1951

An Interpretation of Modern Practices in Discipline

Kenneth W. Elfbrandt
Central Washington University

AN INTERPRETATION OF MODERN PRACTICES IN DISCIPLINE

By

Kenneth W. Elfbrandt

An extended paper submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Master of
Education, in the Graduate School
of the Central Washington
College of Education

August, 1951

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my wife, Hazel. Without her aid this paper would not have been possible.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Grateful acknowledgment is made to Dr. Emil Samuelson, who has directed this study, and to Dr. J. Wesley Crum and Miss Mabel T. Anderson, members of the supervisory committee.

APPROVED by:

THESIS COMMITTEE

_____

Emil E. Samuelson, Chairman

_____

J. Wesley Crum

_____

Mabel T. Anderson

DIRECTOR OF GRADUATE SCHOOL

_____

Ernest L. Muzzall

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

During the past century the study of psychology and other related subjects has given the world a better understanding of the activities of man within his life cycle. At the same time, many changes have occurred in the methods and procedures in the area designated as discipline. Man, being a gregarious animal, must of necessity devise ways to live with fellow humans in a manner satisfying to himself and beneficial to the group.

Since it is the job of the schools to educate the children for living in an adult society, teachers are concerned with discipline in many ways. Muntyan, an assistant professor of education at the University of Delaware, thinks that discipline is commonly considered to be a form of punishment or a method of achieving control over an individual or group, or the degree to which control has been attained. He also believes that discipline operates in two spheres, so-called self-discipline and group discipline.[1]

---

[1] Muntyan, Milosh, "Discipline: Child-Centered, Teacher-Centered, or Group-Centered?" Progressive Education, 26:168-173, April, 1949.

These same ideas are expressed and simplified by Symonds:

> We are frequently told that the term discipline is used in two senses--one referring to repressive and punitive discipline in the interests of control by the teacher, and the other self-discipline, which is exercised by the pupils. There is a wide-spread belief that the aim of education should be the acquisition of self-discipline and self-control and the assumption of self-responsibility on the part of the pupils. Even though this is a final goal to be achieved, the problem of control by the teacher continues as a real problem at all stages of the process.[1]

To accomplish the presentation of the academic subjects in the classroom the teacher must be in command of the situation at all times. If the teacher maintains order through "pressure methods," she will be busy much of the time keeping an eye on potential offenders. If violators of the peace are not corrected, chaos ensues and the educative process is interfered with. The problem is not getting better. Moffitt recently observed:

> The conditions which contribute to poor pupil behavior are increasing. They may be found in every overcrowded classroom or inadequate school building, in the harassment of overworked teachers, in the overzealousness and inexperience of new supervisors, in the lack of community understanding of the objectives of modern education, and in the frustrations of the youngsters of the postwar period.[2]

---

[1] Symonds, Percival M., "Classroom Discipline," The Education Digest, 15:5, March, 1950.

[2] Moffitt, Frederick J., "Lickin' and Larnin'," The Education Digest, 14:20-22, February, 1949.

The problem is confronting teachers, but parents, too, must be aware of the need for guidance and leadership of their children. Many parents are neglecting their children or are not able to answer their needs and fail where discipline is concerned.

The problems considered in this paper are: The development of discipline in the past two centuries and a summary of modern practices.

The material for this paper was gathered from books and periodicals which are available in the Central Washington College of Education library. The contents are secondary sources and no original research was conducted.

Chapter II reviews the varieties of disciplinary practices and the philosophy underlying each phase.

Chapter III amplifies the modern psychological approach to discipline, and treats individual and group problems.

Chapter IV points out the factors which have educational significance.

Chapter V is a summary.

CHAPTER II

EVOLUTION OF DISCIPLINE

Life during the colonial period in America was hard. The early colonists came to the New World to escape political and religious persecution or to gain economic independence in a vast, uncrowded wilderness where their life would be their own. It was not easy, however, for the settlers were not equipped to meet many of the problems which arose. As a group, they displayed their unequaled determination and self-reliance in overcoming the hardships and privations.

The severity of their lives was indicated in their homes, by the type of discipline which was imposed upon the pioneer children. The colonists brought many of the mores and folkways of the old world with them when they came to America. The first essential to discipline with them was obedience to authority.[1] In the home, the father was the dominant individual. His word was law, and any digression from his dictates might have meant expulsion from the group.

---

[1] Anderson, Harold H., Discipline (Iowa City: University of Iowa, December, 1941), p. 2.

There were few adolescent problems in the early days. Land was plentiful and the young boys often left home in their early teens to make a home for themselves. Girls of marriageable age were scarce and that gave the pioneer girls the opportunity to leave home soon after reaching puberty. The attitude which required absolute obedience to authority by children did not alter appreciably for many generations. As an example, MacLean reported, "The most complete statement of this view I have found, appeared in The Mother's Magazine in 1832 which advised mothers to discipline their children as follows:

> Cost what it may, break the child down to obedience to the first command. And when this is once done, if you are careful never to let disobedience escape punishment of some kind or other, and punishment that shall be effectual and triumphant, you will find it not difficult to maintain your absolute authority."[1]

Formal education in the eighteenth and nineteenth century was sparse and irregular for most children. In such schools as there were, the handling of discipline problems reflected the attitude of society in general.[2] Literature written in and about that time is rich with examples of the "hickory stick" style of

---

[1] MacLean, Malcom S., "Discipline and Democracy," California Journal of Elementary Education, 17:2-11, August, 1948.

[2] Brown, Edwin J., "Punishment: Fourteen Rules for Handing It Out," The Clearing House, 23:345-47, February, 1949.

discipline. Samples of this are found in the story of Ichabod Crane written by Washington Irving, in Mark Twain's Tom Sawyer and Huckleberry Finn, and in the Hoosier Schoolmaster by Edward Eggleston.

Punishment used freely. In the autocratic type of discipline that was discussed above, the principal deterrent to incorrect behavior was the threat of punishment. Corporal punishment was practiced both at home and in the school and has not disappeared from use to this day. Bagley in 1908 wrote that there were three factors which determine the efficiency of punishment: (1) degree of pain inflicted, (2) the closeness of association of the crime to the punishment, (3) "its freedom from painful consequences in excess of those needed to inhibit the undesirable impulse."[1] The use of corporal punishment was best adapted to the elementary school, or during the formative period of the child's life, eight to twelve years of age.

Even at best, punishment was not always effective, and Bagley listed three reasons why corporal punishment failed: (1) The child was hardened and the punishment had little sting; (2) the delay between the act and the punishment caused loss of connection; (3) the punishment was out of proportion to the offense.[2]

---

[1] Bagley, Wm. Chandler, Classroom Management (New York: Macmillan Company, 1908), p. 114.

[2] Ibid., p. 114-115.

Corporal punishment has disappeared from many school districts in the past decade. Brown, Dean of the University College, St. Louis University, stated that "punishment does little or no teaching even when carefully chosen and well administered, and improper punishment tends to confirm the offender rather than to correct him."[1] In modern thinking, then, punishment would only be justified when personal safety is involved and the punishment does not humiliate the child. Punishment is also used as a reminder when the child is forgetful or unconcerned. The punishment should never destroy the child's confidence or love and for this reason, if for no other, punishment should be avoided.[2]

The possibility that punishment might cause other serious repercussions is evident. Miner believes that punishment is no deterrent to more serious objectionable behavior. Instead, he essays that it only makes the offenders more adept at the art of not getting caught.[3] In modern practice punishment and discipline are not the same thing. While the goal of punishment is to restrain the child from repeating the offense, the goal of discipline is self-reliance.[4]

---

[1] Brown, op. cit., p. 345-47.

