teacher to teach so we can learn; cooperate with all school personnel; and respect myself, others, and the environment.

By acting in this way, I will be a respectful, responsible, Rolling Hills Middle School student.

1 = On task, 2 = Waiting for teacher, 3 = Distracted, 4 = Disruptive, 5 = Other

1 = On task, 2 = Waiting for teacher, 3 = Distracted, 4 = Disruptive, 5 = Other

1 = (On task, 2 = Waiting for teacher, 3 = Distracted, 4 = Disruptive, 5 = Other

CURRICULUM VITAE

MICHAEL M. BRAME, PH.D.

11306 SKYLINE DRIVE – LOUISVILLE, KY 40229

Home: (502) 955-7270

m.brame@insightbb.com

Cell: (502) 938-2370

SCHOOL BUILDING ADMINISTRATION

I am a dependable educator with 23 years experience as both a teacher and an administrator. My extensive leadership background includes successful completion of my doctorate in educational leadership, membership on a site-based council, coaching three sports, research and training, and two years as a principal in a state school for the deaf. My skills include highly developed research and writing, ability to interact professionally while maintaining a pleasant work environment, and excellent technical skills.

EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE: Doctor of Philosophy May 2007
Educational Leadership Foundations and Human Resource Development
Activities and Achievements

- grade point average 3.98 out of 4.0
- Research – Examining the Empirical Impact of Teacher Pupil Control Ideology on Student Outcomes: The Classroom Perspective (dissertation), St. Matthews Elementary Comprehensive Plan Implementation Analysis, St. Matthews Elementary School Bus Logistics Plan, Bullitt County ISAP (preparing for publication)
- Successful dissertation defense on January 24, 2007

EASTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY: Master of Arts in Education May 1991
Education of Exceptional Children: Hearing Impaired
Activities and Achievements

- 3.9 overall grade point average out of 4.0

EASTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY: Bachelor of Science May 1984
Education of Exceptional Children, Hearing Impaired
Activities and achievements

- 3.7 overall grade point average out of 4.0, deans list, graduated with high distinction
- Phi Beta Kappa – teacher honor society
- Publication: Andrews, J., & Brame, M. (1987). Adults Learn from Children. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 20, 58-60.

CREDENTIALS

Principal Letter of Eligibility – *Level I and Level II (contingent on hire)*

Expires: 06/30/2009

MHIF – *Standard Certificate for Teachers of the Hearing Impaired*

Expires: 06/30/2011

PEB/PHI – *Standard Hearing Impaired/Elementary 1-8*

Life

CAREER ACCOMPLISHMENTSBullitt County Public Schools

- In-school Alternative Program – effectiveness and compliance research
- Model Procurement Code – research and development of small purchasing procedures
- Classroom Management Model – research, development, and training for effective classroom management and maximum instructional time
- Curriculum Mapping – compliance with the Kentucky Education Reform Act
- Kentucky Teacher Internship Program (KTIP) – resource teacher

South Dakota School for the Deaf

- Individual Education Plan Committee Chair – compliance with federal and state regulations while maximizing educational opportunities for deaf children.
- Rewrote Code of Conduct – compliance with related case-law and due process
- Pew Roundtable – represented school interests in settling disputes with local service organizations
- Program Development, Management and Planning – led in the development of school/dormitory behavior, activities association, and fraternal group programs; managed calendar, events planning, and facilities usage

Kentucky School for the Deaf

- Curriculum Alignment – compliance with the Kentucky Education Reform Act
- Site Based Council – teacher member, member of the finance and athletics committees

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

BULLITT COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS: Shepherdsville, KY 2001 – Present
Middle School Teacher

- Science, Language Arts, Reading, and Social Studies
- Discipline committee secretary – meeting notes, disciplinary code revisions
- Intern Resource Teacher – trained new teachers
- Instructional Team Leader – instructional collaboration and logistics for activities
- Curriculum Mapping – collaboration to address gaps in core content coverage

SOUTH DAKOTA SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF: Sioux Falls, SD 1999 – 2001
Principal

- Multidisciplinary and Individual Education Team Chair for more than 100 IEP meetings
- Management and Planning – approval or denial of activities based on organizational priorities, logistics, finances, legal/insurance, and availability of facilities/resources

- School Representative, Pew Roundtable – represented the schools interests when settling disputes among the school and competing agencies
- Regional Advisory Board – represented South Dakota interests in the development of a 12-state regional educational interpreter training and certification program
- Policies and Procedures – revised, rewrote, and edited school policies to address federal and state regulations

KENTUCKY SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF: Danville, KY

1988 – 1999

Middle and High School Teacher

- Site Based Council – Teacher representative and member of the finance and athletics committees
- Curriculum Alignment Committee – aligned the vocational education curriculum with state core curriculum standards and recommended instructional pedagogies
- Coach – Football (1993 National Deaf Championship), Basketball, Track

BRECKINRIDGE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS: Hardinsburg, KY

1984 – 1988

Special Education Resource and Special Class – Hearing Impaired

- Special Education Curriculum Committee – designed special education curriculum to meet federal and state guidelines
- Special Olympics Committee – logistics coordinator
- Coach - Football