Indiscipline and Safety in Public Schools: Teachers and Principals at Odds

Athanase Gahungu
Chicago State University

To cite this article:

Indiscipline and Safety in Public Schools: Teachers and Principals at Odds

Athanase Gahungu

Article Info	Abstract
	This report summarizes analyses of survey responses of approximately 101,310 teachers and principals who, between 1999-00 and 2011-12, answered the School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS) and the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), two national surveys. Their responses to most recurrent discipline incidents and to most serious problems facing schools were cross-referenced with their responses to safety initiatives, programs, and other practices that were implemented to curb indiscipline and crime. The findings reflect efforts underway nationwide to transition from zero tolerance policies to non-retributive, non-exclusionary discipline practices. For teachers, indiscipline incidents and major problems facing schools continue plaguing schools, and increasingly put their careers at risk. By contrast, compliance requirements of the transition period seem to have pushed principals to under-report the incidents and problems. It appears that a genuine dialogue is needed between administrators and teachers to agree on the overarching implications of indiscipline and safety in schools. Non-retributive and non-exclusionary discipline policies can only be effectively implemented when teachers and administrators are equally committed to their success, and when parents and students are provided opportunities to support initiatives.

Introduction

In his concurring opinion in the landmark *New Jersey vs. T.L.O.* case of 1985, Justice Franklin Powell articulated the rationale for establishing discipline and maintaining order in schools. He wrote,

> Without first establishing discipline and maintaining order, teachers cannot begin to educate their students. And apart from education, the school has the obligation to protect pupils from mistreatment by other children, and also to protect teachers themselves from violence by the few students whose conduct in recent years has prompted national concern. For me, it would be unreasonable and at odds with history to argue that the full panoply of constitutional rules applies with the same force and effect in the schoolhouse as it does in the enforcement of criminal laws. (Alexander & Alexander, 2005, p. 414, citing *New Jersey vs. T.L.O.*, 1985)

This opinion was written during the same period as the U.S. governors, at their 1989 Charlottesville Education Summit, made recommendations that resulted in the National Education Goals that all public schools would achieve by the year 2000 (Foxwell, 1993). The 7th of the eight goals boldly states that by the year 2000, "all schools in America will be free of drugs and violence and the unauthorized presence of firearms and alcohol and offer a disciplined environment that is conducive to learning" (National Education Goals Panel, 1999, p. 9).

To support the schools in implementing this lofty goal, the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act of 1994 was passed, with its overarching zero tolerance policies (Soule & Sharp, 1998). While these zero-tolerance policies had good intentions, researchers (e.g., Browne-Dianis, 2011; Mongan & Walker, 2012; Skiba, 2014) argued that they were not empirically supported; they were not implemented consistently or applied fairly. Kajs (2006) further challenged that decisions based on these one-size-fits-all policies could have seriously harmful consequences, particularly for first offenders, consequences "that would impair their academic progress, reputation, career opportunities, and emotional development especially with regard to trust in the educational system" (p. 25). Similarly, Arum and Ford (2012) questioned whether those disciplinary policies and techniques reinforced the moral authority of educators or have the support of all the stakeholders including students and parents. The authors stated,

> Addressing the high rates of discipline problems in U.S. schools will certainly require a shift to disciplinary techniques (both formal and informal) that have the broad support of the teachers, parents, and students themselves. For discipline to be effective, students and parents must perceive it as legitimate. (p. 60)

Legitimacy of school discipline practices is the issue. Black (2016) argues that out of millions of students who are suspended each year, less than 10% are suspended for serious offenses or misbehaviors. To make matters worse, Black contends the disciplinary environment in the lowest achieving schools is dysfunctional. He advocates, "in these schools, discipline reform—not just academic reform—is a necessary intervention to ensure adequate and equal educational opportunities" (pp. 73-74). In the same fashion, the overuse of in-school and out-of-school suspension programs rely on putting the student in an isolated and solitary environment which negatively impacts the student's academic achievement. Students in those in-suspension programs miss so much educational opportunity that they cannot catch up once they re-join the class (Allman & Slate, 2011).

As research shows (e.g., Robers, Zhang, Truman, & Snyder, 2012; Kaufman et al, 1998; Neiman & Hill, 2011), attitudes of students, teachers, and school administrators toward some indicators of school discipline and safety have improved between 1993/1999 and 2009. For instance, the percentage of students reporting non-fatal student victimization, being involved in physical fights, or using alcohol on school property, declined. However, the same authors noted that problems in other key indicators have either fluctuated or increased, at least in the eyes of some stakeholders. Notably, during that period, there was no significant change in the percentage of teachers reporting physical attacks by students, schools reporting discipline incidents, or the percentage of students who reported being threatened or injured with a weapon. Similarly, in an earlier analysis of the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) data, MacNeil and Prater (1999) found differences in perception of discipline seriousness between principals and teachers. While both groups of educators rated *possession of weapons* as a *minor* or *no problem*, it was principals, not teachers, who minimized the seriousness of such problems as *verbal abuse*, *possession of weapons*, *drug abuse*, *robbery/theft* and *cutting class*.

Providing an appropriate interpretation of the drastic shifts in the American stakeholders' (principals, teachers, parents) perceptions of the biggest problems facing schools is not easy. According to Phi Delta Kappa archived polls (http://www.pdkintl.org/poll/past-polls.htm), from 1969 to 1985, Americans perceived *lack of discipline/control* in schools as the number one problem, selected by 23% of survey respondents, on average. Between 1986 and 1992, *use of drugs/dope* became the biggest concern for the Americans, which was selected by 29% of respondents on average. Then, from 2000 to 2014, the focus drastically shifted toward *lack of finance*. On average, 26% of survey respondents selected *lack of financial support/funding/money as the number one problem*. Two years later, in 2012, that perception became so paramount that 43% of public school parents identified *lack of financial support* as the number one problem, against 3% for *lack of discipline*, 2% for *use of drugs*, and 5% for *fighting/violence/gang activities* in schools.

The 2012 Phi Delta Kappa poll results (Bushaw & Lopez, 2012) raise serious questions about what stakeholders consider problems facing schools. If, indeed, only 3% of parents perceive lack of discipline as a problem, where will support for discipline policies come from? It appears necessary to investigate whether other stakeholders—teachers and principals—were equally influenced by the same factors that made parents turn their attention away from discipline problems. Researchers such as Glazer (1994) have theorized that these differences and shifts in perceptions of what constitutes social problems reflect prevailing conditions.

As schools and school districts adopt restorative justice practices, Calhoun (2013) recommends changing the way institutions address discipline. For Calhoun, schools have been managing indiscipline from a retributive, zero tolerance framework, which conflicts with an understanding of wrongdoing as harm to relationships. In the retributive framework, schools are concerned with what rules have been broken, who broke them, and what the consequence the perpetrator deserves. By contrast, in restorative justice, the obligation of the school community is to establish who has been harmed, what his or her needs are, and whose responsibility it is to repair the relationship between the two parties. As Lawrence and Hinds (2016) argue, "through restorative justice, school communities learn that alternate accountability measures result in the reduction or elimination of suspensions and an increase in student engagement and belongingness" (p. 21).

