

THE OPINIONS OF ELEMENTARY TEACHERS IN OPEN-  
SPACED SCHOOLS AND SELF-CONTAINED CLASS-  
ROOMS TOWARD PUNISHMENT, MANAGEMENT  
AND/OR CONTROL, AND TRUST OF  
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS

By

MARGARET MIMS WIGGINS

Bachelor of Science  
Troy State University  
Troy, Alabama  
1954

Master of Science  
Oklahoma State University  
Stillwater, Oklahoma  
1970

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College  
of the Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION  
May, 1973



THE OPINIONS OF ELEMENTARY TEACHERS IN OPEN-  
SPACED SCHOOLS AND SELF-CONTAINED CLASS-  
ROOMS TOWARD PUNISHMENT, MANAGEMENT  
AND/OR CONTROL, AND TRUST OF  
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS

Thesis Approved:

*Lester D. Brown*  
Thesis Adviser  
*William E. Smith*  
*H. Herbert Bureau*  
*Robert T. Pate*  
*D. D. Durham*  
Dean of the Graduate College

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express appreciation to all who contributed to this study. First, sincere gratitude is expressed to Dr. Russell L. Dobson, Chairman of her doctoral committee, for his confidence encouragement, and guidance during this study.

Grateful appreciation is also expressed to Dr. Herbert Bruneau, Dr. William Elsom, and Dr. William Segall for their valuable assistance and criticism from the viewpoints of their particular areas of expertise. To Dr. Robert T. Pate, an adjunct member of the committee from Wichita State University, Wichita, Kansas, the writer expresses appreciation for his interest, concern, and "mileage."

To the many professors, fellow graduate students, and friends who aided in the development of the instrument, as well as other areas of professional growth, goes a heart felt thanks.

Gratitude is also due to Dr. and Mrs. Kenneth St. Clair, Dr. and Mrs. Ronald Oines, and Mrs. Shirley Kirk for their various contributions, and to Mrs. Peggy Smith, the typist.

Without the subjects in the elementary schools included in this study, the study could never have been completed. Though they must remain anonymous, they need not remain unthanked.

To my husband, Kenneth, whose understanding, support, and love aided me over the rough spots, my promise to strive to be a better person both as a wife and professionally. Finally, to our son, Michael, this piece of work is dedicated because of the many sacrifices he made.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION. . . . .	1
Background Information . . . . .	1
Justification for the Study. . . . .	3
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	6
Hypotheses . . . . .	7
Definition of Terms. . . . .	8
Assumptions of the Study . . . . .	10
Limitations of the Study . . . . .	10
Procedures and Analysis of Data. . . . .	11
Data and Instrumentation . . . . .	12
Selection of the Instrument. . . . .	12
Selection and Notification of Teachers . . . . .	13
Summary and Organization of the Study. . . . .	13
II. REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH AND LITERATURE . . . . .	15
Introduction . . . . .	15
Literature Related to Teacher Attitudes. . . . .	15
Literature Related to Punishment . . . . .	19
Literature Related to Classroom Management and/or Control . . . . .	24
Literature Related to Trust. . . . .	29
Literature Related to the Emergence of the Open-Spaced School . . . . .	32
Summary. . . . .	38
III. METHOD AND PROCEDURE. . . . .	39
Introduction . . . . .	39
Instrumentation. . . . .	39
Procedural Steps during Instrument Development . . . . .	41
Validity . . . . .	45
Reliability. . . . .	45
Sampling . . . . .	47
Administration of the Instrument . . . . .	48
Scoring Procedures . . . . .	49
Statistical Treatment of Data. . . . .	50
Summary. . . . .	50

Chapter	Page
IV. AN ANALYSIS AND TREATMENT OF DATA. . . . .	51
Introduction. . . . .	51
Results of the Study. . . . .	54
Summary . . . . .	69
V. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS. . . . .	70
Summary . . . . .	70
Findings. . . . .	72
Conclusions . . . . .	78
Recommendations for Elementary Education. . . . .	80
Recommendations for Further Research. . . . .	81
Theoretical Considerations. . . . .	82
BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .	85
APPENDIX A. . . . .	91
APPENDIX B. . . . .	98
APPENDIX C. . . . .	100
APPENDIX D. . . . .	102
APPENDIX E. . . . .	104
APPENDIX F. . . . .	106
APPENDIX G. . . . .	108
APPENDIX H. . . . .	110

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. A Summary of Pilot Study "Known Groups" Characteristics. . . . .	46
II. The Opinions of Elementary School Teachers Teaching in Open-Spaced Schools and Self- Contained Classrooms Toward Punishment of Students. . . . .	55
III. The Opinions of Elementary School Teachers Teaching in Open-Spaced Schools and Self-Contained Classrooms Toward Management and/or Control of Students. . . . .	56
IV. The Opinions of Elementary School Teachers Teaching in Open-Spaced Schools and Self- Contained Classrooms Toward Trust of Students . . . . .	57
V. The Kruskal-Wallis Test of Variance in Opinions of Male and Female Teachers from Group A and B Toward Punishment, Management and/or Control, and Trust of Students. . . . .	58
VI. The Kruskal-Wallis Test of Variance in Opinions of Teachers from Group A and Group B Toward Punishment, Management and/or Control, and Trust of Students According to Age Groups. . . . .	59
VII. The Kruskal-Wallis Test of Variance in Opinions of Teachers from Group A and Group B Toward Punishment, Management and/or Control, and Trust of Students According to Degree Held . . . . .	61
VIII. The Kruskal-Wallis Test of Variance in the Opinions of Teachers from Group A and Group B Toward Punishment of Students According to Additional Course Work Taken within the Last Three Years. . . . .	63
IX. The Kruskal-Wallis Test of Variance in the Opinions of Teachers from Group A and Group B Toward Management and/or Control of Students According to Additional Course Work Taken within the Last Three Years. . . . .	64

X.	The Kruskal-Wallis Test of Variance in the Opinions of Teachers from Group A and Group B Toward Trust of Students According to Additional Course Work Taken Within the Last Three Years. . . . .	65
XI.	The Kruskal-Wallis Test of Variance in the Opinions Toward Punishment, Management and/or Control, and Trust of Students of Elementary Teachers Who Did or Did Not Volunteer to Teach in Open-Spaced Schools. . . . .	66
XII.	The Kruskal-Wallis Test of Variance in the Opinions of the Elementary Teachers Teaching in Open-Spaced Schools According to Whether or Not They Are Now Participating in an In-Service Program . . . . .	67
XIII.	The Kruskal-Wallis Test of Variances in the, Opinions of Elementary Teachers Teaching in Open-Spaced Schools According to Whether or Not They Had Prior Teaching Experience in a Self-Contained Classroom. . . . .	68

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### Background Information

The ultimate goal of education in America is to allow every individual the opportunity to achieve his highest potential for living a useful and rewarding life. Elementary education for the 70's is aimed at becoming more humanistic according to educational leaders. The impact of the writings of Holt (1967), Kohl (1969), Leonard (1968), Rogers (1969), and Silberman (1971), has crystalized two prominent educational ideas: (1) making the curriculum relevant to the learner's experiences, and (2) giving the learner some choice in regard to what he studies.

In striving to reach these goals, Kohl (1969) writes that the student will tend to "function according to his sense of himself rather than what he is expected to be" (p. 20). In order for a student to be himself a teacher must also be himself. Joyce (1967, pp. 3-4) states that:

The teacher must learn to cope with himself. He must handle information and theories flexibly and accurately, with minimal personal bias and with resolve and understanding. He must be able to control himself when children challenge established authority and standards, and he must help them develop their own standards. He must provide a mountain of support for the frightened and insecure child, however unlovely he may be. He must learn to radiate the interpersonal climate appropriate to the task at hand and to the children being taught. He must become able to assess his own behavior objectively and then work deliberately to improve it...



The authors of National Education Association's Schools for the 70's and Beyond: A Call to Action (1971, pp. 71-72) decry a "Gestapo-like environment that stresses order, discipline, neatness, and SILENCE WHEN YOU ARE NOT RECITING." They suggest that teachers must find ways to make learning "more engrossing, more exciting, more fun than raising hell."

Ausubel (1961) advocates democratic discipline which provides explanations, permits discussion, and invites participation of children in the setting of standards whenever they are qualified to do so. Jersild (1952), DeRoche (1968), and Kraft (1970) are proponents of "creative discipline" in which the teacher and students learn to develop the ability to interpret, understand, and evaluate the behavior exhibited by themselves and their classmates. This requires a flexible teacher who provides an atmosphere of security and warmth in which students feel free to discuss their behavior in a positive and objective manner.

Fantini (1964) argues that in an open society, the highest form of discipline is self-discipline and not an imposed discipline. He is an advocate of the open classroom system which stimulates the process for development of such values as freedom, critical thinking, self-direction, creativity, and cooperation.

The open classroom system is in its infancy in the United States. Its purpose is to establish an educational program in an activity-based environment which capitalizes on the student's natural tendency to manipulate, investigate, and model, and which initiates activities geared to student's needs and interests.

The open-spaced school is to be regarded as a tool for accomplishing these goals. It provides the fluidity of space to foster a desirable learning environment and encourages development of individual differences, according to the authors of Open Space Schools (American Association of School Administrators, 1971).

The American Association of School Administrators summarizes the ultimate goal of American education by stating:

The public schools are committed to serving all young people--the gifted, the average, and the less academically talented. All are important; each has an inalienable right to do the best he is capable of doing; and to the extent that anyone fails to develop his full potential and to use it for worthy purposes the country is weaker and democracy has fallen short of achieving its high purpose. To design and support an educational program that will serve them all--not in the same way, but in ways adapted to their different capabilities and needs--is a challenge to all people who have responsibility for planning, supporting, and operating an educational program (p. 2).

#### Justification for the Study

The open-spaced school concept is receiving a great deal of attention across the country. The main focus has been upon architectural design, organizational strategies, and comparisons of achievement between students of traditional type schools and team teaching, non-graded, or dual progress type organizations (McLoughlin, 1968; Rhodes, 1971).

In evaluating the open-spaced schools, emphasis needs to be directed toward the dimensions of attitudes of teachers concerning punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students. The open-spaced schools were designed to promote autonomy on the part of the students and to permit the teacher to act more as a facilitator

and/or guide, trusting the student to accept the responsibility for personal actions, studies, and decisions. At the same time, rigid scheduling, subject matter content, and grading would become secondary. Teacher opinions, or attitudes, toward student autonomy is therefore viewed as a primary concern in order for the goals and expectations of the open-spaced schools to be reached (Educational Facilities Laboratories, 1965).

An important question to consider is whether a school staff is ready or prepared to operate in an open space design. MacBeth (1971, p. 10) writes:

...Teachers not prepared to interpret the instructional program in other than the traditional lecture-recitation way find it necessary to build their own walls out of whatever is available under the circumstances.

Joyce and Harootunian (1967) note that open-minded teachers have been better able than closed-minded ones to accept new ideas about the behavior of children and to try out new methods of teaching suggested by current research.

Goodlad and Anderson (1963), and Klausmeir and Goodwin (1966) are in agreement that differing social structures and social climates within schools and classrooms have a strong influence upon the interactions between the teacher and students, and upon the teacher's organization and direction of the learning activities. Classroom social structure and climate are greatly influenced by the teacher's personality and by her teaching style and approach. Discipline depends primarily upon the leadership characteristics of the teacher.

Klausmeir and Goodwin (1966, p. 182) further state:

...warm understanding behavior, accompanied by a greater amount of participation in activities by students, is more

effective in securing better attitudes toward subject matter and the teacher; in developing favorable interpersonal attitudes; group cohesiveness, and social skills; and in securing higher achievement in the subject matter than are those associated with aloofness, restricted patterns, indiscriminate use of rewards and punishments, and justifying authority.

An innovative program should expect changes in student and teacher behavior. Problems such as student control must be confronted (McCaffery and Turner, 1970). Educators such as Kelly (1962), Combs (1962), Fantini (1964), Rogers (1969), Kohl (1969), and Silberman (1971) are urging that teachers relinquish their more traditional position toward authority and create a more humanistic approach to classroom climate. Further support for the need for change of thought is pointed out in the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Yearbook, Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming (1962, p. 1), which states:

Whatever we do in teaching depends upon what we think people are like. The goals we seek, the things we do, the judgments we make, even the experiments we are willing to try, are determined by our beliefs about the nature of man and his capacities....Whenever our ideas about human capacities change, the goals of teaching must change, too. Whatever we decide is the best that man can become must necessarily set the goal of education.

Attempts have been made to break the "lockstep" of traditional patterns in favor of designing programs to meet the unique needs of the individual learner, to help him reach his particular goals, and to develop his own full potential. Flexibility in space, facilities, and materials which provide for individual study, for small group discussions, and for large group activities are gaining the attention of those responsible for school planning. Time, people, and money are under consideration as well as a most important environmental resource: facilities that are responsive to the changing needs of the learner

(American Association of School Administrators, 1971).

Much has been written about what the open schools "ought" to be doing in contrast as to what "is" being done. Substantial evidence appears to be lacking to support the statement that traditional school practices and attitudes toward punishment, management and/or control, and distrust of students are replaced by more humanistic attitudes in the open-spaced schools. With the large number of open-spaced schools over the country, there is an apparent need to investigate the influence of the open-spaced facilities upon teacher attitudes, or opinions, toward more student freedom and autonomy.

#### Statement of the Problem

Therefore, the central problem of this study is to determine if a difference of opinions toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students exists between elementary teachers teaching in open-spaced schools and self-contained classrooms. The investigator will attempt to establish whether or not elementary teachers teaching in open-spaced facilities tend to express different opinions, or attitudes, toward student behaviors than elementary teachers in self-contained classrooms.

Answers to the following questions were sought:

- 1) Do teachers working in elementary open space schools differ in opinions toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students from elementary teachers teaching in self-contained classrooms?
- 2) Does pre-service or in-service training for teachers in open-spaced schools tend to show a difference in opinions toward student behavior?

3) Do teachers in elementary open-spaced schools tend to allow for more student participation and freedoms than teachers in elementary self-contained classrooms?

4) Do elementary teachers who taught in a self-contained classroom prior to teaching in an open-spaced school tend to differ in opinions toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students from those elementary teachers who have taught only in an open-spaced school?

5) Is there a difference in certain selected demographic data and the opinions of elementary teachers teaching in open-spaced schools and self-contained classrooms toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students?

### Hypotheses

The following hypotheses stated in the null form will be tested:

1) There is no significant difference between the opinions of elementary school teachers teaching in open-spaced schools and self-contained classrooms toward punishment of students as measured by the PMT Opinionnaire.

2) There is no significant difference between the opinions of elementary school teachers teaching in open-spaced schools and self-contained classrooms toward management and/or control of students as measured by the PMT Opinionnaire.

3) There is no significant difference between the opinions of elementary school teachers teaching in open-spaced schools and self-contained classrooms toward trust of students as measured by the PMT Opinionnaire.

4) There are no significant differences between the opinions of elementary school teachers teaching in open-spaced schools and self-contained classrooms toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students according to selected demographic factors as measured by the PMT Opinionnaire.

#### Definition of Terms

The following definitions are given to clarify terms that are used in this study:

Open-spaced Schools - This term is used to describe schools in which traditional self-contained classrooms have been replaced by shared teaching areas, small quiet rooms and learning bays; they may be referred to as schools without walls, open-classroom pods, or open-classroom clusters. In such schools two or more teachers are responsible for the educational programs for a large group of children.

Self-contained Classrooms - These are classrooms in which one teacher, a generalist by training, accepts responsibility for all curriculum areas and devotes full time and attention to a single class of pupils in a room assigned exclusively to them. Although there is a uniform time schedule, the teacher may have the assistance of a physical education, music, or art specialist.

Opinions - In this study, opinions are feelings, or attitudes, in what is a matter of judgment toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students rather than knowledge; they will be gauged by responses made to comments given to the inventory designed for this study.

Punishment - In this study, punishment refers to an unpleasant experience consequent to a certain course of behavior and mediated by an external agent or by the self acting as an agent, in the hope of providing retribution or of discouraging the repetition of behavior (Dobson, 1966).

Management and/or Control - This is a process of establishing and maintaining internal environment of the group and the classroom conditions for the attainment of educational goals; activities which restore or maintain effective working and learning conditions (Johnson & Bany, 1970).

Teacher Trust - For the purposes of this study the term refers to teachers' opinions toward student freedom in planning, evaluating, decision making, movement, interaction with fellow students, voicing personal opinions, and the acceptance of the individual as a person of worth.

