

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

Explorations of Socially Defiant
Children's Conceptualizations of Teacher Authority

by
Eve Harras

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER'S OF EDUCATION
Department of Educational Psychology

Winnipeg, Manitoba

(c) October 1988

Permission has been granted to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author (copyright owner) has reserved other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her written permission.

L'autorisation a été accordée à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur (titulaire du droit d'auteur) se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation écrite.

ISBN 0-315-48085-8

EXPLORATIONS OF SOCIALLY DEFIANT CHILDREN'S
CONCEPTUALIZATIONS OF TEACHER AUTHORITY

BY

EVE HARRAS

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of
the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the degree of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

© 1988

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVER-
SITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this thesis, to
the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this
thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY
MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this thesis.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the
thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or other-
wise reproduced without the author's written permission.

Abstract

A naturalistic investigation was conducted to examine socially defiant children's conceptualizations of teacher authority regarding academic related and social-interpersonal behavior. The types of legitimate authority that were addressed included formal (traditional and rational-legal) and informal (charismatic and rational-expert) authority. The subjects were 6 intermediate-aged male caucasian children who obtained T-scores of at least 70 on the Revised Behavior Problem Checklist (Quay & Peterson, 1983), who were not identified as having any exceptionality other than behavior disorder, and who were placed in a regular classroom within one urban school division in Manitoba. A triangulation approach to investigating teacher authority was adopted. The investigative devices used in the study included observations of the socially defiant child-teacher authority interactions in the classroom, and general interviews and story vignette related interviews with each socially defiant subject. Each of the four story vignettes depicted a different teacher command type. These were academic related instruction, academic related deviance-imputation, social-interpersonal instruction and social-interpersonal deviance-imputation. The interview data revealed that the six socially defiant children perceived the teacher as having largely traditional or formal legitimate authority, and seldom perceived the teacher as having rational-legal or informal (charismatic and rational-expert) legitimate authority. The observational data revealed that the socially defiant children frequently disobeyed teacher commands, in particular, academic related instructions and deviance-imputations. Thus, the socially defiant children's verbally reported perceptions of teacher authority were in direct conflict with their behavior during student-teacher authority interactions. Possible explanations for this inconsistency are presented. Additional findings are also noted and discussed. For instance, the socially defiant children also gave justifications that did not fit the legitimate authority justifications being investigated. The most frequently given alternative justification was Avoidance Orientation, in particular, "to avoid punishment". Based on the three investigative devices, the socially defiant children also seemed to be engaged in a power struggle with their teacher, and seemed to perceive themselves as the boss in the classroom, rather than their teachers. Implications are discussed in terms of teachers and research. Essentially, the findings suggest that teacher authority should be considered by teachers and teacher trainers; and that additional research needs to be conducted to further illuminate socially defiant children's perceptions of teacher authority, the forms of legitimate authority adopted by teachers, and socially defiant child-teacher authority relationships.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my faculty advisor, Dr. Janet B. Webster, and my thesis committee for guiding me through the process of completing a Master's thesis. I would also like to thank my husband Barry and my parents, for listening to my ideas, concerns and frustrations during my thesis year, and for giving me the support and reassurance that I was capable of meeting this challenge.

Table of Contents

<u>Chapter 1</u>	1
Introduction.....	2
Purpose.....	5
Nature of the Study.....	6
Research Questions.....	6
Definition of Terms.....	8
Limitations.....	12
Organization of Thesis.....	14
 <u>Chapter 2</u>	 16
Introduction.....	16
Nature of Authority.....	16
Authority Relations.....	23
Parental and Peer Authority.....	25
Teacher Authority.....	29
Teacher Authority in the Classroom.....	35
 <u>Chapter 3</u>	 45
Introduction.....	45
The Design of the Study.....	45
Subject Selection.....	47
Subjects.....	49
Data Collection Devices.....	57
Scheduling of the Data Collection Devices.....	66
Data Collection Procedures.....	67
Analytical Procedures.....	74
Problems of Bias.....	81
Generalizability.....	83
 <u>Chapter 4</u>	 86
Introduction.....	86
Results and Discussion.....	86
Interrater Reliability.....	86
Alternative Justifications Regarding Rationale for Legitimacy and Obedience.....	87
Results Based on the Children's Verbal Responses.....	88
Open-ended Questions.....	89
Questions With Preset Options.....	91
Questions Related to the Specific Teacher Commands.....	94
The Nature of the Child-created Teacher Commands.....	106
Comparisons of the Three Sources of Verbally Obtained Data.....	108
Behavioral Data.....	110
Context and Nature of the Children's Disobedience.....	113
Rationales for Disobedience to the Observation-based Teacher Commands.....	115
Representativeness of the Observations.....	116
Summary of the Behavioral Data.....	116
Comparisons of the Verbally Obtained and Behavioral Data.....	118

Possible Explanations for the Discrepancy Between the Verbally Obtained and Behavioral Data.....	119
Comparisons of Teacher Authority Regarding Academic Related Versus Social-interpersonal Behavior.....	135
Summary of the Findings.....	137
<u>Chapter 5</u>	140
Introduction.....	140
Implications.....	140
Implications for Teachers.....	140
Implications for Research.....	146
Conclusion.....	156
<u>References</u>	158
<u>Appendices</u>	165
(A) Rules Associated With Each Lesson Phase.....	165
(B) Letter of Consent--Teachers.....	167
(C) Letter of Consent--Parents.....	168
(D) Essential Background Information Form.....	170
(E) Sample of a Completed Essential Background Information Form.....	173
(F) Observation Recording Sheet.....	176
(G) Activity for Developing Representative Story Vignettes.....	177
(H) Questions for Evaluating the Representativeness of the Story Vignettes Developed.....	181
(I) Story Vignettes and Related Questions.....	183
(J) General Interview Questions.....	185
(K) Coding Scheme.....	189
(L) Sample Transcription of the General Interview.....	193
(M) Sample Transcription of the Story Vignette Related Interview.....	202
(N) Sample Transcription of the Observations.....	208
(O) Alternative Justification Categories Regarding Rationale for Legitimacy and Obedience.....	222
(P) The Children's Specific Legitimate Authority Justifications for Legitimacy and Obedience.....	223
(Q) The Incidents Surrounding the Observation-based Teacher Commands.....	224

Tables

1--Brief Description of Early Authority Levels.....	26, 27
2--Ratings of +1 SD and +2 SD on the Revised Behavior Problem Checklist for Each Child.....	51
3--The Children's Rationales for Legitimacy and Obedience to General Teacher Authority.....	90
4--The Children's Selections of the Best Rationale for Legitimacy and for Obedience to General Teacher Authority.....	93
5--The Preset Teacher Commands Based on the Story Vignettes.....	95
6--The Child-created Teacher Comands for Each Child.....	96
7--The Selected Observation-based Teacher Commands Disobeyed for Each Child.....	97
8--The Children's Rationales for Legitimacy and for Obedience Regarding the Preset Academic Related Teacher Commands.....	99
9--The Children's Rationales for Legitimacy and for Obedience Regarding the Preset Social-interpersonal Teacher Commands....	100
10--The Children's Rationales for Legitimacy and for Obedience Regarding the Child-created Teacher Commands.....	101
11--The Children's Rationales for Legitimacy and for Obedience Regarding the Observation-based Teacher Commands.....	102
12--The Proportion of the Four Types of Teacher Command Disobeyed for Each Child.....	112

Chapter 1

Introduction

The majority of behavior disordered children referred for special services in the regular education system are those who exhibit conduct disorders (Siegal, 1984; Hutton, 1985). One aspect of conduct disorders is social defiance. Socially defiant children typically "... resist authority and carry on a power struggle with the teacher. They want to have their way and not be told what to do" (Brophy & Rohrkemper, 1981).

By definition, socially defiant children challenge teacher authority. According to Damon (1977) and Tisak (1986) authority is the central social relation between children and adults; a crucial element in the child's development knowledge; and a social relation which will remain crucial throughout life.

Some studies have examined "normal" children's conceptualizations of adult, parental, teacher, and peer authority (Damon, 1977; Dunbar & Taylor, 1986; Kutnick, 1980; Laupa & Turiel, 1986; Tisak, 1986; Weston & Turiel, 1980). However, none of these studies have addressed socially defiant children's conceptualizations of authority, in particular, teacher authority.

Damon (1977) proposed that normal children's knowledge of parental and peer authority, regarding legitimacy and rationale for obedience, follows a sequence of fixed development levels. Kutnick (1980) further suggested that normal children's recognition of "Teacher as Teacher", of "Teacher as Disciplinarian", of comparative

aspects of (teacher) authority, and of jobs or roles of authority figures follow developmental sequences. Comparative aspects of teacher authority include teach, control, coercive control, moral control, kind, help and dislike of person in authority; while, jobs of authority figures include such responsibilities as academic and behavioral control. Kutnick (1980) also indicated that possibly 35% of elementary children, by age twelve, do not recognize their teachers as disciplinarians. One subgroup of those children who do not recognize their teachers as disciplinarians may be socially defiant children, since socially defiant children by definition challenge teacher authority. Therefore, it is possible that socially defiant children's recognition and knowledge of teacher authority does not follow the developmental patterns of normal children.

Regardless of age of the child and hence the stage of authority development, Laupa & Turiel (1986) and Tisak (1986) observed that normal children draw boundaries to adult and peer authority. The nature of the boundaries of teacher authority drawn by socially defiant children who characteristically defy teacher authority, surprisingly, has not been empirically addressed.

Regarding sources for teacher authority, Dornbusch and Scott (cited in Dunbar & Taylor, 1982) suggested that informal authority is more powerful than formal authority. Furthermore, they indicate that informal authority is reportedly granted to the teacher by the students, based on the quality of the student-teacher relationship. Consequently, since socially defiant children's relationships with

teachers are typically poor and negative (Algozzine & Curran, 1979; Curran & Algozzine, 1980), socially defiant children may fail to grant their teachers informal authority. This is because they may not perceive that their teachers have legitimately earned it. Children who hold this attitude of teachers may tend to challenge teacher authority, which, in fact, is characteristic of socially defiant children. In addition, Dunbar & Taylor (1982) indicated that normal children's, in particular males', view of teacher informal authority becomes increasingly less positive with an increase in age. It has been observed (Hutton, 1985) that socially defiant children are typically male.

Researchers have demonstrated that socially defiant children's challenging of teacher's formal and/or informal authority, creates problems for their teachers, particularly in terms of classroom management. These children decrease teacher time spent on instructional duties, and increase teacher time spent on classroom management duties (Walker, 1979). Accordingly, socially defiant children represent a constant source of physical and emotional frustration to the teacher (Walker, 1979). Besides creating classroom management problems, socially defiant children's behavior negatively influences teachers' perceptions, expectations, and behavior toward them. Both special and regular class teachers consider socially defiant children as the most difficult and least enjoyable to work with (DeStefano, Geston, & Cowen, 1977) and as the most disturbing and least tolerable group (Algozzine, 1977, 1980; Walker, 1979), as compared to the other three categories of behavior

problems--physically disturbing (e.g., hyperactivity, restlessness), socially immature (e.g., feelings of inferiority, anxiety, lack of self-confidence), and delinquent behaviors (e.g., has bad companions, uses profane language, is truant). These perceptions of socially defiant children are particularly evident for regular classroom teachers. Research has indicated that teachers have low tolerance of socially defiant children's behavior because they are concerned that socially defiant children's misbehavior will lead to a "behavioral contagion" or a "ripple effect" (Algozzine, 1977, 1979; Safran & Safran, 1984, 1985). Behavioral contagion or ripple effect concerns teachers because it disrupts the activity of other children and because other children tend to copy the misbehavior.

Moreover, socially defiant children's behavior is associated with negative student-teacher interactions (Algozzine & Curran, 1979; Curran & Algozzine, 1980); with negative expectations of socially defiant children's academic and behavioral performance as proposed by Good and Grouws, and Gordon and Thomas (cited in Coleman & Gilliam, 1983); and with decision for placement in educational settings other than the regular class (Algozzine, 1980). In short, Good and Grouws, and Gordon and Thomas suggested that teachers' reactions to socially defiant children's behavior may lead to a self-fulfilling prophecy of failure. Consequently, socially defiant children's behavior may be socially and academically self-defeating or self-destructive. Hence, an understanding of the complex nature of the social defiance and student-teacher interaction, and effective interventions are

crucial for the well-being of both the socially defiant children and their teachers. At present research in these areas is either sparse or nonexistent.

One explanation offered to account for why these children are identified as socially defiant is that teachers may be more intolerant of socially defiant behavior as compared to other behavior problems (Algozzine, 1977, 1980; Safran & Safran, 1984). An alternative explanation could be that socially defiant children's conceptualization of teacher authority is in conflict with the teacher's role in the classroom. Therefore, socially defiant children's conceptualization of teacher authority in the classroom warrants investigation.

Purpose

The purpose of the study was to further existing knowledge and understanding of socially defiant children's behavior in the classroom by an examination of how these children conceptualize teacher authority. From a theoretical perspective, the study may enhance our understanding of socially defiant children's conceptualization of teacher authority and how this may affect the complex nature of the teacher-socially defiant child authority relations. From a practical perspective, the study may provide clues for effective education interventions for socially defiant children.

Nature of Study

The study is exploratory in nature, hence, a naturalistic rather than an experimental design was used. The means of investigation were observations, interviews, and story vignettes with related questions. More specifically, the investigations included observations of teacher commands (i.e., instructions and deviance-imputations) given in the classroom and socially defiant children's responses to the commands, socially defiant children's responses to authority-related questions, and socially defiant children's responses to questions about story vignettes which involve the two types of teacher commands. Three investigative means were selected since little is known about socially defiant children's conceptualization of teacher authority in the classroom and since a multi-method approach is more likely to generate valid knowledge. The data gathered by these techniques were used to generate concepts and theory. Frameworks from the literature on authority generally and on teacher authority in the classroom were used to guide the research questions.

Research Questions

In keeping with the exploratory nature of this study, there were no experimental hypotheses. Rather, research questions concerning socially defiant children's conceptualization of teacher authority in the classroom, both for academic related and social-interpersonal behavior, were used to structure the research project.

The research questions are based on notions and concepts discussed in the literature review of relevant areas of authority, in Chapter 2.

There are two basic sources for legitimate authority, formal and informal authority. Two questions addressed formal authority: (a) Do socially defiant children perceive classroom teachers as having formal authority regarding academic related behaviors, and (b) do socially defiant children perceive classroom teachers as having formal authority regarding social-interpersonal behavior? Two questions addressed informal authority: (a) Do socially defiant children perceive classroom teachers as having informal authority regarding academic related behavior, and (b) do socially defiant children perceive classroom teachers as having informal authority regarding social-interpersonal behavior?

Formal and informal authority may be described in other terms. For example, formal authority may be described as traditional and rational-legal authority and informal authority as charismatic and rational-expert authority. Two questions which arose from these alternate descriptions of legitimate authority are: (a) Do socially defiant children perceive classroom teachers as having traditional, charismatic, rational-legal, and/or rational-expert legitimized authority regarding academic related behavior; and (b) do socially defiant children perceive classroom teachers as having traditional, charismatic, rational-legal, and/or rational-expert legitimized authority regarding social-interpersonal behavior?

One of the two major issues in authority knowledge is

legitimacy of authority. Questions which pertained to legitimacy of authority include: (a) What are socially defiant children's rationales for legitimacy of teacher authority regarding academic related behavior, (b) what are socially defiant children's rationales for legitimacy of teacher authority in the classroom regarding social-interpersonal behavior, and (c) do socially defiant children's rationales for legitimacy of teacher authority differ for academic related verses social-interpersonal behavior?

The second major issue in authority knowledge is the rationale for obedience. Questions referring to the rationale for obedience included: (a) What are socially defiant children's rationales for obedience to teacher authority regarding academic related behavior, (b) what are socially defiant children's rationales for obedience to teacher authority regarding social-interpersonal behavior, and (c) do socially defiant children's rationales for obedience to teacher authority differ for academic related behavior and social-interpersonal behavior?

Some questions addressed both legitimacy and obedience. These were: (a) Do socially defiant children's rationales for legitimacy and obedience to teacher authority differ for academic related behavior, and (b) do socially defiant children's rationales for legitimacy and obedience to teacher authority differ for social-interpersonal behavior?

Definition of Terms

There are several terms which were presented and which are

critical to the study. These terms are conceptually defined in this section. The terms include, socially defiant children, authority, legitimate authority, formal authority, informal authority, two types of teacher commands (instructions and deviance-imputations), academic related behavior and social-interpersonal behavior.

As stated earlier, socially defiant children "... resist authority and carry on a power struggle with the teacher. They want to have their own way and not be told what to do" (Brophy and Rohrkemper, 1981, p. 295). Moreover, Brophy and Rohrkemper proposed additional verbal and nonverbal signs of socially defiance. The verbal signs include saying "You can't make me ..." and "You can't tell me to do ...", and making derogatory statements about the teacher to others. The nonverbal signs include making frowns and grimaces, mimicing the teacher, folding arms, putting hands on hips, stomping foot, looking away when being spoken to, laughing at inappropriate times, being physically violent toward the teacher, and deliberately doing what the teacher says not to do.

Damon (1977) described authority as a social relation that is fostered by differential social power between persons and that calls for obedience to the person with greater social power. If the basis for social power is justified by the person with the lesser social power, then it is called legitimate authority. Formal authority, one of the two major types of authority, is "... the authority attached to a position in an organization--that authority exists regardless of the characteristics of individual

position occupants" (Dunbar & Taylor, 1982, p. 250). The other major type of authority is informal authority, which is "... dependent on and granted by the consent of (the person with lesser social power) and is based on the personal characteristics or resources of (the person with greater social power)" (Dunbar & Taylor, 1982, p. 250).

Socially defiant children's conceptualization of formal and informal teacher authority specifically regarding academic related behavior and social-interpersonal behavior is the topic of interest. Academic related behavior refers to any behavior that is directly related to the attainment of academic lesson or activity objectives, and/or to the handling of school property and materials. This includes listening, watching, and keeping quiet during lessons unless otherwise instructed by the teacher; starting, working on, and completing assigned academic activities as instructed by the teacher; using school materials and resources as instructed by the teacher; and using school materials and resources carefully so as to keep them in good, working condition. Essentially, academic related behaviors are task- or object-oriented.

On the other hand, social-interpersonal behavior refers to any behavior that indicates how a child should interact with teachers, other adults (i.e., principal, vice-principal, teacher aide), and other children. This includes using good manners (i.e., saying "please", "thank you", "you're welcome", and "I'm sorry", not interrupting other persons and not swearing or being rude); telling

the truth; not tattle-taling on other children's misbehaviors; respecting other students' and the teachers' property by asking permission to use someone else's property, by returning borrowed items in the same condition, and by not stealing other's property; and not engaging in any behavior that physically harms or could physically harm another person (i.e., hitting, punching, kicking, pushing, biting, throwing things such as paper airplanes, pencils, erasers, books, and chairs, and shooting elastics) nor that could be considered psychologically harmful for another person (i.e., name-calling, teasing, threatening). Social-interpersonal behavior is defined, in part, through negative examples because inappropriate social-interpersonal behavior can be more easily and clearly defined as compared to appropriate social-interpersonal behavior.

Essentially, social-interpersonal behaviors are people-oriented.

In this study, teacher authority regarding academic related behavior and social-interpersonal behavior was investigated via teacher commands. Commands are any verbal, declarative, interrogative, or imperative statement that explicitly or implicitly tells the person with lesser social power how to behave. Commands can be of two forms, instructions and deviance-imputations (Hargreaves, Hester, & Mellor, 1975). An instruction is a future oriented kind of rule in that the person is expected to follow the directive; however, there is no suggestion that present conduct is rule-breaking (Hargreaves et al.). A deviance-imputation "... typically involves an explicit statement which indicates that a person has broken or is breaking a rule, with the

implication that this conduct must cease and be replaced with conduct which conforms to the rules" (Hargreaves, 1975, p.53).

Limitations

There are a few basic limitations to the study. For one thing, the area of behavior disorders of which social defiance is a sub-classification, is confounded with issues of definition and identification (Algozzine & Sherry, 1981; Kavale, Forness & Alper, 1986; McGinnis, Kiraly, & Smith, 1984). Due to the ambiguity and subjectivity of existing definitions and identification procedures, the types of children identified as behavior disordered and as exhibiting specific forms of behavior disorders is dramatically inconsistent within and between countries, provinces or states, cities, school divisions, and local schools, and also research studies. Thus, the socially defiant children selected for this study, first of all, may not even be considered socially defiant by other schools or school divisions, and second of all, may not have been identified using the same or similar criteria. Therefore, the representativeness of the socially defiant children selected may be in doubt.

A second limitation is that teacher authority was measured solely through teacher commands. Hence, the study did not investigate the entire phenomenon of teacher authority, but merely one aspect. Accordingly, whether the study was actually measuring teacher authority is a concern and thus the internal validity

regarding how teacher authority is being investigated can be challenged.

A third limitation is the basic means of investigating socially defiant children's conceptualization of teacher authority--oral interviews. Socially defiant children's perceptions as assessed through interviews may not be representative of their actions in the classroom as assessed through more reliable means, such as direct observation. Hence, the internal validity and generalizability regarding the use of oral interviews may be a concern.

A fourth limitation of the study is the story vignettes may not be representative of academic related behaviors and social interpersonal behaviors. To address this concern, an attempt was made to validate the appropriateness of the vignettes used through utilizing a panel of judges. However, the representativeness and internal validity of the story vignettes may be in question, which means that generalizability to academic related behaviors and social-interpersonal behaviors may also be in question. Another limitation of vignettes is that they were presented orally. The assumption that the socially defiant children selected had adequate oral language processing skills necessary to interpret oral vignettes may not be accurate.

The last main limitation of the study is the small sample size (i.e., 6). With small "n" studies the representativeness of the sample to its population is in doubt. Therefore, the study may have low generalizability to the target population of socially defiant

children.

It seems evident that the main concerns regarding the study, as with any study, are generalization and internal validity. In spite of the major limitations of the study, there was sufficient reason for the exploration of socially defiant children's conceptualization of teacher authority, as described in the introduction. Moreover, measures were taken to address these limitations, as described in Chapter 3.

Organization of Thesis

The thesis is organized in five chapters. Chapter 1 included the introduction to the research topic and a supporting rationale, the purpose and nature of the study, the questions used to guide the research, the conceptual definition of major terms, and the basic limitations of the study.

Chapter 2 includes a literature review of the three areas of authority relevant to the topic of study. These areas of authority are the nature or the philosophy of authority, authority relations in general, and teacher authority in the classroom. In the section on nature of authority, general theoretical views of authority are described. In the section on authority relations, the different configurations of authority, child-parent, child-child, and child-teacher are addressed. Research on authority relations are described and the respective results and conclusions are summarized. Theoretical and practical research on how teacher authority is

displayed in the classroom and in what education contexts teacher authority is most likely displayed are presented in the final section.

The methodology is presented in Chapter 3. This includes the design of the study, and a description of the various means of investigation and of the socially defiant children to be selected as subjects. In addition, the specific questions and procedures used in the observation, story vignettes and interview procedures for data analysis are discussed. Limitations of the study and their implications on the results, conclusions, generalizability, internal validity and replicability are discussed also.

Chapter 4 contains a presentation and discussion of the study results. Data from the three means of investigation are summarized and organized based on the research questions which guide this study. Tables are included as well as prose to highlight the findings. The results were interpreted and organized under themes or topics which were generated from the literature review and the research questions. Moreover, a summary of the findings is presented.

Chapter 5 includes an examination of the implications of the study for teachers and for research.

Chapter 2

Introduction

The purpose of Chapter 2 is to present a literature review which covers the three areas of particular importance to the study. These include the nature of authority, authority relations, and teacher authority in the classroom. The section on the nature of authority is crucial to an understanding of the theoretical basis upon which authority, in general, rests. The section on authority relations is essential to a practical understanding of the three major configurations of authority in the child's experience--child-parent, child-child, and child-teacher. The section on teacher authority in the classroom is vital to a theoretical and practical understanding of how and in what specific educational contexts, teacher authority is displayed.

Nature of Authority

Authority, a unique form of conformity confined to human beings (Peters, 1973), is the bedrock of society and of social systems, and is manifest in diverse spheres of kinship, local community, profession, church, school, guild, labor union, and political government (Monahan, 1975).

Different authority systems are associated with different grounds of legitimacy and different types of rules which give people rights to command (Peters, 1973). Moreover, authority can be

associated with a certain social position, such as teacher, or associated with a certain person, such as parent (Parsons, 1954). Parsons defined authority as "... the institutionally recognized right to influence the actions of others, regardless of their immediate personal attitudes to the direction of influence" (p. 76) or as "... the legitimate right (and/or obligation) to control actions of others in a social relation system" (p. 409). Whereas, Weber (Trans. H. Gerth, 1975) defined authority as "... the probability that a specific command will be obeyed" (p. 109). Lastly, Damon (1977) defined authority as "... a social relation that is fostered by differential social power between persons and that calls for obedience to the person with the greater social power" (p.171-172).

Authority which is based on intrinsic legitimacy, is one of four primary mechanisms of social influence and control, along with: power (based on dominance/submission); persuasion (based on displaced legitimacy); and exchange (based on mutual reciprocity). Spady and Mitchell (1979) proposed that the mechanisms of authority and power are the more fundamental means of control and influence. Weber (cited in Spady & Mitchell, 1979) suggested that "power is reflected in the probability that one actor within a social relation will be in a position to carry out his(/her) own will despite resistance". Hence, power-based relations are, in principle, characterized by competition or conflict, and involve at least implicit confrontation between parties. On the other hand, authority has the ability to influence actively through enhancement

of expectations for intrinsically fulfilling experiences.

Legitimate authority, as suggested by Spady and Mitchell (1979), rather than being rooted in social reactions to the use of power, is rooted in personal orientations and experiences that tie a superordinate who is "in authority" to a subordinate who is "under authority". Persons (e.g., children) respond to influence as authoritative when they perceive in an encounter opportunity to realize their own significance, not merely to satisfy the intentions of someone else because of attractiveness or threat of external resources. Thus, authoritative control is characterized by support and collaboration rather than competitive (e.g., power) interactions. The subordinate's response to authority is accompanied by a sense of who the superordinate is, not just what resources are at his/her disposal. Authority involves a "doing with" orientation, rather than a power based orientation of "doing to" (sanctioning) or "doing for" (rewarding), in which the superordinate displays specific qualities that are admired and desired.

Authority tends to be relatively based on the priority of goal-attainment or system-integrative values. In the first case, the need for authority is the need to coordinate the contributions of various units of system to the goal, or the function of urgency of "getting things done" (e.g., learning). In the second case, the need for authority is the need to prevent units from disturbing the integrativeness of the systems or the need to keep the units of the system "in line" (e.g., classroom management). The first is more

"prescriptive" authority, whereas, the second more "regulative" (Parsons).

Durkheim (cited in Monahan, 1975) suggested that "authority without legitimacy is not authority but only the shell" (p. 211). Some researchers proposed that there are four basic modes of legitimate authority--traditional, charismatic, and rational-legal (Spady & Mitchell, 1979; Weber, 1947), and rational-expert authority (Spady & Mitchell).

The four types of legitimate authority will be discussed separately based on Spady and Mitchell (1979). Traditional authority is supported by a system of fundamental values and symbols that give meaning and importance to social order. Essentially, tradition is where society stores its life goals. A person (e.g., a teacher) achieves traditional authority by explicitly embodying the fundamental values and ultimate goals of a social system within its institutional norms and customs; by embodying the dominant values of society; and by adopting an orientation of unconditional valuing towards subordinates.

Charismatic authority involves a mutual empathetic bond that enables the superordinate to recognize the needs and interests of the subordinate and enables the subordinate to discover needs within, such that the subordinate's interests are transformed by the relationship. The key to charismatic authority is the authenticity and depth of the affective encounter as perceived by the subordinate. A person achieves charismatic authority through creating informal and spontaneous role relationships characterized

by affective attachments and voluntary accommodation to the another person's expectations.

Rational-legal authority operates through the specific and rational pursuit of collective goals, laws, and/or rules that govern the behavior of all members of society. This form of authority is developed when the subordinate identifies their own security and well-being with giving the superordinate legitimate jurisdiction over formal rights and duties within the group. Hence, a person achieves legal authority when the subordinate's acceptance of the authority is based on the superordinate's willingness and ability to create a system of justice by being both judicious and direct in enforcing formal rules.

Lastly, rational-expert authority rests on the superordinate's possession of theoretical knowledge and practical performance skills that contribute to the accomplishment of achievement or work goals by the subordinate. Expert authority is achieved when the superordinate demonstrates and the subordinate recognizes that the superordinate has the capacity for knowledgeable performance of complex or difficult behaviors, and the capacity to enhance the personal adequacy of the subordinate (Peters, 1973; Spady & Mitchell, 1979).

Other researchers proposed that there are two rather than four basic sources of legitimate authority, formal and informal authority (Blau & Scott; Davis; Dornbusch & Scott; Raven & French, cited in Dunbar & Taylor, 1982; Dunbar & Taylor, 1982; Spady & Mitchell, 1979). Dornbusch and Scott (cited in Dunbar & Taylor,

1982) proposed that formal authority accrues to a position in an organization such that it exists regardless of the characteristics of individual occupants. Formal authority relations are expressed and developed through the specification of rules and organizational routines and the establishment of compliance with organizational standards (Spady & Mitchell, 1979). Formal authority is the power possessed through law or quasi-legal force of the position or tradition. However, Dunbar and Taylor (1982) suggested that formal authority merely obligates subordinates (e.g., students) to adhere to minimum performance standards:

If higher standards are aspired, the second source of legitimate authority should be developed (Dornbusch & Scott, cited in Dunbar & Taylor, 1982). Dornbusch and Scott (cited in Dunbar & Taylor, 1982) suggested that informal authority is dependent on and granted by the consent of the subordinate (e.g., student) and is based on the personal characteristics or resources of the superordinate (e.g., teacher). In other words, "... the (superordinate) must 'win' from the (subordinate) the right to make and enforce decisions that will affect them: he or she must win the (subordinate's) trust and liking and be perceived as caring and working hard for the subordinate's sake" (Dunbar & Taylor, 1982, p. 250). Informal authority is developed and expressed through spontaneous interpersonal relations and affective bonds between individuals, such as teachers and children. Informal authority relations and expectations tend to be more situation specific and superordinate-subordinate specific (Spady & Mitchell, 1979).

From a societal perspective and using the school as an example, the creation of formal roles in the school is part of the school's responsibility to develop socially responsible, disciplined, and competent adults. On the other hand, creating informal roles is part of the school's responsibility to enhance the social integration, and personal growth and development of children. Consequently, both formal and informal roles should be exercised in any social system. Unfortunately, these two roles are often in conflict in that, for instance, if teachers stress loyalty to social and classroom rules that support the culture of the school, they may endanger spontaneous participation and leadership. If teachers, for instance, stress the integrative value of spontaneous interaction, they risk losing control over the purpose and order of the activity (Spady & Mitchell, 1979).

Various researchers have viewed legitimate authority as two types (i.e., formal and informal) or four types (i.e., traditional, charismatic, rational-legal, and rational-expert). It seems that there is a relationship between these two classification systems of authority. As Spady and Mitchell (1979) proposed, essentially traditional and rational-legal authority are dependent upon the qualitative characteristics of the institution or organization with which the superordinate is associated; whereas, charismatic and rational-expert authority are dependent upon the personal characteristics of the superordinate. From the discussion of the sources of legitimate authority, formal authority appears to be institution-based. In contrast, informal authority appears to be

superordinate-based. In this study, legitimate authority is viewed as either formal or informal, and may be further identified as traditional and rational-legal, or charismatic and rational-expert.

The nature of authority is complex and varied, and it has far-reaching implications regarding the behavior of superordinates and subordinates. Whether a superordinate strives to earn legitimate authority via formal authority (i.e., traditional and rational-legal) and/or informal authority (i.e., charismatic and rational-expert) modes, authority is essential for the realization of the goals of any social system.

Authority Relations

Authority, and the associated modes of legitimate authority, is evident in all authority relations with children. Damon (1977) and Tisak (1986) regarded authority as the central social relation between children and adults, a crucial element in the child's developing knowledge, and a social relation which will remain crucial throughout life. The forms of authority relations with children include child-parent, child-child, and child-teacher.