[2] Jenkins, Gladys Gardner, "Discipline: What Is It?" Parent's Magazine, 23:18-19, May, 1948.

[3] Miner, Robert J., "Knitting at the Guillotine," The Education Digest, 14:13, November, 1948.

[4] Jenkins, Gladys Gardner, op. cit., p. 18-19.

Delinquency is a problem. In recent years the term "juvenile delinquent" came into common use to designate children who were breaking the law or violating the rules of social decency. "Delinquents are not made overnight. It takes years of carefully piled up mistakes to produce one."[1] Many courts feel that the cause of this problem is delinquent parents rather than children, but it is usually the child who suffers the results. Often the delinquent who is caught is sentenced by the court to a correction institution and comes out a poorer citizen than when he went in. "The idea that delinquent character traits can be defrosted by putting them in an icebox is worse than grotesque, in spite of the fact that it is still a universal practice."[2] If the child would receive adequate rehabilitation while detained, the program of confinement might be justified. Some of the detention periods are from ten to thirty days, and oftentimes the child is thrown in with experienced and hardened criminals. There is actually more danger from association with hardened peers than from being with adult inmates.[3]

---

[1] Redl, Fritz, "Delinquency Prevention and the Role of Love," Discipline, an Interpretation (Washington, D. C.: Association for Childhood Education, 1944), p. 20.

[2] Ibid., p. 20.

[3] Healy, William, and A. F. Bronner, Juvenile Detention Homes (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936), p. 180-183.

In a survey conducted among public school educators some of the serious offenses committed by delinquents were: indecency to teachers and passers-by, offensive language, marking or injuring property, gambling, rough treatment by bullies, cheating, stealing, falsifying, hazing, and the playing of certain harmful games on the playground or in school.[1]

Psychology puts discipline in a new light. The underlying element in the change which has occurred in the realm of discipline traces from the middle of the eighteenth century when modern psychology was born. Even as late as the middle of the nineteenth century, people still believed that children were born in sin, were fundamentally evil, and had to learn to be good. Opposing this ancient belief was another extreme view that children were born good, but it was the life they lived that made them bad. The advocates of psychology, on the other hand, took a middle view, believing that children were amoral: that is to say, neither good nor bad, but with a potential for either goodness or badness. This idea was not readily adopted until the second quarter of the twentieth century.

---

[1] Edmonson, J. B., Joseph Roemer, and Francis L. Bacon, The Administration of the Modern Secondary School (New York: Macmillan Company, 1948), p. 208.

An educator recently observed,

> Out of the findings derived by studies in biology, physiology, and psychology during the past half century, there has developed a different philosophy regarding the management of classes of youth in school. The findings point to a conclusion that children are not by nature either bad or good; they are merely candidates for badness or goodness.[1]

If children were neither bad nor good, there had to be some reason for their conduct, and from this reasoning came the conclusion that behavior is caused. Misconduct is merely the overt expression of an internal urge which has taken the wrong means of expression. The problem was how to channel the feelings of children into socially acceptable patterns. Discipline then, is not unquestioning acceptance of authority, docility, or conformity. Only when the individual understands the implications of his acts do they become significant for his character development.[2] Adult standards were not the only criteria for behavior. Various other elements had to be taken into consideration.

Children of today are not brought up the same way, nor do they have the same standards that existed a century ago. Pleasure seeking, which was once frowned upon, is now pursued by young and

---

[1] Brown, Edwin J., op. cit., p. 400.

[2] Douglas, Harl R., and Hubert H. Mills, Teaching in High School (New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1948), p. 101.

old alike. The adolescent of today does not have the sense of responsibility or the high respect for industry or work which formerly existed. Also, modern children have a different attitude towards authority of parents and teachers. Formerly unquestioned obedience was considered a virtue, but today conformity is more the result of reasoning, negotiation, and compromise.[1] Confidence in cooperating with parents gives the child a much healthier attitude towards behavior.

As a better understanding of why children misbehave is attained, the severity which accompanied the old-fashioned punishment diminishes. "For good discipline as well as good behavior we must deal with the child's feelings as well as his actions."[2] Baruch goes on to say that emotional hunger lies at the foot of most disciplinary problems.[3] The problem of how to deal with the emotional adjustment of children in order to obtain the desired results in behavior patterns has caused considerable discussion. Many people believe that modern disciplinary practices lack the control of the old-fashioned methods. The modern behaviorist counters that the

---

[1] Ibid., p. 108.

[2] Baruch, Dorothy, New Ways in Discipline (New York: Whittlesey House, 1949), p. 6.

[3] Ibid., p. 13.

punishment inflicted upon the child caused many more problems than the inconvenience and extra work required to give the child a satisfactory emotional climate. As a method, "Kindness coupled with fairness and firmness achieves results."[1]

The crux of the problem of discipline revolves around the need in our social order for children to learn the patterns of conduct, of action, of speech, of belief and feeling which our culture favors. To acquire these things child discipline does not have to be submissive obedience to authority (the passive good conduct which continual threats, watchful policing, and dire punishment compel) but rather the voluntary or self-discipline which guides the individual and directs his conduct without an ever-present authority, or police, or retaliatory punishment.[2]

Discipline is learned. In the past section it was stated that the emotions of the child had to be considered when he had misbehaved. It was also mentioned that behavior is caused, and that an important factor in working with children is to discover the cause for their behavior.

The next important idea to be developed is that the principles of learning are basic in the achievement of good discipline. First,

---

[1] Edmonson, Roemer, and Bacon, op. cit., p. 208.

[2] Frank, Lawrence, "Discipline in Our Time," Childhood Education, 20:5-9, September, 1943.

discipline (self-reliance and self-control) is learned; hence, changes in behavior, at best, are gradual. Second, pupils learn by motivation, example, and consistent practice, not by command.[1]

> To the parent and teacher the concept that discipline is learned is important for they are interested in the education of the child. The goals of education should be consistent with the findings of science. Today, the goal is self-discipline through reasoned action and emotional adjustment.[2]

Children, however, are unable to attain this by themselves; they need help. With the aid of his peers and adult companions the child should gain the attitudes and inhibitions required to carry on a social life. In the case of children, discipline begins outside the self, with submission to authority, but true discipline must ultimately come largely from within. A person is not completely disciplined until he can both submit to outside authority and also control himself from within.[3] "A disciplined personality is one with self control."[4]

---

[1] Cohler, Milton J., "A New Look at the Old Problem of Discipline," The Education Digest, 14:1, December, 1948.

[2] Cunningham, Ruth, "Group Discipline," N. E. A. Journal, 38:34-35, January, 1949.

[3] Arbuthnot, May Hill, "Transitions in Discipline," Discipline, an Interpretation (Washington, D. C.: Association for Childhood Education, 1944), p. 7.

[4] Menninger, William C., You and Psychiatry (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948), p. 159.

The modern psychology of discipline is often criticized because it places so much emphasis on self-control and does not take obedience into account. Obedience in this sense means conformity to adult directions or standards.

