2001

Administrators' Perception of Violence in Elementary Schools in an Urban District

Glenda Seals Johnson-Green
Seton Hall University

Recommended Citation

Johnson-Green, Glenda Seals, "Administrators' Perception of Violence in Elementary Schools in an Urban District" (2001). *Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses (ETDs)*. 163.
https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations/163

ADMINISTRATORS PERCEPTION OF VIOLENCE IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
IN AN URBAN DISTRICT

By

GLENDA SEALS JOHNSON-GREEN

Dissertation Committee

Dan Gutmore, Ph.D., Mentor
Mel Shay, Ed.D.
Jacqueline Rucker-Davis, Esq.
El Rhonda Williams-Alston, Esq.

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Education
Seton Hall University

2001

ABSTRACT

In today's society a major concern is that of violence in our schools. All forms of the media report the growing numbers of incidents in and around school buildings. This concern continues to escalate each day. Years ago it was unheard of to think that our society would become dependent on metal detectors in schoolhouse entrances. It is important to examine the perceptions of administrators as it is related to violence in elementary schools. Over the years much focus has been placed on the secondary and middle schools, however, violence begins as early as the primary grades, mirroring our society. The amount and severity of violent acts are real. Thus this manuscript will examine administrators perceptions of violence in elementary schools in an urban district.

ACKOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my heartfelt gratitude and appreciation to those people who have supported me through this endeavor and gave me the desire to "go for the gold".

To my mother, the late Ruby Thomas for her constant encouragement...

To my maternal grandmother, the late Corine Carter Odom for her faith in me...

To my one and only child, Jamal Hakiim Johnson my inspiration...

To my grandchildren, Kamala, Khalis and Matin for your unconditional love...

To my dad, Eugene Seals Sr., my husband, Harold, all of my grandparents, brothers, sisters, aunts, uncles, nieces, nephews, cousins, god-mothers and friends...

To my mentors, the late Gladys Hillman-Jones and Anzella K. Nelms, you always said I could do it...

To my committee members, Dr. Dan Gutmore, Provost Mel Shay, El-Rhonda Williams-Alston and Jaqueline Rucker-Davis for your guidance....

Thank You

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In Eron's, Huesmann's, Dubro's, Romanoff's and Yarmel's book <u>Aggression and its correlates over 22 years</u>, they refer to two theories, which explain aggression in children. The basis of these theories stemmed from a 22-year longitudinal study of a large number of subjects. The study began in 1960 and ended in 1982.

The social learning theory placed great emphasis on external environmental cues as elicitors of aggression (Eron, 1987). They (Eron et al., 1987) proposed that aggressive behavior is learned and maintained through environmental experiences. Aggressive behaviors are learned by "training" from "various socializing agents, specifically parents, teachers and peers" (Eron, 1961). Generally, behaviors that are reinforced will be repeated.

Data from the 22-year longitudinal study showed that when children are exposed to aggressive role models, then children's aggression increased.

The social cognitive theory defines how an individual perceives and interprets environmental events and how he or she will respond (Eron, 1987; Huesmann & Eron, 1984; Huesmann, 1977, 1980, 1982, 1984, 1994). Huesmann hypothesized that programs for behavior that have been

learned during an individual's early development control social behavior to a great extent. These programs are cognitive scripts that are stored in memory and are used later in social problem solving. Aggression is a way of interacting with others, which is learned very early in life and is learned very well (Huesmann, Eron, Lefkowitz & Walder, 1984).

The developing child learns cognition and information processing techniques that are adaptive to his or her environmental context. These cognition's and modes of information processing influence social behavior and violent behavior in particular over the course of development.

Violent human behavior is determined by numerous variables. When there is a convergence of a number of variables violent behavior occurs (Eron, 1982). The child is reinforced for his or her aggression from observing many instances of aggression and through being the object of aggression. Children in this type of environment assume that violent behavior is the norm.

Eron (1982) suggested that aggressive antisocial behavior crystallizes around age 8, which places the child in grade two. The younger the child the greater is the threat of exposure to violence which can have serious developmental consequences for children including psychological disorders, impaired intellectual development and school problems, pathological adaptation to violence and

identification with the aggressor (Craig, 1992; Garbarino, Dubrow, Kostelny & Pardo, 1992).

Contrary to popular belief, youth violence and crime is actually down from its high point in the mid 1970's. Even though there has been a decrease in terms of gross numbers, the kinds of violent acts that young people are committing are more serious in nature and the offenders are getting younger and younger. The viciousness and casualness of the acts indicate that civil codes of behavior are weakening (Kauffman & Burbach, 1997).

We must look to the larger society for clues. Violence means many things in our society. Violence is power through coercion. Violence is viewed as political power through the state retaliating in other countries. Our society spends billions on prisons while cutting back on funding to public education. This present day thinking is leading to an even younger generation of criminals who are increasingly callous and a society that responds with punitive measures (Kauffman & Burbach, 1997).

The National Center for Education Statistics sponsored a report that was conducted in 1991. A national questionnaire was mailed to 884 elementary and secondary principals to whom 94% responded. The statistics presented school principals' perspectives on issues related to safety, discipline and drug-use prevention in their schools (Mansfield & Farris, 1992). Through out this particular

report, disruptive behavior increased from elementary to
secondary schools, from suburban to urban schools and from
small schools with enrollments less than 300 to large
schools with enrollments over 1,000 students. The findings
indicated over 90% of the principals surveyed, referred
disruptive students to social services outside of the school
district.

Violence knows no urban, suburban, or rural limitations.
It can happen anywhere. If two students are yelling at one
another, is it violence? If they are yelling and shoving,
is it violence? If they are making threats towards one
another, is that violence? The answers are not always
clear. Each person, each family, each school, and each
community may have a unique definition of violence.

The number of incidents of violence in schools is cause
for concern, but equally worrying is the fact that schools
are not fully addressing the fact that there is a problem.
Incidents are often not recorded or recorded inconsistently.
Teachers of young children meet many who show early signs of
emotional disturbances - the kindergartner who shows no sign
of conscience and repeatedly re-enacts scenes from The
Terminator, the second grader who kicks his classmates
square in the face. The teachers of such children refer
them for services, but because of under financed public
education, such services are scant in many schools (Leamann,
1998).

In May 1998, a 15-year old boy in Oregon killed his parents and went to his high school and opened fire on hundreds of students in the cafeteria. After the shooting spree, 1 person was dead and 23 others injured, 5 critically. The superintendent of schools, Norman Paulus, said in his district, "This is not a school problem, this is a societal problem" (Egan, 1998). As we are faced with more and more incidents of this nature, younger and younger children cause the violence.

Statement of the Problem

In recent years, more and more incidences of violence have increased in elementary schools in urban districts, even though statistics show a different picture. It is difficult to comprehend that the foundations of violence in middle and high schools began as early as the primary grades in our elementary schools. This study will (a) explore the factors that contribute to this increase in the early grades (b) examine the perceptions of administrators and (c) examine the link between administrators perceptions and violence in schools. The findings of this research can provide school district staff with the data needed to make informed policy decisions regarding the allocation or reallocation of resources on the elementary level.

Statement of Sub-Problems

The sub-problems of this study are to:

1. Identify the factors as perceived by administrators

that contribute to violence in their schools.

2. Identify practices that are utilized in the various elementary schools to address the incidences of violence.

3. Determine the relationship between school climate and incidences of violence.

4. Determine the relationship between law enforcement presence and incidences of violence.

Research Questions

Several research questions are addressed in this study.

1. What were the incidences of violence reported to the Office of Security Services for this district during the 1998-1999 school year?

2. What is the relationship between school climate, as measured by the administrators perceptions reported on the "Principal/School Disciplinarian Survey on School Violence" and incidences of violence?

3. What factors, as perceived by administrators, contribute to violence in this Public School District?

4. What practices do administrators identify as effective in successfully addressing violence at their schools?

Research Hypothesis

The following hypotheses are generated by research questions 1, 2, 3 and 5 respectively.

1. There is no relationship between school climate and incidences of violence.

2. There is no relationship between administrators'
   perception of violence and student behavior or teacher
   behavior that contributes to violence.

3. There is no relationship between reported incidences of
   violence and the perceptions of violence by
   administrators.

Significance of the Study

This study is significant to practice and theory. It
will contribute to the extremely limited body of knowledge
that presently exists in the relationship between
administrators' perceptions and incidences of violence in
elementary schools in urban settings. Primarily, the study
provides data to the School District and it's community on
the factors that administrators perceive as contributing to
violence on the elementary level, as well as informing other
similar urban school districts throughout the country.

Numerous studies have been conducted on factors that
contribute to student violence and vandalism; virtually few
if any empirical studies have been conducted from the
elementary school administrators' perspective. The study
provides a valuable resource for policy makers, teachers,
administrators and the community at large who wish to
develop successful violence prevention programs.

At an alarmingly younger age students are arriving at
school unable or unprepared to mediate conflicts. It is
assumed that the results of the study (a) will give schools

a broader scope on the existence of school violence at the elementary level and (b) will impact upon future development of policies by this School District to aide in the maintenance of a violence-free environment.

Assumptions

This study assumes that the survey adapted from the U.S. Department of Education "Principal/School Disciplinarian Survey on School Violence" accurately assesses school climate. Also, it is assumed that each administrator in each school accurately reported the number of incidences of violence to the Office of Security Services.

Definitions of Terms

Aggressive behavior- behaviors by one individual that are intended to injure or irritate another individual.

Disruptive student- a student who engages in behavior in the classroom that interferes with the process of teaching and learning.

Elementary school- a school that has a low grade of 3 or less and a high grade of 1 through 8.

Incident- a specific criminal act or offense involving one or more victims and one or more offenders or damage of school property.

Physical attack or fight without a weapon- an actual and intentional touching or striking of another person against his or her will, or the intentional causing of bodily harm to an individual without using a weapon.

Rural- a farming area or a small town with a population of less than 50,000.

School- an educational institution consisting of one or more grades K through 12.

School climate- a term that refers to current feelings and attitudes that reflect how students' staff and parents feel about the school environment (Gonder, 1994).

Urban- an urbanized area comprising a place and the densely settled surrounding territory that together have a minimum population of 50,000 people.

Vandalism- the damage or destruction of school property.

Zero tolerance- policies that punish all offenses severely; no matter how minor.

Delimitations

1. The study involved seven K-4 schools.
2. The study involved eighteen K-8 schools.
3. The study involved eight PreK-8 schools.

4. The study involved eight K-5 schools.

5. Teachers, students and parents were not surveyed.

6. The study did not determine the reasons for violence in these schools.

7. The study only surveyed elementary principals.

8. The study only involved an urban district.

9. The study only surveyed perceptions of elementary principals.

Limitations

1. School climate is described as the perceptions of administrators at the surveyed school sites and is therefore subjective.

2. The data from the surveys were collected from administrators in 41 public schools in the largest urban school district in a northeastern state and therefore cannot be generalized to other districts.

