

Beyond Discipline to Guidance

Dan Gartrell

A student teacher in a Head Start classroom recorded in her journal an anecdotal observation of two children involved in a confrontation (printed with permission); the children here are named Charissa and Carlos.

Observation: Charissa and Carlos were building with blocks. Charissa reached for a block, and Carlos decided he wanted the same one. They both tugged on the block, and then Carlos hit Charissa on the back. Charissa fought back tears and said, "Carlos, you're not s'posed to hit—you're s'posed to use the 'talking stick.'"

Carlos said yeah and got the stick. I couldn't hear what they said, but they took turns holding the stick and talking while the other one listened. After only a minute, the two were playing again, and Charissa was using the block. Later I asked her what the talking stick helped them decide. She said, "That I use the block first this time. Carlos uses it next time."

Reflection: I really got concerned when Carlos hit Charissa, and I was just about to get involved. I couldn't believe it when Charissa

didn't hit back but told Carlos to get the talking stick—and he did! Then they solved the problem so quickly. DeeAnn [the teacher] told me she has been teaching the kids since September [it was now April] to solve their problems by using the talking stick. Usually she has to mediate, but this time two children solved a problem on their own. It really worked!

Firm guidance and calm coaching help children solve social problems.

Preschoolers do not typically solve a problem like this, on their own, by using a prop like a talking stick! But DeeAnn had been working with the children all year to teach them this conflict management skill. To ensure consistency, she had persuaded the other adults in the room to also use the talking stick (even once themselves!). Utilizing the ideas of Wichert (1989), the adults started by using a lot of coaching (high-level mediation) but over time encouraged the children to take the initiative to solve their problems themselves.

Conflict management—in this case through the technique of a decorated, venerable talking stick—is an important strategy in the overall approach to working with children called *guidance*

(Janke & Penshorn Peterson 1995). By now guidance is a familiar term in early childhood education, as is its companion term, *developmentally appropriate practice* (DAP). However, like the misinterpretations of DAP that have surfaced in recent years, some interpretations of guidance show a misunderstanding of what the approach is about. Erroneous inter-

pretations have led to the misapplication of guidance ideas: some teachers may think they are using guidance when they are not.

This article is an effort to amplify the concept of guidance. It defines guidance, traces the guid-

ance tradition in early childhood education, examines the present trend toward guidance, explains what guidance is not, and illustrates key practices in classrooms where teachers use guidance.

Guidance defined

Teachers who practice guidance believe in the positive potential of children, manifest through a dynamic process of development (Greenberg 1988). For this reason, teachers who use guidance think beyond conventional classroom discipline—the intent of which is to keep children (literally and figuratively) in line. Rather than simply being a reaction to crises, guidance involves developmentally appropriate, cul-

Dan Gartrell, Ed.D., is professor of early childhood education at Bemidji State University in Minnesota. This article is based on his forthcoming text, titled A Guidance Approach for the Encouraging Classroom, and the writings of many other early childhood educators and developmental psychologists over the years.

turally responsive education to reduce the occurrence of classroom problems. Guidance means creating a positive learning environment for each child in the group.

Guidance teaches children the life skills they need as citizens of a democracy (Wittmer & Honig 1994): respecting others and one's self, working together in groups, solving problems using words, expressing strong emotions in acceptable ways, making decisions ethically and intelligently. Teachers who use guidance realize that it takes well into adulthood to master these skills and that, in learning them, children—like all of us—make mistakes. Therefore, because children are just beginning this personal development, teachers regard behaviors traditionally considered misbehaviors as *mistaken* behaviors (Gartrell 1987b, 1995). The interventions teachers make to address mistaken behaviors are firm but friendly, instructive and solution oriented but not punitive. The teacher helps children learn from their mistakes rather than punishing them for the mistakes they make; empowers children to solve problems rather than punishing them for having

problems they cannot solve; helps children accept consequences but consequences that leave self-esteem intact.

Guidance teaching is character education in its truest, least political sense—guiding children to develop the empathy, self-esteem, and self-control needed for *autonomy*, Piaget's term for the capacity to make intelligent, ethical decisions (Kamii 1984). In contrast to the notion that the teacher handles all problem situations alone, guidance involves teamwork with professionals and partnerships with parents on behalf of the child.

