JUSTICE IN TEACHING

Nura Resh and Clara Sabbagh

Introduction: Distributive Justice in the Educational Sphere

Distributive justice encompasses the principles that 'ought' to regulate the distribution of societal resources ('goods' and 'bads') to individuals or groups in different social spheres (like, economy, health, education). Such principles derive from societies' moral infrastructure, whereby norms about 'right' and 'wrong' are set up and people are instructed to gear their behaviour accordingly. Hence, distributive justice is an embedded aspect of societal ethics. Three major, mutually exclusive, justice principles are delineated (Deutsch, 1985; Leventhal, 1980; Mikula, 1980): (1) equality – requires equal share to all in granting the resource in question, disregarding personal characteristics or performance; (2) need – demands to provide for the basic needs of people, even if this require the sacrifice of other individuals' interests; (3) equity (or meritocratic principle) – differential resource distribution based on personal effort, contribution or ability – which maintain or reinforce status differences among recipients (Sabbagh, Dar & Resh, 1994).

Education – a socially constructed and highly valued public resource is a distinct 'sphere of justice' (Sabbagh, Resh, Mor & Vanhuysse, 2006; Walzer, 1983, 1995) whereby specific, but different, justice principles guide the distribution of instrumental, relational and symbolic goods (or punishments). These goods are constantly being distributed by teachers: they test students and grade their performance; they praise or scold them for learning efforts, homework and class behaviour; accordingly, they place them in classes, ability groups and tracks; and they grant them attention, respect, affection etc. Students, on their part, evaluate the 'fairness' of these distributions and as a result feel that they were justly – or unjustly – rewarded. Hence, justice (or, in students' lingo, 'fairness') is an important component of students' school experience that have far reaching implications for their actual educational opportunities, their motivation, attitudes, affection and actual behaviour. Yet, empirical investigations about the distribution of different educational resources and the possible impact of 'just' and 'unjust' distribution on students' motivation and behaviour are relatively scarce.

In the following we shall elaborate on teachers as agents of distributive justice who are responsible for the just (i.e., morally 'right') distribution of different kinds of educational resources, reviewing research regarding these questions: what are the

L.J. Saha, A.G. Dworkin (eds.), *International Handbook of Research on Teachers and Teaching, 669–682.*

dominant principles that guide teachers' distribution preferences? How do they allocate these resources in their actual daily practice, and what are their students' evaluations of the fairness of these allocations? Specifically, we identify and discuss four distinct school resources, reviewing the research about perception of principles that normatively ought to guide distributions and evaluations of their actual just distribution: grading (student evaluation), teachers' treatment of students (attention, affection, and discipline), teaching–learning (pedagogical) practices, and the special case of radical pedagogy, and allocation of learning places (see prior review by Sabbagh et al., 2006).

Two remarks are important in this regard: First, not every educational good is distributed by teachers, especially those accruing from national policy. For example, the allocation and distribution of educational resources (finances and manpower) and decisions about the structure and composition of schools are a result of policy definitions and legal acts that are carried out by the educational administration at the national or district level. However, at the school level teachers, as well as principals and counsellors, are invested with the responsibility and authority of allocating a number of educational resources that constitute the core of students' educational experience. To the degree that schools enjoy greater autonomy and control over educational matters, the scope of goods that teachers have discretion over their allocation widens. Second, while we focus here on teachers as agents of justice distribution, it is worthwhile to note that they themselves are a significant educational 'good': 'Teachers' quality', as reflected in their professional and academic training and the degree of commitment to their task, is an asset in itself, whose distribution among students might affect their school experience and account for their academic chances. We shall touch upon this aspect in the discussion.

Students' Evaluation (Grading)

Evaluating students' performance by grading them on a standardized, hierarchical scale has become a universal feature of the teaching–learning process.[1] Grades have manifold instrumental and psycho-social effects (Deutsch, 1979; Jasso & Resh, 2002; Nisan, 1985) thus considered a highly valued, wanted reward (Green, Johnson, Kim, & Pope, in press): They serve as 'gatekeepers', providing or withholding access to classes, ability groups and tracks; they provide feedback about students' worth, effecting their self image and motivation, as well as their parents expectations; they may also effect the student's social status and popularity in the class. Grading practices have also a latent function, inculcating important values and norms of behaviour that prevail in the wider society (Deutsch, 1979; Dreeben, 1968).

By definition, grades are being allocated differentially, and their distribution is mainly guided by rules of meritocracy (rules that stress personal achievement) rather than by ascription (in-born characteristics, such as gender or race), or particularistic rules (personal relations with the teacher, kinship ties, and the like) (Hurn, 1985; Parsons, 1959). It seems however, that in grading their students, teachers combine different equitarian considerations: talent, actual performance (success in tests), invested effort, class learning behaviour, and may also apply the principle of need

(students' need of encouragement) in their considerations (Dushnik & Sabar Ben-Yehoshua, 2000; Nisan, 1985; Resh, 2006). In an investigation of high school teachers in Israel, where teachers had to attribute the weight to each of the above five principles, very few concentrated on one or two considerations only. On the average, they suggested that performance (success in tests) should weigh about 50% in the final grading, and student's effort and class learning behaviour should weigh about 19% and 14% respectively (Resh, 2006). Moreover, teachers' grade distribution may not be applied universally but rather vary in different condition according to student's capacity, gender or subject matter. For example, findings in the above mentioned study revealed that about half of the teachers tend to differentiate grading for 'weak' and 'strong' students, ascribing greater weight to effort and need in grading the 'weak' ones. Moreover, science teachers seem less performance-driven than their math teachers' colleagues: in allocating grades they attribute greater weight to effort and need, and this tendency is accentuated in the case of grading (differentially) the weak students.

With regard to gender, maybe because of the strong consensus about equal gender treatment (including, grading) there is no investigation of principle preference (the 'ought') in grading by gender. However, there is ample evidence about the actual distribution of grades, showing that girls are getting better grade than boys' who expectedly feel more deprived (e.g., Dalbert & Maes, 2002; ETS, 1977; Jasso & Resh, 2002; Resh & Dalbert, 2007, in US, Israel and Germany).

Finally, grading distribution practices may vary across socio-cultural contexts. Expanding on Nisan (1985), who found that both students and teachers in junior high schools believed that three main meritocratic distribution rules should guide grading: exhibited performance, learning effort and class participation, Sabbagh, Faheer-Aladeen, and Resh (2004) found that Israeli-Jewish high school students tend to ascribe stronger importance to meritocratic rules, while the more traditional Israeli-Druze students appear to be somewhat more inclined to believe that grading should be guided by particularistic or ascriptive rules.

Teachers' Treatment of Students

Teachers play an important role in distributing a wide range of relational rewards to their students: attention, time invested to help students and respond to their needs, practices of encouragement, and respect and affection in their mutual interactions. They also react to non-routine events (distractions, class fights and other disciplinary violation) with disapproval, or punishments (Deutsch, 1979; Dushnik & Sabar Ben-Yehoshua, 2000). Just as teachers have the authority to define standards of learning demands and bestow grades in accordance with students' academic achievements, they also define appropriate class-behaviour norms, and they have the authority to set up positive and negative relational rewards in accordance (Weiner, 2003). The appropriate principles that underlie distribution of these goods (attention, help, respect, affection) are not unequivocal, though Jencks (1988) concludes that in the absence of firm arguments for differential rewarding, teachers' attention and care ought to

be equally allocated. Thus, justice distribution in grades and in attention and care seem to be based on different principles: equity principle may guide teachers' grades assignment (granting high grades to the most talented, successful, or motivated students), but would not be justifiable in granting attention and care. These rewards are likely to be distributed more equally, or even, based on the principle of need**:** more of it would be offered to weaker students (affirmative action).

The investigation of perceptions regarding just distribution of relational rewards was mostly carried out among students, who express their views about how teachers ought to behave and how they actually do, while teachers' perspectives were hardly studied. Exploring the definitions of entitlement regarding various positive rewards among Israeli junior high students, Dar and Resh (2001) found students to be more egalitarian in the relational domain (teacher–student and peer relations) than in the academic domain. In another study, Thorkildsen, Nolen, and Fournier (1994) who examined 7–12-year-old students about their fairness perceptions of the practices teachers use to enhance learning motivation, found that most of them seem to prefer a more egalitarian distribution. They perceived practices that stress praise for excellent performance as unfair, because they harm those who are not praised and do not provide any direction for future learning. The practices considered as the most fair were those that foster motivation among all students, by encouraging 'fast learners' to attack more challenging problems (the principle of equity) and 'slow learners' to try out new ideas on how they can improve (equality–need rules).

Finally, with respect to the distribution of negative relational rewards, a study by Bear and Fink (1991) examined fifth and eighth graders' perceptions of the fairness of teachers' disciplinary practices in regard to classroom disturbance and involvement in a fight. Assuming that the latter is the more severe offence, because it is intrinsically (morally) wrong, harming and violating the rights of others, while the former, involves breaching a social convention, which is more bound to a social context and should therefore have less severe repercussions, they expected a harsher punishment for the more sever offence (fighting). The authors further assumed that judgments of fairness of a given disciplinary practice would also take into account the reputation of the transgressor as a 'well-behaved' or 'misbehaving' student. Findings confirmed both assumptions: suspension of the transgressor was perceived as fairer for fighting than for disturbing the classroom and as fairer for a past misbehaving student than for a well-behaved one. Interestingly, however, the effect of reputation on fairness judgments was stronger than the effect of severity of the infraction. Thus, disciplinary practices (negative rewards), like academic rewards (i.e., grades), were guided by a notion of equity, while the 'fair' distribution of relational goods (attention, help, care) tend to be guided by equality and need principles.

Pedagogical Practices

Pedagogical practices can be defined as the ways in which teachers choose to carry out their function to encourage learning: to promote knowledge acquisition and intellectual and personal development, as the basic pre-conditions for future successful

performance in society. Resting on philosophical and pedagogical premises about the aims of schooling, the place of children and the role of teachers in the educational process (Anderson & Tverdova, 2001), teaching practices are usually put to the fore and justified in terms of their effectiveness: the degree to which they enhance students' motivation, learning engagement, academic success and personal development. If indeed, as accepted, class practices affect opportunities to learn and personal development, then questions arise as to their just implementation in schools: which is the more appropriate ('just' and effective) pedagogy and how to make sure knowledge is justly distributed via these practices to all students (Chizhik, 1999; Dougherty, 1996; Thorkildsen et al., 1994).

Investigating what kind of justice principles should be (or actually are) applied in teaching practices, Thorkildsen (1989) examined students' perceptions regarding five classroom practices in heterogeneous classrooms: 'Acceleration' – (fits the equity rule); 'fast worker sit and wait' (equality rule); 'peer-tutoring' by fast learners (combined equality and need); 'enrichment' for fast learners (equity rule, though more egalitarian than acceleration); and 'all move on, slow ones never finish' (fits a Machiavellian rule). It was found that 'peer-tutoring' and 'enrichment' was believed to be the most just, and 'all move on, slow ones never finish' to be the least just (see also Thorkildsen, 1993). However, most students claimed that the practice of 'enrichment' was most frequently used by teachers, a gap that points to a possible source of students' sense of injustice.

Against the background of macro-social processes (mainly in the second half of last century) that affected both educational concepts and structural changes, and based on the 'child-centered', 'progressivism' premises, a host of 'pedagogies' have evolved, which rest and are justified, though indirectly, on notions of social justice, (for reviews, see, e.g., Anderson, 1995; Semel & Sadovnik, 1999; Van den Berg, 2002; Windschitl, 2002). Accordingly, children should be more active participants in the learning processes, their concerns, interests and realities of life should be taken into account in classroom practices, which will thus result in more symmetric teachers–students power relations, and both curriculum content and pedagogical practices should recognize (and respect) cultural differences, thus ensuring a more equitable distribution of 'opportunity to learn'.

'Authentic pedagogy', developed in the US by Newman, Marks, and Gamoran (1995, 1996) and implemented also by Roelofs and Terwel (1999) in Holland, is a good example of this trend. Its declared aims are (a) to provide equitable distribution of opportunities to learn for students of different backgrounds and (b) to empower school staff, parents and students. It is more radical than the classical liberal 'progressive pedagogy', explicitly directed towards the socially weak and deprived groups, whose educational advancement would contribute to a decrease of societal inequities. A model of 'productive pedagogies', that was developed by Gore (2001), Ladwig (1998), Lingard, Hayes, and Mills (2003), and Lingard, Hayes, Mills, and Christie (2003) in Queensland, Australia, is building on 'authentic pedagogy' and emphasizes 'recognition of differences' and 'supportive learning environment' as a means for enhancing social outcomes (such as social participation, active citizenship and justice), especially among the socially disadvantage students.[2]

Critical Pedagogy: Teachers As Political Agents

A more radical bent that leans on Neo-Marxist theory, conceives of teaching as a political role and explicitly argue that teaching practices should be used as a means to redress societal inequities and to achieve social justice, and the development of humanistic, critical, self-reflecting personality as the expected educational outcome (e.g., Adler & Goodman, 1986; Apple, 1979; Ayers, 2004a, 2004b; Freire, 1970; Giroux & McLaren, 1986; Hyslop-Margison, 2005; McLaren, 1989). Rather than offering a set of concrete pedagogical practices, Ayers (2004a, 2004b) argues that teaching is political because it is about the reconstruction of public schools and the achievement of equality by promoting engaged citizens who as students develop agency and (critical) reflection. In the same vein, Kroll et al. (2005) state that teachers' political role re-achieving social justice should be enhanced by means of key pedagogical principles such as inquiry and reflection, collaboration and care. These in turn, is designed to improve the academic opportunities of disadvantaged students and their future socio-economic chances in the wider society. Underscored in this framework is instruction and teacher–students' relationship as a moral obligation that should be directed to redress existing social inequities and introduce changes in the institutional structure of classrooms and schools (for a review see Hyslop-Margison, 2005) and recognize 'difference', defined along cultural and socio-economic lines (see also Connell, 1993).