The nature of social power varies dramatically across authority relations (Damon, 1977). In some authority relations, social power is transient, established only for specific limited and temporary purposes, for example, a babysitter. In other authority relations, social power is permanently accrued to persons with certain

distinguishable attributes, such that persons in possession of the requisite attributes have authority over persons who lack them (Damon). Regardless of the permanence of the social power relations, the range of personal attributes upon which authority may be based are enormous (Damon). The attributes may include race, religion, sex, size, strength, age, intelligence, goodness, experience, and "charisma" (Damon). In addition, the basis of authority seems to vary with such context variables of the authority relation as social position of authority figure, content of social context, and type of command (Laupa & Turiel, 1986; Tisak, 1986).

The basis upon which social power is justified is called legitimacy of authority, one of the two major issues in authority knowledge. There is clear evidence that the concept of legitimacy changes as a function of development. For example, development in kinds of social power traits children recognize and respect, and development in children's ability to apply different legitimizing social power traits to different forms of authority relations has been observed (Damon, 1977).

The second major issue in authority knowledge is rationale for obedience, which is why (for what reasons or legitimate social power traits) and when (in what social context(s)) should one obey and disobey. The rationale for obedience can be based upon

... a realistic assessment of consequences for disobedience (for example, punishment), upon a belief that is pragmatically in one's best interests to obey one who knows best, upon a respect for the authority figure, upon some sort of consensual agreement between oneself and the authority figure, and so on" (Damon, 1977, pp. 172-173).

Parental and Peer Authority

Several studies have investigated children's conceptualization of authority. Unfortunately, most of this research addresses normal children, and parental and peer authority, and not socially defiant children and teacher authority. Studies on parental and peer authority are presented first and studies on teacher authority are presented second.

Via story dilemmas, Damon (1977) investigated children's conceptualization of parental and peer authority as related to their perceptions of legitimacy and rationale for obedience, in two cross-sectional and one longitudinal study. The subjects were 4 to 10 year old, lower-middle and middle socioeconomic class (SES) children. Damon (1977) proposed that primary and intermediate children's authority knowledge tends to move upwards along a sequence of six development levels (see Table 1). Developmental differences are evident in the kinds of social power traits which children recognize and respect, and in the child's ability to apply different legitimizing social power traits to different types of authority relations (Damon, 1977). In contrast, regardless of their stage of authority development, children accurately assess the authority's boundaries and state that obedience to authority, be it parental or peer, is proper, except under extreme circumstances.

Subsequent research on children's conceptualization of parental and peer authority has supported and extended Damon's (1977) research. Laupa and Turiel (1986) examined children's concepts of boundaries and jurisdiction of authority with regard to age of adult

Table 1

Brief Descriptions of Early Authority Levels

Level 0-A: Authority is legitimized by attributes that link the authority with the self, either by establishing affective bonds between authority figure and self or by establishing identification between authority figure and self. The basis for obedience is a primitive association between authority's commands and the self's desires.

Level 0-A: Authority is legitimized by physical attributes of person's size, sex, dress, and so on. The specific attributes selected are those which the subject considers to be descriptive of persons in command. These legitimizing attributes may be used in a fluctuating manner, since they are not linked logically to the functioning of authority. The subject recognizes the potential conflict between authority's commands and the self's wishes, and thinks about obedience in a pragmatic fashion: commands are followed as means of achieving desires, or to avoid actions contrary to desires.

Level 1-B: Authority is legitimized by attributes that reflect special talent or ability, and that make the authority figure a superior person in the eyes of the subject. This special talent or ability is no longer associated simply with power, but is rather indicative of the authority figure's ability to accomplish changes that subordinates cannot. Obedience is based on reciprocal exchange: one obeys because authority figure takes care of him, because authority figure has helped him in the past, or because authority figure otherwise "deserves" his obedience.

Level 2-A: Authority is legitimized by prior training or experience related to the process of commanding. Authority figure therefore is seen as a person who is able to lead and command better than the subordinate. Obedience is based on subject's respect for this specific leadership ability and on the belief that his superior leadership ability implies a concern for the welfare and rights of subordinates.

Level 2-B: Authority is legitimized by the coordination of a variety of attributes with specific situational factors. Subject believes that a person might possess attributes which enable him to command well in one situation but not in another. Authority, therefore, is seen as a shared, consensual, relation between parties, adopted temporarily by one person for the welfare of all. Obedience is seen as a cooperative effort which is situation specific rather than a general response to a superior person.

(table continues)

Note. The data in Table 1 are from The social world of the child (pp. 178-179) by William Damon, 1977, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publications.

or peer, and to position of person giving commands, by presenting two vignettes, one with a physical harm theme and one with a turn-taking theme. The subjects were twenty-four lower SES girls and twenty-four lower SES boys from grades 1, 3, and 5. Laupa and Turiel (1986) observed that children do not have a unitary orientation towards authority; children consider the age of authority figure, social position of authority, and type of command when addressing legitimacy and rationale for obedience to authority; and children do not conceptualize the basis for authority solely on adult status.

The authors also noted that children distinguish the legitimacy of authority commands from reasons for obedience, and thus concluded that dimensions of legitimacy and obedience should be assessed separately (Laupa & Turiel, 1986). An example of children's tendency to distinguish legitimacy from obedience is, while most children give authority-orientation justifications for legitimacy of adult and peer authority, they use punishment-avoidance or act-orientation justifications for obedience. Furthermore, Laupa and Turiel observed that children do not unquestioningly accept authority commands that related to issues of harm and welfare, as supported by Damon (1977), Tisak (1986), and Weston & Turiel (1980). For instance, children sometimes give priority to peer and adult nonauthority commands (e.g., that children should stop fighting) over adult authority commands (e.g., that children should continue fighting).

Tisak (1986) also addressed parental authority. More

specifically, Tisak investigated whether children's conceptions regarding legitimacy and obedience of parent authority are a function of their understanding the content of the social event. The subjects included 120 middle and upper-middle SES children ranging in age from 6 to 11. The social events included stealing, family chores, and friendship choice. Tisak (1986) reported that children draw boundaries to parent authority. In evaluating social events pertaining to parental authority, children consider the content of the act. For instance, parental authorities had greater legitimacy in making rules prohibiting stealing and reporting witnessing a stealing transgression, than for transgressions regarding family chores and friendship choice. Likewise, obligations to obey rules inhibiting stealing and reporting witnessing stealing transgressions were greater than obligations pertaining to family chores and friendship choice.

Teacher Authority

In addition to parental and peer authority, teacher authority is a significant authority relation of children. As discussed in the section on nature of authority, teacher authority can be derived from two sources, formal and informal authority. Regardless of the mix of formal and informal authority sought by a teacher, Dunbar and Taylor (1982) suggested that students must have positive perceptions of the teacher as an authority figure.

Moreover, Duke (1979) advocated that

achievement of significant educational outcomes through effective classroom management depends to a very large

extent on the capacity of the teacher to create legitimacy or authority based relationships with students. (Management is crippled whenever there is loss of genuine authority.) Only in the context of legitimate authority can students accept as their own the expectations that society and the teachers have for them and embrace the classroom as a place where their own expectations can be realized. (p. 115)

Research into children's conceptualization of teacher authority is sparse. Moreover, the studies available have solely used normal children as subjects. A few studies on teacher authority will be discussed. Kutnick's (1980) five studies addressed children's behavioral interactions and cognitive awareness of parent authority and of adult and peer authorities of the school. Children in thirty-eight classrooms (approximately 1000 children) were observed and 176 lower and middle class Roman Catholic and nonsectarian children were interviewed.

Kutnick (1980, Study 1) found that children recognized five figures of social authority: parental, teacher as teacher, teacher as disciplinarian, peer leadership, and peer submissiveness (to peer leadership). No significant differences were found across sex, social class, and religious orientation. However, age of child was a significant factor across the five aspects of social authority. "Parental" was constant across age groups (50% to 80%). "Teacher as Teacher" had low recognition the first year of school (16.7%), but jumped dramatically by the second year (94.4%). "Teacher as Disciplinarian" had no recognition in the first year of school (0%), but steadily increased throughout elementary school to 64.7% by grade six. This implies that possibly 35% of elementary children by

age twelve do not recognize their "Teachers as Disciplinarians". (One subgroup of this group of 35% may be socially defiant children.) "Peer Leader" and "Peer Submission" had low recognition in the first year of school (both 8.3%), and steadily increased throughout elementary schooling to 100% by grade six. In Study 2 (Kutnick, 1980), observations of child-teacher and child-child interactions revealed that the teacher became less child-centered and displayed more teaching characteristics and classroom control with the increase in school grade. On the other hand, the child sought less attention with the teacher, sought more attention from other children, and made more academic use of the teacher.

Through the integration of the observations from Studies 1 and 2, Kutnick (1980) made two major conclusions. Firstly, since the behavioral interactions between child and teacher in the first two years of school did not change significantly, but "Teacher as Teacher" jumped dramatically (from 16.7% to 94.4%), a preoperative scheme where behavior precedes cognition was demonstrated. Children build up immediate patterns of behavioral actions within the classrooms but are initially unable to verbalize these behavioral relations. But, by the second year of schooling, for instance, children were able to verbalize "Teacher as Teacher". Secondly, recognition of "Teacher as Disciplinarian", "Peer Leadership", and "Peer Submissiveness" were tied to experiences in the classroom and the knowledge of the teacher was expanded and transformed as a result of the child's developing interactions with the peer group.

In Study 5, Kutnick (1980) observed that children perceive eight comparative aspects of authority: teach, control, coercive control, moral control, care, kind, help and dislike (of authority figure). Furthermore, he observed that children identify jobs of authority figures. For instance, Parents teach, control, care, help, do housework, work and fix; Teachers teach, teach special subjects, control academics and control behavior; and Peer Leaders boss, plan, teach and help. No significant sex and social class differences were found. Nevertheless, significant differences due to age were noted in several areas. "Teach" was increasingly acknowledged for Parent and Peer Leaders, but consistently acknowledged in Teachers. "Control" was increasing acknowledge for Peer Leader, but consistently acknowledged in Parents and Teachers. "Moral" was increasingly acknowledged in Teacher, and consistently acknowledged in Parent. "Dislike" was first acknowledged for Teachers, then for Parents and Peer Leaders.

Based on these observations, Kutnick (1980) suggests that understanding of Parent, Teacher, and Peer Leader is interactive, reflexive, retroactive, and proactive. For instance, Parent was perceived as having Control (especially Moral), who Helped, Cared for, and was Kind to the child. Reflexively, Parent's teaching ability was only realized after "Teacher as Teacher" was acknowledged. Teacher was seen as similar to Parent (Control, Moral, Help, Kind) only after the child's entry to school. Peer Leader took on Parent-like and Teacher-like qualities (Teach, Control, Help) only long after these qualities were realized in

Parents and Teachers.

Based on the five studies on children's conceptualization of authority figures, Kutnick (1980) made several conclusions. Social authority development of the child is continuous. The child develops through stages of constraint and cooperation during the period of primary school. Furthermore, Kutnick concluded that

while new aspects of figure of authority (e.g., figure of teacher and leader) were integrated into the child's repertoire (structure), previous aspects (based upon the parent) remained and provided necessary background for the development of new structure. Structures of authority were made of schemes of actions between the individual and the environment and were dialectical in nature. Interactions between the individual and the environment were physical, social, behavioral, and intellectual. (pp. 64-65)

The final study on teacher authority to be addressed is Dunbar and Taylor (1982). The authors used an opinionnaire to investigate teacher authority as perceived by 555 children in grades 1, 3 and 6, and to investigate the relationship between grade level and other factors that may influence perception. These factors included geographic location (rural or urban), type of school (public or parochial), gender, IQ (94 & below, 95 to 109, 110 to 123, and 124 & above), and SES (blue collar, white collar, farmer, & unemployed). The authors reported that grade level was not related to children's perceptions of formal teacher authority, but that sex, SES, and IQ were. Grade level, and sex were related to children's perceptions of informal teacher authority, but SES and IQ were not.

Dunbar and Taylor (1982) concluded that children's perceptions of teacher's formal authority is similar across grade levels, but children progressively view their teacher's informal authority as

less positive as grade level increases. Whereas, first-graders more likely give enthusiastic compliance to their teachers, sixth graders must be convinced by their teacher's actions that their teachers keep promises, are helpful, and like the children. Furthermore, the authors suggested that since girls perceive their teachers more positively on formal and informal authority than boys regardless of grade level, teachers can more easily gain both types of authority from girls than boys. The authors attempted to explain this "sex effect" by proposing that most elementary teachers are female and girls may be more accepting of authority by female teachers than boys. This "sex effect" with respect to teacher authority is interesting in that most conduct disordered children, hence most socially defiant children are intermediate-aged males (Hutton, 1985).

Based on the discussion of the literature on children's conceptualization of authority relations, several areas of agreement are apparent. Conceptualization of authority follows sequential developmental stages during the elementary years (Damon, 1977; Dunbar & Taylor, 1982; Kutnick, 1980). Children do not have a unitary orientation towards authority (Damon, 1977; Dornbusch & Scott, cited in Dunbar & Taylor, 1982; Dunbar & Taylor; Kutnick, 1980; Laupa & Turiel, 1986; Tisak, 1986; Weston & Tisak, 1980). Children's conceptualizations of authority regarding legitimacy and obedience are influenced by several factors other than age, including social position of authority figure, type of command, and content of social situation (Laupa & Turiel, 1986; Tisak, 1986;

Weston & Turiel, 1980). Children draw boundaries to parent, teacher, and peer authority (Damon, 1977; Laupa & Turiel, 1986; Tisak, 1986; Weston & Turiel, 1980). Children's perceptions of social power treatment justifications for legitimacy and obedience often differ (Damon, 1977; Laupa & Turiel, 1986). And finally, authority is best achieved through the development of a combination of formal and informal authority (Dornbusch & Scott, cited in Dunbar & Taylor, 1982; Dunbar & Taylor).

Teacher Authority in the Classroom

Kneller (cited in Dunbar & Taylor, 1982) described authority as

... one of the essential characteristics of a successful teacher, who must have at least minimal capacity to direct and structure the flow of classroom activities, basic knowledge of the subject area(s), and an understanding of the students and their response to him or her as a person. (p. 250)

Teacher authority is displayed in many contexts within the classroom, in particular, within the central task structures of teachers which are organized around the problems of learning and order (Doyle, 1986).

Tasks of promoting learning and order are proposed to be interdependent, such that teacher tasks of maximizing learning and sustaining order are at times complementary and at other times competing tasks. Doyle (1986) propounded that

learning is served by the instructional function, that is, by covering a specific block of the curriculum, promoting mastery of elements of that block, and instilling

favorable attitudes toward curriculum content so that students will persist in their efforts to learn (see Abrahamson, 1974; Westbury, 1973). (Whereas), order is served by the managerial function, that is, by organizing classroom groups, establishing rules and procedures, reacting to misbehavior, monitoring and pacing classroom events, and the like. (p. 395)

The ultimate goal of order is to ensure that the children are following the program of action necessary for a particular classroom event or lesson objective to be realized.

Teacher commands is one of the most concrete and pervasive way teachers display their authority. In general, two types of commands or statements are made by teachers, "instructions" and "deviance-imputations", as defined in Chapter 1 (Hargreaves et al., 1975). The same teacher command can be an instruction or a deviance-imputation. The command can be differentiated, however, by examining the context. For instance, the teacher command "Pay attention" as a deviance-imputation means, for example, that the teacher is talking and the children should be listening, rather than talking or fidgeting. "Pay attention" as an instruction means, for example, that the teacher wants to start a lesson, so the children must stop what they are doing.

Instructions and deviance-imputations which are characteristic of teacher authority in the classroom, are most often given during lessons. Virtually all lessons involve five phases: the "entry phase", the "settling down" or preparation phase, the "lesson proper" or main activity of the lesson, the "clearing up phase" and the "exit phase" (Hargreaves et al., 1975). The entry phase generally is concerned with the task of ensuring that the teacher

and the children are assembled in the physical boundaries of the classroom. The settling down phase generally is concerned with the task of ensuring that the children go to their respective seats. The lesson proper phase usually involves three subphases. In subphase 1, the teacher is highly active, usually in the form of talking, and the children are relatively passive, such as during lectures, recitations, and activity instructions. In subphase 2, the children take a more active role and the teacher is less active, such as during seatwork, essay writing, solving written problems, and group work. In subphase 3, both the teacher and the children are actively involved in the task, such as during discussions. The clearing up phase generally is concerned with stopping work and putting away any materials and/or equipment used during the lesson proper. Finally, the exit phase generally is concerned with leaving the classroom.

Each phase or subphase of a lesson is associated with a unique combination of rules. These have been specified by Hargreaves and his associates (1975) and are detailed in Appendix A. Children know which rules are in effect because they supposedly know in which phase they are. For instance, during the lesson proper subphase one, the "pay attention" rule is automatically in effect, such that the children must not talk unless asked by the teacher, children must listen to and look at the teacher, and the children (usually) must be sitting on their seats (Hargreaves et al., 1975). During the lesson proper, a teacher statement requesting one of these rules to be obeyed would, thus, be a deviance-imputation.

Lesson phases or subphases and their rules are changed by transitions or switch-signals (Arlin, 1979; Hargreaves et al., 1975). Transitions are teacher-initiated directives (usually verbal) to end one activity, task, or phase, and to begin another. Typical components of transitions include (a) an attention drawer, (b) a linking instruction, and (c) a task indicator (Hargreaves et al., 1975). For instance, "Now class (a). Take out your math books (b) and do questions one to ten on page 168 (c)". Whether all three components are included in each transition statement seems to vary within and between teachers.

Researchers suggested that children's behavior in classrooms is governed by a variety of explicit and implicit official rules of conduct and procedures (see Blumenfeld et al., 1979; Hargreaves et al., 1975; Jackson, 1968) and less official ritualized patterns of interaction and formats for openings, closings, and the conduct of lessons (see Griffin & Mehan, 1979; Yinger, 1979, cited in Doyle, 1986). Rules explicitly or implicitly enforced in the classroom may include moral, universal, institutional, regulations, personal, and relational rules. Hargreaves et al. (1975) proposed that although teachers in the classroom spend much time talking about rules and procedures, most socialization of children to the classroom systems appears to be indirect. Furthermore, in Blumenfeld and his associates' (cited in Hargreaves et al., 1975) study of primary classes and Hargreaves and associates' study of secondary classes, many rules were never explicitly stated. Instead, they were part of the common-sense knowledge that teachers

and children use to interpret situations. Implicit rules, became visible, nevertheless, when rule violations occurred and teachers responded with deviance-imputations.

In order for children to make sense of deviance-imputations, the children must understand: (1) the target of communication, (2) the rule that is in question, (3) the action which is being considered a breach of that rule and (4) the conduct which represents conformity to that rule and which must be substituted for the deviant conduct (Hargreaves et al., 1975). An example of a deviance imputation which includes all four elements is "John (#1), you know you're not supposed to be talking (#2, #3), so stop it and get on with your work! (#4)". Typically, however, when teachers make deviance-imputations, they state one or two of the elements and expect the children to "fill in" the missing elements using common-sense knowledge. For instance, "John! (#1)" and "Hey you lot in the corner (#1), mouths shut! (#4)". Erikson and Mohat (cited in Hargreaves et al., 1975) suggest that the most successful interventions or deviance-imputations tend to have a private and fleeting quality that does not interrupt the flow of classroom events.

Several researchers have examined the forms of deviance-imputations used in elementary classrooms. Humphrey (cited in Doyle, 1986) reported that 47% of the deviance-imputations or teacher desists consisted of the "squelch" form (e.g., "Shh", "Wait", "No", & "Stop") and 28% consisted of a squelch plus a brief explanation (e.g., "Shh. Put your hand up if you want to say

something."). Borman, Lippincott, Matey, and Obermiller (cited in Doyle, 1986) noted that deviance-imputations were most frequently "soft imperatives" or teacher suggestions and questions to control behavior (e.g., "Why don't you put the pencil down?"). Sieber's studies (cited in Doyle, 1986) identified over thirty types of interventions which included simple verbal reprimands (58% of total), manipulation of privileges, physical coercion, generalized threats, isolation, seat changes, repetition of routines, "writing names" and detention. Woolfolk and Brooks (cited in Doyle, 1986) noted several unobtrusive nonverbal signals to control children's deviant behaviors, including gestures, direct eye contact, and physical proximity.

Reseachers have demonstrated that the form of teacher authority and problems of deviance and of deviance-imputations are influenced by the organization of task structure (Arlin, 1979; Bossert, 1977; Duke, 1979; Doyle, 1986; Hargreaves et al., 1975). Organization of classroom tasks can vary in the size of the work group, number of different tasks being completed at a time, the amount of student choice in the organization of the task, and the task "publicness" or the ability of individuals to readily observe other individuals' behavior (Bossert, 1977). Each of these factors can influence the nature of teacher authority and the probability of instructions and deviance-imputations.

Three significantly different forms of classroom task structures are recitations, class-tasks and multi-tasks. Recitations involve the whole class or a large group of children in

a single tasks--the children listen to the questions the teacher asks, raise their hands, wait to be recognized, and give an answer. Class-tasks involve a single task such as worksheets, math assignments, and tests which are done as independent or small group seatwork. Multi-tasks involve several tasks operating simultaneously, which can be completed independently or in small groups (e.g., independent reading, projects, art work).

Of the three tasks, recitations are associated with the highest teacher control over children and the lowest student control (i.e., authoritarian teacher control) and the highest publicness of teacher and child behaviors. Whereas, multi-tasks are associated with the lowest teacher control and the highest student control (i.e., democratic teacher control) and the lowest publicness of teacher and student behavior.

The publicness of an activity and the group size reportedly have significant implications on the probability of deviance (Bossert, 1977) and thus the probability of the display of teacher authority. In large group or whole classroom tasks, where all the children are involved in the same activity in the same physical location, both teacher and student behavior is the most visible to the greatest number of children. Thus, teacher authority--how children respond to teacher authority and how successfully teachers exercise teacher authority to manage student behavior--is also highly visible. Since student behavior, thus deviant behavior, is highly visible to many or all the children, the probability of other children observing, encouraging, and/or copying deviant behavior

(i.e., ripple effect) is greater. In addition, the opportunity for children to assess the teacher's awareness of and response to deviant behaviors, and the opportunity for children to assess the quality of teacher authority and of the teacher's management skills, are also great. Hence, when children challenge teacher authority through exhibiting deviant behavior, in settings such as recitations, teachers would most likely exercise their authority through deviance-imputations to re-establish and/or reaffirm their authority as the teacher of the classroom and to discourage other children from encouraging or copying the deviant behavior and/or exhibiting other deviant behaviors.

Empirical research has supported the propositions discussed regarding the effects of lesson publicness and group size, on deviance rates. Bossert (1977) investigated the effects of task type on teacher control of student behavior, using two third-grade and two fourth-grade classrooms in an upper-middle-class private school. Bossert observed that recitation as compared to class-task and multi-task structures were associated with a more authoritarian control by teachers and greater teacher desist rates, and thus implied greater deviance rates. Kounin and Doyle (cited in Doyle, 1986) reported the greatest off-task rate and thus the greatest deviance rates for recitations, open discussions, group construction, and music and movement classes.

Bossert's (1977) explanation for the occurrence of high desist rates during recitation was highly public large group or whole class instruction requires teachers (a) to be more active eliciting

children's attention to a common target, in order to achieve the lesson objective(s); and (b) to be more impartial and consistent in classroom management by sanctioning every deviance, in order to prevent the spread of deviance to other children (ripple effect). The teacher's increased concern for the spread of deviant behavior in highly public whole class activities, such as recitation, is supported by research. Bossert (1977) observed the ripple effect during recitations and not during class-tasks and multi-tasks structures.

Another area in which deviance rates are reportedly high is during transitions or switch signals. Arlin (1979) naturalistically investigated the off-task rates of children during transitions and nontransitions made by fifty student teachers teaching in grades 1 through 9 and in their last year of a four-year Bachelor of Education Program. Arlin found that there were twice as many deviant behaviors during an average unstructured transition (6.94), than during an average nontransition (3.76). Arlin also observed that when transitions were structured, frequency of deviance did not differ significantly from nontransition times. Unfortunately, Arlin neglected to operationally differentiate between structured and unstructured transitions. Arlin explained that the high frequency of deviance during unstructured transitions was due to the disruptive influence on what Kounin (1970) has described as momentum and smoothness. Momentum is the absence of teacher behaviors that slow down the rate of activities, hold movement back, or produce "dragginess". Smoothness is the absence

of "jerkiness". Another possible explanation for high deviance rates during unstructured transitions is that transitions are usually highly public and directed to a large group or the whole class (e.g., between lessons and lesson phases).

In summary, teacher authority is most commonly displayed through commands--instructions and deviance-imputations--in the process of teachers carrying out instructional and managerial roles. Challenging of teacher authority through deviant behavior seems to be the most frequent and the most threatening for teachers, during highly public large group or whole class activities such as recitations and transitions.

Crucial notions and concepts were discussed within the three areas of authority reviewed, the nature of authority, authority relations, and teacher authority in the classroom. Research from these three areas form the framework for the investigation of socially defiant children's conceptualization of teacher authority. The concepts and ideas discussed above were utilized to structure the design of the study and will be used to interpret the data collected.

Chapter 3

Introduction

In Chapter 3 the methodology of the study is presented. The areas to be discussed are: the design of the study, the target population, the selection procedures to identify socially defiant children, the general approach to data collection, data collection devices and limitations, data collection procedures and schedules, general and specific analytical procedures, problems of bias in the study, and generalizability.

The Design of the Study

The design of the study is naturalistic rather than experimental in nature. Naturalistic and experimental research differ in several ways. The purpose of naturalistic research is to explore or generate hypotheses and questions; whereas, the purpose of experimental research is to test specific hypotheses and to answer specific research questions. In naturalistic research, data analysis is an ongoing process; while in experimental research data analysis only occurs upon completion of the study. In naturalistic research, the ongoing events and experiences during implementation of the study structures the research; whereas in experimental research preconceived ideas and a precise research design structures the research. Essentially, the structure of the research differs for naturalistic and experimental paradigms. Naturalistic research

follows an inductive approach. Whereas, experimental research follows a deductive approach.

A naturalistic research design was selected for this study for several reasons. No available research addresses socially defiant children's conceptualization of teacher authority. The little known in this area is based on research with normal children. It seems reasonable to argue that the experimentation and testing of hypotheses about socially defiant children's conceptualization of teacher authority is premature. A naturalistic design enables exploration and illumination of the topic of interest, which is more appropriate at this time. From the data collected using a naturalistic design, hypotheses may be developed and tested subsequently using an experimental research design.

A small sample size was selected to enable a more thorough and indepth investigation of the socially defiant subject's conceptualization of teacher authority. When more is known about this topic, then large "n" studies may be useful.

Moreover, a pilot study was conducted to estimate time requirements and to evaluate the appropriateness of the methodology. The pilot subject attended the same school division as the actual research subjects and met all subject selection criteria, except that his T-score on the Revised Behavior Problem Checklist was 69, instead of the minimum criterium of 70. The pilot subject who was an eleven year male was observed on six occasions over four nonconsecutive days, with his female homeroom teacher for academic subjects and with two other teachers for

nonacademic subjects. The week after the completion of the observations, the general interviews followed by the story vignette related interviews were implemented. Interview transcriptions, data coding and analysis were then conducted.

Subject Selection

Subjects were selected using a multi-step procedure. The coordinator of special education for the target school division provided the researcher with three schools from which subjects could likely be obtained. Two of the three schools had to be replaced since no child met all the criteria in one of the schools and since the target population was already involved in another study in the other school. School reselection was done by the special education coordinator, using the procedures stated earlier in this section. Within each of the schools, the principals, resource teacher and/or homeroom teachers nominated potential subjects based on the definition of socially defiant children as presented in the Chapter 1 section on definition of terms and based on the subject description section just presented. Then, the homeroom teachers of the children nominated for the study completed the Revised Behavior Problem Checklist. From the school lists of socially defiant children who met all the subject description criteria, two children per school were randomly selected by the researcher. The homeroom teachers of these children were approached in order to obtain formal consent to conduct the study with a child

in their classrooms. The parents of the first 6 children selected were contacted by the school principal in order to obtain written consent for their children to take part in the study. All the parents gave their consent. The reader is referred to Appendices B and C for the teacher and parent consent forms, respectively.

The entire Revised Behavior Problem Checklist was completed by the teachers to help control for teacher bias resulting from knowing the exact purpose of the study. Furthermore, the checklist was scored to enhance subject description. However, only Factor I Conduct Disorders was scored as part of the subject selection process. A criterion of two standard deviations above the mean (i.e., T-score of 70) was selected because Quay and Peterson (1983) have identified "normal" as less than two standard deviations above the mean.

The subjects were selected on a school level rather than a division level because the target school division did not have a formal definition of behavior disordered nor socially defiant children, nor did the division have a formal list of the behavior disordered and thus of socially defiant children.

Only socially defiant children placed in regular classrooms and not those children placed in special classrooms were selected because children who are placed in special classrooms may have different conceptualizations of teacher authority as compared to children who are placed in regular classrooms. Furthermore, how socially defiant students placed in regular classrooms conceptualize teacher authority is of more pressing concern because

referral to special classrooms is based on performance in regular classrooms.

Only male children in intermediate grades were selected because the majority of referrals for conduct disorders, and thus social defiance, are for males in intermediate and middle grades (Hutton, 1985).

One limitation of the sample that was selected is the results can be generalized only to socially defiant males who are in intermediate regular classrooms, and not to socially defiant females, other grades, nor other educational placements.

Subjects

The population selected for the study was elementary-aged socially defiant children who had been identified as socially defiant by their schools and who according to Quay and Peterson's Revised Behavior Problem Checklist (1983) exhibited conduct disorders (Factor I subscale score of at least 2 standard deviations above the mean or a T-score of 70). Also, the population of socially defiant children addressed had IQs within the normal range, had not been identified as exhibiting another exceptionality and were placed in regular classrooms.

A sample of 6 intermediate-aged male children who were identified as socially defiant by their principals, resource teachers and/or homeroom teachers and who attended the same urban school division in Manitoba was selected from this population. The

parents of each child had been previously informed by the school regarding the behavior problem of their child. The children ranged in age from 8 to 12. Pseudonyms will be used when referring to the children. The grade levels of the children were as follows: John and Morgan were in grade 4, Fred and Keith were in grade 5 and Brad and Danny were in grade 6. However, Brad repeated grade 4. Keith, Morgan and Brad had female homeroom teachers; while John, Fred and Danny had male homeroom teachers.

Information based on the entire Revised Behavior Problem Checklist and the essential background information form (see Appendix D), both of which were used to enhance subject description, is presented separately. For a sample of a completed essential background information form, refer to Appendix E.

Results of the Revised Behavior Problem Checklist.

The results obtained on the Conduct Disorder scale and the five remaining scales of the Revised Behavior Problem Checklist (RBPC) for each child are presented in Table 2. Only the obtained T-scores which represented one standard deviation above the mean (over 59) and the obtained T-scores which represented two standard deviations above the mean (over 69) are summarized. This is because these T-scores represent deviations toward high levels of the problem behaviors. T-scores of two standard deviations above the mean indicate greater deviance from the norm as compared to T-scores of one or fewer standard deviations above the mean. According to the T-scores of at least two standard deviations above the mean, all 6

Table 2

Ratings of +1 SD and +2 SD on the Revised Behavior Problem Checklist for Each Child

<u>Child</u>	<u>Scales with T-scores of of +1 SD (Ratings)</u>	<u>Scales with T-scores of of +2 SD (Ratings)</u>
John	Psychotic Behavior (65)	Conduct Disorder (79) Motor Excess (76)
Fred	Socialized Aggression (67) Motor Excess (62) Attention Problems- Immaturity (60)	Conduct Disorder (70)
Morgan	Attention Problems- Immaturity (69) Socialized Aggression (62) Psychotic Behavior (62)	Conduct Disorder (80)
Brad	Anxiety-Withdrawal (66)	Conduct Disorder (78) Motor Excess (70)
Danny		Conduct Disorder (73) Socialized Aggression (70)
Keith	Psychotic Behavior (68) Anxiety-Withdrawal (66) Motor Excess (60)	Conduct Disorder (78) Attention Problems- Immaturity (79)

Note. "SD" stands for standard deviation.

socially defiant children exhibited behaviors associated with the Conduct Disorder scale, 4 of the 6 socially defiant children exhibited behaviors associated with an additional category of behavior disorder, and 2 of the 6 socially defiant children did not exhibit behaviors associated with an additional category of behavior disorder.

Family and Medical Background.

Regarding the children's family background, all the children's parents were married to each other, except John's parents who were separated. John's mother had custody. All the families came from lower or lower-middle socioeconomic class backgrounds based on the parents' occupations. Only John had no siblings.