3. Data regarding the incidences of violence for 1998-1999 were obtained from past reports filed in the Office of Security Services and are considered ex post facto. Ex post facto data represents a limitation due to the researcher's inability to manipulate the variables (Westmeyer, 1981).

Historical View and Violence

For many years, it has been the responsibility of the states to provide an educational system for their children. Years ago the educational system's primary purpose was to

produce good citizens (Newman, 1980). All children were expected to contribute to the good of society. Families instilled the importance of an education in their children in the hopes that their lives would be enhanced; however, education as we know it has changed. A place of learning cannot exist in chaos and disorder.

Violence is posing a serious threat to education. Our society has become one of the most violent in all of the developed countries (Ordovensky, 1993). The exposure to various forms of violence during the course of a day is staggering (Huesmann & Miller, 1994)

The U.S. Department of Education conducted a survey in 1996-1997, which asked principals to rate the following discipline issues as a serious problem, moderate problem, minor problem, or not a problem:

1. Student tardiness

2. Student absenteeism

3. Student possession of weapons

4. Trespassing

5. Physical conflicts among students

6. Robbery or theft of items worth over $10

7. Verbal abuse

8. Physical abuse of teachers

9. Vandalism of school property

10. Teacher absenteeism

11. Student alcohol use

12.Teacher alcohol or drug use

13.Sale of drugs on school grounds

14.Student tobacco use

15.Racial tension

16.Gangs

Principals were more likely to perceive at least one discipline issue as a serious problem in high schools and in schools with over 1,000 students enrolled. Elementary schools reported the lowest percent of serious discipline problems (8%) followed by middle schools with 18%. Thirty-eight percent of principals in large schools reported some serious discipline problems compared to 15% of principals in medium-sized schools and 10% of principals in small schools.

Instructional level, school size, location of the school, minority enrollment and the percentage of students eligible for free or reduced lunch through the federal food program reported the most serious or moderate problems.

Elementary and middle school principals also reported physical conflicts among students as one of their top three serious or moderate discipline problems (18% and 35%).

Physical conflicts among students were more frequently reported to be serious or moderate discipline problems in urban schools rather than in rural schools (25% versus 14%). Twenty-nine percent of schools with 75% or more students eligible for the school lunch program reported physical conflicts as a serious or moderate problem, compared to 13%

in schools that had fewer than 20% of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch (U.S. Department of Education, 1978).

Everyday children in America witness violent acts or are victims of abuse, neglect, or personal assault in their homes or communities. Adults have failed dismally in our most basic responsibility - to protect our society's children from violence (Wright Edelman, 1993).

Every child's life in this country is touched by violence. Constant exposure to violence exists from exposure through the media to being a direct witness, being a victim and for far too many children becoming a perpetrator (Slabey, 1992; Huesmann & Miller, 1994).

Approximately 2.7 million children were reported to child protection agencies in 1991 as victims of physical abuse, neglect, emotional maltreatment or sexual abuse. Nationally the number of children reported abused or neglected has tripled since 1980 (Children's Defense Fund, 1992).

In one Chicago public housing project all of the children, by age five, had witnessed a shooting (Dodd, 1993).

By the age of 18 the average child will have seen 26,000 killings on television (Tuchsherer, 1988). TV Guide reported that a violent incident is shown on television every six minutes (Edelman, 1993).

Children's physical aggression in schools is important not only because of the harm it inflicts, but also because it has long term consequences for settings beyond the school. For example, consistent physical aggression by boys in school predicts later antisocial acts, delinquency, and violent offenses in the community. Proportions of boy fighters have already emerged during kindergarten. When the fighting persists through the first part of elementary school, these boys are highly likely to continue to fight in later grades. Other fighters tend to emerge during the elementary years or a little later. Yet, most of the boys who fight appear already aggressive by age 8 or 9 (Laub & Lauritsen, 1998).

By age 6 a number of children have adopted aggressive patterns of behavior in their interactions with others (Parke & Slabey, 1983).

Americans cannot afford to ignore or minimize the magnitude of violence in schools and its implications for the larger society.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study will be to determine the perceptions of public school administrators in the largest urban school district in this northeastern state on issues of violence in schools. The study will attempt to answer several key research questions:

1. How do administrators perceive violence in schools

in general?

2. What types of violence takes place in schools in a large urban district?

3. What impact does violence have on schools?

4. Do administrators deny having problems and if they do, then why do they deny the problems?

Perceptions of violence provide indicators for solutions to violence in schools in the future. It is hoped that the findings of this study will be of practical value to elementary principals in understanding the extent to which violence impacts upon our schools.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

INTRODUCTION

Violence in schools is not a new phenomenon. Violent acts are happening with increasing frequency and there is no age limitation in the school setting for these acts of violence. School violence, according to Shapiro (1994) in urban settings may be the most pressing issue related to student welfare. Generally, the problem was viewed as an urban problem; however, rural communities can no longer expect to maintain their immunity from violence.

Prothrow-Stith (1991) states that student violence in schools may well be the result of several decades of decaying moral values. Schools merely mirror those behaviors, which children see, and experience at home and in their world (Prothrow-Stith, 1991). General acceptance of lower moral values and a decline in the family unit has allowed violence to creep into schools, which were once considered safe.

The FBI estimates that 3 million crimes and acts of violence are committed on school property each year. These equal 16,000 incidences per school day, or one incident every six seconds (Ordovensky, 1993). These school safety

violations include 300,000 physical assaults in primary and secondary schools, and 500 million dollars in damages from theft, vandalism and arson (Chase, 1993; Riley, 1994).

To better understand violence in schools, a historical perspective, societal perspective and administrative perspective are needed. Perceptions of administrators and the general public need to be understood.

The manner in which schools and their respective districts address safety is a direct by-product of the presence of violence. More and more schools are utilizing on site security personnel to insure that all students will be able to learn in a safe environment. Some schools, due to serious problems are considering placing armed police officers on school campuses. Safety issues are directly related to the levels of school violence.

According to the School crime: A National Crime Victimization Survey Report (1991) from the U.S. Department of Justice, there was an increase in the number of arrests of persons under the age of 18 involved in assaults.

Children under age 10 accounted for 4% of the arrests for assault. Children 11-14 accounted for almost 5% of the arrests for assault. In both instances, most of these arrests took place in cities.

Following the Jonesboro, Arkansas murders of five people in May 1998, Congress reacted quickly to this horrific incident. Unanimous approval was given to boost

schools' ability to provide a safe learning environment for students (Security Distributing and Marketing, 1998). U.S. Senator Jeff Bingaman shared that school safety is an issue on the minds of many people across the country today. People want to know that the school building is a safe place for their children. Unfortunately, recent events illustrate; this is not the case.

<div align="center">School Violence - What is it?</div>

"Violence is anything that denies human dignity and leads to a sense of helplessness or hopelessness" (Martin Luther King).

According to Whitney and Smith (1993), student violence has been defined as those students' acts of assault, theft, and vandalism. The problems involving violence have caused society to be unprepared for the negative impact that violence has become.

Ruebel (1978) found that numerous administrators from rural schools, when surveyed responded that the issue of violence was of little or no concern. By 1984, rural schools principals found that student violence was escalating. The 1990's shifted the overall awareness for school safety to most schools. This shift came about with the development of the National Education Goal Panel (1993). Six national goals were selected which included that every school in America will be free of drugs and violence and offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning by

19

2000.

According to Furlong and Morrison (1994) student violence is those acts initiated by students that create a climate in which school personnel and/or individual students feel fear, intimidation, or threat to their mental and/or physical well being.

Student behavior in schools is a subject that has become a hot topic again due to the numerous well-publicized violent events, which can be viewed in print or other media. High-profile public opinion polls also add to our definition of violence in schools. In 1994, a report was conducted by the nonprofit Public Agenda Foundation in New York, and the annual American Teacher surveys compiled by the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, determined that school discipline was the number one educational concern of the general public and teachers.

Historical Perspective

In 1976-1977 the School Boards Association conducted a school violence survey, which elicited 1,387 responses (56%) from school administrators. Principals were believed to be the people most closely involved in the schools with the most to offer in a survey of this nature. Previously no extensive surveys had been conducted on the extent of violence in the State's public schools. Violence was viewed as a continuing problem in the State's public schools and examining some of its characteristics appeared to be a

desirable tool in securing safe schools (School Board Association, 1978). Also, heightened awareness of violence, as a problem in public education would contribute to the administrative efficiency of school principals and their support staffs.

The State's most recent answer to this escalating problem of violence was to develop the State School Search Manual, considered a document for the times by Attorney General Peter Verniero. His plan was to distribute this "legal encyclopedia" to all schools in the State. Its' purpose was to clear up confusion among the general public and schools over what educators are legally entitled to do in cases of violence.

In 1996 surveys showed acts of violence on the rise in the State's schools. Between 1990 and 1994 the Department of Education reported that incidents of violence, vandalism and substance abuse had tripled from 4,932 to 14,749 incidents.

Violence has been an American theme in the educational system. For centuries (Becker, 1983; Doyle, 1978; Newman, 1980) two arguments have supported the existence of school violence. One assumes some type of inherent relationship between student behavior and the disciplinary practices of the school (Newman, 1980). Secondly, it suggests that school disorder is linked to students' behavior patterns and beliefs irrespective of the school.

A survey of 4,000 public elementary and secondary principals was conducted between 1967 and 1977 by the National Institute of Education (United States Department of Education, 1978). Roughly 282,000 students were attacked in America's secondary schools each month; approximately 2.4 million had something stolen from them during an average month and nearly 8% of urban junior and senior high school students missed a minimum of one day of classes a month because they feared for their safety (United States Department of Education, 1978). Of the nation's million secondary teachers nearly 5,200 were physically attacked at school every month, with 1,000 of them requiring medical attention (United States Department of Education, 1978).

Current students committed most of the offenses. Offenders and victims were usually the same sex and age (usually male). In most cases, the offenders and victims were the same race (United States Department of Education, 1978).

Children are increasingly becoming involved in violence at younger ages and they are committing more violent crimes.

Many schools that once were safe havens from the violence that has plagued homes and communities are now experiencing more violent episodes.

Twenty-five percent of the sample of 50,000 public school teachers in 1987-88 considered verbal abuse of teachers and student drug and alcohol abuse as serious or

moderately serious problems. By 1993-94, 34% of those

queried considered both verbal abuse of teachers and

physical conflict among students as serious problems (Shen,

1997).

Two patterns emerge when comparing elementary and

secondary schools. Teachers in both areas have been equally

concerned about students' physical conflicts. Physical

conflicts and verbal abuse of teachers became more severe

from 1987-1994. Both elementary and secondary schools became

increasingly violent (Shen, 1997).