The main obstacle to truly understanding the extent of the harm lies in the fact that teachers do not share with the administration and the community the daily discipline problems they face in their relationships with students. According to researchers (e.g., Silva, Negreiros, &Albano, 2017), teachers tend to keep student indiscipline incidents they face to themselves. Only 42% of teachers talk about student-caused incidents to the students, 24% to parents, and as few as 3% to the administration. However, in surveys, they openly vent that

indiscipline, in particular, student tardiness and class cutting, is worsening, and continues interfering with their teaching (Musu-Gillette, Zhang, Wang, Zhang, & Oudekerk, 2017). Expert teachers, in particular, may not disclose that they face student misbehaviors for pedagogical reasons (Wolff, Jarodzka, & Boshuizen, 2017). In their research on differences between novice and expert teachers, these authors contend that expert teachers do not just tell what they see as problems. Instead, expert teachers interpret "the relevance of classroom interactions between students as well as those between the teacher and students" (p. 305).

The discrepancy between teachers and principals in reporting discipline incidents could be explained by both this lack of communication and a limited understanding of the paradigm shift that must be operated for less retributive forms of discipline management to work. As Shaw (2007) challenged,

> The application of restorative practices may threaten some teachers with a perceived loss of power and control, particularly within frameworks that involve compliance with school rules regulated by punishment regimes and conferred power of teachers. However, the experience of participants suggested that punishments based on a high control, low support paradigm are less effective in changing negative behavior. (p. 131)

The application of restorative justice approaches, if done inadequately, could challenge the balance of control in a school, which would jeopardize school health, culture and climate. For the authors, "if the entire discipline structure has been historically based on an increasing level of punitive consequences that eventually lead to the student leaving the school community, it would be a huge shift for that particular school" (Ryan & Ruddy, 2015, p. 259).

The Present Study

At issue, in this report, is that existence or lack of key stakeholders' consensus about the seriousness of discipline problems can dictate the extent to which schools and districts implement initiatives to create harmonious school climates. The issue is also whether all safety practices, initiatives, and programs in which schools invest are effective. In this context, this study examined in the Schools and Staffing Surveys (SASS 2003-05 and 2011-12) and the School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS 1999-00 and 2009-10) discipline problems that teachers and principals perceive to be recurrent or pervasive, the effectiveness of safety practices, instructional support programs and initiatives that schools implement to enhance safety and curb crime in schools, and the consequences of student indiscipline on teacher-student relationships. This report explored the following questions:

1. Are there differences between teachers and principals in their assessment of discipline incidents and problems facing schools, and if there are, what are their causes?
2. What is the association between school problems and educators' perceived influence and control?
3. What is the association between school safety practices and school problems?
4. What are the consequences of indiscipline on teacher morale and their relationships with students?

Approximately 101,310 teachers and principals answered the SSOCS and SASS surveys in 1999-2000, 2003-2004, 2009-2010, and 2011-2012. By the numbers, principals made up 20.3% of survey participants, while teachers made up 79.7%. Principals participated in both SSOCS and SASS, while teachers participated in SASS only. Table 1 shows the breakdown of participants by questionnaire and year.

Table 1. Survey participants by survey questionnaire and year

Variables	Questionnaire	N	Percent
	SSOCS 1999-00	2,270	2.24
	SSOCS 2009-10	2,650	2.62
Principals	SASS 2003-04	8,140	8.03
	SASS 2011-12	7,510	7.41
	Total Principals	20,570	20.30
	SASS 2003-04	43,240	42.68
Teachers	SASS 2011-12	37,500	37.02
	Total Teachers	80,740	79.70
Total		101,310	100.0

The SASS and SSOCS survey questionnaires are very extensive. For this report, the researcher focused analyses on items relating to recurrent discipline incidents and serious problems facing schools. Recurrent discipline problems included *student bullying*, *acts of non-verbal student disrespect for teachers*, *student verbal abuse of teachers*, *physical conflicts among students*, *robbery or theft*, and *illegal drugs*. Serious problems included *students coming to school unprepared to learn*, *poverty*, *student apathy*, *lack of parental involvement*, *student absenteeism*, *student tardiness*, and *class cutting*. Response frequencies for those items were further collapsed by the respondents' (1) perceived influence over policies and control over aspects of the curriculum, (2) assessment of safety practices, initiatives, and programs implemented in their schools and (3) perceived impact of school misbehavior and crime on teachers' careers.

As school districts scramble to adopt alternatives to current exclusionary discipline practices, this examination may also help in scrutinizing today's social problems, whether improved or worsened, and assessing skills and resources required to implement fair and durable school safety. The exploration of instructional support services and initiatives is particularly timely as schools and school districts around the nation are transitioning from exclusionary discipline policies to more creative practices that keep students in the educational setting (Ryan & Ruddy, 2015).

Results

Differences Between Teachers and Principals in their Assessment of Most Recurrent Discipline Incidents and Pervasive Problems Facing Schools

There were two sets of questions relating to school problems. One set of questions asked teachers and principals to identify the most recurrent discipline incidents (happen daily, at least once a week, at least once a month, on occasion, never), and another set asked them about problems they perceived to be serious (serious, moderate, minor, not a problem). First, in all five surveys, over the years—SSOCS 1999-00 Principal, SSOCS 2009-10 Principal, SASS 2003-04 Teacher, SASS 2003-04 Principal, SASS 201-12 Principal, respondents were asked to identify types of problems that occurred in their schools *daily*, *at least once a week*, *at least once a month*, *on occasion*, or *never*.

Most Recurrent Discipline Incidents

By the numbers, in both SSOCS administrations—1999-2000 and SSOCS 2009-2010—the principals identified that student bullying and student acts of disrespect were the most recurrent incidents. In 1990-2000, 11.9% of principals reported that student bullying happened daily, while 20.7% reported that it happened at least once a week. Acts of student disrespect happened daily for 8.8% of principals and at least once a week for 17.6% of principals. Ten years later, in slightly lower numbers, student bullying happened daily for 7.9% of principals and at least once a week for 19.6% of respondents. Noteworthy is that only 1.5% and 2.5% of principals reported that student bullying never happened in their schools in 1999-2000 and 2009-2010, respectively. In a slightly higher proportion, 4.8% of principals reported that acts of student disrespect for teachers never happened in their schools in 1990-2000, and that percentage increased to 23.4% 10 years later.