Regarding the socially defiant children's medical background, no medical problems were reported by the parents, except for Fred who has received counselling outside the school system since he was three years old, and John who has had ear infections for several years. However, based on the hearing test information contained in his school file, John's hearing was within the normal range the year previously. None of the children had been taking or were presently taking any form of medication. The one exception was Morgan who had been taking Ritalin since grade 1 and who as of grade four has been taking Pemoline instead.

Academic Performance.

Information which addressed the children's academic strengths and weaknesses was also obtained. All the socially defiant children, except Brad, were identified by their homeroom teachers as being academically strong in all subject areas. The common academic weakness across all the children was a negative attitude toward school work. The problem with work habits or attitude and with the children failing to achieve their potentials was reported by the children's previous homeroom teachers in the school files. John's, Fred's and Keith's homeroom teachers indicated that they were failing several or all subject areas, despite their academic abilities. None of the children were receiving supplementary educational services such as resource, reportedly due to their high potential. These reports are in agreement with Bower's (1969) definition of behaviorally disordered/emotionally disturbed children. One of the definition criteria is "an inability to learn to a marked degree over a period of time, which cannot be explained by intelligence, sensory or health factors". The reports are also in agreement with research that indicated that socially defiant children tend to be academic underachievers or failures despite their ability to learn (Bower, 1960; Jenson, Reavis & Rhode, 1988; Kauffman, 1977).

Assessments of the socially defiant children's intelligence were only available for Morgan. Two years previous, Morgan scored in the superior range on all verbal and performance subtests of the WISC-R. This assessment supports his homeroom teacher's

perceptions of Morgan's underachieving in school.

History of Social Defiance.

The homeroom teachers reported that the children exhibited socially defiant behavior for at least two to five years. However, the reports of previous homeroom teachers contained in the school files, only indicated that the children have had problems with work habits and social adjustment or growth for at least two to five years. For only two of the six children (John and Fred) were possible references to socially defiant behavior made in the school files. John's grade two teacher reported his need to work on "self-control" and Fred's previous teachers reported his aggressive play, strong-willedness and frequent confrontations on the playground.

Only John, Keith and Morgan have been formally identified by the school division as behavior disordered/emotionally disturbed, through the Child Guidance Department of the Manitoba Department of Education. These children were receiving some formal but rather infrequent intervention through a social worker, guidance counsellor and psychologist, respectively. The success of the interventions as perceived by the homeroom teachers were described as "no major effect" and/or "temporary effect". The majority of the interventions, if any, for the socially defiant children, were informal and at the school or homeroom teacher level. These informal interventions encompassed such approaches as consistency and predictability of expectations and consequences for disobedience, and direct confrontation when the child was

disobedient.

Nature of Social Defiance.

The ways in which the children challenged teacher authority, as reported by their homeroom teachers, included such verbal means as argues, manipulates, makes excuses, swears, lies, makes noises and talks under breath, and such nonverbal means as oppositional behaviors, stomps feet, rolls eyes, "angry" facial expressions, shrugs shoulders, slams books, throws paper, cries and has temper tantrums. These examples of challenges to teacher authority are similar to those included in the definition of social defiance in Chapter 2 by Brophy and Rohrkemper (1981, p. 295).

Social-interpersonal Relations.

Information was also obtained on the quality of the children's social-interpersonal relationships. John's and Morgan's homeroom teachers indicated that the children got along reasonably well with their teachers. The other socially defiant children's homeroom teachers indicated that they did not get along well with their teachers, as a result of the children's tendency to manipulate, to engage in power struggles and confrontations, to be stubborn and/or to not do assigned work.

Regarding their rapport with fellow students, all homeroom teachers identified this as a problem area. All the socially defiant children reportedly only got along with students with similar personalities and behavior problems. Generally, the other

students avoided, ignored and/or merely tolerated the socially defiant children. Some of the reasons provided by the homeroom teachers for this trend were the socially defiant children tended to manipulate, aggravate, tease, provoke, physically threaten or physically harm their fellow students.

These reports are consistent with research on socially defiant children's social acceptance. Research indicated that socially defiant children have few if any satisfactory interpersonal relationships. Bower (1969) suggested that a common characteristic of behavior disordered children is "an inability to maintain satisfactory relationships with peers and teachers". Gresham (1982) cited research that demonstrated that behavior disordered children interact less often or more negatively with peers as compared to the interactions of normal peers and that behavior disordered children are poorly accepted by peers. Kauffman (1977) indicated that behavior disordered children are "typically not popular among their classmates and playmates".

Perceived Improvements in Behavior.

When asked whether they felt the socially defiant children had improved over the school year, the homeroom teachers of all six children reported improvements in their behavior, in particular since spring break, which was 2 weeks prior to when the study was implemented/the observations and interviews were conducted. Fred's and Morgan's homeroom teachers attributed their improvement to a meeting with the principal or vice-principal, child and/or parents,

regarding the child's behavior problems, the school's expectations and the consequences for not meeting the expectations. Although improvements were noted for all six children, the improvements were identified as largely in academic or classroom behavior, rather than in social-interpersonal behavior with other students.

An additional explanation for the recent improvements in behavior was the use of incentives. Brad's, John's, Fred's and Danny's homeroom teacher and Fred's and Morgan's parents reported that setting expectations with incentives for meeting the expectations proved to be an effective approach for encouraging desired behavior. These reports of the effectiveness of incentives for obedience and punishments for disobedience with socially defiant children are supported by Jenson, Reavis and Rhode (1988). The authors suggested that behaviorally disordered and thus socially defiant children tend to be contingency-governed rather than rule-governed. In other words, socially defiant children want to know what will happen to them if they misbehave (or behave); they want to know what will happen to them (contingency-governed), rather than what will be the implications of their behavior on other people (rule-governed). Essentially, contingency-governed behavior involves an "if I do this behavior, then this consequence will happen" orientation.

Data Collection Devices

The general approach to data collection was triangulation or

multiple operations. A triangulation of techniques is advisable in naturalistic studies since naturalistic studies characteristically use investigative techniques that have less control over confounding variables and thus have greater probability of error. Webb, Campbell, Schwartz and Sechrest (1966) suggested that implementing three techniques with different methodological weaknesses helps to increase confidence in the combined results. That is, if three imperfect measures with different sources of error variance produce consistent results, the probability of inaccurate and unrepresentative data is reduced. This also increases confidence in making inferences and generalizations based on the combined results (Webb et al., 1966).

The Revised Behavior Problem Checklist, the essential background information form and the three data collection techniques used in this study--observations, interviews, and story vignettes--and their limitations will be discussed separately.

Revised Behavior Problem Checklist (RBPC)

The Revised Behavior Problem Checklist contains 77 statements of common behavior problems of behaviorally deviant children. It is clustered into six factors of general disturbance, Factor I Conduct Disorder (e.g., disobedient, impertinent, argumentative), Factor II Socialized Aggression (e.g., belongs to a gang, steals, truant), Factor III Attention Problems-Immaturity (e.g., dependent, passive, impulsive), Factor IV Anxiety-Withdrawal (e.g., self-conscious, feels inferior, depressed), Factor V Psychotic Behavior

(e.g., repeats self, parrots others, expresses strange, far-fetched ideas), and Factor VI Motor Excess (e.g., restless, tense, hyperactive). Alpha-reliability coefficients for the subscales were reported to be between .70 and .95 and for Factor I was reported to be between .92 and .95 (Quay & Peterson, 1983). Interrater reliability and test-retest reliability for Factor I were .85 and .63, respectively.

This checklist was chosen as part of the subject selection process, because it contains Factor I Conduct Disorder, and social defiance is one aspect of conduct disorders.

Essential Background Information Form

Since the school division from which the six socially defiant children were selected did not have a formal definition of behavior disordered nor did the division have a list of children identified as behavior disordered or socially defiant, an essential background information form was developed to enhance subject description (see Appendix D). The essential background information form contained questions which addressed such areas as demographics, family background, medical history, identification and intervention for social defiance, history and nature of social defiance, quality of social-interpersonal relationships, and academic strengths and weaknesses. This information was obtained by the researcher upon completion of the data collection and analytical procedures. The sources of information for these questions were the parents, the homeroom teacher and the school files. In addition to enhancing

subject description, the information obtained from the essential background information form was used to support and to fail to support some findings of the study.

The main limitation of the background information form is that the form is largely based on the verbal informal reports of parents, present teachers and past teachers. These reports may be highly subjective. Hence, the information obtained via the verbal reports may lack validity.

Observation

Observation of teacher-socially defiant child authority interactions via teacher commands was one of the techniques selected for the study. Observation was selected as part of the methodology because of its strengths. Observation enables researchers to collect data on the behaviors of subjects in natural settings, under natural conditions (Sackett, Ruppenthal, & Gluck, 1978). The observer has the power to make inferences by relating observed behavior to the constructs of the study. According to Kerlinger (1973), inference helps to bridge the gap between behavior and constructs.

Data collected through observation was recorded using narrative specimen records. The nature of the data recorded during observations included general background information (i.e., the socially defiant child's name, the date, length of observation, setting, group size, academic subject, lesson activity), the teacher commands, and the socially defiant child's responses (see Appendix

F).

On the other hand, observation has limitations. One concern is observer-inference. Observation may give rise to inferences which may be incorrect. Another major concern of observations is observer-interference (Lindsey & Aronsen, 1968; Kerlinger, 1973). Observer-interference is the effect the observer has on the natural setting and conditions. The problem of interference is determining the nature and degree of effect of the observer has on the individual being observed. This problem of interference is heightened when small groups are observed (Lindsey & Aronsen; Bogden & Biklen, 1982), when the observer dramatically alters the group structure (e.g., an adult observer enters a classroom with only one other adult and approximately twenty-four children) (Bogden & Biklen), and/or when the "observees" have reason to suspect the motives of the observer (Lindsey & Aronsen). However, Schoggen (cited in Lindsey & Aronsen) suggested that children are usually too busy engaging in other life activities to be bothered by observers.

Story Vignettes

Hypothetical verbal authority interviews was another investigative technique used in the study. The interviews consisted of a standard story vignette with four content variations and a standard set of related questions. The four content variations were academic related instructions, academic related deviance-imputations, social-interpersonal instructions, and social-

interpersonal deviance-imputations. Moreover, the vignettes and related questions were pilot tested.

The specific commands chosen for each vignette variation was based on examples which are representative of the teacher command variations frequently given in the regular elementary classroom. Representative examples were obtained from teachers taking a graduate course in special education at the University of Manitoba (see Appendix G). They were given the definitions of each of the four teacher command variations and then asked to list three examples commonly given during lessons, for each command variation. The teachers were asked to indicate the years they have taught in the regular classroom at the elementary, junior high, and high school level, and their gender. Responses of those teachers who had indicated that they are female and that they have had at least three years regular elementary teaching experience were analyzed. For each teacher command variation, the example with the greatest frequency was selected as the basis for a story vignette variation.

After four vignette variations had been developed, volunteers from the graduate class evaluated the representativeness or appropriateness of the vignette variations and improvements were made based on their feedback (see Appendix H). For the story vignettes and related questions, refer to Appendix I.

Elementary classroom teachers' responses were selected because the study addressed elementary-aged children. Female teachers' responses were selected because most elementary teachers are female; therefore, most elementary teachers who refer children for socially

defiant behaviors are likely female. The responses of teachers with at least three years teaching experience were selected because three years experience seemed sufficient to be able to generate representative examples of teacher commands.

Four vignette variations were selected and implemented for each subject, since there were two main types of teacher commands (instructions and deviance-imputations) and two main areas in which teacher authority were exercised (academic related behavior and social-interpersonal behavior). Since it was uncertain whether socially defiant children conceptualize teacher authority similarly or differentially across these four command variations, all four variations were investigated.

The vignettes were presented orally rather than in writing because they allow for restating or prephrasing of questions when the subjects do not understand what is being asked.

The children depicted in the vignettes were identified as male because the subjects were male. Using male student characters may have increased the likelihood that the subjects identified with the students in the vignettes. This, in turn, may have increased the likelihood of the subjects' responses being representative of their behavior in natural settings, under natural conditions.

Hypothetical verbal authority interviews via vignettes were used as one investigative technique for many reasons. Story vignettes can provide the opportunity to simulate and investigate the portion of reality that is of interest. And, story vignettes seem to be a viable technique for investigating conceptualization

of authority, since several researchers, including Damon (1977), Laupa and Turiel (1986), and Tisak (1986), had used story vignettes to investigate adult authority as perceived by children.

The main limitation of vignettes presented orally is that verbal responses to vignettes which simulate a portion of reality may not be representative of actual behavior in inherently complex natural settings, under natural conditions. The main limitation of the vignettes designed for the study is that the vignettes only refer to socially defiant male children, hence the results of this study can not be generalized to situations in which the vignettes refer to socially defiant female children.

Interviews

Orally presented interviews with socially defiant children was the final technique selected for the study. The interview with open-ended questions and probes followed a semi-structured schedule or guide. The questions were arranged as a "funnel". The interview started with a broad question and move to more and more specific questions and probes centered around the topic of interest. Cannell and Kahn (1953) proposed that the purpose of the funnel is to prevent early questions in a sequence from influencing those that come later and to help determine the respondents frame of reference. The final questions for each socially defiant child probed one academic related instruction and one academic related deviance-imputation that were disobeyed by the child observed. Two types of academic related commands were selected because it was found in the

pilot study and the actual study that social-interpersonal commands were seldom given by the teachers observed. The general interview was pilot tested. For the general interview, see Appendix J.

An interview presented orally was selected as part of the methodology because of its strengths. Kerlinger (1973) presented several strengths of interviews. Interviews are fairly direct, so a great deal of specific information of interest can be obtained. Interviews can be flexible and adaptable to individual situations, and thus are especially suitable for research with children. An interviewer can determine whether the respondent understands the questions and repeat or rephrase the question in order to elicit accurate information. Orally presented interviews enable extensive probing into the context and reasons for responses. They also enable the interviewer to note the body language and incidental comments of the respondents which can expand the richness of the interviews and check for inconsistencies between and within verbal and nonverbal behavioral responses. Open-ended questions were used in the interviews because they can sometimes elicit unexpected answers and alternative explanations regarding the topic of interest, and they can reduce the likelihood of prompting answers.

The three investigative techniques--the observations, story vignettes and interview--also have several limitations in common. They can be time consuming and expensive, in particular, because one person can only collect data from one subject at a time. Also, orally presented interviews and story vignette related questions can put respondents on the spot, in particular, questions that are

embarrassing or personal. The emotional aspect of this type of question can lead the respondents to providing inaccurate responses, which makes the data invalid. Moreover, the assumption made when using orally presented interviews and story vignette related questions is that the respondents have adequate oral language processing skills. This may not be the case.

Scheduling of the Data Collection Devices

Scheduling of the observations, the story vignettes and the interviews was done using random assignment with replacement. Eight consecutive school days were selected starting on a Monday. For each day, four observations, or six story vignettes or interviews were scheduled. To determine when each socially defiant child was observed or interviewed, each child was assigned a different number from one to six. A die was rolled to fill each time slot. For instance, if a six were rolled first, then the child designated as number six was placed in the first slot on Monday morning. Automatically, the child who attended the same school as child number six was placed in the second slot on Monday morning. Then, if a three were rolled next, the child designated as number three was placed in the third slot on Monday, and the child who attended the same school as child number three was automatically placed in the fourth slot on Monday. Automatic placement was adopted to maximize the efficient use of time and to facilitate the implementation of study for the researcher, since the six children came from three schools. Also, each socially defiant child was

observed or interviewed a maximum of once per day. The schedules were adjusted, when necessary. For example, when the schedule was in conflict with the teacher's classroom timetable. When adjustments were made for one child in a school, the other child who attended the same school was rescheduled also.

Data Collection Procedures

All data collection techniques were implemented by the investigator. The order of implementing the techniques was observations, story vignettes and interviews. Observations were first, so that the socially defiant children (and the rest of the class) did not know that the socially defiant children not the entire class, was the target for observation. This have may reduced the confounding effects of observer-interference. Story vignettes were implemented second to prevent the children from parroting terminology and explanations used in the interview questions which involved the presentation of the four legitimate authority options (i.e., traditional, rational-legal, charismatic and rational-expert).

The study was conducted on eight consecutive school days in April, 1988, two weeks after the children's week long spring break. The procedures for each investigative technique are described separately. Attempts to address the limitations of each technique via the procedures are also discussed.

Observation

For each child, the teacher commands and the target socially defiant child's responses to the respective commands were recorded during the observation sessions, in the form of narrative specimen records. The teacher commands of interest were those commands directed towards the socially defiant child, including whole class-, large group-, small group-, and individual-targetted commands.

Narrative specimen records or continuous event recording, was the selected recording procedure rather than time sampling, because specific information on examples of the four variations of teacher commands and on the socially defiant children's responses to the commands was of interest, not frequency, rate, nor duration of teacher commands and subject responses.

Background information was recorded for each observation session using an observational recording sheet (see Appendix F). This information was used in the communication of the observation procedures and demographics (e.g., observation context, school subject, and observation time and length) and in the interpretation of the data collected.

The school subjects and instructional contexts (i.e., whole class recitations, class-tasks and multi-tasks) that were targetted for the observations were identified by the homeroom teacher of each child, prior to conducting the observations. This selection was based on in which school subjects and instructional contexts the child's socially defiant behavior tended to be the most frequent.

The majority of the observations were with the socially

defiant children's homeroom teachers during language arts, mathematics, science and social studies. The remaining observations were with the teachers who taught the specialized classes including art, physical education, music and computer. The majority of the observations were during whole class recitations; while the next most frequent observational context was class tasks, as suggested by the homeroom teachers. The instructional contexts selected by the homeroom teachers as highly deviant behavior occasions were consistent with Bossert's (1977) investigation of the effects of task type on teacher control of elementary-aged children.

For each of the six observation days, the observations were scheduled as follows: one during the first class and one immediately after recess in the morning at one school, and one during the first class and one immediately after recess in the afternoon at a different school. Each socially defiant child was observed once in all four different observation periods. The above times were chosen because a majority of homeroom teachers of the socially defiant children reported that during those times, the children most frequently displayed socially defiant behaviors. The homeroom teachers' selections of transitions as having high rates of social deviance supports Arlin's (1979) research of transitions and nontransition times in grades 1 through 9.

The number of observation sessions per child was four school classes, since this number of classes seemed to provide a sufficient sample of the pilot study child's socially defiant behavior. As class lengths differ, a single observation session

length range from approximately one-half hour to an hour and one-half.

The mean length per observation was 49 minutes; while the length per observation ranged from 25 minutes (Fred) to 95 minutes (John). The mean total observations time per socially defiant child was 196 minutes; while the total observation time per child ranged from 145 minutes (Fred) to 270 minutes (John).

The problem of observer-inference was addressed through four means. Firstly, observations were pilot-tested or pretested on similar socially defiant children first, in order to improve the observation system and to gain practice in observing teacher commands and subject responses. Secondly and thirdly, few categories of teacher commands ($n = 4$) and subject responses ($n = 2$), and clear, unambiguous definitions of the categories were used. Fourthly, straight narrative specimen records rather than an elaborate behavioral recording system was adopted to lessen the interpretive burden and potential for error in categorizing the observations during the sessions. Kerlinger (1973) reported that the fewer the categories the less the interpretive burden and the less the concern for reliability and validity.

The problems of observer-interference were reduced by following two of Lindsey and Aronsen's (1968) solutions to interference. The least disruptive investigative technique-- observations-- was carried out prior to implementing the more disruptive measures--interviews and story vignettes--and "partial concealment" was used. Partial concealment involves informing the

participants of only some of the aims of the observations. Hence, prior to the observations, the researcher informed the class that she was interested in what goes on during lessons. The teacher did, however, know which child had been targetted for observations, since the teacher already had rated the socially defiant child on the Revised Behavior Problem Checklist.

These two solutions may have prevented the socially defiant children (and the teacher) from feeling singled out during the observation sessions. Accordingly, these solutions may have reduced the likelihood of the effects of observer-interference on those persons actually targetted for observation, since all children were supposedly being observed. Observer-interference was further reduced by entering the classroom a minimum of 5 minutes before starting the formal observation and by informally visting the class the day or two before. These steps may have allowed sufficient time for the teacher and the children to acclimatize themselves to the "intruder's" presence, before formal observational data collection began.

Story Vignettes

The four story vignette variations were orally presented to each subject by the researcher, in a private room outside the classroom. For each child, the vignettes were taped and administered in one ten-minute session. The story vignettes were administered in one sessions because administering all four vignettes took only ten minutes in the pilot study and because no

potential confounding variables for administering all four vignettes in one session were identified. Furthermore, the story vignette related interviews were administered individually to all six socially defiant children, on the school day following the completion of all the observations.

Scheduling of the story vignettes was done as follows. Two children from the same school were interviewed before the morning recess; two other children from the same school were interviewed after the morning recess; and the two remaining children from the same school were interviewed before the afternoon recess.

Each interview began with the interviewer stating that she was going to ask some questions about what goes on in classrooms. After each vignette, a series of standard questions were asked.

Order of presentation of the vignettes for the socially defiant children was determined by randomly selecting six permutations from a total of 24 possible permutations of four vignettes.

How most of the limitations of the interviews, vignettes, and vignette related questions were addressed are discussed simultaneously, since the solutions are similar. The interviews and the vignettes were taped to control for inadequacies of memory, and thus, to reduce inaccurate observer-inferences and to increase the accuracy and completeness of the data collected. The interview and vignettes were pilot tested on a similar socially defiant child, in order to reduce any ambiguous, inaccurate and/or "threatening" wording of questions. Sufficient understanding of the interview and vignette questions was ensured by telling the subjects to inform the

interviewer when they did not understand a question, and by having the interviewer-researcher look for signs of confusion as expressed through facial expressions and unrelated, inappropriate responses.

Interviews

Each socially defiant child was interviewed individually for approximately one 20-minute session in a private room outside the classroom. All interviews were taped and each child was asked the same interview questions, and was interviewed by the same person, the researcher. The interviews were administered on the school day immediately following the administration of the story vignettes. The scheduling of the interviews was done in the same manner as the story vignettes.

Additional questions were occasionally asked during an interview to help clarify the socially defiant children's responses. For instance, "What do you mean?", "What do students learn?", "What does the teacher teach?", "Why is the student suppose to listen to or obey the teacher?", "Why is the teacher the boss, in charge or in authority?" and "Is there any other reason?"

A typed-written copy of the four legitimate authority options (i.e., traditional, rational-legal, charismatic and rational-expert) was provided to each child when the researcher asked questions relating to these options. This enabled each child to place a check mark beside those options he liked. This was done to reduce the demand on auditory memory. Controlling for this problem

likely strengthened the reliability of the children's responses.

Analytical Procedures

The combined results of the three investigative techniques were analyzed with reference to the research questions stated in Chapter 1, using the analytic induction and the constant comparative methods. The analytic induction method developed by Znaniecki and by Robinson (cited in Goetz & LeCompte, 1981) involves "... scanning the data for categories of phenomena and for relationships among such categories, developing working typologies and hypotheses upon an examination of initial cases, then modifying and refining them on the basis of subsequent cases" (p. 57). The constant comparative method devised by Glaser and Strauss (cited in Goetz & LeCompte) "... combines inductive category coding with a simultaneous comparison of all social incidents observed. As social phenomena are recorded and classified they also are compared across categories" (p. 58). These two analytic approaches are constructive or generative and flexible in that they are adaptable across all unit of analysis types.

The specific analysis procedures that were adopted to analyze the combined results were presented by Bogden and Biklen (1982). In accordance with the dictates of Bogden and Biklen, the investigator did the following: All data collection pages were numbered sequentially. The investigator reviewed the predetermined classifications in the coding scheme (see Appendix K). Then, she

read the data over in full, at least twice. While reading over the data, additional classifications were developed as they were needed (see Appendix L). In the process of developing new codes, words or phrases that were foreign to the investigator and/or that were used in unusual manners were noted and considered as new coding categories in themselves, with or without modification. "Observer's comments"--personal notes, ideas, and responses to the data--were also made by the investigator, during the process of reviewing the data.

After the data had been reviewed at least two times, anagrams were assigned to the predetermined and newly developed coding categories. For instance, traditional authority and rational-expert authority were coded as "TA" and "EA", respectively. Bogden and Biklen (1982) suggested using numbers; however, anagrams were used instead in order to reduce the need for memorization of the codes, and thus to expedite the coding of the data and possibly to reduce error due to coding. After anagrams were assigned to the coding categories, the investigator read through the data again, this time, assigning the coding category anagrams to "units of data". Units of data refer to pieces of data--paragraph(s) or sentence(s)--that can be represented by the coding category.

During the process of coding the data, workability of the preliminary coding categories was evaluated and modified as necessary. Additional categories were developed to accommodate several alternate justifications for legitimacy and obedience which were not included in the original categories of formal and informal

authority. Since analysis is a process of data reduction, decisions to limit codes was an ongoing process. For instance, a single coding category for alternate justifications with a similar focus was created rather than creating several codes. After revisions and additions had been made to the coding scheme, the workability of the revised coding categories was evaluated.

Once a coding category system had been accepted, a list of coding categories was made and the respective anagram was assigned to each coding category. The reader is referred to Appendix K for the original classification codes and respective anagrams used in general and used with respect to the individual data collection techniques and is again referred to Appendix L for the alternative justification categories and respective anagrams. Before assigning the anagrams to the coding categories, the list was ordered by group-related categories, to facilitate memorization and application of the coding system. For example, the four legitimate authority options--traditional, rational-legal, charismatic and raitonal-expert--were grouped together. Next, the investigator went through all the data and labelled each unit with the appropriate code. This involved deciding what code categories each piece of data would appropriately fit, and where a unit of data began and ended. One piece of data may have been coded, however, with several categories. In the process of coding each piece of data, exactly what sentence(s) represented each code was indicated with a mark.

The cut-up-and-put-in-folder approach as suggested by Bogden and Biklen (1982) was followed to facilitate further data

interpretation and the identification of themes and patterns. Next to each coded unit of data, the investigator placed a number which corresponded to the number of the page it was on; a code for whether it represented data from the observations (O), story vignettes (SV) or interviews (I); and the first initial of the socially defiant child investigated. The codes for the data collection device and the socially defiant child were circled to prevent confusion between these codes and the classification codes.

The next step was that the notes were cut up and put into folders based on the data collection procedure and the interview question type. Bogden and Biklen (1982) suggested cutting and sorting the notes in terms of units of data with the same classification code. The former rather than the latter procedure was adopted because interpretation of the data based on the research questions was simplified when the data was organized that way.

In other words, a different set of folders was used for the data obtained from the questions relating to the observation-based teacher commands, the preset story vignette related teacher commands, the child-created teacher commands and the general interview.

Consequently, for questions related to the observation-based teacher commands, there were seven folders with the following question types: evaluation of legitimacy/illegitimacy, rationale for legitimacy, rationale for illegitimacy, evaluation of obedience/disobedience, rationale for obedience, rationale for disobedience, and rationale for disobeying the observation-based

teacher command.

For questions related to the story vignette preset teacher commands, and for questions related to the story vignette child-created commands, there were six folders each with the same six categories as the first six preceding categories. For the questions related to the story vignettes child-created commands, two additional folders were used. These were child-created commands and reasons for selecting the child-created command.

For the general interview questions, there were 17 folders. Six folders were the same categories as the first six preceding categories. The remaining ten folders were: who's the boss, rationale for legitimacy with the four legitimate authority options, reasons why good options for rationale for legitimacy, reasons why not good options for rationale for legitimacy, best option for rationale for legitimacy, reasons why best option for rationale for legitimacy, rationale for obedience with the four legitimate authority options, reasons why good options for rationale for obedience, reasons why not good options for rationale for obedience, best option rationale for obedience, and reasons why best option for rationale for obedience.

Since a unit of data may be coded with more than one classification code, the investigator photocopied the notes as many times as needed. Once the data had been grouped in manila folders according to data collection procedure, the contents of each folder were reviewed. When confusion arose regarding the original context of a particular unit of data, the investigator referred back to the

master copy by using the page numbers, data collection procedure code and socially defiant child code written on each unit of data.

After the data had been coded and sorted, the investigator referred back to the interview questions, the vignette-related questions, the coding scheme and the research questions in order to interpret the data within each folder.

Intercoder reliability was determined by having a second person code one-sixth of the data collected from each of the investigative techniques. The data obtained from one socially defiant child was randomly selected for use in determining intercoder reliability. The selected method of calculating intercoder reliability was percentage of agreement. Percentage of agreement was determined by dividing the total number of agreements by, itself plus the number of codes made by one coder but not the other, then multiplying by 100.

Individual data collected from the various data collection techniques were transcribed, coded and analyzed by the investigator, and with reference to their unique questions. The specific approaches used for each investigative technique are described separately.

Observation

Each teacher command obtained from the observations was analyzed according to the definitions of the command variations (i.e., academic related instruction, academic related deviance-imputation, social-interpersonal instruction, social-interpersonal

deviance-imputation). Hargreaves and his associates' (1975) rules for each lesson phase occasionally were used to determine whether a command was a deviance-imputation (see Appendix A). Each of the socially defiant children's responses were compared to the respective teacher command and to the classification codes, "obeyed teacher command" and "disobeyed teacher command" to determine if the response should be coded as obeyed (OC) or disobeyed (DO).

Story Vignettes

Responses to each question for each subject were analyzed according to the analytical procedures, analytic induction and constant comparative methods, as outlined under the general analytical procedures.

More specifically, the subjects' responses to the vignette questions evaluating the four variations of teacher commands, were analyzed using the following procedure. The subjects' evaluations of legitimacy and of obedience regarding the teacher command were coded as positive (yes), negative (no), or inconsistent. A response was coded as inconsistent if the child's response to a question included both positive and negative responses. The justifications provided for the rationale for legitimacy or illegitimacy and the rationale for obedience or disobedience were coded as formal or informal, and as traditional, charismatic, rational-legal, and/or rational-expert based on the coding scheme. The alternative justification categories were used when the

original authority-based justification categories did not fit the child's response.

Interviews

The general and specific analytical procedures adopted for the interviews were the same as those described for the story vignettes.

Problems of Bias

In an investigation, bias or sources of error from the subjects, the investigator, sampling imperfections, and differential treatment of subjects represent sources of invalidity. This is because the data may be influenced or affected by the biases, but the nature of the influence or effect is uncertain. Hence, what the results represent is also uncertain. The four sources of error or invalidity will be discussed individually.

One potential source of error or bias is the subjects. The subjects' mere knowledge that they were participating in a research may have influenced the nature of the data and thus confounded the results of data collection. Regarding the subject effect or reactive effect of measurement, Selltitz and her associates (cited in Webb et al., 1966) proposed

data collection techniques used in the experiment may itself affect the outcome. If people feel that they are "guinea pigs" being experimented with, or if they feel that they are being "tested" and must make a good impression, or if the method of data collection suggests responses or stimulates an interest the subject did not previously feel, the measuring

process may distort the experimental results. (p. 97)

All three investigative techniques selected for the study involved the participants' awareness of being tested or analyzed. Hence, all three techniques may have been confounded by the reactive effect of measurement, as described by Selltitz (cited in Webb et al., 1966), and thus by the associated concern for validity.

A second potential source of error is the investigator. The investigator designed and implemented all data collection devices, and analyzed all data collected. The investigator's responsibility to collect and interpret data at the data collection and data analysis stages of investigation represent potential sources of bias or error. This is because what the investigator consciously or unconsciously had chosen and had not chosen to perceive or observe, may have influenced the nature of the data, and thus influenced the results and interpretations. Furthermore, regardless if investigator perception is, in fact, a source of error, the investigator's interpretation of the data may have been inaccurately based on preset and/or unsubstantiated notions. Due to the potential impact of the investigator-effect source of error, more than one person should have collected and coded the data, and intercoder reliability should have been determined for data collection and data analysis. This is because if more than one person made the same observations or interpretations, the probability of error is reduced. Nevertheless, as previously stated, for this study intercoder reliability was determined for

data analysis only. This was due to time and money constraints.

A third potential source of error is differential treatment of subjects. Differential treatment of subjects within investigative techniques may have lead to uncontrolled and unpredictable differences in the data, which may have lead to the making of inferences, interpretations, and conclusions which were inaccurate.

A fourth potential source of error is sampling imperfections. Throughout the study, samples were taken. Subjects were sampled from the socially defiant child population, observation sessions were sampled from the set of all possible observation sessions, teacher command variations were sampled from the set of all potential teacher commands within a particular command variation, and interview questions were sampled from all crucial interview questions related to the topic of interest. It is possible that some or all of these samples were not representative of the population from which they were taken. If so, then the results, conclusions and inferences made from the data were not representative of the target population. Such samples would have poor generalizability to the respective target population.

