

Lindenwood University

Digital Commons@Lindenwood University

Dissertations

Theses & Dissertations

Fall 9-2014

Discrepancies in Discipline of Middle School Students by Gender: A Comparison of Principal Candidates' Responses to Vignettes, and Teacher Perceptions

Jill Lukefahr-Farrar
Lindenwood University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Lukefahr-Farrar, Jill, "Discrepancies in Discipline of Middle School Students by Gender: A Comparison of Principal Candidates' Responses to Vignettes, and Teacher Perceptions" (2014). *Dissertations*. 423.
<https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/dissertations/423>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses & Dissertations at Digital Commons@Lindenwood University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Lindenwood University. For more information, please contact phuffman@lindenwood.edu.

Discrepancies in Discipline of Middle School Students by Gender:
A Comparison of Principal Candidates' Responses to Vignettes, and Teacher Perceptions

by

Jill Lukefahr-Farrar

A Dissertation submitted to the Education Faculty of Lindenwood University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

Doctor of Education

School of Education

Discrepancies in Discipline of Middle School Students by Gender:

A Comparison of Principal Candidates' Responses to Vignettes, and Teacher Perceptions

by

Jill Lukefahr-Farrar

This dissertation has been approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

Doctor of Education

at Lindenwood University by the School of Education

Graham Weir

Dr. Graham Weir, Dissertation Chair

9/5/14

Date

Beth Kania-Gosche

Dr. Beth Kania-Gosche, Committee Member

9-5-14

Date

Sherrie Wisdom

Dr. Sherrie Wisdom, Committee Member

9-5-14

Date

Declaration of Originality

I do hereby declare and attest to the fact that this is an original study based solely upon my own scholarly work here at Lindenwood University and that I have not submitted it for any other college or university course or degree here or elsewhere.

Full Legal Name: Jill Suzanne Lukefahr-Farrar

Signature: Jill Suzanne Lukefahr-Farrar Date: 9-15-17

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Graham Weir, my dissertation chair, for his patience and guidance throughout this journey. Thanks to my committee members, Dr. Beth Kania-Gosche and Dr. Sherrie Wisdom, for taking precious time to provide feedback, encouragement, and support to complete this dissertation. Also, many thanks to Dr. Yvonne Gibbs on teaching me to format the paper.

Much thanks to those who participated in the vignette focus group, discussion, and surveys. This work would not have been possible without the honest feedback of teachers, staff, and the aspiring administrators at the participating University.

Thanks to my family whose love and support have blessed me through this journey. A special thank you to my daughter, Elana, for being my inspiration. A sincere thank you to my mother and father for always encouraging me to get an education because it is the one thing that no one can take away from you.

Abstract

Discipline in schools exists so that there are guidelines to ensure safety and learning. Administrators and teachers give students consequences based upon discipline guidelines made by the school districts' board of education. The discipline administered can be subjective. In a suburban mid-western school district, alarming trends in the amount of discipline referrals of male students both in the primary investigator's middle school and in the other middle schools within the researched district were recognized.

The purpose of this mixed methods study is to analyze and understand if gender discrepancies exist in discipline for middle school students among aspiring administrators, practicing administrators, and teachers. The qualitative data, on-line surveys, sent to every middle school teacher within the researched district, revealed a bias towards male students' behaviors. Quantitative data from the researched school district's archival data also showed that male students' within the district received much more discipline and harsher consequences than female middle school students. Quantitative and qualitative data were collected from students in the Educational Administration Master's program at a Mid-Western University.

One hundred-fifty aspiring administrators were blindly surveyed to analyze their responses of five gender specific vignettes. Each student received a vignette that was exactly the same except for the gender of the student's involved. For each vignette, the number of times each consequence of warning, detention, in-school-suspension, and out-of-school suspension was chosen for each gender of student represented in the disciplinary infraction described in the vignettes was tallied. Each vignette consequence

showed differences in the assignment of the consequences by male and female aspiring administrators.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	i
Abstract.....	ii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Tables.....	ix
List of Figures	xiv
Chapter One: Introduction to the Study.....	1
Background of the Study.....	1
Professional Significance of the Study	3
Overview of Methodology	4
Research Questions.....	5
Hypothesis.....	5
Null Hypothesis # 1	5
Null Hypothesis # 2	5
Null Hypothesis # 3	6
Null Hypothesis # 4	6
Null Hypothesis # 5	6
Limitations	6
Definition of Terms	7
Summary	9
Chapter Two: Literature Review.....	11
Federal Legislation Regarding Gender	11

Discipline	13
Does Teacher and Administrator Gender Matter?.....	16
The Lack of Education about Gender for Teachers and Administrators	21
Gender Expectations for Boys.....	24
Self-Fulfilling Prophecy.....	26
Deductive and Inductive Discipline.....	28
Biological Behavioral Gender Differences	30
Gender Training and Solutions.....	33
Summary	40
Chapter Three: Methodology	41
Purpose.....	41
Research Questions.....	42
Hypotheses	42
Null Hypothesis # 1	42
Null Hypothesis # 2	43
Null Hypothesis # 3	43
Null Hypothesis # 4	43
Null Hypothesis # 5	43
Participants.....	43
Data Gathering Instruments	44
Vignette Development	45
Sampling Procedure.....	50
Vignettes	50

Survey Questions	55
SIS Discipline Data.....	56
Data Analysis Procedure.....	56
Aspiring Administrator Vignettes.....	56
Teacher Survey	58
Discipline Data	59
School 1: 2010-2011 School Year.....	60
School 1: 2011-2012 School Year.....	63
School 1: 2012-2013 School Year.....	65
School 2: 2010-2011 School Year.....	66
School 2: 2011-2012 School Year.....	68
School 2: 2012-2013 School Year.....	70
School 3: 2010-2011, School Year.....	72
School 3: 2011-2012 School Year.....	74
School 3: 2012-2013 School Year.....	75
School 4: 2010-2011 School Year.....	77
School 4: 2011-2012 School Year.....	79
School 4: 2012-2013 School Year.....	81
Data Summary	83
Summary	85
Chapter Four: Results	87
Questions.....	87
Hypotheses	88

Null Hypothesis # 1	88
Null Hypothesis # 2	88
Null Hypothesis # 3	88
Null Hypothesis # 4	88
Null Hypothesis # 5	88
Summary of Vignette Data.....	89
Vignette Data Summation.....	103
Vignettes	103
Hypotheses	105
Null Hypothesis # 1	105
Null Hypothesis # 2	109
Null Hypothesis # 3	113
Null Hypothesis # 4	117
Null Hypothesis # 5	121
Null Hypothesis for Consequence Check	124
Null Hypothesis for Validity Check	125
Teacher Surveys	127
Summary	138
Chapter Five: Discussion, Implications, and Recommendations	140
Addressing the Questions.....	141
SIS Data Analysis and Discussion.....	142
Vignette Data Analysis and Discussion.....	144
Hypotheses Discussion	145

Hypothesis # 1	146
Hypothesis # 2	146
Hypothesis # 3	147
Hypothesis # 4	147
Hypothesis # 5	147
Teacher Survey Data and Analysis.....	148
Triangulation	149
Implications.....	154
Suggestions for Future Studies.....	156
Conclusions	157
References.....	158
Appendix A.....	166
Appendix B	168
Appendix C	169
Appendix D.....	170
Appendix E	173
Vitae.....	176

List of Tables

Table 1. <i>Totals from Baseline Discipline Vignette 3</i>	577
Table 2. <i>Certified Staff by Gender</i>	60
Table 3. <i>Students Receiving Discipline Referrals From Teacher</i>	60
Table 4. <i>Students Receiving Discipline from Administrator</i>	61
Table 5. <i>Discipline Breakdown</i>	62
Table 6. <i>Students Receiving Discipline Referrals From Teacher</i>	63
Table 7. <i>Students Receiving Discipline From Administrator</i>	63
Table 8. <i>Discipline Breakdown</i>	64
Table 9. <i>Students Receiving Discipline Referrals From Teachers</i>	655
Table 10. <i>Students Receiving Discipline From Administrator</i>	655
Table 11. <i>Discipline Breakdown</i>	666
Table 12. <i>Students Receiving Discipline From Teacher</i>	666
Table 13. <i>Students Receiving Discipline From Administrator</i>	677
Table 14. <i>Discipline Breakdown</i>	677
Table 15. <i>Students Receiving Discipline Referrals From Teacher</i>	688
Table 16. <i>Students Receiving Discipline From Administrator</i>	699
Table 17. <i>Discipline Breakdown</i>	699
Table 18. <i>Students Receiving Discipline Referrals From Teachers</i>	70
Table 19. <i>Students Receiving Discipline From Administrator</i>	70
Table 20. <i>Discipline Breakdown</i>	71
Table 21. <i>Students Receiving Discipline From Teacher</i>	72

Table 22. <i>Students Receiving Discipline From Administrator</i>	72
Table 23. <i>Discipline Breakdown</i>	73
Table 24. <i>Students Receiving Discipline Referrals From Teacher</i>	74
Table 25. <i>Students Receiving Discipline From Administrator</i>	74
Table 26. <i>Discipline Breakdown</i>	75
Table 27. <i>Students Receiving Discipline Referrals From Teachers</i>	75
Table 28. <i>Students Receiving Discipline From Administrator</i>	76
Table 29. <i>Discipline Breakdown</i>	777
Table 30. <i>Students Receiving Discipline From Teacher</i>	778
Table 31. <i>Students Receiving Discipline From Administrator</i>	78
Table 32. <i>Discipline Breakdown</i>	799
Table 33. <i>Students Receiving Discipline Referrals From Teacher</i>	799
Table 34. <i>Students Receiving Discipline From Administrator</i>	80
Table 35. <i>Discipline Breakdown</i>	80
Table 36. <i>Student Discipline From Teachers</i>	81
Table 37. <i>Students Receiving Discipline From Administrator</i>	82
Table 38. <i>Discipline Breakdown</i>	82
Table 39. <i>Overall Discipline from Teacher</i>	83
Table 40. <i>Administrator: Student Discipline 2010-2011</i>	84
Table 41. <i>Administrator: Student Discipline 2011-2012</i>	84
Table 42. <i>Administrator: Student Discipline 2012-2013</i>	85
Table 43. <i>Overall Administrator: Student Discipline for Three Years</i>	85
Table 44. <i>Overall Discipline Administered for Vignette 1</i>	899

Table 45. <i>Discipline for Female Students for Vignette 1</i>	90
Table 46. <i>Discipline for Male Students for Vignette 1</i>	91
Table 47. <i>Overall Discipline Administered for Vignette 2</i>	91
Table 48. <i>Discipline for Female Students for Vignette 2</i>	93
Table 49. <i>Discipline Administered for Male Students for Vignette 2</i>	93
Table 50. <i>Overall Discipline Administered for Vignette 3</i>	94
Table 51. <i>Discipline for Female Students for Vignette 3</i>	96
Table 52. <i>Discipline for Male Students for Vignette 3</i>	97
Table 53. <i>Overall Discipline Administered for Vignette 4</i>	97
Table 54. <i>Discipline Administered for Female Students for Vignette 4</i>	99
Table 55. <i>Discipline Administered for Male Students for Vignette 4</i>	99
Table 56. <i>Overall Discipline Administered for Vignette 5</i>	100
Table 57. <i>Discipline Administered for Female Students for Vignette 5</i>	101
Table 58. <i>Discipline Administered for Male Students for Vignette 5</i>	102
Table 59. <i>Consequences Assigned Overall</i>	103
Table 60. <i>Consequences Assigned Overall by Gender</i>	104
Table 61. <i>Vignette 1: Disciplinary Warning</i>	105
Table 62. <i>Vignette 2: Disciplinary Warning</i>	106
Table 63. <i>Vignette 3: Disciplinary Warning</i>	106
Table 64. <i>Vignette 4: Disciplinary Warning</i>	107
Table 65. <i>Vignette 5: Disciplinary Warning</i>	108
Table 66. <i>Null Hypothesis #1 Summary</i>	109
Table 67. <i>Vignette 1: Disciplinary Detention</i>	109

Table 68. <i>Vignette 2: Disciplinary Detention</i>	110
Table 69. <i>Vignette 3: Disciplinary Detention</i>	111
Table 70. <i>Vignette 4: Disciplinary Detention</i>	112
Table 71. <i>Vignette 5: Disciplinary Detention</i>	11212
Table 72. <i>Null Hypothesis #2 Summary</i>	11313
Table 73. <i>Vignette 1: Disciplinary ISS</i>	11414
Table 74. <i>Vignette 2: Disciplinary ISS</i>	11414
Table 75. <i>Vignette 3: Disciplinary ISS</i>	11515
Table 76. <i>Vignette 4: Disciplinary ISS</i>	11616
Table 77. <i>Vignette 5: Disciplinary ISS</i>	11616
Table 78. <i>Null Hypothesis #3 Summary</i>	11717
Table 79. <i>Vignette 1: Disciplinary OSS</i>	11818
Table 80. <i>Vignette 2: Disciplinary OSS</i>	11818
Table 81. <i>Vignette 3: Disciplinary OSS</i>	11919
Table 82. <i>Vignette 4: Disciplinary OSS</i>	11919
Table 83. <i>Vignette 5: Disciplinary OSS</i>	12020
Table 84. <i>Null Hypothesis #4 Summary</i>	12121
Table 85. <i>Overall: Percent Assigned per Gender of PSA and Gender of Student</i>	12121
Table 86. <i>Overall: Disciplinary Warning</i>	12122
Table 87. <i>Overall: Disciplinary Detention</i>	12222
Table 88. <i>Overall: Disciplinary ISS</i>	12323
Table 89. <i>Overall: Disciplinary OSS</i>	12323
Table 90. <i>Null Hypothesis #5 Summary of Data Overall</i>	12424

Table 91. <i>Summary: ANOVA Single Factor</i>	12525
Table 92. <i>PSA Gender and Student Disciplinary Assignment by Vignette</i>	12525
Table 93. <i>Summary of Vignette Average Assignment of Discipline</i>	12626
Table 94. <i>Vignette Comparisons: Analysis of Variance</i>	12626
Table 95. <i>Summary of ANOVA data</i>	12626
Table 96. <i>Number of Years Taught of Surveyed Staff</i>	12828

List of Figures

<i>Figure 1. Vignette # 1.....</i>	<i>466</i>
<i>Figure 2. Vignette #2.....</i>	<i>477</i>
<i>Figure 3. Vignette # 3.....</i>	<i>488</i>
<i>Figure 4. Vignette # 4.....</i>	<i>499</i>
<i>Figure 5. Vignette # 5.....</i>	<i>50</i>

Chapter One: Introduction to the Study

Students are disciplined in schools. Schools collect data on office referrals for student discipline problems, but the information offered does not often describe the rationale behind the teacher's and administrator's subjective reasoning. Discipline referrals most often reflect how an individual student is behaving and how well the teacher is doing in managing student's behaviors (Rusby et al., 2007). Administrators often use discipline referrals to look for trends in discipline issues and the number of occurrences to gain a better understanding of students, teacher's methodologies, and school wide programs to be used as behavior intervention tools (Rusby et al., 2007).

A school's disciplinary system is created to establish control in an atmosphere of mutual respect and confidence within the school (Onderi & Odera, 2012). There are many reasons for which educators choose to discipline students. Teachers have classroom expectations and schools have school policies. When an authority figure deems that a child has broken a rule or expectation, that child may receive an office referral. Since the referral is often left up to the interpretation of the authority figure, there can be a variety of offenses documented, which may or may not be appropriate to the child or children receiving those referrals. This study will look at the discipline children received in a mid-western suburban school district's middle schools.

Background of the Study

Office referral data was a way in which students disruptive or inappropriate behaviors could be examined (Rusby et al., 2007). During the 2009 school year, it was noted that more male students were receiving office referrals for discipline than female students in the researched school district. All the assistant principals in grades 6, 7, and 8

in four different middle schools in the same district had documentation proving more males were referred to the principal's office and received discipline than the female middle school students. During the 2009, 2010, 2011, and 2012 school years the same trends were observed. The observed data was accumulated through the school district's School Information System, or SIS. SIS is a computer program utilized by the district to allow school administrators to easily record all student specific discipline incidents that occurred at school or on the bus. SIS allowed administrators in the district to analyze the discipline administered to all students by location, teacher, gender, ethnicity, special education identification, and date.

In 2006, a researcher, Mead, for Education Sector, an educational think tank, published a report, "The Truth about Boys and Girls." The writing was an attempt to put facts and figures behind the contention that gender gaps are overblown. Mead argued that boys are not doing badly in school; that girls are just doing better (Mead, 2006). In 2009, the Department of Education released new findings in a report on reading levels which showed that boys and girls should be judged separately on school success (U.S. Department of Education, 2009). When judged separately, girls are overwhelmingly far out-succeeding males. Females in the United States have higher graduation rates from high school and college, out score males on tests, and are not disciplined as much in school. In the United States, males are underachieving when compared to females. Males in the U.S. have the highest rates of incarceration in the world. This statistic can be traced back to males' behaviors throughout their school careers. (Whitmire, 2010).

The primary investigator worked as an assistant principal in St. Charles County, a suburb of St. Louis, in Missouri. The investigator saw students who were referred to the

principal's office by teachers and staff for various discipline infractions. The majority of students seen on a daily basis were male. Other assistant principals within the same district stated that they, too, were seeing mostly male students being referred to their office. Males receive 90% of all discipline referrals in public schools (Gurian, 2003).

Professional Significance of the Study

The trend of males receiving more discipline referrals in the examined district had been steady for the researched school years. When researched, the trend was not isolated to this particular district, but also seen across the nation. The policies concerning discipline were linked, weakly, to the moral and educational purposes of schooling (Goodman, 2006). Discipline can lead to academic mastery when in-line with the learning process. It becomes a gateway to learning by establishing order in the classroom (Goodman, 2006). Teachers send office referrals to the assistant principal's office based upon "offenses" that students have committed. These offenses can be subjective. Most office referrals contain information, such as the student's name, referring teacher name, time of day, hour incident occurred, nature and location of offense, and previous interventions tried (Irvin et al., 2006). In the researched district, assistant principals assigned students consequences based upon the description given by the teacher objecting to the student's actions. This data was then entered into a database used by the school or district to make educational decisions. Data-based decision making can benefit social behaviors of students and the climate of schools (Irvin et al., 2006). Analyzing individual and school-wide data about students' behaviors add great value in the design of individualized student behavior interventions. School leaders can use behavior data from office referral patterns to help students academically when behavior interventions are

successful (Irvin et al., 2006). The problem the primary investigator discovered was within a suburban school district in Missouri; male middle school students were receiving more discipline than female middle school students. This mixed method study was performed to provide aspiring and practicing administrators, and teacher's insight into the discrepancy of discipline consequences for middle school students. This insight could provide an awareness into the middle school child's behavior while providing a foundation for improvement of administrator, teacher and student relationships, and increasing academic performance of middle school children.

Overview of Methodology

In the investigator's cooperating district, a system called Student Information Systems, or SIS, was used. All data for the entire district, whether it was discipline, attendance, or grades, was entered into SIS. SIS Data collected by the school district could be viewed by all administrators in the district and was used as an independent variable.

Vignettes, discussed in the methodology chapter, were created by the researcher and given to students in educational administration classes at a Midwestern University in suburban, St. Louis, Missouri. A discipline guide was also given to the university students. Students were asked to read the vignettes and then apply discipline according to the guidelines. The vignettes, given to all students, were the same except for the gender of the offender was female for some participants and male for others. The investigator sat in those classes to observe the conversation and rationale behind the application of discipline to see how discipline was being applied.

In addition, a survey was sent to willing participants who taught in the investigated district. The survey asked teachers about specific discipline practices and how the discipline was handled for both female and male students. Identities of respondents to the survey were anonymous. Thus, the researcher triangulated the quantitative discipline data from one district, the perceptions of administrators in that district, and the responses to vignettes about student misbehavior to determine if and why gender was a factor for administrators assigning consequences to student misconduct.

Research Questions

Is one gender of middle school student, male or female, assigned a disproportionate amount of discipline consequences within the four middle school buildings in the district throughout the length of study for this research? Is so, why?"

The following sub questions accompanied the research question:

RQ1. How do the biases teachers have, whether know or unknown, contribute to males being referred to the principal's office more often than female students?

RQ2. When asked to administer discipline, do administrators apply more severe discipline to males than females who have the same infraction?

Hypothesis

Null Hypothesis # 1: For each disciplinary warning applied to data gathered from each sample vignette, there will be no difference in proportion of gender-based assignment of the consequence when comparing female pre-service administrators' decisions to those of male pre-service administrators.

Null Hypothesis # 2: For each disciplinary detention applied to data gathered from each sample vignette, there will be no difference in proportion of gender-based

assignment of the consequence when comparing female pre-service administrators' decisions to those of male pre-service administrators.

Null Hypothesis # 3: For each disciplinary In-School-Suspension applied to data gathered from each sample vignette, there will be no difference in proportion of gender-based assignment of the consequence when comparing female pre-service administrators' decisions to those of male pre-service administrators.

Null Hypothesis # 4: For each disciplinary Out-of-School-Suspension applied to data gathered from each sample vignette, there will be no difference in proportion of gender-based assignment of the consequence when comparing female pre-service administrators' decisions to those of male pre-service administrators.

Null Hypothesis # 5: For overall disciplinary assignment applied to combined data gathered from each sample vignettes, there will be no difference in proportion of gender-based assignment of the consequence when comparing female pre-service administrators' decisions to those of male pre-service administrators.

Limitations

In this study, students in the educational administration Master's level courses at a Midwestern University were given random vignettes and discipline codes. Not all Master's level courses were utilized due to professor availability. Many professors did not respond to requests for the primary investigator to come into their classes. Some professors did not feel that the vignettes would correspond to what they were teaching. Professors at satellite campuses of the university did not make their classes available. Instructor availability was a determining factor. Location of the classes was a factor due to the availability of the investigator as some of these classes were 400 miles away.

Teachers in the participating school district were emailed an anonymous survey via the internet source, surveymonkey.com. The primary investigator worked in the participating district posing a potential bias despite the survey being anonymous. One teacher stated that it was inappropriate to respond to any questions about gender and how students are treated.

Quantitative data consisted of data compiled on the school district's School Information System (SIS). Data of each year's discipline by school, administrator, and teacher was utilized. The nature of discipline can be subjective and possibly inconsistent which can pose a threat to validity. Data could be effected by the teacher turn-over rate as well. Each year, teachers, both male and female, left the district and were replaced by either a same gender or different gender teacher. This could impact the discipline assigned each year. While the researcher worked in the Midwestern District, all quantitative discipline data was secondary and collected after the fact.

Definition of Terms

Administrator- An administrator in a school district is typically the superintendent, principal, assistant principal, and/or directors. For this study, the term administrator will refer to principals and assistant principal. The term aspiring administrator will refer to those aspiring to be a principal or assistant principal.

In School Suspension (ISS) – According to the school board approved discipline policy in the cooperating district, in-school-suspension is a program used for problems of intermediate seriousness or for the repeated violation of school rules normally dealt with through detention. Students receiving ISS are excluded from the everyday activities, including classroom instruction, within the school day. Most students spend the day in an

alternative environment within the school, rather than with their peers for one through 10 days (District, Participating School, 2013-2014).

Office Referral –The cooperating school district has a school board approved code of conduct, or discipline guidelines. The guidelines state that teachers have the authority to make and enforce rules necessary for the internal governance in the classroom subject to review by the principal. The school board expects each teacher to maintain a satisfactory standard of conduct in the classroom. When a student violated the expectations in the classroom, to the detriment of his or her education or that of others, teachers were to write an office referral. Office referrals were a form a teacher fills out and sends with a child or gave directly to the administrator stating the nature of the offense a child has committed in the classroom or school facility. In the cooperating district, the form, in triplicate, had the following information: Name of student, Teacher name, place of infraction, class hour the teacher has the student, incident descriptor, choices as to the punishment the teacher feels appropriate, such as warning, detention, ISS, OSS, and lines for administrator to respond to referral with consequence(s). One copy of the form was given to the student, one was put in the student’s permanent file, and one was mailed to the parent(s) (District, Participating School, 2013-2014).

Out of School Suspension (OSS) - According to the school board approved discipline policy in the cooperating district, out-of-school suspension should be used when the presence of a student constitutes a threat to other students or has a negative effect upon the learning environment. It could also be helpful when lesser punishments have failed to correct the problem. A flagrant disregard for policies, rules and regulation may result in suspension. When a student receives OSS, he or she is excluded from the

school for disciplinary reasons for one school day or longer. It does not include students who served their suspension in the school for in-school-suspension (District, Participating School, 2013-2014).

SIS (Student Information System) –SIS was a computer program from Tyler Technologies that many school districts in the United States utilize. SIS allowed the district's to manage student incidents and discipline. Administrators were then keenly aware of the importance of effective, timely and reportable management of all incidents. SIS provided the tools necessary for school administrators to easily record and manage all incidents that occurred at school or on the bus including student discipline tracking. This flexible software solution could be set up to act in accordance with a district's specific policies and procedures, allowing school officials to follow a consistent process every time. The school district wide data collection system was provided for all staff to utilize. This computer-generated program was updated overnight for discipline, and immediately for teacher grades and attendance (Tyler Technologies, 2013).

Vignette - Vignette defined has several meanings. For the use of this study, when referring to vignette the definition shall be, “a short descriptive literary sketch as a brief scene or incident (Merriam-Webster, 2006, p. 1395).”

Summary

Based upon the investigators experiences within the researched district, it was obvious there was need for research into the discrepancies in male and female discipline. Addressing the amount of referrals sent by teachers, administered by administrators, and the consequences assigned was going to be a serious undertaking of data compilation. Serving as an assistant middle school principal prepared the investigator to investigate

and analyze the data. The investigator desired to understand the thought processes of administrators and teachers when determining discipline for a male middle school child.

Chapter 2 is a compilation of literature to help in the investigator's study and understanding of discipline in the middle school.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

There is much literature regarding males and their behavior in schools. This literature review is organized into sections. The first section will discuss federal legislation regarding gender, how discipline is defined in schools, and the importance of implementation in classrooms and schools. The next section will address gender significance, the impact of teacher and administrator gender on students, gender differences and expectations in male and female students, and the impact on behaviors in classrooms. The literature will also address the importance of training teachers and administrators to be aware of gender differences in the ways male students learn and behave in the classroom. The researcher did not exclude any types of literature and did not solely base searches to the United States. Nor, did the researcher solely research middle schools specifically. The researcher did look at the age range of 11-14, the typical middle school ages.

Federal Legislation Regarding Gender

Title IX of the 1972 Education Amendments, addresses gender equity in the classroom by making it illegal to treat students differently or separately on the basis of gender. The law states: “No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance” (Department of Justice, 2000, p. 52870). Title IX is administered by the Office for Civil Rights in the United States Civil Rights Office and it applies to an entire school or institution if any part of that school receives federal funds; hence, athletic programs are subject to Title IX, even though there is very little direct

federal funding of school sports. The regulations implementing Title IX require all institutions receiving federal funds to conduct self-evaluations of whether they offer equal opportunities based on sex-and to provide written assurances to the Department of Education that the institution is in compliance for the period that the federally funded equipment or facilities remain in use (Department of Justice, 2000, p. 52871).

Every state receives federal funding for Title IX. It is the state's responsibility to appoint a Title IX Career and Technology Education Sex Equity Administrator and a Title IX Coordinator. The responsibility of these leaders is to promote programs that provide gender equity in public education. Training of staff members for all school districts is mandatory and is under the SEA's jurisdiction (National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education, 2008). Directly working with public school districts on professional and staff development is mandatory. According to the law, SEA are required to provide professional development for all agencies affiliated with the SEA. Collaborating with state institutions, agencies, organizations, and other offices, State Education Agencies (SEA) oversee the directors of each Title IX office.

Public schools in Missouri receive federal funding for Title IX. Training for all staff in gender equity is required to be reported to the SEA. If schools do not comply, there are serious penalties. Schools can lose federal funds for violating the law. The U.S. Department of Education, as well as individual students and their parents, may sue schools for Title IX violations. In some cases, federal funding has been delayed and schools have had to pay substantial damages and attorney fees in cases brought to court. Title IX protects students from discrimination relating to perceived or actual sexual orientation. Recipients of this harassment may recover monetary damages. Title IX

prohibits sexual harassment by faculty and staff members and by other students in all school programs and activities in school facilities or in other locations when the school is the sponsor of the activity (Myra Sadker Foundation, 2014). This also relates to a child's treatment in the school when it comes to disciplinary actions.

