

Exploring Disciplinary Practices in Education: Pros and Cons

IMSA Educational Review Team

Disciplinary practices in education have evolved significantly over the years, with schools and educators constantly seeking the most effective methods to manage student behavior and maintain a conducive learning environment. This article provides an overview of various disciplinary practices, highlighting their advantages and disadvantages.

1. Zero Tolerance Policies

Zero tolerance policies involve strict enforcement of regulations with predetermined consequences, typically for issues like violence, drugs, and weapons.

Pros: These policies create clear expectations and consequences, which can deter serious offenses (Skiba, 2000). They are straightforward to administer and leave little room for ambiguity.

Cons: Critics argue that zero tolerance policies can be overly punitive and inflexible, often leading to disproportionate punishments for minor infractions (American Psychological Association, 2008). They can also contribute to the school-to-prison pipeline, disproportionately affecting minority students.

2. Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS)

PBIS is a proactive approach focusing on teaching and reinforcing positive behaviors rather than punishing negative ones.

Pros: PBIS has been shown to improve school climate, reduce behavioral problems, and enhance academic performance (Bradshaw, Mitchell, & Leaf, 2010). It promotes a more inclusive and supportive environment.

Cons: Implementing PBIS can be resource-intensive, requiring ongoing training and support. It may also be less effective in addressing severe or chronic behavioral issues.

3. Restorative Justice

Restorative justice in education focuses on repairing harm through inclusive processes that involve all affected parties.

Pros: This approach fosters empathy and accountability, and can lead to more meaningful resolutions (Vaandering, 2010). It also reduces suspension rates and improves student relationships.

Cons: Restorative justice can be time-consuming and requires a significant commitment from all involved. It may also be challenging to implement in cases of serious offenses.

4. Detention and Suspension

Traditional methods like detention and suspension involve removing students from their regular activities or school as a consequence of their behavior.

Pros: These methods can provide immediate and clear consequences for unacceptable behavior and remove disruptive students from the classroom (Skiba & Rausch, 2006).

Cons: Research suggests that suspensions can be counterproductive, often exacerbating behavioral problems and academic disengagement (Raffaele Mendez, 2003). They disproportionately affect minority and special education students.

5. Behavior Contracts

Behavior contracts are agreements between students and teachers outlining expected behaviors and consequences.

Pros: Contracts can be effective in promoting self-regulation and responsibility in students (Sulzer-Azaroff & Mayer, 1991). They provide clear guidelines and involve students in the process.

Cons: The effectiveness of behavior contracts can depend heavily on consistent follow-through and may not be suitable for all students, particularly younger ones or those with certain disabilities.

Each disciplinary practice has its strengths and weaknesses, and the effectiveness can vary based on the context and individual student needs. A balanced approach, possibly integrating elements from different practices, may be the most effective strategy in managing classroom behavior while supporting a positive and inclusive learning environment.

References

- American Psychological Association. (2008). Are zero tolerance policies effective in the schools? An evidentiary review and recommendations. *American Psychologist*, 63(9), 852-862.
- Bradshaw, C. P., Mitchell, M. M., & Leaf, P. J. (2010). Examining the effects of schoolwide positive behavioral interventions and supports on student outcomes. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 12(3), 133-148.
- Raffaele Mendez, L. M. (2003). Predictors of suspension and negative school outcomes: A longitudinal investigation. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 2003(99), 17-33.
- Skiba, R. J. (2000). Zero tolerance, zero evidence: An analysis of school disciplinary practice. *Policy Research Report #SRS2*. Indiana Education Policy Center.
- Skiba, R. J., & Rausch, M. K. (2006). Zero tolerance, suspension, and expulsion: Questions of equity and effectiveness. In E. Anderman & L. H. Anderman (Eds.), *Psychology of classroom learning: An encyclopedia* (pp. 1063-1069). Macmillan Reference USA.
- Sulzer-Azaroff, B., & Mayer, G. R. (1991). *Behavior analysis for lasting change*. Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Vaandering, D. (2010). The significance of critical theory for restorative justice in education. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 32(2), 145-176.