

An Exploration of the Impact of School Discipline on Student Achievement

¹Shanda Young-Gnintendem

²Aarek Farmer

Abstract

This study examined the effect of specific disciplinary actions such as in-school suspensions, out-of-school suspensions, and expulsion on student achievement in public high schools. School discipline data from 1291 students educated within a school district in Tennessee were obtained and analyzed against Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System data. Specifically, language arts and math end-of-course exam scores of students who received a disciplinary action were used to conduct a comparative analysis of individual students' discipline and their achievement. Findings showed a statistically significant difference in the achievement of students who were and were not assigned some type of disciplinary action. Furthermore, findings showed no statistically significant difference in the academic achievement of students who were assigned in-school suspension, out-of-school suspension, and expulsion regarding the type of disciplinary action received.

Keywords: *School Discipline, Student Achievement, Disciplinary Actions*

¹Shanda Young-Gnintendem, EdD, Principal, Shelby County Schools, Memphis, TN

Email: YOUNGSL@scsk12.org

²Aarek Farmer, EdD, Academic Coordinator, Freed-Hardeman University, Memphis, TN

Email: afarmer@fhu.edu

Recommended Citation: *Young-Gnintendem, S., Farmer, A. (2023). An Exploration of the Impact of School Discipline on Student Achievement, Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, 7(2)*

An Exploration of the Impact of School Discipline on Student Achievement

Introduction

School policy makers, administrators, and teachers play an intricate role in structuring and maintaining a safe environment where children have the potential to become well-rounded adults in society. Research on school climate (Aggarwal et al., 2021; Fishbaugh et al., 2003; La Salle et al., 2021) concurred that creating a school culture that includes student safety is an essential element of effective schools. In June 1999, immediate awareness of the importance of school safety and procedures spread across the nation after the vicious attack at Columbine High School. The call for action prompted the United States Secret Service and United States Department of Education to launch the Safe Schools Initiative. The initiative was designed to help facilitate learning in schools through equipping students, faculty, and staff on ways to maintain a safe environment (Vossekuil et al., 2002). Recent research into school safety (Bennett, 2015) found there were no certain characteristics that led students to engage in such behaviors; however, there were some common traits that existed among those committing the violent acts. They also stated that being proactive in examining the thinking and planning of such behaviors helps to foster a safe learning environment (Bennett, 2015).

According to Baker (1985), a school environment that is safe and conducive to learning will fundamentally improve the quality of the school and afford students with an opportunity to succeed. More recent research that focused on the broader issue of school climate in general, rather than school safety, indicates that school climate is strongly associated with student achievement (Anderson, 2017; Pounder, 2014; Yang, 2014;). School climate is generally conceptualized as the quality of interpersonal relationships and interactions among students and school personnel (Crichlow-Ball & Cornell, 2021). La Salle et al. (2021) asserted that the association between school climate and student achievement is relatively straightforward. A positive school climate is associated with increased academic achievement. Conversely, negative school climates have been shown to be negatively associated with student academic achievement (VanLone et al., 2019). Similarly, negative school climates have been shown to increase the likelihood of engaging in risky behavior and peer victimization (Wormington et al., 2016).

While school climate is relative to student achievement, there are additional factors that impact student achievement. Coleman et al. (1966) was one of the first studies authorized by federal funds to identify family background as one of the factors that affects student achievement. However, Egalite (2016) demonstrated that there was an achievement gap by socioeconomic status (SES) in the U.S educational system, and Hanushek et al. (2019) reported that the gap still remained. According to Hanushek et al. (2019), the SES achievement gap between the bottom (90th) and the top (10th) deciles, which was labeled the 90-10 gap, showed a very wide achievement gap between the two groups. The gap between the bottom quartile (75th) and the top quartile (25th) was somewhat smaller at 0.8 standard deviations. They referred to this as the 75-25 gap. To put these sizable disparities in perspective, the researchers asserted that the 1 standard deviation difference

between the cohorts is approximately equal to the difference in the average academic performance of students in the 4th and 8th grades. That is four years' worth of learning.

Regarding race and achievement, Henry et al. (2020) and Hanushek et al. (2019) found that the Black-White gap in academic achievement narrowed at higher income levels. In fact, Black children's skills grew slightly faster at the kindergarten and primary grade levels. However, by middle school, the Black-White gap began to widen.

When students of any race are disciplined at school, whether it be in-school suspension, out of school suspension or expulsion, Rafa (2019) defined it as exclusionary discipline. According to Rafa (2019) and Allman and Slate (2012), such forms of discipline require a student's removal from the normal educational setting. In addition, Bell and Puckett (2020) agreed with Allman and Slate (2012) that when students are removed from a standard classroom environment, there is a decline in opportunities for learning and academic success. Likewise, Gregory et al. (2017) suggested that suspension from school can reduce instructional time and impede academic progress for students who may already be lagging in their achievement. Hence, the examination of these disciplinary actions and their impact on student achievement should be explored

Method

Research Design

The purpose of this quantitative study was to investigate the relationship between school discipline and student achievement. Ryan and Kallio (2021) argued that the focus of school discipline is to foster a learning environment that allows students to learn in a safe environment. Moreover, uncontrolled classrooms tend to lead to lower academic achievement for students. This quantitative research design was conducted within a convenient sample high schools in Tennessee and selected due to their similar demographics and disciplinary rates. Discipline data were retrieved from student disciplinary reports provided by the district. Academic achievement scores in language arts and math were retrieved from the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS). The data were used to determine whether there were correlations between student achievement scores and disciplinary action(s) (i.e., in-school suspensions, out of school suspensions, and expulsions). No qualitative data was collected, thus opinions, thoughts, and/or behavior of the individual students was not utilized. Specifically End of Course exam scores and disciplinary actions were analyzed to provide an opportunity for analysis of randomly selected students within demographically similar schools with ISS, OSS, and EXP discipline.