Generalizability

Generalizability is the ability to make inferences, draw conclusions, and/or make predictions about elements of the target population that were not sampled for investigation. High generalizability is the goal of most research, since research is

usually concerned with making inferences and drawing conclusions about a particular population not about a particular sample of the population, and since it is usually impossible to investigate the whole population.

Two major sources of error that could reduce the generalizability of the study are the investigative techniques and sampling imperfections. Sampling imperfection error has already been addressed. Regarding error due to the investigative techniques, each of the techniques to be implemented-- observations, interviews, and vignettes--involved the investigation of a naturally occurring phenomenon under unnatural settings and/or conditions. Socially defiant children may conceptualize teacher authority in the classroom differently when evaluated under natural verses unnatural settings and/or conditions. In short, the investigative settings and conditions were not necessarily representative of the natural setting and conditions of interest. Hence, the selected techniques may not capture socially defiant children's conceptualization of teacher authority in the classroom under natural conditions. Therefore, generalized inferences and conclusions based on the data collected from the three investigative techniques may not be warranted.

A global attempt to address the sources of error and problems of generalizability discussed was the selection of the triangulation or multiple operations approach. As described previously, if three imperfect measures with different sources of error variance produce consistent results, the probability of

inaccurate and unrepresentative data, inferences, and conclusions is reduced (Webb et al., 1966).

Specific attempts to control each source of error are discussed separately. Partial concealment was used in an attempt to control sources of error due to the subject. The investigative techniques and analytical procedures were pilot tested in an attempt to control sources of error due to the investigator. Pilot testing enabled the investigator to gain practice implementing the investigative and analytical procedures, and to evaluate and improve the investigative procedures, analytical procedures and the clarity of the classification codes. Furthermore, all interviews and story vignette related interviews were taped and intercoder reliability was determined for data analysis. These measures likely would have reduced the probability of inaccurate inference- and conclusion-making. Moreover, samples were obtained randomly, when possible, in an attempt to control sources of error due to sampling imperfections. Standardized interviews, vignettes, and vignette-related questions and standardized investigative and analytical procedures within the three techniques were used in an attempt to control sources of error due to differential treatment of subjects. And, the investigator implemented all procedures to further reduce the source of error due to differential treatment of subjects.

Chapter 4

Introduction

In keeping with the naturalistic approach to inquiry selected for this study, Chapter 4 contains a presentation and a discussion of the results. The results and discussion are presented in terms of the research questions which address formal (i.e., traditional and rational-legal) and informal (i.e., charismatic and rational-expert) teacher authority with respect to academic related and social-interpersonal behavior. Information obtained from oral interviews and from observations is presented. The data obtained verbally represents information based on opened-ended questions, questions with preset options and questions related to specific teacher commands. Additional information which further illuminates the authority framework presented in Chapter 2 is also discussed.

Since legitimacy and obedience represent the two critical issues in authority knowledge (Damon, 1977) and represent the basic means of investigating authority (Damon, 1977; Laupa & Turiel, 1986), the findings are presented in terms of evaluation of legitimacy, evaluation of obedience, rationale for legitimacy and rationale for obedience.

Results and Discussion

Interrater Reliability

The data collected from one of the six socially defiant

children were used to determine interrater reliability coefficients. Thus, three interrater reliability coefficients were determined, one each for the general interview, the story-vignette related interview and the observations. Interrater reliability was assessed using the percentage of agreement method, as used by Laupa and Turiel (1986) in their study of normal children's concepts of adult and peer authority. This method involves dividing the total number of agreements by, itself plus the number of codes made by one coder but not the other, then multiplying by 100. The interrater reliability for the general interview, the story vignette related interview and the observations were 96%, 91% and 85%, respectively.

The reader is referred to Appendices L, M and N for the general interview, story vignette related interview and observation data used to determine interrater reliability.

Alternative Justifications Regarding Rationale for Legitimacy and Obedience

Although the four legitimate authority options--traditional, rational-legal, charismatic and rational-expert authority--represent the basis of this study and were frequently used as justifications for legitimacy and obedience by the six socially defiant children, the children provided numerous other justifications with varying frequency. In order to simplify the interpretation of the findings of the study, these additional categories are presented first. The general categories of alternative justifications are: six Act Orientation Categories including Avoidance Orientation, Approach Orientation, Conservation

of Resources, Others' Welfare, Appeal to Fairness and Miscellaneous, and one Physical Attributes category, Age Orientation. Act Orientation, Physical Attributes, Others' Welfare and Appeal to Fairness justification categories were coined by Laupa and Turiel (1986), in their investigation of normal children's perceptions of adult and peer authority. The specific justifications represented by these general categories are presented in Appendix O. All the additional justification categories were used occasionally, except for the Avoidance Orientation category which was used frequently.

Results Based on the Children's Verbal Responses

These data were collected via the general interviews and the story vignette related interviews. Verbal responses collected from the general interviews are presented and discussed in terms of the open-ended questions and questions with preset options. Verbal data obtained from the story vignette related interviews are presented and discussed in terms of questions relating to specific teacher commands.

All six children identified the teacher as the boss of the classroom and occasionally used the term "boss" as a rationale for legitimacy and/or obedience regarding the open-ended questions, the preset teacher commands, the child-created commands and the observation-based teacher commands.

Open-ended Questions/Responses.

All six children considered the teacher as having legitimate authority (evaluation of legitimacy) and reported that students should obey their teachers (evaluation of obedience).

Five out of the 6 children gave traditional authority justifications for legitimacy and 5 out of the 6 children gave rational-expert authority justifications (see Table 3).

Traditional authority justifications for legitimacy included "Because she's in charge of the students" (Morgan) and "Because now that person, the teacher, is a teacher and you have to listen" (John). Rational-expert authority justifications for legitimacy were "Because she teaches you ... stuff that you can learn" (Brad) and "Because the teacher knows what to do and all that ... because they've taken a class or something like that" (Fred). Additional reasons for legitimacy of teacher authority were a Miscellaneous justification--"Kids aren't responsible enough" (Fred), an Age Orientation justification--"Because she's older than you" (Brad) and an Approach Orientation justification--"Some body has to teach us if you want to have a good job when you're older" (Keith).

On the other hand, 3 out of the 6 children gave traditional authority justifications as rationales for obedience and 2 out of the 6 children gave rational-expert authority justifications. Traditional authority justifications included, "Because the teacher is the boss" (Danny and Keith) and "Students must listen to (obey) the teacher" (Fred). Fred and Danny's rational-expert authority justification was "She knows what she's talking about."

Table 3

The Children's Rationales for Legitimacy and Obedience to General Teacher Authority

<u>Child</u>	<u>Rationale for Legitimacy</u>	<u>Rationale for Obedience</u>
John	-Rational-expert Authority -Traditional Authority	-Avoidance Orientation
Fred	-Miscellaneous -Rational-expert Authority	-Traditional Authority -Rational-expert Authority
Morgan	-Traditional Authority	-Avoidance Orientation
Brad	-Age Orientation -Rational-expert Authority	-Avoidance Orientation
Danny	-Rational-expert Authority -Traditional Authority	-Traditional Authority -Rational-expert Authority
Keith	-Traditional Authority -Rational-expert Authority -Approach Orientation	-Traditional Authority

An additional finding was 3 out of the 6 children gave the Avoidance Orientation justification, "to avoid punishment".

Essentially, the most frequently used rationales for legitimacy were traditional and rational-expert authority and for obedience were traditional and Avoidance Orientation justifications. Rational-legal and charismatic authority justifications were not used as rationales for legitimacy or obedience regarding the open-ended questions. Moreover, the rationales of all six children, except for Danny, differed for legitimacy versus obedience.

For a summary of the socially defiant children's specific legitimate authority justifications for legitimacy and for obedience across the data collection devices, see Appendix P.

Questions with Preset Options.

Four out of the 6 socially defiant children selected all four legitimate authority options (i.e., traditional, rational-legal, charismatic and rational-expert) as good rationales for legitimacy and obedience. Two out of the 6 children selected three of the four legitimate authority options. All six children's selections of good rationales remained the same from legitimacy to obedience, except for Brad's. Brad's explanation for not selecting traditional authority as a good rationale for obedience was, "Students should be responsible, cooperative and hardworking, but students also have to have fun. So you don't always have to be like that".

The legitimate authority option that consistently was not selected by 2 of the 6 children was charismatic authority. John's and Brad's explanation for not selecting charismatic authority as a good reason for legitimacy and obedience were "Some teachers don't seem to care because they get mad at you, yell at you and pick on you all the time" and "If teachers don't care and pick on you, why should you do what they say", respectively.

It is possible that the other socially defiant children did not perceive that their teachers care about them and about other students. Nonetheless the interview did not determine these children's perceptions of their teacher's caring attitude toward the children. This is because the interview referred to teachers in general and the other children chose not to relate their responses to their teachers.

The best rationale for legitimacy and obedience differed across the children (see Table 4). Regarding legitimacy, the most frequently selected options were charismatic authority and rational-legal authority with a ratio of 2 out of the 6 children each. Regarding obedience, the most frequently selected options were rational-legal authority with a ratio of 3 out of the 6 children. Moreover, 3 of the 6 children's selections remained constant from legitimacy to obedience.

Fred's and Brad's reason for selecting rational-legal authority as the best rationale for legitimacy was, "If you follow the rules, you can learn more". Morgan's reason for selecting charismatic authority as the best rationale for legitimacy was

Table 4

The Children's Selections of the Best Rationale for Legitimacy and
for Obedience to General Teacher Authority

<u>Child</u>	<u>Best Rationale for Legitimacy</u>	<u>Best Rationale for Obedience</u>
John	-Traditional Authority	-Traditional Authority
Fred	-Rational-legal Authority	-Rational-legal Authority
Morgan	-Charismatic Authority	-Charismatic Authority
Brad	-Rational-legal Authority	-Rational-expert Authority
Danny	-Rational-expert Authority	-Rational-legal Authority
Keith	-Charismatic Authority	-Rational-legal Authority

"Caring is important and when teachers care you more likely want to do what they tell you to do". Danny's explanation for selecting rational-legal authority as the best rationale for obedience was "If you stay out of trouble it's easier at school, to learn and that. Because you're not thinking of having to stay in at recess (i.e., upcoming punishments)".

Questions Related to the Specific Teacher Commands.

Perceptions of teacher authority regarding specific teacher commands were investigated via the preset and the child-created teacher commands addressed in the story vignette related interviews and the observation-based teacher commands addressed in the general interview. The preset teacher commands include academic related instructions, academic related deviance-imputations, social-interpersonal instructions and social-interpersonal deviance-imputations (see Table 5). The child-created teacher commands include one academic related deviance-imputation and one social-interpersonal deviance-imputation per child (see Table 6), and the observation-based teacher commands include one academic related instruction and one academic related deviance-imputation disobeyed during the observations, per child (see Table 7). For the incidents surrounding the selected observation-based teacher commands, refer to Appendix Q.

All six children's evaluations of legitimacy and obedience to teacher authority were positive regardless of the specific teacher command. The one exception was Keith whose responses were

Table 5

The Preset Teacher Commands Based on the Story Vignettes

Academic Related Instruction

"Watch closely while I show you the steps to solve these kinds of math problems."

Academic Related Deviance-imputation

"Peter, stop tapping your pencil. The other students can't concentrate on their assignment."

Social-interpersonal Instruction

"Share the art materials with students in your group."

Social-interpersonal Deviance-imputation

"Tom stop hitting Michael. Hitting is not allowed in our classroom."

Table 6

The Child-created Teacher Commands for Each Child

<u>Child</u>	<u>Child-created Deviance-imputations</u>
John	<u>Academic Related</u> --"Stop tapping your pencil or else I'll make you stay after school." <u>Social-interpersonal</u> --"Stop that or I'll hit you."
Fred	<u>Academic Related</u> --"Please stop." <u>Social-interpersonal</u> --"Stop."
Morgan	<u>Academic Related</u> --"Stop it right now or I'll send you into the hall." <u>Social-interpersonal</u> --"Stop it right away or I'll send you to the office, you'll get a strap, I'll give you 40 fullscaps of paper (i.e., for writing lines) and you're going to stay in for the rest of the year at recess."
Brad	<u>Academic Related</u> --"Peter, you got one more chance or I'll send you out of the classroom." <u>Social-interpersonal</u> --"Stop it, or get out of the classroom and I'll speak to you later."
Danny	<u>Academic Related</u> --"Stop tapping your pencil." <u>Social-interpersonal</u> --"Stop hitting Michael because then you might hurt him or something."
Keith	<u>Academic Related</u> --"Peter, please quit tapping your pencil. I can't concentrate on my work and neither can the kids." <u>Social-interpersonal</u> --"Stop hitting Michael, or you'll have to go down to the office or sit out in the hall for the rest of the day."

Table 7

The Selected Observation-based Teacher Commands Disobeyed for Each Child

<u>Child</u>	<u>Observation-based Academic Related Teacher Command</u>
John	<p><u>Instruction</u>--"In some cases you have to use one layer of the formula and in others you have to use several layers of the formula."</p> <p><u>Deviance-imputation</u>--"Attention, guys at the back."</p>
Fred	<p><u>Instruction</u>--"OK, I'll look at it. You can get back to work."</p> <p><u>Deviance-imputation</u>--"Fred, it's to your advantage to pay attention."</p>
Morgan	<p><u>Instruction</u>--"Carl, get to your desk and Morgan also."</p> <p><u>Deviance-imputation</u>--"Morgan, you haven't started yet. Go and get started."</p>
Brad	<p><u>Instruction</u>--"Start at question #2 and show your work."</p> <p><u>Deviance-imputation</u>--"Listen."</p>
Danny	<p><u>Instruction</u>--"We have four minutes left. I want you to take out your writing notebooks and work on your stories from yesterday."</p> <p><u>Deviance-imputation</u>--"Danny, I would appreciate it if you would focus up here."</p>
Keith	<p><u>Instruction</u>--"What are examples of overworked adjectives?"</p> <p><u>Deviance-imputation</u>--"Keith, I told you not to do it (i.e., punch the calculator keys) with a pen, it might ruin it (i.e., the calculator)."</p>

"negative" and "inconsistent" to evaluations of legitimacy and obedience, respectively, regarding the observation-based academic deviance-imputation.

The frequency of use of authority justifications across the different teacher command types were as follows: traditional (24), charismatic (4), rational-legal (1) and rational-expert (1) authority. Traditional authority justifications were used six times as often as the next most frequently used legitimate authority justification. The frequency of use within each of the four legitimate authority justifications were relatively evenly spread across the different teacher command types, except for the child-created teacher commands. Regarding the child-created commands, 11 out of 12 possible rationales for legitimacy were traditional authority justifications. Summaries of the socially defiant children's rationales for legitimacy by teacher command type are presented in Tables 8, 9, 10 and 11.

Examples of the commonly used traditional authority justification for legitimacy regarding the child-created teacher commands are "The teacher is the boss" and "The teacher is in charge" (John, Morgan, Brad and Danny), "The teacher can do and say anything he or she want to" (John, Brad, Danny and Keith), and "Students are supposed to listen to (obey) the teacher" (Fred and Keith). Regarding the preset academic related instruction, Fred gave the following charismatic authority justification, "Because the teacher wants you to learn". Fred's rational-legal authority justification for the preset social-interpersonal instruction was "

Table 8

The Children's Rationales for Legitimacy and for Obedience
Regarding the Preset Academic Related Teacher Commands

<u>Child</u>	<u>Teacher Command</u>	<u>Rationale for Legitimacy</u>	<u>Rationale for Obedience</u>
John	AI	-Avoidance Orientation	-Avoidance Orientation
	AD	-Traditional Authority -Other's Welfare	-Traditional Authority -Avoidance Orientation
Fred	AI	-Charismatic Authority	-Charismatic Authority
	AD	-Charismatic Authority -Other's Welfare	-Charismatic Authority -Other's Welfare
Morgan	AI	-Avoidance Orientation	-Avoidance Orientation
	AD	-Other's Welfare	-Avoidance Orientation -Traditional Authority
Brad	AI	-Avoidance Orientation	-Avoidance Orientation -Approach Orientation
	AD	-Avoidance Orientation -Other's Welfare	-Avoidance Orientation
Danny	AI	-Approach Orientation	-Traditional Authority
	AD	-Traditional Authority	-Traditional Authority -Approach Orientation -Avoidance Orientation
Keith	AI	-Approach Orientation	-Traditional Authority
	AD	-Traditional Authority -Other's Welfare	-Approach Orientation -Charismatic Authority

Note. "AI" stands for academic related instruction and "AD" stands for academic related deviance-imputation.

Table 9

The Children's Rationales for Legitimacy and for Obedience
Regarding the Preset Social-interpersonal Teacher Commands

<u>Child</u>	<u>Teacher Command</u>	<u>Rationale for Legitimacy</u>	<u>Rationale for Obedience</u>
John	SI	-Appeal to Fairness	-Appeal to Fairness
	SD	-Avoidance Orientation	-Avoidance Orientation
Fred	SI	-Charismatic Authority -Conservation of Resources	-Charismatic Authority
	SD	-Rational-legal Authority	-Rational-legal Authority -Other's Welfare
Morgan	SI	-Conservation of Resources	-Traditional Authority -Avoidance Orientation
	SD	-Other's Welfare	-Avoidance Orientation
Brad	SI	-Traditional Authority	-Avoidance Orientation
	SD	-Traditional Authority -Avoidance Orientation	-Avoidance Orientation
Danny	SI	-Conservation of Resources	-Traditional Authority
	SD	-Other's Welfare	-Traditional Authority
Keith	SI	-Traditional Authority -Appeal to Fairness	-Other's Welfare -Appeal to Fairness
	SD	-Traditional Authority -Other's Welfare	-Traditional Authority -Avoidance Orientation

Note. "SI" stands for social-interpersonal instruction and "SD" stands for social-interpersonal deviance-imputation.

Table 10

The Children's Rationales for Legitimacy and for Obedience
Regarding the Child-created Teacher Commands

<u>Child</u>	<u>Teacher Command</u>	<u>Rationale for Legitimacy</u>	<u>Rationale for Obedience</u>
John	AD	-Traditional Authority	-Traditional Authority -Avoidance Orientation
	SD	-Traditional Authority	-Traditional Authority
Fred	AD	-Traditional Authority	-Traditional Authority
	SD	-Traditional Authority	-Traditional Authority -Other's Welfare
Morgan	AD	-Other's Welfare -Appeal to Fairness	-Traditional Authority -Avoidance Orientation
	SD	-Traditional Authority	-Avoidance Orientation
Brad	AD	-Traditional Authority	-Avoidance Orientation
	SD	-Traditional Authority	-Avoidance Orientation
Danny	AD	-Traditional Authority	-Traditional Authority -Rational-expert Authority -Age Orientation
	SD	-Traditional Authority	-Avoidance Orientation -Other's Welfare
Keith	AD	-Traditional Authority	-Charismatic Authority -Avoidance Orientation -Other's Welfare
	SD	-Traditional Authority -Avoidance Orientation	-Traditional Authority -Avoidance Orientation -Age Orientation

Note. "AD" stands for academic related deviance-imputation and "SD" stands for social-interpersonal deviance-imputation.

Table 11

The Children's Rationales for Legitimacy and for Obedience
Regarding the Observation-based Teacher Commands

<u>Child</u>	<u>Teacher Command</u>	<u>Rationale for Legitimacy</u>	<u>Rationale for Obedience</u>
John	AI	-Traditional Authority	-Avoidance Orientation
	AD	-Conservation of Resources -Other's Welfare	-Conservation of Resources -Appeal to Fairness
Fred	AI	-Traditional Authority	-Traditional Authority
	AD	-Charismatic Authority	-Charismatic Authority
Morgan	AI	-Traditional Authority -Avoidance Orientation	-Traditional Authority -Avoidance Orientation
	AD	-Avoidance Orientation -Conservation of Resources	-Avoidance Orientation
Brad	AI	-Traditional Authority -Avoidance Orientation	-Avoidance Orientation
	AD	-Traditional Authority -Avoidance Orientation	-Avoidance Orientation
Danny	AI	-Traditional Authority	-Traditional Authority
	AD	-Approach Orientation -Avoidance Orientation	-Traditional Authority -Rational-expert Authority -Age Orientation
Keith	AI	-Miscellaneous	-Traditional Authority
	AD	-*Rationale for Illegitimacy-- disagreed with teacher	-*Rationale for Obedience/Disobedience --depends on the student's preference

Note. "AI" stands for academic related instruction and "AD" stands for academic related deviance-imputation.

Because you're supposed to follow rules".

Additional justifications for legitimacy were also given. The frequency of use of the additional justifications across the different teacher command types were: Avoidance Orientation (12), Other's Welfare (10), Conservation of Resources (5), Appeal to Fairness (3), Approach Orientation (3) and Age Orientation (0). The most frequently used Avoidance Orientation justification for legitimacy was "to avoid punishment".

A specific example of an Avoidance Orientation justification for legitimacy regarding the preset academic related instruction is "to avoid not learning" (John, Morgan and Brad) and regarding the observation-based academic related instruction is "to avoid mistakes" and "to avoid homework" (Brad). For the preset academic related deviance-imputation, John, Fred, Brad, Keith and Morgan gave an Other's Welfare justification--"Because it bothers or confuses the teacher and/or other students working". John and Morgan's justification for the observation-based academic related instructions was "to prevent waste of time". An Appeal to Fairness justification for the preset social-interpersonal instruction was "to avoid being unfair in sharing materials" (Keith).

Regarding rationale for obedience, the frequency of use of the authority justifications were as follows: traditional (21), charismatic (5), rational-expert (2) and rational-legal (1) authority. Traditional authority justifications were used four times as often as the next most frequent authority justification. Summaries of the children's rationales for obedience by teacher

command type are presented in Tables 8, 9, 10 and 11.

Examples of traditional authority justifications for obedience for the preset academic related instruction is "Students are supposed to learn and work" (John and Morgan); and the preset social-interpersonal deviance-imputation is "You're supposed to obey the teacher" and "Teachers are in control" (Morgan, Danny and Keith). A charismatic justification for the preset academic related instruction was "The teacher wants you to learn and get a good education" (Fred). Danny's rational-expert justifications for the observation-based academic related instruction were "Because the teacher has sort of got a high education" and "The teacher knows better than us". Fred's rational-legal justification for the preset social-interpersonal deviance- imputation was "Because it's a rule".

Additional rationales for obedience to the specific teacher commands were given by the socially defiant children. The alternate justifications were used with the following frequency: Avoidance Orientation (38), Other's Welfare (16), Conservation of Resources (6), Approach Orientation (6), Appeal to Fairness (5), and Age Orientation (3). The Avoidance Orientation justification was used more than twice as often as the next most frequent additional rationale for obedience. Regardless of the teacher command type, the Avoidance Orientation justification "to avoid punishment" justification represented the majority of the Avoidance Orientation justifications for obedience given by the socially defiant children.

Examples of Avoidance Orientation justifications for the observation-based academic related instructions were "to avoid

mistakes", "to avoid punishment", "to avoid homework" and/or "to avoid extra work" (John, Brad and Morgan). An Age Orientation justification for the child-created social-interpersonal deviance imputation was "Because teachers are your elders and you're supposed to listen to your elders" (Keith).

Regarding the rationales for obedience to the preset academic related instruction, John, Morgan and Brad gave the following Avoidance Orientation justifications, "to avoid failing", "to avoid punishment" and "to avoid homework", respectively and Fred gave a charismatic authority justification--"The teacher wants you to learn and get a good education". John and Morgan gave the following traditional authority justifications for the preset academic related deviance-imputation, "Students are supposed to learn and work". For the preset social-interpersonal deviance-imputation, Morgan, Danny and Keith gave traditional justifications such as "You're supposed to obey the teacher" and "Teachers are in control" and Fred gave a rational-legal justification, "Because it's a rule".

John's, Brad's and Morgan's rationales for obedience to the observation-based academic related instructions were Avoidance Orientation justifications--"to avoid mistakes", "to avoid punishment" , "to avoid homework" and/or "to avoid extra work". Danny's rationales for obedience to the observation-based academic related instruction were a rational-expert authority justification-- "Because the teacher has sort of got a higher education" and "the Teacher knows better than us" and an Age Orientation justification-- "The teacher is older than us".

Overall, the most frequently used rationales for legitimacy and obedience regarding the specific teacher commands were traditional authority and Avoidance Orientation, in particular, "to avoid punishment". Traditional authority justifications were the most frequently used for legitimacy and Avoidance Orientation justifications were the most frequently used for obedience. In other words, the perceived legitimate authority basis for legitimacy and obedience was largely traditional. On the other hand, children gave justifications for legitimacy and obedience which are not subsumed within the authority framework of Spady and Mitchell (1979). (Justifications not within the authority framework will be referred to as nonauthority justifications.) Charismatic, rational-legal, and rational-expert authority justifications were seldom used as rationales for legitimacy and obedience regarding the specific teacher commands.

The Nature of the Child-created Teacher Commands.

Illuminating findings were generated from the child-created teacher commands. The children were asked what they would say if they were the teacher and "Peter was tapping his pencil on his desk" (academic related deviance-imputation) and "Tom was hitting Michael" (social-interpersonal deviance-imputation). Several interesting trends were noted in the commands that the children created. Almost all the child-created commands involved a desist, which is a statement directing the student to stop doing something, and a threat of punishment or consequence for not desisting.

However, none of the child-created commands contained positive incentives or consequences for obedience to the command. For instance, for the social-interpersonal deviance-imputation vignette, Morgan said, "Stop it right now (desist) or I'll send you into the hall (threat of punishment).

Moreover, these commands which included both desists and threat of punishment gave the student who was misbehaving the option to stop misbehaving or to be punished. For instance, for the academic related deviance-imputation, John said, "Stop tapping your pencil (desist) or else I'll make you stay after school" (threat of punishment). Only two children provided rationales for desisting, but only for one of the two commands each. For instance, for the academic related deviance-imputation story vignette, Danny said, "Stop hitting Michael because you might hurt him or something" and Keith said, "Peter, please quit tapping your pencil. I can't concentrate on my work and neither can the kids."

The trends for the inclusion of desists in the child-created commands may be explained, in part, because the preset deviance-imputations presented to the children included desists. However, the deviance-imputations presented also included rationalizations for desisting, and rationalizations were included in only two of the twelve child-created commands.

Another possible explanation for these trends may be that the socially defiant children's previous or present teachers more frequently have given commands that include desists, threat of punishment and options for behavior, rather than commands that

include rationalizations for desisting, and incentives for desisting or obeying the command. Upon reviewing the teacher commands recorded during the observations, the academic related and social-interpersonal instructions simply involved a statement of what was expected, but never involved rationalizations, incentives for obeying or threat of punishment. The academic related and social-interpersonal deviance-imputations sometimes involved desists and often involved a threat of punishment or consequences for disobeying, but never involved rationalizations or incentives for obeying.

It is interesting to note that the forms of punishment included in the child-created commands and in their rationales for legitimacy and obedience of avoiding punishment were the same as used by their present teachers. This relationship was indicated by some of the children during the interviews and the teacher commands recorded during the observations. The common forms of punishment provided by the children were to stay in for recess, stay in after school, get kicked out of the class, get sent to the office and write lines.

Comparisons of the Three Sources of Verbally Obtained Data

Both similarities and differences were noted in the socially defiant children's reported perceptions of teacher authority across the three sources of verbally obtained data (i.e., open-ended questions, questions with preset options and questions related to the specific teacher commands). First the similarities are

discussed. Regarding the open-ended questions and the questions related to the specific teacher commands: (a) the most frequently selected legitimate authority rationale for legitimacy and obedience was traditional authority; while the most frequently selected nonauthority rationale for legitimacy and obedience was Avoidance Orientation, in particular, "to avoid punishment"; and (b) charismatic and rational-legal were the least frequently selected legitimate authority rationales for legitimacy and obedience. The data from these two verbal sources seem to support each other and suggest that, in general, the six socially defiant children perceived the teacher as having traditional legitimate authority. However, justifications for legitimacy and obedience revealed an Avoidance Orientation also.

The critical difference between the verbally obtained data was between the open-ended questions and the questions related to the specific teacher commands versus the questions with preset options. Regarding the two former verbal sources, the children selected traditional legitimate authority and Avoidance Orientation justifications for legitimacy and obedience significantly more often than any other justifications; whereas, regarding the latter verbal source, the majority of children (i.e., 4 out of 6) selected all four legitimate authority options as good rationales for legitimacy and obedience.

This difference seems to indicate that when given the questions with preset options, the children made their selections based on what would be the socially desirable response instead of

based on what they actually perceived; and that when given questions without preset options, the socially defiant children were more likely to provide responses that reflect their actual perceptions of teacher authority. Hence, the data obtained from the questions with preset options is likely to present an unrealistic view of the children's conception of authority. Data obtained from the questions without preset options (i.e., open-ended questions and questions related to the specific teacher commands) may give a more valid picture of the children's conception of teacher authority. In addition, this difference suggests that caution must be exercised in the interpretation of children's conception of teacher authority based on information from interview data.

Behavioral Data

Behavioral data were obtained from the observations of the authority interaction between the socially defiant children and their teachers in the regular classroom setting. Academic related and social-interpersonal teacher commands and the socially defiant children's responses to these commands were recorded.

These data indicated that socially defiant children frequently disobeyed teacher commands during the observations. Academic related instructions were disobeyed approximately 20% (Danny) to 50% (John and Morgan) of the time; while, academic related deviance-imputations were disobeyed approximately 20% (Keith) to 75% (Morgan) of the time. The mean total number of academic

related teacher commands given per child was 142: while the mean total number of social-interpersonal teacher commands given per child was 2. The ranges for the total number of academic related and social-interpersonal teacher commands given per child were 103 to 193 and 0 to 7, respectively. Since so few social-interpersonal teacher commands per child were given, determining the percentages of disobedience to teacher commands would be misleading. Therefore, these percentages will not be presented.

In general, the observational data indicates that the rank order frequency of teacher commands by type and the rank order frequency of children's disobedience to teacher commands by command type is (1) academic related instruction, (2) academic related deviance-imputation, (3) social-interpersonal instruction and (4) social-interpersonal deviance-imputation. The proportion of the four types of teacher commands disobeyed for each child is summarized in Table 12.

It is not surprising that academic related instructions were disobeyed more frequently than academic related deviance-imputations. This is because by definition deviance-imputations imply that an instruction regarding the behavior was already given and the child disobeyed it or imply that the child has been informed previously that the behavior they are exhibiting is not acceptable; hence, deviation-imputations act as reminders or warnings. Whereas, instructions are "first time" commands with no indication that present behaviors are rule-breaking.

An additional finding of the investigation is that the teachers

Table 12

The Proportion of the Four Types of Teacher Commands Disobeyed for Each Child

<u>Child</u>	<u>Academic Related</u>		<u>Social-interpersonal</u>	
	<u>Instruction</u>	<u>Dev.-imput.</u>	<u>Instruction</u>	<u>Dev.imput.</u>
John		24/92	23/56	1/2 2/5
Fred	39/81	12/22	1/1	-
Morgan	90/162	22/31	1/2	-
Brad	21/92	7/13	-	-
Danny	26/121	2/4	-	-
Keith	63/165	3/15	-	-

Note. Dev.-imput. stands for deviance-imputation.

observed gave significantly more academic instructions as compared to academic deviance-imputations. More specifically, academic related instructions were given 1.6 (John) to 30.2 (Keith) times as often as academic related deviance-imputations, with a mean of 9.8.

Context and Nature of the Children's Disobedience.

With John, Brad, Morgan, Danny and Keith, the frequency of disobedience to teacher commands was observed to be relatively evenly distributed across all subject areas and with all teachers observed. For Fred, significantly more teacher commands were disobeyed in music class with the music teacher, than in any other subject area and with any other teacher.

The nature of the disobedience observed with John, Fred, Morgan, Brad and Danny included not paying attention to the lesson, not starting the assigned work, not staying on task with the assigned work, getting out of one's seat without permission, calling out answers, interrupting other students and the teacher while they were talking, arguing with the teacher and talking while the teacher was presenting a lesson. John was the only child observed to be fighting in the classroom. However, Fred's, Brad's and Danny's homeroom teacher reported that they had been in fights with other students during the period in which the researcher was observing a different child. The most common contexts for the fights were reportedly during recess and physical education. The nature of the disobedience observed with Keith was the same as the other children except no interruptive-type of behavior was observed.