'Critical Pedagogy' (also, dialogical pedagogy) developed by Paulo Freire (1970, 1986; see also Shor, 1987) and followed (at least intellectually) by scholars around the world, is the most known version of pedagogy reflecting this radical approach (e.g., see Adler & Goodman, 1986; Aloni, 1998; Apple, 1979, 1982; Giroux & McLaren, 1986; Giroux, 1988; McLaren, 1989). Its main mission is the attempt to inculcate in students the objection to culture of exploitation and oppression that characterize the capitalist system, and the aspiration for solidarity and an equal society. This should be achieved by liberating students' consciousness through the construction of solidary, democratic and critical school experience, and by focusing on a dialogue as the central pedagogical practice.

Thus what is suggested by scholars in this perspective is not just a pattern of just distribution of educational good (i.e., knowledge) but a form of pedagogical practice that is inherently just, as it ensures the active and effective inclusion of students, especially those from weak social groups (and minorities), in a meaningful, emancipating learning process. According to this approach, teachers are assigned a 'transformative role' whereby they are expected to adopt an active and critical perspective regarding the existing societal power relations. Rather than acting as oppressive agents of the reproduction of existing ruling ideologies and power relations, their activity should aim at redressing societal inequities and at emancipating students and nurturing them as agents of social change that challenge conventional thought and resist political agendas that may hinder this effort (see Ayers, 2004b).

Allocation of Learning Places

Learning places are allocated to students through selection practices that assign them to classrooms, tracks, or ability groups.[3] The main arguments proposed for

organizational manipulation that separates students into academic homogeneous learning groups is the need to ensure didactic fit in the teaching–learning process – i.e., to adjust level, pace, and method of teaching to student ability – and to cater for students' needs and interests by adjusting their content of learning (Dar & Resh, 1997; Hallinan, 1988; Oakes, 1985).

Justice considerations regarding decisions on placement in learning-groups, relate first to principles that should guide a just selective process: Who should learn with whom, and in which school and classroom? How should students be assigned to ability groups and tracks? While the call for greater inclusiveness (e.g., children of special needs) rest on the principle of equality, selection and admission practices are commonly conceived as being guided by the rules of meritocracy; that is, equity-based interpretations of equal opportunity, which justify inequality on the basis of effort and achievement (Arrow, Bowles, & Durlauf, 2000; Oakes, 1985). A different interpretation would emphasize the 'need' principle as guiding these differentiations, especially in regard to tracks (e.g., Connell, 1993).[4] In any event, deviation from meritocratic considerations that benefits students from strong backgrounds on the basis of their ascriptive characteristics, such as gender, socio-economic status, race or ethnic origin, are usually considered to be unfair (Elster, 1992, 1995).

Most studies that examine the extent to which *actual* distribution of learning places fits perceived ideals of justice agree that meritocratic rules such as educational performance and ability are most salient in determining assignment to schools, tracks and ability groups. Some studies support the claim of *just* placement (in its liberal interpretation), based solely on ability and performance (Alexander & Cook, 1982; Murphy & Hallinger, 1989). Findings of more recent studies, suggest that, beyond meritocratic considerations, students of affluent background and hegemonic race or ethnic origin have a better chance of being placed in higher or more prestigious learning groups (Gamoran, 1992; Garet & DeLany, 1988; Hallinan, 1992; Resh, 1998; Schuman, 2001; Vanfossen, Jones, & Spade, 1987). School counsellors, who are central figures in guiding students at transition points and shaping decisions about their placement in ability groups, classes or tracks, serve as 'gatekeepers' of the educational stratification system (Cicourel & Kitsuse, 1963). For instance, in their study of the rules that affect counsellors' considerations when they assign students to junior high schools, Yogev and Ayalon (1987) found that meritocratic considerations were less determinant for track placement of disadvantaged as compared to affluent students, and that there was a direct effect of students' ethnic characteristics on school assignment in the case of disadvantaged students. Similarly, Resh and Erhard (2002) found that school counsellors tend to convey 'cooling-out' messages to a greater extent to low class and weak students.

Although the evidence is not conclusive, it appears that girls have a better chance than boys of being placed in higher ability grouping (Jones, Vanfossen, & Ensminger, 1995; Kfir, 1988) and in the more promising academic tracks in high school (Resh, 1998). They are however, less able to accede to the most prestigious, scientific track (Ayalon, 1995). Moreover, since differentiation and placement in schools is an organizational arrangement and the number of learning places is limited and indivisible, it takes place under conditions of competition. When applicants or candidates outnumber

the vacancies in a school or classroom, 'tragic choices' must be made (Calabresi & Bobbit, 1978; Elster, 1992), which are affected not only by academic criteria but also by organizational and administrative considerations, which usually will disadvantage the weak social groups and will not achieve the aim of homogenizing the learning group (Hallinan & Sorensen, 1983).[5]

Discussion and Conclusion

The critical significance of a just school, or rather of justice in schools, is by-and-large three-folded: First, ensuring school 'fairness' in both structure and daily practices is of a merit of its own, since people are striving to achieve justice and to restore it when violated. This is especially true as schools represent to their students a micro-cosmos of society. Second, the just, or unjust, distribution of resources and rewards in school has an instrumental significance, since it affects students' motivation, their chances of educational success and as a result, their future educational and life chances. Finally, the experience of 'just' or 'unjust' distribution of resources in schools is a form of latent curriculum that may be a factor in shaping students' worldview, social perspectives, and actual behaviour.

What happens in schools depends to a great extant on teachers who are the major agent of justice distribution. In the context of imparting knowledge, they are in daily and direct contact with their students and have the authority to allocate a variety of rewards (and punishments). In doing so, their behaviour and decisions represent to their students the adult world. Embedded in their role, thus, is a moral obligation to apply such allocations in as just a fashion as possible. However, justice, like beauty, is in the eye of the beholder (Markovsky, 1985): norms that guide the distribution of various resources are historically and culturally-bound. Thus, the determination of each individual's deservedness regarding any specific reward (or punishment) may not rest on a fully consensual regulation and be affected by personal (social) views.

A more radical interpretation of justice as a moral obligation of teachers, is reflected in the perception of teaching as a political act that involves moral relationships and moral instruction directed towards introducing changes in the institutional structure by promoting equality and educational opportunities, and helping to develop engaged citizens through practices that enhance in students agency, reflection, collaboration and care (e.g., Ayers, 2004a; Connell, 1993; Kroll et al., 2005). Such notions are led by the various versions of critical pedagogy. The questions of whether and what kind of pedagogical practice succeed in achieving these ambitious aims are an important direction for future investigation. There is also no question that moving in the direction suggested by critical scholars, requires a rather dramatic change in teachers' preparation curriculum, as well as in various in-service training programmes.

Finally, in this chapter, we have discussed the role of teachers as agents of distributive justice in schools. Turning up-side-down our viewpoint, teachers, or rather 'quality of teachers' is in itself a distributed 'good', a resource of critical importance

that affect students' educational outcomes, although there is lack of consensus over the specific definition of a 'qualified teacher'. The empirical support to the connection between teachers' qualifications (teaching ability and academic knowledge, subject matter expertise, teaching certificate, experience, pedagogy, and the like) and their students learning and academic progress, self-image, motivation, and attitudes (Darling-Hammond, 2000, 2004; Hanushek, Kain, & Rivkin, 2004; Ingersol, 2005; Raudenbush, Fotiu, & Cheong, 1999).

However, abundant empirical evidence about the actual distribution of teachers in schools, show clearly that (a) students of low-SES and lower-track classes have a much greater chance of being taught by less qualified teachers and (b) schools in disadvantaged areas are more likely to have higher concentration of under-qualified teachers, suffer from greater teachers' turn-over, which increases the rate of out-of-field and less experienced teachers in school (Darling-Hammond, 2004; Ingersol, 2005).

In the lack of investigation regarding perceptions of just distribution of teachers' quality, one would tend to suggest an equal exposure of all students to qualified teachers as the 'right' (just) allocation.[6] However, an argument could be put forward for allocation by need (affirmative action), or by talent (expected contribution to society). This is a line of research worthwhile to follow, and, in any event, questions regarding the process of recruitment and training of teachers, as well as their placement in schools, are also relevant to the study of justice in education.

Considering the high significance attributed to formal education as an essential asset to both individuals and the public, the relatively limited discussion about it in the framework of justice distribution, is a bit surprising. Yet, it is not that educationalists and academics were not concerned about injustice in the distribution of various educational resources, but rather they were framing their concerns in terms of inequality, gaps, disadvantage and the like (Coleman et al., 1966; Jencks et al., 1972; Lynch, 2000; Shavit & Blossfeld, 1992). Resting on a seemingly consensus about equality of educational opportunity and equity in measuring educational outcomes, the educational literature and research was (and to a great deal, still is) occupied with the investigation of 'inequality, or gaps, in education', trying to explain its antecedents and offering policies or projects that may rectify these inequalities and decrease educational gaps. However, the very meaning of 'equal opportunity' is changing over time, in different contexts, and regarding different kinds of educational goods (e.g., Coleman, 1968; Howe, 1989, 1997). So is the definition of what is the 'right' principle to be used in the distribution of various resources to various rewardees, which seems to be bound by personal views and social norms in various cultural contexts.

Hence, framing educational issues as justice distribution issues, and elaborating the investigation of teachers' views about the just principles that should be used, vis-à-vis what is actually being implemented, in the distribution of the wide scope of 'goods' and 'bads' in schools, and in parallel, their students' evaluation of their justice experience in schools, should be a very productive and insightful venue for future research.

Biographical Notes

Nura Resh is a sociologist of education at the School of Education of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Throughout her career, she headed the sociology of education and the educational administration divisions. Her research centres on the stratifying effects of school and classroom organization, especially in the context of the Israeli educational system and its educational policy. A specific venue of this interest is the investigation of distributive justice in rewards' allocation in schools and the development of sense of (in) justice among students as well as teachers' perspective about just distribution of rewards in school. She is currently planning a large scale collaborative research (with Clara Sabbagh and Claudia Dalbert from Germany) on personal and contextual antecedents of sense of (in)justice in school and its relationship to formation of civic attitudes.

Clara Sabbagh is a senior lecturer of sociology of education at the Faculty of Education, University of Haifa. In her work she has endeavoured to analyze key aspects of social justice judgment (SSJ) that underlie the basic structure of society and to what extent they fit the way youth perceive them. In this area of study she has adopted a cross-cultural and multi-method perspective, with the aim of distinguishing between universalistic and particularistic aspects of SJJ. One aspect of her study explores the ways in which SJJ are expressed in the realm of education by highlighting the importance of justice in educational settings and the ways in which conceptions of justice, and grade distributions in particular, are dependent on the socio-cultural contexts in which students learn. Her work has been published in journals such as Social Psychology Quarterly, Journal of Social Policy, Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, Acta Sociologica, Social Psychology of Education and Social Justice Research.

Notes

1. In recent decades there is a growing criticism on this system of grading, but despite various suggestions for 'alternative evaluations' (e.g., Sizer, 1992), grades are still the common mechanism for students' evaluation.
2. Other examples are 'democratic teaching' (e.g., Darling-Hammond, 1996), 'discovery learning' (e.g., Sharan, Shachar, & Levin, 1998; Sharan & Sharan, 1992), and 'cooperative learning' (e.g., Johnson & Johnson, 1994; Slavin, 1995, 1997). For a review, see Windschitl (2002).
3. As already mentioned, policy decisions at the national or state level effect assignment to schools, for example, desegregation policy (voluntary or imposed), registration boundaries or school choice, the degree of school inclusiveness. Within school decisions on classes, tracks, and ability group assignment, are mostly carried out by school principals, counsellors, and/or other appointed specialists in the school. Thus not every teacher is involved in these decisions.
4. Tracking (usually at high school level) is usually presented as a horizontal differentiation by interests. However, in practice tracks assumes a hierarchical order, differentiating students compositions (strong–weak), curriculum (less and more 'valued' subjects), and sometimes, future payoff (kind of certificate acquired at the end of school) (Dar & Resh, 1997). Hence, track placement is guided by similar principles (equity–meritocracy) to those of placements in ability groups, streaming etc.
5. Abundant research that investigates the 'effectiveness' of these organizational manipulations in student composition, i.e., its contribution to further educational and occupational chances of different groups, is beyond the scope of this chapter (e.g., Dar & Resh, 1997; Dougherty, 1996; Oakes, 1985; Oakes, Gamoran, & Page, 1992).