The guidance tradition

The only task harder than learning democratic living skills is teaching them to others. Guidance has always been practiced by the kind of teacher whom, if we were fortunate, we had ourselves; whom we would want our children to have; whom we would like to emulate. From time immemorial there probably have been "guidance teachers." A

rich guidance tradition spanning more than 150 years has been documented in the early childhood field.

The pioneers

Educators interested in social reform long have viewed children as being in a state of dynamic development and adults as patterning effective education and guidance practices responsive to the developmental pattern of the child. During the nineteenth century the European educators Herbart, Pestalozzi, and Froebel began fundamental educational reform, in no small part as a result of their views on the child's dynamic nature (Osborn 1980). Herbart and Pestalozzi recognized that children learn best through activities they can tie to their own experiences rather than through a strictly enforced recitation of facts.



© Hakely Feridge Hundly



© Bob Loveland

Often, friendly adult intervention and assistance can help children work through a seemingly insoluble social problem themselves. Most of the time, children want to solve what they perceive as the problem.

German born Friedrich Froebel was the originator of the kindergarten, at the time intended for children aged three to six. Froebel incorporated such practices as manipulatives-based instruction, circle time, home visits, "mothers' meetings," and the use of women teachers (Lilley 1967). (In the 1870s, his kindergartens were barred in Germany for being "too democratic.") For Froebel the whole purpose of education was guidance so that the "innate impulses of the child" could be developed harmoniously through creative activity. As part of his early developmental orientation, Froebel believed that the nature of the child was essentially good and that "faults" were the product of negative experiences, sometimes at the hand of the educator (Lilley 1967).

Similarly, Maria Montessori took a developmental viewpoint, maintaining that "the child is in a continual state of growth and metamorphosis, whereas the adult has reached the norm of the species" (cited in Standing 1962, 106). Montessori's remarkable vision included not only the innovations of the "prepared environment" and a child-oriented teaching process but also the idea that intelligence is greatly influenced by early experience. It is interesting to note that Montessori's early theory of "sensitive periods" of learning is supported in graphic fashion by the brain research of today.

Montessori—as well as her American contemporary, John Dewey—abhorred the traditional schooling of the day, which failed to consider children's development. She criticized didactic teaching practices with children planted behind desks, expected to recite lessons of little meaning in their lives, and kept in line by systematic rewards and punishments (Montessori 1964). Her approach made the child an active agent in the education process; through this responsibility children would learn self-discipline.

Like Montessori, Dewey viewed discipline as differing in method depending on the curriculum followed. The "preprimary" level in Dewey's University of Chicago Laboratory School featured project-based learning activities that built from the everyday experience of the young learners. Dewey saw the connection between school and society, postulating that our democratic ideals need to be sustained through the microcosm of the classroom. In his 1900 monograph *The School and Society*, Dewey states,

If you have the end in view of forty or fifty children learning certain set lessons, to be recited to the teacher, your discipline must be devoted to securing that result. But if the end in view is the development of a spirit of social co-operation and community life, discipline must grow out of and be relative to such an aim. There is a certain disorder in any busy workshop; there is not silence; persons are not engaged in maintaining certain fixed physical postures; their arms are not folded; they are not holding their books thus and so. They are doing a variety of things, and there is the confusion, the bustle that results from activity. Out of the occupation, out of doing things that are to produce results, and out of doing these in a social and co-operative way, there is born a discipline of its own kind and type. Our whole conception of discipline changes when we get this point of view. (1969, 16-17)

Dewey, of course, was not just speaking of early childhood education but of schooling at all levels. Almost 100 years later, his words still challenge America's educators and eloquently capture the "guidance difference."

Midcentury influences

In the first half of the twentieth century, progressive educators and psychologists increasingly viewed children not in traditional moralistic terms (good and bad) but in terms responsive to a positive developmental potential. The nursery school movement in Britain and the United States was imbued with these progressive ideas and influenced the writings of two midcentury early childhood educators, James L. Hymes Jr. (1949, 1955) and Katherine Read (1950).

