

1987

## A review of Canters' Assertive Discipline

Vincent J. Bonnema  
*University of Northern Iowa*

*Let us know how access to this document benefits you*

Copyright ©1987 Vincent J. Bonnema

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp>

---

### Recommended Citation

Bonnema, Vincent J., "A review of Canters' Assertive Discipline" (1987). *Graduate Research Papers*. 2127.  
<https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp/2127>

This Open Access Graduate Research Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Work at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Research Papers by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@uni.edu](mailto:scholarworks@uni.edu).

---

## A review of Canters' Assertive Discipline

### Abstract

Discipline procedures in our schools today vary not only from building to building but from classroom to classroom. Teachers are expected to maintain "good discipline, but are often left to interpret a few general rules in the student handbook as they see fit. Rules in the individual classrooms are often left to the teacher. While many administrators see value in allowing teachers to maintain this type of control, others are implementing school-wide programs of discipline. Assertive Discipline, developed by Lee and Marion Canter in the mid 1970's, is just one of many discipline packages available for implementation.

A REVIEW OF CANTERS' ASSERTIVE DISCIPLINE

---

A Research Paper

Presented to

The Department of Educational Administration  
and Counseling

University of Northern Iowa

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Arts in Education

---

by

Vincent J. Bonnema

December 1987

This research paper by: Vincent J. Bonnema

Entitled: A REVIEW OF CANTERS' ASSERTIVE DISCIPLINE

has been approved as meeting the research paper  
requirement for the Degree of Master of Arts in Education.

Norman McCumsey

10/27/87  
Date Approved

\_\_\_\_\_  
Adviser

11-5-87  
Date Approved

James E. Albrecht

\_\_\_\_\_  
Second Reader of Research Paper

11/5/87  
Date Received

Dale R. Jackson

\_\_\_\_\_  
Head, Department of Educational  
Administration and Counseling

Discipline procedures in our schools today vary not only from building to building but from classroom to classroom. Teachers are expected to maintain "good" discipline, but are often left to interpret a few general rules in the student handbook as they see fit. Rules in the individual classrooms are often left to the teacher. While many administrators see value in allowing teachers to maintain this type of control, others are implementing school-wide programs of discipline. Assertive Discipline, developed by Lee and Marion Canter in the mid 1970's, is just one of many discipline packages available for implementation.

While there has always been a need for teachers to anticipate student misbehavior and have a set of standards designed to prevent or respond to it, there is belief that teachers today are experiencing greater pressure to maintain a classroom where misbehavior is held to a minimum. This trend is an offshoot of the call to increase academic standards. In the United States today the public wants teachers to "return to the basics" and make sure that students move up the scale of world-wide achievement. Many teachers are initially responding to this call by tightening their control of student activity in the classroom. Assertive Discipline serves this purpose. According to Canter (1979a)

the word assertive means "to state or affirm positively, assuredly, plainly or strongly" (p. 11).

This paper will summarize the Assertive Discipline procedure and give examples of its use. A consideration of why many teachers use the procedure will also be made. No program or model is without its critics, even the Canters' model. Therefore, several criticisms of the Canters' approach will be reviewed. Finally, possible applications of the Assertive Discipline program in elementary classrooms will be explored.

"Assertive Discipline is a program that was developed as a result of seven years of research and evaluation into effective classroom discipline skills" (Canter, 1979b, p. 33). "After its conception, the program was field tested by 20,000 teachers and principals and was found to reduce behavior problems by 80%" (Canter, 1979c, p. 107). Since that time the program has grown very rapidly throughout this country and abroad. Mrs. and Mrs. Canter now sit at the top of a consulting empire which was formed by the program known as Assertive Discipline. What makes this program so widely used?

Zakariya (1983) states that "Assertive Discipline is based on Assertion Training, which is an approach designed to help people learn how to express their wants and feelings,

without violating the rights of others" (p. 14). This model then is built upon the premise that the teacher must have some way to communicate his desires and feelings to the students without infringing on those students' rights. How does the teacher do this? According to Zakariya (1983) the assertive teacher not only expresses her wants and needs to the class, but she is also prepared to reinforce her needs with appropriate actions. "She responds in a manner which maximizes her potential to get her needs met, but in no way violates the best interest of the students" (p. 13).