6. This notion is reflected, for example, in the goal set up by the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) in the US that all children will be taught by 'highly qualified' teachers.

References

Adler, S., & Goodman, J. (1986). Critical theory as a foundation for methods courses. *Journal of Teaching Education*, *37*(4), 2–8.

Alexander, K. L., & Cook, M. A. (1982). Curricula and coursework: A surprise ending to a familiar story. *American Sociological Review*, *47*, 626–640.

Aloni, N. (1998). *To be a human being: Paths of humanistic education*. Tel Aviv, Israel: Hakibutz Hameuchad (Hebrew).

Anderson, C., & Tverdova, Y. (2001). The economy and public opinion in East Germany after the Wall. In S. Stokes (Ed.), *Public support for market reforms in new democracies* (pp. 77–102). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Anderson, L. W. (1995). Instructional programs and strategies. In L. W. Anderson (Ed.), *The International encyclopedia of teaching and teacher education*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Apple, M. (1979). *Ideology and curriculum*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Apple, M. (1982). *Education and power*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Arrow, K. L., Bowles, S., & Durlauf, S. (Eds.). (2000). *Meritocracy and economic inequality*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Ayalon, H. (1995). Math as a gatekeeper: Ethnic and gender inequality in coursetaking of the sciences in Israel. *American Journal of Education*, *104*, 34–56.

Ayers, W. (2004a). *Teaching the personal and the political: Essays on hope and justice*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Ayers, W. (2004b). *Teaching toward freedom: Moral commitment and ethical action in the classroom*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Bear, G. G., & Fink, A. (1991). Judgments of fairness and predicted effectiveness of classroom discipline: Influence of problem severity and reputation. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *6*(2), 83–102.

Calabresi, G., & Bobbit, P. (1978). *Tragic choices*. New York: Norton.

Chizhik, A. W. (1999). Can students work together equitably? An analysis of task effects in collaborative group work. *Social Psychology of Education*, *3*(1–2), 63–79.

Cicourel, A. V., & Kitsuse, J. I. (1963). *The educational decision-makers*. Indianapolis, IN, and New York: Bobbs-Merrill.

Coleman, J. (1968). The concept of equality of educational opportunity. *Harvard Educational Review*, *38*, 7–23.

Coleman, J., Campbell, E. Q., Hobson, C. J., McPartland, J., Mood, A., Weinfield, F. D., et al. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.

Connell, R. W. (1993). *Schools and social Justice*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Dalbert, C., & Maes, J. (2002). Belief in a just world as a personal resource in school. In M. Ross & D. T. Miller (Eds.), *The justice motive in social life. Essays in honor of Melvin Lerner*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Dar, Y., & Resh, N. (1997). Separating and mixing students for learning: Concept and research. In R. Ben-Ari & Y. Rich (Eds.), *Enhancing education in heterogeneous schools* (pp. 191–214). Bar-Ilan, Israel: Bar-Ilan University Press.

Dar, Y., & Resh, N. (2001). Exploring the multifaceted structure of sense of deprivation. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *31*, 63–81.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1996). The right to learn and the advancement of teaching: Research, policy, and practice for democratic education. *Educational Researcher*, *25*(6), 5–17.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teachers quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, *8*(1).

Darling-Hammond, L. (2004). Inequality and the right to learn: Access to qualified teachers in California public schools. *Teachers College Record*, *106*, 1936–1966.

Deutsch, M. (1979). Education and distributive justice. Some reflections on grading systems. *American Psychologist*, *34*(5), 301–401.
Deutsch, M. (1985). *Distributive justice*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
Dougherty, K. J. (1996). Opportunity-to-learn standards. *Sociology of Education*, *69*, 40–65.
Dreeben, R. (1968). *On what is learned in school*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.
Dushnik, L., & Sabar Ben-Yehoshua, N. (2000). Intentions vs. abilities: The ethical dilemmas facing Israeli teachers in the 90s. *Megamot*, *40*(3), 442–465 (Hebrew).
Elster, J. (1992). *Local justice*. New York: Russell Sage.
Elster, J. (Ed.). (1995). *Local justice in America*. New York: Russell Sage.
ETS. (1977). *The ETS gender study: How females and males perform in educational settings*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
Freire, P. (1986). *Education for critical consciousness*. New York: Continuum.
Gamoran, A. (1992). Access to excellence: Assignment to honor English classes in the transition from middle to high schools. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *14*, 185–204.
Garet, M. S., & DeLany, B. (1988). Students, courses, and stratification. *Sociology of Education*, *61*, 61–77.
Giroux, H. (1988). *Teachers as intellectuals: Toward a critical pedagogy of liberation*. South Hedley, MA: Bergin and Garvey.
Giroux, H., & McLaren, P. (1986). Teacher education and the politics of engagement: The case for democratic schooling. *Harvard Educational Review*, *56*(3), 213–238.
Gore, J. M. (2001). Beyond our differences: A reassembling of what matters in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *52*(2), 124–135.
Green, S. K., Johnson, R. L., Kim, D.-H., & Pope, N. S. (in press). Ethics in classroom assessment practices: Issues and attitudes. *Teaching and Teacher Education*.
Hallinan, M. (1992). The organization of students for instruction in the middle school. *Sociology of Education*, *65*, 114–127.
Hallinan, M. T. (1988). Equality of educational opportunity. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *14*, 249–268.
Hallinan, M. T., & Sorensen, A. B. (1983). The formation and stability of instructional groups. *American Sociological Review*, *48*, 838–851.
Hanushek, E. A., Kain, J. F., & Rivkin, S. G. (2004). Why public schools lose teachers. *Journal of Human Resources*, *39*, 326–354.
Howe, K. R. (1989). In defense of outcomes-based conceptions of equal educational opportunity. *Educational Theory*, *39*(4), 317–336.
Howe, K. R. (1997). *Understanding equal educational opportunity*. New York and London: Teachers College Press.
Hurn, C. (1985). *The limits and possibilities of schooling: An introduction to the sociology of education*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
Hyslop-Margison, E. J. (2005). Teaching for social justice. *Journal of Moral Education*, *34*(2), 251–256.
Ingersol, R. M. (2005). The problem of underqualified teachers: A sociological perspective. *Sociology of Education*, *78*(2), 175–178.
Jasso, G., & Resh, N. (2002). Exploring the sense of justice about grades. *European Sociological Review*, *18*, 333–351.
Jencks, C. (1988). Whom must we treat equally for educational opportunity to be equal? *Ethics*, *98*, 518–533.
Jencks, C., Smith, M., Acland, H., Bane, M. J., Cohen, D., Gintis, H., et al. (1972). *Inequality*. New York: Harper Colophon Books.
Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1994). *Learning together and alone: Cooperative, competitive, and individualistic learning* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
Jones, J. D., Vanfossen, B. E., & Ensminger, M. E. (1995). Individual and organizational predictors of high school track placement. *Sociology of Education*, *68*, 287–300.
Kfir, D. (1988). Achievement and aspirations among boys and girls in high school: A comparison of two Israeli ethnic groups. *American Educational Research Journal*, *25*, 213–236.
Kroll, L. R., Cossey, R., Donahue, D. M., Galguera, T., LaBoskey, V. K., Ershler Richert, A., et al. (2005). *Teaching as principled practice: Managing complexity for social justice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ladwig, J. G. (1998). Authentic school reform. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 19*(1), 113–119.

Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? In K. J. Gergen, M. S. Greenberg, & R. H. Willis (Eds.), *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 27–55). New York: Plenum.

Lingard, B., Hayes, D., & Mills, M. (2003). Teachers and productive pedagogies: Contextualizing, conceptualizing, utilising. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society, 11*(3), 399–424.

Lingard, B., Hayes, D., Mills, M., & Christie, P. (2003). *Leading learning: Making hope practical in schools*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Lynch, K. (2000). Research and theory on equality and education. In M. Hallinan (Ed.), *Hanbook of the sociology of education* (pp. 85–102). New York: Kluwer.

Markovsky, B. (1985). Toward a multilevel justice theory. *American Sociological Review, 50*, 822–839.

McLaren, P. (1989). *Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundation of education*. New York: Longman.

Mikula, G. (Ed.). (1980). *Justice and social interaction*. New York: Springer.

Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1989). Equity as access to learning: Curricula and instructional treatment differences. *Curriculum Studies, 21*, 129–149.

Newmann, F. M., Marks, H. M., & Gamoran, A. (1995, April 18–22). *Authentic pedagogy and student performance*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC ED389679)

Newmann, F. M., Marks, H. M., & Gamoran, A. (1996). Authentic pedagogy and student performance. *American Journal of Education, 104*(4), 280–312.

Nisan, M. (1985). Justice in the classroom: Teachers' and students' perceptions of principles that guide grading distribution. In Z. Lam (Ed.), *School and education* (pp. 141–155). Jerusalem: Magnes (Hebrew).

Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping tracks: How schools structure inequality*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Oakes, J., Gamoran, A., & Page, R. N. (1992). Curriculum differentiation: Opportunities, outcomes, and meanings. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 570–608). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Parsons, T. (1959). The school class as a social system: Some of its functions in American Society. *Harvard Educational Review, 29*, 297–318.

Raudenbush, S. W., Fotiu, R. P., & Cheong, Y. F. (1999). Synthesizing results from the trial state? *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics, 24*, 413–438.

Resh, N. (1998). Track placement: How the "sorting machine" works in Israel. *American Journal of Education, 106*, 416–438.

Resh, N. (2006). *Justice in grades' allocation: Teachers perspective*. Paper presented at the International Society for Justice Research Conference, Berlin, Germany.

Resh, N., & Dalbert, C. (2007). Gender differences in sense of justice about grades: A comparative study of high school students in Israel and Germany. *Teachers College Record, 109*(2), 322–342.

Resh, N., & Erhard, R. (2002). "Pushing-up" or "cooling-out"? Israeli counselors' guidance on track placement. *Interchange, 33*(4), 325–349.

Roelofs, E., & Terwel, J. (1999). Constructivism and authentic pedagogy: State of the art and recent developments in the Dutch national curriculum in secondary education. *Curriculum Studies, 31*(2), 201–227.

Sabbagh, C., Dar, Y., & Resh, N. (1994). The structure of social justice judgments: A facet approach. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 57*(3), 244–261.

Sabbagh, C., Faher-Aladeen, R., & Resh, N. (2004). Evaluation of grade distributions: A comparison of Druze and Jewish pupils in Israel. *Social Psychology of Education, 7*(3), 313–337.

Sabbagh, C., Resh, N., Mor, M., & Vanhuysse, P. (2006). Spheres of justice within schools: Reflections and evidence on the distribution of educational goods. *Social psychology of education, 9*, 97–118.

Schuman, H. (2001). Students' effort and reward in college settings. *Sociology of Education, 74*(1), 73–74.

Semel, S., & Sadovnik, A. (1999). *Schools of tomorrow, schools of today: What happened to progressive education?* New York: Peter Lang.

Sharan, S., Shachar, H., & Levin, T. (1998). *The innovative school: Organization and instruction*. Tel Aviv, Israel: Ramot-Tel Aviv University Press (Hebrew).

Sharan, Y., & Sharan, S. (1992). *Expanding cooperative learning through group investigation*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Shavit, Y., & Blossfeld, H. P. (1992). *Persisting inequality: Changing educational stratification in thirteen countries*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Shor, I. (1987). *Freire for the classroom: A sourcebook of liberatory teaching*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Sizer, T. (1992). *Horace's school*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Slavin, R. (1995). Cooperative learning. In L. W. Anderson (Ed.), *The international encyclopedia of teaching and teacher education* (pp. 139–143). Oxford: Pergamon.

Slavin, R. (1997). Cooperative learning and student diversity. In R. Ben-Ari & Y. Rich (Eds.), *Enhancing education in heterogeneous schools* (pp. 215–248). Ramat Gan, Israel: Bar-Ilan University Press (Hebrew).

Thorkildsen, T. A. (1989). Justice in the classroom: The student's view. *Child Development*, *60*, 323–334.

Thorkildsen, T. A. (1993). Those who can, tutor: High-ability students' conceptions of fair ways to organize learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *85*(1), 182–190.

Thorkildsen, T. A., Nolen, S. B., & Fournier, J. (1994). What is fair? Children's critiques of practices that influence motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *86*(4), 475–486.

Van den Berg, R. (2002). Teachers' meanings regarding educational practice. *Review of Educational Research*, *72*, 577–625.

Vanfossen, B., Jones, J., & Spade, J. (1987). Curriculum tracking and status maintenance. *Sociology of Education*, *43*, 355–376.

Walzer, M. (1983). *Spheres of justice*. New York: Basic Books.

Walzer, M. (1995). Education, democratic citizenship and multiculturalism. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, *29*(2), 181–189.