Self-discipline - In this study, the term means control of conduct exercised not by an external authority but by the learner who accepts a task as his own, including whatever effort is involved, and controls his activities accordingly.

Punishment, Management and/or Control, and Trust Inventory - This term refers to the instrument developed by the investigator for this study to gather data concerning opinions of elementary school teachers regarding punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students. It may be referred to as the PMT Opinionnaire.



### Assumptions of the Study

For the purposes of this study, the following assumptions are posited:

- 1) If teachers are not attitudinally ready to accept the philosophy and underlying theories of the open-spaced schools, then the analysis of data derived from this study will reveal this lack of attitudinal readiness.
- 2) If teachers are trusting of students, then they will be less concerned with punishment and strict control of the students.
- 3) If teachers are trusting of students, then focus will be upon providing self-directing learning experiences.
- 4) If teachers are trusting of students, then physical facilities will not be a limiting factor in achieving open education.
- 5) It is assumed that the more preparation a teacher has, then the more accepting he is of new curricula innovations.

### Limitations of the Study

The study is limited by the inherent weakness of the instrumentation. Questionnaire type instruments do not require subjects to perform at their maximum level. Van Dalen (1966, p. 301) states:

...Many people do not give thoughtful consideration to questionnaires; they fill out the forms carelessly or report what they assumed took place. Not uncommonly, respondents tailor replies to conform with their biases, to protect their self-interests, to place themselves in a more favorable light, to please the researcher, or to conform with socially accepted patterns.

One can assume that variations exist which cannot be measured, but still have a certain amount of influence on the attitudes of the subjects in the study. One variation could possibly be the attitude of

the principal within the building in which the respondents work. Such variations are inherent in the findings of the study and should be given consideration when conclusions are drawn from the findings. However, the effect of such variations can be minimized when the responses are considered in groups and treated statistically. Wert, Neidt, and Ahmann (1954) maintain that acceptable measures of human characteristics can be obtained and that generalizations may be drawn from the findings concerning group reaction.

The study is further limited by the accessibility of open-spaced schools. The investigator utilized schools which were available rather than using a random sample of open-spaced schools.

Other factors uncontrolled which may influence the respondents are: size of school, age of school, economic factors of the community, the absence or presence of student teachers, teacher aids, or the number of observers visiting the schools.

#### Procedures and Analysis of Data

1) The sample of the population for this study was drawn from the elementary school teachers in Tucson, Arizona; Wellington, Kansas; Norman and Tulsa, Oklahoma.

2) These cities were utilized on the basis of desirability of location and the willingness of the schools to participate in the study.

3) Two hundred eighty teachers from sixteen schools in the four cities were included in the study.

4) Analyses of data were derived through the IBM 360 computer at Oklahoma State University.

5) The analysis of teachers' opinions toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students was limited to replies received from the instruments of analysis.

#### Data and Instrumentation

The general plan employed in conducting the study may be outlined as follows:

1) The Punishment, Management and/or Control, and Trust Opinionnaire was utilized to determine opinions of elementary teachers teaching in open-spaced schools and self-contained classrooms toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students.

2) The investigator delivered the instruments of analysis and directions to sixteen elementary schools in four southwestern cities.

3) The data gathered were expressed quantitatively. The statistical instrument used on the data obtained was the Pooled Variance t test and the Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance test.

4) A final report of the information gathered was prepared.

#### Selection of the Instrument

The Punishment, Management and/or Control, and Trust Opinionnaire was designed for this study. Through the guidance and aid of several Oklahoma State University faculty members and graduate students, the PMT Opinionnaire was developed in order to determine differences in opinions of elementary teachers teaching in open-spaced schools and self-contained classrooms toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students. The PMT Opinionnaire consists of a fifty-seven

item summated rating scale and certain selected demographic data. The response time is approximately twenty minutes.

The PMT Opinionnaire consists of statements about student behaviors in planning, evaluating, decision making, student mobility, voicing personal opinions, and interaction with fellow students. The statements are categorized into the instrument's component parts: punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students. The teachers' responses to the PMT Opinionnaire were used to describe differences of opinions held by the elementary teachers teaching in open-spaced schools and self-contained classrooms toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students.

Individual school scores were not analyzed.

#### Selection and Notification of Teachers

The selection and notification of schools and teachers was determined through the Research Department of the school districts involved. The principal of each school building was contacted and packets of inventories were delivered to the principal. The principal determined the distribution of the inventories and written directions from the researcher. The pre-stamped opinionnaires were mailed to the investigator.

#### Summary and Organization of the Study

A general description of the problem under investigation has been provided in this first chapter. The purpose and need for the study, as well as the hypotheses to be tested, have been identified. The major assumptions basic to this study, as well as the limitations, have been

stated. The terms used frequently are defined. A short résumé of the research design has been provided. The format for the succeeding chapters is as follows: Chapter II treats the selected, related literature which was reviewed for this study. Chapter III will present a description of the sample population, a description of the instrumentation, and the procedure utilized in the study. Chapter IV will present the analysis of data collected, and Chapter V will present the findings and make recommendations in relation to these conclusions for further research.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH AND LITERATURE

#### Introduction

This study deals with the opinions of elementary school teachers teaching in open-spaced schools and self-contained classrooms toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students.

The survey of related literature has been divided into five areas: 1) literature related to teacher attitudes toward student behavior; 2) literature related to the concept of punishment; 3) literature related to classroom management and/or control; 4) literature related to trust of students; and 5) literature related to the emergence of the open-spaced school and the rationale underlying the philosophy of the open-spaced school. Some of the literature is appropriate to two or all of these categories, which are not to be considered mutually exclusive.

#### Literature Related to Teacher Attitudes

The influence of psychology, particularly clinical psychology, beginning around the 1930's, has emerged as a force in contemporary education. The impact of the Wickman (1928) monograph is one of a series of challenges to the attitudes of educational personnel and its significance continues to be felt (Beilin, 1966). E. K. Wickman's 1928 Commonwealth Fund monograph, "Children's Behavior and Teachers' Attitudes," contrasts teachers' and mental hygienists' attitudes toward the

behavior problems of children. The report evoked an assault upon the teachers' mode of dealing with children when it made evident that teachers' attitudes were greatly dissimilar to those of clinicians. Wickman suggested that mental hygienists were primarily concerned with withdrawing and other nonsocial forms of behavior in elementary school age children. The teachers of these same children were more concerned with classroom management, authority, and sex problems. The results of the Wickman findings were influential in urging teachers to adopt a hierarchy of attitudes closer to that of the clinician.

Watson (1933) pointed out limitations in methods and conceptions of the 1928 monograph. His objections were: 1) The procedures themselves are open to criticism; directions given to teachers and clinicians were not the same; time given to respond was not identical; no definitions were given for behavior terms to be rated. 2) The choice of mental hygienists' attitudes toward the behavior problems of children as criteria for evaluating teachers' attitudes toward the same problems is questionable.

Ellis and Miller (1936) investigated teachers' attitudes using identical directions given to the teachers, to those of Wickman's (1928) study. The significant difference between the ratings revealed by the Ellis and Miller study and those of Wickman was the increased realization of the seriousness of withdrawing and recessive personality traits.

Studies by Bain (1934), Thompson (1940), Del Solar (1949), and Schrupp and Gjerde (1953) reveal considerable evidence to indicate agreement with Wickman's (1928) original findings.

Mitchell (1942), Sparks (1952), Stouffer (1952), Hunter (1957) and Wickman (1957) modified directions given to clinicians or teachers so that, with directions controlled, differences still appear and are of the kind originally observed by Wickman.

Hunter's (1957) study suggested that teachers' understanding of causal factors and consequences of behavior patterns had expanded and deepened over the preceding few decades; the teachers continued to be concerned with annoying and aggressive behavior. He is inclined to believe that teachers considered only the here and now in dealing with behavior problems, whereas mental hygienists considered the future.

Beilin (1966) pointed out that different roles of teachers and clinicians made the major difference in attitudinal patterns toward adjustment difficulties. The different roles influence the organization of subjects' respective experiences. He regarded teachers to be essentially task-oriented and more concerned with the imparting of information and skills.

Roubinek (1971) replicated the Wickman (1928) study with some modifications in order to determine whether the attitudes of present-day elementary school teachers and school psychologists toward teacher-defined behavior problems of children differed from the attitudes of elementary school teachers and mental hygienists sampled for investigations conducted by Wickman, Mitchell (1940), and Schrupp and Gjerde (1951). He found there was a significant difference between the attitudes of teachers sampled in his investigation and the attitudes of teachers sampled in the investigations of 1928, 1940, and 1951 toward teacher-defined behavioral problems of children. He further found that experienced classroom teachers rated behaviors relating to immorality



and dishonesty, and to withdrawing and recessive personality traits as less serious than inexperienced teachers, but they rated aggressive type behaviors and antagonistic personality traits and application to school work as more serious than did inexperienced teachers. The elementary classroom teachers in 1970 perceived behaviors describing withdrawing and recessive traits as more serious than did the teachers sampled in 1928, 1940, and 1951. The elementary classroom teachers in 1970 perceived behaviors relating to immorality and dishonesty as less serious than did the teachers in 1928, 1940, and 1951.

Charters (1963, p. 734) stated:

It is reasonable to attribute the shifts in teachers' judgments of behavior problems to changes which occurred in professional education in this period and even to the Wickman study itself. The Wickman research appeared just at a time the mental hygiene point of view was gaining a foothold in teacher training curricula, and the conclusions widely drawn from Wickman's data, rightly or wrongly, that teachers do not appreciate the significance of withdrawal and autism as symptoms of personality disturbances in children, became a point of departure for mental hygiene courses and textbooks. There is no doubt that the generations of teachers trained after 1930 have been sensitized during their training to problems of personal and social adjustment far more than earlier generations of teachers.

The teacher plays a vital role in the socialization of the student. He is a culture carrier. His behaviors are significant in the student's development of self-control, character traits, values, and work habits. These functions are as important as any function to be carried out. The teacher's role is a reflection of an educational philosophy (Beilin, 1966).

In summary, the Wickman (1928) study set off a series of investigations of punishment and its effects on students. The results of these studies show that teachers are becoming more sensitive to personal

and social adjustments of students and do not consider behavior problems of students to be as serious as did teachers prior to 1930.

#### Literature Related to Punishment

Opinions and practices of children's behavioral development can be traced as far back as the Old Testament. "He that spareth his rod hateth his son, but he that loveth him chasteneth him betimes" (Proverbs 13:24).

One hundred thirty-four years ago, Mann (1840, p. 47) expressed himself as follows: "Punishment should never be inflicted, except in cases of extremest necessity; while the experiment of sympathy, confidence, persuasion, encouragement, should be repeated, for ever and ever." Seven years later Mann (1847) described a school of his day in which there were two hundred fifty "scholars." In one week of five days, there were 328 separate floggings, or an average of  $65 \frac{3}{5}$  per day. On another occasion, eighteen boys were flogged in two hours in the presence of a stranger.

Apparently the idea that man can be trusted has been quite slow in evolving. Time has proven that tradition holds a strong rein. Mort and Cornell (1941, pp. 405-6) tell:

...it is not unusual for a period of fifty years to elapse between the realization of need and the invention and first practical introduction of an acceptable way of meeting it... fifty (more) years may elapse before complete diffusion [of the method of adaptation is achieved]--a period approximately as long as the period from the first realization of need to the emergence of a practical way of meeting it.

The Encyclopedia of Educational Research (1960, pp. 761-2) states the following concerning punishment:

In the earliest formulations of the law of effect, it was assumed that reward "stamps in" and punishment "stamps out" a stimulus-response connection. On the basis, primarily, of his own investigations Thorndike concluded connection only if it leads the individual to vary his behavior until he learns some new response in place of the punished one.... Later research has made it clear, however, that most of the phenomena characteristic of punishment do not appear when the punishment is so mild as to constitute mere nonreward. Numerous lines of evidence support the view that more severe forms of punishment can indeed act promptly and reliably to suppress the punished response, but that they do so by setting up conflicts between the punished response and others evoked by the punishing stimulus....

Hurlock's (1924) study has been quoted many times to prove that reproof is just about equal to praise as an incentive in school learning. Yet in a later experiment, Hurlock (1925) revealed that praise is three to four times superior to reproof on repeated applications.

Symonds (1964) refers to several studies which point out the effects of failure, anxiety, and negative guidance on student achievement. An examination of literature further reveals that some methods of punishment have undergone little change in recent years; extra homework, additional assignments, and retention after school are among these. In 1894, White (p. 215) wrote:

Few devices for punishment of pupils are more easily or more widely abused than the imposition of tasks. The most objectionable of these abuses is the assigning of school tasks, as writing words or sentences, solving problems, memorizing verses, etc., as a penalty for idleness, whispering, inattention, tardiness, etc.,--a practice already condemned. By a law of the mind, the punishment is associated, not with the offense (as it should always be) but with the task or study, thus increasing the pupil's dislike for it. No school duty should ever be assigned as a penalty for misconduct.

Observations of teachers in many classrooms have revealed that punishment is used by many teachers as an instrument of control in order to satisfy the needs of teachers rather than as an instrument of

learning in order to satisfy the needs of students. Education should concern itself more with guidance, direction, and modification of behavior than with its elimination and inhibition. "The aim of education should be to help children to learn desirable ways of responding, rather than eliminate undesirable ways (Symonds, 1964, p. 31)."

The use of punishment as a technique for behavior modification has been indicated as undesirable for the following reasons (Clarizio, 1970, p. 652):

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

Marshall (1965) is one of the several psychologists who is currently reconsidering the concept of punishment. He contends that it can have a beneficial effect if applied to specific responses rather than to general behavior.

When teachers interact with students, they either encourage or discourage the students with gestures or expressions. Each reaction elicits some student behavior. On the whole, rewards tend to reinforce a behavior and increase the likelihood that it will occur again. Furthermore, there are times when punishment checks a certain response, but other times it fixes the response more firmly in the student's mind.

A teacher should strive for an awareness of his own personal behavior so that when he rewards and punishes student behavior he does it with the knowledge of the effects he intends to produce (Joyce and Marootunian, 1967).

Dobson (1966) utilized an instrument of analysis to find out how teachers thought certain kinds of behavior problems should be handled. Eleven of the items in the instrument were considered to be desirable forms of treatment, and eleven items were considered as undesirable forms of treatment for behavioral problems of elementary school children. The following items were listed as desirable:

1. Give pupil opportunity to make contribution to class.
2. Teacher uses simple control.
3. Parent-teacher conferences.
4. Pupil-teacher conferences.
5. Pupil loses some privilege.
6. Pupil referred to special service personnel.
7. Role playing.
8. Isolate the pupil.
9. Emphasize good qualities of child's behavior.
10. Accept misbehavior as normal for child and attempt to change through positive approach.
11. Assess and improve through group discussions.

The following items were considered to be undesirable methods of treating behavioral problems:

1. Pupil apologizes.
2. Teacher lowers grades.
3. Detention after school.
4. Pupil temporarily suspended from room.
5. Corporal punishment is used.
6. Send child to principal's office.
7. Physical control of student.
8. Require additional assignment.
9. Some action by fellow students.
10. Pupil temporarily suspended from school.
11. Behavior called to attention of other class members.

Klausmier and Goodwin (1966) and Symonds (1964) cite several studies which lend support to most of the items listed above.

The effect of punishment is in part a function of the attitude of the punisher. If punishment is motivated impulsively by hate or anger, the recipient might respond with counter-aggression (or by the repression of aroused aggressive impulses). However, if punishment is administered in a spirit of love and with a feeling that only through punishment a child can be taught self-control, the child may show constraint without harboring resentment (Symonds, 1964).

"Learning to view the transition from external discipline to self-discipline as a kind of curriculum can change your whole attitude toward classroom behavior (Kraft, 1970, pp. 116-118)." Time magazine (June 21, 1971) reports a new type of self-discipline which is referred to as Permissipline." To encourage it, the teachers refuse to insist on the old obedience, which often prevents students from learning the consequences of their own choices. At the same time the teachers do not allow pure permissiveness that says if a child is allowed to "goof off" long enough, he will decide for himself that work can be more satisfying.

Symonds (1964) summarizes by saying that the alternative to punishment is not laissez-faire, submission to student, or teacher spinelessness. Firmness and punishment are not synonymous. Punishment hurts (by definition) but firmness does not. A teacher is obligated to lead, influence, direct, and persuade along desirable channels. He writes that the effective teacher is one who is persistent, determined, and, if need be, assertive without being authoritarian or domineering.