Urban teachers consistently said physical conflicts

among students were the most serious. Suburban school

problems changed from 1987-1991. Use of alcohol was viewed

as the most serious, however it changed to verbal abuse of

teachers by 1991. By 1994, the most serious problem facing

suburban schools was the same one facing urban schools:

student physical conflicts. Urban problems had spread to

the suburbs (Shen, 1997).

Students are generally the center of concern as it is

related to school violence. The discourse about violence in

public schools continues.

Demographics and Typologies of School Violence

Victims of school violence cover a broad spectrum.

Over 2,000 students and nearly forty teachers are physically

attacked on school grounds every hour of every school day

throughout the school year according to Keith Geiger,

President of the National Education Association.

Students in grades 6 through 10 are more likely to be victims than older students in senior high school (United States Department of Justice, 1991). Frequent moving of families led to student victimization, as did students who were members of racial minorities within a school tended to be physically assaulted more. Victims of property crime, stemmed from students wearing expensive clothing, jewelry or bringing cameras, cassette players, beepers and other electronic devices to school.

During the day most teachers feel safe in their schools, but after school hours many teachers do not, especially those working in urban areas. Younger less experienced teachers and women are generally the targets of violence. The group most at risk is teachers who insist that students adhere to rigorous academic and behavioral standards. This has had a direct effect on teachers' perceptions (Lorion, 1998). If teachers feel that students will target them they will be less willing to demand higher standards from them and less likely to intervene when altercations take place in their presence. This could place teachers in jeopardy physically and financially if parents sue them.

Two kinds of violence should be distinguished (Boothe & Flick, 1994). The first is violence by trespassers or intruders who enter school buildings to rob or assault

someone. The second type of violence is committed against other staff, teachers, administrators or fellow classmates by students enrolled in the school.

These perpetrators and victims represent all racial, ethnic and economic groups. More often males are likely to be involved in acts of violence in schools. An alarming trend indicates that girls are becoming more involved in such acts.

Perpetrators do not need or have a serious reason to lash out. A look or stare or an accidental bump into someone may trigger a violent reaction. Violence could result from courtship jealousies, gossip, extortion, feeling disrespected or even an attempt to impress friends. Today tempers of many students are ignited quickly and the results are often disastrous.

Children spend thousands of hours annually absorbing scenes of violence in the media, in their homes and in the community. Students reflect the culture and the society that adults have created. The only result is violence in our schools.

Violence is rooted in the social and economic changes that have swept this country over the past two decades. Parents living below the poverty line vent their frustrations on children, yelling at them and physically and emotionally abusing them. For these reasons, children resort to violence. These children have grown accustomed to

violence as the normal means of settling disputes.
Nonviolence isn't even an option in their way of thinking
(Toch, Gest & Guttman, 1993).

Variables Associated with School Violence

There are very distinct characteristics that contribute
to violence in schools such as low family income, which
places families below the poverty line. Children are
identified as troublesome as early as age 8 by teachers and
their peers. These children's psychomotor ability is out of
the normal range. Verbal I.Q. scores are below normal on
any given level. Also, some of these children have
experienced head injuries and/or sexual/physical abuse.

Fagan and Wilkinson (1998) described four types of
violence common during childhood and adolescence.
Aggression is one of the types. For younger children, the
value of aggression, or "rough and tumble" play, is three
fold: a) development of affiliations and selection of
friends, b) development of fighting skills and c) the
establishment of ones position in a dominance hierarchy.
With age, playful behavior becomes more intense, purposeful
and consequential. The meaning, seriousness and
social value of rough play changes as children become
exposed to social diversity. Rough and tumble play is
likely to continue beyond the elementary years when there
are few alternatives for establishing social position.

Violence in Communities

The interaction between individual development and social contexts (e.g. the family, schools and neighborhood) produce violent behavior. Factors such as low socioeconomic status, high population turnover, race and ethnicity and high housing density are very strong predictors of violence. These varied conditions decrease a neighborhood's capacity for social organization (Lorion, 1998). Residents living in low-income neighborhoods tend to experience more difficulty establishing the informal and formal social ties within the community, which are necessary to control crime and violence.

Single-parent households, which make up large percentages of urban neighborhoods, tend to have fewer social resources and networks necessary for developing and sustaining local institutions (Lorion, 1998).

The strongest predictors for school violence rates are local neighborhood crime rates. School violence in particular communities is influenced by school policies regarding discipline, security, drop out rates and by small group interactions that develop within the school that prompt youth to respond violently to routine provocation (Laub & Lauritsen, 1998).

Most of the violence that students are exposed to occurs in their home neighborhood and in the community surrounding the school. A setting is "contaminated" by the

expectations, attitudes, and behaviors that everyone carries from other settings into the school (Lorion, 1998).

Exposure to violence generates a sense of fear that leads to acts intended to reduce or control fear. There are specific side effects to exposure to violence. Some products are:

1. Disruption in interpersonal relationships

2. Generalized emotional distress

3. Problems with aggression, conduct disorder and truancy

4. Cognitive, psychological and physical issues (Laub & Lauritsen, 1998).

More violence in the community, leads to more violence that is encountered in the day-to-day operation of a school.

The escalating rate of violence in many American cities means that large numbers of children are growing up in conditions that have been described as "inner-city war zones" (Garbarino, Dubrow, Kostelny, & Pardo, 1992). All children are affected by the violence that pervades our society. Due to this, the healthy development of our nation's children is in serious jeopardy.

Contributors to violent behavior in society are complex and interrelated. Some of those contributors are unemployment, substance abuse, inadequate or abusive parenting practices, poverty, racism, and real-life adult models of violent problem-solving behavior and frequent exposure to violence in the media (Children's Defense Fund,

1992). As social programs disappeared and the economy worsened, violence in homes, schools and communities have increased.

Research clearly shows that the media, particularly films and television, contribute to the problem of violence in America (Huesmann & Miller, 1994). Children who are frequent viewers of violence on television are less likely to show empathy toward the pain and suffering of others and more likely to act aggressively. U.S. Senator Christopher Dodd pointed out, that violence is a problem for all Americans; from affluent suburbs to inner-city streets, violence knows no social, economic, racial or geographic boundaries.

Administrators Perception of Violence

In 1992 the sixth annual study, conducted by the Executive Educator through Xavier University, analyzed responses from 1,216 school administrators. The primary purpose of the study was to gather perceptions about their own district, neighboring districts and the nation at large. The data revealed that school administrators believed that the nation's public schools are not as they were during the years from 1987-1992. Almost half (46%) of the respondents perceived that the number of violent acts by students had grown (Ordovensky, 1993). From this 1992 survey, the key findings included:

1. Two-thirds of the respondents predicted an increase in

school violence over the two following years.

2. Significant percentages of both suburban (54%) and
   urban (64%) school administrators reported a rise   in
   violent acts.   In small towns, 43% reported an increase,
   while administrators or rural districts reported
   no change or declining levels over the previous five
   years.

3. Even though there was agreement on growth, there was a
   discrepancy between what principals observed in their own
   districts and what they believed to be taking place in
   neighboring districts.

4. Ninety-seven percent of high school principals thought
   school violence had increased across the nation in the
   previous five years. Sixty-one percent said violence in
   neighboring districts had increased in the same period.
   Thirty-one percent had experienced the increase in their
   district.

   One key factor that played a role was denial.
According to Curcio and First (1993) educators are reluctant
to acknowledge the presence of violence in their schools,
either to each other or other parties.   Out of concern for
their own reputations very little data had been maintained.

   Administrators also reported:

   1. Even though there was a widespread increase in
   violent acts, it was considered highest in the
   southeast.

2. The most likely perpetrators of school violence were low achieving students.

3. Little/no parental involvement contributed to school violence (National School Board Association, 1992).

Public Perceptions of Violence

1,326 adults were surveyed during May and June of 1994 for the 26th Annual Gallup Poll. The biggest problems during that period facing schools were:

1. Fighting

2. Violence and gangs and

3. Lack of discipline

Lack of discipline held a top position for 17 years (Gallup Organization, 1994). The causes of violence, per the respondents, were:

1. Increased use of drugs and alcohol by youth (78%)

2. Easy availability to weapons (72%)

3. Growth of youth gangs (72%)

4. Breakdown in family and family values (70%)

5. Little authority by schools to discipline (65%)

6. Increased coverage of violence by the media (60%) (Gallup Organization, 1994).

The National League of Cities (1994) surveyed 700 urban, suburban and rural communities nationwide. Eighty percent of the respondents said that violence was a serious problem in hallways, classrooms and playgrounds (National

League of Cities, 1994). One in four of the schools in the survey reported injuries requiring hospitalization or death as a result of school violence with 41% of the urban schools reporting deaths or serious injuries resulting from violence (National League of Cities, 1994).

Garin-Hart Research Associates surveyed 800 young adults from 16 to 29 years of age in 1993. The topic was violence in America (Garin-Hart Research Associates, 1994). The primary causes were:

1. Drugs (26%)

2. Economy and unemployment (20%)

3. Lack of moral values (16%)

4. Family breakdown (15%)

5. Gangs (14%)

This particular group made several suggestions:

1. Education and after school activities (22%)

2. More law enforcement (21%)

3. Teaching about violence and drugs (20%) (Garin-Hart Research Associates, 1994).

With these suggestions it was hoped that they would have a positive impact on the violence trend that was affecting the nation.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to determine perceptions of Public School Administrators in a large northeastern urban district, referred to as Center City, on issues of violence in their respective schools. This study will (a) explore the factors that contribute to this increase in violence in the early grades (b) examine the perceptions of administrators and (c) examine the link between administrators perceptions and violence in schools. The findings of this research can provide school districts' staff with the data needed to make informed policy decisions regarding the allocation or reallocation of resources on the elementary level. Information was solicited from public school elementary principals in the largest school district in this northeastern state on issues of school violence.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the investigations of this study:

1. What are the incidences of violence reported to the Office of Security Services for this district during the 1998-1999 school year?

2. What is the relationship between school climate, as measured by the administrators perceptions reported on the "Principal/Disciplinarian Survey on School Violence" and incidences of violence?

3. What factors, as perceived by administrators, contribute to violence in this Public School District?

4. What practices do administrators identify as effective in successfully addressing violence at their schools?

Research Design

There were 15 questions on the survey questionnaire with built in sub-questions requiring various types of responses.

Questions 3,5,7,8,11,12, and 15 solicited yes or no responses.

Questions 1,13 and 14 required the respondents to circle and answer.

Questions 2,4,6 and 10 required a number response from the respondents.

Only question number 9 solicited a percentage response.

The research questions were utilized to elicit responses via the survey instrument. A self-administered questionnaire was the primary instrument utilized to gather data.

This study explored the perceptions of principals as it is related to violence in public elementary schools. The

findings will contribute to the limited body of knowledge in this area at the primary school level.

The survey for this study was designed from a prior study that was administered to elementary, middle and high school administrators by the U.S. Department of Education in 1996-1997. The findings were published in 1998.