Katherine Read Baker was a nursery education leader. Her classic *The Nursery School: A Human Relations Laboratory* is currently reprinted under a new title in a ninth edition. For Read, the classroom is a supportive environment for both children and adults to gain understanding in the challenging area of human relationships. Read speaks clearly of the child's need for understandable, consistent limits and of the use of authority to encourage self-control:

Our goal is self-control, the only sound control. But self-control can be sound only when there is a stable mature self. Our responsibility is to help the child develop maturity through giving him the security of limits maintained by responsible adults while he is growing. (Read [1950] 1993, 233)

Hymes distinguished himself as director of the noted Kaiser Day Care Centers during World War II and later as one of the people who strongly influenced the educational approach basic to Head

One of the major areas in which kindergarten and nursery education historically have distinguished themselves from elementary and secondary education is in the area of "behavior education." The former advocates guidance rather than punishment.

Start. Hymes wrote frequently about early childhood education matters, including the landmark *Effective Home-School Relations* (1953). His *Discipline* (1949) and *Behavior and Misbehavior* (1955) stressed the importance of understanding the reasons for children's behavior. He argued that the causes of problems often are not in the child alone but a result of the program placing inappropriate developmental expectations on the child.

Hymes and Read both stressed the need for teachers to have high expectations of children—but expectations in line with each child's development. They articulated a key guidance premise, that the teacher must be willing to modify the daily program for the benefit of children, not just hold the program as a fixed commodity, against which the behavior of the child is to be judged.

The basic educational and child guidance philosophy of Head Start, which was created as a nationwide program by War on Poverty leaders in 1965, was the nursery school/kindergarten philosophy developed long before and taught to several generations of teachers by Read, Hymes, and others of like persuasion.

Jean Piaget, often considered the preeminent developmental psychologist of the twentieth century, discussed implications of his work for the classroom in *The Moral Judgment of the Child* ([1932] 1960). The Swiss psychologist shared with Montessori the precept that children learn through constructing knowledge by interacting with the environment. Further, he shared with Dewey and leaders of nursery school and kindergarten



© BmPorter/Don Franklin

Comfort the hurt child first, then have a conversation with others involved. The objective is to increase empathy and interpersonal problem-solving skills.

education a high regard for the social context of learning—insisting that peer interaction is essential for healthy development. He maintained that education must be an interactive endeavor and that discipline must respect and respond to this fact. Speaking directly about the uses of conventional classroom discipline, Piaget points out,

If one thinks of the systematic resistance offered by pupils to the authoritarian method, and the admirable ingenuity employed by children the world over to evade disciplinary constraint, one cannot help regarding as defective a system which allows so much effort to be wasted instead of using it in co-operation. ([1932] 1960, 366–67)

Like Dewey, Read, and Hymes, Piaget saw the classroom as a “laboratory” in which the practice of democracy was to be modeled, taught, and learned. For these writers, the means to social, personal, and intellectual development was guidance practiced in the classroom by a responsible adult.

As Piaget's work demonstrates, midcentury psychologists as well as educators have enhanced guidance ideas. Important names that readers may have encountered in college educational psychology classes are Erikson, Adler, Maslow, Rogers, Combs, Purkey, and Jersild, among others (Hamacheck 1971).

Two such psychologists who have greatly influenced guidance views are Dreikurs (1968) and Ginott (1972). In line with Adler's theory about personality development, Dreikurs's construct of Mistaken Goals of Behavior has contributed to the present concept of mistaken behavior. Ginott, a particular influence on my writing, has contributed much to

the language of guidance, illustrated by one of his more famous quotes: “To reach a child's mind, a teacher must capture his heart. Only if a child feels right can he think right” (1972, 69). Across the middle of the century, a broad array of educators and psychologists nurtured and sustained the guidance tradition.

The 1980s

Through the 1970s the guidance tradition was sustained by writers such as Jeannette Galambos Stone (1978) and Rita Warren (1977), who authored widely read monographs for the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), along with many other well-known early childhood educators. While guidance was becoming important in pre-school programs, a new trend in the public schools threatened to stop the percolating up of guidance ideas, a long-sought goal of

early childhood educators. "Back to the basics" became the call of public school educators, and curriculum and teaching methods grew more proscribed. During this time academic and disciplinary constraints were even put on kindergarten and preschool children. With disregard for young children's development, teachers were pressured to "get students ready" for the academics of the next level—a pressure still felt by some early childhood teachers today.

