

INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

- 1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.**
- 2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.**
- 3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.**
- 4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.**
- 5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.**

**University
Microfilms
International**

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

8116601

MARKHAM, JEANETTE SUE

TEACHER STEREOTYPES OF CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS AS
RELATED TO LABELING THEORY

The University of Oklahoma

PH.D. 1981

University
Microfilms
International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Copyright 1981

by

Markham, Jeanette Sue

All Rights Reserved

PLEASE NOTE:

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

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

**University
Microfilms
International**

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

TEACHER STEREOTYPES OF CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR
PROBLEMS AS RELATED TO LABELING THEORY

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

JEANETTE SUE MARKHAM

Norman, Oklahoma

1981

TEACHER STEREOTYPES OF CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR
PROBLEMS AS RELATED TO LABELING THEORY

APPROVED BY

Michael Langford
Richard Wisniewski
John D. Pullian
D Lawrence Wick
J. Higgins

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My obligations to individuals who contributed to this dissertation are many and my gratitude for what they have done goes far beyond what is written on these pages.

I am particularly indebted to my major professor, Dr. Michael Langenbach, for his careful direction and high standard of work. As dissertation director, he has been a supportive critic throughout.

Appreciation also goes to Dr. John Pulliam, Dr. Lawrence Wieder, Dr. Thomas Wiggins, and Dr. Richard Wisniewski, who offered their advice and assistance as members of the doctoral committee.

Sincere thanks must be given to Dr. Bonnie Pride for her help during the analysis phase of the work. Without her technical assistance and professional encouragement, the task of data analysis would have been overwhelming. Thanks is also due Linda Ferguson for her help in the compilation of data.

The cooperation of the faculty and staff of the University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma has been greatly appreciated. For the personal support of my colleagues, Dr. Charles Scott, Dr. Kenneth Moore, and Dr. Floyd Coppedge, I am particularly grateful.

Special acknowledgement is extended to the many teachers and administrators in the public schools. Without their assistance and cooperation, this study could not have been done.

I am also grateful to my children, Laura, Karin, Philip, and Tom. They have been most patient and understanding over the past years.

And, finally, deepest appreciation is due to Pat, who was my editor-in-chief, head typist, trouble-shooter, and continual inspiration. Her encouragement made this goal possible.

ABSTRACT

Labeling theory suggests that deviancy is defined by society and that the definition is an important determinant of attitudes individuals have toward others. The present study investigated the stereotypic content of four labeled student deviant types and teachers' levels of tolerance toward those labeled students. The subjects were 87 Intermediate and 52 Junior High classroom teachers who completed a fifty item questionnaire. Analyses of the results indicated that teachers held highly uniform stereotypic images of labeled deviant students. The general hypothesis of label-stereotyping was confirmed.

The hypothesis based upon the second assumption, that teachers' levels of tolerance for labeled students would be negatively affected was not substantiated. Although teachers indicated a moderate intolerance of three deviant types, no significantly negative direction was shown.

A third hypothesis was posed which stated there would be a significant correlation between uniformity of stereotype and degree of tolerance. This was substantiated for only one deviant group, Underachieving/Non-Motivated. No significant relationship was found for the remaining groups.

Generalization to other populations is limited since the findings may be unique to the subjects and setting in

which the study occurred. It would, therefore, seem important that subsequent studies using other populations be conducted to test these hypotheses.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	v
LIST OF TABLES	ix
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Background	
Need for the Study	
Statement of the Problem	
Assumptions	
Definition of Terms	
Limitations	
Overview of Subsequent Chapters	
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	16
Labeling Theory	
Sociological Stereotypes	
Deviancy and Education	
Summary	
III. DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	79
Instrumentation	
Sample	

Collection of Data

Statistical Methodology

Chapter

IV. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	94
Test of Hypothesis One	
Test of Hypothesis Two	
Test of Hypothesis Three	
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . .	106
APPENDICES	
A. STUDENT ASSESSMENT PROFILE	116
B. STATISTICAL TABLES OF RAW DATA	128
BIBLIOGRAPHY	142

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. DESCRIPTIVE TRAITS ENCIRCLED FOR EACH STUDENT DEVIANT GROUP	86
II. SCHOOL LEVEL DISTRIBUTION OF STUDY SAMPLE	88
III. DISTRIBUTION OF STUDY SAMPLE BY SCHOOL	88
IV. COMPARISON OF STATE TEACHER POPULATION AND STUDY SAMPLE	89
V. CHI-SQUARE TEST ON OBTAINED AND EXPECTED FREQUENCIES OF TRAIT SELECTIONS FOR STUDENT DEVIANT TYPES.	95
VI. TRAITS ENCIRCLED AS DESCRIPTIVELY MOST IMPORTANT FOR HYPERACTIVE	97
VII. TRAITS ENCIRCLED AS DESCRIPTIVELY MOST IMPORTANT FOR UNDERACHIEVING/ NON-MOTIVATED	97
VIII. TRAITS ENCIRCLED AS DESCRIPTIVELY MOST IMPORTANT FOR PSYCHOLOGICALLY DISTURBED	98
IX. TRAITS ENCIRCLED AS DESCRIPTIVELY MOST IMPORTANT FOR AGGRESSIVE	98
X. MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND TOLERANCE SCORES FOR HYPERACTIVE	101
XI. MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND TOLERANCE SCORES FOR UNDER-ACHIEVING/NONMOTIVATED.	101
XII. MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND TOLERANCE SCORES FOR PSYCHOLOGICALLY DISTURBED	102
XIII. MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND TOLERANCE SCORES FOR AGGRESSIVE	102

Table

XIV.	SUMMARY OF MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND TOLERANCE SCORES FOR STUDENT DEVIANT GROUPS	103
XV.	CORRELATIONS BETWEEN UNIFORMITY INDICES AND TOLERANCE SCORES OF STUDENT DEVIANT GROUPS.	104
XVI.	FREQUENCY OF TRAIT SELECTIONS FOR HYPERACTIVE	128
XVII.	FREQUENCY OF TRAIT SELECTIONS FOR UNDERACHIEVING/NON-MOTIVATED	130
XVIII.	FREQUENCY OF TRAIT SELECTIONS FOR PSYCHOLOGICALLY DISTURBED	132
XIX.	FREQUENCY OF TRAIT SELECTIONS FOR AGGRESSIVE	134
XX.	MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND TOLERANCE SCORES FOR HYPERACTIVE	136
XXI.	MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND TOLERANCE SCORES FOR UNDER-ACHIEVING/NON-MOTIVATED	137
XXII.	MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND TOLERANCE SCORES FOR PSYCHOLOGICALLY DISTURBED	138
XXIII.	MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND TOLERANCE SCORES FOR AGGRESSIVE	139

Chapter I

Introduction

A well known sociologist has said ". . . all social problems turn out finally to be problems of social control" (Park, 1921, p. 785). One can see this is not an overstatement when the system of schooling is examined. Among the foremost problems of the classroom teacher is social control or the management of behavior. Educators across the nation rated it the number one concern in a Phi Delta Kappan poll (September, 1977).

Discipline problems are found in all kinds of schools, regardless of size or location. The control of the behavior of students represents a daily fact of life for all teachers. Frequent confrontations between teachers and students undermine the teachers' primary goal of teaching; as a result, the students' potential for learning is considerably lessened. Not only do educators believe discipline to be a major problem, parents also rated discipline as the most serious problem in the public schools (Phi Delta Kappan, 1972, 1975).

There are scores of explanations regarding the behavior of today's youth. Some critics claim that students are the victims of a too permissive society. The result, they say,

is a generation of students who lack discipline, whose values are displaced, and who have little goal orientation (Bereiter and Englemann, 1966; Dobson, 1970). Others maintain the problem lies within the system of schooling itself. The schools are charged with being hopelessly out-of-step with the needs of today's children (Herndon, 1968; Silberman, 1970; Illich, 1971).

These overgeneralizations may be partly true. The fact remains, however, that behavior problems are produced by a multiplicity of factors (Ojemann, 1969, p. 100). A reading of the research on behavior problems suggests the veracity of this statement. With all the accumulated research, discipline problems have continued to increase at an alarming rate (Curwin and Mendler, 1980, p. 77).

The problem of social control in schools is complex. And while there is no lack of theory with some explanatory power, there is still much to be understood. Goodlad (1975) has suggested that a change in the direction and nature of the present research is indicated. Heuristic studies are needed which can stimulate and redirect empirical research.

The primary purpose of this study was to offer an added theoretical perspective to the problem of control in schools. Almost all of the past research has been directed at causal and remedial problems. This study attempted to examine the processes of social control as it relates to behavior problems. The following section presents the framework of this perspective and offers an explanation of some

of the fundamental differences between the two approaches.

Background

Control is a sociological phenomenon found in compulsory, bureaucratic organizations which have as their goal the socialization of individuals. Control is evidenced by the need for rules and sanctions. Rules bring about order within the group and sanctions are imposed to maintain that order. As Cohen (1966, p. 3) aptly stated, ". . . if human beings are to do business with one another there must be rules, and people must be able to assume that, by and large, these rules will be observed." Behavior, however, which violates the group rules is considered deviant. If that behavior is not brought into line with sanctions, either positive or negative, the function of the group will be restricted.

Control, then, seeks to bring order to groups so that the "business" of schools can be accomplished. Order is obtained by establishing rules and implementing them. In reality, however, the conforming nature of rules often serves to create the conflict that rules seek to eliminate. Rules are rarely acceptable to all individuals because of personal wishes, needs, and priorities. As a result, rules are violated and order is jeopardized. The dilemma is: schools cannot function without control measures, yet those same control measures may bring about a loss of control.

In order to come to grips with the complex problem of control in schools, it is necessary to specify the perspective from which it will be examined. The sociological study of control has been traditionally approached from a normative perspective (Frazier, 1976). Questions that are asked by the normative social scientists are mainly ones such as: who or what is deviant? what caused the deviancy? and how may deviants be best controlled? (Rubington and Weinberg, 1968, p. 2). The roots of this theoretical approach to deviance grew out of the studies by sociologists in the 1920's and remained the most popular approach to the study of social control through the 1950's (Davis, 1975). It continues to be the dominant perspective in the educational literature of behavior control today. The overwhelming majority of research concerning student deviancy relies on the normative and positivistic interpretations of social control (Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 1969).

In the early 1960's an alternative approach to the study of social control and deviance developed. Turning away from the normative perspective, analysts began to focus on the processes of control and deviancy. The new perspective became known as the societal reaction theory, more commonly referred to as labeling theory. Rubington and Weinberg (1968) described the interactionist approach to deviance as being "subjectively problematic". Proponents of this position make different assumptions based on processual questions such as: how does a person come to be judged as

deviant? what actions do others take on the basis of this definition? why is a person judged deviant at one time and not another? (Hargreaves, Hester, and Mellor, 1975, p. 3).

The central issue of labeling theory is society's reaction to behavior which determines deviance. Deviance is relative to the audience and the setting within which the behavior occurs. For example, fighting is considered deviant on the school playground. It is acceptable in a boxing ring where game rules are followed. Witnesses to the fight on the school ground define the actor as a "ruffian" or a "thug". A rule has been broken; the rule-breaker is defined by those in power (i.e., the teacher, principal, etc.); and sanctions are then applied according to the offense.

Scheff (1966) suggested that rule-breaking evokes a readiness to reaction based upon prior images of conduct. The quality of prior images a person has will direct his reaction and response in a number of possible ways. If the audience views the offense as nonproblematic, the rule-breaker may be ignored or mildly cautioned. If, however, the offense is perceived as problematic, the rule-breaker will likely be punished and future interactions will be affected. The "fighter" will be more closely watched on the playground; his or her future behaviors could be interpreted in such a way that even an innocent shove would be a sign of reaffirmance of the label. According to Scheff:

. . . the more the rule-breaker enters the role of the (deviant), the more he is defined as (deviant); but the more he is defined as (deviant) the more fully he enters the role, and so on. . . (p. 97).

If this theoretical perspective can be supported, one can see how the teachers' labeling of and reaction to deviant students could serve to perpetuate problems of control and furthermore, precipitate them.

The use of labels in schools is common. Children are labeled therapeutically with diagnostic classifications such as "learning disability," "hearing impaired," "educable," etc. Social labeling with regard to economic status, age, and race are implicit in school records. Not only are formal labels used to describe students, informal labels abound in the conversations of teachers about their pupils. Labels such as "slow-learner," "bright," "trouble-maker," and so on are part of the everyday vocabulary of individuals involved in education.

Because of the wide use of labels in the school setting, insights into the formation of labels and the possible halo effects involved are needed. Several studies have examined the effect of labels upon teachers' attitudes (Gillung and Rucker, 1977; Kedar-Voivodas and Tannenbaum, 1979). However, no research was found which sought to determine the content of labels as perceived by teachers. More explicitly, can it be said that labels call forth certain images in the minds of teachers based upon a priori information. And if so, what is the content of the images they hold; how is the label defined?

Labeling theory stresses the importance of the definitional processes for understanding deviant behavior (Becker, 1963). Recently labeling sociologists have turned to the processes of stereotyping to determine how observers define deviance (Simmons, 1965; Schur, 1971; Staats, 1975). Staats justified the examination of stereotypes for the following reasons:

Stereotypes held about deviant actors should be explored because: (1) they are mechanisms that allow individuals to create deviance socially; (2) little has been done concerning the ways they are used in socially "typing" deviant actors. . . . (3) they are mechanisms that reflect the need of others in complex interactions to order expectations so as to predict others' actions; and (4) they may form the basis for reactions that are founded on inaccurate assessments (p. 15).

A further question raised was whether the teachers' perceptions of labeled students are reflected in their affective response to those students. Scheff (1966, p. 47) maintained that stereotypes vitally shape general attitudes toward deviance. Simmons (1965) and Staats (1975) concluded that affective ratings did vary according to the deviant type. Schur (1971) indicated that:

Research into stereotyping of deviators can therefore serve two important functions. Probably the more important is to help illuminate the basic mechanisms at work in the social construction of deviance. But also useful, particularly from the point of view of public policy, is the capacity of such research to reveal peoples' specific beliefs and attitudes about particular types of deviation (p. 42).

In summary, this study was conducted to examine behavior problems in classrooms from another perspective.

The term "behavior problem" has been traditionally defined as ". . . a deviation in behavior from that which is expected or approved by the group making the designation" (Ojemann, 1969, p. 98). The alternate definition of the labeling position contends:

The deviant is one to whom that label has successfully been applied; deviant behavior is behavior that people so label (Becker, 1963, p. 9).

Since labeling is a common phenomenon in the schools, it is important to understand the ways labels are defined, particularly the definitional processes of deviance. If stereotyping is applicable to the labeling of students as deviant, it is necessary to determine the content of those stereotypes and the attitudinal impact they may have on teachers.

Need for the Study

Analysts of education have traditionally used psychological and normative sociological theories to explain deviance in classrooms. This perspective has contributed a vast body of research and has generated many diagnostic approaches to the prevention and control of deviancy (Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 1969, pp. 98-105 and pp. 292-297). Nevertheless, a new perspective is needed to expand what is already known about the problem of social control in schools. The application of labeling theory to the study of deviance offers such a direction for investigation which has been largely ignored until recently. Schur (1971) remarked that:

The study of deviance and control from the labeling approach is likely neither to undermine the legitimacy of workable, sensible, and humane rules and control processes nor to provide a panacea for the problems created by disturbing and offending behavior. It is not a revolutionary new approach to the analyses of social problems but rather a reordering that may help us to view deviance and control in a realistic, comprehensive and sociologically meaningful light (p. 173).

A second need for the study is to examine the phenomenon of stereotyping in schools. Since stereotypes are thought to be central to the labeling process, it would be valuable to know the extent of consensual agreement that exists among teachers regarding the content of deviant types. Davis (1975, p. 176) pointed out that stereotypes are ready-made categories which provide stock interpretative accountings for behavior. She went on to say they are one of the basic mechanisms at work in the social construction of deviance and deserve more study.

Scheff (1966) described the stereotyping process and its effect in the following excerpt:

. . . the traditional stereotype. . . . becomes the guiding imagery for action, both for those reacting to the deviant and, at times, for the deviant himself. When societal agents and persons around the deviant react to him uniformly in terms of traditional stereotypes. . . , his amorphous and unstructured rule-breaking tends to crystallize in conformity to those expectations. . . . The process. . . . is completed when the traditional imagery becomes a part of the deviant's orientation for guiding his own behavior (p. 79).

A third need for the study is to determine if tolerance attitudes of teachers vary according to the type of deviant student being considered. Past research has

indicated that tolerance has important consequences for interactions with others. For example, the variable of tolerance was identified as having the effect of intensifying societal reaction to rule-breakers (Scheff, 1966; Gove, 1975). Studies of reactions to deviants in small groups have shown tolerance to be a critical variable in determining the deviant's status within the group (Schacter, 1951; Orcutt, 1973). Also, stereotyping was found to become more intense when intolerance to certain deviant groups increased (Staats, 1978).

A final need for the study is a methodological one. Labeling theory has traditionally been characterized by a symbolic interactionist framework limited to the fields of ethnographic and descriptive methodologies. This narrowness of approach has been criticized by social scientists (Gibb, 1966; Davis, 1972) as suffering from a lack of rigor and restriction. It is not the intent of this study to enter into the dialectic of which methodology is most appropriate to labeling theory. It is, however, the present contention that, depending upon the problem to be examined, both qualitative and quantitative research should be appropriate. Therefore, it is believed that the questions asked in this study can offer a quantitative approach to the labeling perspective which may partially offset the charge of "methodological inhibition" (Davis, 1975, p. 184).

Statement of the Problem

The problem to be investigated in this study was threefold. First, to determine if different student deviants were differentially stereotyped by teachers. Second, to measure teachers' levels of tolerance toward different types of student deviants. And, finally, to discover whether a relationship existed between the degree of stereotype uniformity and the degree of tolerance for each of the deviant types. More specifically, the questions to be answered were:

1. How uniform in content are the stereotypic images of given student deviant types across teachers?
2. Do teachers' attitudes of tolerance toward student deviants vary according to type of deviance?
3. Is there a relationship between the degree of stereotype uniformity and the degree of tolerance toward student deviant types as expressed by teachers?

In order to test the hypotheses, they were stated in the null form as follows:

H₀₁. Teachers will show no significant content uniformity for student deviant types.

H₀₂. Teachers will show no directional variance of tolerance toward student deviant types.

H₀₃. There will be no correlation between degree of stereotype uniformity and degree of tolerance as related to student deviant types.

Assumptions

This study made the following assumptions:

1. Teacher stereotypes of student deviants can be determined through the adaptation of instruments designed to assess stereotypes of social groups.
2. Teacher attitudes of tolerance can be assessed by the modification of instruments designed to assess attitudes toward social deviant groups.
3. The control of the variable, grade level, was attained by using only intermediate and junior high school classroom teachers.

Definition of Terms

A student deviant is defined as a student whose behavior has been (1) interpreted as deviant; (2) defined as deviant; (3) accorded treatment considered appropriate by others (Kitsuse, 1962, p. 248).

A label is defined as a category type which carries with it stock interpretations which apply to the person(s) subsumed under its special rubric (Rubington and Weinberg, 1968, p. 5).

A stereotype is defined as a collection of trait-names upon which a large percentage of people agree as appropriate for describing some class of individuals (Mackie, 1973, p. 432). The greater the percentage of agreement, the greater the stereotypic impact.

Stereotype content is defined as the total collection of trait-names which make up the stereotype (Cauthen, Robinson, Krauss, 1971, p. 106).

Stereotype uniformity is defined as the agreement on the assignment of traits; the degree of frequency of the individual traits assigned to a group (Cauthen, Robinson, Krauss, 1971, p. 108) and is expressed statistically as the index of uniformity ($p < .05$).

Tolerance is defined as a dispositional attitude to be patient and accepting toward those whose opinions or practices differ from one's own (American College Dictionary). Teachers who express high tolerance (HT) will deviate positively from the mean (3.00) while teachers with low tolerance (LT) will deviate negatively from the mean ($p < .05$).

Limitations

This study was limited in several respects. First, the range of deviant behaviors was limited to four types: hyperactive students, psychologically disturbed students, underachieving/nonmotivated students, and aggressive students. However, the behaviors examined are labels which have been used most commonly as major classifications in factor analytical studies (Spivack and Swift, 1967; Quay and Peterson, 1975; Quay, 1977). In this respect, limiting the behaviors to four major types was not considered a serious limitation.

The second limitation was related to the scope of the study. The subjects were asked to respond according to one of two particular age groups of students (i.e., Intermediate: grades 4, 5, and 6 or Junior high: 7, 8, and 9). Primary student deviants and high school student deviants were not assessed.

Third, sample composition appears to be less than ideal. Since random sampling of the total teacher population was impractical, an availability sample was utilized. In order to minimize effects of local bias, demographic data were obtained and reported. Generalizing beyond the sample findings is problematic and should be done with caution. The primary focus of the study was a heuristic one, however, aimed at examining the relationship of label stereotypes and the tolerance levels of teachers toward these stereotypes. For this reason, the sample limitation is less of a problem.