Discipline

Discipline is when one is submissive to rules (Goodman, 2006). "Rules may be what is learned, what is necessary for something to be learned, or rules of practice and training; the general notion which is connected with conforming to rules" (Goodman, 2006, p. 214). Discipline as defined for schools is "an action by a teacher or school official toward students, after a student's behavior disrupts the ongoing educational activity or breaks a pre-established rule or law created by the teacher, the school administration, or general society" (Goodman, 2006, p. 214). It, discipline, is an integral part of teaching (Wagner, 2001). In two separate studies, Were (2006) and Onderi and Odera (2012) stated discipline can be a guiding system by adults so children will change their behavior by making responsible and reasonable decisions. Students, when they are exposed to self-control, can avoid social chaos, if restraints are built into character of students. Therefore, discipline is central to a school's moral nature (Goodman, 2006). When given quickly, discipline allows children to meet the demands of school and later conquer adult responsibilities (Onderi & Odera, 2012). Students must learn to behave in socially acceptable manners to maintain a healthy learning environment (Wagner, 2001). Discipline is used as a way of training children and guiding individuals to make reasonable decisions in a responsible manner (Onderi & Odera, 2012). A school's

disciplinary system is created to establish control in an atmosphere of mutual respect and confidence within the school (Onderi & Odera, 2012).

However, when asked, teachers, whether experienced or newly hired, will state the biggest student problem is classroom discipline (Mbithi, 1974; Onderi & Odera, 2012). Also, a major concern of parents and the general public is school discipline (Beckett, 2006). Most discipline problems, according to Wagner (2001), “are communication problems with others” (p. 391). Students should behave in a manner that is socially accepted within the classroom, but discipline is used when students show the opposite behavior. Some teachers foster almost all of their students’ abilities, while others frustrate the student. Some teachers encourage students, while others frustrate students (Wagner, 2001). Teachers are instructed to follow school discipline codes, which are typically linked to moral perceptions whether by the teacher or by the administrator (Goodman, 2006).

Discipline in most schools is reported in an office referral. Research showed that office referral data is useful in adding in student programming and student interventions (Kaufman et al., 2010). Dissecting data from office referrals can offer interventions for specific students. When used as a source of information of students’ disruptive behaviors in school, office referrals can have important implications for targeting and ceasing disruptive behaviors (Kaufman et al., 2010). Office referrals can also help individual students by identifying those that need additional supports to help them gain the skills necessary to remain in classes (Kaufman et al., 2010). Discipline referrals can be used to plan interventions, but it also can reinforce behaviors. The student is sent to the office and away from the teacher or class that he or she has disrupted giving him or her a break.

It also can reinforce the teacher to write a referral because it gives the teacher some space from the student who was disrupting the class (Kaufman et al., 2010). This can be justification for the need to enhance the skills or provide professional development for teachers to prevent the onset of disruptive behaviors and to de-escalate behaviors when they begin.

Educators are faced with what type of discipline to use: harsh or effective. Researchers at the University of Vermont researched what works best with children with disruptive behaviors (Parent et al., 2011). The researchers found a variable that was important in the rates of disruptive behavior, gender. Males showed higher rates of disruptive behaviors than females (Parent et al., 2011). What researchers found was that harsh discipline was related to future disruptive behaviors for both males and females, but only permissive discipline was related to future disruptive behaviors of males. Permissive discipline may be detrimental for males and result in them having less well-developed self-regulation than similarly aged females. For females, harsh discipline is the primary contributor of their disruptive behavior (Parent et al., 2011). Overall, the study revealed that harsh discipline consequences are detrimental for children regardless of gender. Lax discipline is also just as detrimental (Parent, et al., 2011). Discipline that is neither too harsh nor too lax is associated with more adaptive child outcomes. Harsh discipline in schools can include, in-school-suspension (ISS), out-of-school suspension (OSS), or expulsion.

In 2006, there were a total of 67,826 elementary and secondary out-of-school suspensions in Missouri. Of those suspensions, 47,010 (69%) were males and 20,810 (31%) were female (U.S. Department of Education, 2006). Total numbers from the

United States reflect the same statistics. In 2006, across the United States one out of every 14 students (7%) were suspended from school at least once. Of those suspensions, 9% were for male students and 4% were for female students. The total number of suspensions for males, 2.3 million, was twice the number of females, 1.1 million (U.S. Department of Education, 2006).

Disruptive behaviors are higher when students perceive that the administration gives unfair discipline (Beckett, 2006). Teachers believe that the enforcement of discipline policies and the overall atmosphere of the school are determined by the school's administration. Nine out of 10 teachers stated that it is the principal who sets the tone of discipline and order in a building (Public Agenda, 2004). Thirty-four percent of United States teachers surveyed after the 2007-2008 school year agreed that student misbehavior interfered with their teaching. However, 72% percent of teachers surveyed that same school year said that teachers in their school enforced the rules fairly and 89% stated that administrators in their school district enforced the rules fairly (Robers, Zhang, Truman, & Snyder, 2010). What happens in classrooms plays an important role in the child's overall school success rate. When the disciplinarian is female, males can suffer (Duffy, Warren, & Walsh, 2001) as discussed in the next section.

Does Teacher and Administrator Gender Matter?

The gender of a child's teacher and administrator can impact the child's school experience (Oplatka & Atias, 2007). The beliefs of teacher's expectations offers insights into gender interactions (Davis & Nicaise, 2011). A study conducted by researchers at Winthrop University examined gender interactions between teachers and students in physical education classes (Davis & Nicaise, 2011). The researchers randomly chose a

rural high school and an urban high school. The researchers chose a purposeful sample of two female and two male tenured, full-time physical education teachers who had taught similar amount of time, 5-11 years, and were between the ages of 25-39. The teachers were interviewed prior to the start of the study and were asked identical questions about how they interacted with different gendered students in the ninth grade. The teachers' classes were then videotaped for eight days (Davis & Nicaise, 2011). The study revealed an imbalance in frequency and quality of gender interactions, even when teachers had professed the equality of gender interaction. It further showed, that teachers did not exhibit gender equity in their use of gender-biased language. There were greater verbal interactions with males to motivate males to pay attention or settle down. However, more praise was given to females to offer encouragement (Davis & Nicaise, 2011). The researchers coded the verbal interactions between the teachers and their male and female students, looking for negative instances and frequencies based upon Martinek and Mancini's dyadic teacher-student observation tool (Davis & Nicaise, 2011). However, teachers are generally unaware of their gender-biased interactions with students (Davis & Nicaise, 2011). This research was similar to an observational instrument developed by Sadker in 1984. The research by Sadker (1984) used an INTERSECT tool and found that administrators and teachers interact differently with female students than male students, in elementary school, middle school, and high school (Duffy et al, 2001; Sadker, 1984).

In American middle school science classes, male teachers have been found to interact two thirds of the time with male students and only one third of the time with female students (Duffy et al, 2001). In contrast, female teachers have been found to

interact with females and males on a 49:51 ratio (Duffy et al, 2001). In the article, “Classroom Interactions: Gender of Teacher, Gender of Student, and Classroom Subject,” by Duffy (2002), the author stated one way to study interaction in a classroom is through the use of the interactions for sex equity in classroom teaching (INTERSECT) observational instrument developed by Sadker in 1984. The instrument aids in the conversion of classroom interactions into measurable, organized elements (Sadker, 1984). The study examined 597 high school students, 294 male students and 303 female students, and 36 teachers, 28 males and 8 females. The INTERSECT instrument structured the coding of interactions that took place between teachers and students within the classroom. The interactions did not include coding for race or teacher interaction with the entire class or groups. All other coding used the same instrument Sadker developed. This instrument coded: 1) initiation by teacher or student; 2) receiver: student, class, group, or teacher; 3) gender of student or teacher; 4) method: call out, move toward, hand up, or private; 5) evaluative type: praise, acceptance, criticism, or remediation; 6) evaluative content: appearance, conduct, intellectual, or other. This allowed for a coding of 16 potential interactions between students and teachers (Duffy et al., 2001; Sadker, 1984). In a junior high (or middle-school aged children), results revealed that male students received more remedial conduct, criticism interactions, and praise (Duffy et al., 2001; Sadker, 1984). Male students were more likely to speak out in class than female students, often disrupting the teacher while he or she was teaching the class resulting in more focus on their behaviors (Duffy et al, 2001; Sadker, 1984). The study found that one area where both male and female teachers acted similarly was in directing more criticism on male students (Duffy et al., 2001).

A teacher's gender does have large effects on student test performance, teacher perceptions of students, and student engagement (Dee, 2006). In a study conducted by Dee (2006), he surveyed 25,000 eighth graders in science, social studies, and English. Females did a better job academically with female teachers and males were better academically with male teachers. Roughly, 80% of all teachers in the public schools in America are female. Currently, in the United States, the number of male teachers is at an all-time low with only 24% of all teachers being male (Whitmire & Bailey, 2010). Dee stated, "Simply put, girls have better educational outcomes when taught by women, and boys are better off when taught by men (p71)." In the study conducted by Dee, he used data from the U.S. Department of Education, School and Staffing Surveys of 1999-2000. The data showed the number of sixth grade teachers who were female ranged from 58 to 91% across four core subject areas, which include, math, science, reading, and history. Eighty three percent of the English teachers in the eighth grade were female, as are more than half of the science and math teachers. In three of the core subject areas, science, social studies, and English, the effect of a woman teacher instead of a man raised the achievement of girls by 4% and lowered the achievement of boys by the same amount. Dee also estimated that female teachers view boys as two to three times more likely than girls to be seen as disruptive, inattentive, and unlikely to do their homework. Dee deduced that males had fewer positive reactions to their academic subject when taught by a female teacher and did not look forward toward the subject area. His conclusions are that part of boys' propensity to be seen as disruptive in grades 6, 7, and 8 is due to the gender interactions resulting from the preponderance of female teachers. Dee stated part of the explanation may be the way teachers view discipline issues.

Drawing from teacher surveys, he found that males are three times more likely than girls to be seen as inattentive, disruptive, and unlikely to finish their homework. He estimated that if even half of the English Language Arts teachers in middle schools were male, the achievement gap in reading would close by approximately a third. In 2007, the average scale score for writing proficiency for all students in the United States was 153. Male student's average scale score in writing in the state of Missouri in 2007 was 143 while female average scale scores in writing were 163 (U.S. Department of Education, 2008). In 2011, the average reading score of eighth graders in Missouri was 267. The average in the nation was 264. Female student's scale scores in 2011 in Missouri were higher than males by 11%. Male students' scale score that year was 261 while female students' scale scores were 272 (U.S. Department of Education, 2011). In a study by Stanford University, researchers detailed a connection with lagging reading skills and school discipline problems for males. The study indicated that slow readers are seen by teachers as aggressive and over time as their frustrations mount, so do their discipline incidents (Miles & Stipek, 2006).

Males go to college at a lower rate and graduate at lower rates than females (Whitmire & Bailey, 2010). Nationally 58% of females get a bachelor's degree and 62% of females get an associate's degree. Dropout rates have been declining in the United States for both males and females. The greater decrease in graduation rates has been for females. Northeastern University released a study that tracked students who graduated from Boston public schools in 2007 (Whitmire & Bailey, 2010). The researchers found 95% of the both male and female students in their ninth grade year aspired to go to college. Of those graduating, for every 167 women in four year colleges there were only

100 men. There is a direct correlation between behaviors in schools causing a poor school experience for male students and males not going on to college (Whitmire & Bailey, 2010).

Due to the increasing demands on accountability of student performance, effectiveness of school administrators has never been demanded more than at the present time. Schools supported by public funding have been challenged by policy makers to

- a) improve student's academic achievement,
- b) enhance student preparedness to enter the workforce,
- c) account for school wide success,
- d) compete with alternate forms of school governance (i.e. charter schools, private schools), and
- e) and social forces that draw student' away from school (i.e. computer games, social media) (Andrews, 2006, p. 36)

In order to reach all students' needs to increase academic performance, schools, teachers and administrators, must adapt to diverse cultures within their schools (Andrews, 2006; Lindsey, Kikanza, & Raymond, 1999). Leaders of schools, both men and women, need to encompass and celebrate all the diversity brought into their schools and serve the learning needs of boys and girls fairly (Andrews, 2006). Those who wish to become school leaders must have a standard of fairness and equity and be aware of the influence of gender (Andrews, 2006).

The Lack of Education about Gender for Teachers and Administrators

Educators are trained to research clues for division among the lines of race and income, but not gender (Whitmire, 2010). At no point in the coursework at the investigators' Midwestern University for a master's, specialist, or doctorate degree is there any type of class examining gender issues. This is the case with most universities

in Missouri. Currently, the state of Missouri requires those wishing to become administrators to complete an educational administration program through a Missouri institution and pass the School Leaders Licensure Assessment in Administration (Educator Certification, 2012). This exam is based upon the Educational Leadership Policy Standards (ISLLC): developed by the Council of Chief State School Officers in collaboration with the National Policy Board on Education Administration to strengthen preparation programs for school leadership (Canole & Young, 2013). Gender is not specifically stated in the standards but could be interpreted within the standards. The ISLLC standards (Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2013, pp. 1-6) stated the following:

Standard 1 = A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

Standard 2 = A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

Standard 3 = A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

Standard 4 = A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members,

responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

Standard 5 = A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

Standard 6 = A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

Missouri, with the collaboration of The Council of Chief State School Officers, is revising the standards to encompass the Common Core State Standards but not to specifically address gender, like Ohio (Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2013). In Ohio, the state changed its requirements for educational administrative licenses by requiring candidates to undergo training in diversity, which includes gender (Andrews, 2006). The University of Dayton, in Ohio, added two courses in the Educational Administration Program, one at the master's level and one in the post-master's level, addressing the differences in student race, social class, ethnicity, sexual orientation, religion, and gender (Andrews, 2006). Andrews and Ridenour at the University of Dayton in 2006 studied the changing levels of students' attitudes toward gender issues based upon the installation of the new coursework at the University of Dayton in their study entitled, "Gender in Schools: A Qualitative Study of Students in Educational Administration" (Andrews, 2006). One master's level course they added to respond to the change was EDA 552, Issues in Diversity, focusing on learning concerns in a diverse society, addressing specifically gender. EDA 653, Leadership in Diverse Communities was added to their post-master's degree students seeking principal

licensure. This focused on promoting an understanding of differences in gender, race, religious affiliation, ethnic origin, social class, and sexual orientation (Andrews, 2006). The researched university, and many other Missouri universities, have not followed the University of Dayton's lead and have not specifically addressed gender in education or discipline.

Gender Expectations for Boys

Teachers come into their classrooms with their own biases and expectations. As early as elementary school, teachers hold gender-differentiated views of their students' academic abilities (Tiedemann, 2002). However, some biases are blatant and some are ingrained so much that the teacher may not realize they are exhibiting those biases (Marshall & Reinhartz, 1997). Teachers treat children of different sexes contrarily because they have already stereotyped and have differentiated expectations about what is typical for males and females (Berekashvili, 2012). Secondary school teachers tend to negotiate with and criticize males more (Berekashvili, 2012; Sadker, 1984). Research in the field of child psychology suggests that teacher's behaviors can play an important role in shaping pupils' gender attitudes. Too often, teachers use gender terms without thinking about the impact on children in the classroom (Bigler, 2005). Teachers should avoid making statements such as, "The girls are doing a good job," or "The boys need to be a bit quieter." Not making gender biased statements will help all children concentrate on their identity as students not as members of a gender group (Bigler, 2005).

In a study done in the country of Georgia, outside of Russia, researchers gave secondary teachers a survey of 104 closed-typed questions regarding gender difference in the teacher's teaching (Berekashvili, 2012). The study showed that gender stereotypes

substantially influence the tendency to differentiate students on the basis of their gender. The researchers found boys were more severely punished for causing commotion in the classroom. This behavior was punished more by making males change their seats or sent to the principal's office. It revealed 53% of the teachers surveyed admit they focus more of their attention on males and only 4.9% pay more attention to girls (Berekashvili, 2012). The study also highlighted the teachers' beliefs that they do not discriminate and the teachers actually conveyed they felt they give equal attention to all students. The study proved otherwise which only can highlight that gender bias is persistent.

In a study conducted in 2002 by Tiedemann entitled, "Teachers' Gender Stereotypes as Determinants of Teacher Perceptions in Elementary School Mathematics," teachers thought the average achieving females were less talented than the males who were equally achieving. This did not change over time (Tiedemann, 2002). More often, teachers call on males, wait longer for males' answers to questions, and provide feedback that is more precise to them. However, they punish males more than females for similar behaviors (Sadker, 1984) Discipline issues, most often arise from teacher and student perceptions about one another. Often, teacher's perceptions from male's body language translates to teachers as an "I do not care" attitude (Wagner, 2001).

The maturation gap between females and males in the teen years is one of the most pronounced brain-based gaps and may be the most disabling feature in a classroom (Gurian, 2003). Males are more impulsive and get into far more trouble in class and in school. They cause 90% of discipline problems in school (Gurian, 2003). In a study, "Teacher Interrupted," conducted by the nonprofit organization, Public Agenda, 49% of teachers have been accused by either a parent or a school official of unfairly disciplining

a student. Seventy-eight percent of the teachers reported that students who are persistent behavior problems and should be removed from school are not removed. Seventy-seven of those same teachers thought that their classroom teaching would be more effective if they did not have to endure disruptive students. Seventy-three percent of teachers believe that most of their students suffer academically and socially at the expense of a few chronic offenders (Public Agenda, 2004). Teachers believe they have the same expectations for all students but yet there is research as to why that may not be working for males. Teachers should reshape their expectations and thoughts on gender stereotypes.

Self-Fulfilling Prophecy

In one study conducted in 1948, sociologist Merton, created the term “self-fulfilling prophecy.” Self-Fulfilling Prophecy, or SFP, draws upon the theorem developed by Thomas in 1928 that stated “If man defines situations as real, they are real in their consequences” (p. 257). Merton drew upon this theorem to create a five-step model, which explained how SFP works:

1. The teacher forms expectations.
2. Based upon the teacher’s expectations, the teacher acts in a different manner.
3. The teacher’s treatment tells each student what behavior and what achievement the teacher expects.
4. If this treatment is consistent, it will tend to shape the student’s behavior and achievement.

5. With time, the student's behavior and achievement will conform more and more closely to that expected of him or her (Merton, 1948 as cited in Tauber, 1998, p. 1).

SPF can work to the benefit or detriment of the student. Teachers form expectations and once a student has been identified by the teacher to fit a certain negative role the chances are increased that a teacher's treatment of a student will aid in negative expectations or prophecies to come true. Teachers form expectations based upon such characteristics as socioeconomic level, dialect, race, ethnicity, name, gender, and other viewpoints (Tauber, 1998, p. 1). Once someone labels a person, it affects how one reacts toward that person. There is research to support the SFP hypothesis that teacher expectations can predict changes in student achievement and behavior (Tauber, 1998, p. 2).

When children become adolescents, there is added pressure for them to conform to the behavior associated with their gender. This is referred to as gender intensification and mirrors the desire to fit into the behavior standards set by peers and authority figures (James, 2007). Children are often intolerant of anything that implies gender ambiguity. If a teacher asks a boy to do something society views as a "girl" activity, such as selecting a pink folder, the reaction may not be an acceptable behavior. Managing those misbehaviors in the classroom represents a challenge for most teachers. Teachers notice the blatant antisocial, aggressive, and overtly challenging behaviors because they are annoying or grating (Berekashvili, 2012). They pay less attention to problems such as anxiety, depression, or social inhibition (James, 2007). The Elton Report in the United Kingdom, (Department of Education and Science and the Welsh Office, 1989) suggested

teachers notice misbehavior in terms of inappropriate movements, physical aggression, distracting others, and interruptions. Teachers notice behaviors, which are annoying, aggressive, antisocial, and overtly challenging. These characteristics are most identified with males (Department of Education and Science and the Welsh Office, 1989).

Another reason that teachers notice the misbehaviors of males more often than females is due to the fact that teachers interact differently with the students of similar gender than they do with students of opposite gender (Krieg, 2005). “Gender,” as a term, represents the differences between femininity and masculinity; the feelings, thoughts, and behaviors identified as either male or female. Thomas (2000) stated in his essay, *The Mind of Man*, “female teachers tend to give female students more praise than boys and give negative feedback more often to boys” (p. 121). He went on further, “women teachers find boys too noisy, too aggressive, boisterous, and consistently reinforce and reward more feminine behaviors...Increasingly, classrooms have become girl-friendly and unintentionally neglect the nature and needs of boys” (Thomas, 2000, p. 121). Our culture often excuses or reinforces negative behaviors of boys and sees it as a function of the gender. The old adage of “boys will be boys” is applied in most environments, but not in the classroom. When males act in this stereotypical manner, boys end up in trouble with the teachers and usually receive some type of discipline (Pollack & Shuster, 2000) as discussed in the next section.

Deductive and Inductive Discipline

Teachers and schools most often use deductive discipline instead of inductive discipline (Ylvisaker, 2006). Deductive discipline occurs when rules are created and then enforced by parents or teachers with rewards and punishments. There are few clear

explanations given for punishments or rewards. Often, children are expected to figure out the rules only after their behavior is punished or rewarded. Enforcement may be consistent, but the punishment may be seen as unreasonable by the child, rather than a natural or logical consequence for not following the rules. Inductive discipline is positive discipline designed to avoid power struggles and negative interactions. It is often associated with a positive middle ground between extreme permissiveness and extreme authoritarian parenting. Authoritative parents or teachers act as the authority figure but discuss and negotiate with children while allowing the child to make decisions when it is appropriate. Parents or teachers invite children to explain themselves and encourage discussions. There are clear expectations, clear rules, and good reasons to follow the rules (Ylvisaker, 2006).

Schools are not traditionally inductive discipline oriented. Teaching styles and school disciplinary habits are not suited for the average boy and sometimes lock them into a cycle of bad behavior (Tyre, 2006). Most teachers care about boys but are not versed in the specific emotional and social needs of boys and teachers often handle these needs inappropriately or inadequately (Tyre, 2006). Teachers with biases toward how boys should behave or not behave make learning environments where boys turn off, get frustrated, seek negative attention, or become the “troublemaker” (Tyre, 2006). Teachers emphasize language, sitting quietly, and speaking in turn (Tyre, 2006). These pressures are undermining the strengths and limitations of what experts call the “boy brain” which can be kinetic and disorganized behaviors that scientists now believe are hard-wired, not learned. Teachers are very well-meaning people who have created a biologically

disrespectful model of education (Tyre, 2006). The teacher's expectations, or rules, should entail more inductive discipline strategies to even the playing field (Tyre, 2006).

A rule identifies general expectations or standards (Emmer, 2003). Sometimes, those deductive rules indicate behavior that is not acceptable such as one cannot talk. Other rules, inductive rules, are positive by stating one may talk when given permission. The unacceptable behavior is implied. Procedures and routines communicate expectations for behavior. Many procedures and routines are not written down anywhere and student interpretation can be different per individual (Emmer, 2003; Salomone, 2006). Males can interpret the rules differently than females.

Biological Behavioral Gender Differences

Male and female reactions and interpretation of experiences is different through biology. Males and females have different brain chemistry that causes them to think differently. The actual structure of the male and female brain is different as well (Kommer, 2006, p. 248). All sensory, sex trait experiences enter the brain through one or more of the human's senses and bring forth reactions in the body (Sax, 2007). Studies on boys and girls show differences in both seeing and hearing (Sax, 2007). Studies reported by Sax (2007), psychologist, family physician, and author of *Boys Adrift: the Five Factors Driving the Growing Epidemic of Unmotivated Boys and Underachieving Young Men*, indicate that girls hear at a different level than boys. Because females are able to hear better than males, sometimes a loud voice is needed for boys. Teachers who do not use a loud enough voice can encounter boys who become off task or lose focus (Gurian, 2003). Females, at birth, hear a 1,500 Hz tone, 81% greater than the average male baby does (Kovalik, 2008). This range of sound is incredibly important because this level is

critical for understanding what others are saying. Studies have also shown that the female and male difference in hearing increases as children get older. Studies have demonstrated that noise levels that distract 11-year-old-females are 10 times softer than noise levels that distract males (Kovalik, 2008).

Boys see motion very well and are attracted to motion (James, 2007). A study was conducted immediately after the birth of 102 babies. The children were given a choice between looking at a simple dangling mobile or the face of a mute, smiling woman. The 102 babies were videotaped and reviewed by researchers who did not know the sex of the children. After analyzing eye movement, the differences noted were significant. The males were more than twice as likely to prefer the moving mobile, while the girls were drawn to the still face (Kovalik, 2008). The reasons males are drawn to motion is due to the rods and cones within the retina being structurally different in the male and female eye. Rods are color blind and cones are sensitive to color. They both send signals to the ganglion cells, some large, some small, but all having different jobs. The large cells are wired to rods and are sensitive to motion, much like a motion detector. The male retina has mostly these larger, thicker, magnocellular cells and can track objects anywhere in the field of vision. The smaller cells contain the parvocellular cells that are concentrated in and around the fovea, the center of the field of vision. These cells are predominately found in the female retina. The male eye structure is geared for motion such as looking out windows and classroom doors, or any other activity involved in motion which is contrary to the expectations of most classrooms (James, 2007).

Girls often start to talk before males and they develop their hippocampus, the part of the brain that is connected with arithmetic, vocabulary, and reading, before boys

(James, 2007). Most times, females are better able to blend information from facial expression, tone and influence of voice, and body language with the words that are said, in order to interpret what a person means (James, 2007).

Male brains are often seen as less flexible than females; therefore they do not multitask as well (Gurian, 2003). This, combined with male hormones, compels males towards inappropriate behaviors. Boys' rambunctiousness, if they get bored, is often seen as inappropriate. The male brain and male hormones can mix to allow for aggressive, uncontrolled, and inappropriate behaviors in the middle school male (Gurian, 2003).

In adolescents, a female's prefrontal cortex is more active than a male's of the same age and generally, develops earlier (King et al, 2010). Adolescent male brains have more cortical areas in the right hemisphere. The adolescent male brain tends to be wired for more spatial mechanical processing than females. Adolescent female brains have greater cortical emphasis on verbal processing (King, Gurian, & Stevens, 2010). Girls are cognitively more ready for school tasks and behaviors than the average boy the same chronological age (James, 2007). In a classroom, girls perceive nonverbal cues from the teacher about being quiet and staying in their seats, while boys may have more difficulty with this (James, 2007). Boys have trouble with what they perceive as ambiguities in rules, so teachers must be consistent in applying them (Gurian, 2003). Boys and girls see taking risks differently and they differ in the likelihood of engaging in risky behaviors, which can have ramifications in a classroom (Sax, 2007, p. 41). Boys present the most problems in the academic setting and are often detached from the learning directives and can seem as if they are goofing off (Kommer, 2006).

Often times males enjoy taking risks and are impressed by peers who do as well and consequences are not a consideration. Girls are willing to take risks but are less likely to seek out those risk taking behaviors. Males are more likely to take risks when other males are present because it gives them what is considered a “charge” (Kovalik, 2008). Emotions, both negative and positive, are processed differently in the brains of females and males. There are limited connections between feelings and language prior to adolescence in both males and females. They have feelings of anger or sadness but are unable to express those feeling in words. During adolescence, the connections between the amygdale, the emotion center, and the cerebral cortex begin to develop and empower reasoning, reflection, and language. However, this only occurs in females, while males’ emotions stay fixed in the amygdale. Often, one way that males can express these feelings is through violence, action, or video games that encompass both (Kovalik, 2008). Males tend to lean toward greater impulsivity, more aggression, and less resilience on bonding because they have less of the bonding chemical in the brain called oxytocin (Kovalik, 2008). Most teachers do not know, nor have been taught in their educational training, how the biological and genetic differences in male and female children effects behavior, nor do they have specific training.