Weiner, B. (2003). The classroom as a courtroom. *Social Psychology of Education*, *6*(1), 3–15.

Windschitl, M. (2002). Framing constructivism in practice as negotiation of dilemmas: An analysis of the conceptual, pedagogical, cultural and political challenges facing teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, *72*, 131–175.

Yogev, A., & Ayalon, H. (1987). School counselors as gatekeepers: Guidance in poor versus affluent neighborhoods. *Adolescence*, *22*, 625–639.

ETHICS AND TEACHING

Clara Sabbagh

The Issue of Morality in Teaching

Educational research has tended to portray the teacher's role as a morally neutral profession, mainly responsible for imparting knowledge and intellectual skills that can be objectively assessed. This has often been done in the name of the "rhetoric of teachers' professionalization," that is, the need to strengthen the status and prestige of teaching in society (Fenstermacher, 1990; Gordon, Perkin, Sockett, & Hoyle, 1985; Hoyle, 1980; Soder, 1990; Wise, 1986). Yet, as suggested by ancient thinkers such as Plato and Confucius, by modern writers such as Rousseau and Dewey, and by a growing number of contemporary authors who are attempting to revive classical normative ideas, teaching is not a "set of mechanical performances judged by the quality of product" (Sockett, 1993, p. 13). It is, rather, a "serving mission" or "a calling" (Hansen, 2001) which is generically subservient to a variety of moral ends (Fenstermacher, 1990; Soder, 1990; Tom, 1984; Valli, 1990; Veugelers & Oser, 2003). According to this approach, the role of teaching to impart knowledge is inseparable from its moral role (Ball & Wilson, 1996; Goodlad, Soder, & Sirotnik, 1990; Olson, 1992). Specifically, teaching is concerned not only with enhancing students' mastery of the subject matter in preparation for their future occupations, but also with their development as moral persons and citizens in a democratic society (Carr, 2006; Sockett, 1993, p. ix).

With these considerations in mind, the present chapter attempts to clarify the basic considerations in ethical thinking and to emphasize the great significance of ethics for the teacher's role. It will focus on three major questions: Why is teaching a moral endeavor? What types of moral ends or considerations apply to the practice of teaching? To what extent can the teaching of ethical values be translated to codes of behavior?

Why Is Teaching a Moral Endeavor?

The notion of morality**,** or ethics in ancient Greek (from "*ethikos*," meaning "arising from habit"), refers to the evaluation of what is right and wrong, good and evil, worthy or unworthy. This is to be distinguished on the one hand from personal preferences that

L.J. Saha, A.G. Dworkin (eds.), *International Handbook of Research on Teachers and Teaching, 683–693.*

express mere subjective desires, and on the other hand from testable factual claims about the world (Buzzelli & Johnston, 2001; Strike & Soltis, 1985).

The notion of teaching covers all "the activities of getting others to learn with a primarily educational end in view" (Sockett, 1993, p. 11). In other words, teachers are guided in their work by conceptions of what an educated growing person is like (Hansen, 2001). In doing so, they are necessarily assuming that certain forms of development are better than others, that certain behaviors are worth enhancing, that certain personality traits are important to develop – which amounts to making a moral evaluation on what is right or wrong, good or bad, worthy or unworthy. Indeed, there are myriad explicit and implicit ways in which teachers weave morality into their practice. For instance, teachers may reward or punish students' behavior, thus judging one behavior to be better than another. Or they may encourage students to learn certain skills and develop their potential in a certain way, thus implying which capacities are more valuable. They may teach standards of achievement, and in this way influence the student's basic choices in life. Or they may portray certain qualities, such as honesty or patience or tolerance, as ethical virtues to strive for.

Such teaching practices presuppose specific conceptions of what it means to live a worthier, or more moral life (Buzzelli & Johnston, 2001; Fenstermacher, 1990; Hansen, 1998). In this sense, teachers are given the responsibility to enhance the human good and promote students' well-being (Noddings, 2003; Sockett, 1993). Moreover, they are responsible for preparing "good citizens" who are fit to participate in an organized civic community, which is to say – for enhancing the collective good by means of enculturation of the young (Aristotle, 1998; Goodlad, 1990; Hurn, 1985; Saha, 2000, 2004; Youniss & Yates, 1999).

Hence, teachers are constantly imparting conceptions of morality upon their students. Teaching decisions – whether to teach one way rather than another, to emphasize one skill at the expense of another skill, to punish or not to punish – usually involve moral decisions and evaluations. But how are these choices and evaluations made? What principles can guide such choices?

In the past 2,500 years, philosophers have developed various principles to guide ethical decisions. This field of study has come to be known as normative ethics. The various approaches to normative ethics are commonly divided to three main groups: deontological ethics, consequentialist ethics, and virtue ethics. These three approaches have influenced much of the current educational research on the ethical values or ideals guiding teachers. It is worth noting, however, that they do not exhaust the entire range of possible approaches (for extensive review of other ethical approaches to teaching see Oser, 1994; Valli, 1990)[1] and that they do not necessarily reflect teachers' and educators' actual ways of thinking (Hansen, 1998).[2]

Approaches to Ethical Values in Teaching

Leaning on philosophical approaches to normative ethics, empirically oriented educational research has yielded three major conceptions of teachers' ethical ways of thinking.[3] These three attempts to describe plausible, though not fully adequate, ways

of thinking about ethical issues, and thus to uncover the hidden structure of moral dilemmas (for examples see Husu & Tirri, 2001, 2003; Sockett, 1993; Strike & Soltis, 1985; Tirri, 1999). Common to these approaches is the assumption that teachers, as moral agents who hold a position of power in relation to their students, are expected to critically reflect upon their practices and analyze their moral and political implications (Tom, 1984; Valli, 1990).

The Deontological, or the Duty-Based Approach

This approach, developed by prominent philosophers (Kant, 1964; Rawls, 1971)[4], states that people's (or teachers') decisions and actions should be guided by considering their own rights and duties and the rights and duties of others (Green, Johnson, Kim, & Pope, in press). Specifically, teachers' decisions or behavior are judged as moral (or immoral) if they fit (or contradict) their explicit and implicit duties with respect to individuals (Kant, 1964) or social institutions (e.g., schools) (Rawls, 1971; Walker, 1998). For instance, teachers' behavior is judged moral if it meets their obligation to grant students the universal right to education. Importantly, teachers' duties and obligations are determined by a-priori rules and principles of behavior rather than by evaluating the results of their actions.(Husu & Tirri, 2003; Walker, 1998). In other words, teachers are expected to do certain things because they are right (or refrain from doing them because they are wrong) independently of whether or not they produce benefits or good consequences. For example, adherence to principles of academic integrity, such as honesty or open-mindedness, is valued in itself even if it leads to negative consequences (e.g., being expelled from school). Conversely, an act that brings about a certain benefit may nevertheless be judged unethical if it was achieved by "wrong" means, for example, if learning was achieved by means of cheating and plagiarism. It is possible, however, to distinguish between contingent (local) duties, limited to specific circumstances, such as deferring to one's superiors or transmitting national values, and categorical or universal (global) duties, such as the promotion of intellectual freedom and the treatment of students with respect, irrespective of class, color or creed (e.g., Turiel, 1983). The latter have to be carried out consistently across nations, regardless of specific circumstances (Carr, 2006).

Consequentialism, or the Outcome-Based Approach

In contrast to the deontological approach, which judges an action as morally right if it follows the appropriate principles of behavior, consequentialism (or the outcome-based approach) judges actions in terms of their positive or negative *consequences*. An activity or policy, including the distribution of social resources, is viewed as morally right if it maximizes utility among people in the society or world The most common version of consequentialism is utilitarianism, which holds that a morally right action is one that produces good (utility) for everybody to enjoy (as opposed to the egotistic version of consequentialism, which is concerned only with the well-being of oneself or of one's group). More accurately, utilitarianism holds that an action

is morally right if it maximizes utility (good consequences) in the world, in other words, if it adds to the population at large more good and less evil than any other action available to the person. Different thinkers developed different conceptions of "utility," or the good which ought to be maximized. Jeremy Bentham, the father of consequentialism, took utility to be pleasure, in the hedonistic sense (1948 [1989]). John Stuart Mill, his follower, undertstood utility to be happiness (1980 [1863]). Contemporary utilitarians, such as Richard Hare (1982) and John Harsanyi (1982), define it in terms of personal preferences (or will and desire).

Noddings' (2003) recent pioneering and insightful book *Happiness and Education* may be generally interpreted as taking a consequentialist approach to teaching and education, because it focuses on an important, but relatively neglected issue: To what extent, and through which means, should the educational system in liberal democracies contribute to the individual's attainment of happiness? The author suggests a dynamic, optimistic and egalitarian approach which would help every student attain happiness by means of teaching practices that enhance their relations of care with students. [5] Her central claim is that good teaching practices can help bring happiness to all. The promotion of "happiness to all" as a moral educational aim is justified on several grounds: First, happy people seem to be good (e.g., less violent or cruel). Second, a greater emphasis on happiness may strengthen students' motivation to learn and increase their positive experience of school. Finally, and probably most importantly, the traditional emphasis on a narrow range of intellectual achievements (see Bell, 1977; Lucas, 1975) as crucial for happiness (Aristotle, 1998; Mill, 1980 [1863]) hinders students' self-realization in a wide range of domains. In contrast, by making happiness an educational aim, teachers and schools can facilitate students' self-realization in a wide range of domains (Walker, 1998). Moreover, if we socialize students with certain moral qualities (e.g., care about civic matters) we may thereby enhance their well-being (Hansen, 1998).

This approach to happiness is important in that it reminds us how crucial interpersonal relations are for happiness. It thus serves to counterbalance the traditional versions of consequentialism that are probably over-individualistic (Bentham, 1948 [1989]; Mill, 1980 [1863]). Nevertheless, in its present form this educational approach may be questioned on several grounds. For instance, it neglects the value of hard work, which is often necessary for self-fulfillment. In other words, suffering, like happiness, is an integral part of life that may lead a person (or student) to become morally better. Moreover, while Noddings is right that the importance of relations for happiness has been traditionally neglected, her attempt to portray all forms of happiness as relational may be argued to be an over-generalization similar to that of her traditional opponents.

Virtue-Based Approach

In contrast to the deontological and consequentialist approaches, which seek to determine what makes an action morally right, the virtue-based approach seeks to define what makes a person good. In the context of education, this approach specifies the teacher's personal and interpersonal traits which are to be aimed at, and argues that the "sustainable moral quality of individual human that is learned" (Sockett, 1993, p. 42)

should be the focal point of ethical theory on teaching. Thus, virtue ethicists stress the cultivation of character and attempt to describe what characteristics a virtuous person would have in the context of a civic community, and argue that people should seek to attain these characteristics (e.g., Aristotle, 1998; Ayers, 2004). It is sometimes said that in comparison with other professionals who serve others, such as medical doctors and lawyers, teachers' personal character are particularly important because they are responsible for the personal and moral development of their students (Carr, 2006).

Sockett (1993) identifies five major professional virtues that are constitutive of the practice of teaching and of teachers' capacity to handle moral dilemmas (see also Oser, 1991): (1) *Intellectual honesty* – refers to the capacity to access knowledge and truth, to distinguish between fact and fiction and to create trust in students, all of which lie at the heart of teachers' role (see also Ball & Wilson, 1996; Mayeroff, 1971); (2) *Courage* is defined as "deliberate practical reasoning in circumstances of difficulty, turbulence, or trouble" (Sockett, 1993, p. 71).This means that the teacher is ready to defend his or her own pedagogical principles even when this is likely to lead to a negative cost for herself/himself (see also Mayeroff, 1971); (3) *Care*[6]: This virtue refers to how individuals treat others (Whether other humans, nonhumans, ideas or inanimate objects). It stresses empathetic understanding and relationships based on receptivity, relatedness and responsiveness, rather than application of rational, formal and abstract principles (Mayeroff, 1971). (4) *Fairness* (see also chapter on justice in teaching in this volume and Sabbagh, Resh, Mor, & Vanhuysse, 2006): It is assumed that students who are treated fairly by their teachers (who are authority figures representative of adult life outside the family) are more likely to expect fair treatment outside schools and to support it in social institutions (see Rawls, 1963). Thus, this virtue, which implies respecting and equally treating students as thinkers and as people with lives and interests of their own, is essential for the civic, social and for the moral growth of children (Ball & Wilson, 1996). (5) *Practical wisdom*: This virtue requires reflective thinking that enables teachers to judge and behave prudently and with reference to the other virtues. In other words, it involves knowing "what to do when and why" (see Shulman, 1987; Sockett, 1993, p.85).

Applied Ethics in Teaching: Toward a Professional Code of Behavior

As suggested above, the study of ethics in teaching has focused mainly on the moral values that may guide educational practices and that underlie teachers' dilemmas. Less attention has been given to studying how to translate ethical values to codes of behavior that define teacher's role. Such an ethical code would specify standards of knowledge, skills and behavior, and how to make reasoned judgments in the framework of teaching as a credentialized profession. This neglect is surprising given that moral considerations are so pervasive in teaching. The teacher's role, after all, includes nurturing many aspects of children's welfare (such as independence, respect, decency, and trust), transmitting culture, preparing for civic life, and providing meanings to life, all of which involve ethical issues and dilemmas.