> 'Douglas Thorn in his Everyday Problems of the Everyday Child, calls attention to the fact that the characteristics favorable to obedience are imitation, submissiveness, suggestibility--all negative. While the characteristics unfavorable to obedience, curiosity, self-assertiveness, initiative, dominance--all positive traits that we hope the child will develop.[1]

The dilemma posed by this realization that conflicting traits are both desirable and undesirable makes it extra hard for the person in charge of the child's development. The decision of how best to encourage the desirable traits and to minimize the undesirable effects of too rigid emphasis on obedience creates a problem. Menninger explains that parents and teachers must base their enforcement of externally applied discipline on their conviction of the importance of the solution they propose for the problem at hand.[2] More and more, parents and teachers are adopting the attitude that punishment does not get to the real basis of the child's behavior. They are beginning to see that discipline is actually counseling. Modern discipline is educative, corrective, and not punitive.[3]

---

[1] Arbuthnot, op. cit., p. 7.

[2] Menninger, op. cit., p. 159.

[3] Miner, op. cit., p. 13.

The need is not for more institutions and more rigid law enforcement, but for a universal understanding of children's problems. Today discipline is essential; every child needs leadership and guidance.[1] The new form of discipline does not give the children license to do as they wish any more than does the freedom guaranteed in the Constitution of the United States permit a citizen of this country to do absolutely as he wishes. In the modern school the objective of all discipline is the pupil's growth in accepting responsibility for his actions with due respect paid to the individual, social, and spiritual values involved.[2] Self-discipline, then, is a step towards freedom, but freedom is not attained until the individual is able to use his freedom in an intelligent, positive manner.

Cultural variation exists. Actually, there are only a few basic disciplinary practices. It is the application of these techniques that varies. Rev. John M. Cooper observed, "There is probably no method or device known to and practiced by civilized man that is not known to and practiced by uncivilized man in the social and moral training of the child."[4] Anthropological studies have shown

---

[1] Baruch, op. cit., p. 4.

[2] Douglass and Mills, op. cit., p. 99.

[3] Ibid., p. 101.

[4] Pettit, George A., Primitive Education in North America (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1946), p. 15.

many examples to confirm this statement. It must be understood, however, that often the application of these practices will be in sharp contrast to western culture.

Murdock, in his book Our Primitive Contemporaries, cites examples of disciplinary patterns in many cultural groups. These are presented to show the similarities and contrasts that exist among ethnic groups.[1]

The nomadic Tasmanian aborigines indoctrinated their youth into the pattern of their culture through conscious inculcation and unconscious imitation. The women and girls of the tribe were in charge of the smaller children, but the discipline was not harsh.[2]

In Samoa the child was turned over to an older brother or sister as soon as possible. Strict obedience to parents was insisted upon and was enforced by constant scoldings and occasional cuffings.[3] The children, so long as their physical well-being was assured and obedience to authority was adhered to, were left to do much as they chose. They often became overbearing to their slightly older tenders. "But just as the child is getting old enough so that its willfulness is becoming unbearable, a younger one is saddled upon it, and the

---

[1] Murdock, George R., Our Primitive Contemporaries (New York: Macmillan Company, 1934), p. 8.

[2] Ibid., p. 8.

[3] Ibid., p. 68-69.

whole process is repeated again, each child being disciplined and socialized through responsibility for a still younger one."[1]

In the Semang tribe of the Malayan Peninsula, parents displayed a great fondness for their children. They never struck them and, though they scolded them, they never permitted outsiders to do so. Children learned solely through imitation and play. Conscious education did not exist.[2]

Uniform kindness to all their children was practiced in the middle Australian aboriginal groups. They sometimes scolded their offspring, but never punished them, except in rare bursts of passion. The children learned the culture patterns of their tribe and the duties of their sex by observation and imitation. Fear of not being initiated into the adult spiritual groups brought a high degree of conformity.[3]

Among the Crow Indians of the central American plains, "parents rarely punish their offspring, and never beat them. If a child cries too long, they put it on its back and pour water down its nose. Before long the words 'Bring the water!' suffice to quiet it."[4]

---

[1] Mead, Margaret, Coming of Age in Samoa (New York: William Moore and Company, 1928), p. 25.

[2] Murdock, op. cit., p. 19.

[3] Ibid., p. 35.

[4] Ibid., p. 275.

Life was very difficult among the Polar Eskimos, and if the father of a young child died, the child was strangled and buried with him as the mother would have no means of support. If the mother died and the child was still nursing, the child was buried with the mother if no wet nurse was available. Despite these practices, the Eskimos loved their children and never inflicted corporal punishment on them, although squalling babies were sometimes placed naked in a snowdrift, even at sub-zero temperatures, until they stopped crying. The education of the children was an individual matter. The mother instructed the daughter in her duties and the father trained his son.[1]

The Iroquois Indians also practiced infanticide when the mother of a young child died. The fathers took little authority over their children and evidenced little interest in them. The children's care fell entirely to the mother, who rarely disciplined them except to occasionally dash water in their faces.[2]

A different type of discipline was evidenced by the Nama Hottentots of Africa.

> Children of about the same age form into gangs with elected chiefs on the model of the political system of their elders. The gang organization directs all games,

---

[1] Ibid., p. 311.

[2] Ibid., p. 311.

> settles all disputes, imposes fines for disobedience to parents, etc. Adults, instead of disciplining their children themselves, leave the regulation of their conduct and activities to the gang.[1]

The most consistently severe disciplinarians were the Aztec Indians of Mexico. Parents were wont to give long moral lectures in an effort to instill industry, honesty, moderation, and filial piety. They did not hesitate to enforce those virtues with such punishments as flogging, binding, pricking with agave thorns, holding over a fire containing pepper, and exposure naked in the rays of the noonday sun. The fathers taught their handicraft to their sons and mothers instructed their daughters in the domestic arts.[2]

It may have appeared from the examples noted above that the primitive tribes had no discipline, but Pettit emphasized that there were indirect, non-parental types of discipline in effect upon the children at all times.[3] In many of the primitive tribes corporal punishment was not inflicted by parents; instead they called in outsiders. The mother's brother or the father's sister were commonly the disciplinarians, for it was believed that children who

---

[1] Ibid., p. 495.

[2] Ibid., p. 383-384.

[3] Pettit, George A., op. cit., p. 161.

were unhappy with their parents would disappear. In some cases the belief that the souls of departed relatives were housed in the bodies of children caused the adults to restrain from striking them. The high infant mortality rate had the effect of making parents more considerate of their children, at least in areas where superstitions prevailed.[1]

Superstition was also used as a means of maintaining order among the children. Many of the tribes created fear in the children's minds by threats that some supernatural being would take them away if they were bad. Sometimes a member of the tribe dressed in a mask and attempted to remove a bad child, who was saved only by the parents' intercession. In other groups an annual event was the awarding of gifts to the good and punishment to the bad children by one of the tribal gods. This practice was similar in origin to the Santa Claus myth.[2]

An often overlooked means of discipline was the practice of nicknames. Children were often given undesirable names which they worked very hard to change. The more desirable the child's conduct, the better the name he received.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 151.

[2] Ibid., p. 161.