In summary, humane education frees the teacher as well as the student and permits one to become "himself" rather than forcing him to live up to standards devised in other days for purposes that no longer are relevant. An open teacher cannot hold the stick of punishment in

a hand and wave the flag of freedom in the other.

## Literature Related to Classroom

### Management and/or Control

Classroom management has had less attention than it deserves. Current points of view on discipline, control, and classroom climate need to be carefully examined as a basis for understanding this approach to classroom management. It is an integral part of the teaching transition which promotes conditions for learning in the classroom and the best potential development of each child (Brown, 1968).

Much of the literature concerning management and control of the classroom takes on tones of negativism in that it refers most often to student control. Classroom management embraces the most important acts that teachers perform; yet, there have been few controlled or empirical studies relating to the matter (Johnson & Bany, 1970).

Frazier (1956, p. 298) writes:

...To be a good teacher one must be able to manage classroom environment and the many different personalities in it with a maximum of efficiency and a minimum of friction and tension.

Classroom management is an important aspect of the teaching process, and, to some, a central aspect. Included in this concept are three factors: the kinds of relationships that exist between teacher and pupil, the kind of discipline--or order--that the teacher can maintain and the students accept, and the direction of classroom routines so that learning can continue unimpeded.

Classroom management can be thought of as a distinct pattern of activities whereby teachers establish and maintain conditions in which individuals in the classroom can apply rational, creative talents to the challenge of educational tasks. It is the development of an effective classroom organization as well as a predictable system of

relationships. It involves the selection of methods appropriate to the situation where problems arise which have an effect on the functioning of the class organization. It is a vital part of teaching in that intellectual vigor cannot prosper if students' energies are constantly diverted by organizational problems or ineffective group relationships. The nature of the problems may be distractions created by uncooperative individuals, or by group needs to make adaptations to relieve frustrating conditions. The essence of classroom management is establishing an effective, cooperative classroom system. Successful handling of human behavior problems which arise in any organized informal work group is another crucial aspect. Tempers, hostilities, individual or group frustrations resulting from ineffectual handling of the human problems in the classroom all lower or destroy individual competence. Classroom management is more than establishing a cooperative work group, satisfactory working conditions, and cooperative efforts toward predetermined objectives. Managerial activities include maintaining the system and restoring order when unresolved problems are a threat to group integration, or cause individuals to react in a disruptive and nonproductive manner (Johnson & Bany, 1970).

Johnson and Bany (1970) further declare that if teachers are not effective in getting the cooperation of children willingly, their effectiveness in the instructional area is significantly reduced. One of the most vital functions the teacher performs is managing the human component of the classroom.

To whatever extent the students assume leadership and manage the affairs of the classroom and the school, to that extent the teachers can spend more time teaching knowledge and less time merely trying to control the students (Joyce and Harootunian, 1967, p. 171).



Jackson (1968) relates to the task of managing the activities of 25 or 30 children for 5 or 6 hours a day, 5 days a week, 40 weeks a year as being somewhat different from an abstract consideration of the learning process. Events occur rapidly in the small, crowded world of the classroom. During a working day the elementary teacher typically engages in 200-300 interpersonal interchanges every hour. There can be no prediction or preplanning with an exactitude of the content or sequence of these interchanges. This does not mean that order in educational affairs is entirely lacking, but the underlying structure of these events is not easily discerned, nor is it, except superficially, under the control of the teacher.

Some regulation of school members is required for the proper functioning of any social system, including the schools of the 70's. If a school system is to function properly, the conduct of the pupils must conform to the conditions most conducive to learning. Principals and teachers are held responsible by the statutes and board regulations to maintain order in the schools. The greater portion of this responsibility rests with the classroom teachers (Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 1969). Since teachers are charged with the major responsibility of maintaining order in the classrooms, then should it not be with teachers that we focus the main concern of re-educating for more humanistic approaches?

When teachers are asked to give the nature of their most difficult task, the problem of helping children to develop and accept desirable standards of conduct is most often stated. Generally, they call this part of their job the "development of discipline," "maintaining order," or "establishing classroom control" (Bany and Johnson, 1964).

Waller related to the situation in 1932 when he wrote:

The teacher represents the established social order in the school, and his interest is in maintaining that order, whereas pupils have only a negative interest in that feudal superstructure. Teacher and pupil confront each other with attitudes from which the underlying hostility can never be altogether removed. Pupils are human beings striving to realize their own results in their own way. Each of these hostile parties stand in the way of the other; in so far as the aims of either are realized, it is at the sacrifice of the aims of the other (Waller, 1932, p. 196).

Shumsky (1965) offers a more optimistic point of view by saying that most teachers tend to be friendly rather than hostile; that their acts toward children are supportive and pleasant rather than punitive. Yet, the majority of elementary school teachers tend to be at least somewhat over-controlling in their teaching behavior. The way the teacher structures the learning process is the major means of control in the classroom rather than the threat of punishment, and structure could mean the following of the textbook. Two other elements which contribute to control and security are the "fixed answer" problem solving and an impression of success. A sense of security and achievement for the teacher is gained when there is smooth progress from one point or part to another; therefore, the teacher feels he is in complete control. Teachers need to become aware that over-controlling behavior is constricting in nature.

Baller (1963) supports Shumsky's (1965) views on the teacher's sense of security by saying:

Control in and of itself is not an educational aim. Control serves primarily the needs of the teacher. A teacher may attempt to justify his efforts to secure and retain control on the grounds that it is in the interest of education...to secure quiet orderliness serves primarily the need of the teacher to feel secure in his work (659).

Johnson and Bany (1970) preface their book by writing:

It is possible for children to like school far more than they do. They may not like all of the learning activities and assigned tasks, but they can enjoy working together and can do so more productively than many of them do at present...unfavorable reaction to school has had harmful consequences for children and for the school as an organization.

Brown (1968) implies that as an area in teacher training, classroom management appears to be lagging. He refers to the discrepancy between what teachers say they know and believe in theory and how they teach as the "theory-practice dilemma." Teachers in training are likely to be faced with a lack of agreement between the theory advocated by their professors of education and the practices demanded of them by the cooperating teachers selected by colleges of education to direct their student teaching practices. Brown further points out that problems exist in several areas; namely, that many textbooks on teaching methods, when discussing theoretical issues and backgrounds, do not relate to the practical problems of teaching encountered later; that rarely do the professor's own teaching practices approach those he advocates; and that, even more rarely, can one find a teacher who actually does anything toward providing for individuality in the classroom. He adds that the problem of dealing with the theory-practice dilemma has been a stumbling block to educational leaders for a long period of time.

To summarize, it is evident that classroom management and/or control is a constant series of dealings with human behavior. Many teachers feel insecure, threatened and afraid to turn loose the reins of control. A way must be found to close the gap between theory and practice so that more energies can be spent toward making the learner's environment a more effective, cooperative system.

## Literature Related to Trust

The Standard College Dictionary (1963) defines trust in several ways. Among these are:

A confident reliance on the integrity, honesty, veracity, or justice of another; confidence; faith. Something committed to one's care for the use or safekeeping; a charge; responsibility; custody; keeping. To allow to do something without fear of the consequences; to believe.

Syn. 1. Trust, faith, confidence, and reliance denote the feeling that a person or thing will not fail in duty, service, or the like. Trust implies that this feeling has no reservation, and that it rests upon an estimate of character more than upon evidence.

McGregor (1963) defines trust when he writes:

The meaning of "trust" is simple to taste, but it is a condition difficult to achieve--particularly under conventional forms of organization. Trust means: "I know that you will not--deliberately or accidentally, consciously or unconsciously--take unfair advantage of me." It means: "I can put my situation at the moment, my status and self-esteem in this group, our relationship, my job, my career, even my life, in your hands with complete confidence."

...Trust is a delicate property of human relationships. It is influenced far more by actions than by words. It takes a long time to build, but it can be destroyed very quickly. Even a single action--perhaps misunderstood--can have powerful negative effects. It is the perception of the other person and of his actions, not the objective reality, on which trust is based. And such perceptions are profoundly influenced by emotions, needs, anxieties, guilts, expectations and hopes."

Erikson (1950) describes eight stages in the personal career. He states that in the first period the task is to establish a basic sense of trust, or confidence in the goodness of the existence and in the reliability of those on whom one depends. Trust exists only in relation to something.

Maslow (1954) describes the levels in the prepotent hierarchy of needs as the need for physiological requirements, security, social

affiliation, esteem, autonomy and self-actualization. The need to attain self-actualization is the highest order of need in the Maslow formulation and represents the need to develop into everything that one can become. Herzberg (1966) enlarges on Maslow's theory and says that man's compelling urge is to realize his own potentiality by continuous psychological growth. The four characteristics of an actualizer are honesty, awareness, freedom, and trust (Shostrom, 1967).

Buber (1951) expresses an actualizer as an appreciator of his own uniqueness, as follows:

Every person born into this world represents something new, something that never existed before, something original and unique. "It is the duty of every person...to know and consider that he is unique in the world in his particular character and that there has never been anyone like him in the world, for if there had been someone like him, there would have been no need for him to be in the world. Every single man is a new thing in the world, and is called upon to fulfill his particularity in this world..." Every man's foremost task is the actualization of his unique, unprecedented and never recurring potentialities, and not the repetition of something that another, and be it even the greatest, has already achieved (p. 16).

Silberman (1971) reports in his study that schools are oppressive, intellectually sterile, aesthetically barren, and inhumane; that schools are too preoccupied with order and control and without trust for pupils. Although all educators might not agree with Silberman's (1971) report, there are many who agree that emphasis should not be on what is being taught but on how it is being taught. Kelly (1965) and Gage (1970) support Silberman by saying that what a person knows is not as important as how a person feels, because how one feels controls behavior while what one knows does not.

A more humanistic attitude toward children will lead teachers to create a democratic atmosphere with open channels of two-way

communication between pupils and teachers. A humanistic orientation is one which stresses the importance of the individuality of each student and the creation of an atmosphere to meet the wide range of student needs (Silberman, 1971). Rogers (1969) alludes to this point when he refers to three qualities which facilitate learning: 1) a realness or genuineness on the part of the facilitator; 2) a prizing of the learner, prizing his feelings, his opinions, his person, an acceptance of this other individual as a separate person, having worth in his own right; and 3) the ability to understand the student's reactions from the inside, a sensitive awareness of the way the process of education and learning seems to the student (empathetic understanding). Rogers (1969, p. 114) further states:

It would be most unlikely that one could hold the three attitudes I have described, or could commit himself to being a facilitator of learning, unless he has come to have a profound trust in the human organism and its potentialities. If I distrust the human being then I must cram him with information of my own choosing, lest he go his own mistaken way. But if I trust the capacity of the human individual for developing his own potentiality, then I can provide him with many opportunities and permit him to choose his own way and his own direction in his learning.

Trust of students involves use of inquiry; simulation and programmed instruction; student-selected problems; subgroup participation; the basic encounter group; and self-evaluation.

In summary, teacher trust of students must be based on such qualities as openness, existentialism, and spontaneity. Teachers, in order to accept students as fully functioning beings, must first be trusting of themselves. Instead of trying to make the students learn, teachers must acquire a faith or trust in students which will allow letting them learn. Teacher trust of students permits a student to be what he

is rather than what the teacher wants him to be. Teacher trust is being humane.

### Literature Related to the Emergence of the Open-Spaced School

A change in the physical structure of the school building was a step toward facilitating a more open and free education. MacBeth (1971) states that little changed in education between 1850 and 1950, and that buildings did not change very much because the educational program did not change very much. It is difficult to be flexible when the school design requires a rigid time schedule, box-like rooms to limit size groupings, and isolation from one's fellow workers.

Adams and Biddle (1970) caution innovators to examine where they have been before planning where they are going. For the past one-hundred years most elementary education has been in the self-contained classroom. In the self-contained classroom organization, one teacher has the responsibility for all or most subjects taught to one group of pupils, usually for one year. Specialist teachers in music, physical education, and sometimes art, break up the self-contained elementary structure.

Feyereisen, et al. (1970, pp. 211-212) write:

At the elementary level the self-contained pattern has traditionally held sway, but recent emphasis on subject-matter and the re-organization of the content of the curriculum at the elementary level led to a reevaluation of its merits. It has been generally held that pupils at the elementary level gain security and confidence from the close association of one teacher and one group and, further, that learning needs can be met on a more individual basis as the teacher comes to understand each child and as subject-matter can be organized and integrated to meet a relatively small number of individual needs. Hence, the self-contained

organization, according to its advocates, promotes better mental health, and more meaningful, integrated learnings geared to individual timing and needs.

Critics of the self-contained pattern question the possibility of one teacher's being prepared adequately to teach in all the disciplines as they are now structured. They question also the probability of the busy teacher's being able to satisfy the individual learning and psychological needs of twenty-five or thirty pupils. Can the pupils be stimulated to learn over the long period of time by one teacher and while being confined largely in one room? They question. The self-contained classroom teacher is mainly responsible not only for the organization of the subject matter but also for the curricular sequence and scheduling of learning activities, but he works in relative isolation from professional colleagues and with little supervision. Either the teacher leans entirely on prepared "guidebooks" and textbook presentations, or he drifts aimlessly along without the benefits of professional stimulation, guidance, and criticism for growth, the critics claim.

Tewksbury (1967) reports that educational psychologists, certain teachers and administrators, and specialists in child development have collected a mass of evidence which indicates plainly that each child is different. With this fact, it is ridiculous to expect all children in a given grade to do the same work and to complete it during the year they spend in the grade, yet, this is the suggested theory of the graded school and its self-contained classrooms. Goodlad's (1954) study points out that children who are retained make poorer social adjustments and develop poorer self-concepts than children of similar ability and background who are promoted. The inability of the graded school to provide sufficiently for individual differences has caused an increasing number of educators to seek modifications in the plan.

Tewksbury (1967) relates to two movements which were instrumental in instigating the open school concept. The Progressive Education movement and the mental health movement stressed concern over the schools not meeting individual differences. The two movements



advocated a freer school environment, one which would be more conducive to nurturing children's creativeness and self-reliance; offering more flexibility in order to provide a better learning environment; and providing enough successful experiences so that each child could develop a positive self-image.

A report from Educational Facilities Laboratories (1965) refers to the continuous effort to devise educational containers which mold themselves to the fluid activities within, leading to a new look in school house architecture: the school without interior partitions. Educators and architects have labeled the new type buildings "open-space schools."

...The major aim in these open-space schools is to provide an environment which encourages greater interaction between teacher and pupil, and teacher and teacher. There are no partitions to fragment learning by dividing teachers, children, and subject matter into tight standardized compartments.... Each child finds his own place, creates his own path (p. 3).

Studies of pupil adjustment to organizational patterns other than the self-contained classroom have been made in many communities, including Tulsa, Oklahoma; Ossining and Long Beach, New York; and New Brunswick, New Jersey. There seems to be no evidence that unusual guidance problems or poor social adjustments result from such organizations. Similarly, available reports from team teaching projects indicate that pupil adjustment problems exist largely in the minds of some visitors to the projects rather than in actual fact. It is hoped that researchers can develop instruments which will produce more accurate data than now exist... (Bair, Medill, and Woodward, 1964, p. 208)

Goodlad (1965, p. 57) said, "Children are downright ornery. They refuse to grow up all of a piece." There is no promise that an open-plan school will make a child less "ornery" but it can make it easier to mesh his schooling with his personal growth. In most cases, the disappearance of walls is usually accompanied by some semblance of less rigid patterns of teaching, learning, and facilitating. Nongrading, team teaching, and the dual progress plan are organizational concepts

found in many open-space schools.

The actual operation of the organizational concept varies from system to system, within the system, from building to building, and even from team to team. The philosophy of the school, the pupil population, the competence of the staff, the availability of resources, and the characteristics of the school plant are but a few of the considerations involved. It would be impossible to describe a single model applicable to all efforts (Feyereisen, et al., 1970, pp. 214-215).

Kohl (1969, p. 58) is in agreement with Feyereisen, et al., when he writes, "There is no single model open classroom. Rather there are as many variations as there are combinations of students and teachers."