Unlike institutionalized professions, such as medicine or social work (e.g., Landau & Osmo, 2003), the teaching profession does not have a formalized community or a shared code of ethics that examines common ethical issues and problems and specifies explicit standards of proper action (Ball & Wilson, 1996). Nevertheless, several attempts have been made to specify general and context-specific ethics codes that underlie teaching practices (Airasian, 2005; Brookhart, 2004) and that are commonly found in other professions (Nickols & Belliston, 2001).

A good example of an ethics code for teaching has been suggested by Strike and Soltis (1985). In their influential book *The Ethics of Teaching* the authors focus on teachers' commitment to students, and specify three main principles, which can be seen as deontological:

First, students are entitled to due process, i.e., a procedure ensuring that teachers' decisions are not made arbitrarily, unsystematically, or on the basis of irrelevant considerations. This "non-maleficent" principle aims at protecting students from disparagement by instituting just procedures and assuring learning and safe environments for students. It seeks to ensure appropriate distribution of goods (e.g., grades, learning places, and teachers' attention) as well as distribution of bads and punishments (see in this volume chapter on justice in teaching). For instance, a teacher who fails to read assignments carefully when grading, or who assigns grades for reasons unrelated to learning, violates the rule of due process. A second ethical principle aims at ensuring teachers' autonomy (or intellectual freedom) and at encouraging autonomy in students. This is done by safeguarding independence of thought and action, and by providing access to different viewpoints without deliberate suppression or distortion. The last principle in this ethical code is aimed at ensuring equal treatment of students. It states that teachers should not exclude students from participating in any program on ascriptive basis (e.g., sex, race, religion) or deny benefits from any student. This is seen as a key educational moral concept underlying teachers' code of professional ethics.

Ethics codes for teaching have also been examined in more specific educational contexts (Airasian, 2005; Brookhart, 2004). For instance, in a recent study Green and colleagues (in press), in an effort to consolidate shared views on teaching ethics, examined to what extent educators agree on the ethical principles governing the evaluation of students. They identified two principles that seem to capture major aspects of classroom evaluation. The first is the principle of "doing no harm" (or non-maleficent values), aimed at protecting the rights of students who are affected by evaluation. It includes values such as confidentiality, the requirement to provide a written policy about how grades are calculated, and the requirement to serve the needs of students and to treat them with respect "as thinkers and as people with lives and interests and thoughts" (see also Ball & Wilson, 1996, p. 185). The second principle is to "avoid score pollution." It states that test scores should represent the students' actual knowledge and not be "polluted" by irrelevant factors such as unconscious preference for certain students (bias issue) or retaliation for behavioral problems or late work (grading practices).

The lack of an agreed-upon ethics code, aside from being indicative of the status of teaching as a semi-profession, is likely to evoke "ambiguities of judgment and appraisal within teachers' perceptions of, and responses to (moral) dilemmas of practice" (Ball & Wilson, 1996, p. 187).

Conclusions-Discussion

Issues regarding the ethics of teaching have occupied education scholars mainly in the philosophical-normative tradition. Studies have aimed at determining the "ought," seeking validation and justification of the ethical values which should guide teachers practice. The empirically-oriented research on teachers' ethics follows the normative tradition but looks for correspondence between normative assumptions and empirical reality (the "is"). It examines those ethical values that are actually adopted by teachers, educators' beliefs about these values in various situations, and the motives underlying ethical behavior (Husu & Tirri, 2001, 2003; Sockett, 1993; Tirri, 1999). Thus, despite the conceptual and methodological differences between philosophical-normative and empirically oriented studies of teaching ethics, these two research traditions have often developed in parallel ways.

While the common ethical approaches (deontological, consequentialist and virtuist) provide a parsimoneous, and to some extent even simple framework for analyzing teachers' ethical judgments and decision making, Nash (1996) has suggested that "real world" ethics is more complex and ambiguous. Ethical behavior involves a complex process of decision-making in a world that is endlessly interpretable, and in which discrepancies and conflicts often arise between the various moral values that are relevant to the classroom. Consequently, only rarely is there a final or definite solution to an ethical dilemma (see also Buzzelli & Johnston, 2001). This ambiguity and complexity of moral judgment and appraisal is probably amplified by the absence of a consolidated professional ethics code in the teaching profession (Ball & Wilson, 1996).

Thus, when teachers apply the notions of "right" and "wrong" in their teaching practice, they are likely to adopt a complex and multivoiced moral perspective (Husu & Tirri, 2003). Moreover, although a teacher's moral values may sometimes be consistent with each other (for example, the duty to respect a student is likely to be consistent with the value of caring), this is not always the case. For example, in cases where rights and duties conflict, scholars have been reluctant to assume that a single integrative account is capable of doing justice to the entire range of moral considerations and to specify which values should take priority in which case. They have also been reluctant to reduce moral behavior to a small set of basic moral stances or to formulate a general principle that would guide teachers in ethical decision making (Carr, 2005; Keith-Spiegel, Whitley, Ware Balogh, Perkins, & Wittig, 2002; Sockett, 1993; Strike & Soltis, 1985; Valli, 1990).

The complexity and ambiguity of moral behavior has several interrelated implications. First, a given teacher is not necessarily guided by an overall consistent, univalent body of moral considerations or by a fixed hierarchy of ethical value (for an example of this approach in the area of social justice judgments see Sabbagh, Cohen, & Levy, 2003). Second, in order to arrive at an ethical decision teachers often weigh several conflicting ethical values at the same time and combine them together in various manners, rather than using one single coherent ethical value at a time. Moreover, they do so differently in different situations. In short, teachers may differ from each other in their personal style of multivalent moral judgments.

For these reasons, we suggest that research should allow for the possibility that teachers are not invariably seekers of consistency and should not assume that they

necessarily adhere to the logic of one single body of moral values. Rather, their decision making may reflect ambivalent dispositions and behaviors and consist of dynamic alternations of norms and counter-norms (Kluegel & Smith, 1986; Merton, 1976).

Two concluding remarks are in place here: First, despite the growing number of empirically oriented studies which attempt to characterize the types of moral dilemmas encountered by teachers, only relatively few have focused on the powerful (though often tacit) impact of teachers' moral decisions on their students (for example see Jackson, Boostrom, & Hansen, 1993; Norberg, 2006).

Second, the present review assumes the existence of multiple ethical approaches or principles, which cannot be reduced to a single, unified system of moral values. The tradition of normative ethics has attempted to specify how moral issues ought to be solved in a general and objective manner by applying general rational procedures (e.g., Rawls, 1971). It is surprising that the majority of empirical studies on teaching and ethics have followed suit and focused, too, on general rational principles. After all, empirical studies deal not with abstract normative principles, but with actual practices of actual human beings, and it cannot be assumed that human behavior is governed by simple, context-free, rational principles. Ethical decisions are probably shaped by specific historical and contextual conditions which mold the issue's form and meaning (Mannheim, 1991). It is therefore unfortunate that studies rarely address questions of how culture may affect teachers' ethical values and what impact these values have on students, or how these values may vary across institutional settings (e.g., higher education vs. schools). Future research in this direction should provide a deeper understanding of such processes as well as of the explicit and implicit ways in which teachers' ethical values affect students' welfare.

Biographical Note

Clara Sabbagh is a senior lecturer of sociology of education at the Faculty of Education, University of Haifa. In her work she has endeavoured to analyze key aspects of social justice judgment (SSJ) that underlie the basic structure of society and to what extent they fit the way youth perceive them. In this area of study she has adopted a cross-cultural and multi-method perspective, with the aim of distinguishing between universalistic and particularistic aspects of SJJ. One aspect of her study explores the ways in which SJJ are expressed in the realm of education by highlighting the importance of justice in educational settings and the ways in which conceptions of justice, and grade distributions in particular, are dependent on the socio-cultural contexts in which students learn. Her work has been published in journals such as Social Psychology Quarterly, Journal of Social Policy, Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, Acta Sociologica, Social Psychology of Education and Social Justice Research.

Notes

1. For instance, leaning on the ideas of "critical pedagogy" (Apple, 1979; Giroux & McLaren, 1986), Valli (1990) identifies a "critical" moral approach in teaching according to which teachers' moral role is to

redress societal inequities and injustice, which are reproduced in the structure of schooling, by empowering the least advantaged students and advancing their rights. (For an extension of this approach see chapter in this volume on justice in teaching).

2. Hansen (1998, p. 649) suggests that rather than deriving the moral meaning of teaching from external authorities, this meaning can be understood directly from the obligations that characterize teaching, which are learned through practice. For instance, the very nature of teaching, which requires teachers to "serve students' growth and development" or to "treat students respectfully," is not necessarily imposed by moral sources outside the practice.
3. It is worth noting, however, that these approaches are not inclusive (for an extensive review of other ethical approaches to teaching see Oser (1994), and the chapter on justice in teaching in this volume) nor necessarily reflect conceptions embedded in educational practice itself (Hansen, 1998).
4. Similarly to Kant, Robert Nozick (1977) appeals to the idea that people should be treated as ends, not merely as a means. Specifically, he argues that an unequal resource distribution is just, so long as it is the result of free exchanges between *consenting adults* and it was made from a just starting position. On this basis, Nozick challenges the deontological character of John Rawls' (1971) argument whereby just inequalities in distribution must maximize the benefits of society's least advantaged group. He claims that this argument implies a forced redistribution of income which treats people as if they were merely sources of money (i.e., means).
5. See Note 4 above.
6. It is worth noting, however, that in the feminist theoretical thought (e.g. Gilligan, 1982; Noddings, 1984, 1988) caring is not defined in terms of virtue but rather in terms of concern for "the human beings involved in the situation under consideration and their relations to each other" (p., 218). In other words, the primary concern is with the other person, not with one's own moral excellence. Moral virtues, such as honesty, courage and perseverance, should be cultivated by teachers not for their own sake, but to make the teachers capable of caring for their students and for their affective growth and self-actualization. For this reason feminists usually regard their ethics of care as distinct from virtue ethics. Since often they also distinguish their approach from the deontologist and consequentialist approaches described in the present chapter (since the latter are not focused on care for others), care ethics has been regarded a distinctive approach (Valli, 1990).

Acknowledgment Author wants to thank Ran Lahav and Nura Resh for their invaluable comments and editorial assistance.

References

Airasian, P. (2005). *Assessment in the classroom: A concise approach* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Apple, M. (1979). *Ideology and curriculum*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Aristotle. (1998). *Nicomachean ethics* (D. P. Chase, Trans.). Mineola, New York: Dover.

Ayers, W. (2004). *Teaching toward freedom. Moral commitment and ethical action in the classroom*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Ball, D. L., & Wilson, S. M. (1996). Integrity in teaching: Recognizing the fusion of the moral and intellectual. *American Educational Research Journal, 33*(1), 155–192.

Bell, D. (1977). On meritocracy and equality. In J. Karabel & A. H. Halsey (Eds.), *Power and ideology in education* (pp. 607–635). New York: Oxford University Press.

Bentham, J. (1948 [1989]). *Introduction to the principles of morals and legislation*. New York: Hafner.

Brookhart, S. (2004). *Grading*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Buzzelli, C., & Johnston, B. (2001). Authority, power, and morality in classroom discourse. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*, 873–884.

Carr, D. (2005). Personal and interpersonal relationships in education and teaching: A virtue ethical perspective. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 53*(3), 255–271.

Carr, D. (2006). Professional and personal values and virtues in education and teaching. *Oxford Review of Education, 32*(2), 171–183.

Fenstermacher, G. D. (1990). Some moral considerations of teaching as a profession. In J. I. Goodlad, R. Soder, & K. A. Sirotnik (Eds.), *The moral dimensions of teaching*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Giroux, H., & McLaren, P. (1986). Teacher education and the politics of engagement: The case for democratic schooling. *Harvard Educational Review, 56*(3), 213–238.

Goodlad, J. I. (1990). The occupation of teaching in schools. In J. I. Goodlad, R. Soder, & K. A. Sirotnik (Eds.), *The moral dimensions of teaching* (pp. 3–34). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Goodlad, J. I., Soder, R., & Sirotnik, K. A. (Eds.). (1990). *The moral dimensions of teaching*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gordon, P., Perkin, H., Sockett, H., & Hoyle, E. (1985). *Is teaching a profession?* London: Institute of Education, University of London.

Green, S. K., Johnson, R. L., Kim, D.-H., & Pope, N. S. (in press). Ethics in classroom assessment practices: Issues and attitudes. *Teaching and Teacher Education*.

Hansen, D. T. (1998). The moral is in the practice. *Teacher and Teaching Education, 14*(6), 643–655.

Hansen, D. T. (2001). *Exploring the moral heart of teaching. Towards a teachers' creed.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Hare, R. M. (1982). Ethical theory and utilitarianism. In A. Sen & B. Williams (Eds.), *Utilitarianism and beyond*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harsanyi, J. (1982). *Papers in Game Theory*, Dordrecht, Holland: Reidel Publishing Company.