A fourth limitation pertains to the content of both instruments utilized in the study. The trait assessment checklist was limited to fifty characteristics. An ideal instrument would include every characteristic any respondent could perceive as pertaining to student deviants. Such an instrument would not be feasible to design. In order to compensate for this limitation, teachers were used in the instrumentation phase of the study. Modification of the instruments was based upon their responses.

As a result, several characteristics were added to the trait checklist.

Overview of Subsequent Chapters

Chapter I has presented the necessary theoretical formulations upon which the study is based. Chapter II will present a review of related research and literature. Literature in three areas will be considered: (1) labeling theory, (2) social stereotyping, and (3) educational studies using labeling and stereotyping, as well as selected studies which are believed to be relevant to the present work. Chapter III will describe the design of the study and the methodology used. Chapter IV will present the analysis of the data and Chapter V will include the summary, conclusions, and recommendations of the study.

Chapter II

Review of the Literature

The review of the literature is presented in three sections. The first section provides the theoretical framework of labeling theory from which the present study is derived. The second division outlines the major assumptions of stereotyping and labeling theory. The final portion offers a summary of the prevalent categories of research in education related to classroom control. It will conclude with a discussion of the studies which have been done in schools involving labeling and stereotyping perspectives.

Labeling Theory

Two major paradigms exist in the social theory of deviance. One is the positivistic paradigm, the other, the phenomenological paradigm. A brief explanation of the differences between the two is important in order to clarify the perspective from which this study has grown.

The positivistic approach to the study of deviance represents the traditional and normative orientations. Behavior which violates the conventional norms of the dominant culture is considered to be deviant. The deviant is thought to be different; explanations are sought to

explain why they became deviant and why they persist in their deviancy. The focus of analysis for normative social theorists presupposes a deterministic and causal approach (Frazier, 1976).

The causal analysis of deviancy leads naturally to the examination of procedures which seek to control and reduce deviancy. Ultimately, prescriptive policies based on these studies are developed to provide therapeutic intervention. The positivistic paradigm is largely correctional, concerned with deviant behavior as norm violation and the resocialization of the deviant into "normal" society. It has been this paradigm which has dominated the educational research on deviancy in classrooms.

For additional contributions to the theoretical issues of the normative perspective of deviance, the reader is directed to the work of Merton (1959), Cohen (1966), Clenard (1968), Davis (1975), and Frazier (1976). This brief description is presented to provide the contrast for the second perspective of deviance which is the major concern of the present study.

The alternative position of the phenomenological theorists focuses on the processes involved in deviancy. Less emphasis is placed upon causal analysis and correctional procedures. According to the phenomenologists, the aim is to understand the experience of being deviant and the social reactions to deviancy. Deviants are not seen as

abnormals but as individuals who have been defined and labeled by others as deviant. It is further believed the ensuing interactions of others serve to place labeled individuals or groups of individuals into roles which act to entrench the deviancy.

Another difference in the two perspectives is, while positivistic analysts tend to reify existing norms, the phenomenological researchers view norms as relative. Rules are recognized to vary according to the culture or group. A deviant act in one context may not be viewed as deviant in another. Deviancy, then, is considered to be contingent upon the societal interaction process which is influenced by many outside variables (Goffman, 1961; Kitsuse, 1962; Becker, 1963; Scheff, 1968; Schur, 1969; Douglas, 1970). The social context becomes the important element of analysis for phenomenological social scientists when identifying and defining deviance.

Proponents of this second approach have come to be known as "labeling theorists" or "interactionists". Becker (1963) explained the definitional process of labeling as follows:

. . . social groups create deviance by making the rules whose infraction constitutes deviance, and by applying those rules to particular people and labeling them as outsiders. From this point of view, deviance is not a quality of the act the person commits, but rather a consequence of the application by others of rules and sanctions to an "offender". The deviant is one to whom the label has been successfully applied; deviant behavior is behavior that people so label (p. 9).

The concept of deviance as a social interactional phenomenon is further emphasized by Erikson (1962):

Deviance is not a property inherent in certain forms of behavior; it is a property conferred upon these forms by the audiences which directly or indirectly witness them. Sociologically, then, the critical variable in the study of deviance is the social audience rather than the individual person, since it is the audience which eventually decides whether or not any given action or actions will become a visible case of deviation (p. 308).
(Original emphasis.)

Kitsuse (1962) concisely summarized this perspective with the statement:

. . . deviance may be conceived as a process by which the members of a group, community, or society (1) interpret behavior as deviant, (2) define persons who so behave as a certain kind of deviant, and (3) accord them the treatment considered appropriate to such deviants (p. 248).

Labeling theorists have traditionally used the ethno-methodological approach of symbolic interactionists: participant observation and intensive interviewing of small groups or individuals. The micro-analytical approach directs the investigator to take the standpoint of those studied, whether it be the social audience, the deviant, or both. It requires the researcher to actively enter the world of the persons studied in order to understand and interpret the behaviors occurring in the natural setting. Denzin (1975) explained the method of naturalistic behaviorism as attempting to combine ". . . the covert private features of the social act with its publicly observable counterpart. It works back and forth between word and deed, definition and act, definer and defined. It endeavors to move beyond ethnographic description to explanatory theory" (p. 273).

The theoretical framework of the labeling perspective has grown out of naturalistic research concerning deviant subcultures. Examples of such studies are: Asylums by Goffman (1961), in which the world of the mentally ill is studied; the subculture of the blind in Scott's book, The Making of Blind Men (1969); and the religious cultists in Erikson's work, Wayward Puritans (1966). These are but a few studies which attempted to present the pragmatic problems of the deviant and their adaptation to society. The focus of these early studies was largely directed to those persons already labeled.

The micro-analytical approach has been criticized by social scientists of other persuasions. Davis (1975) charged the labeling approach with methodological limitations and conceptual impoverishment. The ". . . isolated concern with exotic materials (leads to) a methodological inhibition that limits the field to ethnographic, descriptive and overly restrictive sociology, and an inadequate development of concept or hypothesis testing, due to the penchant for insightful, impressionistic observation" (p. 186).

According to Gibbs, (1966), the labeling framework is a conception rather than a theory productive of hypothesis. He further added that no real empirical support could be found to give credence to the theory. Tittle (1975, p. 185) criticized labeling theory as being so

grossly formulated that it almost invited empirical negation.

Not only do social scientists of the opposing camp criticize the methodology of labeling theorists, a few leading labeling theorists themselves recognize the methodological weaknesses and preoccupation with subculture groups. Schurr (1971, pp. 11-12), for example, acknowledged the over-concern with the outcome of labeling and suggested that the processes of social definitions of deviants be given more attention. Kitsuse (1962) also sought to shift the focus of theory and research from the forms of deviant behavior to the ". . . processes by which persons come to be defined as deviant by others" (p. 249).

Erikson (1962) advised that ". . . the critical variable in the study of deviance is the social audience rather than the individual person, since it is the audience which eventually decides whether or not any given action or actions will become a visible case of deviation" (p. 308). (Original emphasis.)

While participant observation and interviews are still considered important research tools, there has been a shift from phenomenological evaluation to empirical evaluation, via direct measurement and systematic observation. Attempts are being made to limit and refine some of the components of labeling theory in order to derive hypothesis which can be tested. Preliminary work is also being done to find

relationships between labeling theory and other related theories.

Two basic notions of labeling theory have been presented. One, that deviancy is interpreted and defined by the social audience and two, that societal reaction and interaction with the labeled deviant serves to intensify and perpetuate the deviancy. Edwin Lemert (1951, 1967) distinguished the two notions by referring to the first as "primary deviancy" and the latter as "secondary deviancy." Although primary deviancy is the construct upon which this study is based, some discussion of secondary deviancy is necessary to appreciate the full implications of labeling theory. As will be seen in the section dealing with educational research, the few labeling studies which have been done in schools are entirely concerned with secondary deviancy. However, before elaborating further upon primary deviancy, a brief look at secondary deviancy is in order.

According to Lemert, secondary deviation arises when ". . . a person begins to employ his deviant behavior or a role based upon it as a means of defense, attack, or adjustment to the overt and covert problems created by the consequent societal reaction" (1951, p. 76). The labeled deviant, in response to the reactions of others, comes to identify himself or herself as deviant and to act in accordance to the deviant role.

Becker referred to this phase of deviancy in his book, The Outsiders (1963). He suggested that because of public identification and labeling, life for the marked individual is no longer the same. As a result of the interactions and reactions of others, the individual cannot help but see himself or herself in new terms and a state of "role engulfment" develops (p. 70).

In a very early work by Tannenbaum (1938, pp. 1-33), the idea was presented as the "dramatization of evil". Tannenbaum characterized the deviant as becoming bad because he had been "tagged" as bad by others and expected to be bad even when he was good. Society's reactions and expectations evoked the patterning of the deviant's future actions and the role was eventually assimilated into the self-concept of the individual.

Goffman (1959) argued that initial deviance may be only temporary or transitory behavior of an individual attempting to claim identity in nonacceptable ways. As a result of the reactions of others, continuance of the behavior is precipitated through the force of circumstances. Once a person is stigmatized by being labeled a deviant, a self-fulfilling prophecy is initiated with others perceiving and responding to the person as a deviant (Erikson, 1963. p. 311). Furthermore, once persons are publicly processed as deviants, they are typically forced into the deviant group and it becomes extremely

difficult, if not impossible, for the persons to break out of the deviant status (Schur, 1971, pp. 74-75).

One area of special research attention has involved various empirical tests measuring the effects of labeling on the self concept. The labeling perspective, for the most part, maintains that labeling has a negative impact upon the deviant actor (Tannenbaum, 1938; Becker, 1963). Lemert's (1967) concept of secondary deviation asserted that social control events serve to systematize and prolong deviance by altering the self-concept and social identity of the person labeled. Social control processes, such as arrests, convictions, and incarcerations, serve to strengthen the effect of the label upon the self-concept and to increase the likelihood that deviant behavior will be perpetuated. Public labeling, carried out by authoritative individuals such as doctors, specialists, and other credentialed persons, also serves to intensify the negative evaluation of the deviant's self. Spitzer, (1972) maintained the general audience reaction would have an impact upon the self-concept of the actor, particularly to the extent that it enforced a shift in the definitions held by significant others, such as the deviant's family and friends.

At this point, the empirical evidence bearing on the hypothesis that labeling produces changes in the actors' self-evaluations and self-identifications is equivocal. In a longitudinal study, Farrington (1973, 1977)

and Farrington, Osborn and West (1978) tested the hypothesis that individuals who were publicly labeled as delinquent would increase their delinquent behaviors as a result. Two hundred and fifteen London youths were given self-reported delinquency questionnaires at the ages of 14, 18, and 21. In agreement with labeling theory, those who were first convicted between 18 and 21 increased their self-reported delinquency during this period. However, the self-reported delinquency scores of youths first convicted before age 14 significantly decreased by age 21. Farrington, et al. concluded from these data that the amplifying effects of first convictions wear off after a number of years. Before such a conclusion is warranted, however, further studies replicating Farrington's work are needed.

Jensen (1972) found that official delinquent evaluations and the personal delinquent evaluations of more than two thousand junior high and senior high boys were positively related. The strength of the relationship varied, however, according to variables such as race and status level. Self-reported delinquency and official delinquency were more strongly related for Caucasian than for Negro adolescents. Black delinquents were found to be less likely to think of themselves, or to feel thought of by others as delinquent, than were white adolescents. Level of status was a second factor seeming to influence

the self-conception and official evaluation relationship. Delinquency evaluations made virtually no difference for feeling of personal worth among lower-class Blacks. In fact, official delinquency was positively related to self-esteem. Among whites, the higher the status, the weaker the relationship between official and self evaluations. The variation of the data suggested that sociocultural context influenced the degree to which official sanctions affected the self-concepts of deviants. Jensen's conclusion was that while his data were generally consistent with the labeling hypothesis, alternative variables such as race, socioeconomic status, and sex, needed to be studied before the findings could be supported with confidence.

Schur (1971) distinguished two levels of analysis in secondary deviance. The research described above represents the level of analysis which concerned itself with the effects of labeling upon the individual. Another level of analysis Schur noted was the "societal-reaction" level which included ". . . all diverse societal definitions of and responses to behavior" (p. 22). Gove (1975, p. 10) identified four variables which he believed to be influential in the societal reaction to deviants. One, persons with few resources and little power are the ones most likely to have a deviant label imposed upon them. Two, the greater the social distance between the labeler and the potential labelee, the greater the likelihood the person will be

labeled deviant. The likelihood is further increased provided the labeler is of a higher status than the labelee. Third, the lower the tolerance level in the community, the more likely a person will be labeled deviant. And, fourth, the more visible a person is, the more likely he or she will be labeled a deviant (i.e., a black individual in a white neighborhood or a "hippie" in a middle-class neighborhood).

These four variables were also identified by Scheff (1963, pp. 93-97) in a much earlier work. In addition, Scheff named three other variables which have an effect upon societal reactions to rule-breakers: (1) the degree or intensity of the rule-breaking as seen by the labeler; (2) the amount of the rule-breaking; and (3) the degree of availability in one's group or culture of nondeviant roles to play. Scheff maintained if all, or a combination of these factors began to stack up negatively around an individual, societal labeling could be predicted. "These contingencies are causal only because they become part of a dynamic system: the reciprocal and cumulative interrelationship between the rule-breaker's behavior and the societal reaction" (p. 97).

Erikson (1962) described the mechanism of social control of deviants as having three related phases: (1) the formal confrontation between the deviant suspect and representatives of his community (i.e., the trial or case conference); (2) the judgment about the nature of the

deviancy (i.e., the verdict or diagnosis); and (3) the placement of the deviant in a special role (such as "prisoner" or "patient"). Erikson believed these ceremonies to be an important feature in our culture, which mark the passage of an individual into a role labeled deviant. When the deviant label has been successfully applied, the person is often excluded from normal group participation, is denied the freedom and privileges accorded to others and oftentimes may be confined. The deviant becomes a second-rate citizen; "in" but not "of" the group (Scott, 1972, p. 16).

In brief, the examination of secondary deviancy focuses attention upon the reaction of others toward labeled individuals and the effects of those interactions upon the self-concepts of the labeled individuals. The similarity of this proposition of labeling theory to educational studies examining the effects of teacher expectations and the self-fulfilling prophecy is striking. It is understandable that labeling researchers have pursued this level of analysis in education. However lucrative this avenue of research may be, it does not address the basic premise of primary deviation, which is: deviancy is defined by society (Becker, 1963, p. 9). It is of crucial importance, then, to understand the definitional processes in order to understand deviancy. We now turn our attention to how society defines deviant behavior. Lofland (1969, p. 35) suggested that

searching for the distinctive features of what is "really" deviant is irrelevant. Analysis should be turned to what people "construe" deviance to be and the basis upon which they come to define certain acts as deviant.

Scott (1972, pp. 10-17) stated that the most useful place to begin when trying to understand and explain the property of deviance was the social order. The task of the researcher, he believed, was to discover: (1) what deviance consisted of to the community, (2) how it was perceived by the community, (3) what its function was in the life of the community, and (4) how it is reacted to by the community. The effects of variables, such as behavior, personal characteristics, social or sociological, and upon society's perception of deviance also become objects of study for the researcher.

The labeling of behavior as deviant is done by particular social groups in relation to their own norms. Members become sensitized to the group's expected norms of conduct and identify certain behaviors as aberrant or deviant which do not conform to those norms. In order for a given behavior to be considered deviant, someone must perceive the act to be a departure from the social norm of that group and categorize the act according to agreed upon definitions. According to Rubington and Weinberg (1968:v), the constructs of these definitions are generated through the routine and orderly interactions of everyday life. These definitions

become the basis upon which members of a group form interpretations of conduct through typifications of each other.

Wieder (1970, pp. 110-119) described this process to be the principle way a group classifies its environment. Each category of behaviors has its own set of criteria by which it is evaluated. When the criteria is perceived to be met, the behavior is given a name or label specifying the type of behavior.

The act of categorization or identification involves the scanning of the stimulus input in the attempt to find in that display those features that match the specifications of a category. The identification or recognition of the objects as such, is made when there is a "fit" between the properties of a stimulus input and the specifications of a category (p. 117) The use of a name is the method members of a society have of presenting objects to one another and is their method for indicating the features of that object (p. 119).

Social deviants are persons who are typed socially in a very special way. "They are assigned to certain categories and each category carries with it a stock interpretive accounting for any person who is subsumed under its special rubric" (Rubington and Weinberg (1968, p. 5).

Shibutani (1961) described the significance of categorizing behaviors in the following statement:

The category into which a person is placed is a matter of considerable importance, for the motives that can be plausibly imputed to him depend upon it. If those in a given category are assumed to have certain characteristics, they are expected to act in a particular way, and others become sensitized to cues indicative of such conduct. . . . Thus, the kind of hypotheses that can be projected to people depends upon the manner in which they are classified and the evaluation placed upon the category (p. 113).

The naming of particular categories of behavior has been referred to by other terms as well as "typing" and "labeling". Tagging was one of the first references to the phenomenon made by Tannenbaum in 1938. "There is a gradual shift from the definition of the specific act as evil to a definition of the individual as evil. . . . The process of tagging, defining, identifying, segregating. . . evokes the very traits that are complained of" (p. 20). Lofland (1969) wrote that when categories or sets of dimensions begin to cluster and pile up, they become "pivotal categories". The pivotal categories become a form of evidential coding, operating not only as a means of understanding others, but also increasing the intensity in the actual treatment of others as deviant persons (p. 152).

A few labeling theorists have recently turned their attention to the area of stereotyping to explain the process of labeling. Davis (1975, pp. 176-177) in her methodological criticism of labeling theory, remarked that labeling implications of stereotypes was possibly a crucial factor in defining the parameters of belief within which deviance is defined. Schur (1971) noted that:

. . . mechanisms of stereotyping have somehow never been viewed as central explanations of deviance. In the labeling approach these mechanisms emerge as a central component of the social processes by which deviance is created (p. 40).

Hawkins (1975) discussed the close relationship of stereotyping and labeling, and suggested that labeling is

based upon stereotypic knowledge which serves for recognition. Stereotypes become simplified, short-hand notations for various behaviors. They are created by everyday language and media and used by society to categorize and order their environment. Stereotyping can also be anticipated as a common organizational feature.

Processing stereotypes are generated and used as a response to the demand of a bureaucratic organization on its personnel to perform efficiently, to process a large volume of cases, to reduce uncertainty and ambiguity, and to promote a smooth flow of individuals through the system (Hawkins, 1975: p. 183).

Labeling, guided by the imagery of stereotypes, has major implications in both public and private life. Schur (1971), for example, in discussing the impact of labeling, noted that ". . . stereotypes not only shape our general attitudes toward deviance, but also vitally affect individuals who face serious imputations of deviant identity" (p. 47).

There is a tendency for the labeler to jump from a single cue or a small number of cues to a stereotypic image of a person. After the initial labeling of that person as a type of deviant, several mechanisms operate to escalate the label (Lofland, 1969, p. 146). Confirmation of the label is sought so that future behaviors will be interpreted as either supporting the label or not supporting the label. Further escalation occurs through a second mechanism, that of retrospective interpretation (Schur, 1971).

The labeler comes to view the deviant from a different perspective. Past conversations, behaviors, and events are reassessed and reinterpreted based on the new deviant label. All evidence recalled from the past becomes material for retrospective definition of the deviant.

Scheff's (1966, pp. 64-81) studies supported the power of stereotyping in reaffirming beliefs of insanity. Scheff maintained that traditional stereotypes of mental disorders are solidly entrenched because they are learned early in childhood and continuously reaffirmed in mass media and daily conversation. Rothbart, Fulero, Jensen, Howard and Birrell (1978, p. 239) found that when people were initially asked to describe the characteristics of a deviant group, they retrieved from memory information about individual members of this group whom they had known or had known about. Based upon this selective viewing, characteristics were then attributed to the total group.

One of the first researchers to explore the relationship of stereotyping and labeling was Simmons (1965, 1969). In a series of heuristic studies, Simmons attempted to provide a more empirical grounding for labeling theory by using techniques previously developed for studying racial and cultural stereotyping. The first study was designed to answer the question of how much public agreement existed about the nature of deviancy in our society. One hundred and eighty subjects were asked to list those behaviors or

types of persons whom they regarded as deviant. As many as 252 different acts and persons were listed. Analysis of the data revealed, however, that while a tremendous variety of behaviors were considered deviant, nearly half the sample agreed that homosexuality, drug addiction, and alcoholism were considered deviant. The data must be interpreted in light of the inherent weakness of open-ended responses. For instance, it cannot be assumed that because 49% of the subjects regarded homosexuality as deviant, the other 51% did not. The heterogeneity of the responses does not preclude the fact that some homogeneity existed as far as what was considered to be deviant.

The other three studies were designed to explore, (1) the content of public stereotypes of several kinds of deviants, (2) the extent of consensus on these stereotypes, and (3) the possible corollaries of tendency to stereotype. The procedures of these studies will be described more fully in the following chapter concerning methodology. In the studies examining the content and consensus of public stereotypes, Simmons found that discernable stereotypes do exist in society and that there was a fair amount of agreement on the content of these stereotypes.

The final study which examined the correlates of tendency to stereotype revealed several relationships to be significantly associated. First, the factor of education was found to be relevant: the lower the level of education,

the stronger the tendency to stereotype. Two, respondents who scored "liberal" on a composite liberalism scale were found to stereotype less than respondents who obtained "conservative" scores on the scale. And, third, intolerance or social distance related positively to stereotyping. For instance, the greater the social difference perceived by the respondent, the more likely he or she would stereotype.