The independent variables for this study included the type of disciplinary actions received by the students (i.e., ISS, OSS, and EXP). Comparative analyses of the underlying factors in the independent variable that were examined included students' grade level, gender, ethnicity, disability type, and socio-economic status. Table 1 shows how the variables were coded.

Table 1
Coding for Research Variables

Variables	Coding
Gender	Male=1 Female=2
Grade	9 th =1 10 th =2 11 th =3 12 th =4
Race	Black=1 White=2 Hispanic=3 Asian=4 Other=5
Economically Disadvantaged	No=1 Yes=2
Students with Disabilities	No=1 Yes=2
Discipline Codes	No discipline=0 ISS=1 OSS=2 Exp.=3 Meeting=4 Other=5
Any infraction	No=1 Yes=2
Discipline Distribution	No discipline=0 ISS only=1 ISS and OSS=2 OSS only=3 ISS and Exp.=4 OSS and Exp.=5 Exp.=6 ISS, OSS, & Exp.=7
Academic achievement	Below Basic=1 Basic=2 Proficient=3 Advanced=4

Assessment scores, which served as the dependent variable, were retrieved from the Tennessee Department of Education TVAAS reports. The Tennessee State Board of Education states, “value-added assessment is one means recognized by the state of Tennessee for assessing progress toward the academic goals set forth in the plan and the Education Improvement Act” (Sanders & Horn, 1994). The TVAAS focuses on third-eighth grades using the Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program (TCAP) and ninth-twelfth grades uses the End of Course Assessment (EOC) to measure a student’s overall comprehension according to the tested subject matter. In this study, student achievement from EOC exams, including Algebra I, Algebra II, English I, English II, and English III was analyzed. A similar study conducted by Freeman et al. (2019) used cumulative grade point average, college and career readiness, and predictor of post-school outcomes to identify a correlation between school disciplinary types and its effect on academic achievement.

Research Sample

A school district in Tennessee granted approval for existing data from participants to be analyzed. The district serviced approximately 150,149 students daily within 271 schools. Existing data, which included achievement scores and discipline data, were retrieved from the district. The sample ($N = 1,291$) consisted of 639 males (49.5%) and 606 females (46.9%). Of the 1,291 students, there were 249 ninth graders, 280 tenth graders, 245 eleventh graders, and 236 twelfth graders. The number of students according to race included: 1,137 Blacks, 43 Whites, 59 Hispanics, four Asians, and two listed as other. Of these students, 1,082 students were listed as economically disadvantaged, while 163 were not economically disadvantaged. There were 1,202 students listed as general education, while 43 were listed as students with disabilities. There were 384 cases of ISS, 1,233 cases of OSS, and 90 cases of EXP, which totaled 1,707 disciplinary actions assigned. Table 2 provides the mean and standard deviation of descriptive analysis of the sample population. Table 3 and provides a breakdown of the demographics of the sample population.

Table 2
Mean and Standard Deviation of Descriptive Analysis

	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Gender	1245	1.487	.5000
Race	1245	1.145	.5077
Economically Disadvantaged	1245	1.869	.3375
Students with Disabilities	1245	1.035	.1827
Grade	1245	1.998	1.3826
Offenses	1245	2.0006	2.3951

Table 3
Sample Demographics

		<i>n</i>	%
Gender	Male	639	49.5
	Female	606	46.9
	Missing system	46	3.6
	Total	1291	100.0
Grade	9	249	24.7
	10	280	27.7
	11	245	24.3
	12	236	23.4
	Missing system	281	27.8
	Total	1010	100.0
Race	Black	1137	88.1
	White	43	3.3
	Hispanic	59	4.6
	Asian	4	.3
	Other	2	.2
	Missing system	46	3.6
	Total	1291	100.0
Economically Disadvantaged	No	163	12.6
	Yes	1082	83.8
	Missing system	46	3.6
	Total	1291	100.0
Students with Disabilities	No	1202	93.1
	Yes	43	3.3
	Missing system	46	3.6
	Total	1291	100.0

Research Instrument and Procedures

IRB approval was first granted. The participating school district then provided all discipline data and TVAAS data used in the study. The study focused on selected students with no more than 12 disciplinary offenses that resulted in disciplinary actions to maintain the validity of the sample population being studied. The results of the student language arts and math scores from the provided data for the dependent variable. The data were safe guarded by a password-protected database. Anonymity of the participants was maintained by coding the students to remove student names and any identifiable characteristics of the students and/or their school. A letter of consent

was kept on file from the school district's Planning and Accountability Department. Any printed information was stored in a coded file folder and placed in a locked cabinet.

TVAAS was designed to help measure students' understanding of a particular content area of study. The assessment was designed with "criterion-referenced" questions used to measure student performance against specific standards covered in classroom curriculum across the state of Tennessee. This statistical model overarching approach analyzes the academic assessments that measures students' learning growth and teaching effectiveness. Kurtz (2018) states that value-added models, such as TVAAS, refer to a broad class of linear models that utilizes fixed or random effects that show classroom contribution to students' academic performance. TVAAS was the means by which the district measure math and language arts end of the year achievement. The student achievement data, TVAAS, is based on the students' previous years of performance data. This enables the educational entity to avoid misclassification in value-added analysis. In addition, the statistical models have been validated and vetted by various experts in multiple publications, such as McCaffrey et al. (2008).

Data Analysis and Process

Data analyses were conducted by using frequency distributions and an analysis of variance (ANOVA). An ANOVA was used to identify whether there was a significant difference across the groups of students based on the type of disciplinary actions they had received.

Findings

The research question explored if a statistically significant difference existed in the academic achievement of students who were assigned ISS, OSS, and EXP or who had no disciplinary action. An ANOVA was performed to determine a statistically significant difference in the discipline types and student achievement. The factors included the end-of-course (EOC) exam placement score and discipline distribution. The difference in the placement score results yield support of the alternate hypothesis. There was a difference between the academic achievement of students assigned ISS, OSS, and EXP and those who have no disciplinary actions.