Hoyle, E. (1980). Professionalization and deprofessionalization in education. In E. Hoyle & J. E. Meggary (Eds.), *The professional development of teachers* (pp. 42–57). London: Kogan Page.

Hurn, C. (1985). *The limits and possibilities of schooling: An introduction to the sociology of education*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Husu, J., & Tirri, K. (2001). Teachers' ethical choices in socio-moral settings. *Journal of Moral Education, 30*(4), 361–375.

Husu, J., & Tirri, K. (2003). A case study approach to study one teacher's moral reflection. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 19*, 345–357.

Jackson, P. W., Boostrom, R. E., & Hansen, D. T. (1993). *The moral life of schools*. San Francisco: ref-Jossey-Bass.

Kant, I. (1964). *Groundwork of the metaphysic of morals*. New York: Harper and Row.

Keith-Spiegel, P., Whitley, B. E., Jr., Ware Balogh, D., Perkins, D. V., & Wittig, A. F. (Eds.) (2002). *The ethics of teaching: A casebook* (2nd ed.) Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kluegel, J. R., & Smith, E. R. (1986). *Beliefs about inequality: Americans' views of what is and what ought to be*. New York: Aldine.

Landau, R., & Osmo, R. (2003). Professional and personal hierarchies of ethical principles. *International Journal of Social Welfare, 12*, 42–49.

Lucas, J. R. (1975). Equality in education. In W. Bryan (Ed.), *Education, equality and society* (pp. 39–61). London: Allen & Unwin.

Mannheim, K. (1991). *Ideology and utopia*. London: Routledge (New Edition).

Mayeroff, M. (1971). *On caring*. New York: Harper & Row.

Merton, R. K. (1976). *Sociological ambivalence and other essays*. New York: The Free Press.

Mill, J. S. (1980 [1863]). *Utilitarianism*. Indianapolis: Hackett.

Nash, R. (1996). *Real world ethics. Frameworks for educators and human service professionals*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Nickols, S. Y., & Belliston, L. M. (2001). Professional ethics: Caught and taught. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences, 93*(2), 20–25.

Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring. A feminine approach to ethics and moral education*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Noddings, N. (1988). An ethic of caring and its implications for instructional arrangements. *American Journal of Education, 96*(2), 215–230.

Noddings, N. (2003). *Happiness and education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Norberg, K. (2006). Morality at the margins: A silent dimension of teaching and learning. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 38*(2), 189–204.

Nozick, R. (1977). *Anarchy, state and utopia*. New York: Basic Books.
Olson, J. K. (1992). *Understanding teaching: Beyond expertise*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
Oser, F. (1994). Moral perspectives on teaching. *Review of Research in Education, 20*, 57–128.
Oser, F. K. (1991). Professional morality: A discourse approach. In W. Kurtines & J. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Handbook of moral behavior and development* (Vol. 2, pp. 191–228). Mahwah, NJ: Erlabaum.
Rawls, J. (1963). A sense of justice. *The Philosophical Review, 62*, 281–305.
Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Sabbagh, C., Cohen, E., & Levy, S. (2003). Styles of social justice judgments as portrayed by partial order scalogram analysis: A cross-cultural example. *Acta Sociologica, 46*(4), 321–336.
Sabbagh, C., Resh, N., Mor, M., & Vanhuysse, P. (2006). Spheres of justice within schools: Reflections and evidence on the distribution of educational goods. *Social Psychology of Education, 9*, 97–118.
Saha, L. J. (2000). Education and active citizenship: Prospects and issues. *Educational Practice and Theory, 22*, 9–20.
Saha, L. J. (2004). Prosocial behaviour and political culture among Australian secondary school students. *International Education Journal, 5*(1), 9–25.
Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review, 57*(1), 1–22.
Sockett, H. (1993). The moral base for teacher professionalism. New York: Teachers College Press.
Soder, R. (1990). The rhetoric of teacher professionalization. In J. I. Goodlad, R. Soder, & K. A. Sirotnik (Eds.), *The moral dimensions of teaching* (pp. 35–86). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Strike, K. A., & Soltis, J. F. (1985). *The ethics of teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press.
Tirri, K. (1999). Teachers' perceptions of moral dilemmas at school. *Journal of Moral Education, 28*(1), 31–47.
Tom, A. (1984). *Teaching as a moral craft*. New York: Longman.
Turiel, E. (1983). *The development of social knowledge: Morality and convention*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Valli, L. (1990). Moral approaches to reflective practice. In R. T. Clift & M. G. Pugach (Eds.), *Encouraging reflective practice in education* (pp. 39–56). New York: Teachers College Press.
Veugelers, W., & Oser, F. (2003). *Teaching in moral and democratic education*. Bern: P. Lang.
Walker, K. (1998). Jurisprudential and ethical perspectives on "the best interest of children". *Interchange, 29*(3), 287–308.
Wise, A. E. (1986). Graduate teacher education and teacher professionalism. *Journal of Teacher Education, 37*(5), 36–40.
Youniss, J., & Yates, M. (1999). Introduction: International perspectives on the roots of civic identity. In M. Yates & J. Youniss (Eds.), *Roots of civic identity: International perspectives on community service and activism in youth* (pp. 1–15). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

Barbara Landau

Introduction

Of all the controversial subjects in the world of teaching, few strike closer to the heart and soul of educators than the topic of classroom management. Depending on who is doing the talking, classroom management can exemplify the best or the worst aspects of teaching. First of all, to understand the scope of this subject, it must be acknowledged that there are several defining elements of classroom management existing in our collective consciousness and at odds with one another. Many view the whole subject with contempt, labeling it as nothing more than a "bag of tricks." In fact, the status of classroom management as a subject is so widely looked down upon that many teacher preparation programs no longer even include it in their courses of study. Even if it is not viewed with disdain, the nature of what classroom management can and should be is commonly misunderstood. The opinion of the general public is that "Anyone can do it. You just need to get tough." And the subject is the most feared – especially by new teachers but also by those with years of experience. Managing any group of students effectively accounts for more than one sleepless night per teacher per month. For students, it can be the greatest source of stomach churning. Children fear going to school when angry, resentful, and frustrated teachers attempt to manage their classrooms. And finally, when it is done well, thoughtful management practices can be the underpinning of safe, nurturing classrooms. The caring, respectful teacher is often the most cherished memory people have of their school experiences.

In part, the controversial nature of the topic is reflected in a shared uncertainty as to what the process of creating and sustaining peaceful learning communities even should be called. There are those who call it classroom discipline, but that term carries the implication of one person controlling another, making it a less than desirable descriptor for others who are committed to constructivist practices. On the other hand, the term classroom management can include everything from rules and consequences to keeping accurate attendance and grade records. The broad scope encompassed by that term makes it similarly undesirable particularly to those who wish to focus solely on effective strategies for building and sustaining quiet, productive classrooms. Some writers attempt a compromise by referring to the topic as classroom management and discipline – an unwieldy approach that is

L.J. Saha, A.G. Dworkin (eds.), *International Handbook of Research on Teachers and Teaching, 739–753.*

typically only used for book titles. For the purposes of this chapter, the term classroom management, rather than discipline, will be used precisely because the term describes a comprehensive effort to create classrooms that function to support the best interests of teachers and students.

Some Underlying Issues

There are a number of complex and deeply personal issues associated with the term classroom management. In day-to-day living, people grow up with few if any opportunities to practice keeping a room full of other individuals focused on a task or tasks for extended periods of time, day after day. And yet, that is exactly the challenge that teachers take on when they decide to enter the education profession. They might have come to teaching originally because they love working with young children or they have a passion for a content area and want to share the wonders of science or the elegance of well-written prose with future generations. But the reality is that subject matter will never be taught and passion cannot be shared unless and until some expectations have been established – perhaps as some combination of rules; a general plan for redirecting or correcting behaviors when rules are broken; and open, effective channels of communication. And finally, teachers need to display principled and professional demeanors while orchestrating all of these elements.

There are as many strategies for managing classrooms as there are teachers. From classroom to classroom management practices are, in general, reflections of each teacher's educational philosophy, personal values, and professional preparation. The link between professional philosophies and classroom management practices is inextricably interwoven and, in the end, the two meld into one set of basic beliefs defining the perspectives teachers hold regarding their roles in the lives of students and the roles of students in the classroom.

If teachers believe that students serve as vessels waiting to be filled with content knowledge, then their approach to classroom management very likely will be authoritative and their ultimate goal will be to have quiet, obedient students who listen to lectures and perform tasks as instructed. And then there are other teachers who believe learning is a shared process of discovery. Accordingly, their approach to classroom management is characterized by egalitarian practices and their ultimate goal is to use problem solving and reflective thinking both as processes that support a well-managed classroom and processes that support effective content acquisition. The first approach is commonly referred to as behaviorist and the second as constructivist or democratic.

Understanding Behaviorist and Constructivist Management

The Basics of a Behaviorist Approach

A teacher using behaviorist practices develops rules usually without student input, presents them to students, and tells students what will happen if rules are broken and what will happen if rules are obeyed. If rules are broken, behaviorist management

strategies stipulate that there needs to be clearly stated responses. Putting student names on the board followed by an even increasing number of checkmarks – each mark designating a different and more stringent punishment – is one of the more typical forms of a behaviorist response to rule violations. Behaviorists emphasize the need for students to understand that some punishment will be exacted if students choose not to follow the rules. (Canter & Canter, 1992) The teacher predetermines the checkmarks and the punishments they represent. If rules are followed, students can expect to receive some sort of reward that might include anything from tokens such as stickers to more tangible goodies ranging from individual pieces of candy or popcorn parties for the whole class.

Acquiescence and obedience are the behaviors typically reinforced with tokens and food. The language of the rules developed by the teacher emphasizes a top-down management style. It is not unusual for behaviorists to develop classroom rules such as "Do it the first time you're told." and "Always do what the teacher says." This leaves students with one of two options. They can behave as they are expected to do and get the token goodies – all the while learning that the reason to behave is to get some reward and that developing a "What's in it for me" attitude is a good way to be successful in school. Or students can decide they do not want to obey the rules and suffer the consequences of having their names written on the board, or being placed out in a hallway for all to see, or experiencing some other form of public punishment.

Questionable Claims of Equity

Behaviorists claim that their approach to management is just as equitable as constructivism because all students are treated the same; the basic premise being that rules and consequences are applied equally to all students for any rule infraction. Behaviorists argue the worthiness of this approach because it allows teachers to spend their time teaching rather than resolving problems and mediating conflicts. In other words it is a one-size-fits-all approach that by its very design and if practiced in the proscribed fashion, ignores individual needs.

Deciding to enforce school rules through rewards and punishments is typically justified by claiming that the response is consistent, and therefore it is fair. In fact, this approach is neither consistent nor is it fair. Far too often fixed sets of responses to misbehaviors are applied inconsistently. Teachers faced with misbehaving students might decide that, based on the circumstances, the predetermined consequence is inappropriate given whatever incident has occurred and they give students a pass or they do as they are expected to do and impose the punishment regardless. The first situation results in a problem not corrected since the likelihood is that teachers who rely on punishments to control students lack alternative ideas for amending behaviors so they just ignore inappropriate actions. The other option is to impose the punishment regardless of whether or not it suits the situation. This can easily result in students feeling alienated and parents feeling angered at the injustice of an unreasonable system. Ultimately, the core issues causing the misbehaviors never get corrected and true equity suffers irreparable set backs.

Justifying the use of rewards and punishments as fair because they are applied to everyone similarly fails to stand up to scrutiny. Being fair does not mean treating

all students the same. Fair treatment means students are treated in ways that best suit their individual needs. Students would not be punished for failing to understand math computations. Teachers would offer students manipulatives, counting lines, and other aids to teach the skills of correctly adding or subtracting. But students are punished for failing to follow a rule and since every student receives the same punishment, this is deemed fair treatment. As stated above, though, treating everyone the same is the opposite of being fair. Just as the students struggling to understand math would need individualized assistance, students who struggle to remember how to move safely in a classroom might need some special guidance or private reminders to walk instead of run.

The Rationale of "It Works"

Another concern about behaviorist practices is their reliance on public reprimands and the attendant embarrassment to control students. Of course, those practices are balanced with equally public rewards for doing as one is told. Such practices are justified because they are said to "work." The justification of "It works," however, never addresses the question of "It works towards what end?" Anything can work. Scolding, intimidation, and humiliation can all "work" towards quieting students, but what is the lesson ultimately being taught to students who are subjected to controls based on rewards and punishments? What is learned about self-management and personal responsibility? And when competitions are encouraged between classmates to see who has the most points earned toward goodies at the end of the day, what is learned about personal dignity and worth? When classmates are set against each other in a scramble to get the tokens and candy, what is learned about kindness, respect, and caring? Ultimately, what is learned about humanity?