Staats' (1978) study also sought to establish whether there was agreement on the content of stereotyped deviants and to establish interrelationships between the correlates of familiarity and social distance. He employed a modified version of an instrument designed to test stereotyping of ethnic groups. Based upon his findings, Staats concluded that elements of stereotype content are related to social distance evaluations. Generally, the more derogatory the trait assignment, the more positive the social distance from the deviant type. The deviant groups were ranked unfavorably as follows: rapists (95.3%), heroin addicts (70.6%), alcoholics (52.3%), homosexuals (49.8%), prostitutes (40.7%), and mental patients (15.8%).

Only partial support was found concerning the relationship between unfamiliarity and social distance. Minimal positive associations were observed for rapists, alcoholics, and heroin addicts, while stronger associations (significant at the .001 level) were observed for mental patients,

prostitutes, and homosexuals. Staats concluded that based upon his findings, unfamiliarity did not seem to be necessary for social distance increases.

Huff and Scott (1978) tested attitudes toward, and knowledge of sexual "deviance" and public policy. Specifically, they sought to determine whether public attitudes toward deviants were characterized more by patterning of attitudes (the similarity of attitudes across various forms of deviance) or by compartmentalization of attitudes (the inconsistency of attitudes across various forms of deviance). Analysis of the data showed that 84% of the attitudinal and knowledge items intercorrelated significantly, lending support to the contention that perspectives on deviance are patterned. Not only did the study suggest that public attitudes toward sexual deviance tend to be cognitively consistent, they were surprisingly tolerant as well.

Rist, Haggerty, and Gibbons (1972) investigated the same question in an earlier study and concluded that perspectives on deviance were not patterned. It is possible the difference in findings can be attributed to the statistical treatments utilized in the two studies. Huff and Scott found that when they used the statistical technique of Rist, et al., very similar results were obtained. However, when items unrelated to others within the category were eliminated by factoring, completely different results

were obtained. Both studies found there was a significant degree of tolerance toward sexual deviancy.

Overall, the studies concluded that issues on which people least agreed were attitudinal questions, rather than those related to knowledge. Of the items purporting to measure knowledge, maximal variability occurred under the following conditions, when: (1) knowledge on the particular subject was still in dispute, (2) there was ignorance of the facts on a controversial issue, and (3) a factual statement disagreed with their personal opinions of a subject. Huff and Scott contended their study supported the implication that a lack of tolerance toward deviance was accompanied by erroneous beliefs. Therefore, as citizens become more knowledgeable about deviants, they should also become more tolerant. Further research is needed before this statement can be supported with any degree of credibility.

In summary, primary deviance is concerned with how deviancy is defined. Definitions of deviancy are represented by categorical labels which are created by social groups. They are the evidential codes used to classify behaviors which deviate from the accepted norm. The fundamental questions asked in primary deviancy are: (1) upon what criteria are definitions based, and (2) what is the content of these definitions. In order to answer these questions, labeling theorists have recently turned their

attention to the mechanism of stereotyping. It is believed that knowledge of how stereotypes are formed may give greater understanding of the function of labels. The close correspondence between labeling and stereotyping gives indication that it may be an important approach to the study of deviancy.

If labels prove to have stereotypic effect on our perceptions and attitudes, then the implications of this knowledge is of vital importance in education. Labels, both positive and negative, are commonplace in schools. As yet, it is not known if labels have similar stereotypic content across teachers. For example, does the label "hyperactive" call forth similar or disparate images in the minds of teachers? Furthermore, if the proposition can be supported that stereotypes affect attitudes such as social distance and tolerance, then gathering and communicating knowledge of this fact is essential to education.

The following section will review the literature on stereotypes unrelated to deviancy. These studies form the basis of what is known about stereotyping and provide a promising area of investigation for labeling theorists. The relational consequences are only beginning to be recognized.

Sociological Stereotypes

The study of stereotypes as a phenomenon has been part of the social science literature since Lippman first coined

the word in 1922.

For the most part we do not first see, and then define, we define first and then see. In the great blooming, buzzing confusion of the outer world we pick out what our culture has already defined for us, and we tend to perceive that which we have picked out in the form stereotyped for us by our culture (p. 81).

Lippmann stressed the importance of stereotypes for simplifying the environment so that it could be more easily understood. Brown (1965, p. 177) concurred and added that stereotypes also serve to help the individual anticipate the future and predict behavior of others.

The majority of the literature focuses primarily upon ethnic group stereotypes and is a key variable in any theory of prejudice. "The purpose of stereotype research is to investigate the picture or cognitive structure that we act upon as if it were real" (Cauthen, Robinson, and Krauss: 1971, p. 104).

However, not only are ethnic groups viewed stereotypically, members of society are also subject to these portrayals. Shibutani (1961) observed for example:

Other common stereotypes include the woman driver, who can be counted on to do the wrong thing, and the spinster with her sublimated interest in sex, predilection for cats and vulnerability to attentive males. Although college graduates know better, many of them go through life thinking of professors as kindly, stoop-shouldered gentlemen, badly in need of a haircut, absentmindedly conversing in an esoteric vocabulary, often with a foreign accent. Such categories are perpetuated in spite of the numerous inaccuracies (p. 112).

Stereotypy-as-Error

Shibutani's reference to stereotypes as having "numerous inaccuracies", and Lippmann's original characterization of stereotypes as being a product of illogical, fallacious, and rigid thought processes are largely typical statements in discussion of stereotypes. The concept of stereotypy-as-error has been challenged by Mackie (1973). Mackie pointed out some of the common criticisms of stereotyping offered by sociologists. For example, the proposition that stereotypy and error are equated is based upon the following reasons: they often are not the product of personal experience with the target group, the imageholder is prejudiced against the group, stereotypy is an inferior and unscientific cognitive process; and stereotypes are self-fulfilling prophecies. Mackie (p. 432) maintained that these allegations could not be assumed by fiat since the stereotypy-as-error proposition had not been empirically grounded. The criticisms offered were rather stereotypes of stereotypes.

Simmon (1965) argued that stereotyping, in the broad sense, built up inferential generalizations about classes of phenomena, and is an inherent aspect of perception and cognition.

Rather than try to eliminate stereotypes about deviants and other social objects, it would seem then, that social scientists should aim at gathering and communicating valid knowledge, in

the hope that this knowledge will form the basis for future public attitudes (p. 231).

Whether stereotypes are true, false, or tentative is not important. Cauthen, et al. (1971, p. 117) suggested the more productive question to be asked by the researcher is "What effect does the stereotype have on the members of the stereotyped group?" Rothbart, et al. (1977, p. 238) pointed out a second area for investigation: the need to understand the cognitive processes of stereotype formation.

The dimensions of stereotypes were first proposed by Edwards in 1940. They remain the most viable framework in the study of stereotypes to this time. These dimensions are: (a) quality of content, the descriptors used to describe a certain type of individual or group of individuals; (b) uniformity, the extent to which an individual's response is in accord with the responses of others; (c) intensity, the degree of favorableness or unfavorableness of a response; and (d) direction, the favorableness or unfavorableness of a stereotype.

The content of stereotypes refers to the set of traits attributed to a person or group which serve to form an image of that person or group. In a comprehensive review of the literature on stereotypes, Cauthen, et al. (1971) described several of the techniques which have been used to measure the content of stereotypes. The ratings of photographs have been used in various ways. One popular

approach asks the subjects to match photographs with labels. For example, if a picture of a man in a bowler hat with a cigar is matched with the label "Mafia Leader", then this picture can be considered a stereotype of a member of the underworld. Another variant asks the subjects to assign traits to photographs of individuals from recognizable ethnic groups. If the photographs of one group are listed as having a trait that the other groups do not, that trait is considered to be stereotypic of that group.

A second technique of determining stereotypic content is the use of statements which are characteristic of a group. If sufficient numbers of agreement to a statement are found, then the statement is regarded as part of the stereotype. Efforts have also been made to avoid limiting the description. Free association and open-ended responses asking the subjects to list traits, write stories, or descriptions have been utilized. The problems of analysis of such data have proved to be formidable for the researcher.

According to Cauthen, the adjective checklist has been found to be unrivaled as a technique for measuring content. This measure was originally developed by Katz and Braly (1933) to examine stereotypes held about nationalities. Those words which best described the group in question were selected by the subjects from a list of 84 adjectives. The traits associated with each of 10 ethnic groups were found

to be strikingly similar in replicating studies done by Gilbert (1951) and Karline, Coffman, and Walters (1969).

Three exceptions to this stability should be noted, however. In the original study the content of the Japanese, the Germans, and the Chinese were largely favorable. In the study by Gilbert, the following changes were observed: (1) the Japanese stereotype changed from "intelligent", "industrious", and "progressive", to "imitative", "sly", "treacherous", and "extremely nationalistic". (2) The German stereotype of the 1930's listed "scientifically minded", "industrious", "extremely nationalistic", and "stolid". After World War II, the stereotype image added "aggressive", "arrogant", and "cruel". (3) The Chinese stereotype was originally negative, including traits such as "superstitious" and "sly". In the later study they were seen as "tradition loving" and "loyal to family ties".

Stereotypes of Americans have also been subject to both change and stability. In the 1930 study by Katz and Braly, Americans were viewed as "industrious", "intelligent", "materialistic", "ambitious", and "progressive". After the Second World War, two traits were added: "pleasure-loving" and "individualistic". During the 1960's the traits were "materialistic", "ambitious", "pleasure-loving", "industrious", and "intelligent", while the traits of "progressive" and "individualistic" were dropped.

A second dimension of importance affecting content is the extent of consensus on assigned traits. This measure of uniformity is generally determined by the frequency of traits assigned to a given group. Gilbert found there to be less uniformity in his results than had Katz and Braly. Probable lessening of uniformity, as suggested by Braly, was due to progressive social science teaching and the gradual disappearance of stereotypes from cultural media.

Katz and Braly found that groups which were not familiar in the culture, such as the Turks, were not assigned uniform stereotypes. Uniformity also has been found to be affected by group homogeneity (Rice, 1926). It is to be expected that members of a cohesive group would share similar attitudes; discrepancies within the group would be reduced by the tendency toward a reference group norm (Cauthen et al., 1971, p. 109).

The third dimension, intensity, refers to the degree of favorability or unfavorability for a given group. Intensity has been determined by a social desirability rating of the traits of a stereotype (Katz and Braly, 1935; Staats, 1978), or by a favorability ranking of ethnic groups (Schoenfield, 1942; Katz and Braly, 1935). Edwards (1940) conceived intensity as being the different degrees of reaction to a stereotype. However, intensity has been used more as a measure of which groups are liked and disliked. In either case, it has been found that intensity seems to

be more a consequence of individual attitude rather than an inherent characteristic of the stereotypes themselves (Cauthen, et al. 1971).

The fourth dimension of stereotypes is that of direction. Like intensity, direction measures favorableness and unfavorableness. However, while intensity refers to individual attitudes toward a given stereotype, direction refers to the favorableness or unfavorableness of the group in general. For example, the pairing of an author rated as unfavorable (stereotype) and a literary passage rated initially as favorable (object), resulted in later unfavorable ratings of the passage (Sherif, 1935). Stagner (1936) also found that subjects who respond favorably to unlabeled Fascist principles, respond in an unfavorable direction to those same principles when labeled as Fascist.

Two other aspects of stereotyping have been explored. One, the variable of familiarity has been hypothesized as having important consequences for stereotyping. It is reasonable to expect that one's knowledge of a group or individual would affect the stereotypic image of that group or individual. Thus far, the evidence is confusing as to how familiarity influences stereotyping. Schoenfield (1942, p. 52) found unfamiliarity to be associated with extreme uniformity while familiarity was associated with medium uniformity. Vinacke (1956), on the other hand, found the greatest uniformity was attributed to the most

familiar groups. Additional confusion results in determining whether familiarity is based upon actual or presumed knowledge. Familiarity is not simple to measure, but nevertheless, should continue to be examined to determine the extent to which it affects stereotypic notions.

The second important aspect of stereotyping is social distance, (the degree of attracting or repelling forces existing between individuals or groups). For instance, what one thinks about groups or individuals (content), the extent to which these beliefs are shared with others (uniformity), the degree to which one holds the group to be unfavorable (direction), and the extent to which they are disliked (intensity) should affect one's behavior toward those individuals or groups. The measuring of social distance was pioneered by Bogardus in 1933. Bogardus maintained that individuals, when conceptualizing others, are to varying extents both attracted and repelled. If positive valence predominates, social nearness results, while social distance results if negative valence dominates. The Bogardus Social Distance Scale proposed to measure the extent of acceptance or rejection one has for others (Bogardus: 1959, p. 79).

The quality of social interaction is largely dependent upon the level of social distance perceived between individuals or groups. The lower the level of social distance, the greater the likelihood of ease in social

interactions. The greater the level of social distance, the more formalized and self-conscious the social interactions become. The social distance concept is also important regarding deviants. Bogardus noted:

Distance is also increased when the individual is accused of having violated the generally accepted laws of his group. Distance between him and some members of his group will be increased when his behavior violates their standards pertaining to character and ideals (p. 89).

Staats (1978) found that respondents expressed more or less direction and intensity according to the type of deviant group being considered. Rapists, for example, received far greater negative attitudes than alcoholics. This was expressed in terms of social distance. The greater the intolerance for the deviant group, the greater the social distance desired.

Studies concerning the interrelationships of the four dimensions along with the variables of familiarity and social distance have not been plentiful. The lack of direct empirical work makes the interpretation of these relationships uncertain and tentative at best.

According to the analysis of the literature on stereotypes conducted by Cauthen and his associates, certain generalizations can be made based upon the existing evidence:

- (1) uniformity of stereotype was thought to be related to the homogeneity of the group doing the stereotyping;
- (2) the intensity of a stereotype has been found to be an individual factor rather than a cultural factor;
- (3) the

direction of a stereotype was found to influence the direction of objects associated with the stereotype; (4) uniformity was not found to be related to direction because of dissimilar content; (5) familiarity was found to be directly related to intensity; and finally, the relationship of familiarity to uniformity and intensity seemed to be related to the similarity or the dissimilarity of the stereotype of the group in question (Cauthen, et al., 1971, p. 120-121).

It should be evident from this brief review of research on stereotyping, how closely the propositions parallel those of labeling. The interrelationships remain to be tested, however. The present study seeks to examine two of the correlates of stereotyping: that of uniformity of stereotypic content and intensity of stereotype.

Deviancy and Education

A review of the literature addressing deviancy in classrooms revealed three general types of information. The first category consists of a legion of discursive or exhortive articles written by educators concerned with the problem of social control in schools. The January, 1978, issue of Phi Delta Kappan, for example, was devoted entirely to the "problems of discipline and violence in education". Practically every major journal in the field of education has addressed the problems of deviancy and anti-social behavior in the classroom. Some of the articles attempted

to give causal explanations, while others presented recommendations for remediating behavioral problems. While sometimes offering thoughtful reading, these atheoretical publications do little to add to the scientific understanding of classroom deviancy.

The second category of literature is represented by a more scientific base of writing which could be subsumed under the rubric of research and developmental studies. A wide variety of programs have been developed over the past two decades which aim to minimize, or prevent discipline problems in the classroom (Ojemann, 1969, pp. 102-103). The techniques utilized in these programs range from non-intervention methods of control, to direct intervention strategies. For a concise overview of the discipline models being utilized today, the reader is referred to the work of Wolfgang and Glickman (1980). The importance of these programs is their basis of theoretical psychological concepts which are being subjected to empirical testing.

The third body of literature is represented by empirical studies on numerous facets of behavior problems in classrooms. A comprehensive review of the research done in this area can be found in two entries in The Encyclopedia of Educational Research (1969). It was noted that all cited research approached the problem of deviancy from the positivistic paradigm similar to that mentioned earlier in the sociological studies of deviancy. The first entry was an

article written by Ojemann (1969, pp. 98-105), in which the deterministic and causal approach to the study of classroom problems is evident.

In order to come to grips with the meaning of "behavior problems" it is necessary, therefore, to specify in detail the kind of behavior that is under consideration . . . and to describe the behavior not only in its outward form but also in terms of the factors that underlie it or produce it (p. 99).

The second, and final entry in the Encyclopedia addressing deviancy in schools, was written by Smith (1969, pp. 292-297). Smith organized the research into five general areas: (1) types of conduct problems; (2) explanations of misbehavior; (3) control techniques; (4) disciplinary practices; and (5) experimentally tested techniques. The studies presented were all prescriptive and aimed at the study of norm violation, correction, and resocialization.

Two important yearbooks published by the National Society for the Study of Education summarized the major developments in thinking, research efforts, and programs in the area of social maladjustment in classrooms. The first represented a study of the problems of social deviancy among youth (1966); the second surveyed the literature on classroom management (1979), a large portion of which was devoted to behavior problems. An analysis of the work contained in these volumes also revealed the positivistic paradigm of the majority of educational studies concerning deviancy.

This perspective has generated a plethora of theory and research, as well as, many preventive or ameliorative applications. However, it has limited the explanatory power over certain aspects of classroom deviancy. Goodlad stated in his summary chapter of the N.S.S.E. 78th Yearbook: "If we are as short on comprehensive theoretical frames for understanding classroom management as the foregoing chapters suggest, . . . then perhaps what is now needed is inquiry designed to generate rather than confirm hypothesis" (p. 394). He recommended that research be increased in naturalistic studies to stimulate and redirect empirical research (p. 408).

The emergence of naturalistic studies in the last decade attests to the need for more understanding of the complexities of school-life at the micro-analytical level. Participant observational studies of classroom life, such as that done by Philip Jackson (1968), Smith and Geoffrey, (1968) and McPherson (1972) serve to open the way for future verifical investigations. Several other studies have yielded important descriptive data in such areas as: conflict in urban classrooms (Eddy, 1965; Moore, 1967; Leacock, 1969; Fuchs, 1966), small group behavior (Roberts, 1970), the socialization of beginning teachers (Eddy, 1969; Fuchs, 1969), and organizational theory (Metz, 1978). These studies have reflected the methodological preference of the phenomenological paradigm shared by the labeling

theorists. Yet, while much of the data in the studies cited above were related to deviancy in classrooms, none applied the labeling perspective which is the concern of this study. Furthermore, systematic examination revealed very little literature which directly applied labeling theory to the study of deviance in schools and no study was found which examined the relationship between labeling in schools and stereotyping.

The following examination of the literature will be confined to educational studies related to labeling theory and stereotyping respectively. Except for a few contributions relevant to the present study, no attempt will be made to report the positivistic studies which formed the major portion of the literature on deviancy in education.

A study by Werthman (1963) scrutinized the deviant students' attitudes toward teachers. While the study did not directly apply labeling theory, it did rest on theoretical assumptions of labeling theory, such as:

- (1) ". . . students can only misbehave if a rule about proper conduct is invoked by teachers" (1963, 42n), and
- (2) the proposition that teachers' negative typing of students often results in perpetuating deviant behavior.

Cicourel and Kitsuse (1968) applied the labeling theory to the study of deviant adolescent careers in school in order to analyze ". . . the range of adolescent behaviors observed and interpreted by the school personnel whereby

adolescents come to be defined and classified as 'social types'" (p. 125). They showed that adolescent problem-types could be grouped into three categories: (1) academic activities, i.e., "over-achievers", "slow-learners", etc.; (2) infractions of rules of conduct, i.e. "troublemakers", "delinquents", etc.; and (3) emotional problems, i.e. "nervous", "withdrawn", etc. The investigators maintained that as a result of the social typing of the student, his or her school career was largely determined by the bureaucratic processing of schools. The label becomes the measure-stick for judgments about the students' future activities.

One of the most comprehensive and major applications of labeling theory to deviance in classrooms was the work done by Hargreaves, Hester, and Mellor (1975). Their study sought to provide an understanding of classroom deviance from the teachers' perspective. A theory of social typing was developed to explain how teachers come to define certain pupils as deviant persons and how teachers reacted to disruptive classroom conduct. The methodology used for the study was the traditional symbolic interactional and phenomenological approach.

The primary concern of Hargreaves' study was to determine how teachers come to perceive their students as they do, what typifications, if any, developed from these perceptions, and what did teachers do on the basis of these formulations. The emphasis of the study, however, was on

the individual student. They did not address the question of the teachers' perceptions of deviancy conceptualized as a group label, separate from the individual.

After two years of extensive observations and interviews, Hargreaves, et al., determined there were five main labeling constructs used in teachers' descriptions of students. These were: (1) characteristics of appearance; (2) degree of conformity to norms; (3) degree of conformity to academic requirements; (4) degree of likeability; and (5) peer-group relations. While all five constructs were typically used at different times by the teachers to form their typifications of students, they found it was not unusual for a teacher to allow one aspect or construct to dominate all others in their typifications.

Maddock (1976) found that teachers conventionally typified pupils by locating them somewhere along an academic/nonacademic continuum. The academic stratification within a school was in control of the staff and served to group students for teaching and learning purposes. The academically stratified school led to the development of "sub-worlds" known by the teachers and pupils alike as identity types, i.e., "brainy", "dumb", etc.