Eligibility to participate in ceremonies was often used to preserve social conformity. The killing of a boy's first bird was a great occasion, marked by a ceremony, and with each succeeding type of game killed, the youth would move up the ladder towards the warrior class. With the girls, the attainment of goals was of a nature more in line with their role in life, but they had a similar series of feats to perform.

Some anthropologists have written that there was no conscious teaching of skills and crafts; that the children learned these through observation and imitation. Actually, the basic motives for the learning process in primitive children were the three fundamental stimuli: ridicule, praise, and reward. When the children performed their tasks correctly they were praised and sometimes rewarded. When they failed, they were seldom punished; instead, ridicule acted as a motivation factor for future performances.[1]

---

[1] Pettit, George A., op. cit., p. 161.

CHAPTER III

MODERN PRACTICES IN DISCIPLINE

Factors Affecting Individual Discipline

A baby or a small child is absolutely dependent upon outside aid in order to survive, and in normal conditions, it is the parent or the parent substitute that furnishes the aid. Besides supplying the necessities of life, the parent also imposes conditions which are termed discipline. Many, many things he has learned by the time he is eighteen months old, and they have been discipline, though we have not thought of them as such, and we ourselves have taken the entire responsibility."[1] The form which the discipline takes is dependent upon the adult's education, experience, socio-economic status, and future plans for the child.

> The purpose of adults in disciplining is unquestionably the creation (from the primitive little creature who is born to them) of an occupied, self-controlled, adaptable, socially mature person who can carry on, without undue wastage of his emotional energy or that of others, his fair share of the work of the world and who can enjoy his share of its benefits.[2]

---

[1] Burgess, Helen Steers, Discipline: What Is It? (New York: Child Study Association of America, 1938), p. 4.

[2] Washburn, Ruth Wendell, "Discipline in the World of Childhood," Childhood Education, 20:15, September, 1943.

The need in most homes is to maintain control over the child in such activities which are necessary for the child's health and safety, but to give him maximum freedom in his play and in those activities where he can safely try things for himself.[1] In order for the child to learn, he must be allowed to experiment; situations should be created where the child can investigate without causing destruction or without interfering with the property of others. The child also needs to be taught to assume responsibility, but this needs to be done without an appearance of domination on the part of the adult, for children resist excessive supervision.[2]

Every child is, in fact, an individual and has as many emotions and feelings as any adult individual. Parents need to remember,

> The 'Golden Rule' is an excellent standard for child-parent relationships. We haven't any right to force our demands on him just because he is smaller. We can hardly be rude to our children and not expect them to be rude to us. The same is true when we are considerate or inconsiderate, thoughtful or thoughtless, respectful or disrespectful, loving or indifferent.[3]

Parents need to establish rapport with their children, for children who have a relationship with their parents based upon understanding

---

[1] Anderson, Harold H., op. cit., p. 2.

[2] Ibid., p. 3.

[3] Menninger, William C., op. cit., p. 159.

will be ready to respond in an emergency situation which requires a command.[1] Another axiom to remember is that a good example by the parents is necessary for the best development of the offspring.[2]

Stages of development are important. While it is important that adults treat children as human beings it is also necessary that the adult realize that children are not yet adults and that they pass through various stages of growth and development before achieving maturation. Jenkins says, "Much of our discipline fails because we expect more of a child than he can give at his particular age."[3] One of the most annoying stages of development is the negative period. During this stage, the child uses "no" indiscriminantly as an answer to everything. It becomes so unbearable that many parents place restrictions on the children, refuse to let them enter into their normal activities, or punish them in other ways. Baruch condemned this, for she felt that while a child is in a negative stage adults should cut down on as many requests and requirements as possible. "There are so many biological rules which limit his behavior and curtail his independence that piling a lot of extra rules on him only intensifies his unrest and his sense of defeat."[4]

---

[1] Anderson, Harold H., op. cit., p. 3.

[2] Jenkins, Gladys Gardner, op. cit., p. 18.

[3] Ibid., p. 19.

[4] Baruch, Dorothy, op. cit., p. 111.

The need for independence in many children is stifled by parents who fail to realize the importance of it in the development of the child into an adult. Some parents resent their offspring's gaining independence and moving away from them; they become more domineering than before. Others think that the child's assertion of independence is a flaunting of their authority and punish them for disobedience or failure to respect their elders. Actually the drive for independence is but one of the stages of development, and as Baruch pointed out, "In those years of growing, the same sort of behavior keeps cropping up again and again until a child finally passes from childhood into a more adult stage."[1] This emphasizes the need for more adult understanding of child development.

Behavior is caused. Webster defines behavior as: "Behavior applies to our mode of acting in the presence of others, or toward them, and often refers to purely external relations or to particular instances; it is especially used with reference to children."[2] The overt actions of children are often labeled as naughty and the child punished with little regard given to the actual cause of the behavior.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 143.

[2] Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, (Springfield, Mass.: G. and C. Merriam Co., 1945), p. 95.

The new concept of behavior was expressed by Burton when he said,

> Scientific facts concerning heredity have rendered untenable certain earlier conceptions of causation and guilt. Blame for misbehavior cannot always be placed wholly upon the individual. Sometimes even the individual is less to blame than certain other persons and factors in his environment. Individuals are not excused from responsibility, but misbehavior is now regarded as an outgrowth of the total life history of an individual.[1]

The factors that determine the behavior of a child are multitudinous. The many activities entered into by a child in a day defy listing, but every incident leaves some mark upon the personality of the child. When many such influences have acted upon the child it is difficult to determine what caused his behavior. Baruch writes, "A child misbehaves because he has suffered, because he is hurt or afraid."[2] The feelings and emotions of children are sensitive and need expression much the same as do adults'. When they are denied the opportunity to work off their sorrow or hurt feelings, the results are unpredictable. Baruch adds, "When we fail to help a child release his feelings, when we handle him so that he denies them and pushes them into his unconscious mind, they move out of his control."[3]

---

[1] Burton, William H., The Guidance of Learning Activities (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company Inc., 1944), p. 566.

[2] Baruch, Dorothy, op. cit., p. 66.

[3] Ibid., p. 71.

The idea that children should never hate is dangerous, for they often times will feel hate and love at the same time. When a parent thwarts a child's attempts to gain his goal, the child first feels anger. If he is unable to vent this anger without parental punishment, he will withdraw the feeling into himself and feel guilty for having experienced hate towards someone he should love. When many such fears pile up inside the child, he may develop behavior patterns inconsistent with cultural standards. Some children react in an aggressive manner; others withdraw and become reclusive so that they will not get hurt again. The aggressive child does not always take out his anger upon the person or object which caused his problem, but usually transfers his antagonism to some other symbol. For this reason it becomes more difficult to help the child, for his overt action is not premeditated, but spontaneous and seemingly without reason. The use of punishment at this time may be dangerous, for "Any treatment of a disciplinary case which fails to improve the individual must be considered unsatisfactory."[1] Before discipline can have the desired effect, the real cause of the behavior should be known.

---

[1] Cox, Philip W. L., and R. Emerson Langfitt, High School Administration and Supervision (New York: American Book Company, 1934), p. 176.