The term "works" can carry an even more insidious meaning. In United States public schools and elsewhere the culture, race, class and language of students are the overwhelming determiners as to whether or not they will fit into any given classroom structure (Landau, 2004). The common rationale for rejecting constructivist management practices is "That all sounds very good, but it wouldn't work with my students" (McEwan, 1999). On closer examination, it is typically students of color, students with disabilities, students who speak a primary language other than English, and students from low-income homes to whom teachers are referring. Inevitably, imposing the same consequences on all students leads to accusations of bias when the punishments meted out tend to fall primarily on those whose gender, cultures, learning styles, special needs, race, socioeconomic status, primary language or family values differ from those of the teacher (Darling Hammond, 2004). Teachers rarely hesitate to try constructivist approaches to management with students believed to be "the good kids," those who typically come from the dominant culture and from upper middle class homes (Finn, 1999). Their race and class imbues them with an aura of privilege and inoculates them from being viewed as potential discipline problems, so teachers are willing to trust them more and give them more of a voice in the management of the classroom.

Statistics gathered in the United States on drop-out rates, suspensions and expulsions all reflect the fact that classrooms and schools are being managed in ways that

are least forgiving to those students who fall outside whatever parameters have been used to define the mainstream culture (Skiba et al., 2000). Students who resist following rules and meeting expectations will likely be put out of the classroom and into some form of in-school detention. In-school detention can be anything from sitting in the school's office reception area, or in a classroom designated for that purpose, or even in a dark closet – an extreme, but not unheard of, alternative. Some in-school detention rooms even forbid students to work on assignments. LouAnne Johnson, in her article titled "Down With Detention!" said, "Capable, motivated students may decide to mind their manners a bit better after a visit to detention, but struggling students don't emerge from detention with a renewed interest in academic achievement and a burning desire to cooperate with adults. A downward spiral begins when a poor student is first assigned detention. He misses valuable instruction time and falls further behind the class" (2004). If students continue to resist, they will be put out of school for short or long periods of time. The problem with evicting problem students all together is that societies can ill-afford a population of frustrated and angry young people who feel let down and abandoned by their educational system and, as a result, forever locked into low paying, dead-end work.

Constructivist Management

The difference between behaviorist and constructivist practices are marked and dramatic. Teachers who subscribe to constructivist practices will work together with their students to develop rules based on shared values or principles, rather than presenting students with rules that already have been created. Setting out a foundation based on shared values is the necessary first step when working with students to develop classroom rules. For instance, teachers might begin by telling their students it is important for them to treat each other fairly and respectfully. Then the class works together to develop rules that reflect those principles. Another example of this constructivist approach is a model called *Judicious Discipline*, which uses the shared value of citizenship rights, and civic responsibilities as the basis for creating classroom rules (Gathercoal, 2005). Students in constructivist classrooms are not rewarded with trinkets, stickers, or food. Rather teachers rely on private compliments and verbal encouragement to reinforce appropriate decisions and self-management.

When a rule is broken, teachers using constructivist management practices are not locked into a predetermined set of consequences. Rather than having to depend upon a set of predetermined, increasingly severe consequences, constructivist responses to rule violations might include conferences, apologies, some form of restitution, or mediation. Teachers are free to use their professional skills to resolve problems peacefully, to mediate conflicts, and to strategize with troubled students about how to prevent problems from recurring.

> …as more students enter the classroom feeling disempowered and confused, the decisions teachers make in selecting approaches to curriculum, instruction, and classroom management become increasingly important in teaching caring, communication skills, and democratic principles. (Jones, 1996)

Democratic or constructivist management acknowledges the difficult lives led by so many students, and teachers who adopt this approach view their commitment to students as similar to physicians taking the Hippocratic oath and swearing to first "Do no harm." On the other hand, many teachers practicing behaviorism look askance at the whole idea of constructivist management. They will voice their convictions that most students are incapable higher-level thinking and cannot be trusted to act responsibly in a classroom not governed by punishments and rewards.

Misperceptions About Constructivist Management

Some educators believe that a constructivist classroom is one that is structured around rules invented by students and might also be one in which students act as the arbiters of justice, meting out punishments as they see fit. But these are serious misperceptions, especially when constructivist management is used to support a democratically run classroom. Telling students that they will be managed democratically and then asking them to invent whatever rules they want does not serve the purposes of teaching the values inherent in a democracy. Democratic societies are built on a structure of laws that protect individual rights as well as provide for the common welfare. Allowing students to invent any rules they want, absent any underlying principles, seriously misrepresents the way free societies function. And having students serve as "judges" for classroom courts, determining a fit punishment for one of their peers negates the role of the teacher as a model for thoughtful problem solving and gentle redirection. Because students are still developing empathy, they can be far too quick to hand out harsh punishments to their peers. Allowing classroom justice to devolve into kangaroo courts does not further democracy. Teachers must be the sole arbiters of justice – and model tolerance, respect, and reason as they help students learn appropriate responses to difficult situations.

Behaviorist Versus Constructivist Language

The difference between the two approaches, behaviorism and constructivism, can most easily be identified through the language teachers use to establish rules and expectations. Teachers who emphasize the word "I" when describing how their classes will function, tend to be behaviorists. The language of management used in their classrooms emphasizes teacher control and will sound something like "I created these rules." "I like the way you are sitting right now." "I do not like what you are doing." Teachers who use the word "we" to describe their approach to management, typically are employing constructivist practices. The language they use will sound something like, "We will work together to develop our rules so that we can all feel safe and fairly treated. When there is a problem, we will work together to resolve it" (Landau, 2004).

The Voices Representing Each Perspective

Both approaches have their adherents. Currently, the majority of those writing about classroom management advocate the use of constructivist classroom management

in part because the concepts are most compatible with current trends in curriculum design, such as adapting lessons to address the Multiple Intelligences (Gardner, 1993), emphasizing small group learning activities (D. Johnson, R. Johnson, & Stanne, 2000), and authentic assessment (Higgins, 2000).

Thus a teaching philosophy that embraces pedagogical writings such as those by Freire (1972) manifests itself in the integration of constructivist management and curriculum practices. In scholarly studies these practices have proven to be successful when working with students who represent a wide range of diverse needs and interests (Freiberg, 1999; Landau & Gathercoal, 2000). The classroom atmosphere resulting from teachers who practice constructivism is one that supports the academic achievement of all students, so that the management practices and curriculum strategies implemented interweave to assure every student will be treated equitably and all individual needs will be addressed.

As effective as constructive practices have proven to be, behaviorism is still the more common practice found in classrooms everywhere. In general, this is true because behaviorist strategies can be quickly and easily implemented and they offer to teachers the promise of being instantly in charge. (Canter, L., 1992; Wong, H., & Wong, 1998) This strikes a responsive chord with many teachers, especially new teachers, who fear losing control of their students. It is not uncommon for teachers, those who are in their first year as well as those who are seasoned veterans, to reject the entire premise of constructivist management and its fundamental precepts of peaceful conflict resolution and shared problem solving, because it is based on trusting that students will make appropriate decisions if they have sufficient information, if they have opportunities to assume genuine responsibility, and if they are trusted to act as reasonable individuals.

Eclectic Management Styles

The reality, of course, is that few teachers rely solely on behaviorism or constructivist practices. Most teachers develop some personalized blend of the two. And so the reality is that management, as practiced in most classrooms, is an eclectic mix of personal beliefs, teaching philosophies and the strategies acquired from teacher preparation programs, mentor teachers, colleagues, readings, and workshops. Regardless of the approach they use, teachers everywhere agree effective management skills are essential for successful teaching and learning. Whether teachers adhere to behaviorism, constructivist strategies, or some creative mix of the two, the bottom line is that some form of management must be employed. If students are out of control, teaching cannot occur.

Beyond these elements of individual choice, the personal aspirations of those who enter the teaching profession are not insignificant influences when deciding how their classrooms will be managed. Personal visions held by teachers regarding how they want students to perceive them and interact with them may well drive many of their decisions. If they imagine that being a teacher means being best friends and confidants of their students, they will likely be reluctant to enforce a rule when it is broken or to even have any classroom rules for fear that doing so

will make them less popular with students. Consequences will be imposed inconsistently, depending largely on whether or not students are willing participants in the best friend/confidant paradigm. Too many of these teachers find out the hard way that students want and appreciate structure that includes some form of professional guidance and redirection when misbehaviors do occur. While it is certainly true that students need to feel welcome, appreciated, and safe in order to experience academic success (Gathercoal, 2000; Sylwester, 2003) the narrow line between professional support and becoming a buddy or confidant can be a thin one. The more teachers step over that line, the less their classroom is likely to provide equitable support for every student. Those students who do not see teachers as friends are less likely to be supported than those who do.

Responding to Misbehavior

Corporal Punishment

Of all the controversies swirling around classroom management, the biggest and the one most likely to draw widespread attention is corporal punishment. Teachers continually wrestle with what is the best and most effective response when a student misbehaves. The answer to this question closely mirrors the societal or religious values held by teachers, parents, administrators and communities. Is a child who misbehaves inherently good, requiring only gentle guidance and redirection to become a respectful, contributing member of society? Or is the child inherently bad, requiring stern discipline and even physical punishment in order to learn and be able to follow the expectations of adult society? Should educators spare the rod only to spoil the child? Should teachers nurture the child through tender care or is corporal punishment the only way a child can learn to desist from breaking rules?

Corporal punishment has a long history. In the United States, for example, Puritans promoted the idea that children were inherently bad and needed to be civilized through stern discipline so they would fear damnation. Later, during the 1700s education shifted to mirror democratic thinking with less emphasis on corporal punishment (McEwan, 1999). And yet, corporal punishment persists to this day not only in the United States but internationally and it is controversial everywhere.

> A student of Katikamu Seventh Day Adventist School was admitted to Rubaga Hospital after she was flogged by her teacher last month. The errant teacher has since been charged with causing grievous bodily harm. But caning a student into paralysis for failure to do a class assignment is symptomatic of a very old human rights issue of whether corporal punishment…is acceptable. (Susman-Stillman, 1999)

A very angry teacher, who has the sanctioned use of physical punishment, can cause physical and emotional trauma to a child. The issue comes back once again

to the influence that classroom management practices have on the way children perceive school, teachers, and the whole process of learning. Teachers who lose control and cast themselves into the role of child abusers cannot also be teachers who inspire children to achieve academic excellence.

While corporal punishment is still practiced in some countries, it has been completely banned in others. In an interesting side note, fundamentalist Christian parents sued the state educational system in Sweden. They wanted corporal punishment reinstated in their schools fearing that unless their children received physical punishment for misdeeds, the schools would be guilty of sparing rods and spoiling students. Their suit was not successful (Susman-Stillman, 1999). Today in the United States, corporal punishment has largely been outlawed. The exceptions are mostly found in the southeastern states such as Mississippi and Alabama, states not known for enlightened social attitudes.

Given all of this, can corporal punishment ever be an appropriate response for teachers when disciplining students? How severe is too severe when trying to correct a discipline problem? If a parent reprimands a child with a quick swat on the behind, it is not viewed by most of society as an inappropriate response. Teachers, on the other hand, are likely to face accusations of assault or even sexual assault for similar physical contact. In order to prevent such accusations, teachers who do employ corporal punishment resort to the use of some device such as a paddle, or cane, or ruler, etc. The use of a paddle or cane might keep the teacher from having direct physical contact with the student but the punishment meted out is more painful, dramatic, humiliating, and far more likely to leave a bruise. Many parents, who would never hit their child themselves, strenuously object to the whole idea of their child being hit by any other person, especially a teacher.

As psychologists, social workers, psychiatrists, penal workers, and others have documented, the line between physical punishment and outright abuse is all too narrow. Given all the research that indicates strong links between experiencing physical abuse in childhood and becoming a violent adult, parents and school officials alike have taken steps to remove corporal punishment from the options of corrective measures open to educators.

Alternatives to Corporal Punishments

A United Sates organization called the National Coalition to Abolish Corporal Punishment in Schools provides teachers and school administrators with suggestions for preventing misbehaviors and avoiding the need to use corporal punishment. Their suggestions include

- Establishing clear behavior expectations and guidelines.
- Focusing on student success and self-esteem.
- Seeking student input on discipline rules.
- Using a “systems approach” for prevention, intervention and resolution and developing levels of incremental consequences.
- Enforcing rules with consistency, fairness, and calmness.

- Planning lessons that provide realistic opportunities for success for all students.
- Monitoring the classroom environment continuously to prevent off-task behavior, and student disruptions, and for providing help to students who are having difficulty and supplemental tasks to students who finish work early (Center for Effective Discipline, 2006).

Restitution

Helping students correct the problem they have created or to make whole an item they have broken is another example of a constructivist response to misbehavior – one that is far more productive than corporal punishment. Restitution, however, is not about ordering students to clean up when they have made a mess. Rather it is what happens after there has been a two-way discussion between student and teacher as to what happened and what needs to be corrected. Students must have input into this process in order for it to be effective. If students mark up a desk with ink, ordering them to clean all the desks in the classroom is an example of punishment not restitution. Sitting down with students, discussing the need for desks to stay clean, and then asking students what would be the best way to fix the problem of the marked up desk are critically important components of restitution. If students offer to clean all the desks, that is fine. If students promise to clean their own desks and never do it again, that is also fine. If students offer to stand in front of the room and apologize but not clean the desks, that is not fine because it does not resolve the problem created by the students. It is up to the teacher to guide the conversation so that students understand restitution involves fixing the problem they have created. It is applicable to many situations that arise in a typical school day and provides substantial opportunities for teachers to model problem solving as a means to resolve conflicts peacefully and productively.