In the SASS survey, principals and teachers overwhelmingly differed in their perceptions of incidents that happened daily, while almost agreeing on incidents that never happened. For example, for teachers in 2003-2004, acts of non-verbal student disrespect for teachers were the most recurrent incidents, which happened daily for 22.2% of respondents and at least once a week for 17.4%. Similarly, high frequencies of teachers reported that student bullying (17.4%), student verbal abuse of teachers (12.4%), and physical conflicts among students (9.7%), were incidents that happened daily. By contrast, only 4.4% of principals reported that acts on non-verbal student disrespect for teachers happened daily in 2003-2004, and 3.3% in 2011-2012. That is about a ratio of 22 teachers to 4 principals identifying the same acts of non-verbal student disrespect for teachers. Even student bullying, while still being the most recurrent incident for principals, was only reported by 4.8% and 4.3% in 2003-2004 and 2011-2012, respectively, as compared to 17.4% of teachers in 2003-04. Furthermore, a large proportion of principals in the SASS sample—19.7% in 2003-04 and 23.7% in 2011-12—reported that acts of student verbal abuse of teachers *never* happened. These proportions are almost double those of teachers. In fact, only 13.2% of teachers reported that such acts never happened. This denial on part of principals of *acts of student verbal abuse of teachers* is in line with their reporting that such acts happened daily—1.7% in 2003-04 and 1.5% in 2011-12. These trivial proportions pale the 12.4% of teachers who reported that acts of student verbal abuse of teachers occurred daily.

In summary, the teachers and principals seem to disagree on which discipline incident is the most recurrent. A far larger percentage of teachers than principals reported that acts of non-verbal student disrespect for teachers, student bullying, acts of student verbal abuse of teachers, and physical conflicts among students were the top categories of recurrent discipline incidents. By collapsing percentages of principals and teachers who reported that those incidents happened daily or at least once a week, the same sharp differences are noted. Thus, while about 40% of teachers reported that acts of non-verbal student disrespect for teachers happened daily or at least once a week, only 16.2% of principals in 2003-04 and 14.2% in 2011-12 made the same observation. The same applies to student verbal abuse of teachers. For teachers in 2003-04, verbal abuse of teachers happened daily or at least once a week for 27.5% of them, but only 8.5% of principals reported the incidents in 2003-04, and 6.8% of principals in 2011-12(Table 2).

Table 2. Differences between teacher and principals in their reporting of recurrent discipline incidents (SASS: 03-04 Teacher, N=43240; 03-04 Principal, N = 8140)

	Happens Daily			Never Happens		
	03-04T	03-04P	Difference	03-04T	03-04P	Difference
Acts of student disrespect for teachers, not verbal abuse	22.2%	4.4%	-17.80%	5.6%	8.5%	+2.9%
Student bullying	17.4%	4.8%	-12.60%	3.7%	3.1%	-0.6%
Physical conflicts among students	9.7%	3.3%	-6.40%	4.2%	2.9%	-1.3%
Student verbal abuse of teachers	12.4%	1.7%	-10.70%	13.2%	19.7%	+6.5%
Student gang activities	2.8%	0.2%	-2.60%	60.2%	73.7%	+13.5%
Student use of illegal drugs	7.5%	0.6%	-6.90%	34.4%	47.9%	+13.5%
Widespread disorder in classrooms	4.9%	0.4%	-4.50%	35.5%	65.7%	+30.2%
Physical abuse of teachers	0.5%	-	-0.5	68.2%	77.8%	+9.6%
Robbery or theft	3.8%	0.2%	-3.60%	9.0%	11.4%	+2.4%
Student possession of weapons	0.6%	-	-0.6%	49.7%	52.8%	+3.1%
Student racial/ethnic tensions	2.7%	0.1%	-2.60%	39.2%	50.2%	+11.0%
Student use of alcohol	5.4%	0.2%	-5.20%	38.0%	52.2%	+14.2%
Vandalism	3.7%	0.4%	-3.30%	12.5%	11.7%	-0.80%

03-04T = SASS 03-04 Teacher; 03-04P = SASS 03-04 Principal

When using collapsed frequencies, further sharp differences between teachers and principals seemed to be in the assessment of which problems either *never happened* or *happened on occasion*. For teachers in 2003-04, fewer than 50% reported that acts of student disrespect for teachers *never happened* or *happened on occasion*, while that percentage rose to 70.3% for principals in 2003-2004, and 71.4% in 2011-12. As for acts of student verbal abuse of teachers, 57.5% of teachers reported that such acts never happened or happened on occasion, which does not compare with 77.4% of principals in 2003-04, and 81.5% of principals in 2011-12. The issue of teachers perceiving a far higher occurrence of the same incidents than principals is explored in the conclusions section.

Most Pervasive Problems

A second set of questions in SASS 2003-2004 Principal, SASS 2003-2004 Teacher, and SASS 2011-12 Principal, asked respondents to assess the extent of selected problems in their schools by indicating whether they were *serious problem*, *moderate problem*, *minor problem*, or *not a problem* (Table 3). Overall, the seven most pervasive problems, according to both groups, were (1) students come to school unprepared to learn, (2) poverty, (3) lack of parental involvement, (4) student apathy, (5) student absenteeism, (6) student tardiness, and (7) class cutting. A problem such as *students come to school unprepared to learn* was assessed by respondents as being so pervasive that 55.8% of principals in SASS 2003-2004, 65.8% of teachers in SASS 2003-2004, and 65.4% of teachers in SASS 2011-12, reported the problem as either serious or moderate. The ranking of principals slightly differed from that of teachers, even though *students come to school unprepared to learn* was still reported as either serious or moderate. *Poverty* was the most serious problem for 2003-04 principals (20.1%), followed by *students come to school unprepared to learn* (14.6%) and *lack of parental involvement* (12.8%).

As Table 3 shows, there are sharp differences between teachers and principals regarding their assessment of serious problems facing schools. For example, while 28.4% of teachers in SASS 2003-04 reported that *students came to school unprepared to learn* was a serious problem, only 14.6% of principals reported it as a serious problem. The same applies to *student apathy*, which was identified as a serious problem by 21.3% of teachers (vs. 7.5% of principals), *lack of parental involvement* (22.6% teachers vs. 12.8% principals), *student absenteeism* (16.9% teachers vs. 7.4% principals), *student tardiness* (15.7% teachers vs. 9.7% principals), and *student class cutting* (7.9% teachers vs. 2.5% principals). Differences between the teachers themselves in SASS 2003-04 SASS and SASS 2011-12 were not as pronounced.