Love and understanding are necessary. The importance of the emotions was emphasized by Baruch when she said, "If any of the basic elements of emotional nourishment is missing, a human being suffers."[1] As the body needs food, so the emotions need nourishment. Some of the basic requirements for a healthy emotional life are: (1) love and affection (2) sense of belonging (3) pleasure that comes through the senses (4) achievement (5) recognition (6) acceptance and understanding.[2] Parents and teachers need to consciously work to provide the children for whom they are responsible with these emotional requirements. Love and affection are two of the most important of the emotional needs and Redl compared them with the importance of the vitamin requirements in a diet. He also said, "A healthy conscience cannot develop without love."[3] Conscience is a very important part of the well-disciplined person. It helps him to live in a socially acceptable manner without constant supervision from outside sources. The conscience starts developing between the ages of three and six years. It does not mature by six, but continues to grow during the life of the individual. Two elements are essential in its formation, according to Havighurst: Love and affection, and

---

[1] Baruch, Dorothy, op. cit., p. 14.

[2] Ibid., p. 13-14.

[3] Redl, Fritz, op. cit., p. 15.

prohibition in order that the child may take into himself a warning and punishing voice. If either are missing the child will have little conscience.[1] Baruch stressed the need for love when she said, "For the free gift of love to your child in his first days is the best insurance against disciplinary casualties later."[2]

Discipline must be meaningful. Frequently, children fail to see the reason for punishment. Care must be taken to give them an understanding of the situation.

> Administer your discipline in such a way that your offender ceases thinking his real mistake was getting caught and realizes his mistake was doing something undesirable. Discipline must help him to understand why he acted as he did and must assist him in deciding for himself whether this type of behavior befits him as an intelligent, maturing young . . .(person).[3]

Burgess listed three devices of a disciplinary nature which are expedient at the moment, but which do not have the lasting quality of true discipline. The giving of rewards is habit forming and while it relieves the immediate situation, "what has the child learned? He has learned to bargain, not to behave nicely, and thereafter when there are no cookies there'll be no courtesy."[4]

---

[1] Davis, Allison, and Robert Havighurst, Father of the Man (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1947), p. 177-178.

[2] Baruch, Dorothy, op. cit., p. 90.

[3] Miner, Robert J., op. cit., p. 13.

[4] Burgess, Helen Steers, op. cit., p. 10.

The second method which does not qualify as discipline, but which is in general use is the "Do it to please Mama" type. The child is led to believe that he will not be loved if he does not comply with the parent's wishes, and conformity is obtained without understanding. "Don't overuse the desire to please. The loveliest quality changes when we use it as a weapon."[1]

The third method is reasoning. Burgess believed that the use of reason is another limitation which adults should be aware of when they are treating children as human beings.

> Can we use reason as a disciplinary measure? The answer is that we can use reasoning, but not as a disciplinary device. After a certain age it appeals to some children to be treated reasonably, but we mustn't expect them to be the reasonable ones.[2]

The small child functions mainly from emotions and drives. He has yet to learn the use of reasoning. He should be given every opportunity to develop the facility, for it is one of the basic elements of a well-disciplined personality.

Discipline "may be thought of as organization of one's impulses for the attainment of a goal."[3] It should not always be

---

[1] Ibid., p. 13.

[2] Ibid., p. 13.

[3] Shevikov and Redl, Discipline for Today's Children and Youth (New York: Association for Childhood Education, 1944), p. 4.

considered in the negative sense as denials, refusals, or punishment. Discipline should be thought of in a much broader concept, for it is not always a means of coercion. "Treating the child like a human being doesn't mean that the parents give up the use of and indoctrination of discipline."[1]

The job of parents is to help their children obtain emotional stability, a healthful environment, and self-discipline. "Self-discipline requires reasoned action which implies self-understanding . . ."[2]

The reasons American homes are failing in the indoctrination of self-discipline, according to Mead are: different standards between parents and children, heterogeneous standards within a community, and the shifting residences and broken homes.[3] When any one or more of these conditions exists, the emotional needs of the children are not met. During a war or period of national emergency, these factors increase and the stability of the population is undermined.

---

[1] Menninger, William C., op. cit., p. 159.

[2] Cunningham, Ruth, op. cit., p. 34-35.

[3] Mead, Margaret, Changing Culture of an Indian Tribe (New York: Columbia University Press, 1932), p. 203-204.

Therapy requires understanding. Treatment of children after they have become problems does not always require the services of a psychologist or other professional. There are things that can be done in the home to help the children work off the stored-up feelings.

Baruch in her book New Ways in Discipline gives a detailed account of her theory on how parents can help the child relieve tensions. "Understanding acceptance and the mirroring of feelings are all that are needed to bring positive results."[1] The first step requires that the parent know what the child is feeling so well that he can put it into words. The parent must be sympathetic for the child and willing to accept the feelings, whether they are or are not flattering. The next step involves the reflection, in words and in action, of the child's feelings by the parent, so that the child realizes that the parent understands and accepts the feelings. Through the exchange of ideas the child releases his tensions and a more congenial atmosphere prevails between child and parent. The whole process is one designed to re-establish confidence and a co-operative response on the child's part. The child sets the pace, the parent merely takes up the lead and helps the child to give vent to his feelings. When the child's antagonism takes a physical form of expression, use is made of substitute symbols, such as clay, dolls,

---

[1] Baruch, Dorothy, op. cit., p. 28.

or paper, and they are used until verbal release can be resumed.[1]

Factors Affecting Group Discipline

So far in this chapter the discussion has concerned discipline for the individual. However, man operates in groups much of the time, so it is necessary to examine the conditions which determine group action.

A group actually is a collection of individuals. The way the group acts will be in relation to the way in which the individuals act separately. The degree to which an individual is self-disciplined depends also upon his interactions with the group. "The disciplined individual is one who recognizes, accepts, and acts upon the modes of behavior deemed acceptable by the social group. . .self-discipline by an individual is actually conforming to group standards."[2] Lane states "The disciplined person is one who is able to direct the resources at his disposal to the solution of his problems and those of his group."[3] In both these statements emphasis is placed upon the ability of the individual to operate with and in his group.

---

[1] Baruch, Dorothy, op. cit., pp. 26-28, 40-45, 53, 55-57, 62, 106, 110-112, 117, 122-123, 128-129, 133-135, 142, 146, 148, 151, 154-155, 157, 167-168, 176-178, 180-183, 192-194, 203-205, 208-209.

[2] Arbuthnot, May Hill, op. cit., p. 169a.

[3] Lane, Howard A., "Discipline in Today's Education," Discipline, an Interpretation (Washington, D. C.: Association for Childhood Education, 1944), p. 28.

"There is no deterrent to wrong-doing like that of social disapproval."[1] The need for a place and recognition in a group is one of the factors in emotional health and aids in keeping the individual members working for the good of the group.

Group self-discipline is goal. Groups form for a common purpose, hobby clubs, classrooms, family groups, etc., but aside from the one common denominator, there may be little accord among the members. "We need to recognize that group self-discipline is not an all or none business."[2] There will usually be some conflict within the group, whether expressed or covert.

When trying to determine the tone of the group, many group leaders resort to spies to gather information on non-conformists. Actually, "Spying does more harm than good."[3] The inner harmony of a group suffers if it becomes known that they are not trusted and a spy is in the midst. The information received is often subjective and pointed to the bias of the informer. It is much better to work for group self-discipline, even though progress in the early stages may not be so spectacular as in one dominated by an autocrat.