The Educational Facilities Laboratories (1965) point to the assumption that no innovation in plant or program has a chance of being successful unless teachers are willing and able to accept it. Many districts which have built open-space schools have taken pains to staff them with people who want to be there. The majority of the teachers in these schools are volunteers, and in cases where the adoption of an open-plan was accompanied by the introduction of new teaching techniques, the teachers are frequently graduates of more or less formal teacher-training programs. Hapgood (1971, p. 71) reports, "...the New School of Behavioral Studies at the University of North Dakota has estimated that it takes a teacher five years in the classroom to become a first-rate open classroom teacher." Kohl (1969, p. 82-83) has made several observations during his teaching experiences, some of which are: there must be considerable give and take, argument, disagreement and even conflict. He further states:

...An open classroom is a threat in a school where the maintenance of control is a central concern. It is a threat to teachers who may find their pupils demanding rights and freedom not acceptable in their classes. It is a threat to supervisors who have a stake in carefully ordered curriculum or who feel the need to know what the teachers and pupils in

their school are doing at every moment....Initially, teaching in an open classroom can be a lonesome, difficult experience, and the teacher has to be strong and believe it is worth it to himself and to his students.

Many questions have been raised concerning the noise level, large numbers of students moving around constantly creating distractions, inattention, students working with more than one teacher, various types of media all going at once, and record keeping. The report from Educational Facilities Laboratories (1965) responds to many of these concerns in the following paragraphs.

One factor that makes it possible for varied activities to go on at the same time in an open room is the human capacity psychologists call "selective inattention." People who are interested in what they are doing will screen out--often unconsciously--sights and sounds. Sounds irritating to an individual can be covered up by the relatively high level of background noise like the generalized hum of activity. Carpeting and portable furniture aid in cutting down distractions.

The open-space school is a mutual benefit to teachers and students. If it is important that no one teacher be required to carry the emotional burden of any particular child and his special problems throughout the day, it is equally important for the child to have a choice of teachers he knows and by whom he is known. He should be free to seek out those for whom he feels an affinity. Because they are together for shorter periods of time, students as well as teachers are better able to manage personality clashes. When a group of teachers work together with students in an open classroom they can pool their judgments and observations and get a better picture of the whole child.

The teacher's role in the open-space school is one of an activator, a guide, or a facilitator. Loving children, knowing how to group children for mutual benefits, and understanding problems that interfere with learning are only a portion of the requirements for a teacher in the open-space school. He must be honest in discussing evaluations with students and parents. The methods and techniques he employs are visible to all and require a harmonious effort with the other members of the team. He must be flexible and open to suggestions and criticisms from his peers.

The teacher must look upon the student as an active organism. Movement is natural to children. The primary benefit of the open-space school is the freedom it offers to children to move from group to group for different levels of work. This mobility is important academically, physically, and psychologically.

An examination of John Dewey's (1897, 1916) writings leads one to believe that he would have put his stamp of approval on the open-spaced school concept. "Experience" and "learn by doing" became the watchword of his pedagogical theory. In My Pedagogic Creed (1897), he strongly emphasizes individualism, interests, and personal feelings of the students. The teacher's function is not to impose certain ideas or force certain habits upon the child, but to act as a guide or a facilitator. As long ago as 1897 he was advocating making the curriculum relevant and student-centered rather than a mere succession of studies.

Changes in education occurred during the 1950's and 1960's that resulted in modification of some elementary schools' interior space design. The open-spaced schools range from completely open space to

those having only selected open spaces. With movable partitions, in many cases, various sized rooms made for flexible grouping of students. Along with this flexibility came reorganization of staff and curricula, labeling the new patterns as nongraded, team teaching, dual progress plan, crossage teaching, open education, Individual Prescribed Instruction, etc. Being architecturally open does not automatically make the environment open. "Flexibility," "individuality," "freedom," "trust," "choice," "interests," and "humaneness" are key words for the open-spaced school.

### Summary

Chapter II has presented a brief résumé of research and literature pertaining to the related areas of this study. It is intended that the reader would be able to develop a perspective and conception of the need for this study concerning elementary teacher opinions toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of elementary students.

## CHAPTER III

### METHOD AND PROCEDURE

#### Introduction

Chapter III will describe the research method. Specifically, the development of the instrument, the research sampling technique, and the procedure used in administering the instruments are described in this chapter. A description of scoring procedures for deriving data for analyses of the questions and the hypothesis, and a discussion of statistical treatment of the data conclude the chapter.

#### Instrumentation

An analysis of previous research studies in the areas of punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students, plus a number of teacher attitude inventories, revealed an appropriate instrument unavailable for the purposes of this study. Through the guidance and aid of several Oklahoma State University faculty members, the Punishment, Management and/or Control, and Trust of Students Opinionnaire, most often referred to as the PMT Form in this paper, was developed.

An investigation of various instrument scales (Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 1960; Gage, 1963) resulted in the identification of three techniques which were potentially appropriate for determining teacher opinions toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students. These included the Thurstone, Likert, and the

Semantic Differential techniques for scale construction. Further search of the literature focused on aspects of these techniques which included the general purposes, assumptions, advantages and disadvantages of each type of scale. In view of the assumptions of the various scales and the intent of this study, it was concluded that the Likert-type scale would be the most appropriate.

Likert-type scales, sometimes referred to as summated scales, consist of a series of items to which a subject is asked to react. The Likert-type scale is not based upon items which have been judged to be distributed evenly over a continuum of favorableness-unfavorableness. It has as one of its basic premises the assumption that each of the universe of items are of equal attitude value (Kerlinger, 1964). Scott (1954) indicates another assumption of the Likert technique to be that items of the scale should have operating characteristics which are monotonically increasing functions of the latent attitude variable. That is, the more favorable an attitude toward an item, the higher the item score.

The procedure for constructing a Likert-type scale is given by Selltitz, et al. (1959, pp. 367-368):

- (1) The investigator assembles a large number of items considered relevant to the attitude being investigated as either clearly favorable or clearly unfavorable.
- (2) These items are administered to a group of subjects representative of those with whom the questionnaire is to be used. The subjects indicate their response to each item by checking one of the categories of agreement-disagreement.
- (3) The responses to the various items are scored in such a way that a response indicative of the most favorable attitude is given the highest score. It makes no difference whether 5 is high and 1 is low or vice versa. The important thing is that the responses be scored consistently in terms of the attitudinal direction they indicate. Whether "approve" or "disapprove" is the favorable response to an item depends, of course, upon the content and

wording of the item. (4) Each individual's total score is computed by adding his item scores. (5) The responses are analyzed to determine which of the items discriminate most clearly between the high scorers and the low scorers on the total scale. ...Items that do not show a substantial correlation with the total score, or that do not elicit different responses from those who score high and those who score low on the total test, are eliminated to ensure that the questionnaire is "internally consistent"--that is, that every item is related to the same general attitude.

Selltiz, et al. (1959) discuss several advantages of the Likert-type scale. Included are the following: (1) Items may be used which are not manifestly related to the attitude being measured. Any item may be used which is found to be empirically consistent with the total score. (2) The Likert-type scale is considered to be simpler to construct than the Thurstone-type scale. (3) The Likert-type scale is generally more reliable than the Thurstone-type scale in that more categories are possible with the former. (4) More information may be elicited with the Likert-type scale simply because more response categories are possible than with the Thurstone-type scale.

Two disadvantages of the Likert-type scale are cited by Selltiz, et al. (1959). First, only an ordinal level of measurement may be assumed, and second, the total score of an individual often has little meaning since many patterns of responses may produce the same score.

#### Procedural Steps during Instrument Development

Development of the Punishment, Management and/or Control, and Trust Opinionnaire (Appendix A), as an instrument, proceeded through three distinct stages.

Stage one of the developmental process was collecting statements from the literature concerning punishment, management and/or control,



and trust of students. From approximately eighty-five statements, sixty of the seemingly most relevant statements were selected and put in the form of an opinionnaire. This first attempt at the formulation of an opinionnaire was administered to a graduate supervision class at Oklahoma State University during the summer of 1971. The class consisted of approximately thirty classroom teachers, supervisors, and administrators. This group aided in clarifying directions and statements. Some items were deleted due to ambiguity.

Revisions were made and during September, 1971, a jury of ten members of a doctoral seminar class at Oklahoma State University served to: (1) further clarify statements and written directions; (2) examine the opinionnaire for ambiguity; and (3) categorize the statements into the instrument's component parts--punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students. Only those statements, or items, receiving 100 per cent agreement from the jury were utilized in the instrument.

A second jury of three Oklahoma State University faculty members from the area of Elementary Education served to assign values, or weights, to the responses. Here, the judges were to be the respondents themselves, each judging according to his perceptions and in terms of the present day educational goals how teachers should react or view student behaviors. In other words, the jury opined how an "open" elementary teacher should respond to the opinionnaire. The item responses are arbitrarily coded from one to five and not weighted toward one end of the continuum. This jury was in 100 per cent agreement with the researcher as to the coding system for the fifty-seven remaining items.

The instrument first requested a number of kinds of demographic data, including sex, age group, grade presently teaching and number of years at this level, degree or degrees held and majors, teaching experience, whether teaching in an open-spaced school or in a self-contained classroom, if volunteered or assigned to the position, if taught in a self-contained classroom before teaching in an open-spaced school, hours of additional course work taken within the last three years, and whether or not special training or orientation was provided for the present position.

There are 57 items in the opinionnaire with responses ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree. Nineteen of the items deal with punishment. These items are not clustered but are randomly placed throughout the instrument. The nineteen items depicting opinions toward punishment are numbered 3, 7, 17, 19, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 38, 46, 48, 49, 52, 53, 55, and 57. The nineteen items dealing with management and/or control are: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 9, 12, 13, 14, 18, 22, 30, 37, 39, 41, 42, 45, 50, and 54. The nineteen items dealing with trust are: 8, 10, 11, 15, 16, 20, 25, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 40, 43, 44, 47, 51, and 56.

During the Fall semester of the 1971-72 academic year, a pilot study involved two graduate statistics classes. The major purposes focused on communicative aspects, timing, and utilization of the data to determine the reliability of the instrument. The classes of approximately fifty students were asked to write in comments if they so desired. There were none concerning directions or the items themselves; comments received were mainly in rebuttal to some of the statements. All members of the classes were required to complete the instrument

with no instructions other than those provided within the instrument itself. This placed each member of the classes in approximately the same position as a teacher who would receive the instrument. Times were noted as each of the respondents completed the instrument and an average time for completion was computed to be 14.52 minutes.

At this point it appeared that the instrument was in a form satisfactory enough to pursue a pilot study under actual experimental conditions. The primary purpose of this final pilot effort was to determine the discriminating power of the instrument, that is to determine how well it differentiated between known groups of teachers in an elementary open-spaced school and in an elementary self-contained classroom-building. An important secondary purpose of the final pilot study was to obtain a measure of internal consistency for the instrument. A final purpose was that of rechecking the communicative aspects of the instructions under actual experimental conditions. Two schools were identified by the research coordinator in a moderately sized school system. The research coordinator, in turn, granted permission to conduct the final study.

The investigator delivered the opinionnaires to the two schools during the time of the school faculty meeting. Comments made by the investigator were held to a minimum, mainly to tell the groups to read the directions and respond to the opinionnaire as rapidly as possible. The investigator also expressed appreciation to the groups for their taking time to respond.

### Validity

The final pilot study utilized the known-group method to establish a measure of construct validity for the instrument. Kerlinger (1964, p. 453), discussing the known-group method indicates, "In this method groups of people with 'known' characteristics are administered an instrument and the direction of difference is predicted." It was predicted that there would be a difference in the opinions of elementary school teachers teaching in open-spaced schools and self-contained classrooms toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students as measured by the PMT Opinionnaire. Thirty-five teachers responded to the opinionnaire. Of this total, 21 of the elementary teachers in open-spaced schools and 14 of the elementary teachers in self-contained classroom responded to provide data from which the differentiating power of the instrument was to be determined.

Shown in Table I are the results of a t-test of the difference between the means of the teachers in Group A (elementary teachers in open-spaced schools) and Group B (elementary teachers in self-contained classrooms). PMT Inventory scores are shown. The computed t values in all three areas: punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students, exceeded those required for the .05 level of confidence; thus, it was concluded that the instrument did, in fact, discriminate between the known groups.

### Reliability

Reliability of the instrument was determined from data obtained during the administration of the opinionnaire to the graduate

TABLE I  
A SUMMARY OF PILOT STUDY "KNOWN  
GROUPS" CHARACTERISTICS

	N	$\bar{X}$	$\sigma$	t
Total Score				
A	21	202.0	9.6	4.2**
B	14	185.9	12.9	
Punishment Scores				
A	21	64.7	4.9	2.8*
B	14	60.0	5.1	
Management Scores				
A	21	68.2	3.7	2.9*
B	14	64.2	4.7	
Trust Scores				
A	21	69.0	5.7	3.4*
B	14	61.7	6.7	

\*Significant at the .01 level

\*\*Significant at the .001 level

statistics classes and from the final pilot study which utilized two known groups. The split-half method was applied to the data from the graduate classes. According to Downie and Heath (1969), the split-half method provides a "coefficient of internal consistency" for the instrument. The split-half technique, using scores on the even-odd numbered items, showed a coefficient of reliability of 0.91. Utilizing the data from the known-groups, the Kuder-Richardson technique yielded a reliability coefficient of 0.72 and the split-half test yielded a reliability coefficient of 0.80. These reliabilities were deemed of sufficient magnitude to allow further use of the instrument.

### Sampling

In order to test the hypotheses and questions previously formulated, a sample of teachers in sixteen elementary schools in four southwestern cities was asked to respond to the Punishment, Management and/or Control, and Trust Opinionnaire. The cities of Tucson, Arizona; Wellington, Kansas; and Norman and Tulsa, Oklahoma, were selected on the basis of being granted permission to conduct the study, of being desirably located geographically, and of being sufficient in size to maintain both open-spaced school buildings and self-contained classroom school buildings. The sample did not include junior high schools or high schools, nor were any teachers included from private schools. Two hundred eighty teachers were employed in the sixteen schools and all 280 teachers are included in the study. The schools ranged in faculty size from 11 to 33 teachers.

### Administration of the Instrument

Upon completion of the sampling process, a packet containing opinionnaires, instructions for administration and return of the opinionnaires, and a letter from the investigator to each teacher (see appendix B) was mailed or delivered personally to the principal of each building. The method of distribution of the opinionnaires and letters to the teachers in each building was determined by the principal. It was left to the discretion of the individual teacher to complete the stamped opinionnaire and return it by mail to the researcher.

The present method of administering the instruments had its advantages and disadvantages. Advantages were seen to include the following: One, permitting the teachers to respond when they wished should result in a more positive orientation of the teachers toward participation in the study. It is assumed that an alternative method would require a teacher's meeting either before or after school. Two, if the teachers felt threatened as a result of their participation, they could respond in private, thus keeping their responses external to the physical confines of the school. Three, the method was considered to be much more feasible from the school administration's point of view because of the largeness of the sample size. The fact of feasibility seemed to be weighted heavily by the administration when either approving or disapproving research within its school system. Finally, the present method presented some assurance that the instruments arrived at their destination and were not lost in the mail or were not mailed to a wrong address.

An obvious disadvantage associated with this method of instrument administration was the fact that no control could be obtained with

respect to insuring responses to the instrument. The instruments were not coded, therefore, a personal follow-up could not be carried out. Steps taken to gain the cooperation of the teachers included insuring complete anonymity on the part of the teachers and individual schools. It was considered doubtful that 100 per cent of the teachers would choose to participate in the study. At the end of a one month period 67 per cent of the total 280 teachers had responded; replies were received from 77 percent of the open-spaced school teachers and 61 per cent of the self-contained classroom teachers.

As stated earlier, sixteen schools participated in the study. Eight of the schools met the criteria for open-spaced schools as defined in the study. The eight schools employed a total of one hundred forty-six teachers. Eight of the schools met the criteria for self-contained classrooms as defined in the study. One hundred thirty-four teachers were employed in the self-contained classroom schools.

#### Scoring Procedures

Scoring of the Punishment, Management and/or Control, and Trust Opinionnaire was conducted as suggested by Selltiz, et al. (1959).

As discussed in a previous section of this chapter, the five point Likert scale was used to elicit responses. The responses to the various items were scored in such a manner that a response indicative of the most favorable attitude was given the highest score.

The scores were derived from the individual instruments and placed on data cards for processing by the IBM 360 computer at Oklahoma State University. Biographical data were coded and also placed on data cards.



Data to evaluate Hypotheses One, Two, and Three were derived from the scores of the fifty-seven items. Data to evaluate Hypothesis Four utilized both the demographic data and the scores from the fifty-seven items.

#### Statistical Treatment of Data

The statistical technique utilized in analyzing the data obtained by the PMT Opinionnaire to test Hypotheses One, Two, and Three was the Pooled Variance  $t$  formula as described by Popham (1967, 143-150).