Table 3. Differences among sass respondents regarding serious problems, 2003-2012 (SASS 03-04 Teacher, N=43240; SASS 11-12 Teacher, N=37500; SASS 03-04 Principal, N=8140)

	03-04T	03-04P	Difference	03-04T	11-12T	Difference
Students come to school unprepared to learn	28.40%	14.60%	-13.80%	28.40%	30.50%	+2.10%
Poverty	20.50%	20.10%	-0.40%	20.50%	27.00%	+6.50%
Student apathy	21.30%	7.50%	-13.80%	21.30%	24.10%	+2.80%
Lack of parental involvement	22.60%	12.80%	-9.80%	22.60%	23.80%	+1.20%
Student absenteeism	16.90%	7.40%	-9.50%	16.90%	17.00%	+0.10%
Student tardiness	15.70%	9.70%	-6.00%	15.70%	12.30%	-3.40%
Students class cutting	7.90%	2.50%	-5.40%	7.90%	6.40%	-1.50%
Poor student health	4.30%	2.30%	-2.00%	4.30%	4.60%	+0.30%
Students dropping out	5.80%	2.80%	-3.00%	5.80%	4.50%	-1.30%
Teacher absenteeism	1.20%	1.40%	+0.20%	1.20%	1.60%	+0.40%
Student pregnancy	4.00%	1.70%	-2.30%	4.00%	NA	-

NA = Not Asked; 03-04T = SASS 03-04 Teacher; 03-04P = SASS 03-04 Principal; 11-12T = SASS 11-12 Teacher

Compared to SASS 2003-04, there was a slight increase in percentages of 2011-12 teachers identifying problems as serious overall. The only pronounced difference was for the problem of *poverty*, which 6.5% more 2011-12 teachers than 2003-04 teachers identified as serious. It was also found that a lower percentage of 2011-12 teachers than 2003-04 teachers identified *student tardiness* as serious (12.3% vs. 15.7%).

Association between School Problems and Perceived Influence and Control of Teachers and Principals

In this section, associations that exist between school problems and respondents' perceived influence over key school policies and their control over selected areas of planning and teaching are summarized. The analyses explored whether, for a teacher or a principal, having such control or influence could have some association with their reporting of problems as serious or frequent. There is an assumption that the lowest percentages of respondents claiming to have a given influence or control for a serious or frequent problem, would imply that their school was less negatively impacted by that category of incidents or serious problem.

Impact of Teachers' and Principals' Influence in Curbing Discipline Problems

In SASS 2003-04 and 2011-12, teachers were asked to assess how much influence they had over seven key school policies—(1) setting performance standards for students, (2) establishing curriculum, (3) determining the content of in-service professional development programs, (4) evaluating teachers, (5) hiring new full-time teachers, (6) setting discipline policy, and (7) deciding how the school budget will be spent. The frequencies were cross-referenced with problems that happened *daily* and *weekly* in their schools, on one hand, and problems perceived as *serious*, on the other hand.

For the SASS 2003-04 Teacher survey, influence over *deciding how school budget will be spent* was associated with lowest rates of reports of non-verbal disrespect for teachers, student verbal abuse of teachers, and use of illegal drugs and alcohol. Influence over *evaluating teachers* was associated with lowest rates of reporting student bullying. Schools where teachers had influence over *setting discipline policy* had the lowest percentages of teachers reporting student verbal abuse of teachers, illegal drugs, and use of alcohol as the most recurrent incidents. It was teachers who had influence over *setting performance standards for students* who had the lowest rate of those reporting in physical conflicts among students. The least effective areas of influence appeared to be in *establishing curriculum, determining content of in-service professional development (PD)*

programs, and *hiring new full-time teachers*. It was found that among teachers who reported having *a great deal* of influence in those areas were also the highest percentages of the same teachers reporting most recurrent discipline incidents.

Associations were next established between school policies over which teachers had *a great deal* of influence and the extent of school problems. It was found that schools where teachers had influence over *hiring new full-time teachers* and *evaluating teachers* were proportionally the fewest in reporting *students come to school unprepared to learn* as a serious problem. The lowest percentage of teachers reporting lack of parental involvement as a serious problem was among teachers who had influence over *hiring new full-time teachers*. The lowest percentage of teachers reporting student apathy as a serious problem was among those who had influence over *evaluating teachers*. Finally, the lowest percentage of teachers reporting student absenteeism and student tardiness as serious problems was among those who had influence over *deciding how school budget will be spent* and *setting discipline policy*. Overall, it appeared that having influence over *setting discipline policy* and over *deciding how school budget will be spent* was associated with lowest percentages of teachers reporting serious problems in most categories. Thus, setting discipline policy was associated with lowest percentages of teachers reporting *student absenteeism*, *student tardiness*, *student class cutting*, and *student dropping out*. Deciding how school budget will be spent was associated with lowest percentages of teachers reporting *student apathy*, *student absenteeism*, *student tardiness*, *student pregnancy*, and *teacher absenteeism*.

Finally, as in previous surveys, the SASS 2011-12 asked teachers to assess the degree of their influence—a great deal, moderate, minor, or no influence—over selected school policies in one question, as well as identify problems that were *serious*, *moderate*, *minor*, or *not a problem*, in another question. Associations were analyzed for the teachers' perceived influence (a great deal) and seriousness of the problem (serious and moderate) (Table 4). Results varied by policy and school problem. However, overall, it was found the lowest rates of teachers reporting student tardiness were among those who had influence over *determining content of in-service professional development programs*. The lowest reporting of student class cutting was found among teachers who had influence over *setting discipline policy*. The smallest percentages of teachers identifying lack of parental involvement was among teachers who had influence over *hiring new full-time teachers*. The lowest rates of teachers reporting student apathy, students coming to school unprepared to learn and student absenteeism was among those who had influence over *evaluating teachers*. Also, the lowest rates of teachers reporting that students came to school unprepared to learn was among teachers who had influence *over deciding how school budgets were spent*.

Table 4. Percentage of teachers who report most serious problems (serious + moderate) by their perceived influence (A Great Deal) (SASS 11-12 Teacher, N = 37500)

	Total	Students Unprepared to Learn	Student Poverty	Lack or Parental Involvement	Student Apathy	Student Absenteeism	Student Tardiness	Student Class Cutting
Establishing curriculum	10350	57.8	54.3	50.5	46.9	45.5	38.9	18.5
Setting performance standards for students	7700	54.9	53.9	47.5	41.3	41.4	35.5	15.3
Determining content of in-service PD programs	4290	54.1	54.3	47.6	39.9	40.6	34.5	15.6
Setting discipline policy	3910	54.7	56.8	48.6	38.9	41.2	34.8	13.8
Hiring new full-time teachers	1860	51.6	51.6	43.0	38.2	39.8	36.0	15.6
Evaluating teachers	990	49.5	55.6	43.4	33.3	38.4	35.4	15.2
Deciding how school budget spent	970	49.5	53.6	45.4	37.1	39.2	36.1	15.5

Finally, for principals in SASS 2011-12, those who had influence over *establishing the curriculum* were the fewest in reporting all five most recurrent problems—student bullying, student non-verbal disrespect for teachers, student physical conflicts, student verbal abuse of teachers, and robbery or theft. The second lowest percentage was among principals who had influence over *deciding how budget will be spent* (Table 5).