Gender Training and Solutions

Classroom management and discipline is one of the most important but difficult issues for teachers (Baloglu, 2009). Teachers see their biggest challenge as controlling student behaviors. Teachers need to establish standards for acceptable behavior, set norms, and define rules (Baloglu, 2009). One way to prevent problem student behavior is through teacher effectiveness. Teacher’s primary responsibility is to help students learn

in a safe and non-chaotic environment. Teachers are reluctant to admit that the reason's students misbehave can often be related to the teacher's abilities to teach and to manage the classroom environment (Baloglu, 2009). Many times, teachers see the impulsivity, single-task focus, spatial-kinesthetic learning, and physical aggression of males as an opposition to their expectations. "By altering their strategies of classroom management to be more gender aware, teachers and students can succeed (King et al, 2010, p. 57)." Ignoring gender differences does not break down gender stereotypes but neglecting gender differences can result in a reinforcement of gender stereotypes in the classroom (Sax, 2007). Teachers need to consider gender differences in the everyday functioning and language of their classroom.

While instructing, teachers should consider maintaining a balance between competitive and cooperative activities, use gender as a consideration when one regroups, provide movement and energy release activities, build in character education lessons, call on students equally, be aware that some content may be intimidating to one gender or the other, provide gender role models, and provide a positive environment that is gender neutral (Kommer, 2006). In the article, "18 Ways for Faculty to Promote Equity in the Classroom," Lufkin (2009) offered suggestions for school faculty to be gender equal. Teachers should have someone video their class, if possible, to examine how to use praise, how to give feedback, and acceptance. Praise should be coupled with feedback about the quality of work (Lufkin, 2009). Criticism should be in the form of a question, and add suggestions as how to improve. Teachers should not call on the first hand that goes up because traditionally, males raise their hands more quickly and formulate their answers as they go.

A solution is to ask the question, then have students think about their answer, or write it down, before students raise their hands (Lufkin, 2009). When educators do ask questions they must make eye contact with all students, not just male students. Also, teachers should not allow students to interrupt other students since males often interrupt female students. Teachers could use more small groups, which foster cooperative learning rather than competition; however, students must not be grouped by gender.

Teachers should not make seemingly helpful remarks that disparage specific genders abilities such as, “I know that a lot of females have trouble with math” (Lufkin, 2009). Creating a gender-friendly classroom doesn’t mean dividing the classroom, creating gender specific activities, or having same sex classes (Kommer, 2006). Teachers should plan learning experiences that favor both of the genders some of the times to maintain focus and limit opportunities for misbehavior. Learning occurs differently for each gender, and to teach only one way for each gender would do those who do not fit a stereotype a disservice (Kommer, 2006). Students want to know the reasons for classroom activities so teachers should teach them the differences between genders and explain why one teaches things in a certain manner (Kommer, 2006).

Another study pointed out ways that teachers can reduce the opportunity gaps for males and females in classroom. Just like the previous mentioned study, researchers found teachers should avoid stereotypes. For example, do not offer females a place to sit and discuss their feelings and not offer this to males; also, do not offer males more choices for competition, offer both the chance (Eliot, 2010). Teachers should broaden the range of abilities by introducing the arts and kinesthetic abilities to all students; furthermore, strengthen spatial awareness and formally teach spatial and mechanical

skills using puzzles, map reading, and building projects to get students to think in 3D. Teachers should engage boys in verbal immersion. Males must start early with verbal and literary immersion that builds upon vocabulary, phonologic skills, and books. Also, males benefit from a wide variety of reading material that appeals to action, adventure, nonfiction, and humor (Eliot, 2010). When it comes to writing, there is a large gender gap. Males often do not fare as well as females. Therefore, increase the time on task to sharpen the fine motor skills and creativity. Schools should encourage males to belong to nonathletic extracurricular activities due to when the number of males fall below 25% a club becomes non masculine. Thus, schools should recruit males for these types of clubs. Another solution is putting more male teachers in classrooms. Since the 1980's, the number of male teachers in America has declined. More importantly, schools must not tolerate toxic teachers who are entrenched in the thinking that only females can do certain things and only males can do the other. Schools must continue to provide professional development to effectively train teachers (Eliot, 2010).

Due to educational expectations, climates, and policies, boys are most clearly at risk in schools (Guzelman & Connell, 2006). Boys are caught in a Catch-22 in that educators expect boys to be strong and keep emotions to themselves, while on the other hand, educators expect boys to learn the way girls do in school. Learning like a girl can mean to sit still, work cooperatively, be neat and organized, and learn in the same sequence and manner as girls (Guzelman & Connell, 2006).

Abigail James, an educational trainer who provides professional development for teachers on female and male learning differences, thinks that the best thing schools can do is allow more movement and become more tolerant to sound. Teachers tend to want

children quiet and seated at their desks. This is not the best situation for boys whose brains learn better when they have frequent opportunities to move around (Savage, 2006-2007). In middle and high school, a teacher should be careful to call on young men and women equally, include field trips, teach male nature to boys and female nature to girls, teach boys and girls to understand and respect each other, allow movement in the classroom, and offer learning games and competition (Savage, 2006-2007).

During this research, Gurian (2003) found in repeated literature. He has written several books and articles and has an institute dedicated to the male brain and male educational success. He discussed ways for teachers to be more proactive in working with males and stated movement is the most important thing a teacher can incorporate into a lesson for males. He went on to claim that educators should give males at least 60 seconds to respond to a question about their behavior (Gurian, 2003). He also stated that teachers should have more light in the classroom and use more visual aids.

Newberger (2000), a professor at Harvard Medical School, believes that teachers should be aware of not just student's emotional needs but their cognitive needs. He feels that teachers need to be more engaged in students' social world (Newberger, 2000). He also recommended integrating character education by talking about values and elements of character such as

respect and compassion when the opportunity arises. Look for teachable moments around the issues of moral choice in students' lives where their own impulses need to be reconciled with the needs of others...Education ought to be gender neutral at the classroom level, in that high quality instructional design, and

implementation needs to take into account the unique learning needs of students(p. 179).

He encourages educators to examine their own biases and teaching styles by becoming aware of gender and examine their own teaching especially in middle school.

Middle school is a time when the gender achievement gap for males increases and discipline referrals for boys are significantly higher as well (Clark, 2008, p. 127). In a study done by Clark (2008), the researchers worked with a diverse group of 17 middle school male students who were identified as having high academic potential but were disruptive in class. Forty percent were labeled gifted, 60% were considered mainstream students. Of the mainstreamed students, four were receiving special education services. The group met with the young men on alternating class periods for 45 minutes once every two weeks. There were 12 sessions total and they consisted of:

- Session 1: Introductions, rules, norms
- Session 2: Motivational guest speaker
- Session 3: Healthy life choices
- Session 4: Organization and time management
- Session 5: Meditation and negotiation skills
- Session 6: Exercise and nutrition learning stations
- Session 7: Memory strategies and test-taking tips
- Session 8: Preparing for high school part 1
- Session 9: Preparing for high school part 2
- Session 10: Career planning
- Session 11: Financial planning and budgeting for the future

- Session 12: Reflection (p.131)

The group had positive results with the young men. The attendance of the males was excellent and discipline referrals for the group were reduced greatly. Out of the 17 males in the group, only two received referrals during the grading period they were in the group. The previous semester when they were not in the group, there was a total of 21 referrals for eight of the 17 boys. The grades for the mainstreamed males went up 81% and the gifted male's grades stayed the same. Teachers commented on the improved participation, grades, and behaviors. The researchers believed that having the boys envision their futures, offering skills and information on topics important to them, focusing on how to positively communicate with peers and adults, channeling their energy, offering opportunities for exercise, and responding to their concerns focused the young men on their school day (Clark, 2008).

In a Midwestern School District a study was conducted to analyze the referrals for male and female students from elementary through high school using archival data. A Poisson regression model was utilized to determine whether a relationship exists between independent variable, grade, race, ethnicity, gender, and the outcome variable-number of referrals. The study investigated grade level, ethnicity, and gender of the 3,340 students enrolled in the schools and found 1,168, or 49.9% of the school population had one or more referral. Males accounted for 75.4% of total referrals for the schools, which was significantly higher than female students (Kaufman et al., 2010). The data was broken down into four categories: attendance (skipping class, leaving building, detention, tardy), delinquency (weapons, drugs, alcohol, vandalism, theft, cheating), aggression (fighting, threat to staff or peers, harassment, bullying), and disrespect (profanity, disrespect, lying,

disruptive behaviors). For all four types of offenses, males had a significantly higher rate of referrals than female students, 50%. Attendance referrals were 22% more for males than females, and it was three times more for than girls for aggressive behaviors (Kaufman et al., 2010). The study did leave some stones unturned. It did not state whether gender differences were related to the type of office referral. For example, were boys more likely to engage in physical aggression and girls might engage in more social aggression? The gender gap did lessen as the student got older suggesting that developmental levels can also influence behavior in school. The results, overall, were consistent with previous research that boys are significantly more likely to receive office referrals than girls (Kaufman et al., 2010).

Summary

Chapter 2 offered a detailed literature review regarding what is discipline, the impact of teacher and administrator gender in interacting with male students, and how this can determine school discipline outcomes. This chapter offered insight into how to be cognizant of how males learn effectively without engaging them in behaviors that will incur discipline from school personnel. There is compelling educational literature to justify this study. Many researchers see the discrepancies between the amounts of discipline male middle school students are receiving versus that of the female middle school child. The third chapter encompasses the methodology of the study.

Chapter Three: Methodology

As an assistant principal at the study site suburban St. Charles County middle school, the investigator had access to view all discipline referrals and discipline administered in the district. The district data was disaggregated by the school district and was obtained through the school data base called School Information System (SIS). SIS allowed all administrators in the district to view all disciplinary infractions, as well as attendance. Noting the majority of the discipline occurring within the middle schools in the district was for male students caused concern. Chapter 2 provided compelling evidence, from educational research literature, that males are being treated differently in schools across the nation. This chapter explains the purpose of this study and why the investigator felt it was needed. The research was driven by questions and hypotheses. After being driven by these questions and hypotheses, the participants were recruited. This chapter will further discuss the creation of data gathering instruments such as; vignettes that were created to survey aspiring administrators in a Midwestern University, surveys that asked middle school teachers in the cooperating school district to analyze their discipline practices along with possible gender differences, and data from the school district's SIS. A z-test for difference in proportion was applied to data gathered in the study. The chapter will go on to further describe how the vignettes were analyzed and the baseline example. The Teacher Survey will be discussed, as well as, the breakdown of the discipline data from the cooperating school district for a three year time period.

Purpose

This study analyzed administrator response to vignettes describing disciplinary situations involving male and female students in the school setting, data gathered by the

district, and teachers' responses to discipline surveys. This study utilized a mixed method design. The goal of a mixed methods research study is to tackle a given research question from any relevant angle, making use where appropriate of previous research and/or more than one type of investigative perspective. This mixed method study allowed for in-depth, insights of qualitative research coupled with the more-efficient quantitative research (Hall & Howard, 2008).

Research Questions

The research questions guiding the work of this dissertation were "Is one gender of middle school student, male or female, assigned a disproportionate amount of discipline consequences within the four middle school buildings in the district throughout the length of study for this research? Is so, why?" The following sub questions accompanied the research question:

RQ1. How do the biases teachers have, whether know or unknown, contribute to males being referred to the principal's office more often than female students?

RQ2. When asked to administer discipline, do administrators apply more severe discipline to males than females who have the same infraction?

Hypotheses

The hypotheses guiding the work of this dissertation are as follows:

Null Hypothesis # 1: For each disciplinary warning applied to data gathered from each sample vignette, there will be no difference in proportion of gender-based assignment of the consequence when comparing female pre-service administrators' decisions to those of male pre-service administrators.

Null Hypothesis # 2: For each disciplinary detention applied to data gathered from each sample vignette, there will be no difference in proportion of gender-based assignment of the consequence when comparing female pre-service administrators' decisions to those of male pre-service administrators.

Null Hypothesis # 3: For each disciplinary ISS applied to data gathered from each sample vignette, there will be no difference in proportion of gender-based assignment of the consequence when comparing female pre-service administrators' decisions to those of male pre-service administrators.

Null Hypothesis # 4: For each disciplinary OSS applied to data gathered from each sample vignette, there will be no difference in proportion of gender-based assignment of the consequence when comparing female pre-service administrators' decisions to those of male pre-service administrators.

Null Hypothesis # 5: For overall disciplinary assignment applied to combined data gathered from each sample vignettes, there will be no difference in proportion of gender-based assignment of the consequence when comparing female pre-service administrators' decisions to those of male pre-service administrators.

Participants

One population for the study was aspiring administrator students in a Midwestern University master's level classes. Aspiring administrators in the administrative classes totaled 150 students. The investigator went into 6 university classes to accumulate the data. The primary investigator asked for anyone that was willing to participate sign a consent form provided by the university (see Appendix A). One hundred thirty-three

students agreed to participate, some were absent, and 8 declined. Fifty-three men and 80 women participated in the study.

The primary investigator obtained permission from the researched school district's superintendent to survey teachers. The investigator asked teachers in the cooperating school district to reply via an anonymous survey to questions regarding school discipline practices (see Appendix B).

Those teachers participating were middle school teachers only, which consisted of grades sixth through eighth grade. There were four participating middle school within the district. The survey was sent out to 325 teachers. Fifty-nine of the teachers given the survey were male. Two hundred sixty-six of the teachers given the survey were female.

Data Gathering Instruments

The investigator was granted permission by the Superintendent to use secondary district collected data, SIS. The school's Student Information System, SIS, provided the data for the discipline for school years 2010, 2011, 2012. The data was broken down into Excel spreadsheet categories such as student name, gender, teacher name, consequence, time of day, and location of incident. The researcher removed the time of day and location as it did not apply to the study.

The investigator administered 150 vignettes and a discipline guideline to master's level aspiring administrator classes in the education department at a Midwestern university. The investigator then observed classes for aspiring administrators to listen for discussion on vignettes and how discipline was administered based on the guidelines.

The novice principal students wrote a brief reflection explaining how they processed and

made their disciplinary decisions. Subjects responded to five vignettes and had five corresponding reflections (see Appendix C).

Vignette Development: The creation of the five vignettes was a lengthy process. The investigator began by asking other middle school principals, who were colleagues of the investigator, about different events that had happened in their schools. The investigator then took the situations and combined many of them into one vignette. When discussing with the chair, he felt comfortable cutting down all the 10 vignettes the investigator had created to five to be more effective for time and buy in by participants. Dr. Weir, and Dr. Kania-Gosche felt that changing the names to decisively male and female names was important. The investigator felt that different ethnicities must be represented to include all audiences. After much discussion and debate five vignettes and the corresponding male/female names for each were agreed upon (see Appendix D).

Vignette 1 for male and female students is listed in Figure 1 and stated the following:

Female Student
<p>At Anywhere Middle School a student named Jewel and her friends were following another student, Amy, in the hallway back from band. Jewel was taunting Amy by telling Amy how ugly, stupid, and worthless she is. Amy was near tears but held it together as she began to enter the combination into her locker. Jewel and friends, who stopped and were standing near Amy's locker, continue to intimidate and harass Amy by calling her names and laughing at how stupid she was. Amy, who had had enough, began yelling at Jewel to "shut the hell up and get away from me now before I beat your ass!" A teacher who was walking by in the hallway sees the end of this exchange and yells at Amy to get to the office now. Amy starts crying but complies while Jewel laughs and continues down the hallway with her friends to class. When Amy gets to the office with the teacher, the teacher tells you, the principal, what he/she witnessed. You are left to handle the situation. What do you do and what disciplinary consequences would you suggest for the offense?</p>
Male Student
<p>At Anywhere Middle School a student named Zack and his friends were following Adam in the hallway back from band. Zack was taunting Adam by telling Adam how ugly, stupid, and worthless he is. Adam was near tears but held it together as he began to enter the combination into his locker. Zack and friends, who stopped and were standing near Adam's locker, continue to intimidate and harass Adam by calling him names and laughing at how stupid he was. Adam, who had had enough, began yelling at Zack to "shut the hell up and get away from me now before I beat your ass!" A teacher who was walking by in the hallway sees the end of this exchange and yells at Adam to get to the office now. Adam starts crying but complies while Zack laughs and continues down the hallway with his friends to class. When Adam gets to the office with the teacher, the teacher tells you, the principal, what he/she witnessed. You are left to handle the situation. What do you do and what disciplinary consequences would you suggest for the offense?</p>

Figure 1. Vignette 1

Vignette 2 for male and female students is listed in Figure 2 and stated the following:

Female Student
At Anywhere Middle School, in the cafeteria, Laura heads to the normal lunch table where everyone has sat for two years. When Laura arrives, the entire table gets up and moves to another table. Laura attempts to sit at the other table with the students when Ellen says, "You can't sit with us, we hate you." Everyone sitting at the table begins to laugh. Laura is devastated and before walking away yells out, "I am going to kill you Ellen." You overhear this and ask Laura to come with you into the office. What do you do and what disciplinary consequences would you suggest for the offense?
Male Student
At Anywhere Middle School, in the cafeteria, Michael heads to the normal lunch table where everyone has sat for two years. When Michael arrives, the entire table gets up and moves to another table. Michael attempts to sit at the other table with the students when Dan says, "You can't sit with us, we hate you." Everyone sitting at the table begins to laugh. Michael is devastated and before walking away yells out, "I am going to kill you Dan." You overhear this and ask Michael to come with you into the office. What do you do and what disciplinary consequences would you suggest for the offense?

Figure 2. Vignette 2

Vignette 3 for male and female students is listed in Figure 3 and stated the following:

Female Student
In a middle school Math classroom, Kashina continues to talk during the teacher instruction time. The teacher continues to ask Kashina to stop talking and listen to the instruction. The teacher has spoken to Kashina privately, contacted a parent for support, and moved her seat closer to the teacher's smart board to try to redirect the behaviors. Now the teacher is sending Kashina to you for discipline. Kashina tells you that Harper is constantly talking and disrupting the class but the teacher does nothing about it. Kashina feels like the teacher is picking on her. What do you do and what disciplinary consequences would you suggest for the offense?
Male Student
In a middle school Math classroom, Kevin continues to talk during the teacher instruction time. The teacher continues to ask Kevin to stop talking and listen to the instruction. The teacher has spoken to Kevin privately, contacted a parent for support, and moved his seat closer to the teacher's smart board to try to redirect the behaviors. Now the teacher is sending Kevin to you for discipline. Kevin tells you that Henry is constantly talking and disrupting the class but the teacher does nothing about it. Kevin feels like the teacher is picking on him. What do you do and what disciplinary consequences would you suggest for the offense?

Figure 3. Vignette 3

Vignette 4 for male and female students is listed in Figure 4 and stated the following:

Female Student
At the end of the day at a middle school, all the students rush out to catch their respective bus. Students are very quickly running to hug friends' good bye and get one last conversation in before going home. As an administrator you are ushering students onto their busses and helping students with their belongings. Right before the busses pull away, a teacher yells at you to come quickly. You see Samantha and Jocelyn pushing and yelling at one another. Both girls throw down their belongings and look as if they are going to fight. What do you do and what disciplinary consequences would you suggest for the offense?
Male Student
At the end of the day at a middle school, all the students rush out to catch their respective bus. Students are very quickly running to hug friends' good bye and get one last conversation in before going home. As an administrator you are ushering students onto their busses and helping students with their belongings. Right before the busses pull away, a teacher yells at you to come quickly. You see Saul and Jack pushing and yelling at one another. Both boys throw down their belongings and look as if they are going to fight. What do you do and what disciplinary consequences would you suggest for the offense?

Figure 4. Vignette 4

Vignette 5 for male and female students is listed in Figure 5 and stated the following:

Female Student
At a middle school, at the end of the day, a young lady comes up to you, the administrator, and tells you that last night, Michelle has tweeted untrue things about her and another male classmate. Other classmates began tweeting this as well and it has begun to spiral out of control. She is very upset because everyone has been making fun of her all day and calling her names like slut. She is very upset and says she is not coming to school the next day. What do you do and what disciplinary consequences would you suggest for the offense?
Male Student
At a middle school, at the end of the day, a young man comes up to you, the administrator, and tells you that last night, Mitchell has tweeted untrue things about him and another female classmate. Other classmates began tweeting this as well and it has begun to spiral out of control. He is very upset because everyone has been making fun of him all day and calling the young lady names like slut. He is very upset and says he is not coming to school the next day. What do you do and what disciplinary consequences would you suggest for the offense?

Figure 5. Vignette 5

Sampling Procedure

Vignettes: Upon receiving IRB approval, the investigator began working with committee and dissertation chair to determine classes to utilize for the study on March 20, 2013. The investigator determined with the chair that master's level classes for aspiring administrators that had a component of teaching how to interpret or evaluate discipline would be the most beneficial for a sample audience.

The primary investigator met with committee and chair to create vignettes based on situational discipline concerns that were either profoundly female or profoundly male. Two sets of vignettes were created; the only difference was the names were changed to represent male and female students (Figures 1 – 5).

The students used in the vignettes and the actual scenarios were fictional but were based on typical situations found by administrators in a Midwestern middle school. The names utilized in the vignettes were fictional and were identifiable as dominantly female and male names. For example, Amy was used for a female choice and Zack as a male choice. Names were chosen to identify with different ethnicities, such as, Saul to identify with the Jewish culture and Kashina to identify with the African American culture.

It was decided that on the vignette form to be given to aspiring administrator students, study participants would not be asked what subject they currently taught or what district they currently served, as that could serve as identifying information. Gender of the participant would be asked on the vignette form as well as years in the field of education.

The researcher also provided the aspiring administrator students discipline guidelines based upon the investigator's current school district's guidelines (see Appendix E). The committee chair and the investigator spent two weeks dissecting the school district's discipline guidelines to encompass the possibilities for the vignettes. Much revision and communication was involved when narrowing down the possibilities. The discipline guidelines were broken down into three distinct sections based upon relativeness to the vignettes. One section was for minor offenses that could constitute a warning or detention. For example, a student who talked in class could receive a warning or a detention based upon the guidelines. The next section of guidelines were for offenses that warranted ISS, for example, students continued to talk and disrupt class despite several teacher interventions and requests. The third section was for the most

severe offenses, such as bullying another student to the point it impacted the school day and the victim's education. Each offense had a brief description provided.

A response sheet was also created to provide students with an opportunity to reflect upon the vignettes. The response sheet asked the student's fictional name used in the vignette, the grade of the fictional student, and the fictional referring teacher's name, location of vignette incident, aspiring administrator's response, their rationale, consequences given by aspiring administrator to the fictional student, and aspiring administrator feedback.

The initial effort was to go into one smaller, readily available class right away to refine the explanation process before going into a broader audience. It was decided by the committee that the investigator would send an email to the professor explaining what the study was about, how it would be administered in the class, the background of the investigator, the contact information for the dissertation chair, and the university's approval for the study. Attached to the email were the vignettes, the discipline guidelines, and the response sheet. The investigator also made contact with the participating professor to discuss his role in the process. The professor was willing to lead a discussion on the vignettes so that the investigator could write down dialogue.

On April 9, 2013, the lead investigator and the committee chair went into a participating university classroom of aspiring administrators in a master's level class, Educational Supervision, at a satellite location to do the first group of vignettes. The lead investigator and the dissertation chair met with the class instructor prior to the class to review what the lesson would entail.

When students arrived, the investigator and the chair were introduced by the instructor. The chair introduced himself and the program. The lead investigator then asked students to participate in the anonymous situation. Eleven females were enrolled in the class, 10 were present, and all 10 chose to participate and were given consent forms to read and sign, indicating they agreed to participate and that they knew it would be anonymous. After collecting all of the signed forms, the investigator then explained to each Master's level student that she would receive a sheet of five vignettes.

Each vignette had a separate corresponding answer sheet to be completed. On the answer sheet, the master's level student provided the response from them as if they were the principal, the rationale behind their decision, and feedback based on their rationale. The responses and discipline were based on the discipline guidelines the investigator passed out to students after the answer sheet. The investigator had the guidelines printed out and broken down into our categories: warnings, those that warranted detention, those that warranted in-school-suspension, and those that warranted out-of-school suspension, with brief explanations. Students were then given the vignettes.

One set of five vignettes were written so that one page was completely about female students. The female names were chosen based upon names that were associated with predominantly females. One set of five vignettes were written so that one page was completely about male students. The male names were chosen based upon names that were associated with predominantly males. When the investigator passed the vignettes out to the students, the students had not been made aware that the vignettes were different in gender. All students in this particular class were female. Student 1 received a vignette

featuring a female student, Student 2 received a male vignette, Student 3 received a female vignette, and Student 4 received a male vignette, and so on.

The dissertation chair then explained that each vignette would take about six minutes to complete and then he set a timer and called out when it was time to move on. The investigator asked that there be no discussion during or after until all were completed and asked for students not to look at their neighbor's vignettes. Once the 30 minute task was complete, time was called and the investigator and the chair collected the forms. The investigator then began to explain the process. The investigator told the students what the study was and that there were two different vignettes, one male exclusive and one female exclusive. No one in the class admitted to knowing this. The instructor then asked the students their thoughts on the vignettes after the investigator read each one. The responses given verbally in the class were different for males and females in the exact same situations. After briefly discussing the vignettes, the investigator and the chair left the class.

On April 11, 2013, the investigator went into the master's level Field Experience class on the Midwestern University's main campus. The investigator met with the professor prior to class to discuss what was to take place. The lead investigator asked students to participate in the anonymous situation. Sixty students were enrolled in the class, 33 were present, and all chose to participate and were given consent forms to read and sign, indicating they agreed to participate and that they knew it would be anonymous. After collecting all of the signed forms, the investigator then explained to each master's level student that he or she would receive a sheet of five vignettes. Male students were given vignettes first in a pattern of female vignette to male student 1, male vignette to

male student 2, and female vignette to male student 3, etc. Female students were given vignettes in the same pattern of female vignette to female student 1, male vignette to female student 2, and female vignette to female student 3, etc.

The primary investigator went into three other master's level classes over the summer. On June 7, 2013 the primary investigator went into the master's level Field Experience class on university's main campus. The investigator went into a School Supervision class on July 8, 2013. The primary investigator went into the master's level Field Experience class on the main campus on August 26, 2013. The process was repeated in all classes to procure the data.

Survey Questions: With the input of the dissertation chair and the committee, the investigator created survey questions for teachers in the participating district to answer. The questions asked teachers to reflect on student discipline in their classrooms. After creating several questions, the questions were cut down to eleven based upon discussion between the chair and the investigator. The investigator felt it was important to have a response to each question so that the teacher could respond and the chair wanted to focus on the equality of gender. After much discussion, the questions were decided upon. These questions were sent out via email on surveymonkey.com on March 25, 2013 to the participating districts four middle school teachers, 334 total. One-hundred thirteen teachers opened the survey and answered the initial questions asking for voluntary participation, grade level taught, and gender. Each question required a written answer. The first questions were as follows:

1. "What disciplinary issues exist among your male and female students and why do you feel these exist?"

2. “How do you adjust your disciplinary strategies with female and male students?”
3. “What do you believe influences your female student’s behaviors?”
4. “What do you believe influences your male student’s behaviors?”
5. “How do you feel school rules and regulations impact your female students?”
6. “How do you feel school rules and regulations impact your male students?”
7. “How do you expect female students to act in your class?”
8. “How do you expect male students to act in your class?”
9. “How do the students know your expectations?”
10. “What disciplinary interventions work best for female students and elaborate on effectiveness?”
11. “What disciplinary interventions work best for male students and elaborate on effectiveness?”
12. “What patterns, if any, exist in your office referrals?”

SIS Discipline Data. The primary investigator was given access to the discipline data stored in the district’s database by the district’s superintendent. With the help of the district’s technology director, Mike Simpkins, the discipline data desired, the year, school, referring teacher and administrator name, student name, gender, and grade level, was sent via email to the investigator.

Data Analysis Procedure

Aspiring Administrator Vignettes: Vignettes were given to Midwestern university students in the Master’s Level Educational Administration classes. There were five vignettes based upon situations that could occur in a typical middle school. The vignettes given were decidedly male or decidedly female. Students were randomly given

the vignettes. All students received the same discipline guidelines. Students recorded their reflections on an answer sheet provided.

When meeting with the dissertation chair, Dr. Graham Weir, the investigator was asked by Dr. Weir to pick a number between one and five (Bluman, 2011). The investigator picked three. This was to be the vignette number for the baseline question to be analyzed by four practicing administrators; the investigator, Jennifer Waters, Daniel McQuerrey, and Michael Stille (Table 1). The reason to have a baseline was to determine if enough data could be gathered from the situation.