Class Meetings

Another avenue for productive and peaceful conflict resolution is the use of class meetings (Bafile, 2005; Landau & Gathercoal, 2000). Class meetings, in order to be effective, are based on a few basic rules. Students should always sit facing each other whether they are in their desks or seated in a circle of chairs or on the floor. All members of the class must agree to stay on topic and – most important – to never, ever use a person's name. The purpose of the class meetings is to discuss problems and to generate ideas for resolving problems, not to point an accusatory finger at a student who is having trouble understanding or following a rule. For instance, if a student engages in an angry confrontation with another student, the class does not discuss that confrontation, but rather they work together to develop ways to express anger that do not include shouting, offensive words, or fists. The teacher acts as a facilitator of the discussions but is not the person who imposes solutions. Students

discuss the problems and arrive at some ideas for helping everyone do better when faced with the same situation in the future.

If the solutions they generate are not working, the next class meeting can focus on what needs to be adjusted or changed. Proposed solutions that involve anything other than respectful, peaceful actions should be further discussed with the teacher guiding the conversation away from punitive responses and toward supportive outcomes.

Research shows that class meetings are successful ways to prevent management problems when they are held on a regular schedule rather than held once in a while when time allows (Landau & Gathercoal, 2000). Time for this process must be reserved and honored so students will appreciate its importance and value. But unscheduled class meetings can occur if there has been some sort of incident that needs to be discussed. Name calling, or a fight, an accident, or a school-wide incident that has upset students all provide good opportunities to sit down and, through this open forum, share ideas about how best to control anger, how best to express frustration, or how to handle feelings of sadness or even trauma. Class meetings are a positive preventive measure to help avoid misbehaviors and to smoothly resolve problems when they do happen.

Classroom Management as Moral Education

Understanding Moral Education's Role in Classroom Management

When considering how a teacher should respond to disruptions, a good question to ask first is "What should classroom management ultimately accomplish?" If one overarching goal of education is to help young people develop into responsible and respectful adults, then the critically important contribution of classroom management must be acknowledged. Often times, constructivist management is conflated with moral education. Although the two are not necessarily the same, they certainly serve a common purpose. A moral individual is one who is a respectful member of society and a person who is cognizant of, as well as responsive to, the needs of others.

Lawrence Kohlberg's (1979) research into the stages of moral development serves as a valuable guideline for classroom management decisions that support constructivism. The Preconventional stage of Kohlberg's Moral Development Scale describes individuals who act appropriately in order to get a reward and avoid inappropriate behavior for fear of punishment. Individuals operating at this level respond entirely to external motivators and fail to internalize appropriate behavioral decisions. This lowest level of moral development also serves as a good descriptor of behaviorist management systems based on rewards and punishments.

It logically follows then that employing behaviorism impedes the moral development of students since it serves to reinforce the lowest levels of moral development. After all, in a behaviorist classroom the only approval students receive is some form of external reward and the only disapproval will be some form of punishment imposed upon them when they do not follow rules.

Commercial Models of Moral Education

Many of the commercial moral education models available today, sometimes referred as character education models, claim to be democratic but lack a vital element to truly live up to that description. The commercial models available emphasize responsibility and the importance of obedience to rules but they omit discussions about the individual rights of students. One poster on display in a United States public school classroom and observed by this author defined a good citizen as someone who obeys the law.

> What goes by the name of character education nowadays is, for the most part, a collection of exhortations and extrinsic inducements designed to make children work harder and do what they're told. Even when other values are also promoted – caring or fairness, say – the preferred method of instruction is tantamount to indoctrination. (Kohn, 1997)

Most commercial character education models do little more than put a moral education spin on behaviorism, failing to make the profound impact on student character they are hoping to achieve. In *How Children Fail*, John Holt sums up the disconnection between the goals of character education and what is ultimately taught by the commercial models this way, "Teachers and schools tend to mistake good behavior for good character. What they prize is docility, suggestibility; the child who will do what he is told…Small wonder that their efforts to build character is such a failure; they don't know it when they see it" (Holt, 1995).

Classroom Management as Democratic Education

Truly democratic models teach students to make decisions based on their citizenship rights balanced with their responsibilities or, as Kohlberg defined it, to operate at the postconventional level of moral development. In 1831 Alexis de Tocqueville, a Frenchman, traveled through the United States and described his observations in *Democracy in America, Volumes I & II*. His description of the schooling he observed reflects the movement toward moral education as a complementary component of furthering democracy. He wrote, "It cannot be doubted that in the United States, the instruction of the people powerfully contributes to the support of the democratic republic; and such much always be the case, I believe, where the instruction that enlightens the understanding is not separated from the moral education that amends the heart." De Tocqueville understood that education is about far more that basic academic skills. It is about how to use those skills to further goals of common welfare. Constructivist management plays an integral role in achieving these goals by modeling and allowing students to practice respect, responsibility, and common decency.

Models, such as *Judicious Discipline* or First Amendment Schools, provide an on-going daily immersion in the balance between individual rights and the needs

of the majority. Management models such as those cited above are working to empower students with the ability to make appropriate decisions on their own, reflecting the true spirit of Kohlberg's work and effectively addressing the question, "What should classroom management ultimately accomplish?" Teaching the skills of peaceful conflict resolution, self-advocacy, and respectful communication strategies help students strive toward and achieve the upper levels of Kohlberg's model. Put another way, young people develop a working understanding of and daily practice in what Kohlberg called the social contract through daily engagement in responsibly exercising their citizenship rights, acting in accord with civic expectations, and consistently engaging in respectful exchanges with peers and adults. A democratic or constructivist approach challenges children to develop classroom rules that are mutually supportive and to resolve their conflicts using peaceful methods such as class meetings. At the same time it encourages teachers to use a variety of responses when rules are broken in order to most effectively guide students to make better choices next time.

Conclusion

Classroom management, as can be seen in this chapter and as evidenced in every classroom around the world, is a complex, multilayered subject. As such, it cannot be passed along helter-skelter from teacher to teacher as a "bag of tricks" that lacks any philosophical base but has been thrown together because the strategies employed "work" to intimidate students into being quiet and doing their assigned tasks. The toll such an approach takes on the mental health of teachers as well as their students renders it utterly worthless and does nothing to help students become self confident, high-functioning adults. "If the purpose of discipline is to help a child behave in a way which enables him or her to be productive and to achieve in the world, then learning by example rather than fear is far more reasonable" (Green, 1988). Classroom management can be many things – but the question must always be, what is best for students, a question that goes far beyond what will work to keep students quiet for this or that time period. Management must focus on strategies that will best support the efforts of all students to become responsible, respectful adults.

Of course teachers will become frustrated and even angry when faced with repeated student misbehaviors. The ability to step back, take a breath, and respond to student behaviors in ways that demonstrate professionalism and a commitment to best pedagogical practice is a worthy skill. Similarly, responsible self-management is a learned skill that children will gain through safe exploration, emotional growth and, as with teachers, daily practice. Effective management, then, is a two-way street with teachers and students learning from each other. Ultimately the goal of classroom management must be to teach, model, practice and support each other's efforts for making decisions that further the well-being of educators, students, and society.

Biographical Note

Barbara Landau, has been an educator for over 40 years. Over that time, she has taught all grade levels from pre-school to university, and her experience includes working with students with special needs and second language learners. Dr. Landau is the author of *The Art of Classroom Management* and the editor of *Practicing Judicious Discipline* available now in its 4th edition. These and her other writings on classroom management emphasize strategies for promoting safe, respectful, and democratic school and classroom environments. In addition, she has written extensively about school law and its applications to classroom management decisions. She has served as a consultant to school districts and has conducted workshops on democratic management and education law throughout the United States. Dr. Landau can be reached at www.eduquestlearning.com.

References

Bafile, C. (2005). Class meetings: A democratic approach to classroom management. Retrieved from *Education world: The educator's best friend*, http://www.educationworld.com/a_curr/profdev/profdev012.shtml.

Canter, L., & Canter, M. (1992). *Lee canter's assertive discipline: Positive behavior management for today's classrooms*, Santa Monica, CA: Canter and Associates.

Center for Effective Discipline. (2006). *School corporal punishment alternatives*. Retrieved October 28, 2006, from Center for effective discipline, http://www.stophitting.com/disatschool/alternatives.php.

Darling Hammond, L. (2004). Inequality and the right to learn: Access to qualified teachers in California's public schools. From *Teacher college record*. Retrieved October 22, 2006, from http://www.tcrecord.org/Content.asp?ContentId=11677.

de Tocqueville, A. (1945). *Democracy in America*, Part I. Edited by P. Bradley. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Finn, P. (1999). *Literacy with an attitude: Educating working-class children in their own self-interest*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Freiberg, J. (1999). Beyond behaviorism. In J. Freiberg (Ed.), *Beyond behaviorism:Changing the classroom management paradigm*. Needham, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Gardner, H. (1993). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*, New York: Basic Books.

Gathercoal, F. (2004). *Judicious discipline*, San Francisco: Caddo Gap Press.

Gathercoal, P. (2000). Judicious discipline and neuroscience: Constructing a neurological rational for democracy in the classroom. In B. Landau (Ed.), *Practicing judicious discipline: An educators' guide to a democratic classroom* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Caddo Gap Press.

Green, F. C. (1998). Corporal punishment and child abuse: Why do we continue to sanction child abuse in the classroom? *The humanist*. Retrieved November 1998 from http://www.nospank.net/green.htm.

Holt, J. (1995). *How children fail*. New York: Pitman 1964, revised edition Perseus, 1995.

Johnson, D., Johnson, R., & Stanne, M. B. (2000). Cooperative learning methods: A meta-analysis. Retrieved from The cooperative learning center at the University of Minnesota, http://www.co-operation.org/pages/cl-methods.html.

Johnson, L. A. (2004). Down with detention! *Education week*. http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2004/12/01/14johnson.h24.html.

Jones, V. (1996). Classroom management. In J. Sikula, T.J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed.). New York: Simon Schuster Macmillan.

Kohlberg, L. (1979). *Meaning and measurement of moral development. Heinz Werner lectures series #13*. Worcester, Mass: Clark University Press.
Kohn, A. (1997, February). How not to teach values, *Phi delta kappan*.
Landau, B. (2004). *The art of classroom management* (2nd ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill/Prentice-Hall.
Landau, B. (McEwan), & Gathercoal, P. (2000). Creating peaceful classrooms with judicious discipline and class meetings. *Phi delta kappan*, February.
McEwan, B. (1999). Classroom management and discipline. In R. J. Altenbaugh (Ed.), *Historical dictionary of American education*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
Skiba, R. J. Michael, R. S. Nardo, A. C. Peterson, R., (2000). The color of discipline: Sources of racial and gender disproportionality in school punishment, Policy Research Report, Indiana Education Policy Center.
Susman-Stillman, A. (1999). Honoring children and youth. Retrieved from *Consortium connections: The children, youth, and family consortium*, http://www.cyfc.umn.edu/publications/connection/pubs/99winter.pdf.
Sylwester, R. (2003). Is current schooling brain-based and brain-compatible? Part 2. Retrieved from *Connecting brain process to school policies and practices*. Monthly column in *Brain connection.com*, http://www.brainconnection.com/content/234_1.
Wong, H. K., & Wong, R. T. (1998). *The first days of school*. Mountain View, CA: Harry K. Wong Publications.

Recommended further reading

Barger, R. N. (2000). A summary of Lawrence Kohlberg's stages of moral development. http://www.nd.edu/~rbarger/kohlberg.html.
Haynes, C., Chaltain, S., Ferguson Jr., J., Hudson Jr., D., & Thomas, O. (2003). *The first amendment in schools: A guide from the first amendment center*. Alexandria, VA.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
Higgins, K. (2000). Equity in mathematics and science. In B. Landau (Ed.), *Practicing judicious discipline: An educators' guide to a democratic classroom* (3rd ed.).. San Francisco, CA: Caddo Gap Press.
Hoover, R., & Kindsvatter, R. (1997). *Democratic discipline: Foundation and practice*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice-Hall.
Kohn, A. (1996). *Beyond discipline: From compliance to community*, Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
Landau, B. (2000). *Practicing judicious discipline: An educators' guide to a democratic classroom* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Caddo Gap Press.
Landau, B. (2003, March). Educating for citizenship: Who will miss our freedoms if we don't know what they are? *Education Week*, *21*(25), 40–44.
Lickona, T. (1991). *Educating for character: How our schools can teach respect and Responsibility*. New York: Bantam Books.
McEwan, B., Gathercoal, P., & Nimmo, V. (1999). Applications of judicious discipline: A common language for classroom management. In J. Freiberg (Ed.), *Beyond behaviorism: Changing the classroom management paradigm*. Needham, MA: Allyn and Bacon.