Table 5. Percentage of Principals Who Report Incidents That Happen Daily or At Least Once a Week by Their "Major" Influence (SASS 11-12 Principal, N = 7510)

	Total	Physical Conflicts	Robbery or Theft	Illegal Drugs	Student Bullying	Verbal Abuse of Teachers	Disorder in Classrooms	Disrespect for Teachers
Evaluating teachers	7140	11.6%	3.2%	1.7%	20.6%	6.7%	1.4%	14.1%
Hiring new full-time teachers	6510	11.1%	3.2%	1.7%	20.1%	6.5%	1.4%	13.8%
Setting discipline policy	5920	11.5%	3.0%	1.7%	20.4%	6.3%	1.4%	13.7%
Setting performance standards	5460	11.0%	3.1%	1.6%	19.6%	6.4%	1.3%	13.6%
Determining content of PD for teachers	5270	11.2%	3.4%	2.1%	20.5%	6.8%	1.3%	14.0%
Deciding how budget spent	4640	11.2%	3.2%	1.7%	19.4%	6.3%	1.3%	13.4%

Impact of Teachers' Control on Planning and Teaching

In 2003-04 SASS, teachers were asked to assess the amount of control they had over planning and teaching. The researcher then collapsed the teachers' responses to control and their responses to school problems they assessed to be happening daily or at least once a week. It was among teachers who had control over disciplining students that was found the lowest percentage of those reporting the four most pervasive problems—*acts of non-verbal student disrespect for teachers, student bullying, student verbal abuse of teachers*, and *illegal drugs*. Responses to the question about control for the same SASS 2003-04 teachers were grouped by their responses to the extent of problems facing schools (serious and moderate). Like responses about most frequent problems, the smallest percentages of teachers reporting three of the most serious problems—*students come to school unprepared to learn, lack of parental involvement* and *student absenteeism*—were from those who had control over disciplining students.

The sample of teachers in SASS 2011-12 had similar results to those of the 2003-04 teacher sample. It was among teachers who had control over selecting textbooks and other instructional materials that was the lowest percentage of those reporting that the most serious problem facing schools was *students come to school unprepared to learn* and *student poverty* (Table 6). However, overall, it was found that having control over the area of (1) disciplining students and (2) selecting textbooks and other instructional materials was associated with lowest reporting of serious and moderate problems.

Table 6. Percentage of teachers who report serious and moderate problems by their perceived control *(A Great Deal) (SASS 11-12 Teacher, N = 37500)*

	Total	Students Unprepared to Learn	Student Poverty	Lack of Parental Involvement	Student Apathy	Student Absenteeism	Student Tardiness
Selecting textbooks and other instructional materials	12770	58.9	55.4	52.3	48.5	45.1	38.5
Selecting content, topics, and skills to be taught	13810	60.5	56.6	53.8	49.1	46.9	41.0
Selecting teaching techniques	26120	62.6	57.0	55.3	50.9	48.1	41.0
Evaluating and grading students	26900	63.4	57.8	56.1	51.4	48.6	41.4
Disciplining students	19630	59.5	55.7	52.1	45.9	44.4	37.7
Determining the amount of homework to be assigned	28000	64.1	58.4	56.8	51.7	48.9	41.9

Effectiveness of Safety Practices and Programs

The following paragraphs explore associations between school safety practices and initiatives, on one hand, and problems facing schools, on the other. Whenever lists are very long, only the three most effective and the three least effective initiatives, practices or programs are reported.

Effectiveness of School Safety Initiatives

Based on SSOCS 1999-00 data, the most effective initiatives for preventing school bullying in schools are (1) having a program that involves parents at school helping to maintain school discipline, (2) training faculty or staff in crime prevention, and (3) having a formal process to obtain parent input on policies related to school crime and discipline. The most effective initiatives for preventing problems related to student verbal abuse of teachers are (1) having a program that involves parents at school helping to maintain school discipline, (2) review, revision, or monitoring of school-wide discipline practices and procedures, and (3) having a prevention curriculum, instruction, or training for students (e.g., social skills training). Finally, the most effective initiatives for preventing student acts of disrespect for teachers are (1) training faculty or staff in crime prevention, (2) training, supervision, or technical assistance in classroom management for teachers, and (3) providing training or technical assistance to parents in dealing with students' problem behavior.

Similarly, in SSOCS 1999-00 the principals were presented with a list of practices intended to prevent discipline and safety problems. The principals indicated whether those practices were implemented in their schools. The researcher then grouped their responses to answers they had provided about problems that occurred daily, at least once a week, at least once a month, on occasion, or never happened. It was found that the lowest rates of principals reporting frequent cases of student bullying were in schools where (1) *students pass through metal detectors*, (2) *visitors pass through metal detectors*, and (3) *any students are required to drug test*. The lowest rates of principals reporting frequent cases of student acts of non-verbal disrespect for teachers were in schools that (1) *provide school lockers to students*, (2) *provide telephones in most classrooms*, and that (2) *require visitor check-in*. Finally, lowest rates of cases of student verbally abusing teachers were found in schools that (1) *require visitor check in*, (2) where *tobacco is prohibited on school grounds*, and (3) that *enforce a strict dress code*.

Effectiveness of Disciplinary Actions

The same principals in SSOCS 1999-00 were asked about disciplinary actions that were available at their schools, and that they used. Regarding student bullying, it was found that schools where *corporal punishment* was used also had fewest principals reporting cases of student misbehavior being reported: student racial tensions, verbal abuse of teachers, disorder in classrooms, acts of student disrespect for teachers. It was also found that schools that practiced *keeping students off buses for misbehavior* had fewest principals reporting cases of student bullying. In addition, it was in schools that utilized *corporal punishment*, *referrals to school counselors*, and used *in-school suspensions with services* where lowest rates of students verbally abusing teachers were reported. Finally, acts of student disrespect for teachers were least reported in schools that used *corporal punishment*, used *referrals to school counselors*, and inflicted *loss of privileges to students*. Four years later, the SASS 2003-04 survey asked principals to identify safety practices implemented at the schools. Two practices seemed to be associated with lowest percentages of principals reporting all five serious problems. They were (1) *controlling access to school buildings during school hours* and (2) *requiring that all/most students stay on campus during lunch*. It was also found that two practices—(1) *performing random metal detector checks on students* and (2) *requiring students pass through metal detectors each day*—were associated with highest percentages of principals reporting serious problems

In the same SASS 2003-04 survey, principals identified safety practices they implemented in their schools. Results differed by problem and practice. For example, the most effective practice for *physical conflicts among students* was for principals who (1) used random dog sniffs to check for drugs, (2) required clear bags or banned book bags on school grounds, and (3) performed random sweeps for contraband (e.g., drugs or weapons). The lowest rates for reporting *student bullying* were schools that (1) required students to pass through metal detectors each day, and (2) required clear bags or banned book bags on school grounds. Third, the lowest percentages of principals reporting recurrent *student verbal abuse of teachers*, *acts of student disrespect for teachers, not verbal abuse*, and *robbery or theft* were principals of schools that (1) required that all/most

students stay on campus during lunch, (2) controlled access to school buildings during school hours (e.g., locked/ monitored doors), and (3) enforced a strict dress code. Finally, in schools that (1) controlled access to school buildings during school hours (e.g., locked/monitored doors), (2) required that all/most students stay on campus during lunch, and (3) controlled access to school grounds during school hours (e.g., locked/ monitored gates), the lowest percentages of principals reported *student acts of disrespect for teachers*.