What are the basic needs and rights that all teachers have? Zakariya (1983) states the following:

The right to establish a classroom structure and routine that provides the optimal learning environment in keeping with the teachers own strengths and weaknesses.

The right to determine and request appropriate behavior from the students which will meet the teacher's needs and which encourage the positive, social and educational development of the student.

The right to ask for help from the parents, the principal, and others when assistance with a student is needed. (p. 14)

Teachers who subscribe to this program turn poor discipline procedures into effective ones. Instead of being

interested only in the students' rights, and worrying whether or not they will violate them by disciplining, they first consider their own rights. The assertive teacher asks for appropriate behavior from the student, behavior which does not necessarily meet the students' needs, but the teacher's needs. Canter (1979c) tells teachers that they have the right to demand quiet, if that's what they want. They also have the right to have the children in their seats, or to get respect from the children.

Do the students have any rights at all under this model? According to Zakariya (1983) students can expect the following:

The right to have a teacher who is in a position to, and will help the child limit his inappropriate self-disruptive behavior.

The right to have a teacher who is in position to, and will provide the child with positive support for his appropriate behavior.

The right to choose how to behave and to know the consequences that will follow his/her behavior. (p. 14)

These rights, both the teacher's and the students', are an important aspect of the Assertive Discipline program. These rights form the basis for the day-to-day enforcement of rules, and for the rules themselves. To successfully



establish this program, teachers must make students aware of these rights and review them periodically throughout the year.

After the rights have been established the classroom teacher makes the students aware of his rules for behavior. By proceeding in this manner the burden of deciding how to react in a particular situation is lifted from the teacher. If the student chooses to break the rules, he will suffer the pre-stated negative consequences. It's not a judgment call which can backfire for the teacher if he is not consistent. The child knows the rules and the teacher enforces them (Canter, 1979c).

Zakariya (1983) believes that the Assertive Discipline plan, designed by the teacher, served as the foundation for his discipline efforts. "Each classroom program is as unique as the particular class setting and the ideas of the creative assertive teacher" (p. 15). When planning his program the assertive teacher asks himself the following questions: "What behavior(s) do I want the students to eliminate? - or engage in? What limit setting consequences will be appropriate? What positive consequences would be appropriate? What planning is necessary to implement the limit - setting and/or positive consequences?" (Zakariya, 1983, p. 15).

When the teacher has decided upon appropriate and inappropriate behaviors and has made them known to the class,

she also informs them that there will be limit setting or negative consequences. Canter (1979c) suggests the following pattern, open to teacher change, for establishing these consequences. If a child breaks a rule the teacher writes the child's name on the board. The teacher is careful not to break the flow of the lesson or verbally say anything to the child about his action. This serves as a warning. If the action continues the teacher calmly places a check next to the child's name and the child forfeits a privilege such as ten minutes of free time. The next check may signify ten more minutes. The third check, if needed, may mean that the teacher will call the child's parents after class, and the fourth a trip to the principal's office. Canter (1979c) also encourages teachers to add a severe clause to the plan for serious infractions of the rules. If this is the case the teacher may immediately move to step four or five if the child's action warrants it.

Assertive Discipline, used in the intended way, does not only deal with negative actions however. Ferreira (1983) reports that in his school individuals receive recognition tokens from their teacher for positive behavior. The tokens are collected when a certain limit is reached and the children receive a classroom banner. Six banners earn the class a Disney film or the class can work for twelve banners, at

which time they enjoy an ice cream bar or lunch on the lawn with the principal.

Canter (1979c) suggests positive consequences as well. He believes that the teacher must daily praise the students for positive actions. Periodically the teacher should send some type of recognition note home with students who exhibit appropriate behavior. Throughout the day the teacher should establish a routine to let the students know when they are all staying on task. One possibility would be to drop marbles in a jar when the class is following directions. When the jar is full the teacher should reward the children with an activity or event that they all value, such as an extra fifteen minutes of free time.