---

[1] Edmonson, J. B., Joseph Roemer, and Francis L. Bacon, op. cit., p. 210.

[2] Cunningham, Ruth, op. cit., p. 35.

[3] Edmonson, Roemer, Bacon, op. cit., p. 211.

In a democratic group it is necessary that all members should have a voice, and that the group abide by the decisions of the majority. To ostracize a member because of a divergent opinion is hardly justifiable. Cases of isolation or expulsion are only justified under the principle of the good of the group.[1]

"Group discipline looks first to the welfare of the whole."[2] The establishment of a self-directing group requires unanimous understanding in group purposes, a willingness to cooperate and esprit de corps.

"The group, with the leader, will need to begin with basic concepts; such as, that group behavior is not mere 'spontaneous combustion' but is controlled by causes which can be identified."[3] Some of the recognizable factors which affect the group are age of members, sex of members, ability of leader to direct group, external environment, internal environment, temperature, etc.

Cunningham maintains that the leader of the group is the principal determinant of success when she says,

> Group reaction depends upon the insight of the (leader) in keeping pace with the maturity and skills of the group and in providing appropriate scope for group planning. . .

---

[1] Cox and Langfitt, op. cit., p. 176.

[2] Bagley, Wm. Chandler, op. cit., p. 92.

[3] Cunningham, Ruth, op. cit., p. 34.

> (leaders) who throw (members) into the deep water of self-management without first developing skills with the group are those who are loud to proclaim that group planning and group self-discipline won't work.[1]

Lewin, Lippitt, and White conducted an experiment at the University of Iowa in 1940, in the area of the "social climate" of children's groups.[2] The experiment was set up with careful selection of all the participants. As part of the preparation, observer-recorders were trained at the University elementary school so that their observations would be consistent and add up to a total picture. Three club leaders and three club groups of five members each were used.

The main variable used in the project was the three different types of leader control: authoritarian, democratic, and laissez faire.

The chief characteristics of the authoritarian leader were: (1) leader dictated policy (2) Plans were given the students one at a time so that they were always in the dark as to the next step (3) Leader dictated the work task and companion of each member (4) Praise and criticism was made personal by the leader, who remained aloof.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 35.

[2] Lippitt and White, "The 'Social Climate' of Children's Groups," Child Behavior and Development (Barker, et al., editors; New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1943), pp. 485-508.

The democratic leader had the following characteristics: (1) Leader aided and abetted the group in all discussion and in all decision; (2) Discussion periods brought out an activity perspective, and the leader gave two or more alternatives when called upon for advice; (3) Members were free to work with whom they chose, and the division of tasks was left up to the group; and (4) Leader tried to be a regular member of the group without doing too much of the work, and was objective and fact-minded in his comments.

Characteristics of the laissez-faire group were: (1) A minimum of leader participation and the members were free to make their own choices; (2) Leader supplied the materials and made it plain that he would give advice if he were asked; (3) Complete non-participation by the leader; and (4) Leader did not try to regulate the course of events, but gave infrequent spontaneous comments on members and activities.

There were five members in each club, especially chosen so that all groups would be as much alike as possible. Each group was given a series of six meetings with each of the leaders, and it was the response under the different leaders that was observed. Observations were made in the following areas: (1) Interaction between leader and group; (2) Minute-by-minute account of group structure analysis; (3) Interpretive running account of significant member actions; and (4) Continuous stenographic record of all

conversation. The data obtained by the observers was compiled in a consecutive form and studied by the many experts working on the study.

Some of the interpretive comments given concerning the authoritarian group were summarized. Work by the group was slack while the leader was out. The boys had little knowledge of why the leader gave specific orders and showed very little interest in the project as a whole. The free, sociable, joking atmosphere disappeared when they began working. The efficiency was fairly high as long as the leader kept everyone busy. The personalities of the individuals were sublimated in the autocratic group.

In the laissez-faire group there was no leader direction, but the boys usually started out making an effort to work together. Soon, however, the group split up, with one or two looking on with hostility. There were three factors present which made for aggressive behavior: (1) absence of a respected adult (2) idleness (3) frustration, leading to a high level of psychological tension. The children, who were not highly adult-value centered, were happy when the leader left the room, but the children who were highly adult-value centered were unhappy and bothered by the confusion.

Under the democratic leader the group was highly interested in the project, even before the leader entered. They felt that "we" had planned the work, not just the leader. Pleasure in the work

situation promoted friendliness. The friendliness resulted in praise, which gave pleasure in the work. Status in the group was gained by good work. The leader attempted to develop both the skills and vocabulary of democracy. In the democratic club, the group goals were accepted and taken over by each individual.

The study provided a large quantity of material on different types of individuals under different stimuli, and showed that under the democratic leadership far more individual attainment was achieved. The opportunity for recognition of the individual differences accounted for some of the increase. The development of the best emotional life of each member was much greater in the democratic group, and the cheerfulness, cooperative attitude, and sense of accomplishment shown by the members of this group indicate its superiority over the other types of leadership.[1]

The guiding criteria for a disciplinary program, whether for an individual or a group, are the requirements for emotional growth. The emotional health of the individual or individuals is of greater concern than any other factor. Parents and teachers need constantly to evaluate their programs to make certain that they are providing the best possible atmosphere for the development of self-discipline for all the children with whom they are working.

---

[1] Lippitt and White, op. cit., p. 506.

CHAPTER IV

DISCIPLINE AND THE SCHOOL

When the child enters school at the age of six, he is already conditioned to his culture. Many times this conditioning will be in conflict with the teaching of the school, and the teacher has to break the existing habits before she can establish new ones. Each child has a behavior pattern peculiar to himself and the teacher has to fuse the various personalities into an educative unit.

It is difficult to establish effective habits of study in a situation characterized by disorderly, anti-social conduct. One of the immediate objectives of school discipline is to maintain effective work conditions.[1] This does not mean that the room should be so silent that one can hear a pin drop. Very often the climate in such a room is not conducive to work any more than in a classroom where no order is kept. Instead, there should be a relationship between the teacher and class which permits relaxed, meaningful labor without extraneous confusion.

The problem of maintaining a satisfactory classroom atmosphere is difficult, for each group and each situation is different.

---

[1] Douglass, Harl R., and Hubert H. Mills, op. cit., p. 103.

There are not enough formulae for discipline to take care of the many complexities. Some methods work for some teachers and not for others. There seems to be no one solution.[1]

Warters states that teachers who have the "personnel point of view" will be adaptable and understanding enough to meet the various situations that occur. The "personnel point of view" does not infer that the teacher have a bag of tricks or devices; instead, it is an attitude which recognizes the differences in personalities and makes allowances for them. This attitude develops from an understanding of mental hygiene and the processes of human development and gives the teacher a different attitude towards the problem child. Teachers who adopt this point of view change from a policy of assessing blame and punishment to one of seeking the underlying causes of maladjustment and of trying to correct or counteract its influence on the child.[2]

What is often called childhood disobedience is often nothing more than the child's normal growth towards independence.[3] Instead of punishment, effort should be directed toward helping the pupil attain progressive development through learning to accept

---

[1] Baruch, Dorothy, op. cit., p. 236.

[2] Warters, Jane, High School Personnel Work Today (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1946), p. 43.