During these years, the interactive nature of the guidance approach did not fit the regiment of the academic classroom. New "obedience-driven" discipline systems, such as assertive discipline, came into widespread use at all levels of public education—and even in some preschool programs (Gartrell 1987a; Hitz 1988). In *Discipline with Dignity*, Curwin and Mendler lamented the widespread adoption of obedience models of discipline by public schools:

It is ironic that the current mood of education is in some ways behind the past. The 1980s might someday be remembered as the decade when admiration was reserved for principals, cast as folk heroes walking around schools with baseball bats, and for teachers and whole schools that systematically embarrassed students by writing their names on the chalkboard. But we do have hope that the pendulum will once again swing to the rational position of treating children as people with needs and feelings that are not that different from adults. Once we begin to understand how obedience is contrary to the goals of our culture and education, the momentum will begin to shift. Our view is that the highest virtue of education is to teach students to be self-responsible and fully functional. In all but extreme cases, obedience contradicts these goals. (1988, 24)

The guidance trend

Throughout the 1980s and up to the present, educators and writers at the early childhood

level maintained their independence from the obedience emphasis in conventional discipline. In 1987 NAEYC published its expanded *Developmentally Appropriate Practice in Early Childhood Programs Serving Children from Birth through Age 8* (Bredekamp).

Now in its revised edition (Bredekamp & Copple 1997), the position statement and document advocate the interactive teaching practices responsive to the development of each child that our profession always has. In relation to behavior management, the document reflects the guidance approach and draws a sharp distinction with conventional elementary school classroom discipline. In *appropriate* teaching practice,

Teachers facilitate the development of social skills, self-control, and self-regulation in children by using positive guidance techniques, such as modeling and encouraging expected behavior, redirecting children to more acceptable activities, setting clear limits, and intervening to enforce consequences for unacceptable, harmful behavior. Teachers' expectations respect children's developing capabilities. Teachers are patient, realizing that not every minor infraction warrants a response. (Bredekamp & Copple 1997, 129)

Inappropriate practices are those in which

Teachers spend a great deal of time punishing unacceptable behavior, demeaning children who misbehave, repeatedly putting the same children who misbehave in timeout or some other punishment unrelated to the action Teachers do not set clear limits and do not hold children accountable to standards of acceptable behavior. The environment is chaotic, and teachers do not help children set and learn important rules of group behavior and responsibility. (Bredekamp & Copple 1997, 129)

At both the preprimary and primary-grade levels, these NAEYC documents illustrate the ambiguous distinction between conventional discipline techniques and

the use of punishment (Bredekamp & Copple 1997). In fact, a growing number of early childhood professionals have become dissatisfied in recent years with the very term "discipline" (MnNAEYC 1991; Reynolds 1996). The reason is that teachers have a hard time telling where discipline ends and punishment begins. Other educators argue that discipline is a "neutral" term and does not have to mean punishment (Marion 1995). However, when most teachers use discipline, they tend to include acts of punishment; they mix up discipline and punishment out of anger or because they feel the child "deserves it." The very idea of "disciplining" a child suggests punishment, illustrating the easy semantic slide of the one into the other.

Teachers who go beyond discipline do so because of the baggage of punishment that discipline carries. These teachers reject punishment for what it is by definition: the infliction of "pain, loss, or suffering for a crime or wrongdoing."

For many years educators and psychologists have recognized the harmful effects of punishment on children (Dewey [1900] 1969; Piaget [1932] 1960; Montessori 1964; Slaby et al. 1995). Some of the effects of punishment are

- low self-esteem (feeling like a "failure"),
- negative self-concept (not liking one's self),
- angry feelings (sometimes under the surface) toward others, and
- a feeling of disengagement from school and the learning process.

A teacher who uses guidance knows that children learn little when the words they frequently hear are "Don't do that" or "You're naughty" or "You know better than that." When discipline includes punishment, young children have difficulty understanding how to improve their behavior

The ideas in this article are not new, but many teachers are not yet putting them into practice.

(Greenberg 1988). Instead of being shamed into "being good," they are likely to internalize the negative personal message that punishment carries (Gartrell 1995).