Algebra I EOC (Year 1)

A 2-way ANOVA was used to test the effect of school discipline on student achievement on the Algebra I EOC in Year 1. There were 246 students who took the Algebra I EOC. Of those, 69 students had no infraction, and 177 students had an infraction(s). Findings showed that there was a significant difference in the Algebra I EOC scores ($p = .00 < .05$). There was no significant difference ($p = .772 > .05$) in the discipline distribution. There was no interaction between Algebra I EOC and discipline distribution ($p = .980 > .05$). This suggested that the 69 students with no infractions scored higher on the Algebra I EOC as compared to those with infractions. Table 4 provides a summary of the Algebra I EOC and discipline distribution and Table 5 provides Algebra I data results.

Table 4
Summary of Algebra I and Discipline Distribution

Variable	Discipline Code	<i>n</i>
Algebra I (Year 1)	Below basic	85
	Basic	93
	Proficient	43
	Advanced	25
Discipline Distribution	No discipline	69
	ISS only	24
	ISS and OSS	46
	OSS only	80
	ISS and EXP	1
	OSS and EXP	12
	EXP	1
	ISS, OSS, and EXP	13

Table 5
2-way ANOVA Algebra I (Year 1)

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	Sig.
Corrected Model	944776.134 ^a	25	37791.045	35.114	.000
Intercept	24731042.751	1	24731042.751	22979.076	.000
Discipline Distribution Coded	4370.419	7	624.346	.580	.772
Algebra I (Year 1)	611278.665	3	203759.555	189.325	.000
Discipline Distribution Coded Algebra I (Year 1)	6333.308	15	422.221	.392	.980
Error	236773.203	220	1076.242		
Total	111379251.000	246			
Corrected Total	1181549.337	245			

Note. R Squared = .800 (Adjusted R Squared = .777); Algebra I (Year 1) = Algebra I EOC; and DispDistcoded = discipline distribution code.

Algebra II EOC (Year 1)

An ANOVA was used to test the effect of school discipline on student achievement in the Algebra II EOC (Year 1). There were 214 students who took the Algebra II EOC. Of those, 66 students had no infraction, and 148 students had an infraction(s). Findings showed that there was a significant difference in the Algebra II EOC scores ($p = .00 < .05$). There was no significant difference ($p = .688 > .05$) in the discipline distribution. There was no interaction between Algebra II EOC and discipline distribution ($p = .887 > .05$). This suggested that the 66 students with no infractions scored higher on the Algebra II EOC as compared to those with infractions. Table 6 provides a

summary of the Algebra II EOC and discipline distribution, and Table 7 provides Algebra II data results.

Table 6
Summary of Algebra II and Discipline Distribution

Variable	Discipline Code	<i>n</i>
Algebra II (Year 1)	Below basic	152
	Basic	53
	Proficient	8
	Advanced	1
Discipline Distribution	No discipline	66
	ISS only	13
	ISS and OSS	41
	OSS	82
	ISS and EXP	4
	OSS and EXP	4
	ISS, OSS, and EXP	4

Table 7
2-way ANOVA Algebra II EOC (Year 1)

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	533754.880 ^a	17	31397.346	10.201	.000
Intercept	10449187.717	1	10449187.717	3395.021	.000
Discipline distribution code	12053.922	6	2008.987	.653	.688
English I (Year 1)	261942.519	3	87314.173	28.369	.000
Discipline distribution code	11189.876	8	1398.734	.454	.887
English I (Year 1)	603248.354	196	3077.789		
Error	87488124.000	214			
Total	1137003.234	213			
Corrected Total					

Note. R Squared = .465 (Adjusted R Squared = .423); Algebra II I (Year 1) = Algebra II EOC; and DispDistcoded = discipline distribution code.

English I EOC (Year 1)

ANOVA was used to test the effect of school discipline on student achievement in the English I EOC. There were 259 students who took the English I EOC. Of those, 70 students had no infraction, and 189 students had an infraction(s). Findings showed that there was a significant difference in the English I EOC scores ($p = .00 < .05$). There was no significant difference ($p =$

.910 > .05) in the discipline distribution. There was an interaction between English I EOC and discipline distribution ($p = .194 < .05$). This suggested that the 70 students with no infractions scored higher on the English I EOC as compared to those with infractions. Table 8 provides a summary of the English I EOC and discipline distribution, and Table 9 provides English I data results.

Table 8
Summary of English I and Discipline Distribution

Variable	Discipline Code	<i>n</i>
English II (Year 1)	Below basic	65
	Basic	104
	Proficient	83
	Advanced	7
Discipline Distribution	No discipline	70
	ISS only	22
	ISS and OSS	56
	OSS	85
	ISS and EXP	1
	OSS and EXP	13
	EXP	2
	ISS, OSS, EXP	10

Table 9
2-way ANOVA English I EOC (Year 1)

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	534487.825 ^a	22	24294.901	33.095	.000
Intercept	20757447.046	1	20757447.046	28276.325	.000
Discipline distribution code	1984.432	7	283.490	.386	.910
English I (Year 1)	243210.195	3	81070.065	110.436	.000
Discipline distribution code English I (Year 1)	11845.033	12	987.086	1.345	.194
Error	173245.905	236	734.093		
Total	117733855.000	259			
Corrected Total	707733.730	258			

Note. R Squared = .755 (Adjusted R Squared = .732); English I (Year 1) = English I EOC; and DispDistcoded = discipline distribution code.