Sharp and Green (1975) used labeling theory to develop a perspective on levels of social differentiation within the classroom. They noted that while teachers verbalized to the investigators an "open mind" toward all their students,

their observed practice in the classroom revealed stable categorizations of students. They found a marked differentiation in the way the teachers interacted with certain students in terms of amount and quality of interactions. Successful pupils received greater positive attention and the relationships with unsuccessful students were noticeably more negative. With problem children, the teacher became less open-minded and developed typifications.

They noted additionally:

. . . the social stratification . . . of the "problem" child is in a position of low status which is relatively rigid and binding. His life chances in the classroom, to the extent that he has relatively little contact with the teacher and so is unlikely to alter his identity from that of peculiarity, are severely limited. Being really "odd" in the teacher's account, he has a reified identity to her which is socially structured and reinforced at the classroom level, as he has less opportunity to develop contradictory cues at a wider level. (p. 124).

As supported by research, the initial label a child receives often influences the teacher's frame of reference toward the child in the classroom. The studies of Beez (1968), Farina, Allen, and Saul (1968), and Sperry (1974), indicated that different frames of references affected the teacher's attributions and his or her reward allocations to the labeled child.

Kelly (1976) found teachers to be strongly influenced by "diagnostic" labels such as "remedial reader". Kelly based his study on the following proposition of Cicourel and Kitsuse (1968): i.e. the initial label given to students

provides the major basis for the typing and subsequent placement of students. The results of the study supported the notion that teachers play a crucial role in perpetuating "student careers" by their recommendations based on cumulative records. Analyses of actual academic and non-academic criteria employed by the teachers, revealed those students exhibiting emotional, behavioral, and discipline problems were systematically relegated to the remedial reading program. Instead of selecting on the basis of immediate classroom performance, many teachers invoked other non-academic criteria ". . . the most notable being whether or not the student had been enrolled in remedial reading in the past" (p. 216). The author suggested, the label "remedial reader" was viewed by the teachers as a "master status", at least in that school. Becker (1963) commented extensively on this notion.

Some statuses, in our society as in others, override all other statuses and have a certain priority . . . The status of deviant (depending on the kind of deviance) is this kind of master status. One receives the status as a result of breaking a rule, and the identification proves to be more important than most others. One will be identified as a deviant first, before other identifications are made . . . (p. 33). (Original emphasis).

Unrelated to labeling theory, yet extremely relevant, is an early statement made by Waller (1932) in his classic sociological study of schools.

When a situation has once been seen in a particular configuration, it tends to be seen in that configuration ever after, and it is very difficult to

see it in any other. The configuration first established may be said to inhibit the formation of other configurations (Waller, p. 294).

An important element in the creation of a "master status" is public identification of a deviant role. Becker (1963) argued that public labeling is generally the most important step in the initiation of a deviant career.

One of the most crucial steps in the process of building a stable pattern of deviant behavior is likely to be the experience of being caught and publicly labeled as a deviant . . . The most important consequence is a drastic change in the individual's public identity. Committing the improper act and being publicly caught at it places him in a new status. He has been revealed as a different kind of person from the kind he was supposed to be. He is labeled a "fairy", "dope fiend", "runt", or "lunatic", and treated accordingly (pp. 31-32).

Diagnostic labels are thought by some to acquire the "master status" in the school setting. The biasing effect of "master status" labels has been the focus of several studies. Herson's (1974) study sought to determine if the use of mental health diagnostic labels had a biasing effect upon teachers' assessments. In addition, Herson examined whether the variables of pupils' sex, teachers' sex, and teachers' length of teaching experience had effect upon the assessments.

Subjects were asked to respond to descriptions of four types of hypothetical pupils or cases (i.e., marginally retarded, depressed neurotic, emotionally disturbed, and paranoid schizophrenic). The respondents had been previously

assigned to six treatment groups based upon case formats. For instance, pupils or cases were described by means of (a) diagnostic labels only, (b) behavioral descriptions only, and (c) behavioral descriptions with diagnostic labels affixed. These three treatment formats were further modified by alternating masculine and feminine designations.

Analysis of the mean scores obtained on the degree of incapacitation scale revealed that for two conditions -- marginally retarded and depressed neurotic, treatments utilizing labels only were significantly higher. For the two conditions of emotionally disturbed and paranoid schizophrenic, treatments utilizing descriptions with labels affixed were significantly higher. No significant interaction effects were found for sex of either pupils or teachers nor for length of teaching experience. The evidence from this study gave support to the biasing effect of diagnostic labels in the schools.

Gillung and Rucker (1977) examined the effects of labels on regular classroom teachers' expectations. Two methods were employed: (1) a description of a child in terms of relevant behaviors alone, and (2) the same description with a label added. The subjects were asked to choose the most appropriate educational placement for each child. Placement choices consisted of a continuum of seven educational programs ranging from a regular classroom setting to institutional placement. The results

supported the conclusion that teachers indeed have significantly lower expectations for children who are labeled than for children with identical behaviors who are not labeled.

Mazer (1971) studied the effects of teacher expectancy of academic ability based upon the variables of race and socioeconomic status. A rating scale, The Student Performance Estimates Scale (SPEC), was constructed for the study which utilized a five-point rating scale from "highest" to "lowest". The following attributes were representative of the variables used: educational attainment, self-image, appearance and grooming, attendance, cooperative attitude, etc. Written portraits of two male and two female students were developed for the study. The portraits were identical except for the systematic insertion of one of the following labels: "black middle-class", "white middle-class", "black disadvantaged:", and "white disadvantaged". The identical instruments, except for the class and race designations, were given to 157 teachers for rating. The findings were as follows: (1) students labeled "middle-class" were rated above average on all attributes, whereas the same students labeled "disadvantaged" received well below average ratings; (2) racial designations appeared to have little effect on expectations.

Kedar-Voivodas and Tannenbaum (1979) investigated the stigmatic effects on teacher perceptions of labeling. Written reports about hypothetical second-grade children,

some of which contained labels while others did not, were used to determine teachers' expectations for both present and future ratings. The findings were: (1) the pupils' behavior was the most significant determinant of teachers' expectations for present and future ratings; (2) acting-out behaviors were viewed more negatively than were withdrawn ones; (3) pupil variables such as sex, label, and psychotherapy did not affect teacher expectations; and (4) future ratings of the children were consistently more positive than were their present ratings. The contention of labeling theorists, that labels serve to bias teachers' perceptions of childrens' behavior in the present as well as the future, was not supported by this study. A limitation of this type of study is that its results apply only to the particular stimuli used. A changed context, such as different labels, behaviors, and ages of children, could lead to different attitudinal outcomes. According to Scheff (1975), the surrounding contextual or situational factors such as the personal characteristics of the deviant, the sex, age, race, socioeconomic status, etc., were all crucial determinants of attitudes and had varying effects upon the use of a label.

Much of the discussion concerning educational labeling has centered around the detrimental effects that initial negative labels might have on students. Lepper and Dafoe (1979) summarized the danger of labels in the following statement:

Care must be taken to avoid stereotypic casual perceptions based on such cues as pupils' sex, race, or social class . . . The frame of reference is often determined in advance by the label given a child. These different frames of references may also affect a teacher' attributions and his or her reward allocations to students (p. 366).

Proponents of the use of labels have argued that diagnostic labels serve to classify behaviors essential to problem solving, communication, and the advancement of knowledge. Gallagher (1972) argued in support of labels for the following reason:

Labeling is a standard first step in trying to provide needed services to the child for the problem or disorder. In each case, labeling the child causes him and his parents some discomfort, but in the majority of cases described above, it is a price the parents are willing to pay because of the additional benefits that are brought to the child through treatment (p. 529).

Without identification and labeling of a problem, possible loss of support through research, services, and training could be expected. Available research indicated that effects of labels on attitudes were inconclusive and the labeling issue was by no means a simple one (Kedar-Voivodas and Tannenbaum, 1979, p. 800).

Becker, as well as other labeling theorists, claimed that labeling sets in motion a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Treating a person as though he were generally rather than specifically deviant produces a self-fulfilling prophecy. It sets in motion several mechanisms which conspire to shape the person in the image people have of him. . . . In the first place, one tends to be cut off, after being identified as deviant, from participation in more conventional groups, even though the specific consequences

of the particular deviant activity might never of themselves have caused the isolation had there not also been the public knowledge and reaction to it (p. 34).

The literature related to the effect of labeling on the self-image of the person labeled was inconsistent. Few studies were found which examined this notion, and all used the label of "official delinquent" for assessment.

Fisher (1972) compared two groups of junior high pupils; one publicly labeled "delinquent", the other group with no known history of delinquency. The purpose of Fisher's study was to test the claim of labeling theorists that application of a deviant label generates special and consequential difficulties for the person. The difficulties, Fisher assumed, would be reflected in their academic grades when ability was held constant. His findings, by this criterion, showed no difference between groups could be found to support the influence of the labeling process in schools.

Foster, Dinitz, and Reckless (1972) found that legal processing did not appear to be associated with any personal or social liability. They noted that most of the official delinquents did not think being a delinquent would substantially affect their schooling. They did, however, express a concern over the future contacts they might have with the police and potential employers (pp. 204-205).

A later study which closely paralleled Foster's work was found to produce substantially different results.

Kelly's (1975) study of non-delinquents indicated that most students felt they had suffered significant social liabilities as a result of being called a delinquent.

It appears that legal processing is associated with a "spoiled" public identity. This is evident from the observation that the official delinquents, when compared with the non-delinquents, . . . are not only more likely to feel that others consider them to be delinquent, but that their teachers and classmates hold them in low esteem (p. 17). (Original emphasis.)

There is a noticeable lack of studies directed toward an examination of the effects of labeling or social typing, particularly to "deviants" in general. There is a need to examine both short- and long-range consequences of labeling, as well as the effects of both informal and formal labels within varying interactional settings (Kelly, 1977, pp. 378-379). At present, claims made with respect to the effects of labeling upon the self-image of the deviant, seem to be inconclusive.

Stereotyping of children in schools has been studied in a number of ways. Negative stereotyping has been related to social class, racial differences, physical characteristics, sex, and even stereotyping based on first names of children, but no study could be found related to the stereotyping of deviant students.

In the past decade, a great deal of research has been devoted to the educational problems of children from low socioeconomic and other ethnic backgrounds. Early reports

of the effects of teacher stereotyping and expectations of disadvantaged pupils have leant considerable support to the assertions that teachers, either consciously or unconsciously, regard lower-class students as inferior students. Leacock (1969) reported a high correlation between teachers' ratings of their likes and dislikes for students, and the social stereotypes of students. For example, black children were rated lower than white and the lower -SES children were rated lower than the middle-SES children. A finer analysis revealed that children with more ability in the low-income black groups were most likely to be objects of teacher rejection. This was attributed to the fact that these children were not following the stereotypic expectations of black low-income students, therefore, teachers reacted to them with higher rejection.

Mazer (1971) found that the teachers in his study attributed definite patterns of behaviors and attributes that distinguished lower- and middle-class students. According to teacher ratings, lower-status students tended to be linguistically inept, undependable, unkempt, inattentive, unmotivated, and uncooperative, while their middle-class counterparts were expected to exhibit tendencies in precisely the opposite direction.

The status of family structure (divorced vs. intact home) was found to affect the development of stereotypes by teachers. Santrock and Tracy (1978) asked teachers to view

a videotape that focused on the social interaction of an 8-year-old boy. Half of the teachers were given a background information sheet that indicated the boy was from an intact home, while the other half were informed that he was from a divorced home. After viewing the videotape, the teachers rated the boy on eleven personality traits (e.g., anxiety, social deviance, happiness, etc.). The results of the study indicated the teachers rated the child from the divorced home more negatively in areas reflecting affective states or relations. It was suggested by the researchers that a child from a one-parent home was likely to be perceived as more unhappy and maladjusted by his teachers than a similar child from an intact family.

Sex role stereotyping received a great deal of attention in the early 1970's. Britton (1973) investigated sex stereotyping in reading materials for grades 1-10. It was determined that stereotypic models were clearly evidenced by males being consistently portrayed as daring, intelligent, aggressive, achievers, etc., while females were shown as docile, self-effacing, incompetent and passive.

A review of the research and findings of sex role stereotyping can be found in an article written by Saario, Jacklin, and Tittle (1973). Their findings disclosed that research documented not only a marked sex stereotyping in the reading materials in schools, but also in the areas of educational testing and curricular requirements.

Clifford and Walster (1973) found that physical appearance of a student affected the expectations of the teachers they studied. Fictitious school records were developed for fifth grade students containing information pertaining to academic grades, number of absences, and general behavior. Twelve photographs were attached to the reports at random, (three attractive boys, 3 attractive girls, 3 unattractive boys, and 3 unattractive girls). These were randomly distributed to fifth grade elementary teachers who were asked to evaluate the records they received as to their estimate of (1) the pupils' IQ, (2) the pupils' social status with peers, (3) the parental attitude toward school, and (4) the pupils' future educational accomplishments. Analysis of the data showed that teachers evaluated the records of the attractive children significantly higher in all four areas even though the content of the records was the same for both.

Harari and McDavid (1973) documented the significance of first names as the basis of popular stereotypes. Replicating older studies done with adult populations, Harari and McDavid used elementary teachers and undergraduates as their subjects. The subjects were asked to evaluate a set of essays purported to be the products of 10-year-old pupils identified only by first names. One group of essays was designated popular names based on frequency of occurrence and

desirability; the other group of essays received unpopular names, rare names, and undesirable names. The names were assigned randomly to all essays, the same essay having both a popular and unpopular name at different times for different subjects. Numerical grades were assigned to the essays by the subjects and the scores subjected to analysis of variance. The evaluations by the teacher group were significantly higher on the essays having the "attractive" names than the same essays with the "unattractive" names. Analysis of the evaluation scores given by the undergraduates showed no significant effects whatsoever.

It is evident that the primary focus of the above educational studies has been concerned with the effects of labels and stereotypes upon the perceptions and behaviors of teachers. There is considerable support for the labeling proposition of secondary deviance, which holds that labels serve to negatively influence societal reactions toward deviants. Studies examining the effects of the label or stereotype upon the self-concept of the deviant were fewer in number and less conclusive.

No studies were found which examined student behavior from the definitional perspective of primary deviancy. Although some of the research on stereotyping indicated that teachers held certain images of particular types of students, no examination was directed toward discovering the precise content of those images.

The following studies from the positivistic realm of literature were examined because of their relevance to the present study. A number of classroom discipline studies focused on teacher responses to and evaluations of specific deviant acts. In a very early study, Wickman (1928) first reported that teachers regarded problems of behavioral disorder as more serious than did mental hygiene clinicians. Although this study has been criticized on methodological grounds, its influence on American education has been profound. It has been replicated with methodological improvement by several researchers (Stouffer, 1952; Griffiths, 1952; Schrupp and Gjerde, 1953; Mutimer and Rosemier, 1967; and Tolor, Scarpetti and Lane, 1967). These studies suggested that attitudes of teachers over the years have become more congruent with those of clinicians; although teachers continue to be more concerned with problems concerned with management, sexual adjustment, and adherence to authority. The mental health professionals show more sensitivity to withdrawal behavior and social or emotional patterns of behavior.

Beilin (1959) pointed out that attitudinal patterns of teachers and clinicians toward deviant behaviors reflected in part their different roles. Teachers are essentially task-oriented and prone to interpret behaviors which interfere with instruction as deviant. Clinicians who are concerned with the psychological and social growth of the

child regard problems of adjustment more seriously and are more tolerant of a greater variety of child behavior than teachers.

Tolor's, et al. (1967) study affirmed the above findings and also investigated the variable of teacher experience and its effect upon attitudes. Their findings suggested that inexperienced teachers ". . . label considerably more behavior as being abnormal" (p. 179) than teachers with experience. Actual exposure to child behavior was found to be an important determinant of attitudes toward deviancy.

Brooks (1978) asked teachers and clinicians to select from a list of 39 behaviors those which they regarded as symptomatic of a serious underlying problem. "The traits listed (were), in fact, semantic labels likely to be used by teachers when reporting certain types of behavior" (p. 64). Analysis revealed that teachers' responses appeared to be conditioned by the effects of certain conduct on the rest of the group of class. They ranked as most significant: carelessness in work tasks, disobedience and defiance, impudence, inattentiveness, indolence, lying, stealing, and unreliability. Clinicians ranked as most serious: fear of new situations, irrational fears, nervousness, shyness, pessimism, and unsociability. No statistical difference was found between the responses of male and female respondents and only slight indication that less experienced

teachers tended to rank certain traits (i.e., impudence, indolence, and stealing) higher than the more experienced teachers.

A serious weakness in the above studies should be noted. The respondents were not given instructions concerning the age group to which the behaviors were referenced. This undoubtedly resulted in confusion and contamination of data, since what is considered normal and abnormal is closely related to the age level of the child. The lack of control of this variable seriously affected the validity of the studies in this researcher's estimate.

In an extensive survey of behavior problems among over seven thousand school-age children, teachers rated approximately 20% of the total sample as exhibiting excessively aggressive behavior. These were all noninstitutionalized children between the ages of six and eleven (Roberts and Baird, 1972). Kelly, Bullock, and Dykes (1977) found that teachers in their study rated 20.4% of their students as exhibiting behavior disorders.

Unfortunately, longitudinal studies relevant to this issue are not in evidence. There appears to be little information available to warrant any generalization as to the persistence of these behavior problems over a period of time. An exception to the lack of longitudinal research was a study done by Rubin and Balow (1978). The purpose of this study was to determine the prevalence and consistency

of behavior problems as seen from the perspective of classroom teachers. The investigation covered 1,613 students over a period of seven years (kindergarten through sixth grade). Despite methodological problems such as sample mortality, their findings were striking. During the course of their elementary school career, over half (58.6%) of all the subjects were classified as a behavior problem by at least three of their teachers. Among subjects who received six teacher ratings, 60% were considered a behavior problem by at least one teacher. These findings were startling when one realizes the sample was normally distributed according to such variables as IQ, achievement, socioeconomic status, and locale.

Several interpretations of these findings are possible: (1) children's behavior problems are highly transient, what emerges as a problem one year may disappear at another; (2) children's behaviors are constant but teachers vary widely in their identification of behavior problems and their judgments of what constitute a problem; and (3) teachers vary greatly in the environments they create, which in turn produces a high variance in problem behavior.

There have been numerous attempts to factor analyze various aspects of child behavior in order to derive empirical classification systems. The underlying assumptions made by researchers attempting to develop empirical classification systems were: (a) that homogeneous behaviors imply

homogeneity of determinants, and (b) that different treatment programs might be developed for different classes of behavior pathology.

Subsequent studies (Peterson, Quay, and Tiffany, 1961; Quay, 1964; Quay and Quay, 1965; and Miller, 1967) have demonstrated a remarkable consistency in the factoring of behaviors. Most behavior problems were found to reduce to as few as four major clusters of interrelated categories. While these categories have been given different labels at different times, they are most frequently referred to as relating to four general disorders: (1) conduct, (2) personality, (3) inadequacy-immaturity, and (4) socialized delinquency (Quay, 1978).

A related study conducted by Patterson (1964) developed a procedure for empirically constructing a classification system for children's disturbed behavior. The procedure involved three steps. First, the collection of referral and observational data in the clinical setting; second, the factor analysis of the behaviors and characteristics observed; and finally, the analysis of factor profiles to determine homogeneous classes. Five labels of behavior resulted from this analysis: (1) hyperactive, (2) withdrawn, (3) immature, (4) aggressive, and (5) anxious. These labels bear a remarkable similarity to the studies cited above.

Peterson's (1961) study attempted to refine and extend judgments of problem behavior. His sample population was

distributed evenly into four groups: kindergarten, grades one and two, grades three and four, and grades five and six. He further divided his sample according to sex. Fifty-six common problems were selected for analysis. Factor analysis of the data yielded the following information: two factors emerged which were labeled "conduct problems" and "personality problems". Comparisons over all age groups showed that boys displayed more severe conduct problems than girls, but at the higher grade levels girls displayed more personality problems than boys.

As a result of these and other multivariate studies of deviant behavior in classrooms, several instruments have been developed to provide empirical classifications of child behaviors. These scored measures have been found to be useful in the identification of seriously deviant classroom behaviors. Three of the most widely used instruments are the Devereux Elementary School Behavior Scale (Spivack and Swift, 1967), the Conners' Teacher Questionnaire (Conners, 1969), and The Behavior Problem Checklist (Quay and Peterson, 1975; Quay, 1977). The rationale behind these classifications of behavior is to reduce the multiplicity of individual deviant behaviors to a few basic categories which can be used to provide therapeutic programs for disturbed children.

Studies examining how teacher expectations and attitudes are communicated to students are numerous. Jackson, Silberman, and Wolfson (1969) empirically demonstrated that teachers feel

and behave differently toward different children in their classrooms. Silberman (1969) and later, Good and Brophy (1972) showed that such differential teacher attitudes were associated with differential teacher behavior. "(O)nce a teacher forms a particular attitude toward an individual student, the teacher is likely to begin to treat this student accordingly. . . .The students' knowledge of the teachers' attitude then causes them to behave in ways that will reinforce the teachers' initial attitude" (Brophy and Good, 1974, p. 130).