Instrumentation

This study correlated the perceptions of elementary school principals obtained from the "Principal/Disciplinarian Survey on School Violence" for Center City, the largest urban Public School District in this northeastern state during the 1998-1999 school year. The Office of Security Services collected the incidences of violence over this same period. Since the data were previously collected for the incidences of violence, these data are ex post facto. Ex post facto design research is a very specific type of research in which an existing situation is examined by using past data to establish historical causes.

The survey for this study was utilized from a previous study that was administered by the United States Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics in 1996-1997 using questions regarding contributing factors to violence and discipline in elementary, middle and high schools around the United States. In this study each principal in the Center City School District was given the

survey instrument to complete. Forty-two principals responded.

Data Reliability - Sample Selection

The original sample of public schools for the Principal/Disciplinarian Survey on School Violence was taken from the 1993-1994 National Center for Education Statistics Common Core of Data Public School Universe File. There are 84,000 public schools contained in the Common Core Data File. Out of that number 79,000 - 49,000 were regular elementary schools, 14,000 were regular middle schools, and 15,801 were regular secondary/combined schools located in the 50 states and the District of Columbia that met the eligibility criteria. All other types of schools were excluded (i.e. - special education, vocational, alternative, schools in territories, and ungraded).

Instructional level (elementary, middle and secondary/combined), locale (city, urban fringe, town and rural) and school size (less than 300, 300-999, and 1000 and more) stratified the sample. Schools were also sorted by geographic region (Northeast, Southeast, Central and West) and by percent minority enrollment (less than 5% or missing, 5-19%, 20-49% and 50% or more)(U.S. Department of Education, 1998).

Response Rates

The survey was mailed to 1415 school principals in April 1997. There was telephone follow up to non-

respondents in late April of that year. In July 1997 data collection was completed. A total of 1,234 schools completed the survey. This was an 88% response rate (U.S. Department of Education, 1998).

Sampling and Non-Sampling Errors

Possible non-sampling errors may include problems such as the differences in the respondents' interpretation of the meaning of questions; misrecording of responses; memory effects; incorrect editing, coding and data entry; differences related to the time the survey was conducted or errors in data preparation. The questionnaire was pretested with public school principals like those who completed the survey to minimize the potential on non-sampling errors. The National Center for Education Statistics extensively reviewed the questionnaire and instructions. Data were checked for accuracy and consistency via manual and machine editing (U.S. Department of Education, 1998).

Variances

According to Witte and Witte (1996) the standard error of the mean is a rough measure of the average amount by which sample means deviate from the mean of the population. If other samples were surveyed under similar conditions, intervals of 1.96 standard errors below and 1.96 standard errors above a particular statistic would include the true population parameter being estimated in 95% of the samples. This would be a 95% confidence interval (U.S. Department of

Education, 1998).

This particular survey was most appropriate for this study to yield estimates for a number of school-related violence and non-violent crimes. It was conducted nationally in 1997 and gave feedback on principals' perceptions of violence from various demographic areas, instructional levels and sizes. This survey provided data on less serious crime rates, which included physical attacks or fights without a weapon, theft or larceny and vandalism.

The following list of definitions preceded the questions on the survey instrument:

Firearm- any weapon that is designed to (or may readily be converted to) expel a projectile by the action of an explosive. This includes guns, bombs, grenades, mines, rockets, missiles, pipe bombs, or similar devices designed to explode and capable of causing bodily harm or property damage.

Incident- a specific criminal act or offense involving one or more victims and one or more offenders or damage of school property.

Physical attack or fight with a weapon-an actual and intentional touching or striking of another person against his or her will, or the intentional causing of bodily harm to an individual with a weapon. This category should be used only when the attack is serious enough to warrant

calling the police or other law enforcement representatives.

Physical attack or fight without a weapon- an actual and intentional touching or striking of another person against his or her will, or the intentional causing of bodily harm to an individual without using a weapon. This category should be used only when the attack is serious enough to warrant calling the police or other law enforcement representatives.

Police or other law enforcement representative- any regular state or local law enforcement officers, school resource officers, campus police, security personnel employed by school or district, or other security personnel with power to arrest or hold for arrest.

Robbery- the taking or attempting to take anything of value that is owned by another person or organization, under confrontational circumstances by force or threat of force or violence and/or by putting the victim in fear. A key difference between robbery and theft/larceny is that a threat or battery is involved in robbery.

Sexual battery- an incident that includes rape, fondling, indecent liberties, child molestation, or sodomy. These incidents should take into consideration the age and developmentally appropriate behavior of the offenders and are severe enough to warrant calling the police or other law enforcement representatives.

Theft/larceny- the unlawful taking of another person's property without personal confrontation, threat, violence, or bodily harm. Included are pocket picking, stealing a purse or backpack (if left unattended or no force was used to take it from owner), theft from a building, theft from a motor vehicle or motor vehicle parts or accessories, theft of bicycles, theft from vending machines, and all other types of thefts.

Typical week- a typical full week of school. Avoid weeks with holidays, vacation periods, or weeks when unusual events took place at the school.

Vandalism- the damage or destruction of school property including bombing, arson, graffiti, and other acts that cause property

damage.

Weapon- any instrument or object used with the intent to threaten, injure or kill. Examples include guns, knives, other razor blades or sharp-edged objects, ice picks, other pointed objects (including pens, pencils), baseball bats, frying pans, sticks, rocks and bottles.

Zero Tolerance Policy- a school or district policy that mandates predetermined consequences or punishment for specific offenses.

The first survey question asked administrators to rate seventeen problems that may have occurred in their

respective schools from serious (1), moderate (2), minor (3), or not a problem (4). Some of the problems were student tardiness, physical conflicts among students, student absenteeism, racial tensions and gangs.

Question 2 asked administrators to indicate the number of incidences in which the police or other law enforcement officers were contacted. Nine areas were listed as possible incidences.

Thirdly, administrators were asked if there was a district policy that mandated the reporting of incidences to the public via a newsletter.

Question 4 inquired about the number and type of disciplinary actions that were utilized by administrators. This ranged from expulsions, to placement in alternative settings to out-of-school suspensions.

Building and school grounds security were covered through 7 sub-sections soliciting a yes or no response.

Question 6 inquired about the stationing of law enforcement staff on school grounds or buildings.

Whether students wore uniforms and the year of implementation of uniforms were solicited from question 7.

Administrators were asked to indicate the percentage of students who were eligible for the federally funded free and/or reduced-price lunch program. The number of violence prevention programs or initiatives either one-time or ongoing was solicited from administrators.

Various types of prevention programs were listed and administrators were asked to indicate by yes or no if they were utilized in their respective schools.

Next administrators were asked the percentage of students who were serviced by school programs on violence prevention. The percentage of teachers and other staff that were involved in the prevention programs were also solicited.

Lastly, administrators were asked if their schools provided after school programs.

Facts about Center City

Center City is the largest city in this northeastern state and the 56th largest city in the nation. Overall 28.5% of the population is under the age of 18.

Center City is centered along the most important transportation corridor in the country situated between Boston and Washington, DC. Center City encompasses approximately 50 nationalities, their languages and dialects. The 1990 census population count was 275,221. In Center City the per capita income is $9,424, whereas, the state had the second highest per capita income in the country at $24,936. Seventy-seven percent of the children are in families whose income is low enough to qualify them for the federal free and/or reduced-price lunch programs.

Leading public health officials have designated the

city as an epicenter of the HIV epidemic. As of September 1997, Center City had 6,451-recorded cases of AIDS, out of that number 4,235 resulted in death, which in turn orphaned many children.

The transience of many families has led to families living in hotels, shelters and transitional housing. This factor has impacted on student behavior in school.

Newly mandated federal and state regulations are moving individuals from welfare to work. Families are struggling with these issues since many lack marketable skills.

In 1996,there were 4,156 juvenile arrests in Center City. On average 155 Center City youths are detained on a daily basis in the County Juvenile Detention Center.

The Center City Public Schools

The Center City Public Schools was selected as the site of this study because it is viewed as highly representative of many urban districts through out the United States.

The State Operated District in Center City is responsible for 15 high schools, 6 middle schools, 8 special schools and 52 elementary schools. The 52 elementary schools in the school district cover a broad range of grade configurations. The various configurations are Kindergarten-Grade 3, Kindergarten-Grade 4, Kindergarten-Grade 5, Pre-Kindergarten-Grade 8, and several other configurations. These configurations may be a determining factor on the depth of violence or lack of violence in very

young students.

According to the 1990 U.S. Census 85% of Center City residents were African-American or Hispanic, and 89.3% of the children in school come from these families. The student mobility rate of 25% of the elementary schools averages 40%. This extremely high mobility rate has a devastating effect on the children in schools.

Overall there are approximately 48,000 students enrolled in the Center City Public Schools. This school district is also the largest urban district in this northeastern state.

In 1995 the Center City Public Schools System was "taken over" by the State Department of Education. The State Commissioner of Education, through state legislation, was given the authority to appoint a new superintendent, abolish the Board of Education, as it existed, and seize the overall operation of the district. A new State District Superintendent and Deputy Superintendent were appointed in July 1999 to move the district into the new millennium.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were utilized to summarize and classify quantitative survey data. According to Witte & Witte (1997), the main purpose of many surveys is to describe, simple percentages to indicate the proportion of respondents giving each response. Much of the analysis of the data for each survey item was presented in percentages.

The response rate for this analysis was N=41.

Data collection for questionnaire items 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15 and their subsections covered the time period from September 1998 through June 1999. Most data were portrayed utilizing tables and figures.

A number of statistical methods along with descriptive statistics were used to analyze the data. The following discussion provides a brief description of each of these methods and the study variables that were used to answer the research questions.

Correlation: "A bivariate correlation provides a single number which summarizes the relationship between two variables. These correlation coefficients indicate the degree to which variation (or change) in one variable is related to variation (change) in another. A correlation coefficient not only summarizes the strength of association between a pair of variables, but also provides an easy means for comparing the strength of the relationship between one pair/set of variables and a different pair/set." (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner & Bent, 1975) There is an inverse relationship when one value goes up and the other goes down. Several responses on the survey instrument provided results that were easily correlated to other factors. A correlational study was conducted to understand the relationship between school climate and use of various disciplinary actions. The following correlations were

tested with the help of SPSS: climate to expulsions, climate to transfers to alternative programs, and climate to suspensions.