English II EOC (Year 1)

An ANOVA was used to test the effect of school discipline on student achievement in the English II EOC. There were 239 students who took the English II EOC. Of those, 64 students had no infraction, and 175 students had an infraction(s). Findings showed that there was a significant difference in the English II EOC scores ($p = .00 < .05$). There was no significant difference ($p = .117 > .05$) in the discipline distribution. There was no interaction between English II and discipline distribution ($p = .070 > .05$). This suggested that the 64 students with no infractions scored higher on the English II EOC as compared to those with infractions. Table 10 provides a summary of the English II EOC, any infraction, and discipline distribution, and Table 11 provides English II data results.

Table 10

Summary of English II and Discipline Distribution

Variable	Discipline Code	<i>n</i>
English II (Year 1)	Below basic	60
	Basic	111
	Proficient	67
	Advanced	1
Discipline Distribution	No discipline	64
	ISS only	16
	ISS and OSS	47
	OSS	87
	ISS and EXP	2
	OSS and EXP	12
	EXP	4
	ISS, OSS, EXP	7

Table 11
2-way ANOVA English II EOC (Year 1)

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	418634.541 ^a	21	19934.978	22.650	.000
Intercept	12349471.559	1	12349471.559	14031.283	.000
Discipline Distribution code	10301.905	7	1471.701	1.672	.117
English II (Year 1)	176792.606	3	58930.869	66.956	.000
Discipline Distribution code English II (Year 1)	16663.753	11	1514.887	1.721	.070
Error	190990.045	217	880.138		
Total	108661884.000	239			
Corrected Total	609624.586	238			

Note. R Squared = .687 (Adjusted R Squared = .656); English II (Year 1) = English II EOC; and DispDistCoded = discipline distribution code.

Algebra I EOC (Year 2)

An ANOVA was used to test the effect of school discipline on student achievement in the Algebra I EOC. There were 225 students who took the Algebra I EOC. Of those, 37 students had no infraction, and 188 students had an infraction(s). Findings showed that there was a significant difference in the Algebra I EOC scores ($p = .00 < .05$). There was no significant difference ($p = .997 > .05$) in the discipline distribution. There was no interaction between Algebra I and discipline distribution ($p = .608 > .05$). This suggested that the 37 students with no infractions scored higher on the Algebra I EOC as compared to those with infractions. Table 12 provides a summary of the Algebra I Placement, any infraction, and discipline distribution, and Table 13 provides Algebra I data results.

Table 12
Summary of Algebra I and Discipline Distribution

Variable	Discipline Code	<i>n</i>
Algebra I (Year 2)	Below basic	81
	Basic	79
	Proficient	45
	Advanced	20
Discipline Distribution	No discipline	37
	ISS only	17
	ISS and OSS	52
	OSS	87
	ISS and EXP	1
	OSS and EXP	20
	EXP	2
	ISS, OSS, EXP	9

Table 13
2-way ANOVA Algebra I EOC (Year 2)

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	Sig.
Corrected Model	1085181.249 ^a	25	43407.250	29.057	.000
Intercept	24067994.050	1	24067994.050	16111.304	.000
Discipline Distribution code	1249.152	7	178.450	.119	.997
Algebra I (Year 2)	650763.280	3	216921.093	145.209	.000
Discipline Distribution code	20299.195	15	1353.280	.906	.558
Algebra I (Year 2)					
Error	297277.666	199	1493.858		
Total	100334552.000	225			
Corrected Total	1382458.916	224			

Note. R Squared = .785 (Adjusted R Squared = .758); Algebra I (Year 2) = Algebra I EOC; and DispDistCoded = discipline distribution code.

Algebra II EOC (Year 2)

An ANOVA was used to test the effect of school discipline in the Algebra II EOC. There were 211 students who took the Algebra II EOC. Of those, 47 students had no infraction, and 164 students had an infraction(s). Findings showed that there was a significant difference in the Algebra II EOC scores ($p = .00 < .05$). There was no significant difference ($p = .109 > .05$) in the discipline distribution. There was no interaction between Algebra II and discipline distribution (p

= .970 > .05). This suggested that the 47 students with no infractions scored higher on the Algebra II EOC as compared to those with infractions. Table 14 provides a summary of the Algebra II EOC, any infraction, and discipline distribution, and Table 15 provides Algebra II data results.

Table 14
Summary of Algebra II and Discipline Distribution

Variable	Discipline Code	<i>n</i>
Algebra I (Year 2)	Below basic	112
	Basic	66
	Proficient	30
	Advanced	3
Discipline Distribution	No discipline	47
	ISS only	16
	ISS and OSS	53
	OSS	77
	ISS and EXP	1
	OSS and EXP	12
	EXP	3
	ISS, OSS, EXP	2

Table 15
2-way ANOVA Algebra II EOC (Year 2)

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	Sig.
Corrected Model	732031.142 ^a	21	34858.626	17.106	.000
Intercept	13192940.794	1	13192940.794	6474.119	.000
Discipline	24391.303	7	3484.472	1.710	.109
Distribution code					
Algebra II (Year 2)	269210.977	3	89736.992	44.036	.000
Discipline	8057.065	11	732.460	.359	.970
Distribution code					
Algebra II (Year 2)					
Error	385143.644	189	2037.797		
Total	94124984.000	211			
Corrected Total	1117174.787	210			

Note. R Squared = .655 (Adjusted R Squared = .617); Algebra II (Year 2) = Algebra II EOC; and DispDistCoded = discipline distribution code.

English I EOC (Year 2)

An ANOVA was used to test the effect of school discipline on student achievement in the English I EOC. There were 204 students who took the English I EOC. Of those, 33 students had no infraction, and 171 students had an infraction(s). Findings showed that there was a significant

difference in the English I EOC scores ($p = .00 < .05$). There was no significant difference ($p = .806 > .05$) in the discipline distribution. There was no interaction between English I EOC and discipline distribution ($p = .934 > .05$). This suggested that the 33 students with no infractions scored higher on the English I EOC as compared to those with infractions. Table 16 provides a summary of the English I EOC, any infraction, and discipline distribution, and Table 17 provides English I data results.