Table 1.

Totals from Baseline Discipline Vignette 3

	Female Students	Male Students
Warning	0	1
Detention	14	7
ISS	1	6
OSS	0	1

Of the interpreted discipline for number three, male students in the scenario received more severe discipline than the females for the exact same offense.

After analyzing number 3, it was determined by the dissertation chair and the investigator that for the remainder of the surveys a sample size of 30 was sufficient for each of the four areas; male aspiring administrators answering about male students, male aspiring administrators answering about female students, female aspiring administrators answering about female students, and female aspiring administrators answering about male students, out of the 130 vignette answers (Bluman, 2011). The primary investigator located a random number generator on the internet. With this program the primary investigator typed in the number 30 as a sample size to be analyzed. The minimum value

of numbered participants was one and the maximum value was 130. There was no need for a seed number.

The vignettes were pulled from the data according to the randomized numbers generated by the software, in order and copied so that each administrator had the exact packet. The investigator created a tally sheet for each vignette.

In order to analyze all the vignettes that were completed by aspiring administrators the investigator grouped the vignettes into female administrator/female student, female administrator/male student, male administrator/female student, and male administrator/ male student. For each group, the investigator threw the papers into the air having them land all over the floor. The investigator's three-year-old daughter was asked to pick out 30 from the scattered piles. This became the 30 to be analyzed in all four groups.

Each vignette was analyzed by a chart created by the investigator. The vignettes were placed into stacks by female aspiring administrator reporting on female student vignettes, female aspiring administrator reporting on male students, male aspiring administrator reporting on female students, and male aspiring administrator reporting on male students. On the created chart, the discipline administered was recorded.

Teacher Survey: The investigator conducted a qualitative analysis on open ended responses provided to all middle school teachers within the district. The anonymous, voluntary survey contained 11 questions. The surveys that were administered were done through [surverymonkey.com](https://www.surveymonkey.com). The investigator asked teachers to answer a set of questions about their classroom expectations, how this information is given to students, how they know if it is understood, and at what point do they send a child to the office.

The issue of gender was specifically addressed. Teachers were asked if they have different expectations for males and females, and if they are aware of any issues they may have with disciplining children of the same or different gender. Of the 333 staff surveyed, 113 started the survey, only 39 completed it. Of the 113 who started the survey 93 teachers were female and 20 were males. These questions were sent out via email on surveymonkey.com on March 25, 2013 to the participating districts four middle school teachers, 334 total. One-hundred thirteen teachers opened the survey and answered the initial questions asking for voluntary participation, grade level taught, and gender. However, each question that required a written answer was only completed by a small number of teachers. Question five was the first question asking for a response and it was answered by 38 people, question six was answered by 40 people, questions seven and eight were answered by 39 teachers, question nine and ten were answered by 36, questions 11 through 15 were answered by 39 people. Surveymonkey.com provides the subscriber with a print out of all responses and data.

Discipline Data: For this study SIS was utilized to analyze the number of referrals and the number of male versus female students. Teachers send referrals to Assistant Principal's office and discipline is administered according to the school's discipline policy. Secretaries then enter the information into the SIS system. Throughout the school day, information is entered from all secretaries in the buildings. At night the entered data is rolled over by the SIS system and access to the information is available the next business day. The information is consistently updated and includes newly enrolled students and dropped students as well. The investigator researched the number of referrals from each of the participating schools for three years. For each year the

investigator created a chart that listed the teacher who referred the student, the student's gender, and teacher gender. For each year, the investigator also analyzed the administrator's number of referrals, the student's gender, the administrator's gender, and number of student's given discipline. Table 2 lists the number of certified staff by gender in the studied middle schools.

Table 2.

Certified Staff by Gender

School Year	Male Teachers	Female Teachers
2012-2013	59	266
2011-2012	42	203
2010-2011	43	202

School 1: 2010-2011 School Year

Table 3.

Students Receiving Discipline Referrals from Teacher

School 1	6 th Grade	7 th Grade	8 th Grade	Total
Males	193	244	199	636
Females	145	81	59	285

In school 1, male students received more discipline referrals than female students, 636:285. This was consistent with all grade levels. The most referrals for female students came from teachers in the sixth grade with 145. The least amount of referrals from teachers for female student came from eighth grade teachers with 59. The most referrals for male students came from seventh grade students with 244 and the least amount of referrals for male students from teachers was sixth grade males with 193.

Table 4.

Students Receiving Discipline from Administrator

School 1	Male Administrator	Female Administrator	Total
6 th Grade Females	1	29	30
6 th Grade Males	0	124	124
7 th Grade Females	55	1	56
7 th Grade Males	123	4	127
8 th Grade Females	1	126	127
8 th Grade Males	1	251	451
Totals	181	535	915

Each grade level had its own administrator responsible for all the discipline. This particular school had a female sixth grade administrator, and male seventh grade principal, and a female eighth grade principal. Teachers wrote a referral and gave the referral to the grade level office. The administrator then spoke with the student about consequences. Administrators also handled any discipline that they felt needed addressed in any place on any school property. Most of the discipline principals administered did come from referrals from teachers but some of the discipline that was administered came from the administrator and is indicated in the table above. The only male principal gave 181 consequences while the other two female administrators gave 535 consequences. Male and female administrators gave almost four times more discipline to male sixth grade students than female sixth grade students with a ratio of 124:30. Male and female administrators gave seventh grade males almost three times as much discipline as female seventh graders with a ratio of 127:56. Male and female administrators gave eighth grade males almost four times more discipline than female eighth graders with a ratio of 451:121.

Table 5.

Discipline Breakdown

Grade/Gender	Bus Suspension	Warnings	Detention	ISS	OSS
6 th Grade Females	2	45	34	10	0
6 th Grade Males	17	84	147	58	11
7 th Grade Females	6	72	47	11	1
7 th Grade Males	5	147	148	63	8
8 th Grade Females	5	111	52	10	8
8 th Grade Males	18	198	162	57	16

The school district in this study broke discipline down into the consequences of bus suspensions, warnings, detentions, ISS, and OSS. In looking at just the sixth grade numbers, sixth grade males received almost seven times more severe consequences, ISS and OSS, than female students with a ratio of 69:10. Sixth grade males also had almost three times more detentions, warnings, and bus suspensions than female sixth grade students with a ratio of 306:81. Seventh grade males also received almost two times more of the severe consequences than seventh grade females with a ratio of 71:12. Seventh grade males also received four times more bus suspensions, warnings, and detentions than female seventh grade students with a ratio of 300:125. Eighth grade males received four times more severe discipline consequences than female eighth grade students with a ratio of 73:18. Eighth grade males also more detentions, bus suspensions, and warnings than eighth grade females with a ratio of 378:168.

School 1: 2011-2012 School Year

Table 6.

Students Receiving Discipline Referrals from Teacher

School 1	6 th Grade	7 th Grade	8 th Grade	Total
Males	141	278	324	743
Females	53	72	151	276

In school 1, male students received more discipline referrals than female students, 743:276. This was consistent with all grade levels. The most referrals for female students came from teachers in the eighth grade with 151. The least amount of referrals from teachers for female students came from sixth grade teachers with 53. The most referrals for male students came from eighth grade teachers with 324 and the least amount of referrals for male students from teachers was seventh grade males with 141.

Table 7.

Students Receiving Discipline from Administrator

School 1	Male Administrator	Female Administrator	Total
6 th Grade Females	1	28	29
6 th Grade Males	0	83	83
7 th Grade Females	30	5	35
7 th Grade Males	128	8	136
8 th Grade Females	3	112	115
8 th Grade Males	9	318	327
Totals	171	554	724

The only male principal gave 171 consequences while the other two female administrators gave 554 consequences. Male and female administrators gave three times more discipline to male sixth grade students than female sixth grade students with a ratio of 83:29. Male and female administrators gave seventh grade males almost four times as much discipline as female seventh graders with a ratio of 136:35. Male and female administrators gave eighth grade male students almost three times more discipline than female eighth graders with a ratio of 327:115.

Table 8.

Discipline Breakdown

Grade/Gender	Bus Suspension	Warnings	Detention	ISS	OSS
6 th Grade Females	5	56	14	7	0
6 th Grade Males	9	107	87	20	1
7 th Grade Females	3	67	31	7	0
7 th Grade Males	18	184	122	76	14
8 th Grade Females	2	182	60	20	2
8 th Grade Males	10	345	160	103	33

Sixth grade males received more than three times more severe consequences, ISS and OSS, than female students with a ratio of 21:7. Sixth grade males also had almost four times more detentions, warnings, and bus suspensions than female sixth grade students with a ratio of 203:75. Seventh grade males also received more than thirteen times more of the severe consequences than seventh grade females with a ratio of 90:7. Seventh grade males also received three times more bus suspensions, warnings, and detentions than female seventh grade students with a ratio of 324:101. Eighth grade males received almost two times more severe discipline consequences than female eighth grade students with a ratio of 136:22. Eighth grade males also received almost five times more detentions, bus suspensions, and warnings than eighth grade females with a ratio of 515:244.

School 1: 2012-2013 School Year

Table 9.

Students Receiving Discipline Referrals from Teachers

School 1	6 th Grade	7 th Grade	8 th Grade	Total
Males	91	143	267	501
Females	26	30	28	84

In school 1, male students received more discipline referrals than female students, 501:84. This was consistent with all grade levels. The most referrals for female students came from teachers in the eighth grade with 30. The least amount of referrals from teachers for female student came from sixth grade teachers with 26. The most referrals for male students came from eighth grade teachers with 267 and the least amount of referrals for male students from teachers was sixth grade teachers with 91.

Table 10.

Students Receiving Discipline from Administrator

School 1	Male Administrator	Female Administrator	Total
6 th Grade Females	0	53	53
6 th Grade Males	0	103	103
7 th Grade Females	32	1	33
7 th Grade Males	134	0	134
8 th Grade Females	0	256	256
8 th Grade Males	2	431	433
Totals	168	844	1012

The only female principal gave 844 consequences while the other two male administrators gave 168 consequences. Male and female administrators gave males almost two times the amount of discipline compared to sixth grade females with a ratio of 103:53. Seventh grade administrators gave males four times as much discipline as female seventh grade students with a ratio of 134:33. Eighth grade administrators gave male students almost two times as much discipline as female students with a ratio of 433:256.

Table 11.

Discipline Breakdown

Grade/Gender	Bus Suspension	Warnings	Detention	ISS	OSS
6 th Grade Females	2	55	19	3	0
6 th Grade Males	7	77	78	29	3
7 th Grade Females	4	44	12	3	0
7 th Grade Males	14	118	98	42	5
8 th Grade Females	3	172	79	26	4
8 th Grade Males	18	434	145	85	18

Sixth grade males received almost three times more severe consequences, ISS and OSS, than female students with a ratio of 32:3. Sixth grade males also had two times more detentions, warnings, and bus suspensions than female sixth grade students with a ratio of 76:162. Seventh grade males received fifteen times more of the severe consequences than seventh grade females with a ratio of 47:3. Seventh grade males also received almost four more bus suspensions, warnings, and detentions than female seventh grade students with a ratio of 230:60. Eighth grade males received more than three times more severe discipline consequences than female eighth grade students with a ratio of 103:30. Eighth grade males also received more than two times more detentions, bus suspensions, and warnings than eighth grade females with a ratio of 597:254.

School 2: 2010-2011 School Year

Table 12.

Students Receiving Discipline from Teacher

School 2	6 th Grade	7 th Grade	8 th Grade	Total
Males	252	451	414	1117
Females	69	149	162	380

In school 2, male students received more discipline referrals than female students, 1117:380. This was consistent with all grade levels. The most referrals for female students came from teachers in the eighth grade with 162. The least amount of referrals

from teachers for female student came from sixth grade teachers with 69. The most referrals for male students came from seventh grade teachers with 451 and the least amount of referrals for male students from teachers was sixth grade males with 252.

Table 13.

Students Receiving Discipline from Administrator

School 2	Male Administrator	Female Administrator	Total
6 th Grade Females	64	0	64
6 th Grade Males	217	9	226
7 th Grade Females	102	0	102
7 th Grade Males	198	3	201
8 th Grade Females	4	59	63
8 th Grade Males	12	211	224
Totals	597	282	879

The only female principal gave 282 consequences while the other two male administrators gave 597 consequences. Male and female administrators gave almost three times more discipline to male sixth grade students than female sixth grade students with a ratio of 226:64. Male and female administrators gave seventh grade males almost four times as much discipline as female seventh graders with a ratio of 224:63. Male and female administrators gave eighth grade male more discipline than female eighth graders with a ratio of 348:323.

Table 14.

Discipline Breakdown

Grade/Gender	Bus Suspension	Warnings	Detention	ISS	OSS
6 th Grade Females	3	93	25	9	3
6 th Grade Males	31	229	144	51	23
7 th Grade Females	11	135	79	22	4
7 th Grade Males	30	285	233	74	30
8 th Grade Females	5	118	70	22	10
8 th Grade Males	29	296	210	75	28

In looking at just the sixth grade numbers, sixth grade males received more almost two times more severe consequences, ISS and OSS, than female students with a ratio of 74:12. Sixth grade males also had almost three times more detentions, warnings, and bus suspensions than female sixth grade students with a ratio of 404:121. Seventh grade males also received four times more of the severe consequences than seventh grade females with a ratio of 104:26. Seventh grade males also received four times more bus suspensions, warnings, and detentions than female seventh grade students with a ratio of 548:225. Eighth grade males received three times more severe discipline consequences than female eighth grade students with a ratio of 103:32. Eighth grade males also received two times more detentions, bus suspensions, and warnings than eighth grade females with a ratio of 535:102.

School 2: 2011-2012 School Year

Table 15.

<i>Students Receiving Discipline Referrals from Teacher</i>				
School 2	6 th Grade	7 th Grade	8 th Grade	Total
Males	341	356	403	1100
Females	51	61	189	301

In school 2, male students received more discipline referrals than female students, 1100:301. This was consistent with all grade levels. The most referrals for female students came from teachers in the eighth grade with 189. The least amount of referrals from teachers for female student came from sixth grade teachers with 51. The most referrals for male students came from eighth grade teachers with 403 and the least amount of referrals for male students from teachers was sixth grade males with 341.

Table 16.

Students Receiving Discipline from Administrator

School 2	Male Administrator	Female Administrator	Total
6 th Grade Females	36	0	36
6 th Grade Males	228	44	272
7 th Grade Females	52	2	54
7 th Grade Males	147	0	147
8 th Grade Females	64	8	72
8 th Grade Males	28	248	276
Totals	555	302	857

The only female principal gave 302 consequences while the other two male administrators gave 555 consequences. Male and female administrators gave almost eight times more discipline to male sixth grade students than female sixth grade students with a ratio of 272:36. Male and female administrators gave seventh grade males almost four times as much discipline as female seventh graders with a ratio of 147:54. Male and female administrators gave eighth grade male students almost four times more discipline than female eighth graders with a ratio of 276:72.

Table 17.

Discipline Breakdown

Grade/Gender	Bus Suspension	Warnings	Detention	ISS	OSS
6 th Grade Females	0	65	18	4	0
6 th Grade Males	11	327	187	61	27
7 th Grade Females	3	79	22	9	2
7 th Grade Males	8	253	151	77	14
8 th Grade Females	10	163	50	30	8
8 th Grade Males	41	372	153	75	38

Sixth grade males received more than twenty-two times more severe consequences, ISS and OSS, than female students with a ratio of 88:4. Sixth grade males also had almost five times more detentions, warnings, and bus suspensions than female sixth grade students with a ratio of 525:83. Seventh grade males also received more than eight times more of the severe consequences than seventh grade females with a ratio of

91:11. Seventh grade males also received almost four times more bus suspensions, warnings, and detentions than female seventh grade students with a ratio of 412:104. Eighth grade males received almost three times more severe discipline consequences than female eighth grade students with a ratio of 113:38. Eighth grade males also received almost three times more detentions, bus suspensions, and warnings than eighth grade females with a ratio of 566:223.

School 2: 2012-2013 School Year

Table 18.

Students Receiving Discipline Referrals from Teachers

School 2	6 th Grade	7 th Grade	8 th Grade	Total
Males	192	312	419	923
Females	57	55	146	256

In school 2, male students received more discipline referrals than female students, 923:256. This was consistent with all grade levels. The most referrals for female students came from teachers in the eighth grade with 146. The least amount of referrals from teachers for female student came from sixth grade teachers with 57. The most referrals for male students came from eighth grade teachers with 419 and the least amount of referrals for male students from teachers was sixth grade teachers with 192.

Table 19.

Students Receiving Discipline from Administrator

School 2	Male Administrator	Female Administrator	Total
6 th Grade Females	33	1	34
6 th Grade Males	260	19	279
7 th Grade Females	101	0	101
7 th Grade Males	283	25	308
8 th Grade Females	6	66	72
8 th Grade Males	48	284	332
Totals	731	395	1126

The only female principal gave 395 consequences while the other two male administrators gave 731 consequences. Sixth grade males received more discipline than female sixth grade students with a ratio of 279:34. Seventh grade males received more discipline than seventh grade females with a ratio of 308:101. Eighth grade males received more discipline than female eighth grade students with a ratio of 332:72.

Table 20.

Discipline Breakdown

Grade/Gender	Bus Suspension	Warnings	Detention	ISS	OSS
6 th Grade Females	0	75	8	4	0
6 th Grade Males	14	260	95	18	6
7 th Grade Females	2	111	35	4	2
7 th Grade Males	5	308	209	71	22
8 th Grade Females	0	153	51	12	11
8 th Grade Males	13	366	344	127	41

Sixth grade males received six times more severe consequences, ISS and OSS, than female students with a ratio of 24:6. Sixth grade males also had almost two times more detentions, warnings, and bus suspensions than female sixth grade students with a ratio of 369:83. Seventh grade males received more than fifteen times of the severe consequences than seventh grade females with a ratio of 93:6. Seventh grade males also received four times more bus suspensions, warnings, and detentions than female seventh grade students with a ratio of 148:522. Eighth grade males received almost twice as much severe discipline consequences than female eighth grade students with a ratio of 23:168. Eighth grade males also received almost three times more detentions, bus suspensions, and warnings than eighth grade females with a ratio of 723:204.

School 3: 2010-2011, School Year

Table 21.

Students Receiving Discipline from Teacher

School 3	6 th Grade	7 th Grade	8 th Grade	Total
Males	248	160	291	699
Females	60	33	213	306

In school 3, male students received more discipline referrals than female students, 699:306. This was consistent with all grade levels. The most referrals for female students came from teachers in the eighth grade with 213. The least amount of referrals from teachers for female student came from sixth grade teachers with 60. In looking at male students, the most referrals for male students came from eighth grade students with 291 and the least amount of referrals for male students from teachers was seventh grade males with 160.

Table 22.

Students Receiving Discipline from Administrator

School 3	Male Administrator	Female Administrator	Total
6 th Grade Females	6	179	185
6 th Grade Males	20	226	246
7 th Grade Females	46	39	57
7 th Grade Males	128	24	152
8 th Grade Females	22	301	323
8 th Grade Males	20	328	348
Totals	242	1097	1339

The only male principal gave 242 consequences while the other two female administrators gave 1,097 consequences. Male and female administrators gave almost two times more discipline to male sixth grade students than female sixth grade students with a ratio of 246:185. Male and female administrators gave seventh grade males almost three times as much discipline as female seventh graders with a ratio of 152:57.

Male and female administrators gave eighth grade male more discipline than female eighth graders with a ratio of 348:323.

Table 23.

Discipline Breakdown

Grade/Gender	Bus Suspension	Warnings	Detention	ISS	OSS
6 th Grade Females	3	208	20	13	1
6 th Grade Males	9	332	98	38	17
7 th Grade Females	3	95	14	6	0
7 th Grade Males	8	158	86	46	14
8 th Grade Females	18	361	110	36	11
8 th Grade Males	18	435	120	52	14

Sixth grade males received more almost four times more severe consequences, ISS and OSS, than female students with a ratio of 55:14. Sixth grade males also had almost two times more detentions, warnings, and bus suspensions than female sixth grade students with a ratio of 430:231. Seventh grade males also received more than ten times more of the severe consequences than sixth grade females with a ratio of 60:6. Seventh grade males also received more bus suspensions, warnings, and detentions than female seventh grade students with a ratio of 252:112. Eighth grade males received almost two times more severe discipline consequences than female eighth grade students with a ratio of 66:47. Eighth grade males also received more detentions, bus suspensions, and warnings than eighth grade females with a ratio of 573:489.

School 3: 2011-2012 School Year

Table 24.

Students Receiving Discipline Referrals from Teacher

School 3	6 th Grade	7 th Grade	8 th Grade	Total
Males	162	310	416	888
Females	87	81	82	250

In school 3, male students received more discipline referrals than female students, 880:250. This was consistent with all grade levels. The most referrals for female students came from teachers in the sixth grade with 187. The least amount of referrals from teachers for female student came from seventh grade teachers with 81. The most referrals for male students came from eighth grade teachers with 416 and the least amount of referrals for male students from teachers was sixth grade males with 162.

Table 25.

Students Receiving Discipline from Administrator

School 3	Male Administrator	Female Administrator	Total
6 th Grade Females	1	137	138
6 th Grade Males	0	216	216
7 th Grade Females	29	50	79
7 th Grade Males	162	21	183
8 th Grade Females	163	4	167
8 th Grade Males	273	34	307
Totals	628	462	1090

The only female principal gave 462 consequences while the other two male administrators gave 628 consequences. Male and female administrators gave almost two times more discipline to male sixth grade students than female sixth grade students with a ratio of 216:138. Male and female administrators gave seventh grade males almost three times as much discipline as female seventh graders with a ratio of 183:79. Male and

female administrators gave eighth grade male students almost three times more discipline than female eighth graders with a ratio of 307:167.

Table 26.

Discipline Breakdown

Grade/Gender	Bus Suspension	Warnings	Detention	ISS	OSS
6 th Grade Females	3	175	21	18	2
6 th Grade Males	14	270	55	32	4
7 th Grade Females	9	97	22	8	0
7 th Grade Males	18	257	126	69	18
8 th Grade Females	3	219	18	7	0
8 th Grade Males	15	479	127	73	25

Sixth grade males received almost two times more severe consequences, ISS and OSS, than female students with a ratio of 36:20. Sixth grade males also had almost three times more detentions, warnings, and bus suspensions than female sixth grade students with a ratio of 339:199. Seventh grade males also received more of the severe consequences than seventh grade females. Seventh grade males also received almost nine times more bus suspensions, warnings, and detentions than female seventh grade students with a ratio of 87:8. Eighth grade males received more than seven time more severe discipline consequences than female eighth grade students. Eighth grade males also received almost four times more detentions, bus suspensions, and warnings than eighth grade females with a ratio of 621:240.

School 3: 2012-2013 School Year

Table 27.

Students Receiving Discipline Referrals from Teachers

School 3	6 th Grade	7 th Grade	8 th Grade	Total
Males	112	127	250	489
Females	41	49	58	148

Male students received more discipline referrals than female students, 489:148. This was consistent with all grade levels. The most referrals for female students came from teachers in the eighth grade with fifty-eight. The least amount of referrals from teachers for female student came from sixth grade teachers with 41. The most referrals for male students came from eighth grade teachers with 252 and the least amount of referrals for male students from teachers was sixth grade teachers with 112.

Table 28.

Students Receiving Discipline from Administrator

School 3	Male Administrator	Female Administrator	Total
6 th Grade Females	0	52	52
6 th Grade Males	4	162	166
7 th Grade Females	110	5	115
7 th Grade Males	197	9	206
8 th Grade Females	7	147	154
8 th Grade Males	36	474	510
Totals	354	849	1203

The only male principal gave 354 consequences while the other two female administrators gave 849 consequences overall. Male and female administrators gave sixth grade males more than three times for discipline than female sixth graders. Male and female administrators gave seventh grade males almost two times more discipline than female. Male and female administrators gave eighth grade males almost four times as much discipline as female eighth grade students.

Table 29.

Discipline Breakdown

Grade/Gender	Bus Suspension	Warnings	Detention	ISS	OSS
6 th Grade Females	0	72	18	3	0
6 th Grade Males	0	201	40	24	13
7 th Grade Females	0	122	34	8	0
7 th Grade Males	6	211	76	25	15
8 th Grade Females	0	177	21	13	1
8 th Grade Males	20	514	125	101	27

In looking at just the sixth grade numbers, sixth grade males received more severe consequences, ISS and OSS, than female students with a ratio of 37:3. Sixth grade males also had more detentions, and warnings than female sixth grade students with a ratio of 241: 100. Both male and female sixth grade students received zero bus suspensions. Seventh grade males also received more of the severe consequences than seventh grade females with a ratio of 40:8. Seventh grade males also received more bus suspensions, warnings, and detentions than female seventh grade students with a ratio of 287:156. Eighth grade males received more severe discipline consequences than female eighth grade students with a ratio of 128:14. Eighth grade males also received more detentions, bus suspensions, and warnings than eighth grade females with a ratio of 659: 198.

School 4: 2010-2011 School Year

Table 30.

Students Receiving Discipline from Teacher

School 4	6 th Grade	7 th Grade	8 th Grade	Total
Males	110	267	274	651
Females	29	112	99	240

In school 4, male students received more discipline referrals than female students, 651:240. This was consistent with all grade levels. The most referrals for female

students came from teachers in the seventh grade with 112. The least amount of referrals from teachers for female students came from sixth grade teachers with 29. In looking at male students, the most referrals for male students came from eighth grade teachers with 274 and the least amount of referrals for male students from teachers was seventh grade males with 110.

Table 31.

Students Receiving Discipline from Administrator

School 4	Male Administrator	Female Administrator	Total
6 th Grade Females	15	0	15
6 th Grade Males	75	4	79
7 th Grade Females	31	3	34
7 th Grade Males	57	10	67
8 th Grade Females	3	50	53
8 th Grade Males	3	170	173
Totals	184	237	421

The only female principal gave 237 consequences while the other two male administrators gave 184 consequences. Male and female administrators gave almost two times more discipline to male sixth grade students than female sixth grade students with a ratio of 79:15. Male and female administrators gave seventh grade males almost two times as much discipline as female seventh graders with a ratio of 67:34. Male and female administrators gave eighth grade male students three times more discipline than female eighth graders with a ratio of 173:53.

Table 32.

Discipline Breakdown

Grade/Gender	Bus Suspension	Warnings	Detention	ISS	OSS
6 th Grade Females	0	30	14	0	0
6 th Grade Males	5	99	48	28	9
7 th Grade Females	3	50	65	24	4
7 th Grade Males	12	90	137	68	27
8 th Grade Females	6	62	71	5	8
8 th Grade Males	15	225	130	56	21

Sixth grade males received more severe consequences, ISS and OSS, than female students with a ratio of 37:0. Sixth grade males also had almost four times more detentions, warnings, and bus suspensions than female sixth grade students with a ratio of 152:44. Seventh grade males also received three times more of the severe consequences than seventh grade females with a ratio of 95:28. Seventh grade males also received two times more bus suspensions, warnings, and detentions than female seventh grade students with a ratio of 239:118. Eighth grade males received almost six times more severe discipline consequences than female eighth grade students with a ratio of 77:13. Eighth grade males also received almost four times more detentions, bus suspensions, and warnings than eighth grade females with a ratio of 370:139.

School 4: 2011-2012 School Year

Table 33.

Students Receiving Discipline Referrals from Teacher

School 4	6 th Grade	7 th Grade	8 th Grade	Total
Males	336	341	433	1110
Females	79	119	246	444

In school 4, male students received more discipline referrals than female students, 1110:444. This was consistent with all grade levels. The most referrals for female

students came from teachers in the eighth grade with 246. The least amount of referrals from teachers for female student came from sixth grade teachers with 79. In looking at male students, the most referrals for male students came from eighth grade teachers with 433 and the least amount of referrals for male students from teachers was sixth grade teachers with 336

Table 34.