Other correlations that were also of interest were:

1. Zero Tolerance to climate

2. Student behaviors and climate

3. Teacher behaviors and climate

4. Offenses and whether they occurred at/after school or involving one or more students.

Factor Analysis: A factor analysis was performed with the group of variables that contributed to school violence. The most distinctive characteristic of Factor Analysis is its data-reduction capability. Factor-analytic techniques enables the researcher to see whether some underlying pattern of relationships exist so the data may be "rearranged" or "reduced" to a smaller set of factors that may be taken as source variables accounting for the observed interrelations in the data. The most common applications of Factor analysis can be classified into three categories: (a) exploratory uses-the exploration and detection of patterning of variables with a view to the discovery of new concepts and a possible reduction of data; (b) confirmatory uses-the testing of hypotheses about the structuring of variables in terms of the expected number of significant factors and factor loadings; and (c) uses as a measuring device-the construction of indices to be used as new

variables in later analysis(Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner
& Bent, 1975)

Data Collection

Surveys were distributed to all of the regular
elementary school principals in the Center City Public
Schools. An accompanying letter from the researcher
explained that she was a doctoral candidate at Seton Hall
University. Principals were informed that, as part of the
research design, the researcher had attached a survey
questionnaire to the letter. The survey would focus on
their perceptions of violence in their respective schools
from the previous year (1998-1999) as it related to problems
that existed and to what degree, disciplinary actions that
were taken against students, safety issues in the building,
utilization of law enforcement officers, existence of zero
tolerance policies, uniforms, percentage of free/reduced
lunch, organized violence prevention programs and the
existence of after school programs.

The survey instrument was distributed at the monthly
principals meetings and collected on the same day.
Permission to
conduct the study was obtained from the state district
superintendent of schools (Appendix D) prior to the
dissemination of surveys to the principals. The packet
contained the introduction letter (Appendix A) from the
researcher, which explained who the researcher was and why

data were being collected. Assurances were made to the
principals that neither their names nor the names of their
schools would appear in the
study. The letter concluded by stating the importance of
their expertise to the collection of the data.

Summary of Methodology

The setting of the study and the target population were
introduced in this chapter. Included in this discussion
were the research questions, research design,
instrumentation, data analysis and data collection.
Procedures that were utilized to collect the survey
instrument were explained. All data collected were entered
manually into a statistical software package, SPSS. The
findings of this study are presented in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this investigation was to evaluate the
perceptions of elementary school administrators in an urban
school district, as it relates to violence and to add to the
research base on violence in elementary schools.

The following research questions were investigated:

1. What were the incidences of violence reported to
   the Office of Security Services for this district
   during the 1998-1999 school year?

2. What is the relationship between school climate,
   as measured by the administrators perceptions
   reported on the "Principal/Disciplinarian Survey
   on School Violence" and incidences of violence?

3. What factors, as perceived by administrators,
   contribute to violence in this Public School
   District?

4. What practices do administrators identify as
   effective in successfully addressing violence at
   their schools?

Findings

The questionnaire, presented in Appendix C, was analyzed

using exploratory factor analysis, frequencies and correlations. The research questions are addressed and discussed.

Research Question 1: What are the incidences of violence reported to the Office of Security Services during the 1998-1999 school year?

The Office of Security Services requires all schools to report various incidences via the "Security Case/Incident Report" on a monthly basis. The district is mandated to compile information from the schools, which is then forwarded to the State Department of Education in June of each year. This report is divided into 6 categories. They are substance abuse, weapons, disorderly conduct, vandalism, injuries inside school and violence. The data are presented in Table 1:

TABLE 1

Actual Security Case Incident Report during the 1998-1999 School Year

Incident Type	9/98	10/98	11/98	12/98	1/99	2/99	3/99	4/99	5/99	6/99	Total
Substance Abuse	1	3	0	3	3	6	2	4	2	1	25
Weapons	3	24	4	12	5	8	6	13	10	11	96
Disorderly Conduct	1	9	4	6	1	6	1	3	3	0	34
Vandalism	36	29	29	35	25	29	24	25	20	19	271
Injuries inside School	10	9	4	6	2	9	3	1	1	0	45
Violence	21	26	22	15	24	22	16	26	12	7	191
Total	72	100	63	77	60	80	52	72	48	38	662

During the time period from September 1998 through June 1999, in the Center City Public Schools there were a total of 662 reported incidences of which the highest was vandalism with 271 incidences or 41%. Violence was the second highest at 191 incidences (29%). The third highest was weapons possession with 96 reported incidences or 14%. The remaining incident types were injuries inside school (7%-45 incidences), disorderly conduct (5%-34 incidences), and lastly substance abuse (4%-25 reported incidences). These 3 incidence types may yield low frequencies due to the level of the grade configurations.

As a consequence of these reported incidences, the administrators took several disciplinary actions. Disciplinary actions are utilized to influence/change the behaviors of students. The following discussion focuses on the action taken by administrators. Question four dealt with three diverse disciplinary actions: (1) Expulsions, (2) Transfers to Alternative Schools or programs, and (3) Out of school suspension for 5 or more days. The most severe disciplinary action of the three was expulsion. During 1998-1999, one student was expelled for using a firearm, whereas 30 students were expelled for physical attacks or fights, which brought this total to 31. (see Table 2)

TABLE 2

Perceived Expulsions During the 1998-1999 School Year

Number of Schools	Number of Expulsions	Total Number of Expulsions
1	1	1
1	10	10
1	20	20
Total 3		31

In this instance expulsion is the temporary or permanent discharge of a student from a particular school. Some administrators may view a transfer to another program as a type of expulsion. The term is therefore perceived to have this meaning by administrators.

Only 15 students district wide were transferred to alternative programs or schools. However, it is believed that some students who were expelled from one location may have been reassigned to an alternative school in the district.

TABLE 3

Perceived Transfers to Alternative Programs during the 1998-

1999 School Year

Number of Schools	Number of Transfers	Total Number of Transfers
3	1	3
1	2	2
2	5	10
Total		15

TABLE 4

Perceived Suspensions during the 1998-1999 School Year

Number of Schools	Number of Suspensions	Total Number of Suspensions
2	1	2
4	2	8
1	3	3
1	4	4
2	5	10
1	7	7
9	9	81

Number of Schools		Number of Suspensions	Total Number of Suspensions
	2	12	24
	1	20	20
	1	40	40
Total	22		199

Six schools responded to this section of the question as it related to student transfers to alternative programs. According to the administrators there were a total of 15 transfers from these 6 schools during the 1998-1999 school year.

The suspension category was the largest overall of the 3 types of disciplinary actions that were perceived by administrators. This particular action is used more often than transfers and/or expulsions. Administrators cited that 2 students were suspended 5 or more days for using or possessing a firearm. Eight students received the same consequences for possession or distribution of alcohol, drugs or tobacco. The greatest number of suspensions (117) was due to physical attacks or fights. (see Table 4)

However, the actual suspension data reported to Security Services in the district showed a very different view via the monthly suspension report. There were a total of 1190 suspensions reported by the administrators in the 4 elementary School Leadership Teams. These 4 "SLT's" give a

panoramic view of the district as it is related to numbers of suspensions.

TABLE 5

Actual Reported Suspensions during the 1998-1999 School Year

School Leadership Team (SLT)	Principal Suspensions	Superintendent Suspensions	Total
SLT I	90	5	95
SLT III	354	7	361
SLT IV	462	0	462
SLT V	244	28	272
Total	1,150	40	1,190

The difference between the actual reported suspensions (1,190) and the perceived number of suspensions (127) was 1,063 suspensions. This is an extreme disparity. The underreporting by administrators on this survey may be caused by numerous factors that contribute to the denial of administrators in this area. The Principal Suspensions were issued in greater numbers because they could be made independent of the Assistant Superintendent of the respective School Leadership Team. Each building principal had the authority to suspend a student for infractions that warranted measures beyond a teacher or principal conference. One principals' perception may vary significantly from

another principals' perception on each item covered in the survey. Keeping in mind that all administrators would like to be perceived as having their respective buildings under control, one may assume that this could lead to the under-reporting of incidences. It was hoped that providing specific definitions of terms in the survey instrument would give insight to the respondents and would minimize subjective judgment and lead to accurate reporting of suspensions and expulsions.

Research Question 2: What is the correlation between school climate, as measured by the administrators' perceptions reported on the "Principal/Disciplinarian Survey on School Violence" and incidences of violence?

There are 3 ways that climate has been measured in this survey. One is looking at the stationing of security officers for reasons other than instructional purposes in survey question 6. The 8 items queried in question 5 regarding various measures that were utilized by the schools during the 1998-1999 school year were answered. Also, Zero Tolerance Policy may be another proxy to measure climate. The first measure of climate deals with security officers in each school.

The district responded to the issues of safety by placing uniformed security officers in each school. This has been district policy for many years. In survey question number 6, administrators were asked to note the number of

hours that there was security presence in and around their schools. The majority of respondents (70%) stated that no officers were stationed at schools. This was an interesting since security was in fact on duty all day, 5 days a week in each building. The remaining 30% of the respondents stated that there was some type of officer on duty at varied amounts of times. The inconsistency of the reporting may be due to the interpretation of the question itself by the respondents. Security presence is determined by the school enrollment. One security officer is stationed per every 300 students in the elementary schools in the district according to the Director of Security. The formula is not strictly adhered to because some schools may warrant higher numbers of security officers due to the schools' location in the city and the frequency of incidences.

TABLE 6

Security Presence at the Schools

Item	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
Stationed 30 hours or more per week/ 1-9 hours per week	6	15%
Stationed None during the week, but stationed as needed	6	15%
None stationed at school 1998-1999	28	70%
Total	40	100%

The next measure of climate is survey question number 5
which answered numerous questions regarding the overall
security climate in the schools. All respondents stated
that visitors are required to sign in when entering their
schools. Ninety-five percent of the administrators responded
that there was controlled access to their school buildings
and 90% responded that during lunch campus was closed.
Conversely, 100% responded that students do not pass through
metal detectors and 98% said that random metal detector
checks do not occur. Since these questions measure climate
in a school we correlated 3 items in question 5, rate of

expulsions, rate of transfers to alternative programs and rate of suspensions. Of all 3 correlations, suspensions and school climate produced a correlation of .15 (non-significant) followed by transfers with .08 (non-significant) and expulsions with .04 (non-significant). It is interesting to note that none of the correlations are statistically significant. This may be due to the fact that both the climate and the rate of expulsions, rate of transfers to alternative programs and rate of suspensions are measures of perception. Also, one should recall that the rate noted by principals is far below that of what was reported to the state. This discrepancy may explain the lack of any correlations. Another measure used to address school climate is the Zero Tolerance Policy. Respondents agreed that there was a Zero Tolerance Policy available via the district policy manuals. The areas that came under these policies were violence, firearms, and weapons other than firearms, alcohol, drugs and tobacco. Ninety-two percent of the administrators agreed that these policies were in force during the 1998-1999 school year. Surprisingly, there was little correlation between Zero Tolerance Policy and climate (no-significance).

TABLE 7

Zero Tolerance Policy during the 1998-1999 School Year

Zero Tolerance Policy towards:	Yes Responses (%)	No Responses (%)
Violence	90.2	7.3
Firearms	97.6	2.4
Weapons Other than firearms	97.6	2.4
Alcohol	95.1	2.4
Drugs	95.1	2.4
Tobacco	90.2	7.3

Research Question 3: What problems, as perceived by administrators, contribute to violence in elementary schools?