Table 16
Summary of English I and Discipline Distribution

Variable	Discipline Code	<i>n</i>
English I (Year 2)	Below basic	44
	Basic	87
	Proficient	70
	Advanced	3
Discipline Distribution	No discipline	33
	ISS only	17
	ISS and OSS	49
	OSS only	75
	ISS and EXP	1
	OSS and EXP	17
	EXP	2
	ISS, OSS, EXP	10

Table 17
2-way ANOVA English I EOC (Year 2)

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	Sig.
Corrected Model	254261.360 ^a	23	11054.842	18.384	.000
Intercept	14257980.317	1	14257980.317	23710.925	.000
Discipline Distribution code	2260.663	7	322.952	.537	.806
English I (Year 2)	105027.974	3	35009.325	58.220	.000
Discipline Distribution code English I (Year 2)	3741.743	13	287.826	.479	.934
Error	108238.562	180	601.325		
Total	94327972.000	204			
Corrected Total	362499.922	203			

Note. R Squared = .701 (Adjusted R Squared = .663); English I (Year 2) = English I EOC; and DispDistCoded = discipline distribution code.

English II EOC (Year 2)

An ANOVA was used to test the effect of school discipline on student achievement in the English II EOC. There were 231 students who took the English II EOC. Of those, 54 students had no infraction, and 177 students had an infraction(s). Findings showed that there was a significant difference in the English II EOC scores ($p = .00 < .05$). There was no significant difference ($p = .193 > .05$) in the discipline distribution. There was no interaction between English II and discipline distribution ($p = .063 > .05$). This suggested that the 54 students with no infractions scored higher on the English II EOC as compared to those with infractions. Table 18 provides a summary of the English II EOC, any infraction, and discipline distribution, and Table 19 provides English II data results.

Table 18

Summary of English II and Discipline Distribution

Variable	Distribution Code	<i>n</i>
English II (Year 2)	Below basic	55
	Basic	107
	Proficient	67
	Advanced	2
Discipline Distribution	No discipline	54
	ISS only	20
	ISS and OSS	56
	OSS only	78
	ISS and EXP	0
	OSS and EXP	14
	EXP	2
ISS, OSS, EXP	7	

Table 19
2-way ANOVA English II EOC (Year 2)

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	356394.219 ^a	19	18757.590	24.748	.000
Intercept	18992958.803	1	18992958.803	25058.047	.000
Discipline Distribution code	6641.894	6	1106.982	1.460	.193
English II (Year 2)	173224.249	3	57741.416	76.180	.000
Discipline Distribution code * English II (Year 2)	13614.710	10	1361.471	1.796	.063
Error	159929.235	211	757.958		
Total	106191378.000	231			
Corrected Total	516323.455	230			

Note. R Squared = .690 (Adjusted R Squared = .662); English II (Year 2) = English II EOC; and DispDistCoded = discipline distribution code.

English III EOC (Year 2)

An ANOVA was used to test the effect of school discipline on student achievement in the English III EOC. There were 197 students who took the English III EOC. Of those, 45 students had no infraction, and 152 students had an infraction(s). Findings showed that there was a significant difference in the English III EOC scores ($p = .00 < .05$). There was no significant difference ($p = .973 > .05$) in the discipline distribution. There was no interaction between English III and discipline distribution ($p = .929 > .05$). This suggested that the 45 students with no infractions scored higher on the English III EOC as compared to those with infractions. Table 20 provides a summary of the English III EOC, any infraction, and discipline distribution, and Table 21 provides English III data results.

Table 20
Summary of English III and Discipline Distribution

Variable	Distribution Code	<i>n</i>
English II (Year 2)	Below basic	93
	Basic	77
	Proficient	25
	Advanced	2
Discipline Distribution	No discipline	45
	ISS only	14
	ISS and OSS	44
	OSS only	75
	ISS and EXP	1
	OSS and EXP	9
	EXP	4
	ISS, OSS, EXP	5

Table 21
2-way ANOVA English III EOC (Year 2)

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	Sig.
Corrected Model	411221.232 ^a	21	19581.963	12.148	.000
Intercept	12926617.787	1	12926617.787	8019.405	.000
Discipline Distribution code	2781.900	7	397.414	.247	.973
English III (Year 2)	161502.346	3	53834.115	33.398	.000
Discipline Distribution code	8026.560	11	729.687	.453	.929
English III (Year 2)	282085.529	175	1611.917		
Error	88834728.000	197			
Total	693306.761	196			
Corrected Total					

Note. R Squared = .593 (Adjusted R Squared = .544), English III (Year 2) = English III EOC; and DispDistCoded = discipline distribution coded.

Discussion, Conclusion, and Recommendations

OSS and EXP are the most severe consequences that a school district can impose on a misbehaving student (American Academy of Pediatrics, 2013). According to this study, ISS, OSS, and EXP impacted the academic achievement scores of students. As found in the present study, whether students are in ISS or OSS, their academic achievement scores are lower than students with no discipline. It is often assumed that placement of students in a different classroom setting (isolated from general student population) would not compromise their learning opportunities. It is perceived that students could come to school and have access to their assignments, etc. However,

often students are placed in ISS with an ISS monitor that has no established expectation and no access to the assigned students' work. Therefore, there is a need to explore and utilize other forms of discipline to ensure that students are not removed from a normal classroom setting and given an opportunity to complete their assignments daily in the hope of minimizing loss of instructional time.

According to Baker (1985), school environments that are conducive to learning will improve the quality of students' ability to learn and succeed. All stakeholders, parents, teachers, and administrators should view discipline in a proactive manner. In many countries, the parent plays an active role in their child's education, as well as serves as the first line of defense. Therefore, it is important for schools to establish a close relationship with the parent or guardian to ensure an understanding that misbehavior is not tolerated in school (Mayfield & Garrison-Wade, 2015; Canter, 1976; Baron, 1992; Haroun & O'Hanlon, 1997). Parents should be called, parent conferences should be held, and a plan of action should be developed to ensure there is change in the student's negative behavior.