In the 2009-10 SSOCS survey, principals also identified safety practices that were implemented in their schools. The responses to the two questions were collapsed by recurrent problems (Table 7). It was found that principals whose *school grounds had locked or monitored gates* had the lowest rate of those reporting student bullying. Principals whose schools *provided two-way radios to any staff* had the lowest rate of those reporting acts of student verbal abuse of teachers. Finally, principals whose schools *prohibited use of cell phones and text messaging devices* had the lowest rate of those reporting acts of non-verbal student disrespect for teachers.

Table 7. Percentage of principals who identified safety practices implemented in their schools by daily and weekly discipline incidents (SSOCS 09-10, N = 2650)

	Total	Bullying	Verbal Abuse of Teachers	Disrespect for Teachers	Cyber Bullying
Require visitor check in	2640	27.7	6.8	12.5	15.2
Limit access to social networking sites	2500	28.0	7.2	12.8	15.2
Access controlled locked/monitored doors	2410	27.8	7.1	12.4	14.9
Prohibit use of cell phones and text messaging devices	2350	27.7	7.2	12.3	14.0
Provide telephones in most classrooms	2050	29.3	6.8	12.7	16.6
Provide two-way radios to any staff	2010	28.4	6.5	12.4	14.9
Security camera(s) monitor the school	1930	28.0	7.8	14.0	17.1
Practice to close campus for lunch	1900	30.0	7.4	13.7	16.8
Provide school lockers to students	1840	29.3	7.6	14.1	19.6
Provide an electronic notification system that auto notifies parents in case of a school-wide emergency	1810	28.2	7.2	13.3	16.0
Require faculty/staff to wear badge or photo ID	1720	28.5	7.0	12.8	16.9
Practice to enforce a strict dress code	1650	28.5	7.3	12.7	14.5
Grounds have locked/monitored gates	1210	26.4	9.1	13.2	12.4
Provide a structured anonymous threat reporting system	1170	29.1	7.7	14.5	15.4
Practice random dog sniffs for drugs	1040	30.8	7.7	15.4	20.2

As in previous surveys, the SASS 2011-12 survey asked principals to identify both safety practices that were implemented in their buildings and problems that occurred daily or weekly. The analyses showed that schools that *controlled access to school grounds during school hours* (e.g., locked or monitored gates) had the lowest rate of principals reporting (1) acts of student non-verbal disrespect for teachers and (2) student bullying. The same schools that *controlled access to school doors* had the lowest rate of principals reporting acts of student verbal abuse of teachers. Finally, schools that used one or more *random dog sniffs to check for drugs* had the lowest rate of principals reporting physical conflicts among students.

Impact of Parent and Community Initiatives

In SSOCS 2009-10, principals were asked to identify parent and community initiatives or programs that were implemented in their schools. Their responses were grouped by recurrent problems (*daily* or *at least once a week*) (Table 8). It was found that principals of schools that *provided training or technical assistance to parents* in dealing with students' problem behavior had the lowest rate of those reporting two problems—student bullying and student verbal abuse of teachers. In addition, schools that provided *individual mentoring, tutoring, coaching of students by students* had the lowest rate of those reporting acts of non-verbal student disrespect for teachers.

Table 8. Percentage of principals who reported recurrent discipline incidents by parent and community initiatives (SSOCS 09-10, N = 2650)

	Total	Student Bullying	Disrespect for Teachers	Verbal Abuse of Teachers	Cyber Bullying
Student counseling/social work	2470	27.9	12.6	7.3	15.8
Individual mentoring/tutoring by adults	2440	28.3	12.7	7.4	15.2
Behavioral modification for students	2410	27.8	12.4	7.1	15.4
Recreation/enrichment student activities	2270	27.8	12.3	7.0	15.0
Prevention curriculum/instruction/training	2230	28.3	12.1	6.7	14.8
Promote sense of community/integration	2190	27.9	12.3	6.8	15.1
Individual mentoring/tutoring by students	1690	27.2	11.8	6.5	15.4
Formal process to obtain parental input	1490	26.8	12.8	7.4	14.8
Provide training/assistance to parents	1420	26.1	12.0	6.3	14.1
Student involvement resolving problems	1380	27.5	12.3	8.0	14.5
Program involves parents at school	520	25.0	15.4	9.6	9.6

Impact of Parent Involvement

The 2003-04 SASS asked principals to identify the extent to which parents were involved in the schools and the types of activities in which they participated. Their responses on activities in which parents were highly involved (i.e., 76%-100%) were collapsed by responses to problems that happened *daily* or *at least once a week* in their schools (Table 9). It was found that schools in which 76%-100% of *parents participated in open houses or back to school night* had the lowest rate of principals reporting student bullying and student verbal abuse of teachers. It was also found that principals of schools in which 76%-100% *parents participated in subject-area events* had the lowest rate of those reporting acts of non-verbal student disrespect for teachers.

Table 9. Percentage of principals of who reported daily and weekly discipline incidents and who had highly involved parents (76%-100%) (SSOCS 09-10, N = 2650)

	Total	Bullying	Verbal Abuse of Teachers	Disrespect for Teachers	Cyber bullying
Parent participates in open house or back to school night	990	23.2	3.0	8.1	9.1
Parent participates in parent-teacher conference	920	23.9	3.3	8.7	7.6
Parent participates in subject-area events	600	23.3	3.3	6.7	10.0
Parent volunteers at school	90	11.1	--	--	11.1

Role of the Community and Outside Groups

The 2009-10 SSOCS asked principals to identify community and outside groups that were involved in their schools' efforts to promote safe, disciplined, and drug-free schools. It was also found that schools where community involvement included *parent groups* were involved in their efforts to promote safe, disciplined, and drug-free schools had the lowest rate of those reporting acts of *student bullying*, *student verbal abuse of teachers*, *non-verbal disrespect for teachers*, and *cyberbullying*.

Factors that Prevent Efforts to Implement Effective Safety Practices and Initiatives

This section of the report explores associations between a series of formal programs to prevent or reduce crime and the types of challenges schools face to implement them (Table 10). Principals were asked to identify the programs and issues in the School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS) in 1999-2000, and again, 10 years later, in 2009-2010. The analysis showed that in both surveys, three obstacles stood out—(1) lack of or

inadequate alternative placements/programs for disruptive students, (2) federal policies on disciplining students with disabilities, and (3) inadequate funds.