Hypothesis Four states that there is no difference between the opinions of elementary teachers teaching in open-spaced schools and self-contained classrooms toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students according to selected demographic factors collected by the PMT Inventory. The Kruskal-Wallis One-way analysis of variance by ranks was utilized for testing the null hypothesis.

Significance was established at the 0.05 level of confidence.

#### Summary

Chapter III has presented the technique employed to develop the Punishment, Management and/or Control, and Trust Opinionnaire and the procedural steps utilized during the developmental process. Also discussed were the sampling methodology, the scoring procedures utilized to derive data necessary to test the hypothesis and answer the questions, and the statistical techniques utilized. Chapter IV will continue by focusing upon the findings of these analyses.

## CHAPTER IV

### AN ANALYSIS AND TREATMENT OF DATA

#### Introduction

The results of the statistical analyses of the four hypotheses are reported in this chapter. The data obtained in this investigation were used for the primary purpose of testing the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis One. There is no significant difference between the opinions of elementary school teachers teaching in open-spaced schools and self-contained classrooms toward punishment of students as measured by the PMT Opinionnaire.

Hypothesis Two. There is no significant difference between the opinions of elementary school teachers teaching in open-spaced schools and self-contained classrooms toward management and/or control of students as measured by the PMT Opinionnaire.

Hypothesis Three. There is no significant difference between the opinions of elementary school teachers teaching in open-spaced schools and self-contained classrooms toward trust of students as measured by the PMT Opinionnaire.

Hypothesis Four. There are no significant differences between the opinions of elementary school teachers teaching in open-spaced schools and self-contained classrooms toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students according to selected demographic factors as measured by the PMT Opinionnaire.

Before viewing findings as they relate to the hypotheses, it seems appropriate to view data characteristics of the sampled teachers.

Directors of the Research Division for the School Districts in Tucson, Arizona; Wellington, Kansas; and Norman and Tulsa, Oklahoma, granted permission to conduct the study in a total of sixteen elementary schools with a total of two hundred eighty teachers. Eight of the schools met the criteria for open-spaced schools as defined in the study. These eight schools employed a total of one hundred forty-six teachers. Eight of the schools met the criteria for self-contained classrooms as defined in the study. One hundred thirty-four teachers were employed in the self-contained classroom schools.

The one hundred six returns from the elementary teachers teaching in the open-spaced schools represent a seventy-seven per cent return. Throughout the remainder of this report the elementary teachers teaching in the open-spaced schools will be referred to as Group A.

The eighty-two returns from the elementary teachers teaching in self-contained classrooms represent a sixty-one per cent return. Throughout the remainder of this report the elementary teachers teaching in self-contained classrooms will be referred to as Group B.

Presented in Appendix C are the demographic data from the elementary teachers teaching in open-spaced schools and self-contained classrooms who responded and returned the inventories. An examination of Appendix C shows that seven per cent of the returns from Group A are males while ten per cent of the eighty-two returns from Group B are males. With respect to age, forty-four per cent of the teachers in Group A are of twenty-nine years or below compared to twenty-four per cent of the teachers in Group B are twenty-nine years of age or below.

Thirty-eight per cent of the teachers in Group A hold a Masters Degree or hours above while thirty-seven per cent of the teachers in Group B hold a Masters Degree or have obtained a number of hours above a Masters Degree. Seventy per cent of Group A obtained the first major in Elementary Education compared to sixty-five per cent of the teachers in Group B received the first major for the degree in Elementary Education.

Shown in Appendix D are the number of years teaching experience for both groups of teachers. Since some participants did not respond to this item, the information is limited. Of those responding from Group A, seventy-two, or sixty-eight per cent, of the teachers indicated three years or less of teaching experience. Those responding from Group B indicated that thirty-eight, or forty-six per cent, of the teachers had three years or less of teaching experience.

The number of years taught in the present building and the number of years taught in the present system are shown in Appendix E. The reader should be reminded that the open-spaced school concept is relatively new, hence, the evident difference in the number of years taught in the present building. The number of teachers indicating no years taught in the present building or system might indicate only a partial year of teaching in the building or system, or there could be a misinterpretation of the item on the inventory.

Indicated in Appendix F are the responses revealing whether Group A and Group B teachers were assigned or volunteered to teach in the respective buildings; if they received pre-service or in-service training for the present position; or if the teachers are currently participating in an in-service program of some type. Forty-three

per cent of the teachers in Group A were assigned to teach in an open-spaced school while sixty-one per cent of the teachers in Group B were assigned to teach in self-contained classrooms. Sixty-nine per cent of the teachers in Group A indicated they volunteered to teach in an open-spaced school whereas thirty-five per cent of the teachers in Group B indicated they volunteered to teach in self-contained classrooms. Sixty-two per cent of the teachers in Group A reported special pre-service or in-service training for the present position as compared to fifteen per cent of the teachers in Group B. Twenty-six per cent of the teachers in Group A and twenty-three per cent of the teachers in Group B indicated they were presently participating in an in-service program of some type. The type of program was not specified.

Presented in Appendix G are the responses to the number of hours taken either in Subject Matter Content, Curriculum, Educational Psychology, and Social Foundations within the last three years. The large number of responses to zero hours indicates that over fifty per cent of the teachers involved in the study have taken no educational course work within the last three years. An examination of the averages of hours taken in each area shows that elementary teachers in open-spaced schools have taken more hours than elementary teachers in self-contained classrooms over the last three years. The highest concentration of hours taken by both groups was in the area of Curriculum with Subject Matter Content following very closely.

#### Results of the Study

Up to this point the investigator has provided a profile of the characteristics of the teachers involved in the study. The following

presents an analysis of the participants' responses to the fifty-seven items on the PMT Opinionnaire. The reader is referred to Chapter III for further information and clarification of the three categories of items in the PMT Opinionnaire.

As presented in Table II, the result of the Pooled Variance  $t$  test shows the differences of opinions between Group A and Group B toward punishment of elementary students. The computed  $t$  value of 4.31 called for rejection of the null hypothesis, ( $P < .001$ ). There is a significant difference between the opinions of elementary teachers teaching in open-spaced schools and self-contained classrooms toward punishment of students. Hypothesis One is rejected.

TABLE II  
THE OPINIONS OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS TEACHING  
IN OPEN-SPACED SCHOOLS AND SELF-CONTAINED  
CLASSROOMS TOWARD PUNISHMENT  
OF STUDENTS

Group	n	$\bar{X}$	$s^2$	$\sigma$	t
A	106	61.96	52.59	7.25	4.3117*
B	82	57.37	52.48	7.24	

\*Significant beyond the .001 level of confidence.

The differences of opinions of Group A and Group B toward management and/or control of students are reported in Table III. A

significant difference at the .05 level of confidence required a  $t$  of 1.980 with 186 degrees of freedom. The computed  $t$  was 5.3075, ( $P < .001$ ); therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. According to these findings it can be stated that there is a significant difference in the opinions between elementary teachers teaching in open-spaced schools and self-contained classrooms toward management and/or control of students as measured by the PMT Opinionnaire.

TABLE III

THE OPINIONS OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS TEACHING IN  
OPEN-SPACED SCHOOLS AND SELF-CONTAINED CLASSROOMS  
TOWARD MANAGEMENT AND/OR CONTROL OF STUDENTS

Group	n	$\bar{X}$	$s^2$	$\sigma$	t
A	106	67.89	43.43	6.59	5.3075*
B	82	62.95	35.50	5.96	

\*Significant beyond the .001 level of confidence.

The differences of opinions of Group A and Group B toward trust of students are reported in Table 4. The computed  $t$  was 4.2754 ( $P < .001$ ) which signifies the rejection of the third null hypothesis. Therefore, it can be stated that there is a significant difference in the opinions between elementary school teachers teaching in open-spaced schools and self-contained classrooms as measured by the PMT Opinionnaire.

TABLE IV  
THE OPINIONS OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS TEACHING IN  
OPEN-SPACED SCHOOLS AND SELF-CONTAINED CLASSROOMS  
TOWARD TRUST OF STUDENTS

Group	n	$\bar{X}$	$s^2$	t
A	106	67.04	79.96	8.94
B	82	61.71	60.62	7.79

4.2754\*

\*Significant beyond the .001 level of confidence.

Shown in Appendix H are the frequencies of scores from Group A and Group B teachers toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students as measured by the PMT Opinionnaire.

An analysis of the data for Hypothesis Four was made by using the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance to see if differences among the groups did exist pertaining to certain selected demographic data and opinions of elementary school teachers teaching in open-spaced schools and self-contained classrooms toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students. An examination of the tables show that Hypothesis Four could only be partially rejected.

As shown in Table V, there is no significant difference in the opinions toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students between male and female teachers teaching in elementary open-spaced schools and self-contained classrooms.



TABLE V

THE KRUSKAL-WALLIS TEST OF VARIANCE IN OPINIONS OF MALE  
AND FEMALE TEACHERS FROM GROUP A AND B TOWARD  
PUNISHMENT, MANAGEMENT AND/OR CONTROL,  
AND TRUST OF STUDENTS

Group A			Group B			
Sex	n	$\Sigma R$	H	n	$\Sigma R$	H
Punishment						
Male	7	343.00	0.1609*	8	239.00	2.1186
Female	99	5328.00		74	3164	
Management and/or Control						
Male	7	353.00	0.2531	8	360.50	0.1989
Female	99	5336.00		74	3042.50	
Trust						
Male	7	330.50	0.3135	8	340.50	0.0155
Female	99	5340.00		74	3063.00	

\*3.84 is required for significance at the .05 level of confidence.

Another factor in this study was to determine if there is a difference in the opinions of either group of teachers toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students according to age groups. There is no significant difference in the opinions of elementary teachers teaching in open-spaced schools toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students according to age groups. For the elementary teachers teaching in self-contained classrooms, there is no significant difference in the opinions toward punishment and trust according to age groups, however, it appears that the 20-29 year age

group is less concerned with management and/or control of students than the other age groups, as shown in Table VI.

TABLE VI  
THE KRUSKAL-WALLIS TEST OF VARIANCE IN OPINIONS OF  
TEACHERS FROM GROUP A AND GROUP B TOWARD  
PUNISHMENT, MANAGEMENT AND/OR CONTROL,  
AND TRUST OF STUDENTS ACCORDING  
TO AGE GROUPS

Age	Group A			Group B		
	n	$\Sigma R$	H	n	$\Sigma R$	H
Punishment						
60 or above	4	145.50		5	159.00	
50-59	10	578.00		20	746.00	
40-49	23	1462.00		24	1033.50	
30-39	23	1213.50		13	421.50	
20-29	46	2271.50		20	1043.00	
			7.4649			4.7456
Management and/or control						
60 or above	4	187.50		5	108.00	
50-59	10	517.50		20	665.00	
40-49	23	1253.00		24	1016.00	
30-39	23	1207.50		13	587.50	
20-29	46	2505.50		20	1026.50	
			0.03110			9.6367*
Trust						
60 or above	4	96.00		5	206.00	
50-59	10	551.00		20	809.00	
40-49	23	1341.50		24	950.00	
30-39	23	1140.50		13	505.50	
20-29	46	2542.00		20	932.00	
			4.0878			1.2810

\*Significant at the .05 level of confidence

Is there a difference between opinions of Group A and Group B teachers toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students according to degree held? As shown in Table VII, the opinions of the elementary teachers teaching in open-spaced schools toward management and/or control, and trust of students according to degree held is significant at the .05 level of confidence. The teachers with hours above a Master's degree are shown to be less concerned with managing or controlling the class and more trusting of students. The elementary teachers in self-contained classrooms having hours above a Master's degree appear to be more trusting of students than the teachers with a Master's degree or less. For both groups of teachers, there is no significant difference in the opinions toward punishment of students according to degree held.

The demographic data section of the PMT Opinionnaire requested the respondents to indicate in hour numbers any additional educational course work taken within the last three years. The purpose of this was to determine if additional educational experiences might differentially influence the opinions of open-spaced school teachers and elementary self-contained classroom teachers toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students. The course work was broken down into four areas: Subject Matter Content (such as: Biology, Math, Social Studies, Science, etc.); Curriculum (Methods or orientation to new programs); Educational Psychology (such as: Human Development, Guidance, etc.); and Social Foundations (such as: History and Philosophy of Education, Sociology, Anthropology, etc.).

TABLE VII  
THE KRUSKAL-WALLIS TEST OF VARIANCE IN OPINIONS OF  
TEACHERS FROM GROUP A AND GROUP B TOWARD  
PUNISHMENT, MANAGEMENT AND/OR CONTROL,  
AND TRUST OF STUDENTS ACCORDING  
TO DEGREE HELD

Degree	Group A			Group B		
	n	$\Sigma R$	H	n	$\Sigma R$	H
Punishment						
Bachelor	66	3327.00		51	1906.50	
Master	16	805.00		9	433.00	
Hours above Master	24	1539.00		22	1063.50	
			3.7056			4.0332
Management and/or Control						
Bachelor	66	3364.50		51	1888.00	
Master	16	705.00		9	468.50	
Hours above Master	24	1601.50		22	1046.50	
			6.3958*			5.0012
Trust						
Bachelor	66	3322.50		51	1811.50	
Master	16	792.50		9	416.00	
Hours above Master	24	1556.00		22	1175.50	
			4.2249**			9.0920**

\*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

\*\*Significant at the .02 level of confidence.

As shown in Tables VIII, IX, and X, there is no significant difference between the opinions of elementary teachers teaching in open-spaced schools and self-contained classrooms toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students according to hours taken within the last three years in the areas of Subject Matter Content or Curriculum. As to opinions toward punishment and trust, hours taken within the last three years in Educational Psychology were apparently differentially influential upon the elementary teachers teaching in open-spaced schools but not influential toward management and/or control. The opinions of the elementary teachers teaching in open-spaced school toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students indicate a more positive position after acquiring hours in Social Foundations within the last three years.

There is no significant difference in the opinions of elementary teachers teaching in self-contained classrooms toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students according to hours taken within the last three years in the areas of Subject Matter Content, Curriculum, Educational Psychology, or Social Foundations.

Presented in Table XI are the findings of elementary teachers who did or did not volunteer to teach in open-spaced schools and their opinions toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students. The teachers who volunteered to teach in the elementary open-spaced schools appear to be less punitive, less concerned with management and/or control, and more trusting of students than the teachers who did not volunteer.

TABLE VIII

THE KRUSKAL-WALLIS TEST OF VARIANCE IN THE OPINIONS OF TEACHERS  
FROM GROUP A AND GROUP B TOWARD PUNISHMENT OF STUDENTS  
ACCORDING TO ADDITIONAL COURSE WORK TAKEN  
WITHIN THE LAST THREE YEARS

Course Work	Group A			H	Group B		
		n	$\Sigma R$		n	$\Sigma R$	H
Subject Matter Content	No	56	2893.50	0.4217	48	2014.00	0.0429
	Yes	50	2777.50		34	1398.00	
Curriculum	No	55	2680.50	2.7529	46	1821.00	0.6779
	Yes	51	2990.50		36	1582.00	
Educational Psychology	No	63	2987.50	6.0914*	52	2012.00	1.9812
	Yes	43	2683.50		30	1391.00	
Social Foundations	No	74	3403.00	14.6861**	72	2857.50	3.4298
	Yes	32	2268.00		10	545.50	

\*Significant at the .02 level of confidence.

\*\*Significant beyond the .001 level of confidence.

TABLE IX

THE KRUSKAL-WALLIS TEST OF VARIANCE IN THE OPINIONS OF TEACHERS  
FROM GROUP A AND GROUP B TOWARD MANAGEMENT AND/OR CONTROL  
OF STUDENTS ACCORDING TO ADDITIONAL COURSE WORK TAKEN  
WITHIN THE LAST THREE YEARS

Course Work		Group A			Group B		
		n	ΣR	H	n	ΣR	H
Subject Matter Content	No	56	2824.50		48	2101.00	
	Yes	50	2846.50		34	1302.00	
				1.1822			1.0561
Curriculum	No	55	2927.50		46	1803.00	
	Yes	51	2743.50		36	1600.00	
				0.0088			0.9842
Educational Psychology	No	63	3151.00		52	2106.00	
	Yes	43	2520.00		30	1297.00	
				1.9944			0.2505
Social Foundations	No	74	3529.50		72	2869.00	
	Yes	32	2141.50		10	534.00	
				8.7691*			2.8534

\*Significant at the .01 level of confidence.