In order to test this proposition, the researchers asked teachers to identify four types of students. These were: (1) students they would enjoy keeping in their classrooms an additional year; (2) students for whom they felt the most concern and would like to help more; (3) students they would be least prepared to discuss with a parent without prior notification; and (4) students they would be most relieved to have removed from their classrooms. The four categories of students were then given the attitudinal labels as follows: (1) attachment, (2) concern, (3) indifference, and (4) rejection.

After obtaining the responses, observational data were collected in each teacher's classroom to determine how teachers treated the students they nominated, and to determine the characteristics of the four types of students. Analysis of the data supported the proposition that teachers

interact with the four types of students in a distinctly differential manner. In particular, students in the rejection group had fewer response opportunities than their classmates. Of the contacts received by the "rejected" students, most were behaviorial criticisms.

It has been suggested that stimulus qualities or physical characteristics, as well as behaviors, are differentially disturbing to teachers. Algozzini and Curran (1979) demonstrated that teachers' attitudes toward characteristics and behavior influence their interaction potential with certain children. Teachers were first given a list of behaviors to rank according to degree of disturbingness (1 = not very disturbing to 5 = very disturbing). Two groups were formed on the basis of tolerance scores; those with high tolerance and those with low tolerance. Subjects were then asked to read a hypothetical case study of a "socially defiant" child. Analysis of the results indicated that ratings of interaction potential were differentially influenced according to tolerance for socially defiant behaviors. As anticipated, teachers with high tolerance scores were significantly more accepting of a hypothetical child thought to exhibit socially defiant behavior than were subjects with low tolerance scores.

Herr, Algozzini, and Eaves (1976) investigated teachers' interpretations of disturbing behavior from the standpoint of ecological theory, (i.e., ". . . disturbance resides in

the interface between the excitor and his responding environment and is the product of an agitated environment" (p. 261). The investigators contended that:

Due to his own background of experiences, a teacher possesses concepts of "good" and "bad" behaviors which may be much unlike those of other teachers. Thus, behaviors which arouse anxiety in, or are disturbing to, one teacher do not necessarily arouse anxiety in others (p. 261).

A major conclusion was that children typified as "conduct problems" may not be so much disturbed as disturbing to their teachers.

The above studies were found to be relevant to the present study in the following aspects: First, teachers' evaluations of students' behaviors are found to be influenced by variables such as the "type" of misbehavior, length of teaching experience, and personal attitudes. Secondly, during a child's elementary school career, there is a high likelihood that he or she will be labeled a behavior problem by one or more teacher(s). Third, the factor analytical studies which have been done as an effort to classify large numbers of different misbehaviors into manageable categories represents an excellent example of official labeling deviant behavior. And finally, the research has shown that teachers' attitudes and expectations are affected by physical characteristics as well as behavior is pertinent to this study.

Summary

From the studies reviewed, it can be concluded that preliminary work has been accomplished in the area of labeling and stereotyping in schools. Most of the research examined attempted to determine the effects of the label or stereotype upon both the perceptions of teachers and the self-concept of the student.

Considerable evidence was found which suggested that labels serve as important mechanisms for processing students throughout their school careers. The evidence also supported the proposition that teachers develop labels to fit certain types of students. Further, these labels tend to influence teachers' interactions with the students who have been labeled. Factors such as the students' appearance, behavior, degree of conformity, etc., are believed to be influential in the teachers' typifications of students. Varying conclusions were discovered regarding the detrimental effect of the label upon the student. Conflicting evidence was revealed concerning the label of "juvenile delinquent" upon the self-concept of boys. The wide use of labels in schools, both formal diagnostic labels as well as informal labels, suggests that labeling is an important area for investigation and deserves further examination.

Most of the studies of stereotyping indicated that factors such as race, sex, physical attributes, social status, etc., seemed to influence teachers' judgments

about pupils. Negative stereotypes of students were reflected in increased negative attitudes and expectations of teachers. The following conclusions can be made based on the studies reviewed: (1) stereotypes are a commonplace mechanism found in schools; (2) stereotypes serve to categorize students; and (3) stereotypes have been shown to influence teachers' perceptions of students. No study was found which attempted to determine the content of the stereotypes, however. And while stereotypes are known to exist, we do not know of what they consist. Definitional studies are needed seeking to understand the substance of stereotypes commonly used in schools.

Educational studies cited in the review of literature supported the following conclusions: (1) students' behaviors are differentially interpreted according to who does the interpreting and the prior experience of the interpreter; (2) students' behaviors are classified according to major types which are used as categorical labels; and (3) teachers' expectations and attitudes are often biased according to the label the student is given.

Chapter III

Design and Methodology

The present study attempted to investigate two theoretical notions. First, that labels carry stereotypic images of deviants and secondly, that stereotypic images are crucial determinants of attitudes toward the deviant person. Available research indicates these propositions to be generally consistent in studies of social deviance (Simmons, 1965; Staats, 1975). Although labels are frequently used in education, few studies were found which applied the labeling perspective to the school setting, and still fewer which applied it to deviant students.

The first problem of the study was to discover if images of certain labeled student deviants were held in common by teachers and if so, to determine the content of those deviant labels. In order to answer this question, an instrument was developed to explore the stereotypic content of four labeled student deviants: hyperactive, underachieving/unmotivated, aggressive, and psychologically disturbed. The instrument was an adaptation of an adjective checklist designed to determine stereotypic content of nationality groups (Katz and Braly, 1933). A sample of teachers was asked to mark all the adjectives (traits) which they believed were descriptive of each labeled

student deviant. The responses were tabulated in terms of frequency and strength of agreement. Word portraits were developed for each student deviant by ranking the traits receiving the highest frequency of choice. Traits which were distinctly concensual were indicated by a high index of uniformity.

The second problem of the study was to determine if teachers' attitudes were directionally affected by their stereotypic images of deviant students. The attitude of tolerance was selected for examination based on the assumption that certain behavior characteristics are more disturbing to teachers than others (Algozzine and Curran, 1979). Each subject was asked to judge each selected trait according to the degree to which it disturbed the teacher (1 = not at all disturbing to 5 = extremely disturbing). The average affective ratings were obtained by taking the mean rating of each of the student deviant groups. The ratings were considered to reflect the degree of tolerance toward each group. Positive numerical values indicated higher tolerance and negative numerical values indicated lower tolerance. It was further hypothesized that uniformity indices would relate negatively with high tolerance scores. Correlations were performed between and for each student deviant type to determine the relationship, if any, of the two variables.

The factor of grade level was controlled by limiting the sample to Intermediate and Junior High school teachers. This measure was taken to account for responses which might be age-referenced. For example, one's perception of behavior is dependent to a large degree upon the age of the child under consideration. A behavior considered deviant in a junior high student might not be judged deviant in a kindergarten student. The specific procedures of the study design are outlined in the following sections.

Instrumentation

The trait assessment instrument was designed to obtain two types of information: (1) the degree of concensual agreement of stereotypic content of labeled student deviants, and (2) a measure of tolerance toward behaviors thought to be characteristic of certain types of students.

Stereotypic Content

In order to measure stereotypic content, a modified version of the adjective checklist was utilized. The instrument was originally developed by Katz and Braly (1933) for the purpose of identifying the stereotypic content of various nationality groups. Replications of the Katz and Braly study have shown remarkable consistency in findings over the years (Gilbert, 1951; Karlins, Coffman, and Walters, 1969). Cauthen, et al. (1971) named it the most preferable method for determining stereotype content among those instruments designed for that purpose.

Alternative techniques such as the Semantic Differential Scale (Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum, 1957) and essay descriptions were found to be less satisfactory for the following reasons. The determination of the bi-polar adjectives used in differential scales requires great specificity in selection and, furthermore, criteria are lacking by which to determine the adjectives. Written descriptions are problematic because they are taxing for both subjects and researchers. The inordinate amount of time required both to write and analyze the descriptions make their use questionable. Further, the validity and reliability of these scales have been found to be uncertain (Staats, 1975, p. 58).

A second reason for utilizing the adjective trait list was based on the studies by Simmons (1965, 1969) and Staats (1975). Both studies employed the trait checklist to determine the stereotypic content of social deviants. Simmons constructed his trait list from the content analysis of responses to the following question: ". . . list those things or types of persons whom you regard as deviant" (1965, p. 223). A list of 70 traits was extracted which resulted in a variety of positive, negative, and neutral attributes.

The trait list used in Staats' study was identical to the one developed by Katz and Braly which included 84 adjectives to be judged. Staats modified the questionnaire

by including a scale designed to measure positive and negative evaluations of selected words (1975, p. 58).

Measure of Tolerance

The method for determining levels of tolerance toward behavioral characteristics or traits was incorporated into the trait assessment instrument for determining stereotypic content. This procedure was based upon a study conducted by Algozzine and Curran (1979) in which level of tolerance was measured by response to characteristics according to their relative degree of disturbance (1 = not very disturbing to 5 = very disturbing).

The purpose of Algozzine and Curran's study was to explore the relationship between the teachers' tolerance for particular types of behaviors and their interaction potential ratings on hypothetical case study situations. Each subject was administered the Disturbing Behavior Checklist I (DBCI). Two sets of behaviors were identified on the checklist: (1) the social defiance dimension, defined as behaviors viewed by teachers as breaches of the expected order; and (2) the social facility dimension, which was interpreted as behaviors teachers perceived as immature social behavior. The 36 items which comprised the two dimensions were representative of the characteristics generally found to describe behaviors of problem children. Although the exact items were not used in the present study, the method of determining

level of tolerance by use of a Likert scale was found to be appropriate.

Modification of the Instrument

The original adjective checklist of Katz and Braly was designed to define the content of nationality stereotypes. For this reason, a large number of items was found to be unsuitable for the specific population of schools. Therefore, the instrument was subjected to content revision to better approximate terms normally used to describe student behavior.

The first phase in the revision was to retain only those items in the Katz and Braly checklist that might be applicable to student deviants (34 items). Thirteen more traits were added by the researcher to equal 47 behavioral traits. The characteristics were judged adequate based on a search of the literature pertaining to disturbing student behavior.

The second phase of instrumentation utilized a group of public school teachers (N = 68) attending an inservice workshop. The subjects were asked to respond to the checklist as follows: "Please read the following lists of adjectives and circle those traits you believe to be descriptive of the type of student identified at the top of each page. If you do not find appropriate words for all types listed, please add those adjectives you believe should be included."

Responses to the trait assessment of each student deviant type were tabulated for all adjectives. Traits added by the subjects were recorded for addition to the final instrument. The adjective lists for each of the student deviant types were identical; however, the presentation of the adjectives was randomized in order to minimize ordering effects and patterned responses. Fourteen additional adjectives were suggested by the respondents as appropriate characteristics. Several of these adjectives were eliminated because of duplication, vagueness, or slang. Three adjectives were retained and included in the final checklist resulting in a total of fifty items. The responses of the subjects are displayed in Table I. The only traits listed were those adjectives which were circled by 50% or more of the respondents.

Selection of Student Deviant Types

Four student deviant types were selected for assessment. These were: (1) Aggressive Student; (2) Hyperactive Student; (3) Underachieving/Non-Motivated Student; and (4) Psychologically Disturbed Student. The student deviant types were chosen on the basis of categories developed by factor analytical studies of classroom behaviors done by Peterson, Quay, and Tiffany (1961); Quay (1964, 1965); and Miller (1965). The researchers found that most behavior problems could be reduced to four major clusters of interrelated categories. They labeled these as: Conduct Disorders; Personality

TABLE I
DESCRIPTIVE TRAITS ENCIRCLED FOR EACH STUDENT DEVIANT GROUP
(N = 68)

Hyperactive	%	Psychologically Disturbed	%	Aggressive	%	Underachieving/ Non-Motivated	%
Talkative	90	Emotional	90	Alert	70	Disinterested	95
Distractible	90	Sensitive	80	Independent	70	Daydreamer	90
Nervous	85	Nervous	80	Quick tempered	60	Passive	65
Restless	85	Impulsive	65	Industrious	60	Distractible	60
Impulsive	70	Restless	65	Stubborn	55	Lazy	60
Careless	70	Careless	60	Excitable	55	Timid	55
Excitable	65	Distractible	60	Persistent	55	Restless	50
Enthusiastic	60	Quick Tempered	50	Confident	55		
Quick tempered	55	Disinterested	50	Boisterous	50		
				Talkative	50		
TDR = 41		TDR = 47		TDR = 47		TDR = 39	

Note: TDR = Total of Different Responses

Disorders; Inadequacy-Immature Disorders; and Socialized Delinquency Disorders. The characteristics subsumed by each of these categories of behavior disorders are also appropriate to the four category labels chosen for the present study. The labels were slightly altered to fit the more generalized lexicon of the classroom teacher.

The final form of the Student Assessment Profile (SAP) (Appendix A, pp. 117-126) consisted of the four major labels of deviant students, each of which was represented by the list of 50 adjectival traits. Following each adjective, columns were used to form a continuum from one to five by which the respondent indicated the degree to which that particular trait was disturbing (1 = not at all disturbing to 5 = extremely disturbing).

Sample

The sample for the study consisted of teachers (N = 139) of Intermediate (N = 87) and Junior High (N= 52) students. The data were collected in three school districts representative of three counties in central Oklahoma. Tables II and III present an analysis of the returns with regard to distribution by school districts and grade levels. An examination of the tables reveals the percent of usable returns was 72% and was fairly consistent across all schools and both levels.

TABLE II

SCHOOL LEVEL DISTRIBUTION OF STUDY SAMPLE

School Level	Forms Distributed	Forms Returned	Percent Forms Returned	Usable Returns	Percent Usable Returns
Intermediate	107	90	.84	87	.81
Junior High	86	60	.70	52	.60
Total	193	150	.78	139	.72

TABLE III

DISTRIBUTION OF STUDY SAMPLE BY SCHOOL

City (County)	Intermediate N(87) %		Junior High N(52) %		Total N(139) %	
Anadarko (Caddo)	20	.23	16	.31	36	.26
Chickasha (Grady)	32	.37	19	.36	51	.37
Duncan (Stevens)	35	.40	17	.33	52	.37

Demographic data on the entire population of teachers in the State of Oklahoma were obtained for comparison with the study sample. Evidence of the representativeness of the sample was 86% female--the population 71%. The sample having from 4 to 14 years of teaching experience was 55% and the population was represented by 51%. The bachelor's

degree was held by 60% of the sample and the population was 59% for the bachelor's. The population figures were determined from the full-time enrollment (FTE) records of the Oklahoma State Department of Education for the year 1980-81 (Table IV).

TABLE IV

COMPARISON OF STATE TEACHER POPULATION
AND STUDY SAMPLE

	State Population N=33,644.726*	Study Sample N=139
Gender		
Male	29%	14%
Female	71%	86%
Experience		
0-3 yrs.	25%	18%
4-14 yrs.	51%	55%
over 15 yrs.	24%	26%
Last Degree Received		
Bachelor's	59%	60%
Master's	40%	40%
Doctor's	1%	0%
Grade level		
Elementary	52%	63%
Secondary	48%	37%

* Number based on Full-time Enrollment records (FTE: 1980-81).

Collection of Data

The data for the study were collected through the use of the Student Assessment Profile (SAP). The assessment booklets were distributed to 107 Intermediate teachers and 86 Junior High teachers located in 3 school districts during February, 1981. Also included with the assessment booklet was a cover letter (Appendix A, p.116) that explained the nature of the study and requested the teachers' assistance.

Demographic data were also elicited in order to obtain information for use in the analysis of data. Each respondent was asked to indicate his/her school level, sex, degree, and total years of teaching experience.

School principals were contacted initially and permission was obtained to distribute the assessment booklets in their respective buildings. The returned booklets were collected by the researcher after an interval of three days. The number of returns usable in the analysis was (72%).

Statistical Methodology

The method of analysis is given for each null hypothesis in the order of its presentation. The following propositions were tested:

H_{01} : Teachers will show no significant content uniformity for student deviant types.

Each subject was given a booklet which contained four student deviant types. Fifty adjectives were listed under each deviant type. Subjects were asked to circle all traits

which they believed "to be typical of that type of student". All responses for all deviant groups were tabulated to determine the frequency of choice.

The index of uniformity for each deviant group was obtained by dividing the sample number (139) by the total number of responses for each group. Only the data showing 50% or more agreement were treated. A chi-square test for goodness-of-fit was performed to verify that obtained distribution of trait choices was not significantly different from the theoretical one. The significance level of rejection was set at 0.05.

H₀₂: Teachers will show no directional variance of tolerance toward student deviant types.

Respondents were asked to judge each circled trait according to the degree to which it was disturbing to them in the classroom. Each item was rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1, for not at all disturbing, to 5, for extremely disturbing. The mean, standard deviation, and intensity scores were obtained for each characteristic for each deviant group. The intensity score was computed by subtracting the mean from the neutral value of 3. High tolerance (HT) scores were indicated by the positive sign (+) and low tolerance (LT) scores by the negative sign (-).

In order to test the null hypothesis, a t test was performed using the total mean for each deviant group.

H₀₃: There will be no correlation between the degree of uniformity and the degree of tolerance as related to

student deviant types.

The extent of the relationship between the degree of uniformity and level of tolerance was estimated by means of the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation. The degree of correlation was considered to be of practical significance if r was $> \pm .30$ ($> .05$).

Reliability and Validity

The checklist technique to determine stereotypes of groups has been found to be reliable when used in the past. Cauthen et al. (1971) listed other methods such as: ratings of photographs, ratings of statements, and the adjective checklist. Of the three, the checklist technique was found to be unrivaled.

The reliability of the measure of tolerance is difficult to assess because of the absence of similar attitudinal instruments. However, Oppenheim (1966, p. 140) maintained that instruments using the Likert scales tended to be good because of the greater range of responses permitted. He added that the Likert scales often yielded a higher reliability coefficient than the corresponding Thurstone scales.

The reliability of the present instrument was tested using the test-retest approach. The methods of multiple-forms or the split-half technique were found to be inappropriate. Test-retest reliabilities were calculated using a sample of 16 elementary classroom teachers. The test-retest interval was 10 days. The product-moment r for stereotypic

uniformity was .884 and for tolerance level was .726.

The validity of an attitude scale depends partly upon the respondents' candor and willingness to cooperate. This can only be assumed in the present study. However, the relatively high percentage of return does much to affirm the willingness to cooperate. Further generalizations of validity cannot be made without future replications.

Chapter IV

Statistical Analysis of the Data

The findings and statistical analysis given in this chapter are based upon the data obtained from the administration of the Student Assessment Profile (SAP) booklets. The data were the responses on the stereotypic content of four identified student deviants and the degree of tolerance/intolerance toward chosen characteristics.

Of the 150 booklets returned, eleven were discarded because of inaccuracies; e.g., all traits had been rated for disturbing value or none had been circled as characteristic to the deviant type. The main results were computed on the remaining 139 booklets.

The presentation of the analysis follows each of the three hypotheses. A confidence level of 0.05 was used throughout to test the significance of difference. The actual levels of significance are reported in the appropriate tables.

Test of Hypothesis One

Hypothesis 1: Teachers will show no significant content uniformity for student deviant types.

The chi-square test for goodness-of-fit was used to test the difference in proportions of trait selections.

The expected frequency was obtained based upon the total responses to each deviant group divided by the number of traits (50). The raw data are displayed in Appendix B, pp. 125-132. The observed frequencies were calculated for only those traits which were chosen by 50% or more of the sample. The basis for this choice was that traits selected by fewer than half were nonrepresentative and spurious. Table V presents the results of the chi-square test for the traits selected by 50% or more of the sample.

TABLE V

CHI-SQUARE TEST ON OBTAINED AND EXPECTED FREQUENCIES
OF TRAIT SELECTIONS FOR STUDENT DEVIANT TYPES
(DF=49)

Student Deviant	Exp. No.	χ^2	$\sqrt{2\chi^2}$	Sigmas Above Mean (9.85)
Hyperactive	35.64	1093.89	46.77	37.47*
Underachieving/ Non-Motivated	22.66	1411.41	53.17	45.01*
Psychologically Disturbed	37.78	731.96	38.26	27.49*
Aggressive	39.4	270.48	23.25	15.63*

* Probability = Remote

For larger values of DF (> 30), the root of two times chi-square is considered the distribution which approaches the normal curve closely enough to be treated as normal (Minium, p. 448). For example, $\sqrt{2\chi^2}$ is considered the distribution which is approximately normal around a mean of

$\sqrt{2n-1}$, with a sigma of 1.00. The probability is the ratio of one tail of the normal distribution to the area under the entire curve (Schoenfeld, 1942, p. 19). The mean of the chi-square distribution for the present study was $\sqrt{2(49)-1}$ or 9.85.

Inspection of the data in Table V indicates that each value of $\sqrt{2\chi^2}$ was so far above the mean of the distribution (9.85), the probability that the results represented a chance deviation from the expected frequency was too remote to be considered. The null hypothesis was rejected for all four student deviant groups.

The most frequently chosen traits and the proportion of respondents who circled them for each of the student deviant types are presented in Table VI, VII, VIII, and VIX. Examination of the tables shows that for each deviant type, a small number of traits accounts for a large proportion of the responses. The stereotypic portrait of each deviant student type appears to be distinct in content.

Further examination shows that four traits were attributed across three deviant types: restless, impulsive, quick-tempered, and distractible. At least two deviant types were given the traits of talkative, impulsive, nervous, careless, and boisterous. The remaining traits were unique to that particular deviant type.