[3] Baruch, Dorothy, op. cit., p. 140.

responsibilities for his own acts.[1] The child ". . .needs an opportunity to establish free, dynamic, relations with others in a number of situations in which he may function freely and successfully for the sake of an important objective."[2]

The teacher should not lose sight of the fact that "Discipline is training and training is education."[3] Actually, prevention is the keynote of modern discipline. It is much better to develop self-reliance in children than to depend upon punishing them after they have misbehaved. A sympathetic leader and guide is a good type of disciplinarian.[4] It is better for the teacher to work with the children than to have the children working for the teacher, as was indicated in the Iowa University study cited in Chapter III.

Discipline in the school should act as a means of training for effective citizenship.[5] The development of self-control during the

---

[1] Warters, Jane, op. cit., p. 43.

[2] Ibid., p. 124.

[3] Hawkes, Herbert E., and Anna L. Hawkes, Through A Dean's Open Door, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1945), p. 187.

[4] Monash, Louis, "Notes on Mental Hygiene and Preventative Discipline," Understanding the Child, p. 19-22, January, 1949.

[5] Edmonson, J. B., Joseph Roemer, and Francis L. Bacon, op. cit., p. 223.

school years will provide a foundation for mature citizenship. The mature citizen is one who has developed adequate control over his body, his mind, his emotions, and his morals. The task of the school is to arrange and direct the learning experience so that self-discipline gradually becomes a part of the habitual behavior of the maturing man or woman."[1]

The teacher is the most important influence. In order to best guide the children, the teacher must know as much about each child as possible. The most common source of information is the cumulative record which is passed on from teacher to teacher. In the kindergarten or first grade there will be no record available, so questionnaires and interviews will furnish the background information. The beginning the kindergarten or first-grade teacher gives to the cumulative folder is important, for the precedent set as to quality and quantity of material, will determine to a great extent how future notations will be made. The better the teacher understands the individual child and acts in accordance with this understanding the better the guidance will be.[2] The more the teacher knows about the individuals in the group, the better the group guidance will be.

---

[1] Newburn, H. K., "Equipping Youth to Create New Frontiers," The Junior College Journal, 20:3-8, September, 1949.

[2] Baruch, Dorothy, op. cit., p. 18.

Basically, the teacher is trying to gain the student's cooperation and good will, and to use them in developing the child's self-discipline. Punishment, on the other hand, increases the child's resentments, and the cooperation is likely to dwindle.[1] The teacher must understand the child in order to know what actions will have a detrimental emotional effect. A word of caution is given by Baruch when she points out that too often a child that cooperates fully is considered to be emotionally well adjusted. This is not always the case, for the "too good" actions are often a cover-up for bad thoughts which the child stores up inside until a dangerous emotional tension is created.[2]

Jenkins believes that, in teaching our children desirable habits, praise gets better results than blame, for achievement and recognition are two of the necessary requirements for good emotional health. The most successful and lasting ways of getting cooperation are through instructions given with simple but adequate reasons. Children do not have a true interest in activities which they do not understand. The relationships between pupil and teacher are better when understanding exists. "Obedience based upon the acceptance of

---

[1] Ibid., p. 67.

[2] Ibid., p. 35.

a reason leads to self-direction and self-control."[1]

Evaluation by the pupil of his own work and conduct leads to the development of standards, by which he can measure his own social and educational growth. Cooperative planning within the group serves the same function on a group level. Cooperative planning and pupil evaluation are techniques whereby the pupil can see his own progress as a whole person or as a member of the group. Discussion periods following an activity lend perspective to the experience. Similar discussions preceding lessons or purposing set goals and the course to be followed, both in conduct and in procedure. The object is to give the pupil or pupils the necessary attitudes which will enable them to choose their own course of action. Skillful guidance and direction by the teacher help the children attain desirable goals and keep the activity from ending in negative conduct and confusion.

Teacher personality affects discipline. Brown writes that the ability to govern is the first essential to success in teaching. The term "govern" does not mean the act of holding the "big stick" over the heads of the students, but the ability to direct the classroom to the best advantage of the group. The use of force and pressure are signs of domination, not of an ability to govern.[2]

---

[1] Jenkins, Gladys Gardner, op. cit., p. 18-19.

[2] Brown, Edwin J., op. cit., p. 345.

Many times, traits in a teacher's personality that are overlooked by adults have an effect upon children's behavior. Moffitt lists teachers' alertness, voice, temperament, experience, standards, knowledge of subject matter, presentation, fairness and honesty as factors which determine pupil behavior.[1]

Bagley, in 1908, gave authority, courage, tact, persistence, scholarship, justice, and good humor as conditions affecting discipline.[2] He also cited as factors in securing order, the teacher's voice, mechanized routine and keeping pupils occupied.[3]

The situation is also discussed by Cohler, who says:

> Certain prerequisites institute a sine quo non for good discipline, even though they do not of themselves achieve this end. The first is a sound educational program. The more fully the pupils participate in the planning, the more careful the preparation must be. . . .A second prerequisite is excellent classroom management. . . .A third prerequisite is beginning work promptly. Pupils learn by example more than by precept. . .Professionally ethical conduct and attitude of teachers towards one another is a final prerequisite. If they indicate lack of confidence in each other they tear down their own discipline.[4]

The role of the administration in discipline. In the schools of today, punishment and reform school methods are giving way to

---

[1] Moffitt, Frederick J., op. cit., p. 21.

[2] Bagley, Wm. Chandler, op. cit., pp. 93-101.

[3] Ibid., p. 103.

[4] Cohler, Milton J., op. cit., p. 1.

careful scientific diagnosis, followed by sympathetic re-education.[1] Many schools have guidance directors whose duty it is to counsel students and aid them in making adjustments. Not only is aid given to the discipline problems, but many other areas are given attention. If no guidance director is available, some other member of the faculty doubles in this capacity. Edmonson, Roemer, and Bacon place the "general discipline control under the direction of the assistant principal."[2] This is a practice in many high schools, where an assistant is used, but is not a common practice in the elementary field.

Cox and Langfitt assign the responsibility for discipline to the principal and his administrative assistants. They should set up a creative school control which will assure that any interference with the welfare of the school will be unpopular and therefore seldom undertaken. "The emphasis of administrative procedure should be placed upon the direction of the pupil towards school control."[3] The use of student government in many schools as a disciplinary court has been effective, but the administration must always hold final decision.

The responsibility for maintenance of order in the school is

---

[1] Burton, William H., op. cit., p. 566.

[2] Edmonson, Roemer, Bacon, op. cit., p. 96.

[3] Cox, Philip W. L., and R. Emerson Langfitt, High School Administration and Supervision (New York: American Book Company, 1934), p. 175.

actually that of the principal, but every member of the faculty must enter into the program. The classroom teacher is in contact with the pupils the most and the guidance given in the classroom does much to determine the general discipline of the building. No single method of discipline is effective, but the attitude and understanding of the teacher can bring about the desired classroom atmosphere.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

The material discussed in this paper represents the ideas of many people, but the trends in discipline are clearly marked. Basic to each method are distinguishing characteristics.

Adult-dominated discipline of yesterday and today is characterized by the requirement of obedience on the part of the child. Parents and teachers set up adult standards by which children are expected to live. Children are to be seen and not heard. No allowance is made for emotional adjustment, and punishment is used often and is severe.