TABLE X

THE KRUSKAL-WALLIS TEST OF VARIANCE IN THE OPINIONS OF TEACHERS  
FROM GROUP A AND GROUP B TOWARD TRUST OF STUDENTS  
ACCORDING TO ADDITIONAL COURSE WORK TAKEN  
WITHIN THE LAST THREE YEARS

Course Work	Group A			H	Group B		
		n	ΣR		n	ΣR	H
Subject Matter Content	No	56	2773.00	1.9949	48	1982.00	0.0088
	Yes	50	2898.00		34	1421.00	
Curriculum	No	55	2673.00	2.9082	46	1790.00	1.2361
	Yes	51	2998.00		36	1613.00	
Educational Psychology	No	63	2880.50	9.9556*	52	1996.00	2.4381
	Yes	43	2790.50		30	1407.00	
Social Foundations	No	74	3294.00	20.9774**	72	2901.00	1.5236
	Yes	32	2377.00		10	502.00	

\*Significant at the .01 level of confidence.

\*\*Significant beyond the .001 level of confidence.



TABLE XI

THE KRUSKAL-WALLIS TEST OF VARIANCE IN THE OPINIONS TOWARD  
PUNISHMENT, MANAGEMENT AND/OR CONTROL, AND TRUST  
OF STUDENTS OF ELEMENTARY TEACHERS WHO DID OR  
DID NOT VOLUNTEER TO TEACH IN OPEN-  
SPACED SCHOOLS

	n	$\Sigma R$	H
Punishment			
Volunteers	74	3358.50	
Non-volunteers	12	382.50	
			3.0321
Management and/or Control			
Volunteers	74	3402.50	
Non-volunteers	12	338.50	
			5.2467*
Trust			
Volunteers	74	3390.00	
Non-volunteers	12	351.00	
			4.5499*

\*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

As shown in Table XII, the elementary teachers teaching in open-spaced schools who are participating in an in-service program of some type indicate they are less punitive, less concerned with managerial problems, and more trusting of students than those teachers who are not participating in an in-service program.

TABLE XII

THE KRUSKAL-WALLIS TEST OF VARIANCE IN THE OPINIONS OF  
THE ELEMENTARY TEACHERS TEACHING IN OPEN-SPACED  
SCHOOLS ACCORDING TO WHETHER OR NOT THEY  
ARE NOW PARTICIPATING IN AN  
IN-SERVICE PROGRAM

	n	$\Sigma R$	H
Punishment			
Participating	28	1430.00	
Not Participating	46	1345.00	
			17.9874*
Management and/or Control			
Participating	28	1354.00	
Not Participating	46	1421.00	
			11.5254*
Trust			
Participating	28	1397.00	
Not Participating	46	1378.00	
			14.9868*

\*Significant beyond the .001 level of significance.

As indicated in Table XIII, those teachers who had no experience teaching in a self-contained classroom before teaching in an elementary open-spaced school appear to be less punitive and more trusting of students than those teachers who had experience in the self-contained classroom. There is no significant difference dependent upon prior experience in the self-contained classroom in the opinions of the elementary teachers teaching in open-spaced schools regarding management and/or control of students.

TABLE XIII

THE KRUSKAL-WALLIS TEST OF VARIANCES IN THE OPINIONS OF  
ELEMENTARY TEACHERS TEACHING IN OPEN-SPACED SCHOOLS  
ACCORDING TO WHETHER OR NOT THEY HAD PRIOR  
TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN A SELF-  
CONTAINED CLASSROOM

	n	$\Sigma R$	H
Punishment			
No	25	1640.50	
Yes	81	4030.50	
			5.1002*
Management and/or Control			
No	25	1572.50	
Yes	81	4098.50	
			3.0696
Trust			
No	25	1677.50	
Yes	81	3993.50	
			6.4121**

\*Significant at the .05 level of confidence

\*\*Significant at the .02 level of confidence

### Summary

Chapter IV has presented the procedural treatment and the statistical analysis of data collected through the use of the Punishment, Management and/or Control, and Trust Opinionnaire. The data were presented in tabular format with appropriate discussion concerning the statistical test of significance and the results obtained. Statistical confidence was specified at the .05 level of confidence.

Chapter V will continue with a summary, conclusions, and recommendations of the present study.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS

#### AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The central problem of this study was to determine if there is a significant difference in the opinions of elementary teachers teaching in open-spaced schools and self-contained classrooms toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students.

#### Summary

A sample of 280 teachers was drawn from sixteen elementary schools in four southwestern cities. The Punishment, Management and/or Control, and Trust Opinionnaire, developed for use in this study, was distributed to each of the sampled teachers. Sixty-seven per cent of the sampled teachers responded to the inventory.

A review of the related literature indicates that open-spaced schools were designed to create an environment to foster student autonomy and permit the teacher to act as a facilitator and/or guide. The physical facilities abolish the traditional styling of self-contained classrooms and rigid scheduling. The physical setting of the open-spaced school allows the learner the opportunity to interact with more than one teacher; to do independent studies, small group work, or participate in large group activities; and provides for interaction with a larger number of students. Teacher opinions, or attitudes,

toward student autonomy are of major concern if the goals and expectations of the open-spaced schools are to be reached. Often new ideas, or innovations, are too quickly adopted without realizing the implications. Teachers not attitudinally ready to accept the philosophy and underlying assumptions of the open-spaced schools will tend to expect student behaviors to remain unchanged from the rigid expectations of those in the past. Therefore, this study concerns itself with determining if there is a difference in the opinions, or attitudes, of elementary teachers teaching in open-spaced schools and self-contained classrooms.

The major objective of the study was to test the following null hypotheses:

1) There is no significant difference in the opinions between elementary teachers teaching in open-spaced schools and self-contained classrooms toward punishment of students as measured by the PMT Opinionnaire.

2) There is no significant difference between the opinions of elementary school teachers teaching in open-spaced schools and self-contained classrooms toward management and/or control of students as measured by the PMT Opinionnaire.

3) There is no significant difference between the opinions of elementary school teachers teaching in open-spaced schools and self-contained classrooms toward trust of students as measured by the PMT Opinionnaire.

4) There are no significant differences between the opinions of elementary school teachers teaching in open-spaced schools and self-contained classrooms toward punishment, management and/or control, and

trust of students according to selected demographic factors as measured by the PMT Opinionnaire.

The data were analyzed through the use of the Pooled Variance t test and the Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks. Significance was established at the 0.05 level of confidence.

### Findings

The findings of this study considered to be the most important and of significant value were the following:

- 1) Hypothesis One was rejected. There was a significant difference between the opinions of elementary teachers teaching in open-spaced schools and self-contained classrooms toward punishment of students as measured by the PMT Opinionnaire. The mean PMT Opinionnaire "punishment" score for elementary school teachers teaching in open-space schools was significantly greater than the mean "punishment" score for the elementary school teachers teaching in self-contained classrooms.

- 2) Hypothesis Two was rejected. There was a significant difference between the opinions of elementary teachers teaching in open-spaced schools and in self-contained classrooms toward management and/or control of students as measured by the PMT Opinionnaire. The mean "management and/or control" score for elementary school teachers teaching in open-spaced schools was significantly greater than the equivalent mean score for the elementary teachers teaching in self-contained classrooms.

- 3) Hypothesis Three was rejected. There was a significant difference between the opinions of elementary teachers teaching in

open-spaced schools and in self-contained classrooms toward trust of students as measured by the PMT Opinionnaire. The mean "trust" score for elementary school teachers teaching in open-spaced schools was significantly greater than the equivalent mean score for the elementary teachers teaching in self-contained classrooms.

4) Hypothesis Four was partially rejected. Hypothesis Four dealt with differences of opinions of elementary school teachers teaching in open-spaced schools and in self-contained classrooms toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students according to selected demographic factors collected by the PMT Opinionnaire. Demographic variables selected were: sex, age, degree held, additional course work taken within the last three years in the areas of Subject Matter Content, Curriculum, Educational Psychology, or Social Foundations; assigned or volunteered to teach in the present position, special pre-service or in-service training for the present position, and participation in some type of in-service program. The findings, according to the Kruskal-Wallis test, are as follows:

a. There is no significant difference in the opinions toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students between male and female teachers teaching in elementary open-spaced schools and self-contained classrooms as measured by the PMT Opinionnaire.

b. There is a significant difference in the opinions between age groups of elementary school teachers teaching in self-contained classrooms toward management and/or control of students as measured by the PMT Opinionnaire. It appears that the twenty-nine year old and under group of teachers teaching in the self-contained classrooms is less concerned with management and/or control of students than the older



age groups of teachers teaching in the self-contained classrooms.

c. There is no significant difference in opinions between age groups of elementary school teachers teaching in open-spaced schools toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students.

d. There is no significant difference in the opinions between age groups of elementary school teachers teaching in self-contained classrooms toward punishment and trust of students.

e. There is a significant difference in the opinions of elementary school teachers teaching in open-spaced schools toward management and/or control, and trust of students according to degree held. Those teachers having hours above a Masters' degree scored significantly higher on the inventory than those teachers holding a Bachelor or Masters' degree.

f. There is no significant difference in the opinions of elementary school teachers teaching in open-spaced schools toward punishment of students according to degree held.

g. There is a significant difference in the opinions of elementary school teachers teaching in self-contained classrooms toward trust of students according to degree held. Those teachers having hours above a Masters' degree scored significantly higher on the inventory than those teachers holding a Bachelor or Masters' degree.

h. There is no significant difference in the opinions of elementary school teachers teaching in self-contained classrooms toward punishment, or management and/or control of students according to degree held.

i. There is no significant difference between course work taken within the last three years in the areas of Subject Matter Content or Curriculum and the opinions of elementary school teachers teaching in

open-spaced schools toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students.

j. There is a significant difference between course work taken within the last three years in the area of Social Foundations and the opinions of elementary school teachers teaching in open-spaced schools toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students. The teachers who indicated they had taken courses in Social Foundations within the last three years scored significantly higher on the opinionnaire than those teachers who indicated they had not taken any courses in Social Foundations.

k. There is a significant difference between course work taken within the last three years in the area of Educational Psychology and the opinions of elementary school teachers teaching in open-spaced schools toward punishment and trust of students. The teachers who indicated they had taken courses in Educational Psychology within the last three years scored significantly higher on the inventory than those teachers who indicated they had not taken any courses in Educational Psychology.

l. There is no significant difference between course work taken within the last three years in the area of Educational Psychology and the opinions of elementary school teachers teaching in open-spaced schools toward management and/or control of students.

m. There is no significant difference between course work taken within the last three years in the area of Subject Matter Content, Curriculum, Educational Psychology, or Social Foundations and the opinions of elementary school teachers teaching in self-contained classrooms toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students.

n. There is a significant difference between the elementary school teachers who volunteered and those who did not volunteer to teach in an open-spaced school and the opinions toward management and/or control, and trust of students. The teachers who volunteered to teach in the open-spaced school scored significantly higher on the opinionnaire than the teachers who did not volunteer.

o. There is no significant difference between the elementary school teachers who volunteered and those who did not volunteer to teach in an open-spaced school and the opinions toward punishment of students.

p. There is a significant difference between elementary school teachers teaching in open-spaced schools who are presently participating in an in-service program and those who are not and the opinions toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students. The teachers who are participating in an in-service program scored significantly higher on the opinionnaire.

q. There is a significant difference between elementary school teachers who had experience teaching in a self-contained classroom prior to teaching in an open-spaced school and those who did not and the opinions toward punishment and trust of students. The elementary school teachers who had no experience teaching in a self-contained classroom prior to teaching in an open-spaced school scored significantly higher on the opinionnaire.

r. There is no significant difference between elementary school teachers who had experience teaching in a self-contained classroom prior to teaching in an open-spaced school and those who did not and the opinions toward management and/or control of students.

It seems appropriate to note that additional data were gathered from the sampled teachers during this study. Basically, these data are demographic in nature. The following list of findings may be of interest to those concerned with open-spaced schools.

a. Seven per cent of the returned inventories from the elementary school teachers teaching in open-spaced schools were from males as compared to ten per cent males in the self-contained classroom group.

b. Forty-four per cent of the teachers in the open-spaced schools are below age thirty as compared to twenty-four per cent of the teachers in the self-contained classrooms below the age of thirty.

c. Sixty-eight per cent of the teachers teaching in open-spaced schools reported three years or less of teaching experience as compared to forty-six per cent of the teachers in self-contained classrooms with three years or less of teaching experience.

d. Sixty-two per cent of the elementary teachers teaching in the open-spaced schools reported having special pre-service or in-service training for the present position as compared to fifteen per cent of the teachers in self-contained classrooms receiving special training for the present position.

e. Of the 188 teachers responding, 97.8 per cent indicated that college education courses did not adequately prepare them to maintain control of the classroom.

f. Of the 188 elementary teachers responding, 78.05 per cent agreed that there are some hyperactive children who need to be on a prescribed drug of some type in order to help them function socially, and another 15.85 per cent were undecided concerning the matter.

g. Seventy-seven per cent of the elementary teachers teaching in the open-spaced schools involved in the study returned the opinionnaires as compared to sixty-one per cent of the elementary teachers teaching in self-contained classrooms that were involved in the study.

### Conclusions

The reader is cautioned that the conclusions drawn from an analysis of the data reported in this study possess the limitations inherent in a descriptive type research design in addition to the limitations discussed in Chapter III.

On the basis of the findings of this study the following conclusions appear justified:

1. Elementary school teachers teaching in open-spaced schools appear to be less punitive, less concerned with management and/or control, and more trusting of students as defined in this study than teachers teaching in self-contained classrooms.
2. It appears that the elementary school teachers who volunteered to teach in open-spaced schools tend to be more concerned with self-discipline than those who were assigned to the teaching position.
3. Educational Psychology and Social Foundation courses tend to be more influential on elementary teachers' opinions toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students than educational courses in Subject Matter Content and Curriculum.
4. Teaching in an elementary self-contained classroom prior to teaching in an elementary open-spaced school appears to be a significant factor in influencing teachers' opinions toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students. Teachers with prior experience

in a self-contained classroom indicated less positive opinions toward student autonomy than those elementary teachers who had taught only in open-spaced schools.

5. In-service programs appear to be a positive influence upon the opinions of elementary teachers toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students.

6. Sixty-eight per cent of the elementary school teachers teaching in open-spaced schools reported three years or less of teaching experience. It appears that a greater number of years of teaching experience is not a major factor in hiring teachers to teach in the open-spaced schools.

7. Apparently age is not an influencing factor in the opinions of elementary school teachers teaching in open-spaced schools toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students.

8. Whatever the content of the educational courses are, it appears that they are not influential on the opinions of elementary teachers in self-contained classrooms toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students. Apparently, the degree held is not an influencing factor on opinions toward student behavior. This raises the question, "Why then, are these teachers seeking a higher degree or taking additional course work?" It leads one to speculate that the work was done in order to satisfy School Board requirements, certification requirements, or, possibly, for monetary increments.

9. Apparently the elementary teachers teaching in open-spaced schools have accepted the concept of open education as well as open-spaced schools, as evidenced by the percentage of returned opinionnaires, scores on the opinionnaires, degrees held and additional course

work taken; the number of teachers volunteering to teach in the open-spaced school, and the number of teachers participating in some type of in-service program.

#### Recommendations for Elementary Education

1. Teachers need an extended background in psychological, sociological, and philosophical foundations of education. They need to understand more fully the behavior patterns of children.
2. Teachers need to re-examine their own styles of teaching to see if they are congruent with the learner's style of learning.
3. Teachers continue to present a formal curricula as if it were value free. They must learn to organize situations in which the students can search out the contradictions in their own value systems, to explore their own life goals, and to be able to discuss these matters openly with peers and adults.
4. Teacher education, both pre-service and in-service, needs to emphasize what might be called a "developmental psychological viewpoint" of child growth and development.
5. The public, and particularly parents, must be fully cognizant to the roles of the school and the teacher in the education of children. There must be a constant dissemination of information to aid them in understanding what could and should be accomplished in the best interest of the learner. When innovative educational programs are established, parents, the community, and the public as a whole, need to be involved.

### Recommendations for Further Research

The results and conclusions of this study can be of considerable value only as they lead to additional studies. This can be substantiated through the concentration on certain important variables affecting teacher opinions toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students other than those mentioned in this study. Future study in the following areas appears relevant and necessary at this time:

1. A more detailed investigation should be attempted to determine the appropriateness of the Punishment, Management and/or Control, and Trust Opinionnaire.