Teachers should also be required to establish rules and procedures in the classroom. Classroom management is essential in maintaining an environment where students can be successful. Providing teachers with the tools and methods necessary to maintain their classrooms is essential for developing and maintaining an environment where learning can take place. Teachers and administrators should also strive to understand the cultural background of the students being taught within the school building (Baron, 1992; Mayfield & Garrison-Wade, 2015).

Administrators should be observant of the effectiveness of the disciplinary action given. It is important to identify whether the discipline is changing the student's behavior from a negative behavior to a more desired behavior. Administrators should also know and understand the policies established by the school board. There should be consistency amongst all students when distributing discipline (Losen, 2011b; Skiba & Losen, 2010; Smith & Harper, 2015).

It is important to introduce programs that prepare educators to use alternative approaches to discipline through curricula and skill-building experiences. If the ISS program is going to be productive, students should continue to be taught through tutorial and/or by specific subject. The ISS instructor must be able to support the students as they work on assignments and incorporate character building (Kemerer & Walsh, 2000; Hochman & Worner, 1987).

Findings from this study are consistent with previous literature pertaining to how school discipline impacts student achievement. Bell and Puckett (2020) suggested that when students are removed from a normal classroom setting, there is opportunity for a decline in learning. This study aimed to identify which disciplinary measures had the greatest impacted academic achievement. The findings concluded that regardless of the type of disciplinary action (ISS, OSS, and EXP), students who are not in the classroom learning experience lower achievement on end-of-course exams. According to the data, roughly 68.7% of the students received a disciplinary action that required removal from a normal classroom setting. The achievement scores of these students showed that

there were significantly lower achievement scores compared to students with no disciplinary action. Given the data, the following recommendations should be considered in order to reduce the number of students being removed from the classroom setting due to misbehavior.

Prior and Tuller (1991) shared evidence that viewed ISS as more of a positive measure than negative measure compared to OSS. However, the researcher's findings showed that regardless of the type of discipline the academic achievement was lower compared to students with no disciplinary actions. Rausch and Skiba (2005) stated that the consequence of school removal may risk a student's opportunity to learn, especially those with relatively high disciplinary rates. Allman and Slate (2011) argued that when students are removed from the normal classroom settings, they may not be allowed or have the opportunity to ask questions about content or receive instructional support. Therefore, the researcher recommends that students assigned ISS and OSS be able to continue to learn in an environment that models a traditional classroom setting. Students should be able to receive supports from a certified teacher in-person or virtually. For example, every teacher that has a student in ISS would be expected to go to the in-school suspension room to provide guidance and assistance during a portion of their planning period. This would ensure that the student is able to learn the objective covered in class and complete all related activities effectively. Similarly, students assigned to OSS should have access to a virtual platform that enables them to be exposed to the objectives and skills being taught in class with tutorial practice modules embedded throughout the lesson.

According to Eggleton (2001) and Scelso (2013), it is important that students have consequences that are more effective and supportive of positive outcomes. In addition, James (2013) concluded that students believed that discipline should be consistent and fair with a progressive approach. Therefore, the researcher recommends Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS). PBIS is a school-wide initiative used to promote a safe and orderly environment in which student learning can take place (Goodman-Scott, 2014). It is an innovative approach to better support students that are at risk of academic failure and dropout/expulsion (Ryoo & Hong, 2011). PBIS is comparable to Canter's theory, Canter's Assertive Behavior Model. Canter and Canter (1976) suggested that teachers establish rules and routines, address behavior with positive and negative consequences, and focus on building relationships with students. In many schools, successful PBIS initiatives are run by school counselors and supported by leadership. It is important that leadership fully invest in the initiative through implementation practices and linking practices that also aid in effective decision-making (Cressery et al., 2015; Mathur & Nelson, 2013). In addition, Freeman et al. (2019) suggest that leadership should view positive academic outcomes by measuring not only PBIS effectiveness, but also attendance and behavioral variables.

According to Mas-Exposito, et al. (2022), Restorative Practice could be described as a simple way of mediating a conflict to which the person who committed the wrongful act could take responsibility for their actions and give a voice to those victimized. The researcher recommends the implementation of Restorative Practice, if administered with fidelity. Consequently, ensuring that process is followed by all stakeholders.

Monroe (2006) suggested that educators should establish strong relationships with parents and other community stakeholders. Parental and community involvement is an effective way to deter students from negative behavior. Wang and Sheikh-Khalil (2014) and Rapp and Duncan (2012) found that parent involvement in education is important in facilitating positive development in students. They also state that improvement in a student's academic achievement and healthy emotional state has a high correlation to parental involvement. Schools with parental and community involvement tend to have teachers that are highly effective and contribute to positive behavior and academic improvement amongst learners (Boaduo et al. 2009; Jeter-Twilley et al. 2007). Increase parental involvement. Allow the parents and students to have a role in developing a pre-disciplinary behavioral plan when needed. Conduct student and parent conferences and provide data as it pertains to behavior and student achievement. Share resources available at your school and/or district such as counseling and mentorships.

Specific recommendations for policy makers, teacher education programs, district leadership, school leadership (i.e., principals), and teachers are as follows:

Policy Makers

- Reassess the discipline policies within the district and state to determine whether some offenses require a less punitive disciplinary action. This may lead to redefining Zero Tolerance as it pertains to discipline.
- Allocate Federal Program dollars to focus on student behavior. Ensure that each school has the level of support needed to best manage social emotional learning and by providing adequate number of counselors and behavior specialists to lead the social emotional learning opportunities.

Teacher Education Programs

- It is important for higher learning institutions to collaborate with public schools in order to better equip teachers to understand how students develop their overall cognitive skills.
- Provide learning opportunities that focus on helping educators recognize bias and privilege that may contribute to misplaced judgement that results in a harsher punishment.
- Support schools by providing on-going professional development in classroom management and adolescent behavior.