Experts now recognize that through punishment children lose their trust in adults (Clewett 1988; Slaby et al. 1995). Over time young people come to accept doing negative things and being punished for them as a natural part of life. By contrast, the increasing use of conflict management (teaching children to solve their problems with words) fosters children's faith in social processes. Conflict management and other guidance methods are being used more now because they work better than punishment (Carlsson-Paige & Levin 1992). These methods teach children how to solve problems without violence and help children to feel good about themselves, the class, and the teacher (Levin 1994). Young children need to learn how to know better and do better. The guidance approach is positive teaching, with the teacher having faith in the young child's ability to learn (Marion 1995).

Guidance: What it isn't

The term "discipline" remains in wide use at the elementary, middle-school, and secondary levels. Whether educators embrace the term "guidance" or attach a positive qualifier to "discipline," new notions about classroom management can be expected that claim the use of guidance principles. With the never-ending parade of new information, it is important for us to recognize what guidance is not—so as to better understand what it is.

Five misunderstandings about guidance

1. Guidance is *not* just reacting to problems.

Many problems are caused when a teacher uses practices that are not appropriate for the age, stage, and needs of the individual child. Long group times, for instance, cause young children to become bored and restless. (They will sit in large groups more easily when they are older.) The teacher changes practices—such as reducing the number and length of group activities—to reduce the need for misbehaviors. Changes to other parts of the education program—including room layout, daily schedule, and adult-to-child ratios—also help reduce the need for misbehavior. Guidance prevents problems; it does not just react to them.

2. Guidance does *not* mean that the program won't be educational.

When activities are developmentally appropriate, *all* children succeed at them, and *all* children are learning to be successful students. The Three Rs are a part of the education program, but they are integrated into the rest of the day and made meaningful so that children want to learn. This "basic" of Progressive Education, the parent of what we now call developmentally appropriate practice, is well explained in the original and revised editions of *Developmentally Appropriate Practice in Early Childhood Programs* and both volumes of *Reaching Potentials* (Bredekamp 1987; Bredekamp and Rosegrant 1992, 1995; Bredekamp & Copple 1997). When

teachers use guidance, however, the Three Rs are not all there is.

The importance of guidance, according to Lillian Katz, means that the teacher makes *relationships* the first *R* (cited in Kantrowitz & Wingert 1989). The social skills that are learned through positive relationships come first in the education program. Children need to know how to relate with others in all parts of their lives. Beginning to learn social skills in early childhood will help children in their years of school and in adult life (Wittmer & Honig 1994). (Social skills, after all, are really social studies skills and language arts skills.)

3. Guidance is *not* a "sometimes thing."

Some teachers think that it is natural to use "guidance" in one set of circumstances and "discipline" in another. Yet nonpunitive guidance techniques exist for all situations and, once learned, are effective (Carlsson-Paige & Levin 1992; Reynolds 1996). For example, a common discipline technique is the time-out chair, but the time-out chair usually embarrasses the child, seldom teaches a positive lesson, and is almost always punishment (Clewett 1988). The teacher can cut down on the use of this punishment by reducing the need for mistaken behavior and helping children to use words to solve their problems.

If a child does lose control and needs to be removed, the teacher can stay with the child for a cooling-down time. The teacher then talks with the child about how the other child felt, helps the child find a way to help the other child feel better (make restitution), and teaches a positive alternative for next time. Guidance encompasses a full spectrum of methods, from prevention to conflict resolution to crisis intervention to long-term management strategies.

Teamwork with parents and other adults is frequently part of the overall approach.

4. Guidance is *not* permissive discipline.

Teachers who use guidance are active leaders who do not let situations get out of hand. They do not make children struggle with boundaries that may not be there (Gartrell 1995). Guidance teachers tend to rely on guidelines—positive statements that remind children of classroom conduct—rather than rules which are usually stated in the negative, as though the adult expects the child to break them. When they intervene, teachers direct their responses to the behavior and respect the personality of the child (Ginott 1972). They avoid embarrassment, which tends to leave lasting emotional scars. They make sure that their responses are friendly as well as firm.