2. An investigation should be attempted to determine relationships between the opinions of elementary school teachers teaching in open-spaced schools and in self-contained classrooms toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students through different analyses than used in this study.

3. Further research should attempt to determine the relationship between administrative opinions in the school systems and teacher opinions toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students.

4. Attempts should be made to replicate this study in other geographic areas.

5. Study should be given to the kind of preparation for open-spaced school teachers if it is deemed that a different type of preparation is necessary. Those concerned with teacher preparation programs need to be sensitized to special concerns and needs of teachers being prepared for teaching in open-spaced schools.



The value of this study will be determined, partially, by the extent to which further research is stimulated in this area. With further investigations that produce additional information concerning teacher opinions, or attitudes, toward punishment, management and/or control, and trust of students, educators will be better able to view progress along these dimensions and determine directions that need to be taken.

### Theoretical Considerations

Educators are constantly seeking for more effective methods of applying what has been discovered about how people learn. It is imperative that a way be found to create an environment which enables the learner to reach his fullest potential and to bring about the recognition of individual worth. Ways must be created which permit learners to learn from one another as well as to accept and to live with each other while seeking solutions to common problems.

The attitudes of teachers toward students is indeed crucial. The teacher plays a vital role in aiding the learner to develop a sense of responsibility for his actions and decisions. The attitude of the teacher needs to reflect the idea that he is working with a human being first and a learner second. Each person is a learner and is unique, thus, through his experiences he has something unique to contribute to those with whom he is in contact. Environments need to be created in which each unique individual can express himself without fear of being rejected.

Negative attitudes of teachers can build barriers to communication which result in isolation. When freedom of communication or

interaction with fellow students is restricted, then the opportunity to learn, as well as to teach, is restricted. It is difficult to grow in isolation. Teachers can create a learning climate through true freedom of expression of ideas, suggestions, and recommendations on the part of the learner. Permitting the learner to plan or direct studies that are of importance to him will result in a meaningful learning experience.

Teachers need to give serious thought as to whether or not they truly know best about what the learner needs to know. Each learner has different problems and each learner needs to work on his own problems. Growth comes with solving one's own problems and this leads to further personal motivation.

By the same token, teachers should not be held entirely accountable for failure to meet the aforementioned ends. They are proceeding along the lines in which they were trained. Teacher training institutions must become aware of the circumstances and provide the needed experiences for teachers to become prepared to cope with problems.

There is a need for leadership and research in developing new approaches in training teachers to accept the role of being an open facilitator.

Too often evaluation is thought of in terms of ABC's--even F's. The teacher soon forgets the passing or failing grade, but the learner remembers it well in the form of self-concept. When the learner shares the responsibility of evaluating his own progress or actions, he is at the same time judging his responsibility for a course of action or how well his decision turned out. He is then freed to seek alternatives in order to attain his goals; if necessary. Teachers must relinquish the authoritarian attitude if the learner is to be allowed to develop autonomy.

Teachers possibly feel threatened with questions asked by the students. With the fast pace of present day society, it is extremely difficult to keep abreast of happenings and to be knowledgeable of current events. Through the various media available to the learner, he becomes inquisitive about a variety of things and seeks further information. An environment needs to be created where he can satisfy this curiosity. In this manner, the curiosity is not stifled and can lead to rewarding experiences. Teachers must relinquish the idea that they have to be all things to all people; they must give up the attitude that they must possess all the answers. Instead, they must present themselves as a genuine person with limitations, also. Without thwarting the students enthusiasm or feeling threatened personally by the lack of certain knowledge, teachers and students must learn to seek answers together and learn from one another. Open education is the process of sharing of one's self and one's ideas.

Open education begins with honesty. It is a way of thinking, a feeling, an attitude,--a genuine respect for the individual--as Carl Rogers (1969) stated so well, "however unlovely he may be."

#### A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Raymond S. and Bruce J. Biddle: Realities of Teaching; Explorations with Video Tape. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970.

American Association of School Administrators: Imperatives in Education. Washington, D.C.: the Association, 1966, p. 2.

American Association of School Administrators: Open Space Schools. Washington, D.C.: the Association, 1971.

Ausubel, David P. "A New Look at Classroom Discipline." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 43 (October, 1961), pp. 25-30.

Bain, W. E. "A Study of the Attitudes of Teachers Toward Behavior Problems." Child Development, 1934, 5, 19-35.

Baller, Warren R.: Readings in the Psychology of Human Growth and Development. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1963, p. 659.

Bair, Medill and Richard G. Woodward: Team Teaching in Action. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1964, p. 208.

Bany, Mary A. and Lois V. Johnson: Classroom Group Behavior. New York: MacMillan Company, 1964.

Barth, Roland S. "So You Want to Change to an Open Classroom." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LIII, No. 2 (October, 1971), pp. 97-99.

Beilin, Harry. "Teachers' and Clinicians' Attitudes Toward the Behavior Problems of Children: A Reappraisal." The Causes of Behavior; Readings in Child Development and Educational Psychology, ed. Judy R. Rosenblith and Wesley Allin Smith, 2nd. ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1966, pp. 500-507.

Brown, Bob Burton. The Experimental Mind in Education. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.

Buber, Martin: The Way of Man. Chicago: Wilcox and Follett, 1951, p. 16.

Charters, W. W. Jr. "The Social Background of Teaching." Handbook of Research on Teaching. American Educational Research Association, 1963, p. 732.

Clarizio, Harvey F. and Stephen L. Yelon, "Learning Theory Approaches To Classroom Management: Rationale and Intervention Techniques." Contemporary Issues in Educational Psychology. ed. by Harvey F. Clarizio, Robert C. Craig, and William A. Mehrens, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1970.

Combs, Arthur W. "A Perceptual View of the Adequate Personality." Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, N.E.A., 1962.

Combs, Arthur W. "The Human Aspect of Administration." Educational Leadership, (November, 1970), pp. 197-205.

Del Solor, Charlotte. Parents and Teachers View the Child. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1949.

DeRoche, Edward F. "Creative Discipline." Selected Articles for Elementary School Principals. Published by the Department of Elementary School Principals, National Education Association, Washington, D.C., 1968, pp. 180-184.

Dobson, Russell Lee. "The Perception and Treatment by Teachers of the Behavioral Problems of Elementary School Children in Culturally Deprived and Middle Class Neighborhoods." (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1966.)

Educational Facilities Laboratories. Schools Without Walls. New York: 1968.

Ellis, D. B. and L. W. Miller. "Teacher Attitudes and Children's Behavior Problems." Educational Psychology, Vol. XXVII (1936), pp. 501-511.

Encyclopedia of Educational Research. ed. by Chester W. Harris. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1960.

Encyclopedia of Educational Research. 4th ed. by Robert L. Ebel, Victor H. Noll, & Roger M. Bauer. London: Macmillan Co., 1969.

Erikson, Erik H. Childhood and Society. New York: W. W. Norton, 1950.

Fantini, Mario D. "Open v. Closed Classrooms." Readings in the Methods of Education. ed. by Frank L. Steeves, New York: The Odyssey Press, 1964, pp. 103-109.

Feyereisen, Kathryn V., A. John Fiorino, and Arlene T. Nowak. Supervision and Curriculum Renewal: A Systems Approach. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970.

Frasier, George Willard. An Introduction to the Study of Education. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1956.

- Gage, N. L. Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1963.
- Goodlad, John I. "Some Effects of Promotion and Nonpromotion upon the Social and Personal Adjustment of Children," Journal of Experimental Education, 22:301-28, 1954.
- Goodlad, John I., and Robert H. Anderson. The Nongraded Elementary School. Revised edition. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1963.
- Goodlad, John I. "Meeting Children Where They Are." Saturday Review, Vol. XLVIII, No. 12 (March 20, 1965), p. 57.
- Hapgood, Marilyn. "The Open Classroom: Protect it from its Friends." Saturday Review, (September, 1971), pp. 66-75.
- Herzberg, Frederick. Work and the Nature of Man. Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1966.
- Holt, John. How Children Learn. New York: Pitman Publishing Corporation, 1967.
- Hunter, Elwood C. "Changes in Teachers' Attitudes Toward Children's Behavior over the Last Thirty Years." Mental Hygiene, 1957, 41, 3-11.
- Hurlock, E. B. "The Value of Praise and Reproof as an Incentive for Children." Archives of Psychology, Vol. 71, New York, 1924.
- Hurlock, E. B. "An Evaluation of Certain Incentives Used in School Work." Journal of Educational Psychology, 16: 145-159, 1925.
- Jackson, Philip W. Life in Classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968, p. 149.
- Joyce, Bruce R. and Berj Harootunian. The Structure of Teaching. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1967.
- Jersild, Arthur T. In Search of Self. New York: Bureau of Publications, Columbia University, 1952.
- Johnson, Lois V. and Mary A. Bany. Classroom Management Theory and Skill Training. London: Macmillan Company, 1970.
- Kelly, Earl C., and Marie I. Rasey. Education and the Nature of Man. New York: Harper and Bros., 1952.
- Kelly, Earl C. "The Place of Affective Learning." Educational Leadership, Vol. 22 (April, 1965), p. 455.
- Kerlinger, F. N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1964.

- Klausmeir, Herbert J. and William Goodwin. Learning and Human Abilities. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.
- Kohl, Herbert R. The Open Classroom. New York: Vintage Books, A Division of Random House, Inc., 1969.
- Kraft, Arthur. "Discipline as Curriculum." Instructor, No. 1, Vol. LXXX (August/September, 1970), pp. 116-118.
- Leonard, George B. Education and Ecstasy. New York: Dell Publishing Co. Inc., 1968.
- Mann, Horace. Lecture in Education, delivered in 1837 (Boston: Marsh, Capen, Lyon and Webb, 1840), p. 47.
- Mann, Horace. Title page of pamphlet, from which quotation was taken, "Sequel to the So Called Correspondence Between the Reverend Mr. M. H. Smith and Horace Mann, Surreptitiously Published by Mr. Smith; Containing a Letter from Mr. Mann, Suppressed by Mr. Smith, with the Reply Therein Promised." Boston: William B. Fowle, 1847.
- Marshall, H. "The Effect of Punishment on Children: A Review of the Literature and a Suggested Hypothesis." Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1965, 106, 108-133.
- Maslow, A. H. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954.
- MacBeth, Edwin W. "When the Walls Come Tumbling Down." School Management, (August, 1971), pp. 8-11.
- McCaffery, James F. and Daniel S. Turner. "Discipline in the Innovative School." The Education Digest. No. 2, Vol. XXXVI, (October, 1970), pp. 16-19.
- McLoughlin, William P. "The Phantom Nongraded School." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. XLIX No. 5, (January, 1968), pp. 248-250.
- Mitchell, John C. "A Study of Teachers' and Mental Hygienists' Rating of Certain Behavior Problems of Children." The Journal of Educational Research, Vol. XXXVI (December, 1942), pp. 292-307.
- Mort, Paul R. and Francis G. Cornell. American Schools in Transition. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University. 1941, pp. 405-406.
- Popham, James W. Educational Statistics: Use and Interpretation. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.

- Rhodes, Fen. "Team Teaching Compared With Traditional Instruction In Grades Kindergarten Through Six." Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 62, No. 2 (April, 1971), pp. 110-116.
- Rivlin & Herbert Schueler, Encyclopedia of Modern Education, New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1943, p. 240.
- Rogers, Carl R. Freedom to Learn. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1969.
- Rogers, Vincent. [Introduction to an article.] Phi Delta Kappan. Vol. LIII, No. 2, (October, 1971), p. 97.
- Roubinek, Darrell L. "A Comparison of the Attitudes of Elementary School Teachers and School Psychologists Toward the Behavior of Elementary School Children." (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1971).
- Schrupp, Manfred and Clayton M. Gjerde. "Teacher Growth in Attitudes Toward Behavior Problems of Children." The Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. XLIV (April, 1953), 203-214.
- Scott, W. A. "Attitude Measurement." Handbook of Social Psychology. Eds., G. Lindzey and E. Aronson. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, Vol. 2 (1954), 204-273.
- Selltiz, C., M. Jahoda, M. Deutch, and S. W. Cook. Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1959.
- Shumsky, Abraham. Creative Teaching in the Elementary School. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965.
- Shostrom, Everett L. Man, the Manipulator. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentiss-Hall, 1967.
- Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.
- Silberman, Charles E. Crisis in the Classroom. New York: Random House, 1971.
- Sparks, Jack. "A Study of Teachers and of Mental Hygienists' Ratings of Certain Behavior Problems of Children." Journal of Educational Research, Vol. XXXV (December, 1942), pp. 292-307.
- Standard College Dictionary, Text Edition, New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1963.
- Stouffer, George A. W., Jr. "Behavior Problems of Children as Viewed by Teachers and Mental Hygienists." Mental Hygiene. Vol. XXXVI (April, 1952), pp. 271-285.



Symonds, Percival M. What Education Has to Learn from Psychology.  
New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia  
University. 1964.

Schools For the 70's and Beyond: A Call to Action. Main Report  
Published by the National Education Association, 1971.

"The Case for Permissipline." Time (June 21, 1971), pp. 54-55.

Tewksbury, John L. Non grading in the Elementary School. Columbus,  
Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1967.

Ullman, C. A. "Identification of Maladjusted School Children."  
Public Health Monograph No. 7. Washington: U. S. Government  
Printing Office, 1952 (Rev. 1957).

Thompson, C. E. "Attitudes of Various Groups Toward Behavior Problems  
of Children." The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology,  
Vol. XXXV (January, 1940), 120-125.

Van Dalen, Deobold B. Understanding Educational Research, An Intro-  
duction. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Waller, Willard. The Sociology of Teaching. New York: John Wiley &  
Sons, Inc., 1932.

Watson, G. "A Critical Note on Two Attitude Scales." Mental Hygiene,  
Vol. 17, 1933, pp. 59-64.

Wert, James E., Charles O. Neidt, and J. Stanley Ahmann. Statistical  
Methods in Educational and Psychological Research. New York:  
Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954.

Wickman, E. K. Children's Behavior and Teachers' Attitudes. New York:  
The Commonwealth Fund, 1928.

White, Emerson E. School Management. New York: American Book  
Company, 1894, p. 215.

## APPENDIX A

On the following pages are a number of statements regarding teaching. The purpose is to gather information concerning teacher opinion about these statements.

The statements are of such a nature that there are no correct or incorrect answers. Only your frank opinion of the statements is requested.

All responses will be confidential in that there will be no reference to any individual and the statements will be coded and placed on computer data cards. No individual will be identified in the report of this study. Please do not sign your name to this statement.

Your cooperation is deeply appreciated.

### PERSONAL DATA

1. Sex.

\_\_\_\_\_ Male

\_\_\_\_\_ Female

2. Check the range in which your age falls.

\_\_\_\_\_ 60 or above

\_\_\_\_\_ 50-59

\_\_\_\_\_ 40-49

\_\_\_\_\_ 30-39

\_\_\_\_\_ 20-29

\_\_\_\_\_ below 20

3. Grade you are now teaching and number of years taught at this level.

\_\_\_\_\_ K                      \_\_\_\_\_ Years

\_\_\_\_\_ 1                      \_\_\_\_\_ Years

\_\_\_\_\_ 2                      \_\_\_\_\_ Years

\_\_\_\_\_ 3                      \_\_\_\_\_ Years

\_\_\_\_\_ 4                      \_\_\_\_\_ Years

\_\_\_\_\_ 5                      \_\_\_\_\_ Years

\_\_\_\_\_ 6                      \_\_\_\_\_ Years

\_\_\_\_\_ Other                      \_\_\_\_\_ Years

4. Please indicate level of academic training, the major at each level, and year received.

\_\_\_\_ Bachelor's Degree      Major \_\_\_\_\_ Year Received \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_ Master's Degree      Major \_\_\_\_\_ Year Received \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_ Hours above Master's      Major \_\_\_\_\_

5. Please respond only to those statements that apply to you.

\_\_\_\_ Number of years taught in the elementary school.  
 \_\_\_\_ Number of years taught in the present building.  
 \_\_\_\_ Number of years taught in the present system.  
 \_\_\_\_ (Yes or No) I teach in a self-contained classroom (one teacher responsible for a group of approximately 30 students).  
 \_\_\_\_ Number of years in a self-contained classroom.  
 \_\_\_\_ (Yes or No) I teach in an open-spaced school (two or more teachers responsible for a larger number of students in large open-space areas).  
 \_\_\_\_ Number of years taught in an open-spaced school.  
 \_\_\_\_ Number of years taught in a self-contained classroom before teaching in an open school.