District Leadership

- Conduct quarterly meetings to analyze discipline data. Schools that are identified for having high disciplinary infractions should be provided supports according to the area of need.
- Provide schools with funding to support initiatives, such as PBIS, that might increase positive student behavior and in turn improve academic success because the students are remaining in the traditional classroom setting.

- Review the discipline policy. Check for inconsistencies and identify areas where Zero Tolerance infractions could be modified in order to provide students with access to learning without the loss of instructional time.
- Collaborate with higher education programs and discuss the latest instructional practices and develop on-going professional development for administrators and teachers.

School Leadership

- Assess the school's disciplinary practices. Identify whether there are any inconsistencies from the district's expectations.
- Ensure that disciplinary actions are administered with fairness to all students.
- Conduct classroom walkthroughs in order to observe classroom environments. Look for signs that teachers are building positive relationships with students.
- Provide teachers with on-going support around classroom management and how to have engaging lessons. Students tend to have less behavior issues when participating in highly effective and engaging lessons.

Teachers

- Plan lessons that are highly effective and engaging. It is important to maximize instructional time to avoid students having an opportunity to misbehave.
- Set clear expectations for classroom rules and procedures.
- Value relationships. Build positive relationships with students that is based on consistency and fairness for all.
- Incorporate opportunities (PBIS) to which students could earn incentives for displaying positive behavior.
- Create a learning environment that supports positive interactions, promote student belonging, and motivation for learning.

Research should be done to seek measures that incorporate proactive disciplinary procedures that would encourage positive student behavior and identify students that are prone to misbehavior. This will help to establish and maintain positive behavior and lessen repeat offenders. Identifying repeat offenders and determining why their behavior continues to decline should be explored. Many urban school leaders are exploring the use of alternative models of non-punitive discipline, known as restorative discipline. This approach includes conferencing, circles, mediations and reconciliations. Restorative discipline has been linked to improvement in school culture by promoting trust and communication among students (Lustick, 2017). In addition, other models such as School-wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) and parental and community involvement should be closely examined for its appropriateness and effectiveness within the researched district as well as in other districts with similar demographics.

Comparatively, a qualitative study should be done to identify the perspectives of educators within the school buildings. Understanding and identifying whether there is consistency and fairness in decision-making could lead to appropriate professional development on discipline amongst administrators. It could also lead to appropriate professional development on classroom

management amongst teachers (Smith and Harper, 2015). According to Williams III & Wigan (2016), strategic hiring of experienced, highly qualified teachers and professional development opportunities for both new and veteran teachers should be implemented. In addition, increasing funding or reallocation of funds to increase the number of teachers, thus lower the number of overcrowded classrooms are strategies to consider.

It is important that all stakeholders understand that students' academic achievement may be affected by being removed from the classroom. Researching ways to improving how the current disciplinary actions should be implemented to maximize effective results is essential for closing the achievement gap. When students are not in the space to learn, the ability to learn will be minimized.

Limitations

The researcher identified limitations to the study. Data were collected in a large, unique district that may be demographically similar to or different from any district in the United States of America. The first limitation was the type of schools examined in this study. There were no suburban, private, or parochial schools examined. Though schools in this study had similar demographics, only student data from high schools were utilized. The researcher focused on high school students who took the end-of-course exam at the end of the school year. Although there are other measures of student achievement, such as ACT, PSAT, end-of-quarter exam, and end-of-semester exam, this study used language arts and math EOC results. Language arts and math courses were chosen because most high school students were enrolled and tested in those subject areas. In order to consider other grade bands, other forms of assessments would have to be considered. In addition, because these assessments are different, results may vary. The second limitation within the study was the maximum number of disciplinary actions of students examined in the study. Students with no more than 12 infractions were utilized in the random sample size. Further studies could explore students with more or less infractions and how the frequency effects academic achievement. The third limitation was the types of disciplinary actions selected. There are multiple types of disciplinary actions used in school settings; however, this study focused on ISS, OSS, and EXP. The effect of only these forms of discipline on student achievement were examined. The fourth limitation was the findings cannot be applied beyond the school district in which the research was conducted due to the student demographics, the disciplinary procedures used, and the types of student assessments used. Although, school districts with similar demographics, disciplinary procedures, and student assessments can use this study as a template for data-driven decision making. The fifth limitation in the study was the inability to determine whether the administrators had similar perceptions and moral values when making decisions to give a particular disciplinary action to students within their school buildings. The researcher was unable to determine what led to the disciplinary action(s) given. It was presumed that all administrators followed the policies outlined by the school board as it pertains to discipline in secondary schools.