The objective is to teach children to solve problems rather than to punish children for having problems they cannot solve. The outcomes of guidance—the ability to get along with others, solve problems using words, express strong feelings in acceptable ways—are the goals for citizens of a democratic society. For this reason, guidance has a meaning that goes beyond traditional discipline. Guidance is not just keeping children in line; it is actively teaching them skills they will need for their entire lives (Wittmer & Honig 1994).

5. Guidance is *not* reducible to a commercial program.

The guidance tradition is part of the child-sensitive educational practice of the last two decades. Guidance is part of the movement toward developmentally appropriate and culturally responsive

The objective is to teach children to solve problems rather than to punish children for having problems they cannot solve. The outcomes of guidance—the ability to get along with others, solve problems using words, express strong feelings in acceptable ways—are the goals for citizens of a democratic society.

education. Teachers who use guidance rely on a teaching team (adults in the classroom working together) and positive parent-teacher relations. Guidance involves more than a workshop or a program on paper; it requires reflective commitment by the teacher, teamwork by the staff, and cooperation with families and the community.

is practiced here." Six key guidance practices follow. When they are evident in a classroom, the teacher is using guidance.

1. The teacher realizes that social skills are complicated and take into adulthood to fully learn.

In the process of learning social skills, children—like all of us—make mistakes. That's why behaviors traditionally considered to be "misbehaviors" are regarded as "mistaken behaviors" (Gartrell 1987a, b; 1995). The teacher believes in the positive potential of each child. He recognizes that mistaken behaviors are caused by inexperience in social situations, the influence of others on the child, or by deep, unmet physical or emotional needs. Understanding why

children show mistaken behavior permits the teacher to teach social skills with a minimum of moral judgment about the child. He takes the attitude that "we all make mistakes; we just need to learn from them."

The teacher shows this understanding even when the children demonstrate "strong-needs" (serious) mistaken behavior (Gartrell 1987b, 1995). Such children are



© Blakely Pettridge Bundy

One-on-one guidance works better than scolding.

Six key guidance practices

Teachers who use guidance have classrooms that are encouraging places to be in. In the words of one teacher, when guidance is present, children want to come to school even when they are sick. Both children and adults feel welcome in guidance classrooms. An informed observer who visits such a classroom quickly sees that "guidance

sometimes regarded as "bad" children, but the teacher using guidance knows that they are children with bad problems that they cannot solve on their own. In working with strong-needs mistaken behavior, the teacher takes a comprehensive approach. He seeks to understand the problem, modifies the child's program to reduce crises, intervenes consistently but nonpunitively, builds the relationship with the child, involves the parents, teams with staff and other professionals, and develops, implements, and monitors a long-term plan.

2. The teacher reduces the need for mistaken behavior.

One major cause of mistaken behavior is a poor match between the child and the educational program (the program expects either too much or too little from the child). The teacher improves the match by using teaching practices that are developmentally appropriate and culturally sensitive (Bredekamp 1987; Bredekamp & Copple 1997). She reduces wait times by offering many activities in learning centers and small groups. She gives children choices so they can work at their own levels in activities. To avoid problems, she anticipates when particular children will need support and encouragement. She changes activities, adjusts the schedule, and modifies the room arrangement as circumstances warrant. She uses adults in the classroom to increase individual attention and expand opportunities for positive adult-child attachments. When children's development, learning styles, and family backgrounds become the main priorities of a program, children become positively involved and feel less need to show mistaken behavior.

3. The teacher practices positive teacher-child relations.

The teacher works to accept each child as a welcome member of the class (Warren 1977). To prevent embarrassment and unnecessary competition, the teacher avoids singling out children either for criticism or praise. Instead, she uses private feedback with the individual and group-focused encouragement with the class (Hitz & Driscoll 1988).

Even if children are preschoolers, the teacher holds class meetings both for regular business and for problems that arise (Brewer 1992). The teacher relies more on guidelines—positive statements of expected behaviors—than on rules with negative wording and implied threats. She models and teaches cooperation and empathy-building skills. She models and teaches acceptance of children who might be singled out negatively for physical, cultural, or behavioral reasons. She teaches that differing human qualities and circumstances are natural, to be appreciated and learned from. She understands that children who feel accepted in the classroom have less need to show mistaken behavior.