In order to provide a further measure of consensus, an index of uniformity was calculated for each deviant group. The total number of responses for each category was divided

TABLE VI

TRAITS ENCIRCLED AS DESCRIPTIVELY MOST IMPORTANT
FOR HYPERACTIVE

Characteristics	Number of Responses (885)	%	Uniformity Index (15.7)
Talkative	124	.89	14.0
Restless	116	.83	13.1
Distractible	113	.81	12.8
Impulsive	111	.80	12.5
Excitable	110	.79	12.4
Nervous	95	.68	10.7
Careless	77	.55	8.7
Quick-tempered	70	.51	7.9
Boisterous	69	.50	7.8

TABLE VII

TRAITS ENCIRCLED AS DESCRIPTIVELY MOST IMPORTANT
FOR UNDERACHIEVING/NON-MOTIVATED

Characteristics	Number of Responses (700)	%	Uniformity Index (19.9)
Disinterested	127	.91	18.1
Daydreamer	115	.83	16.4
Lazy	110	.79	15.7
Careless	107	.76	15.3
Distractible	89	.64	12.7
Passive	80	.58	11.4
Restless	72	.52	10.2

TABLE VIII

TRAITS ENCIRCLED AS DESCRIPTIVELY MOST IMPORTANT
FOR PSYCHOLOGICALLY DISTURBED

Characteristics	Number of Responses (952)	%	Uniformity Index (14.6)
Emotional	118	.85	12.4
Quick-tempered	93	.67	9.8
Quarrelsome	91	.65	9.6
Distractible	90	.64	9.5
Sensitive	88	.63	9.2
Defiant	82	.59	8.6
Moody	81	.58	8.5
Belligerent	81	.58	8.5
Impulsive	79	.57	8.3
Restless	75	.54	7.9
Nervous	74	.53	7.8

TABLE VIX

TRAITS ENCIRCLED AS DESCRIPTIVELY MOST IMPORTANT
FOR AGGRESSIVE

Characteristics	Number of Responses (541)	%	Uniformity Index (25.7)
Talkative	99	.71	18.3
Confident	77	.55	14.2
Boisterous	77	.55	14.2
Quick-tempered	76	.54	14.0
Quarrelsome	72	.52	13.3
Impulsive	71	.51	13.1
Alert	69	.50	12.8

by the number of subjects to give the index of perfect agreement. The index of uniformity is displayed in column 3 of the Tables. The closer the trait index approaches the overall index for the group, the greater the consensus of the subjects toward that trait. It can be seen that the uniformity indices of some categories are more widely spread than the indices for other categories. For example, there was high agreement on the traits considered characteristic to the deviant groups, Hyperactive and Underachieving/Non-Motivated. Seventy-five percent of the sample described Hyperactive as "talkative", "restless", "distractible", "impulsive", and "excitable". An equal proportion chose the traits of "disinterested", "daydreamer", "lazy", and "careless" as descriptive of Underachieving/Non-Motivated. Seventy-five percent agreement was reached for only one trait in the remaining two categories: "emotional", for Psychologically Disturbed, and "talkative", for Aggressive.

Test of Hypothesis Two

Hypothesis 2: Teachers will show no directional variance of tolerance toward student deviant types.

Using the scores obtained on the characteristics receiving 50% or more responses, the mean, standard deviation, and tolerance scores were computed for each deviant group. The tolerance scores were obtained for each characteristic by subtracting the mean from the neutral score of 3.00. The possible range of these scores was from zero to ± 2 . High

tolerance (HT) received positive scores and low tolerance (LT) received negative scores.

Tables X, XI, XII, and XIII show the findings on the characteristics of each deviant group which were chosen by at least 50% of the sample. The entire lists of characteristics with their means, standard deviations, and tolerance scores may be seen in Appendix B, pp. 133-136.

Inspection of Tables X, XI, and XII reveals that the majority of tolerance scores is negative, which indicates teachers find these deviant groups at least moderately disturbing. The tolerance scores for the Aggressive type (Table XIII) are positive for the most part. Only two characteristics, "quick-tempered" and "quarrelsome", evoked negative responses.

Examination of the standard deviations of the four deviant groups shows there to be more agreement in the intensity of tolerance/intolerance of the Hyperactive and Underachieving/Non-Motivated groups. There is moderate disagreement as to the disturbing nature of the Psychologically Disturbed and a great deal of disagreement for the Aggressive. Reference to the raw data table (p. 131) demonstrates that characteristics chosen by the teachers varied widely between positive and negative traits. This lack of agreement is reflected in the standard deviation.

In summary, the data representing the individual characteristics do not show a particularly strong intolerance for any deviant group. Indeed, the Aggressive type indicates

TABLE X

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND TOLERANCE SCORES
FOR HYPERACTIVE

Characteristics	Number of Responses	Means	S.D.	Tolerance Scores
Talkative	124	3.548	1.072	-.548
Restless	116	3.405	.928	-.405
Distractible	113	3.566	.977	-.566
Impulsive	111	3.081	.922	-.081
Excitable	110	2.909	1.108	+.091
Nervous	95	2.756	.959	+.242
Careless	77	3.493	.783	-.493
Quick-Tempered	70	3.529	.937	-.529
Boisterous	69	3.507	1.058	-.507

TABLE XI

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND TOLERANCE SCORES
FOR UNDERACHIEVING/NON-MOTIVATED

Characteristics	Number of Responses	Means	S.D.	Tolerance Scores
Disinterested	127	3.685	.876	-.685
Daydreamer	115	3.157	1.009	-.157
Lazy	110	3.664	.993	-.664
Careless	107	3.318	.923	-.318
Distractible	89	3.180	1.107	-.180
Passive	80	2.825	1.046	+.175
Restless	72	3.028	.833	-.028

TABLE XII

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND TOLERANCE SCORES
FOR PSYCHOLOGICALLY DISTURBED

Characteristics	Number of Responses	Means	S.D.	Tolerance Scores
Emotional	118	2.991	1.061	+.009
Quick-Tempered	93	3.527	1.022	-.527
Quarrelsome	91	3.670	.950	-.670
Distractible	90	3.078	1.024	-.078
Sensitive	88	2.250	1.180	+.750
Defiant	82	3.853	.977	-.854
Moody	81	3.086	1.250	-.086
Belligerent	81	3.914	1.045	-.914
Impulsive	79	3.177	1.003	-.177
Restless	75	2.960	.916	-.04
Nervous	74	2.770	.952	+.230

TABLE XIII

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND TOLERANCE SCORES
FOR AGGRESSIVE

Characteristics	Number of Responses	Means	S.D.	Tolerance Scores
Talkative	99	3.	1.034	0
Confident	77	1.584	1.061	+1.416
Boisterous	77	2.974	1.032	+ .026
Quick-Tempered	76	3.277	1.241	- .276
Quarrelsome	72	3.347	1.002	- .347
Impulsive	71	2.704	1.080	+ .296
Alert	69	1.594	1.026	+1.406

tolerance rather than intolerance.

To test the hypothesis of no directional variance, the means of each group were totaled, giving the grand mean. A t test was performed to determine whether significant directional difference existed for any of the four deviant groups.

The results are presented in Table XIV.

TABLE XIV

SUMMARY OF MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND TOLERANCE
SCORES FOR STUDENT DEVIANT GROUPS

Deviant Groups	Mean	S.D.	Toler. Score	t	DF	α .05
Hyperactive	3.311	.310	-.311	-.932	8	+2.31
Underachieving/ Non-Motivated	3.354	.372	-.354	-.936	6	+2.45
Psychologically Disturbed	3.207	.498	-.207	-.687	10	+2.23
Aggressive	2.64	.748	.36	.953	6	+2.45

The minimum t values for the appropriate degrees of freedom (df) are given in column seven in the table above. The alpha level of significance for nondirectional (two-tailed) tests was not obtained for any of the four deviant groups, therefore, the hypothesis was not rejected.

Test of Hypothesis Three

Hypothesis 3: There will be no correlation between the degree of uniformity and the degree of tolerance as related to student deviant types.

Correlations were computed between the uniformity indices

and tolerance scores for each of the student deviant categories. The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was employed as follows:

$$r = \frac{N \sum xy - (\sum x)(\sum y)}{\sqrt{[N \sum x^2 - (\sum x)^2][N \sum y^2 - (\sum y)^2]}}$$

The obtained correlation coefficients are displayed in Table XV.

TABLE XV

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN UNIFORMITY INDICES AND
TOLERANCE SCORES OF STUDENT DEVIANT GROUPS

Deviant Group	<i>r</i>
Hyperactive	.184
Underachieving/Non-Motivated	-.795*
Psychologically Disturbed	.030
Aggressive	-.258

* Significant at the .05 level

The required values for rejection ($< \pm .30$) of the hypothesis were not met for the following student deviant groups: Hyperactive, Psychologically Disturbed, and Aggressive. There appeared to be no significant correlation between the uniformity indices and tolerance scores of these groups. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected. However, a highly significant negative correlation was found between the variables for the Underachieving/Non-Motivated category. As a result, the hypothesis was rejected for this particular group.

Summary

This chapter presented the data related specifically to the testing of three null hypotheses. Hypothesis one found there was a highly significant uniformity of response for the stereotypic content of four student deviant groups. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected for all groups.

Hypothesis two tested the degree of tolerance for each deviant group. No significant direction was shown for any of the four groups. Based upon these results, the null hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis three was related to the correlation of degree of content uniformity and degree of tolerance. There was no significant correlation between the two variables for the Hyperactive, Psychologically Disturbed, or Aggressive groups. The null hypothesis was accepted for these groups. However, the hypothesis was rejected for the category Under-achieving/Non-Motivated, which revealed a highly significant negative correlation ($-.795$).

Chapter V

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

Summary

The majority of studies directed toward the subject of deviancy in the classroom has been concerned with the causes and remediation of student misbehavior. The purpose of this study was to offer an alternative perspective based upon labeling theory, which seeks to understand the underlying processes of deviancy.

Labeling sociologists propose that deviancy is defined by the social audience. Therefore, the content of the definitions for various deviant types becomes an important element for study. A second premise of labeling theory asserts that once an individual has been labeled, societal reactions toward the labeled deviant become negative in character.

The dimension of stereotyping has recently been explored as a possible explanation of the process of labeling. Striking similarities exist between the two phenomena.

Because of the common use of labels to describe students, the theoretical propositions of labeling seem particularly applicable to the school setting. The specific problem investigated in this study was the determination of stereotypic content, if any, of labeled student deviants. Not only

was the content identified, but the index of uniformity, (the degree to which teachers agreed upon the content), was determined.

Two related questions were also asked: (1) were teachers' tolerance levels directionally influenced by stereotype uniformity and (2) was there a relationship between the degree of stereotype uniformity and degree of tolerance for each of the labeled deviants.

To investigate these problems, the following null hypotheses were postulated:

H_{01} : Teachers will show no significant content uniformity for student deviant groups.

H_{02} : Teachers will show no directional variance of tolerance toward student deviant types.

H_{03} : There will be no correlation between degree of stereotype uniformity and degree of tolerance as related to student deviant types.

The instrument utilized to collect the data was the Student Assessment Profile (SAP), a modified version of the Katz and Braly adjective checklist. A scale to determine degree of tolerance was incorporated into the instrument. The booklets were distributed to one hundred and ninety-three classroom teachers (107 Intermediate and 86 Junior High). Seventy two percent of the sample responded (81% and 60%, respectively).

Hypothesis one, relating to the stereotype content of labeled student deviants, was found significant beyond the

.05 level. The chi-square test for goodness-of-fit revealed the observed frequencies of trait choice against the estimated frequencies to be larger than could be expected by chance.

An additional finding revealed that although significant stereotyping was evident among teachers, their consensus upon traits varied in degree. A high index of uniformity was indicated for the categories of Underachieving/Non-Motivated and Hyperactive. Over seventy-five percent of the teachers agreed upon at least half of the traits assigned to those groups. The uniformity indices for the categories Psychologically Disturbed and Aggressive were less consensual.

Hypothesis two tested the degree of tolerance for each of the deviant groups as measured by a Likert scale. Positive scores indicated tolerance and negative scores signified intolerance of labeled characteristics. The data revealed that teachers were moderately intolerant of Underachieving/Non-Motivated, Hyperactive, and Psychologically Disturbed groups. The category of Aggressive was rated more positively by the teachers, indicating a general tolerance for this type of student.

The t statistic was used to determine the significance of the directional variances. The alpha level of significance was not obtained for any of the four deviant groups, therefore, the second hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis three dealt with the significance of relationship between the indices of uniformity and the tolerance

scores for each labeled group.. A significant correlation was found to exist for the Underachieving/Non-Motivated category ($r = -.795$). The remaining groups revealed correlation coefficients of low magnitude which were not statistically significant.

Conclusions

In relation to the definitional processes of labeling theory, the findings of this study contribute to the premise that labels of student deviants do possess empirically discernable stereotypic content. However, while all labels used in the present research evoked significantly similar images among teachers, some labels received higher indices of agreement than others. Therefore, it was concluded that for some labels a greater preciseness of common meanings appears to exist than for other labels. The findings suggest that even though individuals may be conversing with one another about a given type of student, the degree to which there is a sharing of common understanding between or among the individuals is variable. For example, according to the data obtained in this study, it can be assumed that teachers who discuss students labeled Hyperactive or Underachieving/Non-Motivated, are communicating with each other at a higher level of common usage than teachers who discuss Aggressive or Psychologically Disturbed students.

We cannot assume the label is perceived in the same way by all teachers, even though it may be highly similar. There

is a need for a greater preciseness of definitions of labels commonly used in the school setting. The argument is not to eliminate the label in schools, for labeling will undoubtedly continue, but rather to strive for a greater definitiveness of categorical labels used as formal and informal descriptors of students.

It should be pointed out the concern of this study was to discover if teachers shared a stereotypic image of deviant students. No attempt was made to determine whether the traits cited by teachers as being characteristic of certain labeled deviants were, in fact, actually possessed by the deviant students themselves. For instance, the findings support the fact that the majority of the teachers sampled characterized the underachieving/non-motivated student as being "disinterested", a "daydreamer", "lazy", and "careless". The accuracy of this characterization, however, remains for other research to determine.

Results of previous research had indicated that teachers' attitudes were negatively influenced by deviant labels. The findings of this study showed only a moderate intolerance for three deviant groups and a moderate tolerance for the fourth. No significant negative affect was found for any of the labeled deviants. It was concluded from these results, that for the labels used in this study, teachers' tolerance levels were not maximally affected.

The theoretical proposition that there is a relationship between content uniformity and the degree of tolerance/

intolerance could not be fully supported in this study. While a significant correlation was found for the deviant group, Underachieving/Non-Motivated, the other deviant groups received correlation coefficients of insignificantly low magnitude. It is apparent that a conclusion of relationship cannot be made from the present findings. There is reason to suspect, however, that for certain deviant labels a correlation may exist. Which labels, if any, remain for subsequent research to verify.

In conclusion, common sense knowledge or "what everyone knows" may well be differentially interpreted. To put common sense ideas into precisely defined concepts and subject the proposition to test was an important task of this study.

In education, such labels as "hyperactive", "underachieving/non-motivated", "aggressive", and "psychologically disturbed", are common-place. The question is raised, however, whether these terms are used in a consensual manner. Do these labels, or other labels, have similar meaning or entirely different meaning for individuals. In any case, it is certain that "what everybody knows" is not known until it has been tested. The first hypothesis of this study sought to determine the existence of empirical uniformities of four specific labels of behavior. This was accomplished; other labels remain to be explored.

Recommendations

The first recommendation for further research concerns

replications of the present study. In order to determine the extent to which generalizations can be made, similar studies are needed using samples from other populations. Studies using comparative groups, such as primary teachers and high school teachers, or teachers from urban schools and rural schools could provide useful information.

Future investigations should also focus upon the possible interactions of variables such as teaching experience. Prior research has suggested that experienced teachers view student misbehavior as less problematic than do inexperienced teachers. The question is raised whether experienced teachers stereotype differently than inexperienced teachers, and if so, how and to what degree.

The sex of the teacher is another variable which bears investigation. Do female teachers stereotype more or less than male teachers. Are there differences found between the tolerance scores of these groups.

Additional research into the formation of labels is needed. How much of the label definition comes from personal experience with a particular deviant group. Do variables such as frequency of a misbehavior, or the perceived seriousness of a misbehavior contribute to teachers' images of labels. Further, is the label definition influenced by training, and, if so, in what manner. Also, studies aimed at determining the content of other commonly used labels are needed.

Another area to explore is the relationship between tendency to stereotype and ratings on scales such as The Pupil Control Ideology (PCI) (Willower, Eidell, and Hoy, (1967). The extent to which "custodial" and "humanistic" ideologies affect stereotyping would be an interesting, as well as fruitful avenue for further empirical investigation.

It has long been recognized that an individual's beliefs, as well as his or her disbeliefs, have an important influence on values and attitudes. The Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Form E) (Rokeach, 1960) has been used to measure the open and closed mindedness of individuals. A study designed to compare teachers' obtained dogmatism scores and tolerance scores toward student deviants would seem to have both practical and theoretical value.

Ethnographic studies conducted in the schools which explore the relationship between teachers' expressed tolerance toward labeled deviants and their observed interactions with students who have been labeled would be enlightening. The use of both quantitative and qualitative data may give rise to further implications for study concerning the labeling of students.

The limited evidence offered by this study suggests that reactions to deviant children differ from those found in research dealing with adult deviants. More carefully constructed observational studies are needed to pinpoint the differences so a clearer understanding of deviancy is gained in the school setting.

A final research recommendation would be that other perspectives of labeling theory be explored. The determination of the effect of labels upon students' self-concept is still inconclusive and bears further study. A second question which needs to be addressed is whether the label carries specific personal and social liabilities for the labeled student. To what extent does the student accept or reject his or her label and under what circumstances. Third, to what extent does labeling inaugurate and/or precipitate a deviant career commitment. Longitudinal studies are needed to accumulate the necessary data before these questions can be answered.

There are numerous directions open to research in schools within the labeling theory approach. These merit further attention. Once data of this kind have been collected and assessed, it will be possible to better determine whether labeling theory is a proper area of theoretical attention. It is hopeful that this perspective can add to the more traditional studies of classroom deviancy.

APPENDIX A



February 16, 1981

Dear Colleague:

The purpose of this letter is to request 15 or 20 minutes of your time to assist in a study of behavior problems in the classroom. As you know, teachers are encountered daily with students who exhibit a number of deviant behaviors which range in intensity from mild to very serious. This study will attempt to identify the characteristics or traits of four general types of student behavior problems and the degree to which these behaviors are disturbing in the classroom. Your assistance and cooperation in the study is needed and will be greatly appreciated.

Will you please complete the booklet and return it to the principal's office at your earliest convenience. The booklets will be collected in two or three days. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jue Markham".

J. Sue Markham
Education Department

JSM/ns

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The purpose of this questionnaire is (1) to identify characteristic behaviors and attributes of certain types of student behavior problems, and (2) to determine the relative disturbingness of these characteristics to the teacher.

As you respond to the questionnaire, please make your judgments on the basis of how these students appear to YOU. There are four types of problem students represented. Do not try to remember how you checked similar items in the booklet. Make each item a separate and independent judgement. Do not puzzle over the items, your first impressions and immediate "feelings" are desired.

Thank you for your cooperation.

PLEASE COMPLETE

GRADE LEVEL

- ☐ Intermediate/Middle School (Grades 4, 5, or 6)
- ☐ Junior High School (Grades 7, 8, or 9)

TEACHING EXPERIENCE (TOTAL)

- ☐ Less than 3 yrs.
- ☐ 4 - 14 yrs.
- ☐ 15 or more yrs.

GENDER

- ☐ Female
- ☐ Male

LAST DEGREE RECEIVED

- ☐ Bachelor's
- ☐ Master's
- ☐ Doctor's

INSTRUCTIONS

As you read through the list of characteristics on each page, **CIRCLE** only those words which you believe to be typical of the type of student at the top of each page. After each circled word, indicate with a **CHECK (✓)** the extent to which this characteristic is disturbing to you.

Scale: (1) Not at all disturbing, (2) Slightly disturbing, (3) Moderately disturbing, (4) Very disturbing, (5) Extremely disturbing.

Example: The traits circled below are thought to be typical of a particular type of student. However, the disturbing value of the traits may vary. **ALERT** may be "not at all disturbing" to you; if this is so, it would be checked (1).

Note: Check only those words you have circled.