It is necessary to note that, the socially defiant children disobeyed teacher authority more frequently than the observational data reveal. This is because for the present study, the procedure for determining challenging of teacher authority was disobedience to teacher commands. The socially defiant children often followed the teacher commands immediately after it was given, but after a minute or so, they stopped following the command. This "delayed disobedience" occurred most frequently for academic related commands such as "Pay attention", "Stay on task", "Don't interrupt" and "Stay in your seat". Also, the socially defiant children frequently disobeyed academic related rules associated with the lesson phases and occasionally disobeyed social-interpersonal rules; however, the teacher did not give a deviation-imputation relating to these disobediences. Consequently, these disobediences were not recorded.

In addition, it is necessary to note that, when the children obeyed teacher commands, they sometimes obeyed with resistance. An example of verbal and nonverbal resistance occurred when Danny was told to go back to his own desk during art class because he and a group of students were off task. He mumbled something, then stomped loudly back to his desk. An example of verbal resistance, occurred when the teacher told John that he had to stay in for five minutes during recess because he was arguing with and annoying students in his group instead of staying on task. John continually said, "Only one minute", in order to convince the teacher to reduce the detention length. The teacher said that he wasn't going to reduce its length. After a couple of minutes of discussion, John

obeyed the teacher's original command. Another example of verbal resistance occurred when the teacher said to Morgan "Maybe you should take your work to the hall" because he was making noises again. Morgan responded, "She's talking to me!" in a loud, whining, indignant voice, then he stopped talking.

In contrast to what they said during the interviews, the socially defiant children's observed pattern of obedience with resistance and delayed disobedience appears to suggest that they did not accept the teacher as an authority figure in the classroom. Their behavior revealed a struggle for power and authority over the teacher.

Rationales for Disobedience to the Observation-based Teacher Commands.

The socially defiant children's explanations for disobedience to the observation-based teacher commands selected varied across the children and across the type of academic related command. Some of the reasons for disobeying the academic related instructions selected were "to save time/prevent wasting time" (John); "I wanted to talk with a friend" (Morgan), "I didn't feel like it (working)" (Brad); and "I already knew the topic" (Keith). Some of the reasons for disobeying the academic related deviance-imputations selected included "I was in the middle of a conversation with a friend" (John and Brad); "The task was boring" (Morgan); and "It's easier my way ... and I paid for the equipment, anyway" (Keith).

The socially defiant children's rationales for disobedience seems to be in contradiction with their perception of teacher

authority as revealed in the verbally obtained data. The children reported that they perceived the teacher as having legitimate authority regarding legitimacy and obedience and they gave largely traditional authority and Avoidance Orientation justifications for legitimacy and obedience; however, they purposely defied teacher authority for reasons that seem to indicate that they consider themselves to be the boss or in charge in the classroom, not the teacher. This attitude suggests that the socially defiant children were in direct competition with the teacher for power and authority.

Representativeness of the Observations.

Since observer-interference was a potential threat to the reliability and the validity of the observations, upon completion of the observations, the teachers were asked by the research whether they felt the socially defiant children's behavior during the observations were representative of their typical behavior during class. The teachers of Brad, Keith and Fred reported that the children's behavior was better than usual. Whereas, the teachers of Morgan, John and Danny reported that the children's behavior was representative of their typical behavior.

Summary of the Behavioral Data.

In short, the behavioral data reveals that the six socially defiant children frequently disobeyed teacher authority in the

classroom, in particular, academic related instructions and deviance-imputations. The behavioral data indicates that the six socially defiant children do not perceive the teacher as having legitimate authority which commands obedience. Moreover, their rationales for disobedience to the observation-based commands, and their tendency to obey commands with resistance and to delay disobedience seems to suggest three things: (a) The socially defiant children perceive themselves as the boss or legitimate authority in the classroom, not the teacher; (b) they are engaged in a power struggle with their teachers; (c) they do not see themselves as the subordinate and the teacher as the superordinate in the authority relationship.

In addition, there are several uncertainties associated with the behavioral data. Whether academic related commands are relatively more frequently disobeyed is uncertain from this investigation, because the teachers observed seldom gave social-interpersonal instructions. Whether teachers do, in fact, give significantly more academic related commands as compared to social-interpersonal commands is also uncertain from this investigation. Likewise, academic related instructions were given significantly more often by the teachers observed as compared to academic related deviance-imputations. Whether teachers do, in fact, give academic instructions significantly more often is uncertain and whether this is, in part, because socially defiant children tend to engage in delayed obedience to instructions, such that they obey the instruction before the deviance-imputation is given, is also

uncertain.

Comparisons of the Verbally Obtained and Behavioral Data

Based on a comparison of the data obtained via verbal interviews on teacher authority and via observations of student-teacher authority interactions in the classroom, it is apparent that the socially defiant children's behavior is inconsistent with their verbal responses to the interview questions. Although the socially defiant children reportedly perceived teachers as legitimate authorities, perceived specific teacher commands as legitimate, perceived that students should obey teachers in general, and perceived that students should obey specific teacher commands; the socially defiant children frequently disobeyed teacher commands during the observations. The disobedience most frequently occurred in response to academic related instructions and academic related deviance-imputations. Refer to Table 13 for the proportion of teacher command types disobeyed for each child.

This discrepancy between verbally obtained and behavioral data seems to indicate that the nature of the data regarding socially defiant children's conceptualization of teacher authority is influenced by whether the methodology that is adopted is interview-based or observation-based.

Possible explanations for the discrepancy between socially defiant children's verbal responses to interview questions and their behavior in the classroom are examined in the next section.

Possible Explanations for the Discrepancy Between the Verbally
Obtained and Behavioral Data

There are several possible explanations for the discrepancy between socially defiant children's verbal responses to interview questions and their behavior with respect to teacher authority. Five possible explanations for the discrepancy are discussed. They include: (a) the children are simply parroting those perceptions of teacher authority espoused by significant adult authority figures, such as parents and teachers; (b) the children do not perceive their teachers as having legitimate authority and do not perceive that they are required to obey their teachers; however, they do perceive teachers in general as having legitimate authority and do perceive that they and other students are required to obey teachers in general; (c) the children perceive the consequences of disobedience to teacher commands as more reinforcing than the consequences of obedience to teacher commands; (d) the children perceive getting their own way as more reinforcing than the consequences of obedience; and (e) the children have skill, performance and/or self-control deficits in the area of social skills. Although some of the potential explanations overlap, they are significantly different enough to warrant individual attention.

Parrotting Authority Figures Explanation.

That the socially defiant children are simply parroting those perceptions of teacher authority espoused by significant adult authority figures, such as parents and teachers, is an alternate explanation for the inconsistency between the children's

verbal responses to interview questions and their behavior regarding teacher authority. Some of the rationales for legitimacy and obedience given by the socially defiant children were: "The teacher is your elder and you must respect your elders"; "The teacher is the boss, in charge of the classroom, and in authority"; and "The teacher is the teacher so he/she can tell you to do anything they want you to do". These rationales sound like what parents and teachers might say when their child or student was disobeying a command or questioning the parent's or teacher's authority.

The socially defiant children may have responded to the interview questions as they thought the researcher would want them to respond or as they thought were socially acceptable ways of responding. This subject bias may have been enhanced by the fact that oral interviews were used and that the interviews were taped; thus, the children's responses were not entirely anonymous. Moreover, all the children knew the researcher was presently studying education at a university, thus the children may have felt that the researcher was "one of them teachers", the other side, or may have felt that the researcher would be offended by the children's actual perceptions since the researcher was a teacher-to-be.

Nevertheless, the parroting explanation does not seem to be plausible, for several reasons. First of all, the interviews were conducted in a separate room to ensure privacy. Secondly, the children were informed that their responses would be confidential

and pseudonyms would be used in place of their real names, thus only the researcher would know whose responses they were. Thirdly, prior to each interview, the children were instructed that the researcher was interested in what they think, not what their friends, parents or teachers think. Fourthly, both the general interview and the story vignette related interview were developed such that the children had to provide reasons for many of their responses, so the child would come to anticipate that they would often have to rationalize or expand on their responses to the interview questions. Lastly, an atmosphere of openness, acceptance and honesty was created by the researcher during the interviews by the researcher accepting all the socially defiant children's responses, acknowledging and encouraging the children's questions of clarification, encouraging expansion of the children's responses, and using body language, such as smiling, leaning forward, and maintaining eye contact to signal to the children that they were being listened to and that their opinions were valued.

Some of the socially defiant children's responses also seemed to indicate that they were being honest and open in their responses to the interview questions. For instance, John and Brad reported that they felt that some teachers don't care, so why should students do what they tell students to do. Morgan and Danny reported that they disobeyed a particular command because "It's boring. I don't like doing that stuff" and because "I didn't feel like listening", respectively.

Perceived Absence of Legitimate Authority Explanation.

Another possible explanation for the inconsistency is that the socially defiant children do not perceive their teachers as having legitimate authority and do not perceive that they are required to obey their teachers; however, they do perceive teachers in general as having legitimate authority and do perceive that they are required to obey teachers in general. The interview questions addressed the socially defiant children's perceptions of teacher authority in general and with respect to specific teacher commands, but the interview did not address the children's perceptions of their teachers' legitimate authority. The main outcomes of the interviews indicated the socially defiant children perceived that teachers in general have legitimate authority and that students should obey teachers. On the other hand, the observations investigated the authority interactions between the socially defiant children and their own teachers, not teachers in general. The main outcomes of the observations were that the socially defiant children did not act consistently as if they perceived their teachers as having legitimate authority and as if they perceived that they should obey their teachers, since all the socially defiant children often disobeyed many of their teachers' commands.

That the socially defiant children do not perceive their teachers as having charismatic authority may explain, in part, the children's disobedience. As John and Brad stated, "Why should you do what the teacher says when the teacher does not care about you ... because the teacher yells at you, gets mad at you and picks on

you." Both John and Brad were referring to their present teachers.

Reinforcement Explanation.

A possible reason for the discrepancy between the children's verbal responses to interview questions and their behavior regarding teacher authority is that the socially defiant children perceive the consequences of disobedience to teacher commands as more reinforcing than the consequences of obedience to teacher commands. This reason is based on the behavioristic principles which state that all behavior is learned and all behavior occurs because it is being reinforced (Nye, 1981; Skinner, 1953; 1969; 1974). Reinforcement is typically defined as the consequence or the event that immediately follows a target behavior and that results in an increase in the likelihood of that behavior occurring again (Nye, 1981; Seifert, 1983; Skinner, 1953; 1969; 1974). Therefore, if socially defiant children are disobeying teacher authority commands, it follows from behavioristic principles that their disobedience is being reinforced and that the reinforcement is from some event or person that immediately follows their disobedience. There are several potential reinforcers for disobedience to teacher commands. Each is discussed separately.

One potential reinforcer is teacher negative attention in the form of verbal or nonverbal behavior. Skinner (1953) suggested that children's misbehaving for attention is common because attention of people is a necessary condition for obtaining other reinforcement from them. The potential for attention from someone

like a teacher or parent who is likely to supply reinforcement results in strong attention-getting behavior, such as misbehavior (Skinner). In addition, teacher negative attention may be perceived as more reinforcing than no teacher attention and even more reinforcing than positive teacher attention. The reinforcement quality of the attention depends on several factors: its intensity, focus, immediacy, and predictability. Often negative attention such as anger meets the criteria of reinforcement quality better than positive attention which is often less intense, less focussed, less immediate and/or less predictable.

Citing from the observations, the teachers' reactions to the socially defiant children's disobeying teacher commands often appeared intense because the teacher was angry and frustrated with the disobedience, highly focussed on the socially defiant child, usually immediately after the disobeying of the command and usually quite predictable, in that many of the children's disobediencies were followed by a related teacher response. For instance, during a social studies lesson, Morgan got out of his seat and went to a shelf to look at some books. The teacher looked at Morgan and responded in a loud voice, "Go back to your desk in a big hurry." Another example of a command that met reinforcement quality criteria occurred during a math lesson, when John was leaning back while sitting on the top of his chair. The teacher immediately said in a stern voice, "John, you could probably learn better if your eyeballs could see the board."

Another potential reinforcer is peer attention. When socially defiant children disobey a command through such behaviors as calling out answers, getting out of their seat and arguing with the teacher, peer reactions may be laughing, looking at the child, or verbally praising or reprimanding the child for misbehaving. As stated in the subject description section, research has shown that socially defiant children as with most children with behavior problems have few if any satisfactory interpersonal relationships (Bower, 1969, Gresham, 1982; Kauffman, 1977) and the reports of the homeroom teachers of the six socially defiant children support these findings.

If the socially defiant children can obtain acceptance or at least attention from their peers for misbehaving in the form of disobeying teacher commands, then disobeying teacher commands may be reinforcing. Unfortunately, recording of peer responses to the socially defiant children's disobeying teacher commands was not part of the research intentions, thus it was not part of the observation recording procedures. Hence, specific support from the present study for this possible explanation is not available.

Doing things that annoy or anger the teacher is another potential reinforcer. If the socially defiant child does not get along with or like their teacher, the teacher's reactions of anger, frustration and annoyance to the child's disobeying of teacher commands may be reinforcing. It is not surprising that socially defiant children and their teachers may not get along with each other. This is because socially defiant behavior can disrupt the

order of the classroom and can interfere with learning, such that teachers spend more time on management duties rather than on instructional duties (Walker, 1979). Because of the implications of socially defiant behavior, teachers' perceptions of (DeStefano, Geston & Cowen, 1977; Algozzine, 1977, 1980; Walker, 1979) and teachers' academic and behavioral expectations (Good & Grouws; Gordon & Thomas, cited in Coleman & Gilliam, 1983) of socially defiant children are typically negative. Moreover, research indicates that socially defiant children-teacher interactions and relationships also tend to be negative (Algozzine & Curran, 1979; Curran & Algozzine, 1980).

The interviews also support the proposition that doing things to annoy or anger the teacher may be a potential reinforcer for disobedience. For example, when the researcher asked Brad whether it was all right for the teacher to say "Peter, stop tapping your pencil. The other students can't concentrate on their assignment." (academic related deviance-imputation story vignette), Brad responded with a grin, "Yes, because I do it all the time. It bothers my teacher". In addition, as Brad and John reported in the general interview, "Why should you do what teachers tell you to do when they don't care about you ... because they always yell at you, get mad at you and pick on you".

Avoidance of school work is another potential reinforcer. By disobeying task related teacher commands through not paying attention to lessons, not starting assignments, not staying on task when assignments are given, getting out of one's seat without

permission and talking with peers, all of which were observed for each socially defiant child, work can be easily avoided. When asked in the general interview why the socially defiant children disobeyed the academic related instructions and deviance-imputations, Morgan replied, "Because it's boring and I don't like doing that stuff"; Danny replied, "I wasn't in the mood to listen"; and Brad explained, "I didn't feel like it. I needed a break from work." If disobeying teacher commands results in not having to do the work or in delaying having to do the work, then it may be reinforcing for some of the socially defiant children. Additional support of this proposition is the homeroom teachers of all six children identified one of their academic weaknesses as "attitude toward school work", and three of the six children (John, Fred & Keith) were reportedly failing several or all subject areas.

The proposition that disobedience to teacher commands may be reinforcing has just been presented through the discussion of several possible reinforcers. The proposition that disobedience to teacher commands is more reinforcing than obedience to teacher commands seems to be supported by the observations of the child-teacher authority interactions. The main positive consequence noted for obedience to teacher commands were: learning, finishing school work, not having homework, not being punished, a smile, simple verbal praise statements such as "yes", "good" and "correct", or no apparent consequence (i.e., obeying the teacher command seemed to be an end in itself). On few or no occasions was it observed that the socially defiant children were directly

reinforced for obeying teacher commands through such means as social reinforcers such as verbal praise or nonverbal gestures, activity reinforcers such as free time, or concrete reinforcers such as gold stars. The consequences for obedience to teacher commands noted during the observations do not seem to be as substantial as the potential consequences for disobedience to teacher commands discussed previously.

Regardless of the specific reinforcer, even if the socially defiant children's disobedience to teacher commands is reinforced occasionally, the children will likely continue to disobey teacher commands in anticipation of receiving reinforcement. This is because behaviors maintained on a schedule of intermittent or partial reinforcement are highly resistant to extinction, even after the reinforcers are no longer given (Jenson, Reavis, & Rhode, 1988; Nye, 1981; Skinner, 1953; 1969; Walker & Shea, 1984).

"Getting Their Own Way" Explanation.

That the socially defiant children perceive getting their own way as more reinforcing than the consequences of obedience to teacher commands, is another possible explanation for the discrepancy between their verbal responses to interview questions and their behavior. The getting their own way explanation is supported by several researchers (Jenson, Reavis, & Rhode, 1988; Morgan & Jenson, 1988; Walker, Reavis, Rhode, & Jenson, cited in Jenson et al.). Essentially, the children's goal of getting their own way, is in direct conflict with the teacher's authority role of

being in charge of the classroom so that learning and order is promoted. This situation results in a power struggle between the socially defiant children and the teacher for the position of boss or superordinate in the classroom. Power-based relations are characterized by conflict or competition, and involve at least implicit confrontation between parties.

Regarding the assumption that socially defiant children want to get their own way or be the boss, the definition of social defiance, the homeroom teachers' ratings on the Revised Behavior Problem Checklist (RBPC) and the observations of the children seem to provide support. By definition, socially defiant children "... want to have their own way and not be told what to do" (Brophy & Rohrkemper, 1981, p. 295). According to the ratings on the RBPC, "refusing to take directions; won't do as told" was considered a severe problem for Keith and Morgan and a mild problem for the rest of the children; "persists and nags; can't take 'no' for an answer" was considered a severe problem for Keith, Morgan, Brad and John and a mild problem for the other children; "argues; quarrels" was considered a severe problem for all the children except Danny, in which it was considered a mild problem; "negative; tends to do the opposite of what is requested" was considered a severe problem for Keith, Morgan and John and a mild problem for the remaining children; "sulks and pouts" was considered a severe problem for Brad, John and Fred and a mild problem for the other children; and lastly, "temper tantrums" was considered a severe problem for Keith, and John, a mild problem for Morgan and Jeff and not a problem for

Danny. All these behaviors represent means or tactics of getting one's own way.

The observations of the socially defiant children supported some of the ratings on the RBPC. When John was told at the end of a science class that he would have to stay in at recess for five minutes for misbehaving, he kept repeating "Only one minute". This incident used the following tactics: "persists and nags; can't take 'no' for an answer", "refuses to take directions; won't do as told" and "argues; quarrels".

Another example that illustrates the same tactics for getting one's own way occurred when Brad was in physical education class and was supposed to finish his standing long jump. He asked the teacher if he could have one practice. The teacher said "no", because she had told him before that if anyone wanted to practice that the student should practice at an assigned area prior to the teacher calling on the student. Brad replied "Oh come on!" and kept insisting that he should get one practice. An example of the "sulking tactic" occurred when Danny was told to return to his desk during art class because he and a group of boys were off task. Danny mumbled something, stomped his feet back to his desk and sat on his chair, silently and idly, with a sad expression on his face. No temper tantrum behaviors were noted during the observations. However, as stated earlier, Brad's, Keith's and Fred's homeroom teachers reported that their behavior was better than usual during the observations.

Besides supporting the RBPC findings, the observations provide

further support of the getting their own way explanation. As previously discussed in the section on behavioral data, the socially defiant children often obeyed teacher commands with resistance and delayed disobedience to teacher commands. Moreover, their rationales for disobeying the observation-based commands, such as "I was in the middle of a conversation with a friend" (John and Brad), "I didn't feel like it (working)" (Brad) and "The task was boring" (Morgan), suggest that the six socially defiant children see themselves as the boss in the classroom, not the teacher.

The proposition that the socially defiant children perceive getting their own way as more reinforcing than the positive consequences for obedience, seems to be supported by the types of consequences reported during the interviews and recorded during the observations. As discussed previously, the main consequences for obedience (e.g., learning, finishing school work, not being punished and a smile) were not very powerful.

Furthermore, even if the socially defiant children's tactics of getting their own way results in them only occasionally getting their own way or getting out of complying with teacher commands, socially defiant children would likely continue to use these tactics. This is because, as stated in the reinforcement explanation, behaviors maintained on an intermittent or partial schedule of reinforcement are highly resistant to extinction, even after the reinforcers are no longer given (Jenson, Reavis & Rhode, 1988; Nye, 1981; Skinner, 1953; 1969; Walker & Shea, 1984).

Social Skill Deficit Explanation.

Another possible reason for the discrepancy between socially defiant children's verbal responses to interview questions and their behavior regarding teacher authority is that the children have skill, performance and/or self-control deficits in the area of social skills. Kauffman (1977) defined children with behavior problems, of which social defiance is a subset, as "Those who chronically and markedly respond to their environment in socially unacceptable and/or personally unsatisfying ways but who can be taught more socially acceptable and personally gratifying behavior" (p. 23). By definition socially defiant children exhibit deficiencies in social skills. According to Morgan and Jenson (1988), social skills are "those interpersonal behaviors which allow an individual to successfully interact with others ... This includes both verbal and nonverbal behaviors applied in a mutually beneficial and reinforcing manner" (p. 1).

Gresham (1981) defined lack of social skills as being a deficit in one of three areas: skill, performance or self-control. A skill deficit is any behavior that is not in a child's repertoire which must be taught in order for the skill to be learned. A performance deficit is any behavior known to the child which are not being appropriately applied in real-life situations. A self-control deficit is any behavior which may be evidenced by the child in certain situations but which are not intrinsic to the child across situations and settings.

Socially defiant children's verbal responses and behavior

regarding teacher authority may be inconsistent as a result of a skill deficit. In the actual classroom context, socially defiant children may not be able to consistently discriminate between teacher commands which imply no room for compromise or discussion and teacher requests which imply room for compromise and discussion. This may explain why some commands were followed and other commands were not followed by the children, and why some of the socially defiant children chose to argue or discuss the teacher commands rather than to follow them immediately. This explanation may have been the case when John was trying to convince the teacher to reduce the severity of the command to stay in for recess from five minutes to one minute, and when Keith presented reasons for using his pen to punch the keys on the calculator and continued using his pen, when the teacher told him not to use a pen on his calculator. Moreover, this explanation may have been the case when the socially defiant children disobeyed the teacher commands without discussion. For instance, Danny explained that he disobeyed the teacher's command to take out his writing notebook and work on the stories from yesterday by saying, "I wasn't in the mood". While, Morgan explained that he disobeyed the teacher's command to go to his seat before the morning announcements by saying, "I felt like talking to a friend".

Conversely, socially defiant children's verbal responses and behaviors regarding teacher authority may be inconsistent as a result of a performance deficit. It's possible that the socially defiant children understand the difference between teacher commands

which imply no room for discussion or compromise and teacher requests which imply room for discussion or compromise, but the children do not consistently obey teacher commands because disobedience to teacher commands is sometimes more reinforcing than obeying teacher commands. The possible reinforcers for misbehaving were presented in the reinforcement explanation for the inconsistency between the socially defiant children's perceptions and behavior.

That socially defiant children have a self-control deficit may explain the inconsistency between their verbal responses and behavior regarding teacher authority. Fagen and Long (1979) defined self-control as "the capacity to flexibly and realistically direct and regulate personal action or behavior so as to effectively cope with a given situation." Possibly, the socially defiant children's perceptions and behaviors were inconsistent because perceptions tend to be evaluated in a noncomplex, intellectual, artificial, thought-oriented context; while behavior tends to be evaluated in a multifaceted, real life, thought- and action-oriented context. The socially defiant children may be able to intellectualize their perceptions of teacher authority and to intellectualize how they think they should and other students should respond to teacher commands, but under real life circumstances they react impulsively without thinking about the consequences of obeying or disobeying teacher commands.

The socially defiant children's impulsive behaviors or lack of self-control was directly observed by the researcher and reported

by the children's present and previous homeroom teachers. For instance, Morgan and John frequently would get out of their seat, walk around the room and go talk to a fellow student in the middle of a lesson. Morgan and Keith would take out a book and start reading it or start doing work from another subject area in the middle of a lesson. All the socially defiant children would call out answers immediately after the teacher explicitly requested that the students raise their hands before answering a question. John's, Fred's, Danny's and Brad's homeroom teachers reported that they would get angry at another student during physical activities such as recess and physical education, and would hit, punch or kick the student. Morgan's parent reported that he had been taking Ritalin since grade one and is now taking Pemoline instead. Both these medications are prescribed for the treatment of hyperactive/impulsive behavior. Also, John's and Fred's school files contained reports from previous homeroom teachers of "impulsive behavior", "poor self-control" and/or "aggressive play behavior". While, many of the children's previous homeroom teachers reported problems in the areas of work habits, social adjustment and social growth.

Comparisons of Teacher Authority Regarding Academic Related Versus Social-interpersonal Behavior

Perceptions of teacher authority regarding academic related and social-interpersonal behavior were investigated via the preset teacher commands, the child-created teacher commands and the

observation-based teacher commands.

All the socially defiant children's evaluations of legitimacy and obedience to the preset and child-created academic related and social-interpersonal teacher commands were positive. In general, the children's rationales for legitimacy were similar for the academic related versus social-interpersonal commands. Regarding the children's rationales for legitimacy to the preset academic related and social-interpersonal teacher commands, traditional authority was the most frequently used authority justification and justification overall, and Avoidance Orientation was the most frequently used nonauthority justification. There were two differences regarding the preset teacher commands: an Approach Orientation justification was used only for the academic related commands, and Appeal to Fairness and Conservation of Resources justifications were used only for the social-interpersonal commands. The children's rationales for legitimacy regarding the child-created teacher commands were largely traditional authority justifications for the academic related and social-interpersonal behaviors.

Regarding the children's rationales for obedience, no significant differences were noted between rationales for commands relating to academic related versus social-interpersonal behavior. Traditional authority was the most frequently given legitimate authority rationale and Avoidance Orientation was the most frequently given rationale overall.

Comparisons of the academic related versus social-interpersonal behavior based on the observations can not be made

with confidence. This is because, as stated earlier, academic related commands were given significantly more frequently than social-interpersonal commands. As stated in the previous section, the mean total numbers of academic related teacher commands and social-interpersonal teacher commands given per child were 142 and 2, respectively. Moreover, no social-interpersonal commands were given during the observations with Brad, Danny and Keith. Hence, observation-based comparisons of academic related versus social-interpersonal behavior will not be made.

Summary of the Findings

The findings of the study with respect to the six socially defiant children are discussed in terms of the research questions presented in Chapter 1 and the additional findings.

First of all, the findings related to the research questions are presented.

(1) Data based on verbal sources suggest that the socially defiant children perceived the teacher as having largely traditional or formal legitimate authority regarding academic related and social-interpersonal behavior.

(2) Additionally, the socially defiant children seldom perceived the teacher as having rational-legal legitimate authority or informal (i.e., charismatic and rational-expert) legitimate authority, regarding academic related and social-interpersonal behavior.

(3) The observational data revealed that the socially defiant children frequently disobeyed teacher commands, in particular, academic related instructions and deviance imputations.

(4) The socially defiant children's verbally reported perceptions of teacher authority were in direct conflict with their behavior during student-teacher authority interactions.

Six salient additional findings of the study were noted.

(1) The socially defiant children also used nonauthority based justifications for legitimacy and obedience including: Approach Orientation, Conservation of Resources, Other's Welfare, Appeal to Fairness and Age Orientation; and frequently used Avoidance Orientation justifications, in particular, "to avoid punishment".

(2) The socially defiant children most frequently used traditional legitimate authority justifications, then Avoidance Orientation justifications as rationales for legitimacy, and most frequently used Avoidance Orientation justifications, then traditional legitimate authority justifications as rationales for obedience.

(3) The teachers of the socially defiant children appeared to exercise traditional authority based on the children's responses to the interview questions, and power based control as revealed by the observed and reported frequent use of teacher commands which included threats of sanction.

(4) The socially defiant children's rationales for disobedience to the observation-based teacher commands, and their frequent tendency to delay disobedience to teacher commands and to

obey teacher commands with resistance, seem to indicate that the children: were engaging in a power struggle with the teacher; did not perceive themselves as the subordinate (i.e., under authority) and the teacher as the superordinate (i.e., in authority) in the student-teacher authority relationship; and perceived themselves as the boss in the classroom, not the teacher.

(5) The socially defiant children's desire to be in power or to be the boss seemed to lead them to behave as if the teacher did not have traditional or any other form of legitimate authority.

(6) The socially defiant children tended to be contingency-governed rather than rule-governed as indicated by their frequent use of Avoidance Orientation justifications for legitimacy and obedience to teacher authority, and their frequent use of threats of sanction in the child-created teacher commands.

Chapter 5

Introduction

Chapter 5 contains a discussion of the implications of the study of socially defiant children's conceptualization of teacher authority for teachers and for research.

Implications

Implications for Teachers

Regarding implications for teachers, the ways in which teachers can apply the findings of the present investigation in order to improve the education of socially defiant children and to develop intervention approaches for socially defiant children, are delineated.

An improvement in the quality of the commands given by teachers might do much to help socially defiant children recognize teacher authority in the classroom. It was observed that many of the commands recorded during the observations were ambiguous and global and some of the commands were stated in interrogative form. Jenson, Reavis and Rhode (1988) advocated the use of specific, descriptive commands stated in imperative form. Some examples of the observed teacher commands which tend to be ambiguous, global and stated in interrogative form include: "Let's get cracking."; "We're not on that page."; "You're interrupting."; "You guys serious here?"; "Are you working hard?"; and "Why are you guys talking?". Also, none of

the deviance-imputations recorded contained all four elements of deviance-imputations that researchers have indicated are necessary to ensure that students can make sense of the commands (Hargreaves et al., 1975).

In order to ensure that children understand teacher commands, teachers should give commands that include the essential elements. For instructions, the essential elements are the target of communication and the expected behavior. For deviance-imputations, the essential elements are: (1) the target of communication, (2) the rule that is in question, (3) the action which is being considered a breach of that rule and (4) the conduct which represents conformity to that rule and which must be substituted for the deviant conduct (Hargreaves et al., 1975).

Similarly, an improvement in classroom management procedures pertaining to rules might also add credence to teacher authority for socially defiant children. During the observations it was noted that no classroom or activity rules, nor consequences for obedience and disobedience were posted in the classrooms. Moreover, the classroom and activity rules, and the consequences for obedience and disobedience were never reviewed prior to or during a lesson. Likewise, formal incentives for obedience, such as social, activity or concrete reinforcers, were not used during the observations. As stated in a previous section, the main incentives or consequences for obedience noted during the observations were: learning, finishing the assigned work, not having homework, not being punished, a smile, simple verbal praise

such as "good" , "correct" or "yes", or no apparent consequence (i.e., obedience to teacher commands seemed to be an end in itself).

Preventing discipline problems and improving children's classroom behavior can be achieved through incorporating several elements into the classroom scheme. The elements include: making a list of classroom and activity rules or expectations and the consequences for obedience and disobedience; posting the rules and consequences; reviewing the rules and the consequences for obedience and disobedience often, especially before lessons or activities; predictably and systematically applying the rules and consequences for obedience and disobedience; and encouraging obedience through reinforcement and discouraging disobedience through withdrawal of reinforcement or through punishment (Bell & Stefanich, 1984; Doyle, 1982; Emmer, Evertson, & Anderson; Evertson & Emmer, cited in Doyle; Long, Frye, & Long, 1985; Hargreaves et al., 1975; Shultz & Florio, cited in Doyle). Skinner (1953) proposed that using positive reinforcement rather than punishment is more effective and more socially acceptable. Further to this, Skinner indicated that punishment tends only to suppress the behavior preceding it and punishment results in a focus on inappropriate behaviors rather than appropriate behaviors.

The six socially defiant children's frequent use of Avoidance Orientation justifications for legitimacy and, in particular, obedience to teacher authority, and their frequent use of threats of punishment in the child-created teacher commands seemed to indicate

that they were contingency-governed. Additional research supports the premise that behavior disordered children and thus socially defiant children tend to be contingency-governed rather than rule-governed (Jenson, Reavis, & Rhode, 1988). This suggests that teachers should always inform the socially defiant children of the personal consequences for obedience and disobedience. In order for teacher authority to become apparent to socially defiant children it is advisable, also, to consistently and predictably apply these consequences.