Students Receiving Discipline from Administrator

School 4	Male Administrator	Female Administrator	Total
6 th Grade Females	29	0	29
6 th Grade Males	89	0	89
7 th Grade Females	4	27	31
7 th Grade Males	106	14	121
8 th Grade Females	4	99	103
8 th Grade Males	12	198	210
Totals	244	338	583

The only female principal gave 338 consequences while the other two male administrators gave 244 consequences. Sixth grade males almost four times as much discipline than sixth grade female students with a ratio of 89:29. Seventh grade males received almost four times as much discipline as female students with a ratio of 121:31. Eighth grade males received two times more discipline than eighth grade females with a ratio of 210:103.

Table 35.

Discipline Breakdown

Grade/Gender	Bus Suspension	Warnings	Detention	ISS	OSS
6 th Grade Females	6	75	18	9	0
6 th Grade Males	13	229	109	63	12
7 th Grade Females	4	83	46	16	1
7 th Grade Males	11	202	95	122	32
8 th Grade Females	5	210	101	30	3
8 th Grade Males	12	320	173	107	31

Sixth grade males received eight times more severe consequences, ISS and OSS, than female students. Sixth grade males also had almost three times more detentions, warnings, and bus suspensions than female sixth grade students. Seventh grade males received almost two times more of the severe consequences than seventh grade females. Seventh grade males also received almost three times more bus suspensions, warnings, and detentions than female seventh grade students. Eighth grade males received almost four times more severe discipline consequences than female eighth grade students. Eighth grade males also received almost twice as many detentions, bus suspensions, and warnings than eighth grade females.

School 4: 2012-2013 School Year

Table 36.

<i>Student Discipline from Teachers</i>				
School 4	6 th Grade	7 th Grade	8 th Grade	Total
Males	109	269	200	578
Females	31	76	72	179

In school 4, male students received more discipline referrals than female students, 578:179. This was consistent with all grade levels. The most referrals for female students came from teachers in the seventh grade with 76. The least amount of referrals from teachers for female student came from sixth grade teachers with 31. In looking at male students, the most referrals for male students came from seventh grade teachers with 269 and the least amount of referrals for male students from teachers was sixth grade teachers with 109.

Table 37.

Students Receiving Discipline from Administrator

School 4	Male Administrator	Female Administrator	Total
6 th Grade Females	31	0	31
6 th Grade Males	118	2	120
7 th Grade Females	113	1	114
7 th Grade Males	425	0	425
8 th Grade Females	2	110	112
8 th Grade Males	15	346	361
Totals	704	459	1163

The only female principal gave 459 consequences while the other two male administrators gave 704 consequences. Male and female administrators gave sixth grade males more discipline than female students by a ratio of 120:31. Male and female administrators gave seventh grader males more discipline than female students by a ratio of 425: 114. Male and female administrators gave males more discipline than female administrators with a ratio of 361:112.

Table 38.

Discipline Breakdown

Grade/Gender	Bus Suspension	Warnings	Detention	ISS	OSS
6 th Grade Females	1	43	13	4	1
6 th Grade Males	8	119	67	26	9
7 th Grade Females	3	96	71	19	1
7 th Grade Males	14	260	275	136	9
8 th Grade Females	2	100	62	14	6
8 th Grade Males	42	297	136	65	21

In looking at just the sixth grade numbers, sixth grade males received more severe consequences, ISS and OSS, seven times more than female students. Sixth grade males also had almost four times as many more detentions, and warnings than female sixth grade students. Seventh grade males also received more of the severe consequences than seventh grade females with a ratios of 20:145. Seventh grade males also received more bus suspensions, warnings, and detentions than female seventh grade students with a ratio

of 170:459. Eighth grade males received three times more severe discipline consequences than female eighth grade students. Eighth grade males also received more than two times more detentions, bus suspensions, and warnings than eighth grade females.

Data Summary

In the 2010-2011 school year in grades six through eight for all four middle schools in the cooperating school district, 3,103 males received some type of discipline from a teacher and 1,211 females received discipline. Males received over two times more discipline referrals than female students. During the 2011-2012 school year 3,841 male students received some form of discipline from teachers and 1,271 females received discipline. Males received three times more discipline from teachers this year than females. In the 2012-2013 school year, 2,491 male students received discipline from teachers and 667 females received discipline from teachers. Males received almost four times more discipline from teachers than females in the cooperating school district this year (Table 39).

Overall, male students received more discipline than female students, 9,434 to 3,149, all three years from male and female teachers in all four of the cooperating school districts. Male students received three times more discipline than female students.

Table 39.

Overall Discipline from Teacher

School Year	Male Students Receiving Discipline	Female Students Receiving Discipline
2012-2013	2,491	667
2011-2012	3,841	1,271
2010-2011	3,102	1,211
Total	9,434	3,149

In the cooperating school districts four middle schools in 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013 there were nine male administrators and seven female administrators. For the 2010-2011 school year, the female administrators gave 1,360 male students discipline and 791 female students' discipline. The male administrators gave 854 males discipline and 350 females' discipline (Table 40).

Table 40.

Administrator: Student Discipline 2010-2011

School Year 2010-2011	Male Students Receiving Discipline	Female Students Receiving Discipline
Female Administrator	1,360	791
Male Administrator	854	350
Totals	2,214	1,141

For the 2011-2012 school year, the female administrators gave 1,184 males students discipline and 472 female students' discipline. The male administrators gave 1,182 male students discipline and 416 female students' discipline (Tables 41).

Table 41.

Administrator: Student Discipline 2011-2012

School Year 2011-2012	Male Students Receiving Discipline	Female Students Receiving Discipline
Female Administrator	1,184	472
Male Administrator	1,182	416
Totals	2,366	888

For the 2012-2013 school year, the female administrators gave 1,855 male students discipline and 692 female students' discipline. Male administrators gave 1,522 male students' discipline ad 435 female students' discipline (Table 42).

Table 42.

Administrator: Student Discipline 2012-2013

School Year 2012-2013	Male Students Receiving Discipline	Female Students Receiving Discipline
Female Administrator	1,855	692
Male Administrator	1,522	435
Totals	3,377	1,127

Overall, male students in the cooperating school districts four middle schools also received more discipline from the nine practicing administrators for all three years as well with male students receiving a total of 7,957 and female receiving 3,156 instances of discipline. (Table 43).

Table 43.

Overall Administrator: Student Discipline for Three Years

Overall for the three researched years	Male Students Receiving Discipline	Female Students Receiving Discipline
Female Administrator	4,399	1,955
Male Administrator	3,558	1,201
Totals	7,957	3,156

Male students in the researched district received more discipline from both administrators and teachers. This specifically addressed the research question that guided this study; “Is one gender of middle school student, male or female, assigned a disproportionate amount of discipline consequences within the four middle school buildings in the district throughout the length of study for this research? Is so, why?”

Summary

The data that was collected at the end of the 2009-2010 school year prompted the investigator to study the fact that more males in the participating school district were receiving office referrals than the female students. The investigator analyzed the data

from the amount of referrals and it supported the investigator's theory. During the 2010-2012 school years, the pattern stayed the same; more males were receiving office referrals than females. The data collected from the cooperating school district's SIS system showed the proof. The discussion that needed to take place was why this was occurring in four middle schools within the same district. Chapter 3 analyzed the archival statistical data from the schools. Chapter 4 will look at the data procured from vignettes from aspiring administrators in a Midwestern university and anonymous surveys of teachers in the participating school district.

Chapter Four: Results

As studied in Chapter 1, the researched problem focused on the issue of inequities found in the recorded disciplinary infractions of male and female middle school students. This mixed method action research study was performed to provide aspiring and practicing administrators, and teachers' insight to both the numerical discrepancy of school discipline for male and female middle school students as well as the possible gender biases that may exist among male and female teachers and administrators. Disciplinary vignettes were created to measure decision-making concerning assignment of disciplinary consequences to both male and female middle school students. For each vignette, the number of times each consequence was chosen for each gender of student represented in the disciplinary infraction described in the vignettes was tallied. Tallies were converted into percentages for comparison through the use of a z -test for difference in proportion. This awareness can provide an insight into the male middle school child's behavior while improving administrator, teacher, and student relationships, and increasing academic performance of male middle school children. This chapter is organized in terms of research questions and hypotheses.

Questions

The research question guiding the work of this dissertation was "Is one gender of middle school student, male or female, assigned a disproportionate amount of discipline consequences within the four middle school buildings in the district throughout the length of study for this research? Is so, why?" The following sub questions accompanied the research question:

RQ1. How do the biases teachers have, whether know or unknown, contribute to males being referred to the principal's office more often than female students?

RQ2. When asked to administer discipline, do administrators apply more severe discipline to males than females who have the same infraction?

Hypotheses

The hypotheses guiding the work of this dissertation are as follows:

Null Hypothesis # 1: For each disciplinary warning applied to data gathered from each sample vignette, there will be no difference in proportion of gender-based assignment of the consequence when comparing female pre-service administrators' decisions to those of male pre-service administrators.

Null Hypothesis # 2: For each disciplinary detention applied to data gathered from each sample vignette, there will be no difference in proportion of gender-based assignment of the consequence when comparing female pre-service administrators' decisions to those of male pre-service administrators.

Null Hypothesis # 3: For each disciplinary ISS applied to data gathered from each sample vignette, there will be no difference in proportion of gender-based assignment of the consequence when comparing female pre-service administrators' decisions to those of male pre-service administrators.

Null Hypothesis # 4: There will be no difference in the ratio of ISS assigned by pre-service principals considering vignettes based on either the gender of the administrator or the student.

Null Hypothesis # 5: For overall disciplinary assignment applied to combined data gathered from each sample vignettes, there will be no difference in proportion of

gender-based assignment of the consequence when comparing female pre-service administrators' decisions to those of male pre-service administrators.

Summary of Vignette Data

Table 44.

Overall Discipline Administered for Vignette 1

Discipline	Warning	Detention	ISS	OSS	Total
Administrator Gender/ Student Gender					
Female/Female	4	10	10	0	24
Female/Male	1	17	7	1	26
Male/Female	5	10	10	0	25
Male/Male	3	13	9	0	25
Total	13	50	36	1	100

Vignette 1 discussed a student and his or her friends following another student. Student A was taunting Student B saying things such as, "You are ugly, stupid, and worthless." Student B had had enough and yelled back at the group, "Shut the hell up or I will beat your ass!" A teacher walking by only heard Student B's comment and told Student B to get to the office now. Student A and the group began to laugh.

Overall, the most assigned discipline choice was for detention. Fifty aspiring administrators chose to give male and female students detention. The next most assigned choice was for ISS with 36 students receiving this option. The next most assigned option was for just a warning, with 13 male and female students receiving warnings. Only one student received OSS for this offense.

Question 2 of this research asked, "When asked to administer discipline, do administrators apply more severe discipline to males than females who have the same infraction?" Based upon the responses, administrators answering vignette 1, observably, did not apply more severe discipline to male students than female students. Of the most

severe offenses, OSS and ISS, male students received 17 assignments while female students received 20 assignments. Male students received 30 detentions while female students received 20 detentions. Female aspiring administrators assigned more detention to male students than male aspiring administrators with a ratio of 17:13. It is noted that female students received an equal amount of ISS from both male and female aspiring administrators with 10. Twenty female students received ISS while only 16 male students received ISS. Both female and male aspiring administrators gave female students 10 ISS assignments, while female aspiring administrators gave 10 male students ISS and male aspiring administrators gave male students nine ISS assignments. Nine female students received just warnings and only four males received a warning. Female aspiring administrators gave four female students warnings while male aspiring administrators gave female students five. Male students only received one warning from female aspiring administrators and only three from male aspiring administrators. One student, a male, was given OSS for the offense by a female aspiring administrator.

Table 45.

Discipline for Female Students for Vignette 1

Discipline for Females Administrator Gender/ Student Gender	Warning	Detention	ISS	OSS	Total
Female/Female	4	10	10	0	24
Male/Female	5	10	10	0	25
Totals	9	20	20	0	49

Note: One female reporter did not complete vignette 1

In looking at discipline for just female students, it is noted that male and female aspiring administrators gave females the exact same amount of detentions, with both giving 10 assignments. The same instance occurred with the amount of female students receiving ISS with both genders of aspiring administrators giving 10 assignments. Even

the amount of warnings issued by male and female aspiring administrators was close with a ratio of 5:4. Zero female students were given OSS. The investigator did not know why one female reporter did not complete vignette 1.

Table 46.

Discipline for Male Students for Vignette 1

Discipline for males Administrator Gender/ Student Gender	Warning	Detention	ISS	OSS	Total
Female/Male	1	17	7	1	26
Male/Male	3	13	9	0	25
Totals	4	30	16	1	51

Note: One female reporter gave multiple forms of discipline.

In looking at discipline for just male students, the most assigned discipline was for detention. Female aspiring administrators gave 17 male students detention while male aspiring administrators assigned 13. The second most assigned offense was ISS with male aspiring administrators giving male students nine assignments while female aspiring administrators seven. The third most assigned offense was for just a warning with male aspiring administrators assigning male students three and female aspiring administrators gave just one. One male student received OSS from a female aspiring administrator and male aspiring administrators gave zero. One female reporter gave two different assignments, one OSS and one detention.

Table 47.

Overall Discipline Administered for Vignette 2

Discipline Administrator Gender/ Student Gender	Warning	Detention	ISS	OSS	Total
Female/Female	11	6	4	3	24
Female/Male	6	7	7	5	21
Male/Female	0	13	7	5	25
Male/Male	5	2	8	10	25
Total	22	28	26	23	95

Vignette 2 two discussed the students in the cafeteria at lunch. A student had sat with the same group of friends for two years; however, when the student arrived at the table on this particular day, one student said, “We hate you, you can’t sit with us.” Everyone at the table got up and moved to another table. The student was upset by this and while walking away yelled out, “I am going to kill you” to the student who made the offending statement. In the vignette, the aspiring administrator is the administrator in the situation and overheard the student making the statement about killing the other student.

Overall, the most assigned discipline choice was for detention. Twenty-eight aspiring administrators chose to give students detention. A close second was to assign students ISS with 26 aspiring administrators feeling this was the best option. Twenty-three aspiring administrators felt OSS was appropriate, and 22 felt that just a warning was efficient.

Question 2 of this research asked, “When asked to administer discipline, do administrators apply more severe discipline to males than females who have the same infraction?” Based upon the responses, administrators answering vignette two, observably, male students received more assignments to the more severe punishments of OSS and ISS. Thirty-one males received the more severe consequences while females received 20 assignments.

In looking more carefully at the gender differences, male aspiring administrators assigned more OSS to male students than female aspiring administrators by a ratio of 2:1. Male aspiring administrators did not give female students any warnings and requested for the majority of female students to receive detention. In contrast, female aspiring administrators gave the majority of female student’s warnings and assigned OSS the

least. Male aspiring administrators gave the majority, 13, of female offender's detention while only giving two male students detention. Female aspiring administrators gave male students an equal amount of detention and ISS with seven.

Table 48.

Discipline for Female Students for Vignette 2

Discipline for females	Warning	Detention	ISS	OSS	Total
Administrator Gender/ Student Gender					
Female/Female	11	6	4	3	24
Male/Female	0	13	7	5	25
Totals	11	19	11	8	49

Note: One female reporter did not complete vignette two

In looking at the discipline for just female students, female administrators gave 11 warnings and male aspiring administrators gave no warnings. Male aspiring administrators gave the majority of female students' detention, with 13, while female aspiring administrators gave six female students detention. Male aspiring administrators gave female students more of the harsher consequences of ISS and OSS than female aspiring administrators with a ratio of 13:7. Overall, female aspiring administrators gave more of the less severe consequences, warnings and detentions, to female students than male aspiring administrators with a ratio of 17:13. The investigator is unsure as to why one reporter did not complete vignette 2.

Table 49.

Discipline Administered for Male Students for Vignette 2

Discipline for males	Warning	Detention	ISS	OSS	Total
Administrator Gender/ Student Gender					
Female/Male	6	7	7	5	25
Male/Male	5	2	8	10	25
Totals	11	9	15	15	50

In looking at the discipline for just male students, the most severe offenses of ISS and OSS were equal at 15. However, male aspiring administrators gave 18 males those severe consequences in contrast to female aspiring administrators giving male students only 12 of the most serious offenses. Female aspiring administrators gave male students more of the less severe consequences, warnings and detentions, than male aspiring administrators with a ratio of 13:7. The amount of students receiving ISS was similar by both genders of aspiring administrators, males receiving eight, females receiving seven, as was the amount of warnings with males receiving five and females receiving six. Female aspiring administrators gave male students more detention than male aspiring administrators by a significant margin, 7:2.

Table 50.

Overall Discipline Administered for Vignette 3

Discipline	Warning	Detention	ISS	OSS	Total
<i>Administrator Gender/ Student Gender</i>					
Female/Female	4	13	5	0	22
Female/Male	4	16	5	0	25
Male/Female	0	22	2	1	25
Male/Male	3	11	9	0	23
Total	11	73	21	1	95

Vignette 3 discussed a student who continued to talk during the teacher's class instruction time. The teacher made numerous requests for the student to be quiet. The teacher had tried several interventions in the past such as, speaking with the student privately, contacting the parent for support, and moving the child's seat closer to the teacher's smart board. The teacher sent the student to the principal's office for discipline.

The aspiring administrators seemed to overwhelmingly feel that detention was the appropriate response for all students with 62 overall. The second most common option

for the aspiring administrators was ISS with 21. Ten students received just a warning from aspiring administrators, and only one student received OSS.

Question 2 of this research asked, “When asked to administer discipline, do administrators apply more severe discipline to males than females who have the same infraction?” Based upon the responses, administrators answering vignette 3, observably, male students received more severe discipline assignments, OSS and ISS, with 14. Female students received eight assignments to OSS and ISS. Of the lesser severe punishments, warnings and detentions, detention is considered more serious. Males also received more detentions, 27, while female students received 25 detentions.

In looking more carefully at gender differences, male aspiring administrators gave 22 female students detention and gave only 11 male students detention. However, the male reporters gave nine male students ISS and only two female students ISS. Female aspiring administrators gave only five male students ISS and five female students ISS. Male aspiring administrators gave one female student OSS. No other students received OSS. Of the most serious offenses, ISS and OSS, male students received the most with 14 and female students received eight assignments of the most severe offenses. Female aspiring administrators’ assigned 20 male students the less severe assignments, warning and detentions, with 20 and male aspiring administrators giving male students 14. Female aspiring administrators assigned 17 female students warnings and detentions, while male administrators assigned 22 males the less severe consequences, however, of the lesser consequences, male students received them all in the form of detentions and no warnings. Overall, female aspiring administrators gave male and female students the most of the

lesser offenses with 37 while male administrators gave both male and female students the lesser offenses with 36.

Table 51.

Discipline for Female Students for Vignette 3

Discipline for females	Warning	Detention	ISS	OSS	Total
Administrator Gender/ Student Gender					
Female/Female	4	13	5	0	22
Male/Female	0	22	2	1	25
Totals	4	35	7	1	47

Note: Three female reporters did not complete vignette three

In looking at discipline administered by aspiring administrators for just female students it is notable that the majority of female students, 35, received detention. Twenty-two male aspiring administrators and 13 female aspiring administrators gave female students detention. It was interesting to note that the second most assigned consequence was ISS with only 7 total female students receiving this consequence. Two females received ISS from male aspiring administrators and five female students received ISS from female aspiring administrators. Four female students received just a warning from female aspiring administrators and zero from male aspiring administrators. Four female students received warnings from female aspiring administrators and zero female students received warnings from male aspiring administrators. Only one female student was assigned OSS and that was by a male aspiring administrator. The investigator does not know why three female aspiring administrators did not report on vignette three.

Table 52.

Discipline for Male Students for Vignette 3

Discipline for males	Warning	Detention	ISS	OSS	Total
<i>Administrator Gender/ Student Gender</i>					
Female/Male	4	16	5	0	25
Male/Male	3	11	9	0	23
Totals	7	27	14	0	48

Note: Two male reporters did not answer vignette three

In looking at the discipline for just male students, it is notable to see that the majority of male students, 27, received detention. Female aspiring administrators assigned the most male students detention with 16. Male aspiring administrators only assigned male students 11 detentions. The second most received offense was for ISS. Fourteen male students received ISS, none of those were assigned by male aspiring administrators, and five by female aspiring administrators. Seven male students were just given warnings which was close among aspiring administrators at three for male aspiring administrators and four for female aspiring administrators. No male or female aspiring administrator assigned male students to OSS. The investigator is unsure as to why two male reporters did not complete the vignette.

Table 53.

Overall Discipline Administered for Vignette 4

Discipline	Warning	Detention	ISS	OSS	Total
<i>Administrator Gender/ Student Gender</i>					
Female/Female	4	6	4	7	21
Female/Male	1	9	6	8	24
Male/Female	6	6	6	8	26
Male/Male	2	11	2	8	23
Total	13	32	18	31	94

Vignette 4 discussed the end of the day dismissal and students getting on their busses. A teacher called the administrator over because two students were pushing and

yelling at one another. Both students threw down their belongings and looked as if they were going to fight.

The most common response, overall, from aspiring administrators was for detention. Thirty-two aspiring administrators chose to give students detention. A close second was to suspend the offenders' out-of-school with 31 aspiring administrators feeling this was the best option. Eighteen aspiring administrators felt that ISS was the best option, while 13 thought that just a warning was sufficient.

Question 2 of this research asked, "When asked to administer discipline, do administrators apply more severe discipline to males than females who have the same infraction?" Based upon the responses, administrators answering vignette 4, observably, female students received more of the severe consequences, OSS and ISS, with 25 and male students received 24 assignments.

In looking more carefully at gender differences in discipline, the amount of detention given to male students by male aspiring administrators, 11, seem to be most dominant, especially since female aspiring administrators giving female students detention was only six. What was apparent was the amount of warnings received by male students, three, versus the amount for female students, which was 10. However, the amount of female aspiring administrators giving male students detention was not too far behind by 9:11. The amount of students receiving ISS by both genders showed no large discrepancies.

Table 54.

Discipline Administered for Female Students for Vignette 4

Discipline for females	Warning	Detention	ISS	OSS	Total
<i>Administrator Gender/ Student Gender</i>					
Female/Female	4	6	4	7	21
Male/Female	6	6	6	8	26
Totals	10	12	10	15	47

Note: Four female reporters and one male reporter did not complete the vignette 4.

In looking at the discipline administered by aspiring administrators for just female students it is notable to see that the majority of female students received OSS. It was interesting to see that the second most received discipline was detention, then warnings and ISS. It appears that both male and female aspiring administrators were in the same opinion when it came to warnings, detentions, and ISS as both assigned the exact same amount of discipline. The investigator is unsure as to why four female reporters and one male did not complete the vignette but could assume that it was perhaps because the aspiring administrators came in late to the class and did not have time to complete the vignette or just did not want to complete the vignette. Only 21 female aspiring administrators responded and 24 male aspiring administrators responded. Of the additional male aspiring administrator's three choices, one was a suspension.

Table 55.

Discipline Administered for Male Students for Vignette 4

Discipline for males	Warning	Detention	ISS	OSS	Total
<i>Administrator Gender/ Student Gender</i>					
Female/Male	1	9	6	8	24
Male/Male	2	11	2	8	23
Totals	3	20	8	16	47

Note: One female reporter and two male reporters did not complete the vignette 4.

When looking at discipline administered for just male students it was notable that detention seemed to be the overwhelming response. Male aspiring administrators gave more detention than female administrators by two. Female aspiring administrators gave ISS more than male administrators did. It was interesting to note that the number of OSS was equal among the administrators. Also, notable was the small number of warnings issued. Males were given 20 detentions and, even harsher, 16 were given OSS. The investigator was unsure as to why the one female aspiring administrator and the two male aspiring administrators did not complete the vignette.

Table 56.

Overall Discipline Administered for Vignette 5

Discipline	Warning	Detention	ISS	OSS	Total
Administrator Gender/ Student Gender					
Female/Female	4	2	9	6	21
Female/Male	4	5	13	2	24
Male/Female	6	4	11	2	23
Male/Male	7	2	6	6	21
Total	21	13	39	16	89

Vignette 5 discussed a student tweeting untrue rumors about another student and the issue became that other students were joining in on these rumors by calling the victim names, so much so, that the victim did not want to come back to school the next day.

The most common response from the aspiring administrators was to give the offending student ISS. Overall, 39 students were assigned ISS. A distant second offense was a warning, with 21 students receiving a warning. Sixteen students received OSS from aspiring administrators while only 13 received detention.

Question 2 of this research asked, “When asked to administer discipline, do administrators apply more severe discipline to males than females who have the same

infraction?" Based upon the responses, administrators answering vignette 5, observably, female students received more severe consequences of OSS and ISS with 28 assignments while male students received 27 assignments to the two.

In examining gender differences more carefully, female aspiring administrators gave 13 males students ISS and male aspiring administrators gave 11 females ISS. It is interesting to note the aspiring administrator, both male and female, gave the opposite gender student harsher consequences than the same gender student. Male students did receive one more warning than female students from the aspiring administrators, 11 versus 10. The amount of students, both male and female, receiving OSS was equal. Male students received seven detentions while female students received six detentions from aspiring administrators.

Table 57.

Discipline Administered for Female Students for Vignette 5

Discipline for females Administrator Gender/ Student Gender	Warning	Detention	ISS	OSS	Total
Female/Female	4	2	9	6	21
Male/Female	6	4	11	2	23
Totals	10	6	20	8	44

Note: Four female and two male reporters did not complete vignette 5

In looking at the discipline administered by aspiring administrators for just female students it is notable to see that the majority of female students received ISS. It was interesting to see that the second most received discipline was a warning, then, OSS, and lastly, detention. It appears that female aspiring administrators gave female students more of the most severe discipline, OSS, than male aspiring administrators did. Male aspiring administrators gave female students more ISS, more detentions, and more warnings than female aspiring administrators. The investigator is unsure as to why four

female reporters and two male reporters did not complete the vignette but could assume it was because the aspiring administrator came in late to the class and did not have time to complete the vignette or just did not want to compete the vignette. When analyzing the most severe forms of discipline, ISS and OSS, female aspiring administrators gave female students more of the severe forms of discipline than male aspiring administrators by a ratio of 15:13.

Table 58.

Discipline Administered for Male Students for Vignette 5

Discipline for males Administrator Gender/ Student Gender	Warning	Detention	ISS	OSS	Total
Female/Male	4	5	13	2	24
Male/Male	7	2	6	6	21
Totals	11	7	19	8	45

Note: One female and four male reporters did not complete vignette 5

When looking at discipline administered for just male students it was notable that ISS was the overwhelming option chosen by aspiring administrators. Female aspiring administrators gave male students more ISS than male aspiring administrators gave by seven. The second most administered discipline was warnings and male aspiring administrators gave male students more warnings than female aspiring administrators did by three. Male aspiring administrators gave six males the most severe offense, OSS, and female aspiring administrators gave only two male students OSS. However, female aspiring administrators gave more male students detention than male aspiring administrators by a ratio of 5:2. One female reporter did not complete this vignette and four male reporters did not complete it. The reasons as to why they did not complete the vignette are unknown.

Vignette Data Summation

Vignettes: Question 2 of this study stated, “When asked to administer discipline, do administrators apply more severe discipline to males than females who have the same infraction?” When aspiring administrators in classes at a Midwestern University read the vignettes and administered discipline, observably, they did not administer more severe discipline to males in every situation. Vignettes 2 and 3 of the five administered were the only ones where male students received more severe discipline than female students. In the other remaining vignettes, female students received more severe consequences than males. In vignettes 4 and 5, the amount of discipline received by female students over male students was by only one assignment. It is noted that more female aspiring administrators took the surveys than male aspiring administrators.

The following table shows the number of consequences assigned overall for each vignette by gender of administrator and gender of student. (Table 59).

Table 59.

Consequences Assigned Overall

Gender of Administrator/Student	Vignette 1	Vignette 2	Vignette 3	Vignette 4	Vignette 5	Total
Female/Female	24	24	22	21	21	112
Female/Male	26	21	25	24	24	120
Male/Female	25	25	25	26	23	124
Male/Male	25	25	23	23	21	117
Total	100	95	95	94	89	473

Overall, the data showed that it was similar. Females received more discipline than males in vignettes number one, and number two. Males received more discipline, overall, in vignettes number three and five. It was an even tie in vignette four.

The following table shows the overall assigned discipline by aspiring administrators broken down into consequence by gender of administrator and the gender of the students (Table 60).