6. Please respond with a yes or no if the statement applies to you.

\_\_\_\_ I was assigned to teach in this school.  
 \_\_\_\_ I volunteered to teach in this school.  
 \_\_\_\_ The district provided special orientation or training for this assignment.  
 \_\_\_\_ I am now participating in an In-service program.

7. Please indicate below in hour numbers any additional course work taken within the last three years.

\_\_\_\_ Subject Matter Content (such as: Biology, Math, Social Studies, Science, etc.).  
 \_\_\_\_ Curriculum (Methods or orientation to new programs).  
 \_\_\_\_ Educational Psychology (such as: Human Development, Guidance, etc.).  
 \_\_\_\_ Social Foundations (such as: History and Philosophy of Education, Sociology, Anthropology, etc.).

INSTRUCTIONS:

Following are statements about teaching in the elementary school. Please indicate your personal opinion concerning each statement by circling the appropriate response at the right of the statement. Make your ratings as rapidly as possible. Please do not consult anyone in answering this questionnaire.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. A teacher has to spend too much time solving disciplinary problems.	SA	A	U	D	SD
2. A child who disrupts class is a more serious problem than one who will not respond when called upon.	SA	A	U	D	SD
3. Fellow students should have a part in recommending punishment for an offender.	SA	A	U	D	SD
4. Students should be assigned seats.	SA	A	U	D	SD
5. Beginning teachers are often overly strict with their students.	SA	A	U	D	SD
6. The subject of most parent-teacher conferences centers around disciplinary problems.	SA	A	U	D	SD
7. Teachers should have the freedom to administer corporal punishment when deemed necessary.	SA	A	U	D	SD
8. A teacher usually reminds students to be on their best behavior when a visitor enters the class.	SA	A	U	D	SD
9. Children who keep other students from working are greater disciplinary problems than those who annoy only the teacher.	SA	A	U	D	SD
10. Students should be trusted to go to the bathroom, get a drink, or get materials without asking for permission.	SA	A	U	D	SD

- |  |    |   |   |   |    |
|--|----|---|---|---|----|
| 11. Children who come from poverty areas often exhibit more disciplinary problems than children from middle-class areas.           | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 12. Teachers who do not maintain good classroom control are often alienated from fellow teachers.                                  | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 13. In "schools without walls" there is a tendency for students to misbehave or get out of control.                                | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 14. Students should line up to enter the building in order to avoid misconduct.  | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 15. Respect for teachers should be expected from all students.   | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 16. A successful teacher treats all children alike.  | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 17. Angry students who "talk back" should be punished.   | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 18. Most disciplinary problems are caused by children of low achievement.  | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 19. Teachers should use rewards rather than punishment to elicit desirable student behavior.                                       | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 20. A teacher should avoid becoming too friendly with a student because then it is hard to pass judgments or do anything with him. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 21. A student who destroys school property should be punished.   | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 22. There are some hyperactive children who need to be on a prescribed drug of some type in order to help them function socially.  | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 23. Playing with the genitalia should be considered an emotional problem.  | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 24. Keeping students in after school is an acceptable form of punishment.  | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 25. If students are allowed freedom to plan a great part of their studies they will learn better.                                  | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 26. Most school rules should be enforced without exception.  | SA | A | U | D | SD |

- |   |    |   |   |   |    |
|---|----|---|---|---|----|
| 27. A teacher usually takes a student with a discipline problem to the principal and expects him to be the disciplinarian.  | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 28. Children whose parents teach in the same building with them usually receive more lenient treatment than other students. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 29. Scolding a student in front of the class for misbehaving is an acceptable teacher action.                               | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 30. Discipline problems occur more frequently when students work in small groups.   | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 31. How a student feels about his work is more important than what he knows.  | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 32. Most students will develop self-control when they work in a relaxed atmosphere.   | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 33. Children should be permitted to work through recess time in order to complete a project.                                | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 34. Students arriving in the classroom before the teacher usually misbehave.  | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 35. Most students can be depended upon to evaluate their progress adequately.   | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 36. When a student confides in a teacher, the teacher should not break that confidence.                                     | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 37. Disciplinary problems rarely arise when school work is interesting.   | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 38. A student who uses obscene or profane language should be corrected immediately.   | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 39. Whispering among students should not be allowed.  | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 40. Students should be allowed to remain in the building after school is dismissed.   | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 41. When a student expresses his strong personal feelings, it may be threatening to a teacher's authority and prestige.     | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 42. College education courses adequately prepare teachers to maintain control of the classroom.                             | SA | A | U | D | SD |

- |  |    |   |   |   |    |
|--|----|---|---|---|----|
| 43. Students should be permitted to choose their own seating arrangement.  | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 44. Group planning sessions are more successful when the teacher is involved.  | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 45. Teachers are afraid they might lose their jobs if they allow a permissive atmosphere to exist within their classrooms.   | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 46. Children who employ "attention seeking" methods should be excluded from group activities.  | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 47. Students' ideas or suggestions are usually too unrealistic to integrate into the plan of studies.  | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 48. Students should be required to apologize to the class for causing disturbances.  | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 49. Requiring a student to spend a period of time isolated from his peers is an acceptable form of punishment.   | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 50. Teachers who permit a lot of student interaction and movement do not have good classroom control.  | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 51. A teacher may use modern curriculum methods but she should remember that children are still children and must be constantly monitored in order to insure socially acceptable behavior. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 52. Truancy, day dreaming, and inattention should be considered discipline problems.   | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 53. Students whose parents are prominent leaders in the community usually receive less punishment than the average citizen's children.   | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 54. Boys create more discipline problems than girls.   | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 55. Punishment for girls tends to be less severe than boys for the same offense.   | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 56. Students should be consulted about textbook selection.   | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 57. Extra homework is an acceptable form of disciplinary action.   | SA | A | U | D | SD |



## APPENDIX B

Dear Teacher,

Let me thank you in advance for your cooperation.

At a time when education is truly in a state of flux, it is important that we take a look at teachers' opinions on a number of points. In the last analysis it is the teachers who incorporate and bring about change. If innovations are to occur, then the teachers need to be heard. This opinionnaire gives you the opportunity to express your feelings. Your name and the name of your school building will be held completely anonymous. The data of over 200 teachers will be computer processed and a report of the findings will be made available to your building principal.

I fully realize what a busy time of the year it is for you and I know that to ask you for 15 minutes of your time to complete the opinionnaire is one more added chore. But if you will please do so, staple or tape it together and drop it either in the outgoing school mail or at a mailing point of your choice I will be deeply grateful. Research procedures prevent me from personally expressing my gratitude.

Thank you again from one of your fellow teachers.

Sincerely,

Margaret Wiggins

MW:rh

## APPENDIX C

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA OF TEACHERS PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY

Group	Sex		Age		Degree Held		First Major		Second Major	
	M	F								
A	7	99	60 or above	4	Bachelors	66	No response	7	No response	91
			50-59	10	Masters	16	Elem. Educ.	75	Elem. Educ.	5
			40-49	23	Above Masters	24	Reading	-	Reading	1
			30-39	23			Guidance	-	Guidance	2
			20-29	46			Other	24	Other	7
B	8	74	60 or above	5	Bachelors	51	No response	7	No response	63
			50-59	20	Masters	9	Elem. Educ.	54	Elem. Educ.	8
			40-49	24	Above Masters	22	Reading	2	Reading	2
			30-39	13			Guidance	-	Guidance	2
			20-29	20			Other	24	Other	7

## APPENDIX D

## TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Number of Years	Frequency Group		Number of Years	Frequency Group	
	A	B		A	B
-	-	3	16	-	1
1	35	21	17	-	1
2	21	8	18	2	-
3	16	6	19	-	-
4	8	6	20	1	1
5	8	4	21	-	-
6	66	-	22	-	1
7	3	7	23	-	1
8	-	1	24	-	-
9	2	1	25	1	2
10	1	3	26	-	-
11	1	4	27	-	1
12	-	2	28	-	-
13	-	5	29	-	-
14	-	1	30	-	-
15	-	4	31	-	-
			32	-	-
			33	1	-

## APPENDIX E

## YEARS TAUGHT IN THE PRESENT SYSTEM AND PRESENT BUILDING

Group A				Group B			
<u>Present Building</u>		<u>Present System</u>		<u>Present Building</u>		<u>Present System</u>	
Years	Frequency	Years	Frequency	Years	Frequency	Years	Frequency
-	2	-	1	-	4	-	3
1	37	1	19	1	21	1	10
2	29	2	18	2	13	2	5
3	20	3	19	3	16	3	5
4	9	4	11	4	6	4	4
5	3	5	8	5	3	5	4
6	4	6	7	6	5	6	8
7	1	7	3	7	4	7	2
8	-	8	-	8	4	8	5
9	-	9	2	9	2	9	3
10	-	10	3	10	-	10	5
11	-	11	1	11	-	11	5
12	-	12	-	12	1	12	3
13	-	13	3	13	-	13	4
14	-	14	3	14	-	14	3
15	-	15	1	15	2	15	3
16	-	16	2	16	-	16	-
17	-	17	1	17	1	17	1
18	-	18	1	18	-	18	1
19	-	19	-	19	-	19	3
20	-	20	-	20	-	20	2
21	-	21	-	21	-	21	-
22	-	22	-	22	-	22	1
23	-	23	-	23	-	23	-
24	-	24	-	24	-	24	1
25	-	25	-	25	-	25	-
26	-	26	-	26	-	26	-
27	-	27	-	27	-	27	-
28	-	28	-	28	-	28	1
29	-	29	-	29	-	29	-
30	-	30	1	30	-	30	-



## APPENDIX F

TEACHER RESPONSES TO BEING ASSIGNED OR VOLUNTEERED TO TEACH  
 IN RESPECTIVE BUILDING; HAD SPECIAL PRE-SERVICE OR  
 IN-SERVICE TRAINING FOR PRESENT POSITION; OR  
 NOW PARTICIPATING IN AN IN-SERVICE PROGRAM

Group	Assigned			Volunteered			Special Orientation			In-Service		
	NR*	Yes	No	NR	Yes	No	NR	Yes	No	NR	Yes	No
A	26	45	35	20	74	12	18	66	22	32	28	46
B	15	58	9	36	29	17	38	12	32	33	19	30

\*Indicates no response

## APPENDIX G

Number of Hours	Subject Matter		Curriculum		Educational Psychology		Social Foundations	
	Group		Group		Group		Group	
	A	B	A	B	B	A	A	B
0	56	48	55	46	63	52	74	72
1	-	2	1	3	-	1	-	-
2	2	5	13	2	2	6	6	-
3	13	5	11	11	16	10	12	4
4	5	3	-	2	2	2	-	2
5	5	1	3	3	3	-	1	-
6	6	6	8	8	13	44	9	4
7	1	1	1	1	-	-	1	
8	1	1	1	1	-	-	1	
9	6	4	2	4	1	3	1	
10	3	2	2	-	1	-	-	
11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
12	4	1	2	1	1	1	-	
13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
14	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	
15	-	-	2	-	3	2	1	
16	-	1	-	1			-	
17	-	-	-				-	
18	-	1	1				-	
19	-	-	-				-	
20	1	1	-				-	
21			-				-	
22			-				-	
23			1				-	
24							-	
25							1	
Average	3.03	2.65	2.78	2.22	2.24	1.85	1.53	0.54

## APPENDIX H

FREQUENCY OF SCORE OF GROUP A AND GROUP B TEACHERS  
TOWARD PUNISHMENT TOWARD STUDENTS

Group A		Group B	
Score	Times	Score	Times
41	1	44	4
42	-	45	2
43	-	46	1
44	-	47	1
45	-	48	2
46	1	49	3
47	-	50	2
48	-	51	3
49	1	52	4
50	3	53	4
51	1	54	2
52	2	55	2
53	1	56	3
54	4	57	7
55	3	58	3
56	6	59	6
57	5	60	5
58	5	61	7
59	4	62	4
60	8	63	-
61	12	64	6
62	5	65	2
63	5	66	4
64	6	67	-
65	6	68	1
66	2	69	-
67	1	71	1
68	1	71	1
69	3	72	-
70	2	73	-
71	4	74	-
72	3	75	1
73	2	76	-
74	1	77	-
75	1	78	-
76	3	79	1
77	3		
Minimum Value	41	Minimum Value	44
Maximum Value	77	Maximum Value	79
Average	61.96	Average	57.37
Standard Deviation	= 7.2518	Standard Deviation	= 7.2445
Standard Error of Mean	= 0.7044	Standard Error of Mean	= 0.8000

FREQUENCY OF SCORES OF GROUP A AND GROUP B TEACHERS TOWARD  
MANAGEMENT AND/OR CONTROL AND TRUST OF STUDENTS

Group A		Group B	
Score	Times	Score	Times
51	2	49	1
52	-	50	1
53	1	51	-
54	1	52	-
55	-	53	2
56	-	54	4
57	-	55	4
58	1	56	2
59	2	57	4
60	3	58	4
61	9	59	1
62	4	60	2
63	1	61	6
64	11	62	3
65	3	63	5
66	8	64	7
67	4	65	6
68	9	66	7
69	6	67	7
70	6	68	4
71	6	69	2
72	5	70	3
73	5	71	2
74	3	72	1
75	1	73	2
76	4	74	-
77	1	75	-
78	1	76	1
79	2	77	-
80	3	78	1
81	3		
82	1		
Minimum Value	51	Minimum Value	49
Maximum Value	82	Maximum Value	78
Average	67.89	Average	62.95
Standard Deviation	= 6.5905	Standard Deviation	= 5.9586
Standard Error of Mean	= 0.6401	Standard Error of Mean	= 0.6580

FREQUENCY OF SCORES OF GROUP A AND GROUP B TEACHERS  
TOWARD TRUST OF STUDENTS

Group A		Group B	
Score	Times	Score	Times
50	2	42	1
51	2	43	-
52	-	44	-
53	1	45	1
54	-	46	-
55	5	47	1
56	1	48	-
57	2	49	-
58	5	50	-
59	4	51	-
60	4	52	5
61	4	53	1
62	6	54	4
63	3	55	4
64	6	56	5
65	6	57	5
66	6	58	3
67	6	59	6
68	5	60	3
69	4	61	2
70	2	62	5
71	1	63	4
72	3	64	7
73	2	65	2
74	3	66	3
75	-	67	3
76	3	68	2
77	3	69	2
78	2	70	1
79	2	71	1
80	1	72	2
81	2	73	1
82	2	74	2
83	3	75	2
84	1	76	2
85	4	77	-
		78	-
		79	-
		80	-
		81	2
Minimum Value	50	Minimum Value	42
Maximum Value	85	Maximum Value	81
Average	67.04	Average	61.72
Standard Deviation	= 8.9421	Standard Deviation	= 7.7863
Standard Error of Mean	= 0.8685	Standard Error of Mean	= 0.8598



## VITA

Margaret Mims Wiggins

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

esis: THE OPINIONS OF ELEMENTARY TEACHERS IN OPEN-SPACED SCHOOLS  
AND SELF-CONTAINED CLASSROOMS TOWARD PUNISHMENT, MANAGEMENT  
AND/OR CONTROL, AND TRUST OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS

for Field: Elementary Education

ographical:

Personal Data: Born in Houston Co., Alabama, August 17, 1934,  
the daughter of Inez G. and L. J. Mims.

Education: Attended Geneva County High School, Hartford, Ala.;  
graduated in 1951; received a Bachelor of Science degree from  
Troy State University, Troy, Alabama, in 1954 with a major in  
Elementary Education; attended Auburn University, Auburn,  
Alabama, during the summers of 1957 and 1960; attended  
Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma; received a  
Master of Science degree in 1970; completed requirements for  
the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University  
in May, 1973.

Professional Experience: Teacher in the Bay County Public Schools,  
Panama City, Florida, 1955-1960; teacher in the Lee County  
Public Schools, Opelika, Alabama, 1960-1961; teacher in the  
Kansas City, Missouri, Public Schools 1961-1962; teacher in  
the Stillwater Public Schools, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1963-  
1969; Title III Innovations Program for Educational Television  
with the Stillwater Public Schools, Stillwater, Oklahoma,  
1969-1970; team leader in Skyline Elementary School,  
Stillwater, Oklahoma, Public School System, 1970-1971;  
Assistant Instructor, Wichita State University, 1972.

Professional Membership and Honors: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development; National Education Association; Oklahoma Education Association; Phi Kappa Phi; Delta Kappa Gamma; Kappa Delta Pi; Kappa Kappa Iota; Oklahoma Aerospace Education Association; Oklahoma Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.