Attention by teachers to the development of authority based control rather than power based control might be more productive in the management of socially defiant children. Weber (cited in Spady and Mitchell, 1979) and Mitchell identified the two fundamental means of social influence and control as power which involves a "doing to" (sanction) or "doing for" (reward) competitive orientation and authority which involves a "doing with" collaborative orientation. Based on the teacher commands recorded during the observations and the socially defiant children's responses to the story vignettes and interview questions, it appears that their teachers used a power based control largely through threatening to sanction or sanctioning, rather than an authority based control. This trend appears to be supported further by the socially defiant children's frequent use of Avoidance Orientation justifications for legitimacy and obedience, especially "to avoid punishment", and their frequent use of threats of punishment in the child-created teacher commands. Since the

socially defiant children seem to want to have the power or control, as supported by the interviews and the observations, the teacher's use of power based control is ineffective, because it simply leads the socially defiant child and teacher into an endless struggle for power. Hence, the struggle is self-defeating for not only the child but the teacher. The adoption of an authority based control which does not nurture the socially defiant child's desire for power might be more advantageous.

These socially defiant children clearly perceived that their teachers had traditional authority, but not charismatic, rational-expert or rational-legal authority. Spady and Mitchell (1979) advocated that both formal and informal legitimate authority should be developed fully. Other researchers indicated that formal authority merely obligates subordinates (e.g., children) to adhere to minimum performance standards (Dornbusch & Scott, cited in Dunbar & Taylor, 1982; Dunbar & Taylor). Therefore, teachers must seek to earn informal authority via charismatic and rational-expert legitimate authority in order to encourage the children to meet higher performance standards. Dunbar and Taylor's investigation revealed that teachers must convince normal intermediate-aged children through their actions that the teachers deserve to be granted informal legitimate authority by the children.

Ideas for developing rational-legal, rational-expert and charismatic and legitimate authority are presented. Regarding rational-legal legitimate authority, teachers should inform the socially defiant children of the classroom and school rules;

explain why the rules are important; explain the personal consequences for obedience and disobedience; and judiciously, consistently and predictably enforce the rules (Spady & Mitchell, 1979; Weber, 1947). It is essential for teachers to inform the socially defiant children of the personal consequences for obedience and disobedience, because as discussed earlier, these children tend to be contingency-governed rather than rule-governed.

Regarding rational-expert legitimate authority, teachers should demonstrate to the socially defiant children that teachers have theoretical knowledge and performance skills, and that teachers can enhance the personal adequacy of students through helping them to acquire the knowledge and skills (Spady & Mitchell, 1979).

Developing charismatic authority seems to be essential for the teacher. At least two of the six socially defiant children's perceptions portray the teacher as not necessarily caring about students. It may be that charismatic legitimate authority is the most effective vehicle for teachers to develop positive authority roles with socially defiant children. Teachers can develop charismatic authority through demonstrating to the socially defiant children that they care about the children, recognize the needs and interests of the children, know what's best for them and work hard for the children's sake (Spady & Mitchell, 1979; Weber, 1947). Demonstrating a caring attitude can, in part, be done by focussing on the reinforcement of obedience and academic and social-interpersonal strengths rather than focussing on the reinforcement

or punishment of disobedience, and academic and social-interpersonal weaknesses. Because, as Brad and John reported "Some teachers don't care ... The teacher yells at me, gets mad at me and picks on me ... Why should students do what the teacher tells them to do when the teacher doesn't care?"

Authority is an effective tool for influencing subordinate's behavior (Spady & Mitchell, 1979), all teachers consciously or unconsciously use authority to influence children's behavior, and socially defiant children and possibly all children may have preferences for how teachers exercise authority. Therefore, it might be advisable for formal teacher training to address teacher authority. Suggested teacher authority topics which may be useful in a teacher training program include: the definition of teacher authority, the different types of teacher authority, how each type of authority is developed or exercised in the classroom, the effectiveness of each authority type on influencing students' behavior, the relationship between the form(s) of teacher authority adopted by the teacher and children's likely perceptions of the teacher's authority, and the importance of consciously developing teacher authority.

Implications for Research

The research implications of this investigation are discussed in terms of past research and future research.

Past Research.

Regarding past research, this investigation has supported, failed to support and extended research in the area of authority and teaching.

Damon's (1977) and Laupa and Turiel's (1986) research indicated that normal children tended to distinguish legitimacy from obedience when giving social power justifications or rationales. Furthermore, Laupa and Turiel (1986) suggested that normal children tended to give authority-orientation justifications for legitimacy of adult and peer authority and use punish-avoidance or act-orientation justifications for obedience to adult and peer authority. Act-orientation justifications included appeal to fairness and other's welfare (e.g., to prevent harm).

The present study extends these findings to the six socially defiant children's perceptions of teacher authority. Legitimate authority justifications, in particular, traditional authority were frequently used by the socially defiant children as rationales for legitimacy; while punishment-avoidance and act-orientation were used less frequently. On the other hand, punish-avoidance justifications were frequently used by the socially defiant children as rationales for obedience, especially regarding the specific teacher commands. On the contrary, act-orientation justifications were seldom used, even when the specific commands involved hitting another student or tapping a pencil while other students were working.

Damon (1977), Dunbar and Taylor (1982) and Kutnick (1980)

advocated that normal elementary-aged children's conceptualizations of authority regarding legitimacy and obedience were influenced by several factors including age or grade level of the child. According to Dunbar and Taylor (1982), although normal children's perceptions of teachers' formal authority were similar across grade levels, their perceptions of teachers' informal authority were less positive as grade level increases. Consequently, Dunbar and Taylor suggested that sixth graders must be convinced that the teacher keeps promises, is helpful and likes the children. In other words, the teacher must convince the children that they have earned informal legitimate teacher authority. The findings of the present study seem to indicate that the socially defiant children considered the teacher to have traditional legitimate authority, but not informal (i.e., charismatic and rational-expert) legitimate authority.

Nevertheless, the findings of the present study are also in conflict with Dunbar and Taylor's (1982) findings, in that the socially defiant children did not seem to consider the teacher as having formal legitimate authority based on rational-legal means. This conflict in findings may exist because rational-legal legitimate authority involves an acceptance of and dependency on rules and socially defiant children tend to be contingency-governed rather than rule-governed.

Several researchers (Laupa & Turiel, 1986; Tisak, 1986; Weston & Turiel, 1980) have observed that normal elementary-aged children's conceptualizations of authority are influenced by

command type. In contrast, the present investigation discovered that there were more similarities than differences across teacher command types. The most frequently provided rationales for legitimacy and obedience regardless of command type, were traditional authority and Avoidance Orientation justifications.

In study one, Kutnick (1980) investigated normal elementary-aged children's recognition of figures of social authority. The study revealed that approximately 65% of normal children by the age 12 recognized "Teacher as Disciplinarian". It seems that all six intermediate-aged socially defiant children recognized "Teachers as Disciplinarian". This is because the socially defiant children frequently used "to avoid punishment" as a justifications for legitimacy and, in particular, for obedience; frequently gave examples of their homeroom teachers' typical forms of punishments; and frequently included threat of punishment in the child-created teacher commands. Accordingly, it seems reasonable that Kutnick's findings regarding normal children's perception of "Teacher as Disciplinarian" can be extended to include the six socially defiant children.

In Kutnick's study five (1980), he observed that normal elementary-aged children identified jobs of authority figures, such as teach, teach specific subjects, control academics and control behavior. In general, these results may be extended to the socially defiant children studied. All six socially defiant children likely perceived that teachers "teach" and "teach specific subjects", because all the children occasionally gave rational-expert

justifications and the Approach Oriented justification "to learn". Likewise, all six socially defiant children seemed to perceive that teachers "control behavior" based on the same reasons why they probably perceived "Teacher as Disciplinarian" and because the children sometimes gave such traditional authority justifications as "Because the teacher can tell you to do anything she wants".

Bossert (1977) suggested that high deviance rates are likely to occur during highly public, large group activities, such as recitations as compared to class tasks and multi-tasks. Whereas, Arlin (1979) identified transitions as occasions for high deviance rates. The present study generally supports both researchers. The greatest frequency of deviance was observed during recitations and transitions. However, independent and group class tasks were also high deviance occasions. These findings were also consistent with most of the homeroom teachers' perceptions regarding the context in which the children were most frequently socially defiant. At least five of the six homeroom teachers picked recitations and transitions as occasions for high deviance rates. More specifically, Danny's and Fred's homeroom teachers singled out transitions after recess and at the beginning of the morning and afternoon classes. The two homeroom teachers explained this trend by reporting that Danny's and Fred's problems tended to start on the playground, during highly social-interpersonal contexts and spread to the classroom.

Future Research.

In addition to contributing to existing research, this investigation has stimulated a need for future research.

The potential relationship between evaluations of legitimacy and obedience should be investigated. The present study found an apparent relationship between evaluations of legitimacy and obedience. The socially defiant children's evaluations of legitimacy and obedience were all positive. Whether socially defiant children's evaluations of legitimacy influence or determine their evaluations of obedience is not certain from the study.

Subsequent teacher authority research should investigate female socially defiant children, other grade levels and other educational placements. The present study of the perceptions of teacher authority addressed socially defiant intermediate-aged children in regular classrooms. Several researchers have identified age or grade of child as a significant factor in normal elementary aged children's perceptions of authority (Damon, 1977; Dunbar & Taylor, 1982; Kutnick, 1980). Moreover, Dunbar and Taylor determined that normal elementary aged children's perceptions of teacher authority was influenced by the gender of the children. It is possible that the grade factor and the other factors influence socially defiant children's perceptions of teacher authority and behavior during student-teacher authority interactions. Therefore, they should be investigated.

Future investigations of socially defiant children's conceptualization of teacher authority should include

observations during more social-interpersonal oriented contexts. The present study focussed solely on the classroom context. Thus, observations were conducted in the classroom and the story vignettes described classroom-based incidents. Several researchers indicate that children's conceptualization of authority regarding legitimacy and obedience is influenced by context-related factors (Laupa & Turiel, 1986; Tisak, 1986; Weston & Tisak, 1980). Possibly, including observations during more social-interpersonal oriented contexts such as recess, lunch and physical education would provide a more balanced assessment of the socially defiant children's behavior during student-teacher authority interactions. Also, including nonclassroom based story vignettes may provide a more holistic assessment of the socially defiant children's perceptions of specific teacher commands.

In addition, including observations during social-interpersonal oriented contexts may provide a larger sample of social-interpersonal commands. Having a larger sample of social-interpersonal commands would enable comparisons between and within socially defiant child-teacher authority interactions regarding academic related and social-interpersonal behavior.

Subsequent research should investigate socially defiant child-teacher authority interactions by recording the socially defiant children's disobedience to stated teacher commands, implied teacher commands and to the academic related and social-interpersonal routines of the classroom. As discussed in the Chapter 4 section on context and nature of the children's

disobedience, the socially defiant children disobeyed teacher authority more frequently than the observational data revealed. Using the proposed procedure, data regarding the children's delayed disobedience to teacher commands and regarding disobediences to rules and routines of the classroom that were not preceded by a teacher command could be obtained. The proposed procedure would likely provide more exhaustive and accurate data on the socially defiant children's disobedience to teacher authority as compared to the procedure used in the present study.

A longitudinal study of socially defiant children's conceptualization of teacher authority, over a period of at least several months, should be conducted. The present study was conducted during April, two weeks after spring break. Many of the homeroom teachers reported that the socially defiant children's behavior improved over the past year, especially since spring break. Keith's homeroom teacher suggested that the best months to observe socially defiant children are December, January, February and March. This is because the children reportedly tend to be at their worst during these months.

It is possible that a long term study starting earlier in the year would provide a better sample of the socially defiant child-teacher authority interactions under conditions of high social defiance rates. A longitudinal study of the socially defiant children's perceptions of teacher authority may provide information regarding whether these children's perceptions of teacher authority change over time; why certain times of the year are

characteristically occasions for high deviance rates; and how the children's changes in perception of teacher authority and the changes in the student-teacher authority interactions are related.

Socially defiant children's conceptualization of teacher authority should be examined using teacher gender as a variable. The present study involved three female and three male homeroom teachers. However, gender of teacher was not a factor being investigated in the study. Dunbar & Taylor (1982) proposed that normal elementary aged girls' and boys' perceptions of teacher authority may differ as a function of teacher gender. It is possible that socially defiant children's perceptions and behaviors regarding teacher authority differ as a function of teacher gender. If this variable is to be investigated, a significantly larger sample size than six should be used, in order to improve the reliability of the study.

Socially defiant children's conceptualization of parent and peer authority, and a comparison of their conceptualization of teacher, parent and peer authority warrants investigation. The present study investigated socially defiant children's conceptualization of teacher authority. Based on the informal comments made by John's, Fred's, Keith's and Brad's parents, it seems that socially defiant behaviors are also a problem at home. It is possible that socially defiant children's perceptions and behavior regarding parent authority and regarding peer authority are also inconsistent. If similar inconsistencies are noted for parent and for peer authority, the same explanations and associated

interventions may be applicable to parent and peer authority.

Investigations of how teachers manifest their authority in the classroom and which approach to authority is most effective for educating socially defiant children should be conducted. The present study seemed to reveal that the teachers largely used traditional legitimate authority and power as means of control. These comments are based on the nature of the teacher commands and the socially defiant children's comments and responses during the interviews. There are probably numerous means in which teachers manifest their authority besides the ones used in the present study. If the other means could be identified teachers would know how to consciously develop and exercise the different types of authority. Moreover, if procedures could be established to assess how teachers manifest their authority in the classroom, this information could be used to determine which approach to authority is the most effective for educating socially defiant children. Finding appropriate matches may be an effective intervention option.

Investigations of the most effective means of assessing socially defiant children's and normal children's conceptualization of teacher authority are needed. The present study investigated conceptualization of teacher authority via three verbal sources and one behavioral source. Differences in the socially defiant children's conceptualizations of teacher authority were noted across the sources. It is possible that some of these approaches are more effective than the others and that alternative approaches would be even more effective in determining the actual conceptualizations.

Subsequent research should also investigate whether socially defiant children's perceptions and behavior regarding teacher authority may be inconsistent because: (a) disobedience is being reinforced through such means as teacher negative attention, peer attention, teacher annoyance and avoidance of school work; (b) socially defiant children do not perceive their teachers as having legitimate authority and do not perceive that students should obey their teachers; (c) socially defiant children want to get their own way; and (d) socially defiant children have skill, performance and/or self-control deficits in the area of social skills.

One approach to investigating each of these possible explanations is to conduct interviews with the socially defiant child and record observations of the child during school hours, as done in the present study. Another approach to investigating each of these possible explanations is to assume an explanation is valid, to implement a related intervention such as the interventions proposed in the previous section on implications for teachers and to determine whether disobedience to teacher commands decreases as a result of the intervention. A third approach is to combine the first two approaches to investigating the validity of the possible explanations.

Conclusions

The present study of socially defiant children's conceptualization of teacher authority has contributed to the

understanding of authority in general and of socially defiant children's perceptions and behavior regarding teacher authority. A salient finding of the study is that the socially defiant children perceived the teacher as a legitimate authority that should be obeyed, but during real-life student-teacher authority interactions these children frequently disobeyed teacher authority. As indicated by previous authority research and by the present study, authority is a complex area and warrants further investigation in order to identify the numerous variables involved and to understand their interrelations.

References

- Abrahamson, J. H. (1974). Classroom constraints and coping strategies: A way to conceptualize the teaching task. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.
- Algozzine, B. (1977). The emotionally disturbed child: Disturbed or disturbing? Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 5, 205-211.
- Algozzine, Bob. (1980). The disturbing child: A matter of opinion. Behavioral Disorders, 5, 112-115.
- Algozzine, B., & Curran, T. J. (1979). Teachers' predictors of children's school success as a function of their behavioral tolerances. Journal of Educational Research, 72, 344-347.
- Algozzine, Bob, & Sherry, Lee (1981). Issues in the education of emotionally disturbed children. Behavioral Disorders, 6(4), 223-237.
- Arlin, Marshall (1979). Teacher transitions can disrupt time flow in classrooms. American Educational Research Journal, 16(1), 42-56.
- Bell, L. C., & Stefanich, G. P. (1984). Building effective discipline using the Cascade Model. The Clearing House, 58, 134-137.
- Blau, P.M. & Scott W.R. (1962). Formal organization. San Francisco: Chandler.
- Blumenfeld, P.C., Hamilton, V.L., Bossert, S.T., Wessels, K., & Meece, J. (1983). Teacher talk and student thought: Socialization into the student role. In J. Levine & M. Wang (Eds.), Teacher and student perceptions: Implications for learning. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1982). Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.
- Borman, K. M., Lippincott, N. S., Matey, C.M., & Obermiller, P. (1978, March). Characteristics of family and classroom control in an Appalachian neighborhood. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto.
- Bossert, Steven T. (1977). Tasks, group management, and teacher control behavior: A study of classroom organization and teacher style. School Review, 85, 552-565.
- Bower, E. M. (1960). Early identification of emotionally disturbed children in school. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.

- Bower, E. M. (1969). Early identification of emotionally handicapped children in school (2nd ed.). Springfield, Ill: Charles C. Thomas.
- Brophy, J. E., & Rohrkemper, M. M. (1981). The influence of problem ownership on teachers' perceptions of and strategies for coping with problem students. Journal of Educational Psychology, 73(3), 295-311.
- Cannell, C., & Kahn, R. (1953). The collection of data by interviewing. In L. Festinger & D. Katz (Eds.), Research methods in the behavioral sciences. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Cartwright, G., Cartwright, C., & Ward, M. (1984). Emotional disturbance. In Educating special learners (2nd ed.) (pp. 216-250). New York: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Coleman, M. C., & Gilliam, J. E. (1983). Disturbing behaviors in the classroom: A survey of teacher attitudes. The Journal of Special Education, 17(2), 121-129.
- Curran, T. J., & Algozzine, B. (1980). Ecological disturbance: A test of the matching hypothesis. Behavioral Disorders, 5, 169-174.
- Damon, William (1977). Legitimacy and obedience; The development of authority. In The social world of the child. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publications.
- Davis, K. (1948). Human society. New York: MacMillan.
- DeStefano, M. A., Geston, E. L., & Cowen, E. L. (1977). Teachers' views of the treatability of children's school adjustment problems. Journal of Special Education, 11, 275-280.
- Dornbusch, S. M., & Scott, W. R. (1973). Evaluation and the exercise of authority. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publications.
- Doyle, Walter. (1986). Classroom organization and management. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.). Handbook of Research on Teaching (3rd ed.) (pp. 392-431). New York: MacMillan Publishing Co.
- Duke, Daniel L. (Ed.). (1979). Classroom management. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press.
- Dunbar, Ann M., & Taylor, Beverly W. (1982). Children's perceptions of elementary teachers as authority figures. The Journal of Social Psychology, 118, 249-255.
- Erikson, F., & Mohatt, G. (1982). Cultural organization of participation structures in two classrooms of Indian students. In

- G. Spindler (Ed.), Doing the ethnography of schooling. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Fagen, S. & Long, N. (1979). A psychoeducational approach to teaching self-control. Behavioral Disorders, 4, 68-82.
- Gluck, J., & Clark-Stewart, K.A. (1978). The development of social understanding. New York: Gardner Press, Inc.
- Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte, M. D. (1981). Ethnographic research and the problem of data reduction. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 12(1), 51-70.
- Good, T. L., & Grouws, D. (1972). Reaction of male and female teacher trainees to descriptions of elementary school pupils. (Tech. Rep. No. 62). Center for Research in Social Behavior, University of Missouri, Columbia.
- Gordon, R. H., & Thomas, J. T. (1967). The effects of student characteristics on teachers ratings. Instructor, 77, 51-56.
- Gresham, F. (1981). Social skills training with handicapped children: A review. Review of Educational Research, 51, 139-176.
- Griffin, P. & Mehan, H. (1979). Sense and ritual in classroom discourse. In F. Coulman (Ed.), Conversational routine: Explorations in standardized communication situations and prepatterned speech. The Hague: Mouton.
- Hargreaves, D. H., Hester, S. K., & Mellor, F. J. (1975). Deviance in the classroom. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Houghton, Vincent, McHugh, R., & Morgan, C. (Eds.). (1975). Management in education. London: The Open University.
- Humphrey, F. M. (1979). "Shh!": A sociological study of teachers' turn-taking sanctions in primary school lessons. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Georgetown University, Washington, DC.
- Hutton, Jerry, B. (1985). What reasons are given by teachers who refer problem behavior students? Psychology in the schools, 22(1), 79-82.
- Jackson (1968). Life in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Jenson, W. R., Reavis, K., & Rhode, G. (1988). A conceptual analysis of childhood behavior disorders: A practical educational Approach. To appear in: Topics in Emotional Disturbance, Austin, Texas: Behavioral Learning Center.

- Kauffman, J. M. (1977). Characteristics of children's behavior disorders. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill.
- Kavale, K. A., Forness, S. R., & Alper, A. E. (1986). Research in behavioral disorders/emotional disturbance: A survey of subject identification criteria. Behavioral Disorders, 12, 159-167.
- Kerlinger, F. N. (1973). Foundations of behavioral research (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.
- Kneller, G. F. (1971). Foundations of education. New York: Wiley.
- Kounin, J. S. (1970). Discipline and group management in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Kounin, J. S. & Doyle, P. H. (1975). Degree of continuity of a lesson's signal system and the task involvement of children. Journal of Educational Research, 67(2), 159-164.
- Kounin, J. S. & Gump, P. (1974). Signal systems of lesson settings and the task related behavior of preschool children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 66, 554-562.
- Kutnick, (1980). The inception of school authority: The socialization of the primary school child. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 101, 35-70.
- Laupa, Marta, & Turiel, Elliot. (1986). Children's conceptions of adult and peer authority. Child Development, 57, 405-412.
- Lindsey, G., & Aronsen, E. (1968). Handbook of social psychology (Vol. 2). Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Long, J. D., Frye, B. H., & Long, E. W. (Sept, 1985). Troubleshooters' guide to classroom discipline. Instructor, 122-124.
- McGinnis, Ellen, Kiraly, John, Jr., & Smith, Carl R. (1984). The types of data used in identifying public school student as behaviorally disordered. Behavioral Disorders, 9(4), 239-246.
- Monahan, W. G. (1975). Theoretical dimensions of educational administration. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc.
- Morgan, D., & Jenson, W. (1988). Teaching social skills to behaviorally disordered children. In Teaching Social Skills to Children.
- Morris, R. J. (1985). Teaching desirable behaviors to children. In Behavior modification with exceptional children: Principles and practices (pp. 66-94). Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman & Company.

- Nash, Paul (1966). Authority and freedom in education. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Nye, Robert D. (1981). B. F. Skinner and radical behaviorism. In Three psychologies: Perspectives from Freud, Skinner, and Rogers (2nd ed.) (pp. 47-106). Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- Parsons, Talcott. (1954). Essays in sociological theory (Rev.) New York: The Free Press.
- Peters, R. S. (1973). Authority, responsibility and education (rev. ed.). London: George Allen and Unwin Limited.
- Quay, H. C., & Peterson, D. R. (1983). Manual for the Revised Behavior Problem Checklist. Mimeographed, University of Miami.
- Ravin, B. H., & French, J. R. P., Jr. (1958). Legitimate power, coercive powers, and observability in social influence. Sociometry, 21, 83-97.
- Sackett, G. P., Ruppenthal, G. C., & Gluck, J. (1978). Introduction: An overview of methodological and statistical problems in observational research. In G. P. Sackett (Ed.). Observing behavior (Vol. 2): Data collection and analysis methods (pp.1-14). Baltimore, Maryland: University Park Press.
- Safran, Stephen P., & Safran, Joan S. (1984). Elementary teachers' tolerance of problem behaviors. The Elementary School Journal, 85(2), 237-243.
- Safran, Stephen P., & Safran, Joan S. (1985). Classroom context and teachers' perceptions of problem behaviors. Journal of Educational Psychology, 77(1), 20-28.
- Schoggen, P. (1964a). Environmental forces in the everyday lives of children with physical disabilities. Unpublished manuscript.
- Seifert, K. (1983). Learning as behavior change. In Educational psychology (pp. 142-171). Boston: Houghton Mifflon Company.
- Serafica, F. C. (1982). Social-cognitive development in context. New York: Guilford Press.
- Sieber, R. T. (1976). Schooling in the bureaucratic classroom: Socialization and social reproduction in Chesnut Heights. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University.
- Sieber, R. T. (1979a). Classmates as workmates: Informal peer activity in the elementary school. Anthropology and Educational

- Quarterly, 10, 207-235.
- Sieber, R. T. (1981). Socialization implications of school discipline, or how first-graders are taught to "listen". In R. T. Sieber & A. J. Gordon (Eds.), Children and their organizations: Investigations in American culture (pp. 18-43). Boston, MA: G.K. Hall.
- Siegel, D. L. (1981). Children's behavior problems and referral for school psychological services. Psychology in the Schools, 18, 364-368.
- Skinner, B. F. (1953). Operant behavior. In Science and human behavior (pp. 59-90). New York: The MacMillan Company.
- Skinner, B. F. (1969). The role of environment. In Contingencies of reinforcement: A theoretical analysis (pp. 3-28). New York: Meredith Corporation.
- Skinner, B. F. (1974). About behaviorism. New York: Vintage Books.
- Spady, W. E. & Mitchell, D. E. (1979). Authority and the management of classroom activities. In D. L. Duke (Ed.), Classroom management (pp. 75-115). Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press.
- Tisak, Marie S. (1986). Children's conceptions of parental authority. Child Development, 57, 166-176.
- Walker, H. M. (1979). The acting-out child: Coping with classroom disruption. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Walker, J. E. & Shea, T. M. (1984). Basic principles of behavior modification. In Behavior management: A practical approach for educators (pp. 24-38). Toronto: Times Mirror/Mosby College Publishing.
- Webb, E. J., Campbell, D. T., Schwartz, R. D., & Sechrest, L. (1966). Approximations to knowledge. In Unobtrusive measures: Nonreactive research in the social sciences. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Weber, M. (1947). The theory of social and economic organization, (pp. 328-339), trans. Alexander M. Henderson & Talcott Parsons, Talcott Parsons (Ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Weber, M. (Trans. H. Gerth) (1975). The three types of legitimate rule. In V. Houghton, R. McHugh, & C. Morgan (Eds.). Management in education. London: The Open University.
- Westbury, I. (1973). Conventional classrooms, "open" classrooms and the technique of teaching. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 5, 99-

121.

Weston, D., & Turiel, E. (1980). Act-rule relations: Children's concepts of social rules. Developmental Psychology, 16, 417-424.

Woolfolk, A. E. & Brooks, D. M. (1985). Beyond words: The influence of teacher's nonverbal behavior on students' perceptions and performances. Elementary School Journal, 85, 513-528.

Yinger, R. J. (1979). Routines in teacher planning. Theory into Practice, 18(3), 163-169.

Appendix A

Rules Associated With Each Lesson PhaseEntry phase:

- (1) Students must line up outside the room in the corridor.
- (2) Students must not enter the room until the teacher gives them permission to do so.
- (3) Students must enter the room "in an orderly fashion", i.e., without running or pushing.

Settling down or preparation phase:

- (1) Students must go to their seats and sit down or remain in close proximity to their seat.
- (2) Students are free to talk to other pupils on any matter, but they must not shout or scream.
- (3) Students must cooperate in the distribution of equipment, if this takes place.

Lesson proper:

Subphase 1

The pay attention rule is in effect:

- (1) Students must stay in their seat or wherever they were instructed by the teacher to sit.
- (2) Students must be quiet.
- (3) Students must listen to and look at the teacher.
- (4) Students must not interrupt the teacher with superfluous or irrelevant comments or questions.

Subphase 2

Student-student talk is permitted, provided that:

- (1) There is no loud talking or shouting.
- (2) The talk is work-related or relevant to the task, except for the occasional irrelevant talk.
- (3) Students must not interfere with, distract or disturb other students in their work by excessive irrelevant talk or by any other kind of action.
- (4) Restricted movement is permitted in some activities (e.g., project work), but is forbidden in other activities (e.g., independent reading).

Subphase 3

- (1) On the whole it is the teacher who asks the questions and the students who contribute the answers.
- (2) Students should be willing to volunteer answers.
- (3) That a student is willing to volunteer an answer should normally be signalled to the teacher by hand-raising.
- (4) Students must answer when called upon to do so, and normally should not "shout out" an answer on their own initiative.

OR

- (5) If the teacher does allow the students to take the initiative,

several students must not call out their answers simultaneously.

- (6) Students must not offer an answer whilst another student is stating his/her answer.
- (7) Students must not talk to one another whilst (a) the teacher is talking, or (b) a student is answering the question.

Clearing up phase

- (1) Students are required to put away any materials used during the lesson in the proper place.
- (2) If the teacher specifically delegates clearing up tasks to certain students, those students are required to complete those tasks before the exit phase.
- (3) Students are required to pick up and put away in the proper place anything else (regardless if it was used in the lesson) that is not in its proper place or that is disorganized (e.g., scraps of paper on the floor and magazines not stacked neatly).

Exit phase

- (1) Students must not leave the classroom until they have received permission from the teacher after the bell goes, if there is one.
- (2) Elementary students are often required to line up at the door while waiting for teacher permission to leave the classroom after the bell goes.

Note. The data in Appendix A are from Deviance in the classroom (pp. 71-83) by D. H. Hargreaves, S. K. Hester, and F. J. Mellor, 1975, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Appendix B

Letter of Consent--Teachers

Dear

I am a University of Manitoba graduate student who is currently working on a Master's thesis. I would like to invite you to participate in my study. I am interested in how children who have behavior problems in school think about teacher authority.

I would like to observe the child identified by the school division as having behavior problems, under normal or regular classroom conditions. I would also like to interview the child, during school hours, regarding how the child perceives teacher authority. The child will be observed for the equivalent of one morning or afternoon. Each of the three interviews will be about a half hour in length. Confidentiality of the information gathered during the study is assured.

My faculty co-advisor is Dr. Joanne Keselman. Further information about the proposed study may be obtained from me at 284-0321. Upon completion of the study, a summary of the results will be made available to you.

Thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

Eve Harras

I understand that the observations will take place in my classroom and that the child will be interviewed for three half-hour sessions during school hours. I understand that consent is voluntary and may be withdrawn at any time.

Signature of Consent: _____

I do not consent to having the child observed in my classroom nor to having the child interviewed during school hours.

Signature: _____

Appendix C

Letter of Consent--Parents

Dear

I am a University of Manitoba graduate student who is currently working on a Master's thesis. It appears that children's behavior influences how they get along with each other and with the teacher, and influences their success in school. Therefore, children's behavior in school seems to be very important. I am interested in how children who have some difficulty behaving appropriately in school think about the authority of the teacher and how they respond to teacher directions in the classroom. I would like to observe the children in the classroom and record the teacher's directions and the children's responses to the directions. I would also like to interview the children regarding how they think about teacher authority. One interview will cover general questions about teacher authority and the other two interviews will cover more specific questions about specific teacher directions. From the observations and interviews in combination with general background information obtained from the school, potential ideas may be obtained regarding how to help these children learn more appropriate behavior, in order to enhance their social relationships and their success in school.

I am writing to request your permission to observe your child during regular classroom activities for about one morning or afternoon, and to interview your child at school on three occasions, for about a half hour each time. You are under no obligation to grant permission for me to observe and interview your child. Should you grant permission, confidentiality of the information gathered is assured. In addition, you may rescind your permission at any time.

Should you desire further information on the proposed study and/or on the results of the study, feel free to contact me at 284-0321. My faculty co-advisor is Dr. Joanne Keselman.

Thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

Eve Harras

I give permission for my child to be observed in his/her classroom and to be interviewed at school. I understand that consent is

voluntary and may be withdrawn at any time.

Signature of Consent: _____

I do not give permission for my child to be observed in his/her classroom and to be interviewed at school.

Signature: _____

Appendix D

Essential Background Information Form

Note: The symbols P (parent), T (homeroom teacher) and F (school file) indicate the sources of information for each question.

Name (P): _____

Age (P): _____

Grade (P): _____

Father's Occupation (P): _____

Mother's Occupation (P): _____

Family Composition (i.e., brothers, sisters) (P): _____

Parents' Marital Status (P): _____

(1) For how many years has the student exhibited this behavior problem (i.e., challenging teacher authority) in school (T)?

(2) In what ways does the student challenge teacher authority (T)?