Survey question 1 had 17 items that addressed various problems that occurred in the school that could contribute to violence. These behavior problems could be grouped into violence/criminal factors and social factors. Survey question 1 also asked the respondents to indicate the degree, (ranging from 1 to 4) to which they perceived such behavior as a problem. While 1 denoted a serious problem, 4 denoted not a problem.

The items on survey question 1 were factor analyzed to determine if indeed these problems could be grouped into 2 major factors and which factors as perceived by administrators contribute to elementary school violence.

First, a factor analysis was run without constraining the number of factors using the Principal Components method of extraction followed by varimax rotation. It resulted in 2 factors with an eigen value above 1. The first factor group could be named as criminal/violent offenses and the second factor group social offenses. The first factor, labeled criminal offenses, had an eigen value of 4.93 and explained 30.8% of the variance. Ten items loaded on criminal offenses with loadings between .41 and .84. Physical conflicts loaded at .41 under criminal/violent offenses and verbal abuse of teachers loaded at .84.

The second factor labeled social offenses, had an eigen value of 2.74 and explained 17.0% of the variance. Six items loaded on social offenses with loadings between .46 and .80. Teacher alcohol or drug abuse loaded at .46 under social offenses and student alcohol use loaded at .80. We must remember that this factor analysis is the result of administrators' perception of the various types of problems that occurred in their respective schools. All items noted in Table 8 were considered to be significant in nature. Even teacher absenteeism with .44 was considered to be significant in this analysis. The items that showed no significance under criminal/violent offenses were:

Robbery of items over $10

Student alcohol use

Student drug use

Sale of drugs on school grounds

Trespassing and

Teacher alcohol or drug use

TABLE 8

Factor Analysis-Criminal/Violent offenses and Social

offenses

Item	Criminal/Violent offenses	Social offenses
Student tardiness	.605*	-
Student absenteeism	.532*	-
Physical conflicts	.414*	-
Robbery of items over $10	-	.725*
Vandalism of school property	.572*	-
Student alcohol use	-	.807*
Student drug use	-	.706*
Sale of drugs on school grounds	-	-
Student tobacco use	-	.711*
Student possession of weapons	.790*	-
Trespassing	-	.649*

Item	Criminal/Violent offenses	Social offenses
Verbal abuse of teachers	.841*	-
Physical abuse of teachers	.624*	-
Teacher absenteeism	.440*	-
Teacher alcohol or drug use	-	.467*
Racial tensions	.575*	-
Gangs	.765*	-

These 2 factors, criminal/violent offenses and social offenses, with their loadings address the major problems as perceived by the administrators. A further in depth look at the classification of these problems as minor, serious, moderate or not a problem adds more value to the question at hand (see Table 9)

Of the 39 principals, 31.8% or 21 of them perceived student tardiness as a moderate problem. Twenty or 48.8% viewed student absenteeism or class cutting as a minor problem. Also, 18 principals or 45% believed that physical conflicts among students were a minor problem. The other areas in question one that the majority of principals

perceived as minor problems were:

1.Robbery or theft over $10

2.Vandalism of school Property

3.Verbal abuse of teachers

4.Teacher absenteeism

5.Gangs

Nine areas in survey question 1 that were perceived by the majority of the administrators as not a problem were:

1.Student alcohol use

2.Student drug use

3.Sale of drugs on school grounds

4.Student possession of weapons

5.Trespassing

6.Physical abuse of teachers

7.Teacher alcohol or drug use

8.Racial tensions

The problems that some administrators perceived as serious problems were:

1.Student tardiness

2.Physical conflicts

3.Robbery of items over $10

4.Sale of drugs on school grounds and

5.Trespassing

Table 9 gives the sub-totals and grand totals of all responses for each problem in question 1. Again, it is very interesting that these perceived numbers are not aligned to the actual numbers reported to Security Services by administrators in the schools.

TABLE 9

Student Problems/Behaviors Perceived by Administrators

Item	Serious (1)	Moderate (2)	Minor (3)	Not a problem (4)	Mean
Student tardiness	4	21	12	2	2.25
Student absenteeism	0	10	20	11	3.00
Physical Conflicts	4	12	18	6	2.75
Robbery of items over $10	3	1	14	23	2.75
Vandalism of school property	0	6	18	15	3.28
Student alcohol use	0	0	5	36	3.93
Student drug use	0	0	8	32	3.84
Sale of drugs on school grounds	2	0	3	36	3.84
Student tobacco use	0	0	9	32	3.87
Student possession of weapons	0	2	7	30	3.71
Trespassing	2	4	12	23	3.40
Racial tensions	0	1	7	32	3.78

(table continues)

Item	Serious	Moderate	Minor	Not a problem	Mean
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
Gangs	0	0	9	32	3.81
Total	15	57	142	310	

There were problems examined in survey question 1 that directly related to the teachers. Those 4 items were verbal abuse of teachers, physical abuse of teachers, teacher absenteeism, and teacher alcohol or drug use. It is easy to comprehend how these factors could impact on student behavior in schools. Everyone that children come in contact with on a daily basis has an impact on children especially if this contact is consistent. Next to the home most students spend more time in school then anyplace else. The administrators responded to most of these questions as minor or not a problem, with some listed as moderate problems and very few as serious problems (see Table 10)

TABLE 10
<u>Teacher Problems/Behaviors Perceived by Administrators</u>

Item	Serious (1)	Moderate (2)	Minor (3)	Not a problem (4)	Mean
Verbal abuse of teachers	2	7	19	13	3.06
Physical abuse of teachers	0	2	11	27	3.62
Teacher absenteeism	1	12	22	6	2.78
Teacher alcohol or drug use	0	0	6	35	3.81
Total	3	21	58	81	

Survey question 2 asked administrators to note the

involvement of students in crimes or offenses at varied

times (during school hours and after school hours) and

involving 1 or more students as victims or perpetrators.

There were 8 areas addressed in this question under 3

categories. There were no murders or suicides at any of the

schools during 1998-1999. Three categories out ranked the

others by very large margins. Physical attacks of fights

without a weapon occurred 491 times, theft/larceny without

personal confrontation occurred 130 times and vandalism to school property of person items occurred 106 times during this period. The overall breakouts of the data are shown in Table 11.

TABLE 11

Perceived Criminal or Other Offenses in School by Administrators

Offense	Occurred at school	Involving one or more students	During school hours or other school events	Total
Murder	0	0	0	0
Rape or other type of sexual battery	2	4	1	7
Suicide	0	0	0	0
Physical attack or fight with a weapon	3	3	1	7
Physical attack or fight without a weapon	159	192	140	491
Robbery	3	3	12	18

(table continues)

Offense	Occurred at school	Involving one or more students	During school hours or other school events	Total
Theft/ larceny	69	24	37	130
Vandalism-school property	54	17	35	106
Total	290	243	226	759

This frequency distribution shows a clear picture of the results from survey question 2. There were 290 offenses that occurred at school. Two hundred and forty-three offenses involved 2 or more victims or perpetrators. Two hundred and twenty-six offenses happened during school hours or during other school events. The administrators perceived a total of 759 criminal or other offenses during the 1998-1999 school year.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMENDATIONS

SUMMARY

The primary purpose of this study was intended to describe perceptions of public school elementary administrators in a large urban district about issues related to violence. The existing literature on violence in elementary schools is very limited. In this study the intent was to describe what exists rather than to explain why it exists. A self-administered questionnaire was the primary method utilized to obtain the data. The survey was distributed to 52 public elementary school principals with a cover letter and instructions. A response rate of 78.8% was achieved with 41 of the 52 principals responding.

Proposed in this study were four major research questions:

1. What are the incidences of violence reported to the Office of Security Services for this school district during the 1998-1999 school year?

2. What is the relationship between school climate, as measured by the administrators perceptions reported on the "Principal/Disciplinarian Survey on School Violence" and incidences of violence?

3. What factors, as perceived by administrators,

contribute to violence in this Public School District?

4. What practices do administrators identify as effective
in successfully addressing violence at their schools?

Descriptive statistics provided a profile of
administrator's perceptions of perceived degree of problem
and effectiveness of programs.

For the perceived degree of problem in schools, all
administrators reported that violence was a minor or
moderate problem. Certain factors were perceived as not a
problem to the administrators.

Effectiveness of programs varied and was not examined in
depth for this study. Administrators perceived controlled
access to school buildings and grounds as very effective.
Random metal detector checks on students were not an issue
since no elementary schools in this district utilize them.
All administrators stated that visitors were required to
sign in and this was viewed as an effective method of
control. Few administrators had on going violence
prevention programs in place, however, there were numerous
one-day, one-time programs presented to students regarding
violence prevention. Most schools did not have mandatory
school uniforms. Many administrators maintain after-school
programs for their students daily. To varying degrees many
programs existed in schools such as, behavior modification,
counseling (group and individual), tutoring, recreation and
some reorganization of schools into houses or teams.

Chapter IV presented the results/analysis of the data in

this study. This analysis provided answers to the four research questions.

1.What were the incidences of violence reported to the Office of Security Services during the 1998-1999 school year?

During the 1998-1999 school year administrators submitted Violence, Vandalism and Substance Abuse reports to the Office of Security Services on a regular daily basis. This data were compiled into a monthly district wide report. From September 1998 through May 1999 consistently the highest two areas were vandalism and violence. During October 1998 weapons possession ranked third in the six categories covered in this report. Schools experienced the following as reported to the Office of Security Services:

1. Administrators reported vandalism overall in 50% of the cases in September 1998.

2. Administrators reported 29% vandalism, 26% violence and 24% weapons possession in October 1998.

3. Administrators reported 41% of vandalism, 25% violence and 21% weapons possession in May 1999.

What is the correlation between school climate, as measured by the administrators perception on the "Principal/Disciplinarian Survey on School Violence" and incidences of violence?

Climate is moderately correlated to vandalism and physical attacks or fights by students. Another moderate correlation was climate to theft or larceny without personal

confrontation.

What factors as perceived by administrators contribute to violence in elementary schools?

The most serious to moderate factors that administrators perceived as problems were:

1. Student tardiness

2. Student absenteeism

3. Student drug use

4. Physical conflicts

5. Verbal abuse of teachers

6. Vandalism of school property

7. Student possession of weapons

8. Physical abuse of teachers

9. Student tobacco use

10. Gangs

11. Teacher alcohol or drug use

What practices do administrators identify as effective in successfully addressing violence at their schools?

Having on site security officers was perceived as a positive deterrent even though 70% of the respondents stated that there was no security stationed at their buildings. The 30% who responded perceived this to be helpful. At the elementary level few to no searches were made with metal detectors.

Ongoing violence prevention programs are the most lasting in their results according to the respondents.

In all instances off-campus lunches were prohibited.

This decreases the availability to students and school property by trespassers.