Table 60.

Gender of Administrator/Student	Warnings	Detention	ISS	OSS	Total
Female/Female	23	37	32	16	108
Female/Male	16	54	38	16	124
Male/Female	17	55	36	16	124
Male/Male	20	39	34	24	117
Total	76	185	140	72	473

Overall, male students received harsher consequences, ISS and OSS, than female students from the aspiring administrators surveyed by a ratio of 112:100.

For each hypothesis, analysis was applied to proportions representing the different possible combinations of gender between the pre-service administrator assigning the disciplinary consequence and the student receiving the consequence. Combinations included an examination of the proportion of: a) females assigned the consequence by a female pre-service administrator, b) males assigned the consequence by a female pre-service administrator, c) females assigned the consequence by a male pre-service administrator, and d) males assigned the consequence by a male pre-service administrator, as well as: e) female pre-service administrators assigning consequences to female students, f) female pre-service administrators assigning consequences to male students, g) male pre-service administrators assigning consequences to female students, and h) male pre-service administrators assigning consequences to male students.

Hypotheses

Null Hypothesis # 1: For each disciplinary warning applied to data gathered from each sample vignette, there will be no difference in proportion of gender-based assignment of the consequence when comparing female pre-service administrators' decisions to those of male pre-service administrators (PSA).

For the disciplinary consequence of warning in vignette 1, comparison of proportions of all combinations of assignment according to gender between PSAs and students resulted in non-rejection of the Null Hypothesis. The data did not support a difference in the disciplinary treatment of male students compared to female students.

Table 61.

Vignette 1: Disciplinary Warning

	Male	Female	z-test value	Significance
Female PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	3.8	16.6	1.511	
Male PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	12.0	20.0	0.771	
Male Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	12.0	3.8	-1.090	
Female Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	20.0	16.6	-0.307	

Note: PSA- pre-service administrators. Critical Value = ± 1.96 .

For the disciplinary consequence of warning in vignette 2, the Null Hypothesis was rejected in the cases of assignment to male students versus female students by male PSAs and the assignment to gender by male PSAs versus female PSAs. Data supported a significantly larger proportion of male students receiving disciplinary warning than female students, when assigned by male PSAs. The data also supported a significantly

larger proportion of female PSAs assigning to female students than male PSAs assigning to female students.

Table 62.

Vignette 2: Disciplinary Warning

	Male	Female	z-test value	Significance
Female PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	28.5	45.8	1.194	
Male PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	20.0	0.0	-2.357	*
Male Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	20.0	28.5	0.673	
Female Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	0.0	45.8	3.842	*

Note: PSA- pre-service administrators. Critical Value = ± 1.96 .

For the disciplinary consequence of warning in vignette 2, all other comparisons of proportions of assignment according to gender between PSAs and students resulted in non-rejection of the Null Hypothesis. The data did not support a difference in the disciplinary treatment of male students compared to female students, in those cases.

Table 63.

Vignette 3: Disciplinary Warning

	Male	Female	z-test value	Significance
Female PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	16.0	18.1	0.191	
Male PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	13.0	0.0	-1.861	
Male Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	13.0	16.0	0.294	
Female Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	0.0	18.1	2.223	*

Note: PSA- pre-service administrators. Critical Value = ± 1.96 .

For the disciplinary consequence of warning in vignette 3, the Null Hypothesis was rejected in the case of assignment to gender by male PSAs versus female PSAs. The data supported a significantly larger proportion of female PSAs assigning to female students than male PSAs assigning to male students.

For the disciplinary consequence of warning in vignette 3, all other comparisons of proportions of assignment according to gender between PSAs and students resulted in non-rejection of the Null Hypothesis. The data did not support a difference in the disciplinary treatment of male students compared to female students, in those cases.

Table 64.

Vignette 4: Disciplinary Warning

	Male	Female	z-test value	Significance
<hr/>				
Female PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	4.1	19.0	1.590	
Male PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	8.6	23.0	1.363	
Male Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	8.6	4.1	-0.634	
Female Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	23.0	19.0	-0.333	

Note: PSA- pre-service administrators. Critical Value = ± 1.96 .

For the disciplinary consequence of warning in vignette 4, comparison of proportions of all combinations of assignment according to gender between PSAs and students resulted in non-rejection of the Null Hypothesis. The data did not support a difference in the disciplinary treatment of male students compared to female students.

Table 65.

Vignette 5: Disciplinary Warning

	Male	Female	z-test value	Significance
Female PSAs Male Student% vs. Female Student%	16.6	19.0	0.210	
Male PSAs Male % vs. Female %	26.0	33.3	0.528	
Male Student Consequence Assignment Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	26.0	16.6	-0.772	
Female Student Consequence Assignment Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	33.3	19.0	-1.073	

Note: PSA- pre-service administrators. Critical Value = ± 1.96 .

For the disciplinary consequence of warning in Vignette 5, comparison of proportions of all combinations of assignment according to gender between PSAs and students resulted in non-rejection of the Null Hypothesis. The data did not support a difference in the disciplinary treatment of male students compared to female students.

Summary of Null Hypothesis #1

The Null Hypothesis stated that each disciplinary warning applied to data gathered from each sample vignette, there will be no difference in proportion of gender-based assignment of the consequence when comparing female pre-service administrators' decisions to those of male pre-service administrators. The overall data did not support a difference in the disciplinary treatment of male students compared to female students.

The following table shows each vignette, the critical value, the total value, and if the null hypothesis was rejected or not.

Table 66.

Null Hypothesis #1 Summary

Vignette	Total Value	Critical Value	Reject Y/N
#1	-.307	1.96	N
#2	3.842	1.96	Y
#3	2.223	1.96	Y
#4	-.333	1.96	N
#5	-1.073	1.96	N

Null Hypothesis # 2: For each disciplinary detention applied to data gathered from each sample vignette, there will be no difference in proportion of gender-based assignment of the consequence when comparing female pre-service administrators' decisions to those of male pre-service administrators.

Table 67.

Vignette 1: Disciplinary Detention

	Male	Female	z-test value	Significance
Female PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	65.3	41.6	-1.679	
Male PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	52.0	40.0	-0.851	
Male Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	52.0	65.3	0.964	
Female Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	40.0	41.6	0.113	

Note: PSA- pre-service administrators. Critical Value = ± 1.96 .

For the disciplinary consequence of detention in vignette 1, comparison of proportions of all combinations of assignment according to gender between PSAs and students resulted in non-rejection of the Null Hypothesis. The data did not support a difference in the disciplinary treatment of male students compared to female students.

Table 68.

Vignette 2: Disciplinary Detention

	Male	Female	z-test value	Significance
Female PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	33.3	25.0	-0.612	
Male PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	8.0	52.0	3.394	*
Male Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	8.0	33.3	2.155	*
Female Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	52.0	25.0	-1.939	

Note: PSA- pre-service administrators. Critical Value = ± 1.96 .

For the disciplinary consequence of detention in vignette 2, the Null Hypothesis was rejected in the cases of assignment to male students versus female students by male PSAs and the assignment to gender by male PSAs versus female PSAs. Data supported a significantly larger proportion of female students receiving disciplinary detention than male students, when assigned by male PSAs. The data also supported a significantly larger proportion of female PSAs assigning to male students than male PSAs assigning to male students.

For the disciplinary consequence of detention in vignette 2, all other comparisons of proportions of assignment according to gender between PSAs and students resulted in non-rejection of the Null Hypothesis. The data did not support a difference in the disciplinary treatment of male students compared to female students, in those cases.

Table 69.

Vignette 3: Disciplinary Detention

	Male	Female	z-test value	Significance
Female PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	64.0	59.0	-0.351	
Male PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	47.8	88.0	3.001	*
Male Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	47.8	64.0	1.130	
Female Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	88.0	59.0	-2.273	*

Note: PSA- pre-service administrators. Critical Value = ± 1.96 .

For the disciplinary consequence of detention in vignette 3, the Null Hypothesis was rejected in the cases of assignment to male students versus female students by male PSAs and the assignment to gender by male PSAs versus female PSAs. Data supported a significantly larger proportion of female students receiving disciplinary detention than male students, when assigned by male PSAs. The data also supported a significantly larger proportion of male PSAs assigning to female students than female PSAs assigning to female students.

For the disciplinary consequence of detention in vignette 3, all other comparisons of proportions of assignment according to gender between PSAs and students resulted in non-rejection of the Null Hypothesis. The data did not support a difference in the disciplinary treatment of male students compared to female students, in those cases.

Table 70.

Vignette 4: Disciplinary Detention

	Male	Female	z-test value	Significance
Female PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	37.5	28.5	1.590	
Male PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	47.8	23.0	-1.820	
Male Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	47.8	37.5	-0.713	
Female Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	23.0	28.5	0.430	

Note: PSA- pre-service administrators. Critical Value = ± 1.96 .

For the disciplinary consequence of detention in vignette 4, comparison of proportions of all combinations of assignment according to gender between PSAs and students resulted in non-rejection of the Null Hypothesis. The data did not support a difference in the disciplinary treatment of male students compared to female students.

Table 71.

Vignette 5: Disciplinary Detention

	Male	Female	z-test value	Significance
Female PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	20.8	9.5	-1.044	
Male PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	9.5	17.3	0.754	
Male Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	9.5	20.8	1.044	
Female Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	17.3	9.5	-0.239	

Note: PSA- pre-service administrators. Critical Value = ± 1.96 .

For the disciplinary consequence of detention in Vignette 5, comparison of proportions of all combinations of assignment according to gender between PSAs and

students resulted in non-rejection of the Null Hypothesis. The data did not support a difference in the disciplinary treatment of male students compared to female students.

Summary of Null Hypothesis #2 Data

Null Hypothesis #2 stated that each disciplinary detention applied to data gathered from each sample vignette, there will be no difference in proportion of gender-based assignment of the consequence when comparing female pre-service administrators' decisions to those of male pre-service administrators. The overall data did not support a difference in the disciplinary treatment of male students compared to female students. The following table shows each vignette, the critical value, the total value, and if the null hypothesis was rejected or not.

Table 72.

Null Hypothesis #2 Summary

Vignette	Total Value	Critical Value	Reject Y/N
#1	0.113	1.96	N
#2	-1.939	1.96	N
#3	-2.273	1.96	Y
#4	0.430	1.96	N
#5	-0.239	1.96	N

Null Hypothesis # 3: For each disciplinary ISS applied to data gathered from each sample vignette, there will be no difference in proportion of gender-based assignment of the consequence when comparing female pre-service administrators' decisions to those of male pre-service administrators.

Table 73.

Vignette 1: Disciplinary ISS

	Male	Female	z-test value	Significance
Female PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	26.9	41.6	1.096	
Male PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	36.0	40.0	0.291	
Male Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	36.0	26.9	-0.700	
Female Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	40.0	41.6	0.113	

Note: PSA- pre-service administrators. Critical Value = ± 1.96 .

For the disciplinary consequence of ISS in Vignette 1, comparison of proportions of all combinations of assignment according to gender between PSAs and students resulted in non-rejection of the Null Hypothesis. The data did not support a difference in the disciplinary treatment of male students compared to female students.

Table 74.

Vignette 2: Disciplinary ISS

	Male	Female	z-test value	Significance
Female PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	33.3	16.6	-1.301	
Male PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	32.0	28.0	-0.308	
Male Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	32.0	33.3	0.093	
Female Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	28.0	16.6	-0.956	

Note: PSA- pre-service administrators. Critical Value = ± 1.96 .

For the disciplinary consequence of ISS in Vignette 2, comparison of proportions of all combinations of assignment according to gender between PSAs and students

resulted in non-rejection of the Null Hypothesis. The data did not support a difference in the disciplinary treatment of male students compared to female students.

Table 75.

Vignette 3: Disciplinary ISS

	Male	Female	z-test value	Significance
<hr/>				
Female PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	20.0	22.7	0.225	
Male PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	39.1	8.0	-2.561	*
Male Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	39.1	20.0	-1.454	
Female Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	8.0	22.7	1.412	

Note: PSA- pre-service administrators. Critical Value = ± 1.96 .

For the disciplinary consequence of ISS in vignette 3, the Null Hypothesis was rejected in the case of assignment to male students versus female students by male PSAs. Data supported a significantly larger proportion of male students receiving disciplinary ISS than female students, when assigned by male PSAs.

For the Disciplinary Consequence of ISS in Vignette # 3, all other comparisons of proportions of assignment according to gender between PSAs and students resulted in non-rejection of the Null Hypothesis. The data did not support a difference in the disciplinary treatment of male students compared to female students, in those cases.

Table 76.

Vignette 4: Disciplinary ISS

	Male	Female	z-test value	Significance
Female PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	25.0	19.0	-0.483	
Male PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	8.6	23.0	1.363	
Male Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	8.6	25.0	1.497	
Female Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	23.0	19.0	-0.333	

Note: PSA- pre-service administrators. Critical Value = ± 1.96 .

For the disciplinary consequence of ISS in vignette 4, comparison of proportions of all combinations of assignment according to gender between PSAs and students resulted in non-rejection of the Null Hypothesis. The data did not support a difference in the disciplinary treatment of male students compared to female students.

Table 77.

Vignette 5: Disciplinary ISS

	Male	Female	z-test value	Significance
Female PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	54.1	42.8	-0.756	
Male PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	28.5	47.8	1.313	
Male Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	28.5	54.1	1.734	
Female Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	47.8	42.8	-0.332	

Note: PSA- pre-service administrators. Critical Value = ± 1.96 .

For the disciplinary consequence of ISS in vignette 5, comparison of proportions of all combinations of assignment according to gender between PSAs and students

resulted in non-rejection of the Null Hypothesis. The data did not support a difference in the disciplinary treatment of male students compared to female students.

Summary of Null Hypothesis #3 Data

Null Hypothesis #3 stated that each disciplinary ISS applied to data gathered from each sample vignette, there will be no difference in proportion of gender-based assignment of the consequence when comparing female pre-service administrators' decisions to those of male pre-service administrators. The overall data did not support a difference in the disciplinary treatment of male students compared to female students. The following table shows each vignette, the critical value, the total value, and if the null hypothesis was rejected or not.

Table 78.

<i>Null Hypothesis #3 Summary</i>			
Vignette	Total Value	Critical Value	Reject Y/N
#1	0.113	1.96	N
#2	-0.956	1.96	N
#3	1.412	1.96	N
#4	-0.333	1.96	N
#5	-0.332	1.96	N

Null Hypothesis # 4: For each disciplinary OSS applied to data gathered from each sample vignette, there will be no difference in proportion of gender-based assignment of the consequence when comparing female pre-service administrators' decisions to those of male pre-service administrators.

Table 79.

Vignette 1: Disciplinary OSS

	Male	Female	z-test value	Significance
Female PSAs				
Male % vs. Student %	3.8	0.0	-0.964	
Male PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	0.0	0.0	n/a	
Male Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	0.0	3.8	0.984	
Female Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	0.0	0.0	n/a	

Note: PSA- pre-service administrators. Critical Value = ± 1.96 .

For the disciplinary consequence of OSS in Vignette 1, comparison of proportions of all combinations of assignment according to gender between PSAs and students resulted in non-rejection of the Null Hypothesis. The data did not support a difference in the disciplinary treatment of male students compared to female students.

Table 80.

Vignette 2: Disciplinary OSS

	Male	Female	z-test value	Significance
Female PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	23.8	12.5	-0.989	
Male PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	40.0	20.0	-1.543	
Male Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	40.0	23.8	-1.167	
Female Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	20.0	12.5	-0.710	

Note: PSA- pre-service administrators. Critical Value = ± 1.96 .

For the disciplinary consequence of OSS in vignette 2, comparison of proportions of all combinations of assignment according to gender between PSAs and students

resulted in non-rejection of the Null Hypothesis. The data did not support a difference in the disciplinary treatment of male students compared to female students.

Table 81.

Vignette 3: Disciplinary OSS

	Male	Female	z-test value	Significance
Female PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	0.0	0.0	n/a	
Male PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	0.0	4.0	0.969	
Male Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	0.0	0.0	n/a	
Female Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	4.0	0.0	-0.948	

Note: PSA- pre-service administrators. Critical Value = ± 1.96 .

For the disciplinary consequence of OSS in Vignette 3, comparison of proportions of all combinations of assignment according to gender between PSAs and students resulted in non-rejection of the Null Hypothesis. The data did not support a difference in the disciplinary treatment of male students compared to female students.

Table 82.

Vignette 4: Disciplinary OSS

	Male	Female	z-test value	Significance
Female PSAs				
Male % vs. Female%	33.3	35.0	0.120	
Male PSAs				
Male % vs. Female%	34.7	30.7	-0.298	
Male Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	34.7	33.3	-0.101	
Female Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	30.7	35.0	0.312	

Note: PSA- pre-service administrators. Critical Value = ± 1.96 .

For the disciplinary consequence of OSS in vignette 4, comparison of proportions of all combinations of assignment according to gender between PSAs and students resulted in non-rejection of the Null Hypothesis. The data did not support a difference in the disciplinary treatment of male students compared to female students.

Table 83.

Vignette 5: Disciplinary OSS

	Male	Female	z-test value	Significance
Female PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	8.3	28.5	1.770	
Male PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	28.5	8.6	-1.712	
Male Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	28.5	8.3	-1.770	
Female Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	8.6	28.5	1.712	

Note: PSA- pre-service administrators. Critical Value = ± 1.96 .

For the disciplinary consequence of OSS in vignette 5, comparison of proportions of all combinations of assignment according to gender between PSAs and students resulted in non-rejection of the Null Hypothesis. The data did not support a difference in the disciplinary treatment of male students compared to female students.

Summary of Null Hypothesis #4 Data

Null Hypothesis #4 stated that each disciplinary OSS applied to data gathered from each sample vignette, there will be no difference in proportion of gender-based assignment of the consequence when comparing female pre-service administrators' decisions to those of male pre-service administrators. The overall data did not support a difference in the disciplinary treatment of male students compared to female students.

The following table shows each vignette, the critical value, the total value, and if the null hypothesis was rejected or not.

Table 84.

Null Hypothesis #4 Summary

Vignette	Total Value	Critical Value	Reject Y/N
#1	n/a	1.96	N
#2	-0.710	1.96	N
#3	-0.948	1.96	N
#4	0.312	1.96	N
#5	1.712	1.96	N

Null Hypothesis # 5: For overall disciplinary assignment applied to combined data gathered from each sample vignettes, there will be no difference in proportion of gender-based assignment of the consequence when comparing female pre-service administrators' decisions to those of male pre-service administrators.

Table 85.

Overall: Percent Assigned per Gender of PSA and Gender of Student

Gender of Administrator/ Student	Warnings	Detention	ISS	OSS
Female/Female	21.3	34.3	29.6	14.8
Female/Male	12.9	43.5	30.6	12.9
Male/Female	13.7	44.4	29.0	12.9
Male/Male	17.1	33.3	29.1	20.5

Note: PSA- pre-service administrators. Critical Value = ± 1.96 .

For the disciplinary consequence of warning for overall assignment, comparison of proportions of all combinations of assignment according to gender between PSAs and students resulted in non-rejection of the Null Hypothesis. The data did not support a difference in the disciplinary treatment of male students compared to female students.

Table 86.

Overall: Disciplinary Warning

	Male	Female	z-test value	Significance
Female PSAs	43.5	34.3	-1.431	
Male % vs. Female %				
Male PSAs	33.3	44.4	1.765	
Male % vs. Female %				
Male Student Consequence Assignment	33.3	43.5	1.626	
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs%				
Female Student Consequence Assignment	44.4	34.3	-1.568	
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs%				

Note: PSA- pre-service administrators. Critical Value = ± 1.96 .

For the disciplinary consequence of detention for overall assignment, comparison of proportions of all combinations of assignment according to gender between PSAs and students resulted in non-rejection of the Null Hypothesis. The data did not support a difference in the disciplinary treatment of male students compared to female students.

Table 87.

Overall: Disciplinary Detention

	Male	Female	z-test value	Significance
Female PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	43.5	34.3	-1.431	
Male PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	33.3	44.4	1.765	
Male Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	33.3	43.5	1.626	
Female Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	44.4	34.3	-1.568	

Note: PSA- pre-service administrators. Critical Value = ± 1.96 .

For the disciplinary consequence of ISS for overall assignment, comparison of proportions of all combinations of assignment according to gender between PSAs and

students resulted in non-rejection of the Null Hypothesis. The data did not support a difference in the disciplinary treatment of male students compared to female students.

Table 88.

Overall: Disciplinary ISS

	Male	Female	z-test value	Significance
Female PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	30.6	29.6	-0.165	
Male PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	29.1	29.0	0.085	
Male Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	29.1	30.6	0.254	
Female Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	29.0	29.6	0.100	

Note: PSA- pre-service administrators. Critical Value = ± 1.96 .

For the disciplinary consequence of OSS for overall assignment, comparison of proportions of all combinations of assignment according to gender between PSAs and students resulted in non-rejection of the Null Hypothesis. The data did not support a difference in the disciplinary treatment of male students compared to female students.

Table 89.

Overall: Disciplinary OSS

	Male	Female	z-test value	Significance
Female PSAs				
Male% vs. Female %	12.9	14.8	0.418	
Male PSAs				
Male % vs. Female %	20.5	12.9	-1.585	
Male Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	20.5	12.9	-1.585	
Female Student Consequence Assignment				
Male PSAs % vs. Female PSAs %	12.9	14.8	0.418	

Note: PSA- pre-service administrators. Critical Value = ± 1.96 .

Summary of Null Hypothesis #5 Data

Null Hypothesis #5 stated that for the overall disciplinary assignment applied to combined data gathered from each sample vignettes, there will be no difference in proportion of gender-based assignment of the consequence when comparing female pre-service administrators' decisions to those of male pre-service administrators. The overall data did not support a difference in the disciplinary treatment of male students compared to female students. The following table shows each vignette, the critical value, the total value, and if the Null Hypothesis was rejected or not.

Table 90.

Null Hypothesis #5 Summary of Data Overall

Overall	Total Value	Critical Value	Reject Y/N
Disciplinary Warning	1.528	± 1.96	N
Disciplinary Detention	-1.568	± 1.96	N
Disciplinary ISS	0.100	± 1.96	N
Disciplinary OSS	0.418	± 1.96	N

Null Hypothesis for Consequence Check: For overall disciplinary assignment applied to combined data gathered from each sample vignettes, there will be no difference in proportion of gender-based assignment for any specific consequence assigned by pre-service administrators' decisions when comparing results from the five vignettes.

The test value of 32.670, compared to the critical value of 3.490 resulted in the rejection of the Null Hypothesis, which stated there would be no difference. Therefore, the data supported a difference in proportion of assignment of disciplinary consequences with regard to gender of the assigning PSA and the student.

Table 91.

Summary: ANOVA Single Factor

Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
Warnings	4	65.003	16.251	14.611
Detention	4	155.496	38.874	34.628
ISS	4	118.367	29.592	0.569
OSS	4	61.134	15.284	12.966

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	1538.116	3	512.705	32.670	0.000	3.490
Within Groups	188.3199	12	15.693			
Total	1726.435	15				

The assignment of disciplinary detention was used heaviest, with disciplinary ISS a close second. Detention was assigned equally by male PSAs to female students and by female PSAs to male students. ISS was assigned most heavily by female PSAs to male students.

Null Hypothesis for Validity Check: For overall disciplinary assignment applied to combined data gathered from each sample vignette, there will be no difference in proportion of gender-based assignment of the consequence assigned by pre-service administrators' decisions when comparing results from the five vignettes.

Table 92.

PSA Gender and Student Disciplinary Assignment by Vignette

Gender of Administrator/ Student	Vignette 1	Vignette 2	Vignette 3	Vignette 4	Vignette 5
Female/Female	21.4	21.4	19.6	18.8	18.8
Female/Male	21.7	17.5	20.6	20.0	20.0
Male/Female	20.2	20.0	20.2	21.0	18.5
Male/Male	21.4	21.4	19.7	19.7	17.9

Note: PSA- pre-service administrators.

Table 93.

Summary of Vignette Average Assignment of Discipline

Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
Vignette 1	4	84.624	21.156	0.456
Vignette 2	4	80.457	20.114	3.378
Vignette 3	4	80.296	20.074	0.314
Vignette 4	4	79.376	19.844	0.840
Vignette 5	4	75.247	18.812	0.743

Table 94. *Vignette Comparisons: Analysis of Variance*

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	11.164	4	2.791	2.435	0.093	3.056
Within Groups	17.195	15	1.146			
Total	28.360	19				

The test value of 2.435, compared to the critical value of 3.056 resulted in the non-rejection of the Null Hypothesis, which stated there would be no difference. Therefore, the data supported no difference in proportion of assignment of disciplinary consequences with regard to gender of the assigning PSA and the student, when comparing results of each of the five vignettes to each other. This indicates a potential lack of bias in assignment of disciplinary consequences.

Table 95.

Summary of ANOVA data

Null Hypothesis For:	Total Value	Critical Value	Reject Y or N
Consequence Check	32.670	3.490	Y
Validity Check	2.435	3.056	N

The Null Hypothesis for the Consequence Check stated that overall discipline applied to combined data gathered from each sample vignette would result in no difference in proportion of gender-based assignment for any specific consequence assigned by pre-service administrators' decisions when comparing results from the five vignettes. The data, critical value of 3.490 and total value of 32.670, suggests that there is a difference in proportion of assignment of disciplinary consequences with regard to gender of assigning pre-service administrator and the student.

The Null Hypothesis for validity check stated that overall disciplinary assignment applied to combined data gathered from each sample vignette would result in no difference in proportion of gender-based assignment of consequence assigned by pre-service administrators' decisions when comparing the results from the five vignettes. The data, critical value of 3.056 and total value of 2.435, suggests that there is no difference in proportion of assignment of disciplinary consequences with regard to gender of assigning pre-service administrators and students when comparing the results of each of the five vignettes to each other. There is no bias in assignment of disciplinary consequences.

Teacher Surveys

The investigator conducted a qualitative analysis on open ended responses provided to all middle school teachers within the district. The anonymous, voluntary survey contained 11 questions. The surveys that were administered were done through surverymonkey.com. The investigator asked teachers to answer a set of questions about their classroom expectations, how this information is given to students, how they know if it is understood, and at what point do they send a child to the office. The issue of gender

was specifically addressed. Teachers were asked if they have different expectations for males and females, and if they are aware of any issues they may have with disciplining children of the same or different gender. Of the 334 staff surveyed, 113 started the survey, only 39 completed it. Of the 113 who started the survey 93 teachers were female and 20 were males.

The following table shows the number of years taught by the 113 teachers surveyed and the percentages (Table 96).

Table 96.

Number of Years Taught of Surveyed Staff

Years of Service	Totals	Percentage of Total
0-10 years	46	40.7%
11-20 years	58	51.3%
21+ years	9	8%

Question 1 stated, “What disciplinary issues exist among your male and female students and why do you feel these exist?” The reoccurring theme seemed to be a lack of respect to teachers. When discussing males, most responses stated that males are louder and more impulsive than females. The general answer was that males are more off task. The statement was made that “male disruptions are caused from ADD/ADHD behaviors and most males need to be on medication. While for girls, disrespect to peers and teachers are predominant.” Another stated,

Male students seem to enjoy drawing negative attention to themselves in the classroom setting. Either by getting up without permission or yelling out. They often will give silly answers to get noticed. Girls often fly under the radar and

can be involved in mean/social issues. Bullying seems to occur equally among boys and girls.

Yet another echoed, “Boys can be quite impulsive whereas girls are more sneaky and manipulative.” One teacher expressed frustration by saying,

Females are more talkative amongst classmates, and males are loud and disruptive in the classroom. I feel the process of discipline takes too long to reach level that is a deterrent for students. A teacher writes a referral for a student after many warnings, contacts home, etc. and the first thing a principal does is give a warning! The district needs to rethink its severity in steps if it wants to deter these behaviors.

Another stated, “There is poor administration support for teachers. Kids are just not respectful and if they get in trouble they ask to go to the principal’s office so they don’t have to work or learn.” Only four of the 38 teachers that answered stated that they had no issues with students. One teacher said, “My students respect all people in the classroom and their peers.”