(a) verbal means- _____

(b) nonverbal means- _____

(3) Has the student been formally identified as having behavioral/emotional problems by this or a previous school division

(a) in the past (T,F)? _____

(b) at present (T)? _____

(4) Has there been any formal or informal interventions (i.e., counselling, therapy, behavior techniques, social skill training,...) to address the student's behavior problems

(a) in the past (T, F)? _____

(b) at present (T)? _____

(5) Briefly describe how successful each intervention was/is (T, F). _____

(6) Describe how well the student gets along with his/her

(a) teachers (T). _____

(b) fellow students (T). _____

(7) What, if any, are the student's academic

(a) strengths (T)? _____

(b) weaknesses (T)? _____

(8a) Is the student receiving any supplementary educational services (e.g., resource) (T)? _____

(b) If so, describe the nature and frequency of the service (T). _____

(9a) Has the student been held back in school (P)? _____

(b) If so, what grade(s) (P)? _____

(10a) Has the student been accelerated in school (P)? _____

(b) If so, what grade(s) (P)? _____

(11) What is the student's intelligence quotient as determined by a standardized intelligence test (name the test also) (F)? _____

(12a) Does the student have any history of medical problems (P, F)? _____

(b) If so, describe (P,F). _____

(13a) Had the student been on any form of medication since the beginning of grade one (P, F)? (e.g., ritalin) _____

(b) Is so, describe what and when (P, F). _____

(14a) Is the student presently on any form of medication (P, F)? _____

(b) If so, describe what and for how long (P, F). _____

(15) Has the student's socially defiant behavior lessened in severity over this past school year (T)? _____

(16) Was the student's behavior during the observations better than, worse than or representative of his typical behavior in class (T)? _____

Additional Comments: _____

Appendix E

Sample of a Completed Essential Background Information Form

Note: The symbols P (parent), T (homeroom teacher) and F (school files) indicate the sources of information for each question.

Name: John

Age (P): 9 (born July, 1978)

Grade (P): 4

Father's Occupation (P): unemployed

Mother's Occupation (P): homemaker

Family Composition (i.e., brothers, sisters) (P): none

Parents' Marital Status (P): separated

 (1) For how many years has the student exhibited this behavior problem (i.e., challenging teacher authority) in school (T)?

The present homeroom teacher reported two years, grade three and four. The school files contained previous homeroom teachers' reports: Kindergarten evaluations of work habits and social development were "satisfactory", "needs improvement" and "is improving"; grade 1 evaluations of work habits and social development were "satisfactory"; grade 2 evaluations of work habits and social development were "satisfactory", "needs improvement", "is improving" and "... needs to work on self-control"; and grade 3 evaluations of work habits and social adjustment were "satisfactory", "needs improvement", "is improving" and "... needs to focus his energy".

(2) In what ways does the student challenge teacher authority (T)?

(a) verbal means--talking back, arguing.

(b) nonverbal means--does the opposite of what you tell him to do, manipulates, and has temper tantrums and cries but only seldom.

(3) Has the student been formally identified as having behavioral/emotional problems by this or a previous school division

(a) in the past (T, F)? last year

(b) at present (T)? yes

(4) Has there been any formal or informal interventions (i.e., counselling, therapy, behavior techniques, social skill training,...) to address the student's behavior problems

(a) in the past (T, F)? social worker from Child Guidance

(b) at present (T)? occasional visits from social worker from Child Guidance

(5) Briefly describe how successful each intervention was/is (T, F).

The teacher reports the intervention has had no major effect, in part, because the visits are so seldom.

(6) Describe how well the student gets along with his/her

(a) teachers (T). pretty good now, but before spring break he was in trouble with all his teachers

(b) fellow students (T). not too well. The other students, in general, pretend he doesn't exist, except for other problem students. He tends to aggravate other students and tattle-tale on them.

(7) What, if any, are the student's academic

(a) strengths (T)? all areas

(b) weaknesses (T)? his attitude. He is impulsive and has problems on long written assignments because he lacks persistence and concentration. He doesn't like to work.

(8a) Is the student receiving any supplementary educational services (e.g., resource) (T)? no

(b) If so, describe the nature and frequency of the service (T).
not applicable

(9a) Has the student been held back in school (P)? no

(b) If so, what grade(s) (P)? not applicable

(10a) Has the student been accelerated in school (P)? no

(b) If so, what grade(s) (P)? not applicable

(11) What is the student's intelligence quotient as determined by a standardized intelligence test (name the test also) (F)?

not available

(12a) Does the student have any history of medical problems (P, F)? frequent ear infections

(b) If so, describe (P, F). He takes antibiotics for a while every year, but not this year.

(13a) Had the student been on any form of medication since the beginning of grade one (P, F)? (e.g., ritalin) no

(b) Is so, describe what and when (P, F). not applicable

(14a) Is the student presently on any form of medication (P, F)? no

(b) If so, describe, what and for how long (P, F). not applicable

(15) Has the student's socially defiant behavior lessened in severity over this past school year (T)?

The teacher reported that his behavior has improved since spring break, two weeks before the study was implemented. He provided several reasons for this improvement including maturation, his mother's use of incentives for good behavior at school and home, and his desire to improve his grades from the previous term.

(16) Was the student's behavior during the observations better than, worse than or representative of his typical behavior in class (T)? the behavior observed was typical of his behavior since spring break.

Additional Comments (P, T, F): none

Appendix G

Activity for Developing Representative Story Vignettes

INTRODUCTION TO AN ACTIVITY FOR TEACHERS

For my Master's thesis I am exploring socially defiant children's conceptualization of teacher authority. Teacher authority can be investigated through teacher commands. Hence, I am interested in examples of teacher commands given to students in the regular elementary classroom. The particular commands of interest are of two types (i.e., instructions and rule violation statements) and are related to academic related behavior and social-interpersonal behavior.

Examples of academic related behavior are: listening and watching the teacher, and keeping quiet during lessons unless otherwise instructed by the teacher; starting, working on, and completing assigned academic activities as instructed by the teacher; using school property, materials, and resources as instructed by the teacher; and using school property, materials, and resources carefully so as to keep them in good, working condition.

Examples of social-interpersonal behavior are: using good manners (i.e., "please", "thank you", and "you're welcome", and not swearing or being rude); telling the truth; not tattling on other students' misbehaviors; respecting the teacher's and other students' property by asking permission to use someone else's property, by returning borrowed items in the same condition, and by not stealing others' property; and not engaging in any behavior that physically harms or that could physically harm others (i.e., hitting, punching, kicking, pushing, biting, throwing paper airplanes, books, erasers, and pencils, and shooting elastics), nor that could be considered psychologically harmful to others (i.e., name-calling, teasing, threatening).

The information obtained from this activity will assist me in setting up story vignettes based on representative teacher commands. The story vignettes will be used as part of my investigation.

Number of years of regular classroom teaching:
elementary _____ junior high _____ high school _____
Gender: male _____ female _____

Activity

Instructions:

- (1) Read the definitions for each teacher command variation.
- (2) List three examples for each teacher command variation.
**These examples should be representative of the commands often given in the regular elementary classroom.

(1) Academic Related Instructions

Definition: An academic related instruction is a future oriented kind of rule that refers to any behavior directly related to the attainment of academic lesson or activity objectives, and/or to the handling of school property and materials and is a future oriented kind of rule in that the person is expected to follow it, however, there is no suggestion that present conduct is rule-breaking.

Examples:

- (1) _____

- (2) _____

- (3) _____

(2) Academic Related Rule Violation Statements

Definition: An academic related rule violation statement involves an explicit or implicit statement which indicates that a person has broken or is breaking a rule or instruction that refers to any behavior directly related to the attainment of academic lesson or activity objectives, and/or to the handling of school property and materials, with implication that this conduct must cease and be replaced with conduct that conforms to the rules.

Examples:

- (1) _____

(2) _____

(3) _____

(3) Social-Interpersonal Instructions

Definition: A social-interpersonal instruction is a future oriented kind of rule that refers to how a student should interact with teachers, other adults and other students and a future oriented kind of rule in that the person is expected to follow it, however, there is no suggestion that present conduct is rule-breaking.

Examples:

(1) _____

(2) _____

(3) _____

(4) Social-Interpersonal Rule Violation Statements

Definition: A social-interpersonal rule violation statement involves an explicit or implicit statement which indicates that a person has broken or is breaking a rule or instruction relating to how a student should interact with teachers, other adults and other students, with implication that this conduct must cease and be replaced with conduct that conforms to the rules.

Examples:

(1) _____

(2) _____

(3) _____

The second part of the activity involves reading and evaluating whether the four vignettes designed for the investigation are representative of the teacher command variations in the regular elementary classroom. This part of the activity could easily be done during a five to ten-minute phone call. If you are interested in assisting me in the second part of the activity, please write your name and number in the space provided.

Name: _____

Phone Number: _____

Appendix H

Questions for Evaluating the Representativeness of the
Story Vignettes Developed

Teacher Code Number: _____

Vignette Variation: _____

Instruction Related Questions

1. Is the teacher command appropriate for the elementary classroom?
2. If "no": Why isn't the teacher command appropriate for the elementary classroom?
3. How would you change the content of the teacher command to make it more appropriate for the elementary classroom?
4. How would you change the wording of the teacher command to make it more appropriate for the elementary classroom?

Teacher Code Number: _____

Vignette Variation: _____

Deviance-Imputation Related Questions

1. Does the story vignette depict behavior that could be exhibited by students in the elementary classroom?
2. If "no": Why doesn't the story vignette depict behavior that could be exhibited by students in the elementary classroom?
3. How would you change the content of the student behavior described to make it more appropriate for the elementary classroom?
4. How would you change the wording of the description of the student's behavior to make it more appropriate for the elementary classroom?
5. Is the teacher command appropriate for the student behavior described?
6. If "no": Why isn't the teacher command appropriate for the student behavior described?
7. How would you change the content of the teacher command to make it more appropriate for the student behavior described?
8. How would you change the wording of the teacher command to make

it more appropriate for the student behavior described?

9. Is the teacher command appropriate for the elementary classroom?

10. If "no": Why isn't the teacher command appropriate for the elementary classroom?

11. How would you change the content of the teacher command to make it more appropriate for the elementary classroom?

12. How would you change the wording of the teacher command to make it more appropriate for the elementary classroom?

Appendix I

Story Vignettes and Related QuestionsStory Vignettes:Academic Related Instruction

Mrs. Simms, the teacher, told John and the rest of the class, "Watch closely while I show you the steps to solve these kinds of math problems."

Academic Related Deviance-Imputation

While the other students were working on their science assignment, Peter was tapping his pencil on his desk. Mrs. Curran, the teacher, said, "Peter, stop tapping your pencil. The other students can't concentrate on their assignment."

Social-Interpersonal Instruction

Mrs. Campbell, the teacher, told Gerry and the rest of the class, "Share the art materials with students in your group."

Social-Interpersonal Deviance-Imputation

Tom was hitting another student during writing class. Mrs. Mallow, the teacher, said, "Tom stop hitting Michael. Hitting is not allowed in our classroom."

Related Questions:

Note. The investigator were read each vignette variation. The following questions were asked of each student after each vignette variation had been read.

Do you think that it is all right for the teacher to say teacher command? (evaluation of legitimacy/illegitimacy)

If answered "yes", asked:

How come it is all right for the teacher to say teacher command? (rationale for legitimacy)

If answered "no", asked:

How come it isn't all right for the teacher to say teacher command? (rationale for illegitimacy)

If answered "yes" or "no", asked:

Should the student do what the teacher tells him to do, when the teacher says teacher command? (evaluation of obedience/disobedience)

If answered "yes", asked:

Why should the student do what the teacher tells him to do, when

the teachers says teacher command? (rationale for obedience)

If answered "no", asked:

Why shouldn't the student do what the teacher tells him to do, when the teacher says teacher command?
(rationale for disobedience)

Asked the following questions for story vignettes illustrating deviance imputations:

If answered, "yes" or "no", asked:

What would you say if you were the teacher and the student was describe the student's behavior? (child-created teacher command)

Why would you say child-created command? (rationale for child-created teacher command)

Would it be all right for you as the teacher to say child-created teacher command? (evaluation of legitimacy/illegitimacy)

If answered "yes", asked:

Why would it be all right for you as the teacher to say child-created teacher command? (evaluation of legitimacy)

If answered "no", asked:

Why wouldn't it be all right for you as the teacher to say child-created teacher command? (evaluation of illegitimacy)

Should the student do what you as the teacher tell him to do, when you say child-created teacher command? (evaluation of obedience/disobedience)

If answered "yes", asked:

Why should the student do what you as the teacher tell him to do, when you say child-created teacher command? (rationale for obedience)

If answered "no", asked:

Why shouldn't the student do what you as the teacher tell him to do, when you say child-created teacher command? (rationale for disobedience)

Appendix J

General Interview QuestionsGeneral Questions Addressing Legitimacy and Obedience, and Formal And Informal Authority

Who is the boss of the classroom?

Is the teacher the boss of the classroom?

Legitimacy/Obedience

Is it all right for the teacher to be the boss of the classroom?
(evaluation of legitimacy/illegitimacy)

If answered, "yes", asked:

How come it is all right for the teacher to be the boss of the classroom? (rationale for legitimacy)

If answered, "no", asked:

How come it is not all right for the teacher to be the boss of the classroom? (rationale for illegitimacy)

Should students do what the teacher tells the students to do?
(evaluation of obedience/disobedience)

If answered, "yes", asked:

Why should students do what the teacher tells them to do?
(rationale for obedience)

If answered, "no", asked:

Why shouldn't students do what the teacher tells them to do?
(rationale for disobedience)

Legitimacy

Interviewer: "I'm going to tell you four possible reasons for why the teacher is the boss of the classroom and I want you to tell me which of these reasons you think are good reasons."

The teacher is the boss of the classroom:

- (1) because the teacher's job in the school is to be the boss of the classroom so that students learn to be hard-working, cooperative, and respectful (traditional justification for legitimacy);
- (2) because the teacher cares about students and knows what's best for them (charismatic justification for legitimacy);
- (3) because the teacher knows more about school subjects, such as math, science, reading, music and physed than students; therefore, the teacher can help students learn how to do things in the

different school subjects (rational-expert justification for legitimacy);

(4) because someone has to make sure that students follow school and classroom rules so that students can learn and get along with each other (rational-legal justification for legitimacy).

Note. The interviewer repeated these reasons as many times as the student needed them to be repeated.

Which of these reasons do you think are good reasons for why the teacher is the boss of the classroom? (rationale for legitimacy with options)

Why did you choose (state the reasons the student chose) as good reasons for why the teacher is the boss of the classroom? (reasons why good options for rationale for legitimacy)

Why didn't you choose (state the reasons the student did not choose) as good reasons for why the teacher is the boss of the classroom? (reasons why not good options for rationale for legitimacy)

If you could only choose one reason, which do you think is the best reason for why the teacher is the boss of the classroom? (best option for rationale for legitimacy)

Why did you choose (state the reason the student chose) as the best reason for why the teacher is the boss of the classroom? (reasons why best option for rationale for legitimacy)

Obedience

"I'm going to tell you four possible reasons for why students should do what the teacher tells them to do and I want you to tell me which of these reasons you think are good reasons."

Students should do what the teacher tells them to do:

- (1) because it is the teacher's job to tell students what to do so that the students can learn to be hard-working, cooperative, and respectful (traditional justification for obedience);
- (2) because the teacher cares about students and knows what's best for them (charismatic justification for obedience);
- (3) because the teacher knows more about school subjects, such as math, science, reading, music, and physed than students; therefore, the teacher can help students learn how to do things in the different school subjects (rational-expert justification for obedience);
- (4) because rules and commands are supposed to be followed so that students can learn and get along with each other (rational-expert justification for obedience).

Note. The interviewer repeated these reasons as many times as the student needed them to be repeated.

Which of these reasons do you think are good reasons for why students should do what the teacher tells them to do? (rationale for obedience with options)

Why did you choose (state the reasons the student chose) as good reasons for why students should do what the teacher tells them to do? (reasons why good option for rationale for obedience)

Why didn't you choose (state the reasons the student did not choose) as good reasons for why student should do what the teacher tells them to do? (reasons why not good option for rationale for obedience)

If you could only choose one reason, which do you think is the best reason for why students should do what the teacher tells them to do? (best option for rationale for obedience)

Why did you choose (state the reason the student chose) as the best reason for why students should do what the teacher tells them to do? (reasons why best option for rationale for obedience)

A FIVE MINUTE BREAK WAS TAKEN

Questions Related to the Observations of the Students

One academic related deviance-imputation and one social-interpersonal deviance-imputation command that were disobeyed by the child observed was selected for each socially defiant child. The following questions were asked of each child, for each of the deviance-imputation commands selected.

During (description of context of the teacher command--subject, activity, day), the teacher said observation-based teacher command.

Do you think it is all right for the teacher to say observation-based teacher command? (evaluation of legitimacy/illegitimacy)

If answers "yes", ask:

How come it is all right for the teacher to say observation-based teacher command? (rationale for legitimacy)

If answers "no", ask:

How come it isn't all right for the teacher to say observation-based teacher command? (rationale for illegitimacy)

Should students do what the teacher tell them to do, when the teacher says observation-based teacher command? (evaluation of obedience/disobedience)

If answers "yes", ask:

Why should students do what the teacher tells them to do, when the teacher says observation-based teacher command? (rationale for obedience)

If answers "no", ask:

Why shouldn't the students do what the teacher tells them to do, when the teacher says observation-based teacher command? (rationale for disobedience)

Regardless of previous response, ask:

Why did you not do what the teacher told you to do when the teacher said observation-based teacher command? (rationale for disobeying the specific teacher command)

Appendix K

Coding SchemeGeneral Coding Scheme

Evaluation of legitimacy (EL)--whether the subject responds positively (yes), negatively (no), or inconsistently to the question "Do you think that it is all right for the teacher to say that (a command)?" or the equivalent. (A response is coded as inconsistent if the student's response to a question includes both positive and negative responses.)

Evaluation of obedience (EO)--whether the subject responds positively (yes), negatively (no), or inconsistently to the question "Should the student do what the teacher tells him to do?" or the equivalent. (A response is coded as inconsistent if the student's response to a question includes both positive and negative responses.)

Rationale for legitimacy (RL)--the justification the student gives for why it is all right for the teacher to give a certain command.

Rationale for obedience (RO)--the justification the student gives for why the student should obey the teacher command.

Formal authority (FA)--any justification for legitimacy or obedience that is based on the qualitative characteristics of the institution and institutional position held by the superordinate. This includes any justification that can be categorized as traditional or rational-legal.

Informal authority (IF)--any justification for legitimacy or obedience that is based on the personal characteristics, resources, and experience of the superordinate. This includes any justification that can be categorized as charismatic or rational-expert.

Traditional authority (TA)--any justification for legitimacy or obedience that refers to the teacher's right to give commands and/or the students' responsibility to obey teacher commands because he/she is the teacher and teachers are in charge of the class, and/or because the role of the school and thus the teacher to help students learn to be hard-working, cooperative, respectful, and disciplined.

Charismatic authority (CA)--any justification for legitimacy or obedience that refers to the teacher's right to give commands and/or the students' responsibility to obey teacher commands because the teacher cares about the students' welfare, knows what's best for them, and/or works hard for the students' benefit.

Rational-legal authority (LA)--any justification for legitimacy or obedience that refers to the teacher's right to give commands and/or the students' responsibility to obey teacher commands because the teacher is required to judiciously enforce certain rules (and routines) in the classroom, and/or because rules (and routines) are supposed to be followed so that law and order is maintained.

Rational-expert authority (EA)--any justification for legitimacy or obedience that refers to the teacher's right to give commands and/or the students' responsibility to obey teacher commands because the teacher knows more about school subjects and knows more about how to perform tasks related to the school subjects than students, and/or because the teacher is capable of enabling students to learn more about school subjects and to perform tasks related to the subjects.

Academic related behavior (AB)--any behavior that is directly related to the attainment of academic lesson or activity objectives, and/or to the handling of school property and materials. This includes listening, watching, and keeping quiet during lessons unless otherwise instructed by the teacher; starting, working on, and completing assigned academic activities as instructed by the teacher; using school materials and resources as instructed by the teacher; and using school materials and resources carefully so as to keep them in good, working condition. Essentially, academic related behaviors are task- or object-oriented. This includes the rules associated with each lesson phase (see Appendix A).

Social-interpersonal behavior (SB)--any behavior that indicates how a student should interact with teachers, other adults (i.e., principal, vice-principal, educational assistant), and other students. This includes using good manners (i.e., saying "please", "thank you", "you're welcome", and "I'm sorry", and not interrupting other persons and not swearing or being rude); telling the truth; not tattle-taling on other students' misbehaviors; respecting other students' and the teachers' property by asking permission to use someone else's property, by returning borrowed items in the same condition, and by not stealing other's property; and not engaging in any behavior that physically harms or that could physically harm another person (i.e., hitting, punching, kicking, pushing, biting, throwing things such as paper airplanes, pencils, erasers, books, and chairs, and shooting elastics), nor that could be considered psychologically harmful for others (i.e., name-calling, teasing, threatening). Essentially, social-interpersonal behaviors are people-oriented.

Instruction (I)--a future oriented kind of rule in that the person is expected to follow the directive; however, there is no suggestion that present conduct is rule-breaking.

Deviance-imputation (D)--involves an explicit or implicit statement which indicates that a person has broken or is breaking a rule,

with the implication that this conduct must cease and be replaced with conduct which conforms to the rules.

Academic related instruction (AI)--a future oriented kind of rule that refers to any behavior directly related to the attainment of academic lesson or activity objectives, and/or to the handling of school property and materials and a future oriented kind of rule in that the person is expected to follow it, however, there is no suggestion that present conduct is rule-breaking.

Academic related deviance-imputation (AD)--involves an explicit or implicit statement which indicates that a person has broken or is breaking a rule or instruction that refers to any behavior directly related to the attainment of academic lesson or activity objectives, and/or to the handling of school property and materials, with implication that this conduct must cease and be replaced with conduct that conforms to the rules.

Social-interpersonal instruction (SI)--a future oriented kind of rule that refers to how a student should interact with teachers, other adults and other students and a future oriented kind of rule in that the person is expected to follow it, however, there is no suggestion that present conduct is rule-breaking

Social-interpersonal deviance-imputation (SD)--involves an explicit or implicit statement which indicates that a person has broken or is breaking a rule or instruction relating to how a student should interact with teachers, other adults and other students, with implication that this conduct must cease and be replaced with conduct that conforms to the rules.

Coding Categories Used for the Observations

Obedied teacher command (OC)--the command was obeyed in full.

Disobeyed teacher command (DC)--the command was not obeyed at all or was not obeyed in full.

Academic related instruction
Academic related deviance-imputation
Social-interpersonal instruction
Social-interpersonal deviance-imputation

Coding Categories Used for the General Interview and Story Vignette Related Interview

All those coding categories listed under general coding scheme were used for coding the interview and story vignette data collected.

Appendix L

Sample Transcription of the General Interview

Student: John

I: Today is May 2 and this is interview questions with John, general interview questions.

First of all, these will be general questions.

First question:

Who is the boss of the classroom? (boss)

J: the teacher.

I: Is it all right for the teacher to be the boss of the classroom? (evaluation of legitimacy/illegitimacy)

J: Yes.

I: How come it is all right for the teacher to be the boss of the classroom? (rationale for legitimacy)

J: Because the teacher is, has experience in teaching because they had to take a course and now she and now that person, the teacher, is the teacher and you have to listen.

I: Is there any other reasons how come it's OK for the teacher to be the boss of the classroom? (rationale for legitimacy)

J: No.

I: Should students do what the teacher tells them to do? (evaluation of obedience/disobedience)

J: Yes.

I: How come students should do what the teacher tells them to do? (rationale for obedience)

J: Because if they don't they'll just get in big trouble.

I: OK. Ahum. What I'm going to do is tell you four possible reasons for why the teacher is the boss of the classroom and I want you to tell me which of these reasons you think are good reasons. So you can pick one, two, three or four.

J: OK.

I: What I'm going to do is give you a copy of the reasons. Sometimes it's hard to remember them. So that way if you like one

just put a little tick beside it. There's one, two, three, four.

J: OK.

I: The teacher is the boss of the classroom:

#1 because the teacher's job in the school is to be the boss of the classroom, so that students learn to be hard-working, cooperative, and respectful (traditional authority justification for legitimacy);

#2 because the teacher cares about students and knows what's best for them (charismatic authority justification for legitimacy);

#3 because the teacher knows more about school subjects, such as math, science, reading, art, music and physed than students, so the teacher can help students learn how to do things in the different school subjects (rational-expert authority justification for legitimacy);

#4 because someone has to make sure that students follow school and classroom rules so that students can learn and get along with each other (rational-legal authority justification for legitimacy).

Remember the question is tell me which of these reasons you think are good reasons for why the teacher is the boss of the classroom. OK, and what do you say? (rationale for legitimacy with options)

J: #1 (traditional authority justification)

I: You mean because it is the teacher's job ... respectful?

J: Ya.

I: OK. Why did you choose that reason as a good reason for why the teacher is the boss of the classroom? (reason why good option for rationale for legitimacy)

J: Because, uh, because if you didn't have a teacher to teach, you wouldn't, when you grow up you wouldn't be very smart.

I: Why wouldn't you be very smart?

J: Because you wouldn't know anything.

I: And teachers help you to know things?

J: Ya, they teach you things, then you know them and maybe you could be a teacher when you grow up.

I: Now I'm going to ask you why you didn't choose the other reasons, one at a time.

Why didn't you choose #2, "because the teacher cares ..."? (reason why not good option for rationale for legitimacy)

J: Because I thought that #1 (traditional authority justification) was better.

I: It was the best reason?

J: Ya, it was the best reason.

I: Now, I said umm good reasons, we're going to pick the best reason a little bit later. Now do you think any of those 2, 3 or 4 are good reasons? You don't only have to pick one. You could pick a couple; you could pick all of them. (rationale for legitimacy with options)

J: I think #3 (rational-expert authority justification) too.

I: Ahmm, that's another good reason?

J: Ya.

I: Any other good reasons between #2 and #4 or you don't think they are good reasons? (rationale for legitimacy with options)

J: And I guess #4 (rational-legal authority justification) too.

I: But you don't think #3?

J: #2 (charismatic authority justification).

I: #2. Ya, you don't think #2

J: Ya (right).

I: OK. Let's go to #3 then. Why do you think "because the teacher knows more..."? Why do you think that is a good reason for why the teacher is the boss? (reason why good option for rationale for legitimacy)

J: Because if, because if the teacher didn't know all these things, then the teacher wouldn't be able to teach you and you wouldn't know.

I: OK. And #4 (rational-legal authority justification). Why did you choose this reason as a good reason for why the teacher is the boss of the classroom--"because ... rules ..."? (reason why rationale for legitimacy)

J: So if the teacher doesn't teach teach them, teach them, they won't, they won't be nice people when they grow up.

I: If they don't teach what?

J: Teach them to be nice to other children in the classroom, they

won't be nice when they grow up to other adults.

I: OK. And let's go to #3, oh I mean #2 (charismatic authority justification). Why didn't you choose "because the teacher cares ... " as a good reason for why the teacher is the boss of the classroom? (reason why not good option for rationale for legitimacy)

J: Because if, if a, sometimes when the teacher gets mad at you, you don't think that the teacher cares. You don't think that the teacher cares. So that's why.

I: Ahmm.

J: Because like when the teacher gets mad at you, you don't think they care.

I: Because people that care don't get mad at you?

J: No. Well, kids just think that.

I: Oh. I see. So is that what you think because I want to know what you think?

J: Sometimes, sometimes.

I: OK. Let's go to the next one. If you could only choose one reason which one do you think is the best one for why the teacher is the boss of the classroom? Which is the best of all the ones you picked? (best option for rationale for legitimacy)

J: "because the teacher's job ... " (#1, traditional authority justification)

I: OK. Why did you choose that reason as the best reason for why the teacher is the boss of the classroom? (reason why best option for rationale for legitimacy)

J: Ahh, because it's the teacher's job.

I: Ahmm?

J: And the teacher is the boss of the classroom, so the teacher could teach you to be hardworking and teach you to cooperative and respect people.

I: So that's the most important things the teacher can teach you I guess?

J: Yes.

I: I see. OK. We're going onto the next one. We're looking at

the same statements though. I'm going to tell you four possible reasons for why students should do what the teacher tells them to do and I want you to tell me which of these reasons are good reasons. So how many can you pick? There's four reasons.

J: You can pick all four if you want.

I: That's right. Good. So now it's for why students should do what the teacher tells them to do, so it's a little bit different.

I: First #1 "because it's the teacher's job ... " (traditional authority justification for obedience). These are the same reasons;

J: Oh.

I: #2 "because the teacher cares ... " (charismatic authority justification for obedience);

#3 "because the teacher knows more ... " (rational-expert authority justification for obedience),
and finally; #4 "because ... rules ... " (rational-legal authority justification for obedience).

Which are good reasons for why you should do what the teacher tells you to do? (rationale for obedience with options)

J: #3 (rational-expert authority justification).

I: Is that the only good reason?

J: I guess ...

I: You tell me which you think are good reasons.

J: #3 (rational-expert authority justification).

I: Ahmm.

J: And #1 (traditional authority justification) ... and #4 (rational-legal authority justification).

I: So the same reasons as before.

J: Yes.

I: OK. I'm going to ask you each one and why you think they are good reasons. Why did you choose #1 "because the teacher's job ... "? Why did you choose that as a reason for why students should do what the teacher tells them to do? (reason why good options for rationale for obedience)

J: Because, if, because if they don't do what the teacher tells them to do, they won't, they won't be, they won't get a good job,

because they won't be hardworking, they won't be cooperative and they won't be respectful, because they have to be respectful to get a job.

I: So those are important things for getting a job later?

J: Yes.

I: OK. #3. Why did you choose #3 "because the teacher knows more ..."? Why is that a good reason? (reason why good options for rationale for obedience)

J: Because if you didn't listen to the teacher then you wouldn't know anything about math or science or reading, you wouldn't know how to read; you wouldn't know how to sing, and you wouldn't, you wouldn't, the teacher wouldn't let you have physed.

I: Ohh. #4. Why did you choose this as a good reason for why students should do what the teacher tells them to do, "because ... rules ..."? (reason why good option for rationale for obedience)

J: Because if the teacher doesn't, because if they don't listen to the teacher then their teacher won't be able to teach them.

I: So you have to follow rules in order to learn?

J: Ya.

I: Now. If you could only choose one reason, which is the best reason for why students should do what the teacher tells them to do? (best option for rationale for obedience)

J: Umm, I guess ... #1 (traditional authority justification).

I: So that's that best reason as before?

J: Ya.

I: OK. Why did you choose that reason as the best reason for why students should do what the teach tells them to do? (reason why best option for rationale for obedience)

J: Because it's the teacher is the teacher and that's about ... The teacher is the teacher and you have to listen to the teacher.

I: OK. Now we're onto the second part. Now these are questions related to the observations. Remember when I was in you classroom observing?

J: Ya.

I: And I told you I was writing down teacher directions and your

reactions or behavior after the directions?

J: Ya.

I: What I did was I chose two different situations in which the teacher gave a direction and I observed your behavior. And the two times I picked were when you didn't do what the teacher told you to do. Now these are questions about the situations. OK?

The first one is:

During math class the Thursday before last, the teacher taught a lesson on volume equals length times width times height. Do you remember that?

J: Ya.

I: The teacher said "In some cases you have to use one layer of the formula and in other cases you have to use several layers of the formula." When you did the assignment, you did not write the formula on any of the questions.

Now the first question:

Do you think it is all right for the teacher to say "In some cases ... formula"? (evaluation of legitimacy/illegitimacy)

J: Ya.

I: How come you think it's OK for the teacher to say that? (rationale for legitimacy)

J: Because, I guess the teacher's just the boss, that's the only thing. The teacher's the boss, so that's the only thing. And whatever the teacher says goes.

I: OK. Should students do what the teacher tells them to do when the teacher says, "In some cases ... formula"? (evaluation of obedience/disobedience)

J: Yes.

I: Why should students do what the teacher tells them to do when the teacher says, "In some cases ... formula"? (rationale for obedience)

J: Because, ... if they don't, then the question will come out wrong.

I: OK. Why didn't you do what the teacher told you to do when the teacher said, "In some cases ... formula"? You didn't write the formula. Why didn't you do that? (rationale for disobeying the observation-based teacher command)

J: Because if you write the formula, it takes longer to write it than if you just didn't write it.

I: Ahmm?

J: And that's it.

I: OK. We're onto the next one:

During science class on Monday, the teacher told the class that when everyone is quiet, he will start the group presentations on energy conservation. Do you remember that?

J: (he nodded his head "yes")

I: You continued to talk with the other students beside you. The teacher said, "Attention, guys at the back." You looked up at the teacher and continued to talk to the other students.