4. The teacher uses intervention methods that are solution oriented.

The teacher creates an environment in which problems can be solved peaceably (Levin 1994). He intervenes by modeling and teaching conflict management—initially using high-level mediation and continually encouraging the children to negotiate for themselves. He avoids public embarrassment and rarely uses removal (redirection and cooling-down times) or physical restraint, and then only as methods of last resort. After intervention, the teacher assists the child with regaining composure, under-

standing the other's feelings, learning more acceptable behaviors, and making amends and reconciling with the other child or group.

The teacher recognizes that, at times, he too shows human frailties. The teacher works at monitoring and managing his own feelings. The teacher learns even as he teaches. As a developing professional, the teacher models the effort to learn from mistakes.

5. The teacher builds partnerships with parents.

The teacher recognizes that mistaken behavior occurs less often when parents and teachers work together. The teacher also recognizes that being a parent is a difficult job and that many parents, for personal and cultural reasons, feel uncomfortable meeting with educators (Gestwicki 1992). The teacher starts building partnerships at the beginning of the year. Through positive notes home, phone calls, visits, meetings, and conferences, she builds relationships. It is her job to build partnerships even with hard-to-reach parents. When the invitations are sincere, many parents gradually do become involved.

6. The teacher uses teamwork with adults.

The teacher recognizes that it is a myth that she can handle all situations alone. She creates a teaching team of fellow staff and volunteers (especially parents), who work together in the classroom. She understands that children gain trust in their world when they see adults of differing backgrounds working together. When there is serious mistaken behavior, the teacher meets with parents and other adults to develop and use a coordinated plan. Through coordinated assistance, children can be helped to overcome serious problems and build self-esteem and social skills. The teacher knows that

effective communication among adults builds a bridge between school and community. Though working together, teachers accomplish what they cannot do alone.

* * *

In summary, guidance goes beyond the traditional goal of classroom discipline: enforcing children's compliance to the teacher's will. On a day-to-day basis in the classroom, guidance teaches children the life skills they need as citizens of a democracy. Teachers encourage children to take pride in their developing personalities and cultural identities. Guidance teaches children to view differing human qualities as sources of affirmation and learning.

Guidance involves creating a successful learning environment for each child. The teacher plans and implements an educational program that is developmentally appropriate and culturally responsive. She serves as leader of a classroom community and helps all children to find a place and to learn. The teacher uses nonpunitive intervention techniques, in firm but friendly ways, to establish guidelines and guide children's behavior. She uses conflict resolution as a regular and important tool.

The guidance approach involves teamwork on the part of adults, especially in the face of serious mistaken behavior. Guidance links together teacher, parent, and child on a single team. Success in the use of guidance is measured not in test scores or "obedient" classes but in positive attitudes in the classroom community toward living and learning.