Teachers who choose to use Assertive Discipline soon learn that it is an extremely structured program. The teacher must establish and communicate her rights, the students' rights, the rules of the room, and the negative and positive reinforcers. This program seems like it would take an inordinate amount of instructional time to administer each day. Why do so many administrators and teachers like a program that is so time consuming and rigidly structured?

One school was so impressed with Assertive Discipline that they extended it to their lunch room where they now claim to have developed a restaurant-like atmosphere

(McCormack, 1981). Why do so many schools seem to use this program? Assertive Discipline provides results.

Mandlebaum (1983) tells the account of a study he participated in to study the effectiveness of Assertive Discipline. The researchers went into a third grade classroom where the teacher had a twenty year history of discipline problems. The researchers trained her in the use of Assertive Discipline and then observed her as she went on, off, and back on two week periods of using the program with her class. By measuring out-of-seat time and free talking, the researchers found that student behavior measurably changed for the better while Assertive Discipline was in use.

The principal was so happy with the results of the study that he asked the researchers to come back and help every teacher who had discipline problems in their room. The teacher indicated that she would be starting the program full-time with her next class. The students themselves accomplished more work in a shorter time. They liked the positive consequences and disliked the negative ones.

Canter (1979c) claims that "all children, regardless of background or ability, can behave appropriately at school" (p. 108). Assertive Discipline, developed on the foundation of this belief, seems to have convinced many administrators and teachers that this is true.

Assertive Discipline does have critics. Watson (1982) claims that classroom management systems like Assertive Discipline are not consistent with the guidelines suggested by contemporary research. "Systems like Assertive Discipline undermine both the socialization and the education process" (Watson, 1982, p. 75). Researchers such as Watson seem to believe that while Assertive Discipline does have immediate positive effects on the ability to control behavior in the school, its long term effects are devastating.

Why doesn't Assertive Discipline prepare students for life in society? Watson (1982) believes that in the classroom, where the teacher has control of the major reinforcers and punishments, Assertive Discipline may work, but this program doesn't prepare students for the future. Will there always be someone in each child's life to provide positive and negative reinforcement? Absolutely not.

Schools must prepare students for life, willingly upholding society's values and laws. We must help children develop the ability to control their own behavior so that it will be in keeping with society's values, not merely guided by self interest. (Watson, 1982, p. 76)

How is this goal accomplished? Watson (1982) believes "research shows that rather than firm control, mutual control does a better job of socializing children. Mutual control

means adding warmth, respect, concern, and giving children a voice in the decision making process" (p. 81). Writers like Watson are claiming that the best thing we can do for our children is to show them some sensitivity and some concern.

Other critics of the Assertive Discipline program object to it for different reasons. Davidman and Davidman (1984) attack the role of the teacher in this model. These authors claim that teachers trained in the Canterian method may become overly cold and authoritative. The reason for this danger is found right at the beginning of the model where the teacher is taught to stress her own rights at all times. These rights are overly me oriented, according to the Davidmans, not student oriented. The concern seems to be that by putting their concerns over the students', teachers may become too authoritarian, overly obsessed with student discipline.

These criticisms can be easily justified. The public owns the classrooms of America's government schools. These rooms are meant for the use of the teacher and the children, but they are not the private kingdoms of each individual teacher. If any teacher, through Assertive Discipline or otherwise, becomes overly aggressive towards his students an injustice is being committed.

The Davidmans (1984) make another point which also may have merit. They claim that the Assertive Discipline program

does not take into account the uniqueness of each child. It has class-wide rules and regulations. Some of the built-in consequences might be psychologically harmful for an individual.

Does the quality of instruction have anything to do with discipline in the classroom? Many educators believe that it does. Another possible fault of the Assertive Discipline model is that teachers aren't encouraged to look for probable causes of misbehavior such as a personal need for attention or a boring curriculum. The teacher is only encouraged to deal with the misbehavior itself and not to deal with the possible reason for it.