Question 2 stated, “How do you adjust your disciplinary strategies with female and male students?” The recurring answer was that teachers do not believe they have different discipline for males and females. Teachers stated that they treated the male and female students the same. One teacher stated, “My discipline strategies are consistent but are catered to each individual child, as each child’s background and behavior impact’s their individuality.” Another stated, “You need to look at each student individually because not all strategies are effective for all female and male students. Rather than

looking at it from a female/male perspective, I look at the issues and problems for that individual child.”

Some teachers stated, they are more lenient with girls and they do treat females “softer” than boys. One teacher commented, “Usually guys are not as bright as girls when it comes to interacting, guys are just guys.” Another stated,

Boys need to know you will follow through. Warnings don’t work so well because they see warnings as a way of pushing limits. They need to know what the limits are and the teacher must follow through with few expectations. I find that I deal with them one-on-one with best results. Calling them out in front of others often turns their behavior into something silly. By talking to them one-on-one, I can remove them from the social situations to deal with their behavior. Girls don’t want to be in trouble so more often than not, a quiet work or just being in the proximity works well when talking to them about consequences, they respond better if the teacher deals with them personally and not in front of their peers. Both genders usually have discipline issues that stem from social relations. Few are just outright defiant.

Another stated,

When issues arise, I treat them the same. I find that often, boys are written up for more often than girls. Boys behave differently. They act silly and get in trouble while the girls tend to be more subversive in their actions. Therefore, they end up in the counselor’s office versus the principal’s office.

Question 3 asked, “What do you believe influences your female student’s behaviors?” The overwhelming answer to this question was that female students are

influenced by their peers, families, and moods. They want to be socially accepted. One teacher stated,

I think girls are influenced by the need to be liked and to receive positive interactions with their teachers. They want to be socially accepted. Girls just want to fit in.

Another reported,

My female students are influenced by their home-lives first and foremost. They are then influenced by me and when they are in the classroom. They are then influenced by their social female peers, friends, and enemies. Lastly, my female students are influenced by the male students in their classes.

One summarized the response by saying, "I believe students, no matter which gender, and are influenced behaviorally by what they are taught as acceptable and unacceptable behavior." Another teacher stated, "Females are generally motivated by grades and peer prospective and therefore, usually do the right thing."

Question 4 asked, "What do you believe influences your male student's behaviors? The overwhelming answers to this were that boys are influenced by peers, especially, girls, a need for attention, and competition. One teacher stated, "I think male behaviors are influenced by peer attention. If someone will laugh at it, a boy will do it." One teacher stated,

Males are influenced first and foremost by their home environments. How they behave in the classroom is greatly dependent upon me and my influence over him. They are then influenced by other males that they consider friends. Finally, they are influenced by the girls within their classes.

Another stated,

Some boys are worse than others, but, football is a huge issue with boys. It is like a club and if you aren't on the 'right' team, you can't belong to the "club" the boys that don't play football don't get to hang out with the top dogs. In order to maintain the "club" students cause classroom issues and encourage each other to do similar behaviors to disrupt.

This was followed up with another teacher's comment, "Some parents expect their sons to become the next great baseball, football, soccer, ice hockey or whatever sport they participate in star. So school takes a backseat." Another felt that there was "not enough movement in middle school for boys to burn off energy."

Question 5 asked, "How do you feel school rules and regulations impact your female students?" The overwhelming response was that rules and regulations drive girls to do the right thing. One district staff member said, "Females take the consequences more seriously. They often need only one offense to impress on them the desire to change behavior." Another stated, "For the majority, I think the rules and regulations drive the girls to do the right thing most of the time. They see rules as the way to be accepted by the adults at school." One teacher stated, "I feel female students take disciplinary actions seriously and they don't often repeat the action that would warrant discipline." However, another stated,

I feel if there are consequences at home for rules not followed at school, the rules and regulations impact students of both genders. If there are not consequences at home, why should they care about rules and regulations? Hopefully, at some

point they realize that rules and regulations will impact their lives in whatever they do as they get older and have jobs.

Many teachers commented on the dress code and difficulty in enforcing that with females because of today's styles. One teacher said, "The biggest issue I have to talk to female students about is dress code. Girls like short shorts and skirts and we do send them to find more school appropriate attire." Another stated, "I think the dress code really impacts female students." One staff person said, "I believe that girls are watched closer than boys in the dress code issue."

Question 6 asked, "How do you feel school rules and regulations impact your male students?" The overall answer was that males seem to test the limits of school rules and regulations with no respect for outcome. One teacher wrote, "Male students do what they want, when they want. Too many times they think the rules do not apply to them." Another wrote that rules "have no impact on them (males), they will engage in any behaviors that they wish in order to fit in or be with peers." Another teacher stated, "I have numerous ADHD male students who find conforming to classroom expectations difficult." One went on to state, "I see more male students as 'repeat offenders' and they are often disciplined multiple times for the same type of behavior occurring over and over. Those that do receive consequences often repeat the same behavior and receive more severe consequences but do not seem very concerned by it." One teacher's views were that "some boys like to challenge the school rules. They think if they break the rules they will be cool." Another teacher said, "I notice that many of the boys suffer during unstructured time as they have no way to release energy or negative feelings.

Therefore, they can get into trouble for disrupting class or being disruptive during lunch.”

Another educator said,

Male students who were raised with chores, rules, and expectations at home adapt easily to the rules and regulations at school. They will also transition into the working environment without much trouble. Those raised to believe that they can do what they want, when they want and where they want will not have an easy time of growing up to be productive.

Question 7 asked, “How do you expect female students to act in your class? How do they know your expectations?” Unanimously, the teachers stated that expectations are communicated consistently and that all students are expected to follow them. One teacher responded, “I have high expectations for behavior for both boys and girls in my classroom. Gender does not matter.” Several stated that they have expectations that are consistently communicated. One teacher said, “My expectations are verbalized daily, practiced hourly, repeated constantly. They are posted in my room and they are the same for all students.” Another stated,

I do not expect my female students to act any different than males. I expect them to follow the class rules, participate in activities, and treat others as they want to be treated. They know my expectations because we go over them at the beginning of the year, I quiz them over the expectations, and I remind them what they are throughout the year in class.

Another said,

I expect all of my students to be respectful of me and one another. I expect them to be engaged in classroom discussions and to work cooperatively within their

groups. I expect them to complete their work and to stay on task until it is done. I give these directions up front and I reinforce them daily. I do not accept less and I will not hesitate to discipline a child by removing them from the situation, conferencing with them, revoking the privilege of conducting experiments or calling parents.

Question 8 asked, "How do you expect male students to act in your class? How do they know your expectations?" The answers all stated that the teacher had the same expectations for all, however, when compared to the way the same teachers answered about female teachers, teachers went into much more detail about their expectations and stated that they go over expectations periodically. One teacher stated,

As a teacher, you teach expectations at the beginning of the year to all students. There is consistency throughout with regards to expectations for all. Male students tend to see where or when they are free to engage in inappropriate behaviors until they cannot engage anymore.

Another stated,

I expect the males to listen while I am teaching and to participate in class discussion, work with small groups using quiet voices, and work independently without talking during this type of assignment. The male students know this from the class expectations I have set up as well as each hour(s) code of conduct we do together at the beginning of the school year.

Another replied,

As a teacher, you teach expectations at the beginning of the year to all students. There is consistency throughout with regards to expectations for all. Male

students tend to see where or when they are free to engage in inappropriate behaviors until they cannot engage anymore.

Question 9 asked, “What disciplinary interventions work best for female students? Elaborate on effectiveness.” The resounding answer for this question was that one-on-one discussion is what most teachers use as an intervention with female students. The second most reported intervention was to give a female a warning. One teacher stated, girls understand and want to understand what you expect.” Another stated, “I usually just give them reminders unless it gets to become a bigger issue and then I follow the team discipline policy. Usually it only takes one warning or reminder.” Another replied, “Girls mostly respond to warning, or ‘the look’. At times, I’ll move seats. This is almost always effective.” Another wrote,

I usually give them a warning, and then talk with them privately in the hallway. If it continues I call the parent, and give an office referral if the negative behavior continues. This system has worked best for me. I very rarely write office referrals.

Lastly a teacher replied,

Female students respond better than male students to quiet reminders/redirection. They don't want to stand out in front of their classmates for misbehaving and avoid parent contact or discipline. Female students tend to react to a decision they don't like by talking about it later or silently refusing to engage or turn in work.

Question 10 asked, “What disciplinary interventions work best for male students? Elaborate on effectiveness.” The responses to this question were not as uniform as the same question posed for female student interventions. Eight of the 39 responses discussed calling home as an intervention. One teacher responded, “Calling home to

parents works well for boys- especially if I call the ‘dad’ in the home.” Other teachers tried to talk to the student one-on-one, and others jumped straight to a consequence such as detention or ISS. One teacher said,

Boys push discipline. Warnings aren't always effective. Discipline sometimes requires card signing or an office referral. Sometimes neither is effective and ISS is necessary. This makes a big impact on the student and sets an example for the team.

Another said,

With the boys I use a lot of humor to change what they are doing. I don't ever embarrass them but have always found humor to diffuse a situation. I think this feeds on itself though. I normally don't have too many discipline problems because I am easy going so the kids don't feel tense. They know I'm not going to embarrass them so they don't feel the need to act out.

Another educator replied, “The best disciplinary intervention I have is allowing cool down time when students are agitated. This is effective because usually after a few minutes the behavior improves.”

Question 11 asked, “What patterns, if any, exist in your office referrals?”

Seventeen of the 39 responders stated that they have little or few office referrals. Of the ones who did analyze their patterns, six of the 22 stated that males receive more discipline referrals from them. One teacher stated, “I refer more males than females. I would guess normally because they are louder and less likely to comply with redirectives (sic) that are given. Males also seem to be more impulsive outside of the classroom

(halls, restrooms).” Many teachers said they were fair in their interventions and did many of the same interventions and only use office referrals as a last resort. One teacher stated,

Office referrals are last resort for me and happen only when previous steps didn't work. Office referrals are generally for chronic behavior issues that did not respond to previous steps, I rarely have classroom issues that require immediate office referral (ie. fights, swearing).

Another stated, “I rarely use office referrals. When I do have to write a referral it for serious behaviors such as aggressively touching other students, saying something very disrespectful to others, or academic dishonesty.” Another educator said, “I find that I have more boys on discipline steps as they tend to be more impulsive and disruptive. After five steps, and contact with parents, I create an office referral.” Lastly, a teacher commented,

I have had more referrals for male students this year. I complete a referral according to the policy for the discipline card procedure unless student safety is involved. Male students seem to play around more in the hallway, so I have more referrals for that issue.

Summary

The data in Chapter 4 provided a variety of conclusions. When looking at just the discipline warnings, vignette 2 data supported a significantly larger proportion of male students receiving disciplinary warnings than female students, when assigned by male PSA's. The data also supported a significantly larger proportion of PSAs assigning to female students than male PSAs assigning to female students. For discipline warning for vignette 3 data supported a significantly larger proportion of PSAs assigning to

female students than male PSAs assigning to female students. When looking at just disciplinary detention, vignettes 2 and 3 data supported a significantly larger proportion of male students receiving disciplinary detentions than female students, when assigned by male PSAs. The data also supported a significantly larger proportion of female PSAs assigning to female students than male PSAs assigning to female students. When looking at disciplinary ISS, vignette 3, the data supported a significantly larger proportion of male students receiving disciplinary ISS than female students, when assigned by male PSAs. In looking at disciplinary OSS, the data did not support a difference in the disciplinary treatment of male students compared to female students. This indicated a potential lack of bias in assignment of disciplinary consequences. When looking at if any one consequence was different from another the data supported a difference in proportion of assignment of disciplinary consequences with regard to gender of the assigning PSA and the student. When looking at if any one vignette was treated differently than another the data supported no difference in proportion of assignment of disciplinary consequences with regard to gender of the assigning PSA and the student, when comparing the results of each of the five vignettes to each other. This indicated a potential lack of bias in assignment of disciplinary consequences.

Based on qualitative feedback, the investigator observed a direct bias of harsh discipline towards males in all 11 survey questions given to practicing middle school teachers. The teacher survey data did show a difference in the overall disciplinary treatment of male students compared to female students. Further discussion and recommendations regarding the above findings is found in Chapter 5.

Chapter Five: Discussion, Implications, and Recommendations

This chapter will examine the data collected from the cooperating school district's SIS program, the surveys that were sent via email to teachers within the cooperating school district, and the responses from male and female specific vignettes given to pre-service school administrators in the master's level school leadership program at a Midwestern university. The investigator was granted permission by the superintendent to use secondary district collected data. The school's Student Information System, SIS, provided the data for the discipline for all school years analyzed.

The investigator administered 150 vignettes and a discipline guideline to master's level aspiring administrator classes in the education department at a Midwestern university. The investigator then observed classes for aspiring administrators to listen for discussion on vignettes and how discipline was administered based on the guidelines. The novice principal students wrote a brief reflection explaining how they processed and made their disciplinary decisions. Subjects responded to five vignettes and had five corresponding reflections.

To answer the questions and determine the hypotheses outcomes, the primary investigator obtained permission from the researched school district's Superintendent to survey teachers. The investigator asked teachers in the cooperating school district to reply via an anonymous survey to questions regarding school discipline practices. The surveys were overwhelmingly biased toward male students.

The summary of the results were used to determine if there was enough evidence to show a bias against one gender of middle school student over another gender. This study was a mixed-methods study performed to provide aspiring and practicing

administrators insight into the discrepancy of discipline consequences for middle school students. The research questions and the study's findings based upon those questions will be addressed through a discussion of SIS data conclusions, vignettes given to pre-service administrators, and the teacher surveys administered to the cooperating school district's middle school teachers. The hypotheses and the study's findings based upon vignettes given to pre-service school administrators and the results in Chapter 4 will be individually discussed. The following information will explain the results of this study in more detail.

Addressing the Questions

The research question that guided this study was "Is one gender of middle school student, male or female, assigned a disproportionate amount of discipline consequences within the four middle school buildings in the district throughout the length of study for this research? Is so, why?" The following sub questions accompanied the research question:

RQ1. How do the biases teachers have, whether know or unknown, contribute to males being referred to the principal's office more often than female students?

RQ2. When asked to administer discipline, do administrators apply more severe discipline to males than females who have the same infraction?

SIS data, gender specific vignettes given to pre-service administrators, and teacher surveys helped answer the research questions and will be discussed in more detail.

SIS Data Analysis and Discussion

In order to help answer the questions, SIS was utilized to analyze the number of referrals and the number of male versus female students that received referrals. Discipline referrals were given by teachers for specific students and the school administrators assign a consequence. Referral data was entered into the SIS system. The investigator studied the number of referrals from each of the four participating middle schools for three years. For each year, the investigator created a chart that listed the teacher who referred the student, the student's gender, and teacher gender. For each year, the investigator also analyzed the administrator of each grade's number of referrals, the student's gender, the administrator's gender, and number of student's given discipline. Tallies were converted into percentages for comparison through the use of a z -test for difference in proportion. First, the teacher data will be discussed.

Overwhelmingly, males received more discipline referrals from teachers than females in all four middle schools for all three years. In all three of the researched years, the amount of female teachers out-numbered the amount of male teachers. In the 2012-2013 school year there were 59 male teachers to 266 female teachers. In the 2011-2012 school year there were 42 male teachers to 203 female teachers. During the 2010-2011 school year there were 43 male teachers to 202 female teachers (refer to Table 7 in Chapter 3).

When looking at the question guiding this research, "Is one gender of middle school student, male or female, assigned a disproportionate amount of discipline consequences within the four middle school buildings in the district throughout the length of study for this research? Is so, why?" the investigator can answer this by stating that

yes, males are assigned a disproportionate amount of discipline consequences within the four middle school buildings in the district throughout the length of the study. The possible thinking behind this research will be further discussed in the triangulation.

Another answer to why one gender of middle school student, male or female, assigned a disproportionate amount of discipline consequences within the four middle school buildings in the district throughout the length of study was found in the on-line survey given to the teachers serving the studied district. The raw data indicated there is a bias toward males. The majority of the teachers surveyed and those that answered the survey were female teachers. Teachers gave some very specific which helps to answer sub question 1, “How do the biases teachers have, whether know or unknown, contribute to males being referred to the principal’s office more often than female students?” Sub question 1 is directly answered in the surveys. The following paragraphs will discuss sub questions 2, which states, “When asked to administer discipline, do administrators apply more severe discipline to male or female students who have the same infractions?”

The information as to why this occurs will be found in the triangulation.

The results of the data help to answer sub question 2, which states, “When asked to administer discipline, do administrators apply more discipline to male or female students who have the same infractions?” The results show that male middle school students within the researched district did receive more discipline than female middle school students. The results from the vignettes given to pre-service administrators further discusses sub question 2.

Vignette Data Analysis and Discussion

Disciplinary vignettes were created to measure decision-making concerning assignment of disciplinary consequences to both male and female middle school students. For each vignette, the number of times each consequence was chosen for each gender of student represented in the disciplinary infraction described in the vignettes was tallied. Tallies were converted into percentages for comparison through the use of a z -test for difference in proportion. The vignettes were analyzed and overall, the data showed variances.

When looking at just the discipline warnings, vignette 2 data supported a significantly larger proportion of male students receiving disciplinary warnings than female students, when assigned by male PSAs. The data also supported a significantly larger proportion of PSAs assigning to female students than male PSAs assigning to female students. For discipline warning for vignette 3 data supported a significantly larger proportion of PSAs assigning to female students than male PSAs assigning to female students. Vignettes 1, 4, and 5 data did not support a difference in the disciplinary treatment of male students compared to female students.

When looking at disciplinary detention, vignettes 2 and 3 data supported a significantly larger proportion of male students receiving disciplinary detentions than female students, when assigned by male PSAs. The data also supported a significantly larger proportion of female PSAs assigning to female students than male PSAs assigning to female students. Vignette numbers 1, 4, and 5 data did not support a difference in the disciplinary treatment of male students compared to female students.

When looking at disciplinary ISS, vignette 3, the data supported a significantly larger proportion of male students receiving Disciplinary ISS than female students, when assigned by male PSAs. Vignettes 1, 2, 4, and 5 data did not support a difference in the disciplinary treatment of male students compared to female students.

In looking at disciplinary OSS, the data did not support a difference in the disciplinary treatment of male students compared to female students. This indicated a potential lack of bias in assignment of disciplinary consequences.

To check if any one consequence differed from another, a single factor ANOVA was applied to data. Comparison of the F -test value of 32.670.21 to the critical value of 3.490 resulted in non-rejection of the Null Hypothesis, which stated there would be no difference. Therefore, the data supported a difference in proportion of assignment of disciplinary consequences with regard to gender of the assigning PSAs and the student.

To determine if any one vignette was treated differently than another a validity check was done. The test value of 2.435, compared to the critical value of 3.056 resulted in the non-rejection of the Null Hypothesis, which stated that there would be no difference. The data supported no difference in proportion of assignment of disciplinary consequences with regard to gender of the assigning PSA and the student when comparing the results of the five vignettes to each other. This indicated a potential lack of bias in assignment of disciplinary consequences.

This data will be further discussed when looking at the hypotheses.

Hypotheses Discussion

The hypotheses that guided this study were as follows:

Hypothesis # 1: For each disciplinary warning applied to data gathered from each sample vignette, there will be a difference in proportion of gender-based assignment of the consequence when comparing female pre-service administrators' decisions to those of male pre-service administrators.

Statistically speaking, the overall data did not show a difference in proportion of gender-based of the consequence when comparing female pre-service administrators' decisions to those of male pre-service administrators. However, in vignette 2 males received more discipline than females when assigned by male pre-service administrators. Female pre-service administrators gave female students less warnings than they did male students. Vignette 3 showed a larger proportion of female pre-service administrators assigning female students more warnings than male pre-serving assigned to female students. All other comparisons of proportions of assignment according to gender rejected the hypotheses.

Hypothesis # 2: For each disciplinary detention applied to data gathered from each sample vignette, there will be a difference in proportion of gender-based assignment of the consequence when comparing female pre-service administrators' decisions to those of male pre-service administrators.

Overall, statistically speaking, data did not show a difference in proportion of gender-based of the consequence when comparing female pre-service administrators' decisions to those of male pre-service administrators. However, vignette 2 showed that more female students than male students were given detention by male PSAs. A larger proportion of female PSAs assigned male students' detention than male PSAs assigned to male students. Vignette 3 showed a larger proportion of female students than males

receiving detention by male PSAs. Male PSAs gave female students more detention than female PSAs gave to female students. All other comparisons of proportions of assignment according to gender rejected the hypotheses.

Hypothesis # 3: For each disciplinary ISS applied to data gathered from each sample vignette, there will be a difference in proportion of gender-based assignment of the consequence when comparing female pre-service administrators' decisions to those of male pre-service administrators.

Overall, statistically speaking, data did not show a difference in proportion of gender-based of the consequence when comparing female pre-service administrators' decisions to those of male pre-service administrators. However, vignette 3 showed a larger proportion of male students receiving ISS than female students when assigned by male PSAs. All other comparisons of proportions of assignment according to gender rejected the hypotheses.

Hypothesis # 4: For each disciplinary OSS applied to data gathered from each sample vignette, there will be a difference in proportion of gender-based assignment of the consequence when comparing female pre-service administrators' decisions to those of male pre-service administrators.

Hypothesis # 5: For overall disciplinary assignment applied to combined data gathered from each sample vignettes, there will be a difference in proportion of gender-based assignment of the consequence when comparing female pre-service administrators' decisions to those of male pre-service administrators.

For both Hypotheses #4 and #5, the overall data did not support a difference in the disciplinary treatment of male students compared to female students.

The data from the hypotheses showed that the answer to sub question 2, “When asked to administer discipline, do administrators apply more severe discipline to males than females who have the same infraction”, is no they do not, statistically speaking. The data did support a difference in the disciplinary treatment of male students compared to female students. It was interesting to see the choices the pre-service administrators made. Disciplinary detention was utilized the heaviest and ISS was a close second. The harsher discipline consequences were given to male students. ISS was assigned most heavily by female pre-service administrators to male students. The teacher survey data also followed this trend of harsher consequences for male students.

Teacher Survey Data and Analysis

The investigator conducted a qualitative analysis on open ended responses provided to all middle school teachers within the district. The anonymous, voluntary survey contained 11 questions. The investigator asked teachers to answer a set of questions about their classroom expectations, how this information is given to students, how they know if it is understood, and at what point do they send a child to the office. The issue of gender was specifically addressed. Teachers were asked if they have different expectations for males and females, and if they are aware of any issues they may have with disciplining children of the same or different gender. Of the 334 staff surveyed, 113 started the survey, and only 39 completed it. Of the 113 who started the survey 93 teachers were female and 20 were males. In these survey’s that were sent to the female dominated staff, some harsh comments were made about males and their behavior in classrooms.

These biases can be seen throughout the research and is discussed in the triangulation.

Triangulation

Looking at the research overall, it shows concern for male students, not just in the researched district, but in general. SIS data, vignette responses, and teacher surveys, show a distinct discrepancy in the discipline assigned to male students.

When looking at teacher assigned consequences in the district's SIS system, it is obvious that teachers are giving more male students discipline and more severe consequences than female students. Perhaps the fact that the majority of teachers in the four researched middle schools are women plays a part in the amount of discipline referrals for male students. Female teachers view males to be two to three times more likely than girls to be seen as disruptive and inattentive (Dee, 2006). The positive interactions between male students and female teachers is not in the majority (Dee, 2006). The four middle schools have the middle school team concept. This concept includes four teachers of the four core subjects, math, science, English, and social studies, who share the same students throughout the day. The teachers work together to create cross-curricular lessons, closely monitor individual student's academics, develop relationships with students, and manage behaviors. When the four core area teachers are women a male student may be at a disadvantage. If one teacher is having difficulty with a male student, she may discuss this with her teammates. The teammate, who had previously not had an issue with the male student, may then see the male student as more disruptive or disrespectful than before the conversation with the teammate. This perception of a disruptive student could create more discipline issues for the student.

Many female teachers find male students too disruptive, loud, or noisy (Thomas, 2000). Males in middle school are, typically, less mature than their female counterparts. When they act silly or are boisterous, female teachers compare this behavior to a quieter and calmer female student. Because males are just being themselves, female teachers are sending them to the office with a discipline referral (Pollack & Shuster, 2000).

The office referrals from the SIS data suggested that administrators show bias in their judgment towards males, and female students, more so than male administrators. Administrators in the cooperating district for the researched years were not offered any gender expectations training. Of the practicing administrators, all but one received their principal certificates from a university in the state of Missouri. In Missouri, no programs offer specific gender training in order to be an administrator. This could be a factor into the reason male students behaviors were seen as inappropriate to the educational setting, whether it be the classroom, bus, or general school grounds. Overall, the amount of discipline given by female administrators to male and female students outnumbered the male administrators even though there were more male administrators in the district than female. The fact that women administrators see, not just male behaviors, but, female behaviors as more inappropriate than male administrators could be related to the idea of what is acceptable at a middle school age and what is not acceptable to a woman is different to a man. Women administrators gave more, and more severe, consequences than their male counterparts. Tolerance for the middle school aged behaviors could be an issue. Perhaps the male administrators do not see the same behavior as “offensive.”

Administrators, most often, administer discipline because a teacher has requested the discipline. An issue will arise in the hallway or cafeteria and a teacher will make an

administrator aware of the situation, giving their account of the incident and what they deem as acceptable. Teacher bias of male versus female behaviors could directly impact the information given to the administrator, which in turn, can determine an outcome biased to the student, male or female. The data from the vignettes given to pre-service administrators was cause for alarm as well.

When looking at the vignettes, the responses and assigned discipline was directly related to the situation. Vignette 2, discussed the bullying of a student by peers. In the scenario, a student goes to their usual lunch table and the entire table gets up and leaves when the student sits down. A student then states, “You can’t sit with us, we hate you.” The entire table begins to laugh. When the bullied student gets up to leave, the targeted student yells, “I am going to kill you” to the bully.

Overall, the male PSAs gave male students more warnings than female students. Female PSA gave males more warnings than females. Male PSAs gave females more detention than they did male students and female PSAs assigned male students more detention than male PSAs assigned to male students. It appears that males were told to stop the bullying type behavior while females were given harsher consequences. It directly relates to the adage that “boys will be boys.” It is more socially acceptable for boys to be aggressive or angry (Kovalik, 2008). When female students behaved in the same manner, they were given more of a punishment than a warning, like males, from both genders of PSAs. This suggests to the researcher that gender stereotypes are impacting the rationale of school administrators, therefore, creating unfair discipline.

Vignette 3 described a student who continued to talk during instruction time, despite numerous warnings from the teacher. Once the student was sent to the

administrator's office, the student tells the administrators there is another student of the same gender who continues to talk and disrupt class but the teacher does not take notice of the other student. The student in the administrator's office feels picked on.

Overall, female pre-service administrators gave female students more warnings than male pre-service administrators gave to female students. Male PSAs gave female students more detention than male students and more than the female PSAs gave to the male students. This suggests to the researcher that perhaps the male pre-service administrators have less tolerance for just warning a student once a teacher has sent a child to the office. It appears that male pre-service administrators feel that if a teacher is asking for discipline they should follow through. This could be seen further in the amount of ISS students received from the male PSAs. Male students were given higher numbers of ISS than female students by male PSAs. There were four instances of a significant difference where male PSAs gave harsher discipline to female students than male students and only one instance, ISS, where male PSAs gave harsher discipline to males. There were no statistical significant instances of female PSAs giving significantly different discipline to either group of students. Female pre-service administrators may feel that more information is warranted or that just warning the student is adequate. Perhaps, female pre-service administrators can identify with being a mother and can be more emotional in their decisions than males. Males might remove emotion from many situations and may feel a decision must be made based upon the evidence. Perhaps this is why males garnered more discipline.

Vignettes 1, 4, and 5 all displayed comparisons of proportions of assignment of discipline according to gender and rejected the hypothesis. Gender discrepancy was an

issue when looking at the responses from the surveys given to teachers in the cooperating district.