First question:

Do you think it is all right for the teacher to say, "Attention, guys at the back"? (evaluation of legitimacy/illegitimacy)

J: Ya.

I: How come it is all right for the teacher to say, "Attention, guys at the back"? (rationale for legitimacy)

J: So the class won't be interrupted.

I: OK. Why is that important?

J: Because if the class is interrupted, then time will be wasted.

I: OK. Any other reason?

J: No.

I: Should students do what the teacher tells them to do when the teacher says, "Attention, guys at the back"? (evaluation of obedience/disobedience)

J: Ya.

I: Why should students do what the teacher tells them to do when the teacher says, "Attention, guys at the back"? (rationale for obedience)

J: Because if they don't then the other class will get mad because they won't be able to have science.

I: Ahmm?

J: And that's it. That's all.

I: OK. Why didn't you do what the teacher told you to do when the teacher said, "Attention, guys at the back"? Instead of looking up at the board and stop talking, you continued to talk. Why didn't you do what the teacher told you to do? (rationale for disobeying the observation-based teacher command)

J: Because I was in the middle of a conversation.

I: OK. Any other reason?

J: No.

Appendix M

Sample Transcription of the Story Vignette Related Interview

Student: John

I: Today is April 27 and this is an interview with John on story vignettes. OK, the first vignette. What I am going to do is read you a little situation and then I'm going to ask you a set of questions. So in total I'm going to be reading you four situations and asking you four sets of questions.

The first situation is:

While the other students were working on their science assignment, Peter was tapping his pencil on his desk. Mrs. Curran, the teacher said, "Peter, stop tapping your pencil. The other students can't concentrate on their assignment."

First question:

Do you think it is all right for the teacher to say, "Peter, stop tapping your pencil. The other students can't concentrate on their assignment"? (evaluation of legitimacy/illegitimacy)

J: Yes.

I: Why do you think that it's OK for the teacher to say "Peter, stop tapping your pencil ... assignment"? (rationale for legitimacy)

J: Because the other students wouldn't be able to work if there was too much noise and the teacher is the boss.

I: Should the student, Peter, do what the teacher tells him to do when the teacher says, "Peter, stop tapping your pencil ... assignment"? (evaluation of obedience/disobedience)

J: Yes.

I: Why should Peter do what the teacher tells him to do when she says, "Peter, stop tapping your pencil ... assignment"? (rationale for obedience)

J: Because he's supposed to listen to the teacher.

I: OK. Why is he supposed to listen to the teacher? (rationale for obedience)

J: Because if he doesn't, he won't get good grades on his report card for directions and for following directions and regulations and rules.

I: Any other reason why Peter should do what the teacher tells him to do and stop tapping his pencil? (rationale for obedience)

J: No.

I: Now we're going onto the next story. The next story is, oh, actually we have some questions after this:
What would you say if you were the teacher and Peter was tapping his pencil? (child-created teacher command)

J: I would say, "Stop tapping your pencil or else I'll make you stay after school."

I: Why would you say "Stop tapping your pencil or else I'll make you stay after school"? (rationale for the child-created teacher command)

J: Because then they'd would be disturbing other students and if they weren't finished maybe they would have to stay after school.

I: Would it be all right for you as the teacher to say, "Stop tapping ... after school"? (evaluation of legitimacy/illegitimacy)

J: Yes.

I: OK. Why would it be all right for you as the teacher to say, "Stop tapping ... after school"? (rationale for legitimacy)

J: Because if I were the teacher, I would be the boss.

I: Uhhh. And it's OK for the boss to what? (rationale for legitimacy)

J: Ya. To tell the kids what to do.

I: Should the student, Peter, do what you as the teacher tell him to do, when you say, "Stop tapping ... after school"? (evaluation of obedience/disobedience)

J: Yes.

I: Why should the student do what you as the teacher tell him to do, when you say, "Stop tapping ... after school"? (rationale for obedience)

J: Because if he doesn't then he'll have to stay after school.

I: Is there any reason why he should do what you tell him to do when you tell him/? (rationale for obedience)

J: Ya. Because if, you're supposed to listen to what the teacher says and if you don't you just get into big trouble.

I: OK. Next story vignette:

Tom was hitting another student during writing class. Mrs. Mallow, the teacher, said, "Tom stop hitting Michael. Hitting is not allowed in our classroom."

First question:

Do you think it is all right for the teacher to say, "Tom stop hitting ... our classroom"? (evaluation of legitimacy/illegitimacy)

J: Because if you hit Michael/

I: Are you saying it is all right or not all right? (evaluation of legitimacy/illegitimacy)

J: It's not all right. Because if you hit Michael, if he gets hurt, then you'll be in big trouble.

I: OK. Is it all right for the teacher to say "Tom stop hitting ... our classroom"? (evaluation of legitimacy/illegitimacy)

J: Yes.

I: And you're saying. (rationale for legitimacy)

J: Because if you hit him really hard and he gets hurt, then you'd be in trouble.

I: Any other reason why? (rationale for legitimacy)

J: No, not really.

I: Should the student, Tom, do what the teacher tells him to do, when the teacher says, "Tom stop hitting ... our classroom"? (evaluation of obedience/disobedience)

J: Yes.

I: Why should Tom do what the teacher tells him to do when the teacher says, "Tom stop hitting ... our classroom"? (rationale for obedience)

J: Because if he doesn't, he'll be in big trouble.

I: We have another set of questions here. Let's see now. What would you say if you were the teacher and Tom was hitting Michael? (child-created teacher command)

J: I would say, "Stop that or I'll or I'll hit you."

I: Why would you say, "Stop that or I'll hit you"? (rationale for the child-created teacher command)

J: Because it's not fair if you hit someone and if you hit them back, then they get the same feeling that, the other person got.

I: OK. Would it be all right for you as the teacher to say, "Stop hitting him or I'll hit you"? (evaluation of legitimacy/illegitimacy)

J: Ya, I guess so.

I: Why would it be all right for you as the teacher to say "Stop that or I'll hit you"? (rationale for legitimacy)

J: Because I'm the teacher and I say, and whatever I say goes.

I: Should the student, Peter, do what you as the teacher tell him to do when you say "Stop hitting him or I'll hit you"? (evaluation of obedience/disobedience)

J: Yes.

I: Why should Tom do what you as the teacher tell him to do when you say, "Tom stop hitting him or I'll hit you"? (rationale for obedience)

J: Because I'm the teacher.

I: And therefore what? (rationale for obedience)

J: And therefore he has to listen to me.

I: OK. We're onto the next one.
Mrs. Campbell, the teacher, told Gerry and the rest of the class, "Share the art materials with students in your group."

First question:

Do you think it is all right for the teacher to say, "Share the art materials ... your group"? (evaluation of legitimacy/illegitimacy)

J: Yes.

I: Why is it OK for the teacher to say, "Share the art materials ... your group"? (rationale for legitimacy)

J: Because if you didn't share the art materials, then other people wouldn't get any and you would have very, you would have lots.

I: So that's why it's OK for the teacher to say that? (rationale for legitimacy)

J: Yes.

I: Should the student do what the teacher tells him to do when she says, "Share the art materials ... your group"? (evaluation of obedience/disobedience)

J: Because/

I: You are saying "yes" or "no" the student should do what the teacher tells him to do/? (evaluation of obedience/disobedience)

J: Yes.

I: Why should the student do what the teacher tells him to do when the teacher says, "Share the art materials ... your group"? (rationale for obedience)

J: Because if you don't then the other people won't get any and you'll just get a whole bunch.

I: OK. And so that's why they should do what the teacher tells them to do? (rationale for obedience)

J: Ya.

I: Next one:

Mrs. Simms, the teacher, told John and the rest of the class, "Watch closely while I show you the steps to solve these kinds of math problems."

First question:

Do you think it is all right for the teacher to say, "Watch closely while I show you the steps to solve these kinds of math problems"? (evaluation of legitimacy/illegitimacy)

J: Yes.

I: How come it is all right for the teacher to say, "Watch closely ... math problems"? (rationale for legitimacy)

J: Because if you don't watch closely then you won't know how to do it and if you don't know how to do that you won't get a good job.

I: Should the student do what the teacher tells him to do when the teacher says, "Watch closely ... math problems"? (evaluation of obedience/disobedience)

J: Yes.

I: Why should the student do what the teacher tells him to do when the teacher says, "Watch closely ... math problems"? (rationale for obedience)

J: Because if they, if they don't they might fail because they won't know how to do any of the math.

I: So that's why they should do what the teacher tells them to do/? (rationale for obedience)

J: Ya.

I: Any other reason? (rationale for obedience)

J: No.

Appendix N

Sample Transcription of the ObservationsObservation #1

Student: John Date: April 19, 1988
 Length of Observation: 1 hour, 10 minutes (10:50 to 12:00)
 Setting: classroom
 Group Size: whole class--class tasks
 Academic Subject: math
 Lesson Activity: volume--review perimeter and area

TEACHER COMMANDS	STUDENT RESPONSES
- "I'll give you a minute to get your math books out."	- John does not take his book out.
- "Have you got your text, John?"	- John takes his math book out.
- "John, what else do we have to do?"	- "We have to measure the sides."
- "Would you sit down please, John."	- "How?", John replies, and keeps sitting on the back rest of his chair.
- "On the seat of the chair."	- John sits on the seat of his chair.
- "What could we measure inside the box?"	- "Air."
- "Hands please, if you have a comment."	- John was talking, but stopped.
- "What might be easier than using blocks?"	- John yells out, "The width and the length, ... times it." (no hand).
- "John, I think you have something to share. Would you tell us please?"	- "You got to do the other side too."
- "Look with your eyes, which is the greater, the height or the width?"	- John looks at the box and responds, "Width." (no hand)
- "Hands please."	- John yells out, "Twenty." (no

TEACHER COMMANDS

STUDENT RESPONSES

- | TEACHER COMMANDS | STUDENT RESPONSES |
|---|--|
| | hand). |
| - "What do you do then, Mike?
John, not you." | - John stops calling out the answer. |
| - "John, you could probably learn better if your eyeballs could see the board" (i.e., "Sit properly facing the board.") | - John sits up properly on his chair and looks toward the board. |
| - "Yes, John?" (i.e., "What do you want?") | - "I know an easier way." |
| - "Show me (the easier way)." | - John explains his easier way. |
| - "Now let's do some practicing." | - John starts the questions. |
| - "I would like you to do page 274 and page 275." | - John starts the questions and finishes both pages by the end of the class. |
| - "In some, you have to use one layer and others you have to use several layers in the formula." (i.e., $v = l \times w \times h$) | - John completes the questions, but does not include the formula steps. |
| - ("What do you do for #3?", John asks.) "Count the number of halves." | - "Oh.", John replies and then counts the number of halves. |
| - "John, I said write the formula $v = l \times w \times h$ and do the three steps." | - John changes his answers to include the formula steps. |
| - "Look at the box. How many boxes are there?" | - John looks at the box and says, "six." |
| - "You tell me what you write first." | - " $v = l \times w \times h$ " (correct answer) |
| - "Let's do page 276, since we have seventeen minutes left, then that's the end of the volume unit." | - John starts the new assignment and finishes it. |
| - "Squat down (John)." (The teacher explains meter cubed.) | - John squats. |
| - "You're interrupting (John)." | - John keeps trying to talk with |

TEACHER COMMANDS

STUDENT RESPONSES

I'm trying to explain something (to another student)."	the teacher.
-"Hold it (John)." (i.e., "Hold your question until I'm finished.")	-John keeps trying to talk with the teacher.
-"When you get to questions on dimensions, grade 4, here are the dimensions of the room. Use that information."	-John used the dimension information for the appropriate questions.
-"You're interrupting, John."	-"OK.", John responds, then stops talking.
-"Hang on. Raise your hand." (i.e., at your desk).	-John sits down but does not raise his hand before he asks the question again.
-"Just a minute. I don't need four people (talking at once)."	-John stops talking.
-"John, go sit down please."	-John does not sit down.
-"Sit down. Go sit down (John)."	-John sits down and gets up within ten seconds.
-"OK, that's enough. Now go sit down."	-John gets out of his chair.
-"Sit down John."	-John walks around the classroom.
-"Everyone can go after I tell one joke."	-John leaves the classroom after the teacher tells one joke.

Observation #2

Student: John Date: April 21, 1988
 Length of Observation: 1 hour, 35 minutes (8:55 to 10:30)
 Setting: classroom
 Group Size: whole class--class tasks
 Academic Subject: opening exercises and language arts
 Lesson Activity: Chonook Readers--silent reading, direct teacher reading instruction (DRTA) and workbook assignment

TEACHER COMMANDS

STUDENT RESPONSES

- | | |
|--|--|
| - "Let's go to class, John." (i.e., The bell had already rung and students should be in the classroom.) | - John returns to the classroom. |
| - "Write down the names of absent students and you can take it down to the office." | - John takes out a piece of paper, writes down the names, and takes it down to the office when the teacher tells him to. |
| - "During the time between 'O'Canada' and the announcements, I want you to read your books, so take them out." | - John was walking around the classroom with a piece of paper (looking to see which students were absent). |
| - "Attention boys back there, John." (i.e., "Stop talking and pay attention to the lesson at the board.") | - John stops talking, turns around to face the teacher and says, "What?" |
| - "Get your Chonook books out rather than your USSR books." | - John does not take his book out. |
| - "John, get your Chonook book out first." | - John does not get the book out. |
| - "Listen carefully to the announcements." | - John looks around the room and does not talk. |
| - "John, you may hurry and take that (absentee slip) to the office and come back quickly." | - John leaves the classroom with list of absent students, goes to the office and returns soon after. |
| - "Give me your Chonook book and USSR. Page 144." | - John takes out his Chonook book, turns to page 144 and looks at (reads?) the pages. |

TEACHER COMMANDS	STUDENT RESPONSES
-"Yes." (i.e., "Yes John, you make go to the washroom.")	-John walks out of the classroom.
-"John, just stay at your desk."	-John responds, "I'll be too far away. I can't hear." Then, he walks toward the reading group.
-"OK, just sit here."	-John sits down where the teacher pointed.
-"Looking at the title and the picture, can you tell what the story is about?"	-John and the rest of the class yell, "Worms or bait." (no hands required)
-"Georgina is speaking (John, so stop talking)."	-John stops calling out the answer.
-"Can bait be something besides worms?"	-John calls out. (no hands required)
-"Could they be burglars?"	-John calls out, "Yes." with the rest of the class. (no hands required)
-"What clues give you the feel—they are not burglars?"	-"They're in pyjamas." (no hands required)
-"How can you tell the dog is awake."	-John and the rest of the class yell, "His eyes are open." (no hands required)
-"Hands please."	-John puts up his hand.
-"Listen and put that down (John)."	-John puts down the meter stick and sits up, then looks in the book case, then lies down.
-"Is it (the pick-up truck) like my truck?"	-John and the class yell, "Yes." (no hands required)
-"Who says 'yes'?"	-John puts up his hand. (hands are required)
-"Have you seen my truck?"	-John and the class say, "Yes." (no hands required)
-"How many would work for a cent a piece (i.e., per worm)?"	-John does not put his hand up.
-"John, you're interrupting."	-John stops calling out

TEACHER COMMANDS

STUDENT RESPONSES

TEACHER COMMANDS	STUDENT RESPONSES
	responses.
- "Yes (what do you want John)?"	- John replies, "I get a dollar a day for walking a dog."
- "Why is he shivering?"	- John and the class yell, "He's cold." (no hands required)
- "John, here's your book. Now sit down and get with it." (i.e., "Pay attention.")	- John sits down, takes his book and looks at it.
- "Would you read on from there John?"	- John responds, "Ahh, ... OK, from where?"
- (Read on from) "The pickers ... down there."	- John starts reading, "The pickers ..."
- "Carry on (reading, John)."	- John continues reading.
- "Be ready, John." (i.e., "Follow along with us so you can read after I have finished.")	- "Yes", John replies. John looks at the book while the teacher is reading.
- "Shh." (i.e., "John you are interrupting another student's reading. Stop interrupting.")	- John stops correcting the student's reading.
- "You're interrupting." (i.e., "Stop interrupting.")	- John stops calling out answers while the teacher was asking a question.
- "OK (read can read now John)."	- While lying down, John started to read.
- "Sit up first and read like you mean it."	- John sat up and started reading again.
- "Quiet (John, another student answering)."	- John stopped calling out an answer.
- "Yes (John you may answer)?"	- "What if the lady bugs die? What would happen to the aphids?"
- "I'd like you to go back (to your desks) and take out your workbooks."	- John keeps sitting on the floor, then plays with a meter stick and talks with another student.

TEACHER COMMANDS	STUDENT RESPONSES
-(John) quiet. Sit down so everyone can work."	-John stops talking and returns to his desk.
-(Do) page 52, 53 and 54."	-John looks around on his desk for his workbook.
-Where's your workbook (John)?"	-"I can't find it."
-"Are you going to get started John?"	-John continues looking, then finds his workbook.
-"OK, go ahead (and work, John). You can work over here, if Jeff needs help."	-John flips through his workbook and starts working.
-"No, no. I asked you to work over here. You work at your book and he works on his page and if he has any questions you can help him."	-John moves over beside Jeff, sits down, opens his workbook and starts reading out loud from workbook, Jeff.
-"Yes." (i.e., "John, you can go to the washroom.")	-John walks out of the classroom.
-"Come on (John). I can't start the three minutes until you get busy." (i.e., After three minutes of work, you can go to the washroom.)	-John sits down, talks with Jeff, but does not look at the workbooks. (i.e., unrelated talk)
-"Have you done any work yet, (John)? Let's see it."	-John does to his desk and shows the teacher his workbook.
-"Do this question first (then you can go to the washroom)."	-John starts talking with Jeff and does not do the question.
-"Grade 4, the discussion is getting too loud. Can you turn it down please?"	-John continues to talk with Jeff at the same level of loudness.
-"Yes, (John what do you want)?"	-John replies, "He (i.e., another student) threw my pen and now I have nothing to write with."
-"So far, five minutes guys." (i.e., "You have to stay in for recess for five minutes for being noisy and not working. So, keep quiet and start	-John stops talking and looks at his workbook.

TEACHER COMMANDS

STUDENT RESPONSES

working.")

- "No (you can't go to the washroom now)."

- "Why?" You said I could go when I finished this (the question).
John doesn't go to the washroom.

- "You can't because you were fooling around."

- "I have to go bad." John stays at his desk.

- "Jeff and John, that (keeping on talking and not working) will cost another five (minutes in at recess). (So keep quiet and start working.)"

- John and Jeff continue to talk.

- "Get started now (John)."

- John stops talking and looks at his workbook.

- "Yes ('thought' is another word for 'meditated')."

- John replies, "OK." Then, he returns to his desk and starts writing.

- "OK gang. Let's get our books closed up and put away."

- John walks around the classroom.

- "John and Jeff you come with me and you can go out five minutes after recess starts."

- John walks out of the classroom with the teacher.

Observation #3

Student: John Date: April 25, 1988
 Length of Observation: 1 hour, 15 minutes (12:55 to 2:10)
 Setting: classroom
 Group Size: whole class--class tasks
 Academic Subject: science
 Lesson Activity: energy conservation--discussion of group ideas
 and group work

TEACHER COMMANDS	STUDENT RESPONSES
- "Take your coat off."	- John takes his coat off.
- "No fighting you two." (i.e., John and Jason)	- John and Jason did not fight during science class.
- "Do you understand that (i.e., no fighting)?"	- "Yes.", John replies.
- "Now go sit down."	- John walks around the classroom.
- "John, sit down."	- "I have to go take the slip to the office.", John responds, still standing.
- "Not now."	- John sits down.
- "Attention (to the announce- ments)."	- John sits down and does not talk.
- "Quickly John (take the list of absent students to the office)."	- John leaves the classroom and returns soon after.
- "Anybody that interrupts is in trouble."	- John does not talk.
- "When we have complete silence we will start."	- John does not talk, but looks toward the student who is presenting his group's science project on energy conservation.
- "Attention, guys at the back."	- John looks up at the teacher, then continues to talk to another student.
- "Hold it, (talk) one at a time."	- John was calling out his opinion while Nicole was supposed to be answering the question, but he stopped.

TEACHER COMMANDS

STUDENT RESPONSES

- | | |
|--|--|
| - "I want to talk to you about the group's ideas and listen." | - John was writing, looking up in the direction of the blackboard and talking to another student. |
| - "The other groups, remember about what I just said about complete sentences." (i.e., capitals and periods) | - John wrote conservation ideas in complete sentences. |
| - "You may now very quietly move into your groups and start working." | - "John was already in his group and started discussing the teacher's directions with the students in his group. |
| - "Keep discussion on topic and in a civilized voice." | - "John was discussing with the group, the teacher's directions, but was talking loudly. |
| - "First do a rough copy, then each of you copy the report with pen in your notebook." | - John and his group talked about topics other than the energy conservation assignment. |
| - "Let's get cracking (John's group)." | - John starts talking with his group on energy conservation tips. |
| - "You're on topic John, but a little noisy." | - "OK", John replies and stops talking for a second, then continues to talk in a loud voice. |
| - "This will be the last class for this assignment, so stay on task." | - John and his group were still talking about unrelated topics, for example, phone numbers. |
| - "Drop it." (i.e., "Sit properly in your chair.") | - John keeps talking while sitting on the back rest of his chair. |
| - "Come on, now." (i.e., "Sit properly in your chair.") | - John sits on the seat of his chair. |
| - "John that's too noisy." | - John keeps talking loudly. |
| - "That student is the chairperson because he has more votes." | - John responded, "You said that everyone had to vote for the group chairperson." |
| - "No I didn't (say that everybody had to vote for the group chairperson)." | - "Yes you did.", John replied. |

TEACHER COMMANDS	STUDENT RESPONSES
-"What you can do is when you (your group) are presenting you can explain things."	-"OK.", John replied.
-"If this nonsense (arguing) continues, you will have to do it by yourselves (John's group)."	-John listens, then continues talking about energy conservation ideas and does not argue.
-"(John's group) get together and produce one paper."	-John continues talking about energy conservation ideas and does not argue.
-"John, sit down please."	-"It doesn't make sense.", John responds, and keeps standing beside the teacher.
-"Sit down and give me a minute to explain."	-John sits down.
-"If you will just put down your pencils and pens, and listen for a minute (class)."	-John looks at the teacher and than around the room.
-"Are you listening (John)?" (i.e., "Listen.")	-John stops talking.
-"What's another type of energy?"	-John calls out, "Geothermal energy." (hands required)
-"Hands please."	-John stops calling out and puts his hand up.
-"Yes (John, what is your comment)?"	-"Geothermal energy.", John replies.
-"Listen. Don't talk. Just listen."	-John stops talking and calling out answers.
-"Now work in your groups of two on paragraphs about different kinds of energy."	-John does.
-"You stay with me on the way to recess." (i.e., Because John reported that Jason had threatened to beat him up at recess.)	-"OK.", John replies and does stay with the teacher on the way to recess.
-"I bet if you stop talking	-"But they always start it."

TEACHER COMMANDS	STUDENT RESPONSES
(John), there would be less arguments."	John responds, and keeps talking.
-"Put them away." (i.e., two things he found under a student's desk.)	-John puts them in his book bag.
-John, now leave (the classroom for recess)."	-"He's calling me names.", John replies, and does not leave the classroom.
-"Leave (the classroom for recess)."	-"He's calling me names.", John replies again, and still does not leave the classroom.
-"No recess for you (John)."	-John walks out of the classroom guided by the teacher.
-"John, stay in for recess for five minutes."	-"One minute.", John responds.
-"Get your jacket and I'll show you where you can stand for/"	-John gets his jacket and tries to convince the teacher to change the detention to only one minute.
-"I'm not changing my mind."	-"Only one minute.", John repeats.

Observation #4

Student: John Date: April 26, 1988
 Length of Observation: 30 minutes (11:30 to 12:00)
 Setting: classroom
 Group Size: whole class--class task
 Academic Subject: math
 Lesson Activity: multiplication facts speed quiz and
 addition of two multi-digit numbers

TEACHER COMMANDS

STUDENT RESPONSES

- "Before we start, I'll do one example with you." (i.e., The students should be in their seats facing the teacher.)	- John is standing at the teacher's desk, looking around.
- "Sit down please (John)."	- John does not move.
- "Sit and watch (John)."	- John walks toward his desk and stops.
- "John, you too (sit and watch)."	- John returns to his desk and looks toward the teacher.
- "If you are not sure how to do these (problems), you should pay extra attention."	- John looks toward the board and the teacher solving the problem.
- "(What is) 8 plus nothing?"	- "8.", John calls out with the rest of the class. (no hands required)
- "(What is) 7 plus 1?"	- "8.", John calls out. (no hands required)
"(What is) 7 plus 0?"	- "7.", John calls out. (no hands required)
- "(What is) 1 plus 0?"	- "1.", John calls out. (no hands required)
- "(What is) 8?"	- "8.", John calls out. (no hands required)
- "OK, get a pencil and let's see how quickly you can do this sheet (multiplication facts speed quiz) and put your name on your paper."	- John walks to the cloakroom, gets a paper (multiplication facts answer sheet), returns to his desk and takes his pen out, and uses the answer sheet to help him. He does not put

TEACHER COMMANDS

STUDENT RESPONSES

-
- his name on his paper.
- "As of now, your name should be on it."
- "John writes his name on the paper."
- ("Can I go to the washroom please?", John asks.) "Sit down."
- "John sits down."
- ("Can I go now, he's back now?", John asks.) "OK."
- "John leaves the classroom for the washroom."
- "Are you done yours (speed quiz, John)?"
- "Yes.", John replies.
- "I'll take it (speed quiz)."
- "John gives the sheet to the teacher."
- "Grade 4, make sure if you have taken the second test to put your name on it and give it to me."
- "John did not take the second test so he didn't put his name on it."
- "Take it (a message) to Mrs. Robinson."
- "OK.", John replies, then walks out of the classroom.

Appendix O

Alternative Justification Categories Regarding Rationale for
Legitimacy and Obedience

ACT-ORIENTATION

Avoidance Orientation (AO)

- to avoid punishment/trouble
- to avoid mistakes
- to avoid poor grades/failing
- to avoid homework
- to avoid homework for others
- to avoid detention
- to avoid getting behind
- to avoid not learning/avoid being confused
- to avoid reteaching
- to avoid extra work
- to avoid spread of problem
- to avoid not getting a good job
- to avoid punishment of the teacher
- to avoid having to ask for help again and again

Approach Orientation (PO)

- to learn
- to get good grades
- to finish work
- to get a good job when you are older

Conservation of Resources (CR)

- to save money/prevent waste of money
- to save materials/prevent waste of materials
- to save time/prevent waste of time

Others' Welfare (OW)

- to prevent harm
- to avoid giving other students homework
- to avoid bothering or confusing the teacher or other students

Appeal to Fairness (AF)

- to be fair/avoid being unfair

Miscellaneous (M)

- kids aren't responsible enough
- to check student's knowledge of subject
- to check whether student is paying attention

PHYSICAL ATTRIBUTES

Age Orientation (GO)

- the teacher is older/the elder
- students are suppose to respect their elders

Appendix P

The Children's Specific Legitimate Authority Justifications
for Legitimacy and Obedience

Traditional Legitimate Authority Justifications

- The teacher wants you to get more work done.
- The teacher is the boss of the classroom and the of students.
- The teacher is in charge or in control.
- The teacher is in authority.
- The teacher is the head of the class.
- The teacher can tell students what to do.
- The teacher can say what he or she wants.
- The teacher can do anything he or she wants.
- Whatever the teacher says goes.
- Teachers got to teach the kids.
- Teachers are supposed to be teaching us.
- It's the teacher's job.
- The teacher is the teacher.
- Students are supposed to listen to the teacher.
- Students are supposed to obey the teacher.
- Students should do what the teacher tells them to do.
- Students are supposed to work.
- Students got to get their work done.
- Students have to concentrate on their work.

Rational-legal Legitimate Authority Justifications

- Because it's a rule.
- You're supposed to follow rules in the classroom.

Charismatic Legitimate Authority Justifications

- The teacher wants the best for students.
- The teacher wants students to get a good education.
- The teacher wants students to learn.
- The teacher wants students to learn how to share.
- The teacher wants students to learn about music.
- The teacher doesn't want students annoying other students while they're trying to work.

Rational-expert Legitimate Authority Justifications

- The teacher knows better (than students).
- The teacher has got a higher education (than students).
- The teacher has got more education than students.
- The teacher has been in school longer than students.
- The teacher knows what the teacher is talking about.
- The teacher teaches students work, stuff that students can learn.
- The teacher knows what to do and all that because teachers have taken a class or something like that.
- The teacher has taken a course.
- The teacher teaches you.
- The teacher has experience in teaching.

Appendix Q

The Incidents Surrounding the Observation-Based Teacher Commands

Student: John

(1) Academic Related Instruction

(Tuesday, April 19, 1988)

During math class the Tuesday before last, the teacher taught a lesson on volume equals length times width times height. The teacher said that when you do the math assignment, "In some cases you have to use one layer of the formula and in others you have to use several layers in the formula." When you did the assignment, you did not write the formula on any of the questions.

(2) Academic Related Deviance-imputation

(Monday, April 25, 1988)

During science class on Monday, the teacher told the class that when everyone is quiet he will start the group presentations on energy conservation. You continued to talk with students beside you. The teacher said, "Attention, guys at the back." You looked up at the teacher, and continued to talk to other students.

Student: Fred

(1) Academic Related Instruction

(Thursday, April 28, 1988)

During language arts class on Thursday, you handed in some of your work to be marked by the teacher. The teacher said, "OK,

I'll look at it. You can get back to work." You returned to your seat and looked around the classroom and then played with your baseball glove.

(2) Academic Related Deviance-imputation

(Tuesday, April 26, 1988)

During music class on Tuesday, the teacher was teaching a lesson on how to write musical scales. You were looking around the classroom. The teacher said, "Fred, it's to your advantage to pay attention." You looked over at another student's sheet rather than at the teacher and the board where the lesson was being presented.

Student: Morgan

(1) Academic Related Instruction

(Monday, April 18, 1988)

Just before "O'Canada" and the announcements the Monday before last, the teacher said, "Carl, get to your desk and Morgan also." You walked over to a group of students and talked with them.

(2) Academic Related Deviance-imputation

(Friday, April 22, 1988)

On the Friday before last, the teacher had finished the lesson on map reading, for example, the directions north, south, east and west. Ten minutes after the teacher assigned three map reading worksheets, you still hadn't started the sheets, rather you were talking with the student beside you. The teacher said, "Morgan,

you haven't started yet. Go and get started." You continued talking to the student, rather than starting the map reading sheets.

Student: Brad

(1) Academic Related Instruction

(Monday, April 18, 1988)

During math class on the Monday before last, the teacher had finished a lesson on division with decimals. The teacher said, "Start at question #2 and show your work." You got out of your seat, sharpened your pencil, walked around the classroom, then sat down, but didn't start working.

(2) Academic Related Deviance-imputation

(Wednesday, April 20, 1988)

During physed class on the Wednesday before last, the teacher was going to tell the class what was planned for physed class that day. The plan was to finish the Canada Fitness Pretest, such as half sit-ups, and play basketball. First the teacher told you and a group of boys to be quiet and you stopped talking. A few minutes later the teacher said, "Listen". You kept talking with the group of boys.

Student: Danny

(1) Academic Related Instruction

(Monday, April 25, 1988)

On Monday, after the health class lesson on food groups and your favorite foods, the teacher said, "We have four minutes left, I want you to take out your writing notebooks and work on your stories from yesterday." You talked with another student instead.

(2) Academic Related Deviance-imputation

(Friday, April 22, 1988)

During math class on the Friday before last, the teacher was teaching a lesson on rounding off decimals to the hundredths and tenths places. The teacher was ready to start the lesson, but you were talking with another student. The teacher said, "Danny, I would appreciate it if you would focus up here." You stopped talking with the other student, but you didn't look up toward the teacher and the lesson.

Student: Keith

(1) Academic Related Instruction

(Monday, April 25, 1988)

During a language arts class on Monday, the teacher was teaching a lesson on adjectives. The teacher asked the question, "What are examples of overworked adjectives?" You were looking at the board not where the lesson was and doodling in your workbook, instead of looking toward the teacher and/or putting your hand up

to answer the question.

(2) Academic Related Deviance-imputation

(Wednesday, April 27, 1988)

During math class on Wednesday, the teacher was teaching a lesson on how to add and subtract large numbers on the calculator. You were punching in the keys of the calculator with your pen. The teacher said, "Keith, I told you not to do it with a pen, it might ruin it." You replied, "It's easy this way" and kept on using your pen.