Table 10. Factors that limit in a major way implementation of formal programs to prevent/reduce crime (SSOCS 2009-10, 2650)

	Prevention curriculum, instruction, or training for students	Behavioral or behavior modification intervention for students	Counseling, social work, psychological, or therapeutic activity for students	Recreational, enrichment, or leisure activities for students	Student involvement in resolving student conduct problems	Programs to promote sense of community/social integration among students
Lack of or inadequate alternative placements/ programs for disruptive students	22.4	22.4	22.5	22.5	23.2	22.4
Inadequate funds	26.5	26.1	26.1	26.4	25.4	26.0
Federal policies on disciplining disabled students	17.9	18.3	18.1	18.1	18.1	18.3
Other federal policies on discipline and safety	4.9	5.0	4.8	4.8	5.1	4.6
Lack of parental support for school policies	8.1	8.3	7.6	7.5	8.7	7.3
Inconsistent application of school policies	8.1	8.3	8.0	8.4	8.0	8.2
Lack of or inadequate teacher training in classroom management	5.4	5.4	5.2	4.8	5.8	5.0
State or district policies on discipline and safety	5.4	5.4	5.2	5.3	5.8	5.5
Fear of litigation	3.1	3.3	3.2	3.5	3.6	3.2
Likelihood of complaints from parents	2.7	2.9	2.8	2.6	2.9	2.7
Lack of teacher support for school policies	3.1	3.3	3.2	3.1	3.6	2.7
Fear of district or state reprisal	1.8	2.1	2.0	1.8	2.2	1.8
Teachers' fear of student reprisal	1.8	2.1	2.0	1.8	2.2	1.8
Total	2230	2410	2490	2270	1380	2190

Impact of School Discipline Problems on the Teaching Profession

This paragraph summarizes the data on the negative consequences that school discipline problems can have on the teaching profession. First, the frequencies of teachers who had been threatened by a student in the school to injure them or who had been physically attacked were calculated. In the 2003-04 SASS survey, students had threatened to injure 19% of teachers, and physically attacked 7.8% of them at some point in the teachers' career. In addition, within the previous 12 months, 7.6% of teachers had been threatened, and 3% of teachers had been attacked. Those percentages increased among teachers who responded to the 2011-12 SASS survey. That year, 21.8% of teachers had been threatened and 8.8% had been attacked at some point in their careers. During the previous 12 months, 9.8% and 4.2% had been threatened and attacked, respectively.

In the second series of questions, the frequency of teachers who, in the 2011-12 SASS survey, were affected by discipline problems is summarized. As Table 11 shows, 15,260 (40.7%) teachers *strongly* or *somewhat* agreed that the level of student misbehavior interfered with their teaching, 14,900 (39.7%) that the amount of tardiness and class cutting interfered with their teaching, 8170 (21.8%) had been threatened by a student in the school, and 3,290 (8.8%) had been physically attacked by a student in their school. An analysis of the tabulations shows the repercussions of those teachers' decisions to discharge their professional duties. Thus, for approximately 4,870 teachers or 31.9% of the teacher sample, the level of student misbehavior was associated with the realization that *the stress disappointments involved in this school aren't really worth it*.

Table 11. Percentage of teachers who strongly and somewhat agree that their careers are in jeopardy because of problems in their schools (SASS 2011-12, N= 37500)

	The stress disappointments involved in teaching at this school aren't really worth it (N= 7,810)	I think about transferring to another school (N=11,160)	I don't seem to have as much enthusiasm as I did before I began teaching (N=14,880)	I think about staying home from school because I am too tired to go (N=7,490)	If you could go back to your college days, and start over again, would you become a teacher (No, N=5,990)
The level of student misbehavior interferes with my teaching (N= 15,260)	31.9	41.3	50.9	27.2	20.6
The amount of student tardiness and class cutting in this school interferes with my teaching (N = 14,900)	28.9	38.0	47.0	24.9	19.1
Has a student from this school ever threatened to injure you? (N= 8170)	35.8	47.6	56.8	30.5	25.1
Has a student from this school threatened to injure you in the past 12 months? (N=3690)	8.8	11.8	12.2	7.2	5.4
Has a student from this school ever physically attacked you? (N= 3290)	29.5	37.7	47.7	26.1	19.5
Has a student from this school physically attacked in the past 12 months? (N=1560)	29.5	42.3	46.8	27.6	17.9

There was also association between indiscipline and teachers' *thinking of transferring to another school* for 41.3% of them, an association with not having much enthusiasm for 50.9%, an association with wanting to *stay home from school because I am too tired to go* for 27.2%, and an association with the feeling that if you could go back to your college days, would you become a teacher (20.6% probably and certainly not). Likewise, student class cutting was associated with stress disappointments for 28.9% of 14,900 teachers, transferring to another school for 38%, no enthusiasm for 47%, wanting to stay home for 24.9%, and regretting becoming teachers for 19.1% of them. These associations were amplified for teachers whose students had threatened to injure, and those who had been physically attacked. Thus, for 47.6% of teachers who had been threatened and 42.3% of those who had been attacked within the previous 12 months, the misbehavior was associated with thinking about transferring to another school. Even more heightened was the percentage of teachers that students had threatened to injure and physically attacked. The analysis showed that 56.8% of teachers who had been threatened and 47.7% of those who had been physically attacked were also those who *didn't seem to have much enthusiasm as I did before I started teaching*. Overall, student misbehavior, student tardiness and class cutting, threats to injure teachers, and physically attacking teachers appeared to be factors in teachers having second thoughts about discharging their professional duties.

Conclusions

This report summarizes findings from six surveys of teachers and principals between 1999-00 and 2011-12— 1999-00 School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS) for Principals, 2003-04 Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) for Teachers, 2003-04 SASS Principals, 2009-10 SSOCS Principals, 2011-12 SASS Teachers, and

2011-12 SASS Principals. It is written at the time when schools nationwide are implementing non-retributive, non-exclusionary discipline policies. The following conclusions reflect the role of the principals and teachers as the primary guarantors of schoolwide expectations for positive behavior.

Firstly, from the surveys, it was clear that principals were not aligned with teachers regarding the incidence and pervasiveness of indiscipline or problems facing the teaching and learning environments. While literature shows that teachers do not share issues of classroom management they face daily, the failure of the principals to become aware of those issues must be motivated. The role of the principals to articulate clear expectations for positive discipline, to hold both students and adults accountable for meeting those expectations, and reinforcing them, cannot be properly discharged without knowing what occurs in the lives of students and teachers. Acts of widespread student bullying, non-verbal and verbal disrespect for teachers are what cause teachers to want to leave their positions or lose their enthusiasm. It is at the heart of the instructional leadership role of the principals to regularly listen to all the stakeholders regarding schoolwide discipline data. Failure, on the part of the principals, to engage the teachers and students in creating together a culture of mutual respect will make it difficult for schools to design data-driven alternatives to exclusionary discipline policies. Principal-centered policies may exacerbate the situation by minimizing student-teacher relationship problems such as acts of *verbal abuse* and *non-verbal disrespect* for teachers or for students.

Secondly, the data point to areas of policy, planning, teaching, and initiatives in which teachers and parents need empowerment to assist their schools in implementing a safe and positive school climate. Schools where teachers have the influence and control over *how budgets are spent*, *evaluating teachers*, *setting discipline policy*, *setting performance standards for students*, *hiring new full-time faculty*, *establishing the curriculum*, and *disciplining students*, appear to be the ones in which discipline incidents and other school problems are least reported. Teachers, by their training and responsibilities, have the expertise and competencies to assist in leadership. Empowering the teachers to exercise these influences and controls, and therefore entrusting them with more accountability, will help in ensuring heightened collaboration with the leadership on setting and reinforcing effective schoolwide expectations for safety and positive climate.