The responses to the survey questions positively answers the guiding question, “Is one gender of middle school student, male or female, assigned a disproportionate amount of discipline consequences within the four middle school buildings in the district throughout the length of study for this research? If so, why.” The “why” being the bias’ teachers have toward their male students. Adults treat students of different genders differently because teachers already have stereotypes and different expectations about what is appropriate for male and female students (Salomone, 2006). The responses showed that teachers do assign male students’ more discipline than the female students. It also positively answers sub question 1, which asks “How do the biases teachers have, whether known or unknown, contribute to males being referred to the principal’s office more often than female students.” The biases that the teachers show toward the male students actions or lack of actions causes them to be seen as difficult to control in the school environment, resulting in office referrals (Berekashvili, 2012). This bias, as seen again with the large disproportionate amount of discipline referrals from the SIS data, shows that, perhaps, there is a miscommunication between female staff and male students. Female teacher’s perceptions of male behaviors are often critical and the female teacher will give the male student a discipline referral for their perceived off-task behavior. Many of the comments made by the teachers from the survey, further proved this. One female teacher stated, “For the majority, I think the rules and regulations drive girls to do the right thing most of the time. They see the rules as a way to be accepted. But, not boys.” Another female teacher said, “Girls follow the rules and are able to be

quiet when they need to be.” Another female teacher stated, “Some boys tend to push the limits. They are bolder, braver, and more often disrespectful than girls.” However, a male teacher stated, “I do not expect my male students to act any differently than my female students.” This statement may be why male teachers have much less discipline referrals in the district. The implications of these thoughts and the rest of the study can be found below.

Implications

After analyzing the data in Chapter 4, the primary investigator noticed the practices of the primary researcher and the other administrators in the district did not change over the years. Upon reflection of the vignettes and the responses of the aspiring administrators, males in the cooperating district were given more and harsher consequences than their female counterparts for the exact same offense, so, when presented with similar situations from typical middle school situations, why do pre-service administrators not follow this pattern? Could it be the culture of the district, could it be gender of teacher issue alone, or could it be both? After analyzing the survey results, the primary investigator was surprised by some of the very blatant comments about male student’s behaviors being unacceptable. The majority of the people participating in the surveys and vignettes were female. The findings from both these female dominated data collections gave the primary investigator much to contemplate.

The implications of this study leave the investigator worried for the education of males. Middle school aged students struggle with finding their own identity while battling hormones, and social acceptance (Clark, 2008). School can be a difficult place to fit in and feel accepted. Male students are facing all of these things, plus the added

pressure of a feeling if they do anything conceived as “wrong” at school, they will have harsh consequences just because they are a male. There has to be an even playing field for male and female students. Since discipline is subjective in many cases, there needs to be clearer cut guidelines and student expectations. There are many programs available to schools to help make the expectations and guidelines clearer.

The primary investigator recommends that the cooperating school district provide professional development for all administrators and teachers on gender awareness. The district could also research different programs such as Positive Behavioral Intervention and Support Method (PBIS), or Behavior Intervention Support Teams (BSIT). If implemented with fidelity, these programs take much of the subjectiveness out of the discipline referral process. With clear expectations and early interventions, males could achieve more school success.

PBIS is a decision making framework that guides selection, integration, and implementation of the best evidence-based academic and behavioral practices based upon individual student data for improving important academic and behavior outcomes for all students (PBIS, 2013). Schools that use this model see classrooms and schools that are less reactive, dangerous, and exclusionary, and more engaging, responsive, and focused on supporting students (PBIS, 2013).

Behavior Intervention Support Teams (BSIT), is a program devoted to helping teachers, administrators, parents, and student learn techniques to effect positive change and create a positive learning environment for all. Focus is placed on individual students behavioral needs to help them find success (Boyd, 2012).

Suggestions for Future Studies

Future research should begin by addressing many more areas of data. While analyzing the research the investigator noticed that discipline data reflected ethnicity and special education students and non-special education students. If one were to attempt this study in the future, one could incorporate both race and a diagnosis of special education to analyze how many of the males that are receiving discipline belong to one or both of those groups. Another area where this study could be analyzed further is to study the location of the infractions. Students do not just misbehave in the classroom. If one were to look for locations to see patterns of discipline occurring, it could be telling. One could also study individual teachers and their referral patterns for male and female students and analyze interactions between the genders.

This study would be interesting at an all-male or all female middle school or single-gender classrooms. When one removes females or males from the equation, what type of referrals and consequences does one see? It would be worthy of research to see if the infractions by gender of teacher revealed telling results of bias. To elaborate on the single-gender classroom analysis, it would be telling to have a similar gender teacher in the room.

Another area of study would be to look at the why teachers are not trained in gender equality and apply this in their disciplining of students. Researching the interactions that teachers have with male students and to see what patterns, if any, exist would be an area of possible interest.

Conclusions

This mixed-method research study was performed to provide aspiring and practicing administrators, and teacher's insight to the discrepancy of school discipline for middle school students. This insight can provide an awareness into the middle school child's behavior while providing a foundation for improvement of administrator, teacher and student relationships, while increasing academic performance of middle school children. The data from the cooperating school district showed that male middle school students were receiving more and harsher discipline than female middle school students from both administrators and teachers. Teachers seem to assume male students are going to misbehave just because they are male, and that what male students do is at a more severe level than if a female student were to do the same thing. Teachers and current practicing administrators within the researched district do have biases against male middle school behaviors and believe that those behaviors are innate to males.

After reading the literature, analyzing the surveys, and looking at the data, the researcher knows that without training for teachers within the cooperating district, males will continue to be referred to the principal's office more than females. It is the primary investigators responsibility to male students in the building and district to make certain teachers are trained in gender equity to reduce the occurrences.

References

- Andrews, M. (2006, September/October). Gender in schools: A qualitative study of students in educational administration. *Journal of Educational Research, 100*(1), 35-43.
- Baloglu, N. (2009, March). Negative behaviors of teachers with regard to high school students in classroom settings. *Instructional Psychology, 36*(1), 69-78.
- Beckett, K. (2006). The role of the school district in student discipline: Building consensus in Cincinnati. *The Urban Review, 38*(3), 235-256.
- Berekashvili, N. (2012). The role of gender-biased perceptions in teacher-student interaction. *Psychology of Language and Communication, 16*(1), 39-51.
- Bigler, R. (2005). *Good morning boys and girls*. Retrieved from Teaching Tolerance: www.tolerance.org/magazine/number-28-fall-2005/good-morning-boys-and-girls
- Bluman, A. (2011). *Elementary statistics* (8th ed.). New York, New York: McGraw Hill.
- Boyd, L. (2012). 5 myths about student discipline. *Educational Leadership, 70*(2), 62-66.
- Canole, M., & Young, M. (2013). *Standards for educational leaders: An analysis*. Council of Chief of State School Officers.
- Clark, M. (2008). Tackling male underachievement :Enhancing a strengths-based learning environment for middle school boys. *Professional School COounseling, 12*(2), 127-132.
- Davis, K., & Nicaise, V. (2011). Teacher student interactions: Four case studies of gender in physical education. *Journal of Classroom Interaction, 46*(2), 11-23.
- Dee, T. (2006, Fall). The why chromosome: How a teacher's gender affects boys and girls. *Education Next, 6*(4), 70-75.

- Department of Education and Science and the Welsh Office. (1989). *Discipline in schools*. London: Crown Publishing.
- Department of Justice. (2000). *Title IX of the Education Amendment of 1972*. Civil Rights Division. Washinton, D.C.: National Archives and Records Administration.
- District, Participating School. (2013-2014). Discipline guidlines. *Middle School Administrative Manual*. Missouri, St. Charles.
- Duffy, J., Warren, K., & Walsh, M. (2001). Classroom interactions: Gender of teacher, gender of student, and classroom subject. *Sex Role: A Journal of Research*, 45(9/10), 579-592.
- Educator Certification*. (2012). Retrieved May 4, 2013, from Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education:
<http://dese.mo.gov/eq/cert/AdminBecomeCertified.html>
- Eliot, L. (2010, November). The myth of pink and blue brains. *Educational Leadership*, 68(3), 32-36.
- Emmer. (2003). *Classroom management for secondary teachers* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Goodman, J. (2006, June). School discipline in moral disarray. *Journal of Moral Education*, 35(2), 213-230.
- Gurian, M. (2003). *The boys and girls learn differently action guide for teachers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Guzelman, B., & Connell, D. (2006). The new gender gap: Social, psychological, neuro-biological, and educational perspectives. *Educational Horizons*, 84(2), 94-101.

- Hall, B., & Howard, K. (2008). A synergistic approach: Conducting mixed methods. *Journal of Mixed*, 248–269.
- Irvin, L., Robert, R., Ingram, K., Todd, A., Sugai, G., & Sampson, N. (2006). Using office discipline referral data for decision making about student behavior in elementary and middle schools. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 8(1), 10-23.
- James. (2007). *Teaching the male brain*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Kaufman, J., Jaser, S., Vaughn, E., Reynolds, J., Di Donto, J., Bernard, S., & hernandez-Brereton, M. (2010). Patterns in office referral data by grade, race/ethnicity, and gender. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 12(1), 44-53.
- King, K., Gurian, M., & Stevens, K. (2010). Gender-friendly schools. *Educational Leadership*, 68(3), 38-42.
- Kommer, D. (2006). Boys and girls together: A case for creating gender-friendly middle school classrooms. *The Clearing House*, 79(6), 247-251.
- Kovalik. (2008, December). *Gender differences and student engagement*. Retrieved September 12, 2009, from International Center for Leadership in Education: www.nyctecenter.org/spn/media/files/articles/research/Student%Engagement%20and%20Gender520white%20paper.pdf
- Krieg, J. (2005). Student gender and teacher gender: What is the impact on high stakes test scores? *Current Issues in Education*, 8(9), 1-16. Retrieved from CIA.
- Lindsey, R., Kikanza, J., & Raymond, D. (1999). *Cultural proficiency: A manual for school leaders*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.

- Lufkin, M. (2009, March). 18 ways for faculty to promote equity in the classroom. *Techniques*, 84(3), 24-26.
- Marshall, C., & Reinhartz, J. (1997). Gender issues in the classroom. *Clearing House*, 333-335.
- Mbithi, D. (1974). *Foundation of school administration*. Nairobi: Oxford University Press.
- Mead, S. (2006). *The truth about boys and girls*. Education Sector. Retrieved from http://www.educationsector.org/sites/default/files/publications/ESO_BoysandGirls.pdf
- Merriam-Webster. (2006). *Merriam-Webster's collegiate dictionary* (11th ed.). Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster Inc.
- Merton, R. (1948). The self-fulfilling prophecy. *Antioch Review*, 193-210.
- Meyer, P. (2008, Winter). Learning separately: The case for single-sex schools. *Education Next*, 18(1), 11-21.
- Miles, S., & Stipek, D. (2006, Jan/Feb). Contemporaneous and longitudinal associations between social behavior and literacy achievement in a sample of low income elementary school children. *Child Development*, 77(1).
- Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2013, October 14). *Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education: Educator Quality*. Retrieved 2013, from dese.mo.gov: <http://dese.mo.gov/divteachqual/leadership/isllc/>
- Myra Sadker Foundation. (2014, May). *Myra Sadker Foundation*. Retrieved from <http://www.sadker.org/TitleIX>

- National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education. (2008). Title IX and gender equity responsibilities of state education agencies. *Public Schools of North Carolina State Board of Education*. Retrieved from <http://dpi.state.nc.us/federalprograms/titleIX/resources/sea>
- Newberger, E. (2000). *The men they will become: The nature and nurture of male character*. New York, NY: Perseus Publishing.
- Onderi, E., & Odera, F. (2012). Discipline as a tool for effective school management. *Educational Research, 3*(9), 710-716.
- Oplatka, I., & Atias, M. (2007). Gendered views of managing discipline in school and classroom. *Gender and Education, 19*(1), 41-59.
- Parent, J., Forehand, R., Merchant, M. J., Edwards, M., Conners-Burrow, N., Long, N., & Jones, D. (2011). The relation of harsh and permissvie discipline with child disruptive behaviors: does child gender make a difference in an at-risk sample? *Spring Science + Business Media, LLC, 527-533*.
- PBIS. (2013, November 8). *OSEP Center on Postive Behavioral Interventions and Supports effective schoolwide interventions*. Retrieved from PBIS: <http://www.pbis.org>
- Peters, R. (1967). *Ethics and education*. Atlanta, GA: Foresman.
- Pollack, W. S., & Shuster, T. (2000). *Real boys' voices*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Public Agenda. (2004). *Teaching interrupted: Do discipline policies in today's public schools foster the common good?* New York, NY: Public Agenda.
- Robers, S., Zhang, J., Truman, J., & Snyder, T. (2010). *Indicators of school crime and safety*. Retrieved November 2, 2012, from National Center for Education

Statistics:

<http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2010/key.asp>

Rusby, J., Taylor, T., & Foster, E. (2007). A descriptive study of school discipline referrals in first grade. *Psychology in the Schools, 44*(4), 333-350.

Sadker, D. S. (1984). Teacher reactions to classroom responses of male and female students. *National Institute of Education*. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED245839.pdf>

Salomone, R. (2006, April). Single-sex programs: Resolving the research conundrum. *Teachers College Record, 108*(4), 778-802.

Savage, M. (2006-2007). *Gender differences impact learning and post-school success*.

Retrieved September 5, 2009, from Center for Exceptional Children:

<http://www.cec.sped.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Home&TEMPLATE=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm&CONTENTID=6270>

Sax, L. (2007). *Boys adrift : The five factors driving the growing epidemic of unmotivated boys and underachieving young men*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Tauber. (1998). *Good or bad, what teachers expect from students they generally get!*

Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S.

Department of Education.

Thomas. (2000). *The presence of others*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

Thomas, W. (1928). *The child in America*. New York, NY: Knopf.

Tiedemann, J. (2002). Teachers' gender stereotypes as determinants of teacher perceptions in elementary school mathematics. *Educational Studies in Mathematics, 50*(1), 49-62.

- Tyler Technologies. (2013, December 07). *Empowering People Who Serve the Public*. Retrieved from Tyler Technologies.
- Tyre, P. (2006). The trouble with boys: A surprising report card on our sons, their problems at school, and what parents and educators must do. *Newsweek*, pp. 44-52.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2000). *Suspensions and expulsions of public elementary and secondary school students, by state, sex, and percent of enrollment*. Office of Civil Rights. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d11/tables/dt11_170.asp
- U.S. Department of Education. (2006). *Number of students suspended and expelled from public elementary and secondary schools, by sex, race/ethnicity, and state*. Institute of Education Sciences. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d11/tables/dt11_170.asp
- U.S. Department of Education. (2008, August). *The nation's report card: State snapshot report: Writing results*. Retrieved November 2, 2012, from Institute of Education Sciences National Center for Education Statistics: <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/writing/interpret-results.asp#statistical>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2009). *The condition of education 2009, Student Suspensions and Expulsions*. Institute of Education Sciences. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2009/2009081.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2011). *The nation's report card, Reading 2011 state snapshot reports for grade 8*. Retrieved from The National Center for Educational Statistics: <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/pdf/stt2011/2012454MO8.pdf>

- Wagner, H. (2001). Discipline in schools is inseparable from teaching. *Education*, 103(4), 390-394.
- Were, N. (2006). *Discipline, guidance and counseling in schools*. Nairobi, Kenya: Nehema Publishing.
- Whitmire. (2010). *Why boys fail, saving our sons from an educational system that's leaving them behind*. New York, NY: American Management Association.
- Whitmire, R., & Bailey, S. (2010, Spring). Gender gap. *Education Next*, 2, pp. 53-61.
- Wolfgang, C. (1999). *Solving discipline problem methods and models for today's teachers* (Vol. 13). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Ylvisaker, M. (2006, September). *What is discipline?* Retrieved September 5, 2009, from Learnnet.com: <http://projectlearnnet.org/tutorials/discipline.html>

Appendix A**Lindenwood University**

School of Education
209 S. Kingshighway
St. Charles, Missouri 63301

Informed Consent for Participation in Research Activities**Discrepancies in Discipline: A Comparison of Principal Candidate Responses to Vignettes**

Principal Investigator Jill S Farrar
Telephone: 314-283-7692 E-mail: jf986@lindenwood.edu

Participant _____
Contact info _____

1. You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Jill S Farrar and Dr. Graham Weir. The purpose of this research is to understand why teachers write more office referrals for males than they do females.
2. a) Your participation will involve
 - Participating in an anonymous surveys on-line.
 - b) The amount of time involved in your participation will be very limited.
 - .
3. There are no anticipated risks associated with this research.
4. There are no direct benefits for you participating in this study. However, your participation will contribute to the knowledge about male students and discipline and may help teachers understand their students better and administrators to see behavior patterns quicker..
5. Your participation is voluntary and you may choose not to participate in this research study or to withdraw your consent at any time. You may choose not to answer any questions that you do not want to answer. You will NOT be penalized in any way should you choose not to participate or to withdraw.
6. We will do everything we can to protect your privacy. As part of this effort, your identity will not be revealed in any publication or presentation that may result from this study and the information collected will remain in the possession of the investigator in a safe location.

7. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, or if any problems arise, you may call the Investigator, Jill S. Farrar or their Faculty Advisor, Dr. Graham Weir, 636-949-4315. You may also ask questions of or state concerns regarding your participation to the Lindenwood Institutional Review Board (IRB) through contacting Dr. Jann Weitzel, Vice President for Academic Affairs at 636-949-4846.

I have read this consent form and have been given the opportunity to ask questions. I will also be given a copy of this consent form for my records. I consent to my participation in the research described above.

Participant's Signature

Date

Participant's Printed Name

Signature of Principal Investigator

Date

Investigator Printed Name

Appendix B

Teacher Survey Questions

All surveys are anonymous, so please feel comfortable responding honestly.

Gender _____ Male or Female

Grade(s) taught _____

Years with District 0-10 11-20 21+

What disciplinary issues exist among your male students and female students and why do you feel these exist?

How do you adjust your disciplinary strategies with female students and male students?

What do you believe influences your female student's behaviors

What do you believe influences your male student's behaviors?

How do you feel school rules and regulations impact your female students?

How do you feel school rules and regulations impact your male students?

What disciplinary interventions work best for male students and elaborate on effective?

What disciplinary interventions work best for female students and elaborate on effective

What patterns, if any, exist in your office referrals?

How do you expect female students to act in your class? How do they know your expectations?

How do you expect male students to act in your class? How do they know your expectations?

Appendix C

Vignette Number _____

Any Place School District

Sunny Side Middle School

Disciplinary Referral

Student Name _____

Referring Teacher _____

Location _____

Administrator's

Response _____

Rationale: _____

Administrator Feedback Any or All

____ Parent Phone Contact

____ Parent Meeting

____ Conflict Mediation

____ After School Detention

____ Saturday Detention Hours _____

____ Warning

____ In-School-Suspension Days 1, 3, 5, 10

____ Out-of-school Suspension Days 1,3,5,10

Other _____

Appendix D

Below are some vignettes that are being used in the dissertation process for a Lindenwood University doctoral candidate. You are being asked to read and discuss the manner in which you would handle the situation, the discipline you would assign, and why you administered the specific discipline.

Please provide the following information:

Your program of study? (i.e. teacher ed, administration) _____

Your grade level are you seeking certification/certified? _____

Male or Female Ethnicity _____ Are you currently working in a school? _____

If yes, what is your role? _____

1. At Anywhere Middle School a student named Jewel and her friends were following another student, Amy, in the hallway back from band. Jewel was taunting Amy by telling Amy how ugly, stupid, and worthless she is. Amy was near tears but held it together as she began to enter the combination into her locker. Jewel and friends, who stopped and were standing near Amy's locker, continue to intimidate and harass Amy by calling her names and laughing at how stupid she was. Amy, who had had enough, began yelling at Jewel to "shut the hell up and get away from me now before I beat your ass!" A teacher who was walking by in the hallway sees the end of this exchange and yells at Amy to get to the office now. Amy starts crying but complies while Jewel laughs and continues down the hallway with her friends to class.
When Amy gets to the office with the teacher, the teacher tells you, the principal, what he/she witnessed. You are left to handle the situation. What do you do and what disciplinary consequences would you suggest for the offense?

2. At Anywhere Middle School a student named Zack and his friends were following Adam in the hallway back from band. Zack was taunting Adam by telling Adam how ugly, stupid, and worthless he is. Adam was near tears but held it together as he began to enter the combination into his locker. Zack and friends, who stopped and were standing near Adam's locker, continue to intimidate and harass Adam by calling him names and laughing at how stupid he was. Adam, who had had enough, began yelling at Zack to "shut the hell up and get away from me now before I beat your ass!" A teacher who was walking by in the hallway sees the end of this exchange and yells at Adam to get to the office now. Adam starts crying but complies while Zack laughs and continues down the hallway with his friends to class.
When Adam gets to the office with the teacher, the teacher tells you, the principal, what he/she witnessed. You are left to handle the situation. What do you do and what disciplinary consequences would you suggest for the offense?

3. At Anywhere Middle School, in the cafeteria, Laura heads to the normal lunch table where everyone has sat for two years. When Laura arrives, the entire table gets up and moves to another table. Laura attempts to sit at the other table with the students when Ellen says, "You can't sit with us, we hate you." Everyone sitting at the table begins to laugh. Laura is devastated and before walking away yells out, "I am going to kill you Ellen." You overhear this and ask Laura to come with you into the office. What do you do and what disciplinary consequences would you suggest for the offense?
4. At Anywhere Middle School, in the cafeteria, Michael heads to the normal lunch table where everyone has sat for two years. When Michael arrives, the entire table gets up and moves to another table. Michael attempts to sit at the other table with the students when Dan says, "You can't sit with us, we hate you." Everyone sitting at the table begins to laugh. Michael is devastated and before walking away yells out, "I am going to kill you Dan." You overhear this and ask Michael to come with you into the office. What do you do and what disciplinary consequences would you suggest for the offense?
5. In a middle school Math classroom, Kashina continues to talk during the teacher instruction time. The teacher continues to ask Kashina to stop talking and listen to the instruction. The teacher has spoken to Kashina privately, contacted a parent for support, and moved her seat closer to the teacher's smart board to try to redirect the behaviors. Now the teacher is sending Kashina to you for discipline. Kashina tells you that Harper is constantly talking and disrupting the class but the teacher does nothing about it. Kashina feels like the teacher is picking on her. What do you do and what disciplinary consequences would you suggest for the offense?
6. In a middle school Math classroom, Kevin continues to talk during the teacher instruction time. The teacher continues to ask Kevin to stop talking and listen to the instruction. The teacher has spoken to Kevin privately, contacted a parent for support, and moved his seat closer to the teacher's smart board to try to redirect the behaviors. Now the teacher is sending Kevin to you for discipline. Kevin tells you that Henry is constantly talking and disrupting the class but the teacher does nothing about it. Kevin feels like the teacher is picking on him. What do you do and what disciplinary consequences would you suggest for the offense?
7. At the end of the day at a middle school, all the students rush out to catch their respective bus. Students are very quickly running to hug friends' good bye and get one last conversation in before going home. As an administrator you are ushering students onto their busses and helping students with their belongings. Right before the busses pull away, a teacher yells at you to come quickly. You see Samantha and Jocelyn

pushing and yelling at one another. Both girls throw down their belongings and look as if they are going to fight. What do you do and what disciplinary consequences would you suggest for the offense?

8. At the end of the day at a middle school, all the students rush out to catch their respective bus. Students are very quickly running to hug friends' good bye and get one last conversation in before going home. As an administrator you are ushering students onto their busses and helping students with their belongings. Right before the busses pull away, a teacher yells at you to come quickly. You see Saul and Jack pushing and yelling at one another. Both boys throw down their belongings and look as if they are going to fight. What do you do and what disciplinary consequences would you suggest for the offense?

9. At a middle school, at the end of the day, a young lady comes up to you, the administrator, and tells you that last night, Michelle has tweeted untrue things about her and another male classmate. Other classmates began tweeting this as well and it has begun to spiral out of control. She is very upset because everyone has been making fun of her all day and calling her names like slut. She is very upset and says she is not coming to school the next day. What do you do and what disciplinary consequences would you suggest for the offense?

- 10.

11. At a middle school, at the end of the day, a young man comes up to you, the administrator, and tells you that last night, Mitchell has tweeted untrue things about him and another female classmate. Other classmates began tweeting this as well and it has begun to spiral out of control. He is very upset because everyone has been making fun of him all day and calling the young lady names like slut. He is very upset and says he is not coming to school the next day. What do you do and what disciplinary consequences would you suggest for the offense?

Appendix E

Middle School Discipline Guidelines

Detention

Bullying/Harassment/Cyberbullying

Each infraction will be dealt with on an individual basis up to and including suspension and expulsion, possible notification of law enforcement.

Class Disturbance/Inappropriate Behavior

2 to 8 hours

Minor Scuffling

1st offense - 2 to 4 hours

2nd offense - 4 to 8 hours

Vulgar Language

1st Offense – 4 hours

2nd Offense – 8 hours

In School Suspension

In School Suspension Program will be used for problems of intermediate seriousness or for the repeated violation of school rules normally dealt with through Saturday Detention.

Bullying/Harassment/Cyberbullying

Each infraction will be dealt with on an individual basis up to and including suspension and expulsion, possible notification of law enforcement.

Class Disturbance/Inappropriate Behavior

5 days

Disrespect

(Student to Student and/or Student to Staff)

1. Disparaging or Demeaning Language or (defamation of a person's religion, gender or ethnic origin)

2. Disrespectful Conduct or Speech (verbal, written or symbolic language or gesture)

1st offense - 3 days

2nd offense – 5 days

Blatant Disrespect

(To Staff)

1. Disparaging or Demeaning Language (defamation of a person's religion, gender or ethnic origin)

2. Disrespectful Conduct or Speech (verbal, written or symbolic student language or gesture directed to staff member)
3. Disruptive Speech or Conduct (conduct or verbal, written or symbolic language)
1st offense – 5 days
2nd offense – 10 days

**Blatant Disrespect
(To Student)**

1. Disparaging or Demeaning Language (defamation of person's religion, gender or ethnic origin)
2. Disparaging or Demeaning Speech (verbal, written or symbolic student language or gesture directed to another student)
3. Disruptive Speech or Conduct (conduct or verbal, written or symbolic language)
1st offense – 5 days
2nd offense – 10 days

Insubordination

- 1st offense - 3 days
2nd offense – 5 days

Blatant Insubordination

Defiantly disregards reasonable and repeated requests.

- 1st offense – 5 days
2nd offense – 10 days
-

Out-of-School Suspension

Out of school suspension should be used when the presence of a student constitutes a threat to other students or has a negative effect upon the learning atmosphere. Each infraction will be dealt with on an individual basis up to and including suspension or expulsion of the student.

Inappropriate Behavior

5 to 10 days

Internet Misuse

Suspension or revocation of Internet and Computer access as well as possible disciplinary action taken up to and including suspension and expulsion from school and possible notification of law enforcement officials.

Misuse of electronic device/videotaping

Each infraction will be dealt with on an individual basis up to and including suspension or expulsion of the student.

Acts of Violence

An “act of violence” means the exertion of physical force by a student with the intent to do serious bodily harm to another person while on school property, including a school bus in service on behalf of the district, or while involved in school activities.

Acts of Violence

10 days with referral to Superintendent for additional suspension days or expulsion, notification to law enforcement officials

Assault (Attempting to cause injury to another person; placing a person in reasonable apprehension of imminent injury)

5 to 10 days with possible referral to Superintendent for additional suspension days, notification of law enforcement officials

Fighting

5 to 10 days with possible referral to Superintendent for additional suspension days, possible notification of law enforcement officials.

Threats of Violence

Each infraction will be dealt with on an individual basis up to and including suspension and expulsion of the student, and possible notification of law enforcement officials.

Racial Harassment/Slur/Ethnic Comments

Allegations of racial harassment shall be investigated and, if substantiated, corrective or disciplinary action taken, up to and including suspension and/or expulsion of the student, possible notification of law enforcement officials.

Bullying/Hazing/Harassment

Each infraction will be dealt with on an individual basis up to and including suspension and expulsion of the student, possible notification of law enforcement officials.

Vitae

The investigator/researcher earned her Bachelor of Arts in Secondary Language Arts Education from the University of Missouri-Columbia in 1995. She then began teaching High School and Junior High English. In 1997, the investigator earned a Masters of Arts in Teaching, and in 2005, earned a Specialist in Educational Administration from Webster University in St. Louis, Missouri. After teaching in the classroom for thirteen years, the researcher became an Assistant Principal in a suburban middle school. The researcher has been an administrator in the researched suburban district since 2008.