References

- Bredenkamp, S., ed. 1987. *Developmentally appropriate practice in early childhood programs serving children from birth through age 8*. Exp. ed. Washington, DC: NAEYC.
- Bredenkamp, S., & C. Copple, eds. 1997. *Developmentally appropriate practice in early childhood programs*. Rev. ed. Washington, DC: NAEYC.
- Bredenkamp, S., & T. Rosegrant, eds. 1992. *Reaching potentials: Appropriate curriculum and assessment for young children—volume 1*. Washington, DC: NAEYC.
- Bredenkamp, S., & T. Rosegrant, eds. 1995. *Reaching potentials: Transforming early childhood curriculum and assessment—volume 2*. Washington, DC: NAEYC.
- Brewer, J.A. 1992. Where does it all begin? Teaching the principles of democracy in the early years. *Young Children* 47 (3): 51–53.
- Carlsson-Paige, N., & D.E. Levin. 1992. Making peace in violent times: A constructivist approach to conflict resolution. *Young Children* 48 (1): 4–13.*
- Clewett, A.S. 1988. Guidance and discipline: Teaching young children appropriate behavior. *Young Children* 43 (4): 22–36.*
- Curwin, R.L., & A.N. Mendler. 1988. *Discipline with dignity*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Dewey, J. [1900] 1969. *The school and society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dreikurs, R. 1968. *Psychology in the classroom*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Gartrell, D.J. 1987a. Assertive discipline: Unhealthy for children and other living things. *Young Children* 42 (2): 10–11.
- Gartrell, D.J. 1987b. Punishment or guidance. *Young Children* 42 (3): 55–61.
- Gartrell, D.J. 1995. Misbehavior or mistaken behavior? *Young Children* 50 (5): 27–34.
- Gestwicki, C. 1992. *Home, school and community relations*. Albany, NY: Delmar.
- Ginott, H. 1972. *Teacher and child*. New York: Avon.
- Greenberg, P. 1988. Avoiding 'me against you' discipline. *Young Children* 43 (1): 24–25.*
- Hamacheck, D.E. 1971. *Encounters with the self*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Hitz, R. 1988. Viewpoint. Assertive discipline: A response to Lee Canter. *Young Children* 43 (2): 25–26.
- Hitz, R., & A. Driscoll. 1988. Praise or encouragement? New insights into praise: Implications for early childhood teachers. *Young Children* 43 (4): 6–13.
- Hymes, J.L. 1949. *Discipline*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Columbia University.
- Hymes, J.L. 1953. *Effective home-school relations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hymes, J.L. 1955. *Behavior and misbehavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Janke, A.J., & J. Penshorn Peterson. 1995. *Peacemaker's A.B.C.s for young children*. S. Marine on St. Croix, MN: Growing Communities for Peace.*
- Kamil, C. 1984. Autonomy: The aim of education envisioned by Piaget. *Phi Delta Kappan* 65 (6): 410–15.
- Kantrowitz, B., & P. Wingert. 1989. How kids learn. *Newsweek*. 17 July, 50–56.
- Levin, D.E. 1994. *Teaching young children in violent times*. Cambridge, MA: Educators for Social Responsibility.
- Lilley, I.M., ed. 1967. *Friedrich Froebel: A selection from his writings*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Marion, M. 1995. *Guidance of young children*. 5th ed. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Minnesota Association for the Education of Young Children (MNAEYC). 1991. *Developmentally appropriate guidance of children birth to eight*. Rev. ed. St. Paul: Author.
- Montessori, M. 1964. *The Montessori method*. New York: Schocken.
- Osborn, D.K. 1980. *Early childhood education in historical perspective*. Athens, GA: Education Associates.
- Piaget, J. [1932] 1960. *The moral judgment of the child*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Read, K.H. [1950] 1993. *Early childhood programs: Human relations and learning*. 9th ed. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace.
- Reynolds, E. 1996. *Guiding young children: A child-centered approach*. 2d ed. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.
- Slaby, R.G., W.C. Roedell, D. Arezzo, & K. Hendrix. 1995. *Early violence prevention: Tools for teachers of young children*. Washington, DC: NAEYC.
- Standing, E.M. 1962. *Maria Montessori: Her life and work*. New York: New American Library.
- Stone, J.G. 1978. *A guide to discipline*. Rev. ed. Washington, DC: NAEYC.
- Warren, R.M. 1977. *Caring: Supporting children's growth*. Washington, DC: NAEYC.
- Wichert, S. 1989. *Keeping the peace: Practicing cooperation and conflict resolution with preschoolers*. Philadelphia: New Society.*
- Wittmer, D.S., & A.S. Honig. 1994. Encouraging positive social development in young children. *Young Children* 49 (5): 61–75.*

For further reading

- Gartrell, D.J. 1994. *A guidance approach to discipline*. Albany, NY: Delmar.
- Greenberg, P. 1990. Ideas that work with young children. Why not academic preschool? (Part 1). *Young Children* 45 (2): 70–80.
- Greenberg, P. 1992. Why not academic preschool? (Part 2) Autocracy or democracy in the classroom? *Young Children* 47 (3): 54–64.
- Greenberg, P. 1992. Ideas that work with young children. How to institute some simple democratic practices pertaining to respect, rights, roots, and responsibilities in any classroom (Without losing your leadership position). *Young Children* 47 (5): 10–17.
- Hendrick, J. 1992. Where does it all begin? Teaching the principles of democracy in the early years. *Young Children* 47 (3): 51–64.

Copyright © 1997 by Daniel J. Gartrell, Ed-
Art 327, Bemidji State University, Bemidji,
MN 56601. See inside front cover for infor-
mation on rights and permissions. [Volume
52, Number 6]

* Recommended reading.