Gartrell (1987) believes that "the negative effects of Assertive Discipline can be crushing for children, especially those between the ages of four and eight" (p. 10). During these years one of the most important things happening in the child's life is the development of attitudes regarding school and learning. The attitudes are a major contributor to the child's success as a student. When a child of this age continually sees her name on the board, in front of everyone's eyes, negative attitudes toward school can be formed. These attitudes may last a lifetime.

For the child who is frequently punished a self fulfilling prophecy can also be formed. This child may learn to believe

that "I am what you tell me I am." This child is punished for having a problem rather than being helped to overcome the problem (Gartrell, 1987).

What kinds of programs do critics of Assertive Discipline offer as an alternative? Crockenberg (1982) "supports any sort of discipline program where the students have a right to share in the rule making" (p. 61). Gartrell (1987) "suggests the Jones, Glasser or Ginott models, all models where the teacher communicates to the students in more subtle, private ways, and in which the students are highly respected as individuals" (p. 11).

The proponents and critics of Assertive Discipline seem to have totally opposing views regarding discipline in our schools. Watson (1982) does hint at some middle ground when he writes, "The basically sound intuitions of good teachers have often saved us from the excess of unsound educational philosophy" (p. 90). Whether one agrees that Assertive Discipline is an "unsound educational philosophy" or not, Watson's words contain a lot of wisdom.

Teachers should never adhere to any one educational philosophy so strongly that they lose their own perception of what is best for each of their students. No one theorist, however well trained, is able to form a miracle plan for discipline or any other educational issue. Classroom teachers



should take plans such as Assertive Discipline and modify them to meet their own need, situation and students.

Assertive Discipline works. Many studies have shown that teachers with discipline problems have been able to correct them by following this procedure. Teachers that wish to use this model, however, have to realize that the students need to be given some input into the classroom rule formation. Teachers also must be able to adjust the program so that they take the time and effort to search for the cause of student misbehavior.

Teaching is a challenging occupation in many different ways. Many teachers need to use a more structured method of discipline now than ever before. The public often holds teachers accountable for student achievement and behavior but doesn't always provide their necessary support.

Assertive Discipline, based on Assertive Training, is a discipline approach designed to help teachers learn how to express their wants and desires without infringing on the rights of others. Many teachers all over the world are using this model in their classrooms.

Although many believe deeply in this program, others are very concerned about its long-term effects. The sensitive and sensible teacher who uses the Assertive Discipline model

will temper it with their own knowledge of their students' personalities, activities and needs.

## References

- Canter, L. (1979a). Competency-based approach to discipline --It's assertive. Thrust for Educational Leadership, 8(3), 11-13.
- Canter, L. (1979b). Taking charge of student behavior. National Elementary Principal, 58(4), 33-36, 41.
- Canter, L. (1979c). You can do it! Discipline. Instructor, 89(2), 106-108.
- Crockenberg, V. (1982). Assertive discipline: A dissent. California Journal of Teacher Education, 9(4), 59-74.
- Davidman, L., & Davidman, P. (1984). Logical assertion: A rationale and strategy. The Educational Forum, 48(2), 165-176.
- Ferreira, C. L. (1979). A Positive Approach to Assertive Discipline. (Report No. SP 022 587). Martinez, CA: Martinez Unified School District. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 240 058).
- Gartrell, D. (1987). Assertive discipline: Unhealthy for children and other living things. Young Children, 42(2), 10-11.
- Mandlebaum, L. H., Russell, S. C., Krouse, J., & Gonter, M. (1983). Assertive discipline: An effective classwide behavior management program. Behavioral Disorders, 8(4), 258-264.

- McCormack, S. (1981). One School's Positive Action Plan.  
(Report No. RC 012 614). Jefferson, OR: Jefferson  
Elementary School. (ERIC Document Reproduction  
Service No. ED 200 375).
- Watson, M. (1982). Classroom control: To what ends? At  
what price? California Journal of Teacher Education, 9(4),  
75-95.
- Zakariya, J. B. (1983). Developing a discipline code in your  
school. (Report No. EA 016 402). Reston, VA: National  
Association of Elementary School Principals. (ERIC  
Document Reproduction Service No. ED 242 000).