There was a significant inconsistency between respondents response to factors that they perceived as minor, moderate or serious problems compared to the actual numbers of incidences reported to the Office of Security Services. 9.8% of the principals perceived physical conflicts as a serious problem whereas; actual reported incidences for physical conflicts were 29% for 1998-1999. Vandalism was perceived to be a moderate problem with 14.6% however there were 41% of vandalism cases reported during 1998-1999. This indicates that there is little relationship between perceptions and actual reported problems by administrators on violence.

Conclusions

One of the key findings from this study points to a marked difference between principals' perceptions of the degree and type of violence which occurs and actual reports of violence from schools. If these differing views are generated by what appears to be underreporting of violence, who is not reporting incidences and why? Several explanations are possible. Administrators may choose to underreport out of fear that large numbers of incidences from their respective schools may give the appearance that they have little control of their buildings. This information could be used in their annual performance evaluations. If administrators report violence, it needs to

be viewed as an opportunity to put corrective action plans in place.

Not all schools are providing the district with violence related data. Due to the disparity between perceptions and actual reported incidences indicates that underreporting exists.

The purpose of this study was to add to the existing body of knowledge regarding school violence at the elementary level. This study explored the degree to which violence was perceived to be a problem in schools, the degree to which programs aimed at reducing violence in schools was viewed to be effective, and the degree to which certain factors were perceived to contribute to violence in elementary schools. The results of this investigation demonstrated that violence is a problem of degree, but not of high degree at this level.

These findings contribute to a greater understanding of the phenomenon of violence in schools and what measures may be helpful in providing safe schools in an urban district.

Recommendations and Future Research

Eron (et al., 1987) placed great emphasis on the social learning theory, which determined that external environmental cues were elicitors of aggression. This theory could be examined in greater detail in future studies on violence in elementary schools. This study also reaffirms the need for research in this area to evolve beyond asking administrators their perception on the nature and extent of

violent behaviors. Even though these types of data are useful, researchers must broaden their studies. Those broader studies could improve school practices and policies that may effectively prevent school violence at the elementary level.

Several recommendations can be made based on the findings of this research study. Some recommendations are not new, but mirror the recommendations made by others.

1. The study should be conducted in other large urban districts in other regions of the country.

2. A survey should be conducted with elementary students' perceptions of violence in an urban district.

3. A comprehensive Longitudinal study should be conducted over a period of several years focusing on violence at the elementary level and its effects on students.

4. All principals should be mandated to accurately report incidences in their schools.

5. An evaluation component to measure the success of violence prevention programs be built in from the inception of programs.

6. Preventive measures to curb violence and vandalism begin in kindergarten and carry through the early grades.

7. Conduct focus group interviews with students to gain insight into their thoughts and experiences with violence in schools. This qualitative approach will provide in depth information about students' [perceptions and

attitudes that could not be gathered by other research
methods]

8. A study be conducted which examines incidences of
violence at the elementary level, but utilizes a
different measurement instrument.

This study provided a starting point from which
additional research can be conducted to obtain more insight
into the complexity of violence at the elementary level.
This study found little statistically significant
relationships between perceptions and incidences of
violence. According to Attorney General Janet Reno, "Youth
crime and violence are still one of the great challenges
that we face" (Associated Press, Star-Ledger Oct.27, 2000).

School safety must be placed at the top of the
educational agenda in all school districts across the
country. Ultimately each school should adopt a broad based
strategy and plan to deal with violence in our schools.
Violence prevention curricula and anti-violence expectations
need to be a priority. The future of our nation's youth
depends on it.

REFERENCES

Becker, D.C., (1983). Impact of crime and violence on schooling: Is there a solution? <u>Contemporary Education</u> 55, 45-47.

Boothe,J.E.,Flick,T.M.,Kirk,S.P.,Bradley,L.H.,& Keough, K.E., (1993). The violence at our door. <u>Executive Educator</u> 15(n1), 16-22.

Chase, A., (1993). School violence: Two ways to fight back. <u>Governing</u>, 20-21.

Children's Defense Fund (1992). The state of America's children. Washington, D.C.:, Children's Defense Fund.

Craig, S., (1992). The educational needs of children living with violence. <u>Phi Delta Kappan 74</u>(1), 67-71.

Curcio, J. L., & First, P.F. (1993). <u>Violence in the schools how to proactively prevent and defuse it.</u> Newbury Park, CA, Corwin Press.

Dodd,C. (1993). Testimony prepared for the Joint Senate-House hearing on Keeping Every Child Safe: Curbing the epidemic of violence, 103rd congress, 1st Session.

Doyle, W., (1978). Are students behaving worse that they used to behave? <u>Journal of Research and Development in Education</u> 11, 3-16.

Edelman, M.W., (1993). Testimony prepared for the Joint Senate-House hearing on keeping every child safe: Curbing the epidemic of violence. 103rd Congress(1st Session).

Egan, T. (1998). Oregon student held in 3 killings; one dead, 23 Hurt at His School. <u>New York Times Late Edition (East Coast)</u>. New York: 1.

Eron, L. D., (1961). Use of theory in developing design. In L.D. Eron (Ed.), Application of role and learning

theories to the study of the development of aggression in children. Psychology Reports 9, 292-334.

Eron, L. D., (1982). Parent-child interaction, television violence and aggression of children. American Psychologist 42, 435-442.

Eron, L.D., Huesmann, L.R., Dubow,E., Romanoff,R., & Yarmel,P.W., (1987). Aggression and its correlates over 22 years. In D. Crowell, I.M. Evans & C.R. O'Donnell (Eds.). Childhood aggression and violence. New York:Plenum.

Eron, L. D., (1987). The development of aggressive behavior from the perspective of a developing behaviorism. American Psychologist 42, 435-442.

Fagan,J., & Wilkinson,D.L.(1998). Social contexts and functions of adolescent violence. New York, Cambridge University Press.

Furlong, M.J., & Morrison, G.M., (1994). School violence and safety in perspective. School Psychology Review 23(2), 139-152.

Gallup Organization (1994). 26th Annual Gallup Poll of the public's attitude toward the public schools. New York, Gallup Organization.

Garbarino,J., Dubrow,N., Kostelny,K. & Pardo,C.(1992). Children in danger: Coping with the effects of community violence. San Francisco, Jossy-Bass.

Garin-Hart Research Associates (1994). The MTV telephone survey of young adults. New York, Garin-Hart Research Associates and MTV Network.

Gorski,J.D.P., (1993). Interpersonal violence among youth: A challenge for school personnel. Education Psychology Review 5, 35-61.

Hart,J. (1998). More Pupils Ousted for Year, without backup, report says. Boston Globe. Boston.

Huesmann, L.R. (1977). Formal models of social behavior. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Experimental Social Psychology. Austin, Texas.

Huesmann, L.R. (1980). Encoding specificity in observational learning. Paper presented at a colloquium at the Institute of Psychology, University of Warsaw. Warsaw, Poland.

Huesmann, L.R. (1982). Television violence and aggressive behavior. In D.Pearl, L.Bouthilet & P.Lazar (Eds.) Television and behavior: Ten years of scientific programs and implications for the 80's. Washington, DC, U. S. Government Printing Office.

Huesmann, L.R., Eron, L.D., Lefkowitz, M.M., & Walder, L.O., (1984). The stability of aggression over time and generations. Developmental Psychology 20, 1120-1134.

Huesmann, L.R., & Miller, L. (1994). Long-term effects of repeated exposure to media violence in childhood. Aggressive behavior: Current perspectives. New York, Plenum.

Laub, J. H., & Lauritsen, J.L. (1998). The Interdependence of school violence with neighborhood and family conditions. Violence in American Schools: A new perspective. New York, Cambridge University Press

Lorion,R.P. (1998). Exposure to urban violence: Contamination of the school environment. Violence in American schools: A new perspective. New York, Cambridge University Press

Mansfield,W., & Farris,E.(1992). Public school principal survey on safe, disciplined, and drug-free schools. Rockville, MD: Westat, Inc.

McQueen, A. (2000, October 26). Study shows school violence ebbing. The Star-Ledger, pp. A6.

National Education Goals Panel (1993). The National Education Goals Report, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office.

National League of Cities (1994). A Survey of 700 Communities on Violence in Schools, Washington,D.C., The National League of Cities.

National School Board Association (1994). Violence in the schools: How America's school boards are safeguarding your children. Alexandria,VA, National School Board Association.

Newman,J., (1980). From past to future: School violence in a broad view. Contemporary Education 52(1), 7-12.

Nie, Norman H., Hull,C. Hadlai, Jenkins,Jean G., Steinbrenner, Karin, & Bent, (1975). Statistical package for the Social Sciences, Second Edition SPSS. McGraw-Hill Book Company 468-473, New York, New York.

Ordovensky, P., (1993). Facing up to violence. The Executive Educator 15, 22-24.

Parke, R.D., & Slabey,R.G., (1983). The development of aggression. Handbook of Child Psychology, 547-642.

Prothow-Stith, D.(1991). Deadly consequences: How violence is destroying our teenage population and a plan to begin solving the problem. New York, Harper Collins.

Riley,R.W. (1994). Curbing youth violence. USA Today, 36-38.

Ruebel,R.J., (1978). Analysis and critique of HEW's safe school study report to Congress. Crime and Delinquency 24(3), 257-265.

Security Distributing and Marketing (1998). Communities seek security answers to school violence. Newton 28, 158.

Shapiro,E.S., (1994). Editors comments. School Psychology 23(2), 134-135.

Shen,J. (1997). The evolution of violence in schools. Educational Leadership 55, 18.

Slabey,R.G. (1992). The prevention of youth violence. Testimony prepared for the U.S. Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs. 102nd Congress, 2nd session, March 31.

Steinberg, A., (1991, July/August). How schools can help stem violence in today's youth. The Harvard Education Letter 7, 1-2, 4-5.

Toch,T., Gest,T. & Guttman,M., (1993, November). When killers come to class: Violence in schools. U.S. News and World Reports pp. 31-36.

Tuchscherer, P.(1988). TV interactive toys: The new high tech threat to children. Bend, OR, Pinnaroo Publishing.

United States Department of Education (1998). National Center for Education Statistics. Violence and discipline problems in U.S. public schools. Appendix A

United States Department of Education (1978). Violent schools-safe schools: The safe school study report to Congress, Washington, DC, United State Government Printing Office.

United States Department of Justice (1991). School crime: A National Crime Victimization Survey Report, Washington, DC, United States Government Printing Office.

West, C.(1993). Race Matters. Boston, Mass., Beacon.

Whitney,I., & Smith,P.K., (1993). A survey of the nature and extent of bullying in junior/middle, secondary schools. Educational Research. 35, 3-25.

Witte, Robert S. & Witte, John S., (1997). Statistics 5th Edition. Orlando, Florida. Harcourt Brace College Publishers, 387-394.