	1	2	3	4	5
distractible			✓		
neat					
industrious					
defiant					✓
talkative				✓	
enthusiastic					
stubborn					
alert	✓				

THE HYPERACTIVE STUDENT					
	Not at all disturbing	Slightly disturbing	Moderately disturbing	Very disturbing	Extremely disturbing
	1	2	3	4	5
1. alert					
2. independent					
3. timid					
4. impulsive					
5. belligerent					
6. suggestible					
7. nervous					
8. sly					
9. distractible					
10. happy					
11. selfish					
12. persistent					
13. careless					
14. dishonest					
15. efficient					
16. excitable					
17. sincere					
18. neat					
19. industrious					
20. stubborn					
21. boastful					
22. restless					
23. emotional					
24. deceitful					
25. defiant					

THE HYPERACTIVE STUDENT					
	Not at all disturbing	Slightly disturbing	Moderately disturbing	Very disturbing	Extremely disturbing
	1	2	3	4	5
26. talkative					
27. intelligent					
28. prompt					
29. dependable					
30. quarrelsome					
31. cooperative					
32. daydreamer					
33. passive					
34. kind					
35. confident					
36. boisterous					
37. imaginative					
38. gregarious					
39. disinterested					
40. profane					
41. courteous					
42. sensitive					
43. enthusiastic					
44. disrespectful					
45. quick-tempered					
46. critical					
47. lazy					
48. influential					
49. moody					
50. eccentric					

THE UNDERACHIEVING/NON-MOTIVATED STUDENT					
	Not at all disturbing	Slightly disturbing	Moderately disturbing	Very disturbing	Extremely disturbing
	1	2	3	4	5
1. careless					
2. daydreamer					
3. disinterested					
4. enthusiastic					
5. impulsive					
6. lazy					
7. profane					
8. selfish					
9. suggestible					
10. alert					
11. boisterous					
12. critical					
13. dishonest					
14. emotional					
15. imaginative					
16. kind					
17. persistent					
18. restless					
19. stubborn					
20. belligerent					
21. deceitful					
22. disrespectful					
23. excitable					
24. independent					
25. neat					

THE UNDERACHIEVING/NON-MOTIVATED STUDENT					
	Not at all disturbing	Slightly disturbing	Moderately disturbing	Very disturbing	Extremely disturbing
	1	2	3	4	5
26. prompt					
27. sensitive					
28. talkative					
29. boastful					
30. confident					
31. defiant					
32. distractible					
33. gregarious					
34. intelligent					
35. nervous					
36. quarrelsome					
37. sincere					
38. timid					
39. sly					
40. cooperative					
41. industrious					
42. quick-tempered					
43. happy					
44. efficient					
45. passive					
46. dependable					
47. courteous					
48. eccentric					
49. influential					
50. moody					

THE PSYCHOLOGICALLY DISTURBED STUDENT					
	Not at all disturbing	Slightly disturbing	Moderately disturbing	Very disturbing	Extremely disturbing
	1	2	3	4	5
1. sensitive					
2. independent					
3. emotional					
4. confident					
5. alert					
6. talkative					
7. defiant					
8. efficient					
9. gregarious					
10. belligerent					
11. intelligent					
12. disinterested					
13. neat					
14. careless					
15. impulsive					
16. quarrelsome					
17. dependable					
18. profane					
19. lazy					
20. cooperative					
21. sincere					
22. restless					
23. timid					
24. daydreamer					
25. suggestible					

THE PSYCHOLOGICALLY DISTURBED STUDENT					
	Not at all disturbing	Slightly disturbing	Moderately disturbing	Very disturbing	Extremely disturbing
	1	2	3	4	5
26. courteous					
27. happy					
28. distractible					
29. kind					
30. boastful					
31. nervous					
32. quick-tempered					
33. enthusiastic					
34. prompt					
35. deceitful					
36. selfish					
37. imaginative					
38. excitable					
39. passive					
40. boisterous					
41. stubborn					
42. industrious					
43. dishonest					
44. persistent					
45. sly					
46. disrespectful					
47. critical					
48. moody					
49. influential					
50. eccentric					

THE AGGRESSIVE STUDENT					
	Not at all disturbing	Slightly disturbing	Moderately disturbing	Very disturbing	Extremely disturbing
	1	2	3	4	5
1. courteous					
2. disrespectful					
3. imaginative					
4. industrious					
5. nervous					
6. quick-tempered					
7. sincere					
8. timid					
9. alert					
10. confident					
11. disinterested					
12. happy					
13. neat					
14. quarrelsome					
15. sensitive					
16. talkative					
17. belligerent					
18. critical					
19. distractible					
20. impulsive					
21. intelligent					
22. passive					
23. restless					
24. suggestible					
25. boisterous					

THE AGGRESSIVE STUDENT					
	Not at all disturbing	Slightly disturbing	Moderately disturbing	Very disturbing	Extremely disturbing
	1	2	3	4	5
26. daydreamer					
27. emotional					
28. kind					
29. stubborn					
30. careless					
31. defiant					
32. efficient					
33. sly					
34. independent					
35. gregarious					
36. dishonest					
37. prompt					
38. lazy					
39. boastful					
40.1 cooperative					
41. profane					
42. dependable					
43. persistent					
44. enthusiastic					
45. selfish					
46. deceitful					
47. excitable					
48. eccentric					
49. moody					
50. influential					

APPENDIX B

TABLE XVI
FREQUENCY OF TRAIT SELECTIONS
FOR HYPERACTIVE

Characteristic	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Alert	27	2	4	2	1	36
Independent	11	9	4	1	1	26
Timid	0	0	0	1	0	1
Impulsive	1	30	49	21	10	111
Belligerent	0	2	10	18	13	43
Suggestible	3	11	4	4	0	22
Nervous	2	47	23	18	5	95
Sly	1	2	5	4	1	13
Distractible	1	15	38	37	22	113
Happy	17	1	2	1	0	21
Selfish	2	4	3	5	1	15
Persistent	3	13	20	10	4	50
Careless	0	7	32	31	7	77
Dishonest	1	3	3	3	4	14
Efficient	0	0	1	0	0	1
Excitable	11	30	37	22	10	110
Sincere	4	0	0	0	0	4
Neat	1	0	1	0	0	2
Industrious	10	3	0	0	0	13
Stubborn	0	4	6	10	7	27
Boastful	3	6	7	3	4	23
Restless	2	17	42	42	13	116
Emotional	2	14	20	20	9	65
Deceitful	1	3	5	4	3	16
Defiant	1	4	9	10	16	40
Talkative	6	14	34	46	24	124
Intelligent	21	2	2	2	0	27
Prompt	2	0	0	0	0	2
Dependable	2	0	1	0	0	3
Quarrelsome	2	5	19	29	11	66
Cooperative	5	2	1	0	0	8
Daydreamer	1	10	11	3	2	27
Passive	0	3	2	1	0	6
Kind	7	1	0	0	0	8
Confident	4	0	2	0	0	6
Boisterous	2	10	22	21	14	69
Imaginative	25	9	3	3	0	40
Gregarious	9	11	8	4	0	32
Disinterested	0	2	10	16	4	32
Profane	0	1	4	3	6	14
Courteous	5	1	0	0	0	6
Sensitive	8	8	5	1	1	23

TABLE XVI (continued)

Characteristic	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Enthusiastic	25	6	5	2	2	40
Disrespectful	0	3	5	9	12	29
Quick-Tempered	0	10	25	23	12	70
Critical	0	2	9	5	2	18
Lazy	0	1	2	6	2	11
Influential	0	4	3	3	3	13
Moody	3	11	19	6	1	40
Eccentric	1	7	5	0	1	14

Total Number of Responses 1782

TABLE XVII

FREQUENCY OF TRAIT SELECTIONS FOR
UNDERACHIEVING AND NON-MOTIVATED

Characteristic	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Careless	0	22	41	32	12	107
Daydreamer	1	35	37	29	13	115
Disinterested	0	11	42	50	24	127
Enthusiastic	0	0	1	1	0	2
Impulsive	0	3	1	2	1	7
Lazy	1	14	31	39	25	110
Profane	0	1	2	3	4	10
Selfish	0	4	5	1	0	10
Suggestible	0	1	0	1	1	3
Alert	0	0	0	0	0	0
Boisterous	0	3	1	7	2	13
Critical	0	4	7	2	1	14
Dishonest	0	2	3	12	7	24
Emotional	2	8	9	3	3	25
Imaginative	5	2	0	0	0	7
Kind	17	1	0	1	0	19
Persistent	0	1	1	0	1	3
Restless	2	15	37	15	3	72
Stubborn	1	3	16	16	6	42
Belligerent	0	3	4	8	10	25
Deceitful	0	2	6	11	4	23
Disrespectful	0	3	6	11	14	34
Excitable	0	3	3	4	1	11
Independent	1	1	0	0	0	2
Neat	1	1	0	0	0	2
Prompt	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sensitive	8	8	7	0	0	23
Talkative	1	6	17	21	9	54
Boastful	0	4	2	7	1	14
Confident	0	1	0	0	0	1
Defiant	1	3	6	11	12	33
Distractible	7	16	31	24	11	89
Gregarious	0	5	2	1	0	8
Intelligent	4	1	1	2	1	9
Nervous	0	13	7	6	0	26
Quarrelsome	0	6	8	14	5	33
Sincere	6	1	0	0	0	7
Timid	18	19	9	2	0	48
Sly	3	5	8	9	0	25
Cooperative	5	0	1	0	0	6

TABLE XVII (continued)

Characteristic	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Industrious	0	0	0	0	0	0
Quick-Tempered	0	3	11	9	2	25
Happy	8	0	0	0	0	8
Efficient	0	0	0	0	0	0
Passive	11	17	29	21	2	80
Dependable	1	1	0	1	0	3
Courteous	10	0	2	0	0	12
Eccentric	0	1	0	0	0	1
Influential	1	0	4	0	0	5
Moody	5	22	26	9	4	66

Total Number of Responses 1383

TABLE XVIII

FREQUENCY OF TRAIT SELECTIONS FOR
PSYCHOLOGICALLY DISTURBED

Characteristic	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Sensitive	30	24	21	8	5	88
Independent	2	3	2	1	0	8
Emotional	9	28	48	21	12	118
Confident	1	1	1	0	0	3
Alert	4	3	0	0	0	7
Talkative	0	5	18	16	15	54
Defiant	0	9	19	29	25	82
Efficient	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gregarious	2	3	2	5	2	14
Belligerent	2	6	18	26	29	81
Intelligent	15	3	0	1	0	19
Disinterested	4	8	19	21	8	60
Neat	6	0	0	1	1	8
Careless	0	11	19	17	7	54
Impulsive	1	22	27	20	9	79
Quarrelsome	0	9	34	26	22	91
Dependable	4	1	0	0	0	5
Profane	0	4	8	13	13	38
Lazy	2	5	10	4	5	26
Cooperative	2	1	1	1	0	5
Sincere	6	0	0	0	0	6
Restless	3	19	36	12	5	75
Timid	7	8	5	2	0	22
Daydreamer	2	18	18	10	2	50
Suggestible	1	8	4	5	3	21
Courteous	5	0	0	0	0	5
Happy	1	0	0	0	0	1
Distractible	3	24	37	15	11	90
Kind	7	0	0	0	0	7
Boastful	2	8	9	3	0	22
Nervous	3	30	27	9	5	74
Quick-Tempered	3	11	30	32	17	93
Enthusiastic	6	2	0	0	0	8
Prompt	3	0	0	0	0	3
Deceitful	0	4	9	19	11	43
Selfish	2	7	13	9	3	34
Imaginative	10	5	5	2	0	22
Excitable	3	21	21	15	7	67
Passive	2	6	10	6	1	25

TABLE XVIII (continued)

Characteristic	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Boisterous	1	3	11	12	8	35
Stubborn	3	9	23	20	9	64
Industrious	2	0	0	0	0	2
Dishonest	1	3	6	10	11	31
Persistent	1	3	13	1	1	19
Sly	1	4	11	12	3	31
Disrespectful	2	4	13	14	19	52
Critical	4	6	8	7	5	30
Moody	10	15	29	12	15	81
Influential	2	3	1	0	3	9
Eccentric	8	4	10	5	0	27

Total Number of Responses 1889

TABLE XIX

FREQUENCY OF TRAIT SELECTIONS
FOR AGGRESSIVE

Characteristic	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Courteous	21	1	0	0	2	24
Disrespectful	3	8	14	23	20	68
Imaginative	41	6	1	0	0	48
Industrious	45	7	5	1	0	58
Nervous	4	8	12	6	2	32
Quick-Tempered	9	9	25	18	15	76
Sincere	23	1	2	1	0	27
Timid	0	1	0	0	0	1
Alert	48	8	7	5	1	69
Confident	54	11	4	6	2	77
Disinterested	0	1	5	4	0	10
Happy	30	0	3	0	0	33
Neat	18	0	0	0	0	18
Quarrelsome	2	12	27	21	10	72
Sensitive	8	5	8	2	1	24
Talkative	11	15	41	27	5	99
Belligerent	1	4	18	29	15	67
Critical	2	8	23	13	11	57
Distractible	2	8	13	11	2	36
Impulsive	11	17	30	8	5	71
Intelligent	51	3	1	3	0	58
Passive	0	1	0	0	0	1
Restless	4	14	8	10	4	40
Suggestible	7	7	5	3	0	22
Boisterous	7	17	28	21	4	77
Daydreamer	1	3	3	2	1	10
Emotional	5	12	19	5	2	43
Kind	16	1	1	0	0	18
Stubborn	1	11	15	9	6	42
Careless	1	6	11	7	5	30
Defiant	4	9	15	11	14	53
Efficient	24	1	4	0	0	29
Sly	2	4	2	4	2	14
Independent	48	9	4	1	1	63
Gregarious	16	8	5	7	1	37
Dishonest	0	1	4	4	4	13
Prompt	28	1	1	1	0	31
Lazy	0	3	1	2	2	8
Boastful	12	16	24	8	2	62
Cooperative	31	1	1	0	1	34

TABLE XIX (continued)

Characteristic	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Profane	1	6	2	4	6	19
Dependable	27	3	0	1	0	31
Persistent	19	14	18	6	2	59
Enthusiastic	40	6	5	1	0	52
Selfish	0	8	9	4	2	23
Deceitful	0	1	4	7	2	14
Excitable	9	19	19	7	3	57
Eccentric	0	3	2	1	0	6
Moody	2	10	3	3	0	18
Influential	16	11	10	1	1	39

Total Number of Responses 1970

TABLE XX

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND TOLERANCE SCORES
FOR HYPERACTIVE

Characteristics	Means	S.D.	Tolerance
Alert	1.556	1.066	1.444
Independent	1.923	1.035	1.077
Impulsive	3.081	.922	- .081
Belligerent	3.977	.849	- .977
Suggestible	2.409	.937	.591
Nervous	2.758	.959	.242
Sly	3.154	1.026	- .154
Distractible	3.566	.977	- .566
Happy	1.381	.844	1.62
Selfish	2.933	1.181	.067
Persistent	2.98	1.01	.02
Careless	3.494	.783	- .494
Dishonest	3.429	1.294	- .429
Excitable	2.909	1.11	.091
Industrious	1.231	.421	1.77
Stubborn	3.741	1.003	- .741
Boastful	2.957	1.268	.043
Restless	3.405	.928	- .405
Emotional	3.308	1.051	- .308
Deceitful	3.313	1.158	- .313
Talkative	3.548	1.073	- .548
Intelligent	1.444	.916	1.556
Dependable	1.667	.943	1.333
Quarrelsome	3.636	.948	- .636
Cooperative	1.5	.707	1.5
Daydreamer	2.815	.944	.185
Passive	2.667	.745	.333
Kind	1.125	.331	1.875
Confident	1.667	.943	1.333
Boisterous	3.507	1.058	- .507
Imaginative	1.6	.917	1.4
Gregarious	2.219	.992	.781
Disinterested	3.688	.768	- .688
Courteous	1.166	.373	1.833
Sensitive	2.087	1.06	.913
Enthusiastic	1.75	1.157	1.25
Disrespectful	4.034	.999	-1.034
Quick-Tempered	3.529	.937	- .529
Critical	3.389	.826	- .389
Lazy	3.818	.833	- .818
Influential	3.385	1.146	- .385
Moody	2.775	.88	.225

TABLE XXI

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND TOLERANCE SCORES
FOR UNDERACHIEVING/NON-MOTIVATED

Characteristics	Means	S.D.	Tolerance
Careless	3.318	.923	- .318
Daydreamer	3.157	1.009	- .157
Disinterested	3.685	.8758	- .685
Impulsive	3.143	1.125	- .143
Lazy	3.664	.993	- .664
Selfish	2.7	.64	.3
Suggestible	3.667	1.247	- .667
Boisterous	3.615	1.003	- .615
Critical	3	.845	0.
Dishonest	4	.866	-1
Emotional	2.88	1.107	.12
Imaginative	1.286	.452	1.714
Kind	1.211	.694	1.789
Persistent	3.333	1.247	- .333
Restless	3.028	.833	- .028
Stubborn	3.548	.905	- .548
Deceitful	3.739	.845	- .739
Disrespectful	4.059	.968	-1.059
Excitable	3.273	.962	- .273
Sensitive	1.957	.806	1.043
Talkative	3.574	.955	- .574
Boastful	3.357	.972	- .357
Defiant	3.909	1.083	- .909
Distractible	3.18	1.107	- .180
Gregarious	2.5	.707	.5
Intelligent	2.444	1.5	.556
Nervous	2.730	.811	.269
Quarrelsome	3.545	.956	- .545
Sincere	1.143	.35	1.857
Timid	1.896	.847	1.104
Sly	2.92	1.01	.089
Cooperative	1.333	.745	1.666
Passive	2.825	1.046	.175
Dependable	2.333	1.247	.667
Courteous	1.333	.7454	1.667
Moody	2.77273	.98158	.227

TABLE XXII

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND TOLERANCE SCORES
FOR PSYCHOLOGICALLY DISTURBED

Characteristics	Means	S.D.	Tolerance
Sensitive	2.25	1.18	.75
Independent	2.25	.968	.75
Emotional	2.992	1.062	8.475
Confident	2.	.8165	1.
Alert	1.429	.495	1.571
Talkative	3.759	.961	- .759
Defiant	3.854	.977	- .854
Gregarious	3.143	1.301	- .143
Belligerent	3.914	1.045	- .914
Intelligent	1.316	.729	1.68
Disinterested	3.35	1.077	- .35
Neat	1.875	1.536	1.125
Careless	3.37	.95	- .37
Impulsive	3.177	1.003	- .177
Quarrelsome	3.67	.95	- .67
Profane	3.921	.984	- .921
Lazy	3.192	1.177	- .192
Cooperative	2.2	1.166	.8
Restless	2.96	.916	.04
Timid	2.091	.949	.909
Daydreamer	2.84	.924	.16
Suggestible	3.048	1.174	- .048
Distractible	3.078	1.024	- .078
Boastful	2.591	.834	.41
Nervous	2.77	.952	.23
Quick-Tempered	3.527	1.022	- .527
Enthusiastic	1.25	.433	1.75
Deceitful	3.86	.904	- .860
Selfish	3.118	1.022	- .118
Imaginative	1.955	1.021	1.045
Excitable	3.03	1.065	- .03
Passive	2.92	.977	.08
Boisterous	3.657	1.013	- .657
Stubborn	3.359	1.036	- .36
Dishonest	3.781	1.1	- .871
Persistent	2.895	.788	.105
Sly	3.387	.939	- .387
Disrespectful	3.846	1.116	- .846
Critical	3.1	1.274	- .1
Moody	3.086	1.249	- .086
Influential	2.889	1.595	.111
Eccentric	2.444	1.1	.556

TABLE XXIII

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND TOLERANCE SCORES
FOR AGGRESSIVE

Characteristics	Means	S.D.	Tolerance
Courteous	1.375	1.111	1.625
Disrespectful	3.741	1.136	- .721
Imaginative	1.167	.425	1.833
Industrious	1.345	.708	1.655
Nervous	2.813	1.073	.188
Quick-Tempered	3.276	1.242	- .276
Sincere	1.296	.761	1.7
Alert	1.594	1.026	1.41
Confident	1.584	1.061	1.416
Disinterested	3.3	.64	- .3
Happy	1.182	.575	1.818
Quarrelsome	3.347	1.002	- .347
Sensitive	2.292	1.136	.708
Talkative	3.	1.035	0
Belligerent	3.791	.907	- .791
Critical	3.404	1.057	- .404
Distractible	3.083	.982	- .083
Impulsive	2.704	1.08	.296
Intelligent	1.241	.727	1.759
Restless	2.9	1.179	.1
Suggestible	2.182	1.029	.818
Boisterous	2.974	1.032	.026
Daydreamer	2.9	1.136	.1
Emotional	2.698	.977	.302
Kind	1.167	.5	1.833
Stubborn	3.19	1.052	- .19
Careless	3.3	1.069	- .3
Defiant	3.415	1.25	- .415
Efficient	1.31	.699	1.69
Sly	3	1.309	0
Independent	1.381	.805	1.62
Gregarious	2.162	1.241	.838
Dishonest	3.846	.948	- .846
Prompt	1.194	.644	1.81
Lazy	3.375	1.218	- .375
Boastful	2.548	1.042	.452
Cooperative	1.206	.758	1.794
Profane	3.421	1.35	- .421
Dependable	1.194	.591	1.81
Persistent	2.288	1.12	.712
Enthusiastic	1.365	.735	1.635

TABLE XXIII (continued)

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND TOLERANCE SCORES
FOR AGGRESSIVE

Characteristics	Means	S.D.	Tolerance
Selfish	3	.933	0
Deceitful	3.714	.795	- .714
Excitable	2.57	1.06	.421
Eccentric	2.667	.745	.333
Moody	2.389	.891	.611
Influential	1.974	.999	1.026

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Algozzine, R. What Teachers Perceive--Children Receive. Communications Quarterly, Vol. 24, No. 3, (Summer 1976), pp. 41-47.