With the development of psychology the premises of the old discipline are shown to be fallacious. Children are not young adults. Because the emotional development of children is not considered, children are growing up with poor emotional health. The punitive measures employed stifled independent development of a child's personality and force him to submerge his feelings.

From information gained in scientific studies a new type of discipline has evolved. The goals of the new type of discipline are: self-discipline, living with others, and self-direction, choosing one's own course from data supplied. No longer is the adult the autocrat, but instead a leader and guide to help the child develop organization

for the attainment of these goals.

The adult must have a knowledge of the requirements of a healthy emotional life. Authorities list love as the first requirement. Love and affection are as vital to human emotions as food is to the physical organism, but love alone is not enough. Coupled with love is the requirement understanding; the willingness to accept the child's feelings, complimentary or uncomplimentary.

Rapport must exist between adults and children to enable the child to discuss and release his feelings in a socially acceptable manner. This creates a mutual feeling of confidence, and companionship, giving the home and the classroom a harmonious closeness. As control of emotions is another of the goals, the administrator of guidance and discipline must himself be emotionally stable, self-controlled and sympathetic. Conformity to ethnic mores is not overlooked. Conformity is attained through the child's understanding of a reason. Therefore, the child is given reasons and explanations for the conduct he is assuming and for the actions he must make.

It must be admitted that the problem is not solved. Modern conditions, however, indicate that as more opportunities present themselves and conditions improve, progress will be made. The increase in the numbers of mental health clinics, child guidance centers and adult education centers is spreading the psychological

approach. The higher standards required of teachers are also bringing a more understanding group of teachers into the classroom. The higher standard of living in America has an accompanying higher level of education making possible greater understanding of children's problems by adults.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Axline, Virginia Mae, Play Therapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1947.

Bagley, Wm. Chandler, Classroom Management. New York: Macmillan, 1908.

Barker, Roger G., Jacob S. Kounin, and Herbert F. Wright, Child Behavior and Development. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company Inc., 1943.

Baruch, Dorothy, New Ways in Discipline. New York: Whittlesey House, 1949.

Blatz, William E., Understanding the Young Child. New York: William Morrow and Company, 1944.

Burton, William H., The Guidance of Learning Activities. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company Inc., 1944.

Clemens, Samuel Langhorne, The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn. New York: The Heritage Press, 1940.

Clemens, Samuel Langhorne, The Adventures of Tom Sawyer. New York: The Heritage Press, 1940.

Cox, Philip W. L., and R. Emerson Langfitt, High School Administration and Supervision. New York: American Book Company, 1934.

Davis, W. Allison, and Robert J. Havighurst, Father of the Man. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1947.

Douglas, Harl R. and Hubert H. Mills, Teaching in High School. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1948.

Edmonson, J. B., Joseph Roemer, and Francis L. Bacon, The Administration of the Modern Secondary School. New York: Macmillan Company, 1948.

Eggleston, Edward, The Hoosier Schoolmaster. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1913.

Hawkes, Herbert E., and Anna L. Rose Hawkes, Through a Dean's Open Door. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1945.

Healy, William, and A. F. Bronner, Juvenile Detention Homes. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936.

Kluckhohn, Clyde, and Henry A. Murray, Personality in Nature, Society, and Culture. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1948.

Mead, Margaret, Coming of Age in Samoa. New York: William Morrow and Company, 1928.

Menninger, William C., You and Psychiatry. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948.

Murdock, George P., Our Primitive Contemporaries. New York: Macmillan Company, 1934.

Pettit, George A., Primitive Education in North America. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1946.

Sapirstein, Milton R., Emotional Security. New York: Crown Publishers, 1948.

Warner, Charles Dudley, editor, Library of the World's Best Literature. Vol. XX, New York: J. A. Hill and Company, 1902.

Warters, Jane, High School Personnel Work Today. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1946.

Webster's Collegiate Dictionary. Springfield, Mass.: G. and C. Merriam Company, 1945.

Williams, L. A., Secondary Schools for American Youth. New York: American Book Company, 1948.

PAMPHLETS

Anderson, Harold H., Discipline. Iowa City: University of Iowa, 1941.

Arbuthnot, May Hill, "Transition in Discipline," Discipline, an Interpretation. Washington, D. C.: Association for Childhood Education, 1944.

Auerbach, Aline B., Discipline Through Affection. New York: Child Study Association for America, 1939.

Burgess, Helen Steers, Discipline: What Is It? New York: Child Study Association of America, 1938.

Fostering Mental Health in Our Schools. 1950 Yearbook, Washington, D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, National Education Association, 1950.

Lane, Howard A., "Discipline in Today's Education," Discipline, an Interpretation. Washington, D. C.: Association for Childhood Education, 1944.

Redl, Fritz, "Delinquency Prevention and the Role of Love," Discipline, an Interpretation. Washington, D. C.: Association for Childhood Education, 1944.

Shevikov, G. V., and Fritz Redl, Discipline for Today's Children and Youth. New York: Association for Childhood Education, 1944.

PERIODICAL ARTICLES

Brown, Edwin J., "Punishment: Fourteen Rules for Handing it Out," Clearing House, 23:345-347, February, 1949.

Cohler, Milton J., "A New Look at the Old Problem of Discipline," School Review, 56:468-75, October, 1946.

Cunningham, Ruth, "Group Discipline," N. E. A. Journal, 39:34-35, January, 1949.

Duff, John Carr, "Detention Room--A Catch-All for the Sinful," Clearing House, 21:61-4, April, 1947.

Frank, Lawrence K., "Discipline in Our Time," Childhood Education, 20:5-9, September, 1943.

Hill, Henry Harrington, "Middle-of-the-Road Discipline," Peabody Journal of Education, 24:75-77, September, 1946.

Jenkins, Gladys Gardner, "Discipline: What Is It?" Parent's Magazine, 23:18-19, May, 1948.

MacLean, Malcom S., "Discipline and Democracy," California Journal of Elementary Education, 17:2-11, August, 1948.

Miner, Robert J., "Knitting at the Guillotine," Educational and Psychological Measurement, 3:550-51, 1948.

Moffitt, Frederick J., "Lickin' and Larnin'," The Education Digest, 14:20-22, February, 1949.

Monash, Louis, "Notes on Mental Hygiene and Preventative Discipline," Understanding the Child, 16-18:19-22, January, 1949.

Muntyan, Milosh, Discipline: Child-Centered, Teacher-Centered, or Group-Centered?" Progressive Education, 26:168-173, April, 1949.

Newburn, H. K., "Equipping Youth to Create New Frontiers," The Junior College Journal, 20:3-8, September, 1949.

Perkins, Hugh V. Jr., "The Effects of Climate and Curriculum on Group Learning," Journal of Educational Research, 44:269-286, December, 1950.

Plutte, William, "Fear is the Root of All Discipline," Clearing House, 23:165, November, 1948.

Symonds, Percival M., "Classroom Discipline," Teacher's College Record, 51:147-58, December, 1949.

Taylor, Katherine Scott, "Music Influences Classroom Discipline," Music Educators' Journal, 36:13-14, January, 1950.

Washburn, Ruth Wendell, "Discipline in the World of Childhood," Childhood Education, 20:14-19, September, 1943.

Webber, Frank D., and Byron H. Atkinson, "Dynamic Classroom Control," California Journal of Secondary Education, 24:350-352, October, 1949.