APPENDIX A

200 Park Place
Irvington, New Jersey 07111
April 2000

Dear Educator,

As you are aware, violence in schools has become the hottest
topic in education today. At this time I am completing my
dissertation at Seton Hall University, which centers on
"Administrators Perception of Violence in Elementary Schools
in an Urban District". As part of my dissertation, I am
utilizing the "Principal/Disciplinarian Survey on School
Violence" which was developed by the U.S. Department of
Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

As an elementary school principal in the Newark Public
School District you have been selected to participate in
this study. Your participation is strictly voluntary.

The enclosed questionnaire is easy to read and complete.
Please take a few minutes now to fill it out and return it
to me. When you have finished, simply place the completed
survey in the envelope provide for your convenience.

Please be assured that your responses will be kept in strict
confidence. Neither your name nor your school will ever
appear on the completed survey, dissertation or any other
reports of my research findings. The identification number
on the survey is for mailing purposes only. This number
will allow me to check your school off of the mailing list
when your survey is returned.

Your professional insights on school violence are extremely
important not only to this research but also to all
educators. Your immediate response is deeply appreciated.
Feel free to call me at (973) 372-7248 if you have any
questions regarding this research.

Sincerely,

Glenda Johnson-Green
Seton Hall University Doctoral Candidate

Enclosure (1)

APPENDIX B

200 Park Place
Irvington, New Jersey 07111
February 2000

Marion Bolden,
State District Executive Superintendent
Newark Public School District
2 Cedar Street
Newark, New Jersey 07102

Dear Ms. Bolden,

I am currently enrolled in the Executive Ed. D. program at
Seton Hall University. My dissertation topic is
"Administrators Perception of Violence in Elementary Schools
in an Urban District". I am requesting your permission to
conduct this survey with the elementary principals in your
district. The time that will be needed to complete the
survey instrument will not interfere with the principal's
usual duties.

All responses to the survey will be kept in the strictest
confidence. No names of schools or principals will be used.
I will submit a completed copy of my research upon the
completion of my dissertation to you. Please feel free to
contact me at (973) 372-7248 if you have any questions.

Thanking you in advance for your anticipated permission.

Sincerely,

Glenda Johnson-Green
Seton Hall University Doctoral Student
Enclosure (1)

APPENDIX C

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

PRINCIPAL/SCHOOL DISCIPLINARIAN

SURVEY

ON

SCHOOL VIOLENCE

Title/Position_____

Grades_____

Current
Enrollment_____

Definitions

Firearms- any weapon that is designed to (or may readily be converted to) expel a projectile by the action of an explosive. This includes guns, bombs, grenades, mines, rockets, missiles, pipe bombs, or similar devices designed to explode and capable of causing bodily harm or property damage.

Incident- a specific criminal act or offense involving one or more victims and one or more offenders or damage of school property.

Physical attack or fight with a weapon- an actual and intentional touching or striking of another person against his or her will, or the intentional causing of bodily harm to an individual with a weapon. This category should be used only when the attack is serious enough to warrant calling the police or other law enforcement representatives.

Physical attack or fight without a weapon- an actual and intentional touching or striking of another person against his or her will, or the intentional causing of bodily harm to an individual without using a weapon. This category should be used only when the attack is serious enough to warrant calling the police or other law enforcement representatives.

Police or other law enforcement representative- any regular state or local law enforcement officers, school resource officers, campus police, security personnel employed by school or district, or other security personnel with power to arrest or hold for arrest.

Robbery- the taking or attempting to take anything of value that is owned by another person or organization, under confrontational circumstances by force or threat of force or violence and/or by putting the victim in fear. A key difference between robbery and theft/larceny is that a threat or battery is involved in robbery.

Sexual battery- an incident that includes rape, fondling, indecent liberties, child molestation, or sodomy. These incidents should take into consideration the age and

developmentally appropriate behavior of the offenders and are severe enough to warrant calling the police or other law enforcement representatives.

Theft/larceny- the unlawful taking of another person's property without personal confrontation, threat, violence, or bodily harm. Included are pocket picking, stealing of purse of backpack (if
left unattended or no force was used to take it from owner), theft from a building, theft from a motor vehicle or motor vehicle parts or accessories, theft of bicycles, theft from vending machines, and all other types of thefts.

Typical week- a typical full week of school. Avoid weeks with holidays, vacation periods, or weeks when unusual events took place at the school.

Vandalism- the damage or destruction of school property including bombing, arson, graffiti, and other acts that cause property damage.

Weapon- any instrument or object used with the intent to threaten, injure or kill. Examples include guns, knives, razor blades or other sharp-edged objects, ice picks, other pointed objects (including pens, pencils), baseball bats, frying pans, sticks, rocks, and bottles.

Zero tolerance policy- a school or district policy that mandates predetermined consequences or punishment for specific offenses.

1. Circle the number indicating to what extent, if any, each
of the following has been a problem in your school during
the 1998-1999 school year.

		Serious	Moderate	Minor	Not a Problem
a.	Student tardiness	1	2	3	4
b.	Student absenteeism Class cutting	1	2	3	4
c.	Physical conflicts among students	1	2	3	4
d.	Robbery or theft of items over $10	1	2	3	4
e.	Vandalism of school property	1	2	3	4
f.	Student alcohol use	1	2	3	4
g.	Student drug use	1	2	3	4
h.	Sale of drugs on school grounds	1	2	3	4
i.	Student tobacco use	1	2	3	4
j.	Student possession of weapons	1	2	3	4
k.	Trespassing	1	2	3	4
l.	Verbal abuse of teachers	1	2	3	4
m.	Physical abuse of teachers	1	2	3	4
n.	Teacher absenteeism	1	2	3	4
o.	Teacher alcohol or drug use	1	2	3	4
p.	Racial tensions	1	2	3	4
q.	Gangs	1	2	3	4

2. During the 1998-1999 school year, how many incidents
involving each type of the following crimes or offenses
have at your school? Only include incidents in which
police or other law enforcement representatives (see
definitions) were contacted.

In column I, record the number of incidents or each
type of crime in which one or more incidents occurred
at your school.

In column II, indicate how many of the incidents
reported in column I involved one or more of your
students as either a victim or perpetrator.

In column III, indicate how many of the incidents
reported in column I occurred either during school
hours or at school-sponsored events or activities after
school hours.

		Column I	Column II	Column III
a.	Murder	_____	_____	_____
b.	Rape or other type of sexual battery	_____	_____	_____
c.	Suicide	_____	_____	_____
d.	Physical attack or fight with a weapon	_____	_____	_____
e.	Physical attack or fight without a weapon	_____	_____	_____
f.	Robbery - the taking of things directly from a person by force.	_____	_____	_____
g.	Theft/larceny - the taking of things without personal confrontation	_____	_____	_____
h.	Vandalism - damage or destruction of school property or personal items on school property.	_____	_____	_____

3. Does your school have a policy to report information
   about the types of incidents listed in question 2 to
   the public (e.g. to parents in a school newsletter)?

4. During the 1998-1999 school year, how many of the
   following disciplinary actions have been taken for each
   of the listed offenses?

	Expulsions	Transfers to Alternative Schools or Programs	Out of School Suspensions for 5 or more days
a. Possession or use of a firearm	_____	_____	_____
b. Possession, distribution, or use of alcohol or drugs, including tobacco	_____	_____	_____
c. Physical attacks of fights	_____	_____	_____

5. During the 1998-1999 school year, did your school have:

	Yes	No
a. A requirement that visitors sign or check in?	1	2
b. Controlled access to school grounds (e.g., locked or monitored gates)?	1	2
c. Controlled access to school buildings (e.g., locked or monitored doors)?	1	2
d. Metal detectors through which all students must pass each day?	1	2
e. Random metal detector checks on students?	1	2
f. Closed campus for most students during lunch (i.e., most students are not allowed to leave school grounds for lunch)?	1	2
g. One or more drug sweeps (e.g., locker searches, dog searches)?	1	2

6. In a typical week during the 1998-1999 school year, how many school hours have one or more police or other law enforcement representatives been stationed at your school (other than for instructional purposes)? (Circle one)

30 hours or more per week	1
10-29 hours per week	2
1-9 hours per week	3
None during the typical week, but stationed as needed	4
None stationed at school during 1998-1999	5

7. During the 1998-1999 school year, does your school have a zero tolerance policy for:

		Yes	No
a.	Violence?	1	2
b.	Firearms?	1	2
c.	Weapons, other than firearms?	1	2
d.	Alcohol?	1	2
e.	Drugs?	1	2
f.	Tobacco?	1	2

8. During the 1998-1999 school year, are students at your school required to wear school uniforms?

Yes...................1   In what school year were uniforms first
                              required?   19___ - 19___ school year
No........................2

9. During the 1998-1999 school year, what percentage of your students is eligible for the federally funded free or reduced-price lunch program? _____%

10. During the 1998-1999 school year, how many formal (planned and organized) programs or efforts did your school have that were intended to prevent or reduce school violence? (These programs or efforts can include instruction, other services to students, or changes to classroom and school management, and can take place either during school hours or after school hours.)

Number of one-day, one time programs   _____

Number of ongoing programs (more than one day _____

(If your school has no programs, enter "0" and go to question 15.)

11. Were the incidents of crimes and offenses reported in question 2 used to modify these programs or to introduce new programs?

Yes..............1 No.............2   No incidents reported in question
2.........3

12. During the 1998-1999 school year, did any of the formal
    programs or efforts intended to prevent or reduce
    school violence include the following?

		Yes	NO
a.	Prevention curriculum, instruction, or training for students (e.g., social skills training)	1	2
b.	Behavioral programming or behavior modification for students	1	2
c.	Counseling, social work, psychological, or therapeutic activity for students	1	2
d.	Other activities involving individual attention for students (e.g. tutoring, mentoring)	1	2
e.	Recreational, enrichment, or leisure activities for students	1	2
f.	Student involvement in resolving student conduct problems (e.g. dispute or conflict resolution or mediation, student court)	1	2
g.	Training, supervision, or technical assistance in classroom management for teachers	1	2
h.	Review, revision, or monitoring of school wide discipline practices and procedures	1	2
i.	Community or parent involvement in school violence prevention programs or efforts	1	2
j.	Reorganization of school, grades, or schedules (e.g., school within a school, "houses" or "teams" of students)	1	2

13. During the 1998-1999 school year, about how many
    students in your school participated in (or will
    participate in) programs or efforts that directly serve
    students and were intended to prevent or reduce school
    violence?   (Circle one)

    All or almost all (91-100%)   1
    Most   (61-90%)   2
    About half (41-60%)   3
    Some (11-40%)   4
    Few   (1-10%)   5
    None   6

14. During the 1998-1999 school year, about how many

teachers and staff in your school were substantially involved in any of the programs or efforts that were intended to prevent or reduce school violence?

All or almost all (91-100%)	1
Most (61-90%)	2
About half (41-60%)	3
Some (11-40%)	4
Few (1-10%)	5
None	6

15. During the 1998-1999 school year (including or in addition to those programs reported in question 10), did your school provide or sponsor any after school programs?

Yes..............................1   No..............................2