_____ and Curran, T. J. Teachers' Predictions of Children's School Success as a Function of Their Behavioral Tolerances. Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 72, July/August 1979, pp. 344-347.

Becker, H. S. The Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance. New York: The Free Press, 1963.

_____ (ed.). The Other Side: Perspectives on Deviance. New York: The Free Press, 1964.

Beez, W. V. Influence of Biased Psychological Reports on Teacher Behavior and Pupil Performance. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1968.

Beilen, H. Teachers' and Clinicians' Attitudes Toward the Behavior Problems of Children; A Reappraisal. Child Development, Vol. 30, 1959, pp. 9-25.

Bereiter, C., and Engelmann, S. Teaching Disadvantaged Children in the Preschool. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.

Blalock, H. M., and Blalock, A. B. Methodology in Social Research. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1968.

_____. Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1972.

Bogardus, E. S. Social Distance. Yellow Springs, Ohio: Antioch Press, 1959.

Britton, G. E. Sex Stereotyping and Career Roles. Journal of Reading, November 1973.

Brooks, R. Contrast Between Teachers; and Clinicians' Perceptions of Secondary School Children's Behavior. Educational Research, Vol. 21, No. 1, November 1978, pp. 64-65.

Brophy, J., and Good, T. Teachers' Communication of Differential Expectations for Childrens' Classroom Performance. Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 61, 1970, pp. 365-374.

_____. Teacher-Student Relationships: Causes and Consequences. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.

Broverman, I., Vogel, S. R., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., and Rosenkrantz, P. S. Sex-role Stereotypes: A Current Appraisal. Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 28, 1972, pp. 59-78.

Brown, R. Social Psychology. New York: Free Press, 1965.

Cauthen, N. R., Robinson, I., and Krauss, H. Stereotypes: A Review of the Literature: 1-26-1968. Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 84, 1971, pp. 103-125.

Cicourel, A. V., and Kitsuse, J. The Educational Decision-makers. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, Co., Inc., 1963.

_____. The Social Organization of the High School and Deviant Adolescent Careers. In E. Rubington and M. Weinberg (eds.) Deviance: The Interactionist Perspective, New York: MacMillan and Company, 1968.

_____. (et al.). Language Use and School Performance. New York: Academic Press, Inc., 1974.

Clenard, M. B. Sociology of Deviant Behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968.

Clifford, M. M. and Walster, E. The Effect of Physical Attractiveness on Teacher Expectations. Sociology of Education, Vol. 46, 1973, pp. 248-258.

Cohen, A. K. Deviance and Control. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.

Conners, C. K. A teacher Rating for Use in Drug Studies with Children. American Journal of Psychiatry, Vol. 126, 1969, pp. 884-888.

Davis, N. J. Labeling Theory in Deviance Research: A Critique and Reconsideration. Sociological Quarterly, Vol. 13, Autumn 1973, pp. 447-474.

- _____. Sociological Construction of Deviance: Perspectives and Issues in the Field. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown, Co., Pub., 1975.
- Dedrick, D. K. Deviance and Sanctioning Within Small Groups. Social Psychology, Vol. 41, No. 2, January 1978, pp. 94-105.
- Denzin, N. K. The Methodological Implications of Symbolic Interactionism for the Study of Deviance. British Journal of Sociology, Vol. 25, No. 3, February 1975, pp. 269-282.
- Dobson, J. Dare to Discipline. Wheaton, Ill.: Tyndale House, Pub., 1970.
- Douglas, J. D., (ed.). Understanding Everyday Life. Chicago: Aldine Pub. Co., 1970.
- _____. and Scott, R. (eds.). Theoretical Perspectives on Deviance. New York: Basic Books, 1972.
- Eddy, E. M. Becoming A Teacher. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College Press, 1969.
- _____. Walk The White Line: A Profile of Urban Education. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Pub. Co., 1965.
- Edwards, A. L. Four Dimensions in Political Stereotypes. Journal of Abnormal and Sociological Psychology, Vol. 35, 1940, pp. 357-366.
- Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 4th ed., R. S. Ebel (ed.), Toronto, Canada: MacMillan, 1969.
- Erikson, K. T. Notes on the Sociology of Deviance. Social Problems, Vol. 9, No. 4, Spring 1962, pp. 307-313.
- _____. Wayward Puritans. New York: John C. Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.
- Farina, A., Allen, J., and Saul, B. The Role of the Stigmatized Persons in Affecting Social Relationships. Journal of Personality, Vol. 36, 1968, pp. 169-182.
- Farrington, D. P. Self-reports of Deviant Behavior: Predictive and Stable? Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, Vol. 64, 1973, pp. 99-110.
- _____. The Effects of Public Labelling. British Journal of Criminology, Vol. 17, 1977, pp. 112-125.

- _____, Osborn, S. G., and West, D. J. The Persistence of Labelling Effects. British Journal of Criminology, Vol. 18, No. 3, July 1978, pp. 277-284.
- Fisher, S. Stigma and Deviant Careers in School. Social Problems, Vol. 20, No. 1, Summer 1972, pp. 78-83.
- Foster, J. D., Dinitz, S., and Reckless, W. C. Perceptions of Stigma Following Public Intervention for Delinquent Behavior. Social Problems, Vol. 20, 1972, pp. 202-209.
- Frazier, C. E. Theoretical Approaches to Deviance: An Evaluation. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, Pub., Co., 1976.
- Frieze, I. H., Bar-Tal, D., and Carroll, J. S. (eds). New Approaches to Social Problems. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Pub., 1979.
- Fuchs, E. Pickets at the Gates. New York: The Free Press, 1966.
- _____. Teachers Talk. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., Anchor Books, 1969.
- Gallager, J. J. The Special Education Contract for Mildly Handicapped Children. Exceptional Children, Vol. 38, March 1972, pp. 527-535.
- Gibbons, D. C., and Jones, J. F. The Study of Deviance: Perspectives and Problems. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975.
- Gibbs, J. Conceptions of Deviant Behavior: The Old and the New. Pacific Sociological Review, No. 9, Spring 1966, pp. 9-14.
- Gilbert, G. M. Stereotypes Persistence and Change Among College Students. Journal of Abnormal and Sociological Psychology, Vol. 46, 1951, pp. 245-254.
- Gillung, T. B., and Rucker, C. N. Labels and Teacher Expectations. Exceptional Children, April 1977, pp. 464-465.
- Glickman, C. D., and Wolfgang, C. H. Dealing With Student Misbehavior: An Eclectic Review. Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. XXX, No. 3, May/June 1979, pp. 7-13.
- Goffman, E. Asylums. Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1961.

- Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.
- Good, T. L., and Brophy, J. E. Behavioral Expression of Teacher Attitudes. Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 63, 1972, pp. 617-624.
- Goodlad, J. Perspectives on Theory, Research and Practice. National Society for the Study of Education, Seventy-eighth Yearbook. Bloomington, Ill.: Public School Pub., Co., 1979, pp. 391-412.
- Goudy, W. J., Bain, R. K., and Spiker, K. S. Stereotyping as a Form of Attempted Social Control. Sociology and Social Research, Vol. 61, No. 3, April 1977, pp. 350-362.
- Gove, W. (ed.). The Labelling of Deviance: Evaluating A Perspective. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1975.
- Griffiths, W. Behavioral Difficulties of Children as Perceived and Judged by Parents, Teachers, and Children Themselves. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1952.
- Guichard, C. P., and Connolly, M. A. Ethnic Group Stereotypes: A New Look at an Old Problem. Journal of Negro Education, Vol. 46, Summer 1977, pp. 344-357.
- Gurwitz, S. B., and Topol, B. Determinants of Confirming and Disconfirming Responses to Negative Social Labels. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, Vol. 14, 1978, pp. 31-42.
- Harari, H., and McDavid, J. W. Name Stereotypes and Teachers' Expectations. Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 65, 1973, pp. 222-225.
- Hargreaves, D. H., Hester, S. K., and Mellor, F. J. Deviance in Classrooms. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975.
- Hawkins, R., and Tiedeman, G. The Creation of Deviance: Interpersonal and Organizational Determinants. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Pub., Co., 1975.
- Hepburn, J. R. The Role of the Audience in Deviant Behavior and Deviant Identity. Sociology and Social Research, Vol. 59, No. 4, 1978.

- Herndon, J. The Way It Spozed To Be. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1968.
- Herr, D., Algozzine, B., and Eaves, R. Modification of Biases Held by Teacher Trainees Toward the Disturb- ingness of Behaviors. Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 69, 1976, pp. 261-264.
- Herson, P. F. Biasing Effects of Diagnostic Labels and Sex of Pupil on Teachers' Views of Pupils' Mental Health. Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 66, No. 1, 1974, pp. 117-122.
- Huff, C. R., and Scott, J. E. Deviance and Cognitive Consistency: Patterns in Public Attitudes Toward Deviance. Sociology and Social Research, Vol. 50, No. 4, 1978, pp. 330-343.
- Illich, I. Deschooling Society. New York: Harper and Row, Inc., 1971.
- Jackson, P. Life in Classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1968.
- _____, Silberman, M., and Wolfson, B. Signs of Personal Involvement in Teachers' Descriptions of Their Students. Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 60, 1969, pp. 22-27.
- Jenkins, R. L. Delinquency as Failure and Delinquency as Attainment, In P. T. Hountras (ed.) Mental Hygiene. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, Pub., Co., 1961.
- Jensen, G. F. Delinquency and Adolescent Self-Conceptions: A Study of the Personal Relevance of Infraction. Social Problems, Vol. 20, No. 1, Summer 1972, pp. 84-102.
- Karlins, M., Coffman, T. L., and Walters, G. On the Fading of Social Stereotypes: Studies in Three Generations of College Students. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. Vol. 13, 1969, pp. 1-16.
- Katz, D., and Braly, K. W. Racial Stereotypes of 100 College Students. Journal of Abnormal and Sociological Psychology, Vol. 28, 1933, pp. 280-290.
- Kedar-Voivodas, Gita and Tannenbaum, A. J. Teachers' Attitudes Toward Young Deviant Children. Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 71, No. 6, 1979, pp. 800-808.

- Kelly, D. H. Labeling and the Consequences of Wearing a Delinquent Label in a School Setting. Education, Vol. 97, Summer 1977, pp. 371-380.
- _____. The Role of Teachers' Nominations in the Perpetuation of Deviant Adolescent Careers. Education, Vol. 96, No. 3, Spring 1976, pp. 209-217.
- Kelly, T. J., Bullock, L. M., and Dykes, M. D. Behavioral Disorders: Teacher Perceptions. Exceptional Children, Vol. 43, 1977, pp. 316-318.
- Kitsuse, J. D. Societal Reaction to Deviant Behavior: Problems of Theory and Method. Social Problems, Vol. 9, Winter 1962, pp. 247-256.
- _____. and Scheff, T. The Societal Reaction to Deviance: Ascriptive Elements in the Psychiatric Screening of Mental Patients in a Midwestern State. Social Problems, Vol. 11, Spring 1964, pp. 401-413.
- Leacock, E. Teaching and Learning in City Schools. New York: Basic Books, 1969.
- Lemert, E. M. Social Pathology: A Systematic Approach to the Theory of Sociopathic Behavior. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1951.
- _____. Human Deviance, Social Problems and Social Control. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.
- Lepper, M. R., and Dafoe, J. L. Incentives, Constraints, and Motivation in the Classroom, in New Approaches to Social Problems, ed: I. H. Freeze, D. Bar-Tal, and J. S. Carroll. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Pub., 1979.
- Lippmann, W. Public Opinion. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1922.
- Lofland, J. Deviance and Identity. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.
- Mackie, M. Arriving at 'Truth' by Definition: The Case of Stereotype Inaccuracy. Social Problems, Vol. 20, No. 4, Spring 1973, pp. 431-446.
- Maddock, J. Academic Stratification and the Sustaining of Identity Types, Paper presented at the Conference of the Sociological Association of Australia and New Zealand, LaTrolie University, Melbourne, August 1976.

- Mazer, G. Effects of Social-Class Stereotyping on Teacher Expectation. Psychology in the Schools, Vol. 8, 1971, pp. 373-378.
- McPherson, G. H. Small Town Teacher. Cambridge Massachusetts Harvard University Press, 1972.
- Merton, R. The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy. Social Theory and Social Structure, Rev. ed., Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1957, pp. 421-439.
- Metz, M. H. Classrooms and Corridors: The Crisis of Authority in Desegregated Secondary Schools. Berkely: University of California Press, 1978.
- Miller, C. E., and Anderson, P. D. Group Decision Rules and the Rejection of Deviates. Social Psychology Quarterly, Vol. 42, No. 4, December 1979, pp. 354-363.
- Miller, L. C. Dimensions of Psychopathology in Middle Childhood. Psychological Reports, Vol. 21, 1967, pp. 897-903.
- Moore, G. A. Realities in the Urban Classroom: Observations in Elementary Schools. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1967.
- Mutimer, D. D., and Rosemier, R. A. Behavior Problems of Children as Viewed by Teachers and the Children Themselves. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1967, pp. 583-587.
- National Society for the Study of Education, pt. 1, "Social Deviancy Among Youth", Sixty-fifth Yearbook, ed. by W. W. Wattenberg. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966.
- National Society for the Study of Education, pt. 2, Classroom Management, Seventy-eighth Yearbook, ed. D. L. Duke. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.
- Newmark, J. Statistics and Probability in Modern Life, 2nd ed., New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1977.
- Norland, L., Hepburn, J. R., and Monette, D. The Effects of Labeling and Consistent Differentiation on the Construction of Positive Deviance. Sociology and Social Research, Vol. 61, No. 1, October 1976, pp. 83-95.

- Ojemann, R. H. Behavior Problems. Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 4th ed. Toronto, Canada: MacMillan, 1969, pp. 98-105.
- Oppenheim, A. N. Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement. New York: Basic Books, 1966.
- Orcutt, J. D. Societal Reaction and Response to Deviation in Small Groups. Social Forces, Vol. 2, December 1973, pp. 259-267.
- Park, R. E., and Burgess, E. W. Introduction to the Science of Sociology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1921.
- Patterson, G. R. An Empirical Approach to the Classification of Disturbed Children. Journal of Clinical Psychology, Vol. XX, No. 3, July 1964, pp. 326-337.
- Peterson, D. R., Quay, H. D., and Tiffany, T. L. Personality Factors Related to Juvenile Delinquency. Child Development, Vol. 32, 1961, pp. 355-372.
- Phi Delta Kappan. Violence and Discipline Problems in the Schools: A Symposium, Vol. 59, January, 1978.
- _____. Fourth Annual Gallup Poll of Public Attitudes Toward Education, Vol. 54, September, 1972, pp. 36-46.
- _____. Sixth Annual Gallup Poll of Public Attitudes Toward Education, Vol. 56, September 1974, pp. 20-32.
- _____. What the People Think About Their Schools: Gallup's Findings: Eighth Annual Poll, Vol. 59, September 1977, pp. 33-48.
- Quay, H. C. Personality Dimensions in Delinquent Males as Inferred from the Factor Analysis of Behavior Ratings. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 1, 1964, pp. 33-37.
- _____, and Quay, L. C. Behavior Problems in Early Adolescence, Child Development, Vol. 36, 1965, pp. 215-220.
- _____, and Peterson, D. R. Manual for the Behavior Problem Checklist. Unpublished manuscript, 1975.
- _____. Behavior Disorders in the Classroom. Journal of Research and Development in Education, Vol. II, No. 2, 1978, pp. 8-17.

- Rice, S. A., Stereotypes; A Source of Error in Judging Human Character. Journal of Personality Research, Vol. 5, 1926, pp. 267-276.
- Rist, R. C., Haggerty, L. J., and Gibbons, D. C., Public Perceptions of Sexual "Deviance": A Preliminary Report. Paper presented at the 1973 Pacific Sociological Association Meeting, 1973.
- Roberts, J. I., Scene of the Battle: Group Behavior in Urban Classrooms. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1970.
- Roberts, J. I. and Baird, J. T., Behavior Patterns in School: United States. (Vital and Health Statistics, Series II), Rockville, Md.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Division of Health Examination Statistics, February 1972.
- Rothbart, M., Fulero, S., Jensen, C., Howard, J., and Birrell, P., From Individual to Group Impressions: Availability Heuristics in Stereotype Formation. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, Vol. 14, 1978, pp. 237-255.
- Rubin, R. A. and Balow, B., Prevalence of Teacher Identified Behavior Problems: A Longitudinal Study. Exceptional Children, October 1978, pp. 102-111.
- Rubington, E., and Weinberg, M., Deviance: The Interactionist Perspective. New York: Macmillan Co., 1968.
- Saario, T. N., Jacklin, C. N., and Title, C. K., Sex and Role Stereotyping in the Public Schools. Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 43, Summer 1973, pp. 386-415.
- Santrock, J. W. and Tracy, R. L., Effects of Children's Family Structure Status on the Development of Stereotypes by Teachers. Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 70, No. 5, 1978, pp. 754-757.
- Schacter, S., Deviation, Rejection and Communication. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, Vol. 46, 1951, pp. 190-208.
- Scheff, T. J., Being Mentally Ill: A Sociological Theory. Chicago: Aldine Press, 1966.
- _____, Negotiating Reality: Notes on Power in the Assessment of Responsibility. Social Problems, Vol. 16, 1968, pp. 3-19.

- Schoenfeld, N., An Experimental Study of Some Problems Relating to Stereotypes. Archives of Psychology, Vol. 38, No. 270, June 1942, pp. 6-57.
- Schrupp, M. H., and Gjerde, C. M., Teacher Growth in Attitudes Toward Behavior Problems of Children. Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 44, 1953, pp. 203-214.
- Schur, E., Reactions to Deviance. A Critical Assessment. American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 75, 1969, pp. 309-322.
- Schur, E. Labeling Deviant Behavior: Its Sociological Implications. New York: Harper & Row Pub., 1971.
- Scott, R. A., The Making of Blind Men. New York: Russell Sage Co., 1969.
- _____, and Douglas, J. D., ed., Theoretical Perspectives On Deviance. New York: Basic Books, 1972.
- Sharp, R. and Green, A., Education and Social Control: A Study in Progressive Primary Education. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975.
- Sherif, M. A., A Study of Some Social Factors in Perception. Archives of Psychology, Vol. 27, No. 187, 1935.
- Shibutani, R., Society and Personality: An Interactionist Approach to Social Psychology. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall Pub. Co., 1961.
- Silberman, C. A., Crisis in the Classroom. New York: Random House, 1970.
- Silberman, M., Behavioral Expression of Teachers' Attitudes Toward Elementary School Students. Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 60, 1969, pp. 402-407.
- Simmons, J. L., Deviants. Berkeley: Glendessary Pub. Co., 1969.
- _____. Public Stereotypes of Deviants. Social Problems, Vol. 13, 1965, pp. 223-232.
- Smith, B. O., Discipline. Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 4th ed., Toronto, Canada: Macmillan Co., 1969, pp. 292-297.

- Smith, L. M. and Geoffrey, W., The Complexities of an Urban Classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1968.
- Sperry, L., Effects of Expectations, Social Class, and Experience on In-Service Teacher Behavior in Small Groups. Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 59, 1974, pp. 244-246.
- Spitzer, S., Labeling the Deviant Act: Toward a General Theory of Deviant Behavior. Unpublished paper presented at the national convention of the American Sociological Association, New Orleans, 1972.
- Spivack, G., Swift, M., and Prewitt, J., Syndromes of Disturbed Classroom Behavior: A Behavioral Diagnostic System for Elementary School. Journal of Special Education, Vol. 5, No. 3., February 1971, pp. 269-292.
- Stagner, R., Facist Attitudes: Their Determining Conditions. Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 7, 1936, pp. 438-454.
- Staats, G. R., Images of Deviants: Stereotypes and Their Importance for Labeling Deviant Behavior. Washington, D. C.: University Press of America, 1978.
- Stouffer, Jr., G. A., Behavior Problems of Children as Viewed by Teachers and Mental Hygienists. Mental Hygiene, Vol. 36, 1952, pp. 271-285.
- Tannenbaum, F., Crime and the Community. New York: Columbia University Press, 1938.
- Tittle, C. R., Labelling and Crime: An Empirical Evaluation. In The Labelling of Deviance: Evaluating a Perspective, ed. by W. Gove. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1975, pp. 157-179.
- Toler, A., Scarpetti, W. and Lane, P., Teachers' Attitudes Toward Behavior. Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 58, No. 3, 1967, pp. 175-180.
- Vinacke, W. E., Explorations in the Dynamic Processes of Stereotyping. Journal of Social Psychologists, Vol. 43, 1956, pp. 105-132.
- Waller, W. The Sociology of Teaching. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1932.

Wells, L. E., Theories of Deviance and the Self-Concept. Social Psychology, Vol. 41, No. 3, September 1978, pp. 189-204.

Werthman, C., Delinquents in Schools: A Test for the Legitimacy of Authority. Berkeley Journal of Sociology, Vol. 8, 1968, pp. 39-60.

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

Wieder, D. L., On Meaning by Rule. In Understanding Everyday Life, ed. by J. D. Douglas. Chicago: Aldine Pub. Co., 1970.

Wolfgang, C. H. and Glickman, C. D., Solving Discipline Problems: Strategies for Classroom Teachers. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc., 1980.