Other initiatives that appeared to have an advantage over traditional ways schools operate included (1) creating programs that involve parents in helping to address student misbehaviors, and training them in policies and practices, (2) providing two-way radios to any staff, (3) reviewing, revising, and monitoring school-wide discipline practices and procedures, (4) providing training to teachers in violence reduction and training staff in crime prevention (5) controlling or prohibiting use of cell phones and text messaging devices on campus, (6) engaging students in providing mentoring and tutoring programs in safety and positive school climate, (7) enhancing parent involvement through open house or school night programs as well as subject-area events. These and other support systems that engage the whole school community in finding solutions can help in facilitating a smooth transition from retributive discipline practices to less exclusionary policies and initiatives.

Thirdly, it seems that schools ought to be guarded against external, negative influence as well as students' malicious use of media. There are quite a host of effective practices and structures implemented in schools. However, the most effective practices tended to include (1) controlling access to school building, doors and grounds during school hours, (2) controlling use of cell phones and text messaging devices, (3) requiring most students to stay on campus during lunch, and (4) conducting random dog sniffs for drugs.

Fourthly, the surveys, particularly the SSOCS 1999-00 were administered before the schools and districts started transitioning from the zero-tolerance era to the present-day alternatives to exclusionary discipline policies. Notably, in SSOCS 1999-00, questions about disciplinary actions included such retributive practices as *removal with no services*, and *outside suspension with no services*, *in-school suspension with no services*, and *corporal punishment*. Although those disciplinary actions appeared to be associated with low occurrences of discipline incidents, their inclusion in this report is for the sole purpose of highlighting the transition. They are not reported to illustrate examples of effective alternatives to exclusionary discipline policies or practices.

Finally, it appears urgent for schools to take indiscipline, crime and violence seriously. Teachers are demoralized through acts of *verbal abuse* and *disrespect*. Students are deprived means of learning through acts *of student bullying*, *cyberbullying*, *physical conflicts*, and other deterrents. Schools cannot afford to lose both students and teachers. However, the work is not easy. If teachers, students, parents and community groups are not fully engaged in collaborating with the principals to review, revise and monitor schoolwide discipline data and initiatives, all schools will not be places for learning and developing socio-emotionally.

Acknowledgements

References

Alexander, K., & Alexander, A. D. (2005). *American public school law*. Thomson Learning.

Allman, K. L., & Slate, J. R. (2011, April-June). School discipline in public education: A brief review of current practices. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation, 6*(2), 1-8. ISSN 2155-9635.

Arum, R., & Ford, K. (2012, October). How other countries do discipline: Case studies of how other countries approach student behavior suggest lessons to be shared. *Educational Leadership, 70*(2), 56-60.

Black, D. W. (2016, March 30). Reforming school discipline. *Northwestern University Law Review, 111* (1), 1-74.

Browne-Dianis, J. (2011, September). Stepping back from zero-tolerance: How can schools create a positive culture when they treat students like criminals? *Educational Leadership, 69*(1), 24-28.

Bushaw, W. J., & Lopez, S. J. (2012). Public education in the Unites States: A nation divided. *Phi Delta Kappan, 94*(1), 8-25.

Calhoun, A. (2013, February). Introducing restorative justice: Re-visioning responses to wrongdoing. *The Prevention Researcher, 20*(1), 3-6.

Foxwell, E. (1993). *Making the grade: Teacher education's role in achieving the national education goals*. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.

Glazer, N. (1994). How social problems are born. *Public Interest, 115,* 31-44.

Heaviside, S., Rowand, C., Williams, C., & Farris, E. (1998). *Violence and discipline problems in U.S. public schools: 1996-97*. Rockville, MD: National Center for Education Statistics.

Kajs, L. T. (2006). Reforming the discipline management process in schools: An alternative approach to zero tolerance. *Educational Research Quarterly, 29*(4), 16-27.

Kaufman, P., Chen, X., Choy, S. P., Chandler, K.A., Chapman, C.D., & Rand, M. R. (1998). *Indicators of school crime and safety: 1998*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Lawrence, E. & Hinds,T. (2016, November/December). From punish and discipline to repair and restore: Promoting restorative justice in the early childhood classroom. *Principal, 96*(2), 20-23.

MacNeil, A.J., & Prater, D. (1999). Teachers and principals differ on the seriousness of school discipline: A national perspective. *National Forum of Applied Educational Research Journal, 12*(3), 1999.

Mongan, P., & Walker, R. (2012). The road to hell is paved with good intentions: A historical, theoretical, and legal analysis of zero-tolerance weapons policies in American schools. *Preventing School Failure*, *56*(4), 232–240.

Musu-Gillette, L., Zhang, A., Wang, K., Zhang, J., & Oudekerk, B. A. (2017). *Indicators of school crime and safety: 2016*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

National Education Goals Panel (1999). *The National Education Goals report: Building a nation of learners, 1999*. Washington, DC: National Education Goals Panel.

Neiman, S., & Hill, M. R. (2011). *Crime, violence, discipline, and safety in U.S. Public schools: Findings from the School Survey on Crime and Safety*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Institute of Education Science.

New Jersey v. T.L.O., 105 S. Ct. 733 (1985).

Phi Delta Kappa International. *PDK Gallup past polls*. Available from http://www.pdkintl.org/poll/past-polls.htm

Robers, S., Zhang, J., Truman, J., & Snyder, T. (2012*). Indicators of school crime and safety: 2011*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Ryan, T. G., & Ruddy, S. (2015). Restorative justice: A changing community response. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education, 2015, 7(2), 253-262.*

Shaw, G. (2007, Fall). Restorative practices in Australian schools: Changing relationships, changing culture. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly, 25*(1), 127-135

Silva, A. M. P. M., Negreiros, F., & Albano, R. M. (2017). Indiscipline at public school: Teachers' conceptions on causes and intervention. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science (IJRES), 3*(1), 1-10.

Skiba, R. J. (2014, Winter). The failure of zero tolerance. *Reclaiming Children and Youth*, *22*(4), 27-33.

Soule, P. P., & Sharp, J. E. (1998). *Safe and drug-free schools and communities: 1998 student survey results*. Carson City, NV: Nevada State Department of Education.

Wolff, C. E., Jarodzka, H., & Boshuizen, H. P. A. (2017). See and tell: Differences between expert and novice teachers' interpretations of problematic classroom management events. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 66*(2017), 295-308.

Author Information

Athanase Gahungu,
Professor of Educational Leadership and
Administration
Chicago State University
9501 S. King Drive/ED 319
Chicago, IL 60628
USA
Contact e-mail: *atkgah@gmail.com*