References

- Aggarwal, J., Eitland, E. S., Gonzalez, L. N., Greenberg, P., Kaplun, E., Sahili, S., Koshy, K., Rajan, S., & Shendell, D. G. (2021). Built environment attributes and preparedness for potential gun violence at secondary schools. *Journal of Environmental Health, 83*(4), 8-16.
- Allman, K. L., & Slate, J. R. (2012). Disciplinary consequence effects on the achievement of students with disabilities: A statewide examination. *Journal of Education Research, 6*(4), 369-384.
- Amemiya, J., Mortenson, E., & Wang, M.-T. (2020). Minor infractions are not minor: School infractions for minor misconduct may increase adolescents' defiant behavior and contribute to racial disparities in school discipline. *American Psychologist, 75*(1), 23-36. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000475.supp>
- American Academy of Pediatrics (2013). Out-of-school suspension and expulsion. *Pediatrics, 131*(3), e1000-e1007. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2012-3932>
- Anderson, M. (2017). Transformational leadership in education: A review of existing literature. *International Social Science Review, 93*(1), 1-13.
- Baker, K. (1985). Research evidence of a school discipline problem. *The Phi Delta Kappan, 66*(7) 482-488. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20387399>
- Baron, E. B., (1992). *Discipline strategies for teachers. Fastback 344. Phi Delta Kappa, ED. 356201*
- Bell, C., & Puckett, T. (2020). I want to learn but they won't let me: Exploring the impact of school discipline on academic achievement. *Urban Education. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085920968629*
- Bennett, L. (2015). Improve campus threat assessment by incorporating Secret Service, FBI strategies. *Campus Legal Advisor, 15*(7), 1-5.
- Boaduo, N. A., Milondzo, K. S., & Adjei, A. (2009). Parent-community involvement in school governance and its effects on teacher effectiveness and improvement of learner performance: A study of selected primary and secondary schools in Botswana. ERIC database (EJ888208).
- Canter, L., & Canter, M. (1976). Assertive discipline: What do we really know? *ERIC: McCormack, S. eric.ed.gov/?id = ED286618*
- Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E., Hobson, C., McPartland, J., Mood, A., Weinfeld, F., & York, R. (1966). The Coleman report. *Equality of Educational Opportunity, 3*(18), 1-32.
- Cressery, J. M., Whitcomb, S. A., McGilvray-Rivet, S. J., Morrison, R. J., & Shander- Reynolds, K. J. (2015). Handling PBIS with Care: Scaling up to school-wide implementation. ERIC database. (EJ1052436).
- Crichlow-Ball, C., & Cornell, D. (2021). Association of school climate with student willingness to report threats of violence. *Journal of Threat Assessment and Management, 8*(3), 77-93. <https://doi.org/10.1037/tam0000163>
- Egalite, A. J. (2016). How family background influences student achievement: Can schools narrow the gap? *Education Next, 16*(2), 70-78.
- Eggleton, T. (2001). *Discipline in the schools*. ERIC database. ED451554

- Fishbaugh, M., Berkeley, T., & Schroth, G. (2003). Ensuring safe school environments: Exploring issues-seeking solutions. Montana: American Council on Rural Special Education.
- Freeman, J., Kern, L., Gambino, A. J., Lombardi, A., & Kowitt, J. (2019). Assessing the relationship between the positive behavior interventions and supports framework and student outcomes in high schools. *Journal of At-Risk Issues*, 22(2), 1-11.
- Goodman-Scott, E. (2014). Maximizing school counselors' efforts by implementing school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports: A case study from the field. ERIC database. (EJ1034669)
- Gregory, A., Skiba, R., & Mediratta, K. (2017). Eliminating disparities in school discipline: A framework in intervention. *Review of Research in Education*, 41(1), 253-278.
- Hanushek, E. A., Peterson, P. E., Talpey, L. M., & Woessmann, L. (2019). The achievement gap fails to close. *Education Next*, 19(3), 8-17.
- Haroun, R., & O'Hanlon, C. (1997). Do teachers and students agree in their perception of what school discipline is? *Educational Review*, 49(3), 237-50.
- Henry, D. A., Betancur Cortés, L., & Votruba-Drzal, E. (2020). Black-White achievement gaps differ by family socioeconomic status from early childhood through early adolescence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 112(8), 1471-1489.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000439>
- Hochman, S. R., & Worner, W. (1987). In-school suspension and group counseling: Helping at risk-students. *NASSP Bulletin*, 71, 93-97. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019263658707150124>
- Hwang, N. (2018). Suspensions and achievement: Varying links by type, frequency and subgroup. *Educational Researcher*, 47(6), 363-374.
- James, J. (2013). *The student experience of in-school and out-of-school suspension*. [Counselor Education Master's Thesis, State University of New York]. Paper 150.
<http://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/edc-theses/150>
- Jeter-Twilley, R., Legum, H., & Norton, F. (2007). *Parental and Community Involvement in Schools: Does socio-economic status matter?* ERIC Database. (ED 496815).
- Kemerer, F., & Walsh, J. (2000). *The educator's guide to Texas school law* (8th ed.). University of Texas Press.
- Kurtz, M. D. (2018). Value-added and student growth percentile models: What drives differences in estimated classroom effects? *Statistics & Public Policy*, 5(1), 1-8.
<https://doi-org.ezproxy.memphis.edu/10.1080/2330443X.2018.1438938>
- La Salle, T., Rocha-Neves, J., Jimerson, S., Di Sano, S., Martinsone, B., Majercakova Albertova, S., Gajdošová, E., Baye, A., Deltour, C., Martinelli, V., Raykov, M., Hatzichristou, C., Palikara, O., Szabó, É., Arlauskaitė, Z., Athanasiou, D., Brown-Earle, O., Casale, G., Lampropoulou, A., Zvyagintsev, R. (2021). A multinational study exploring adolescent perception of school climate and mental health. *School Psychology*, 36(3), 155-166.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/spq0000430.supp>
- Losen, D. J. (2011b). *State legislative recommendations to promote fair and effective school discipline*. National Education Policy Center.
<http://www.nepc.colorado.edu/publication/discipline-policies>

- Losen, D.J., Hodson, C., Ee, J. & Martinez, T. E. (2014). *Disturbing inequities: Exploring the relationship of discipline disparities for students with disabilities by race with gender with school outcomes*. University of California, Los Angeles. <http://tinyurl.com/JanCRP> conference
- Lustick, H. (2017). Administering discipline differently: A foucauldian lens on restorative school discipline. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 20(3), 277-311.
- Mas-Expósito, L., Krieger, V., Amador-Campos, J. A., Casañas, R., Albertí, M., & Lalucat-Jo, L. (2022). Implementation of whole school restorative approaches to promote positive youth development: Review of relevant literature and practice guidelines. *Education Sciences*, 12(3), 187.
- Mathur, S. M. & Nelson, C. M. (2013). PBIS as prevention for high-risk youth in restrictive settings: Where do we go from here? ERIC database (EJ1014474).
- Mayfield, V. M. & Garrison-Wade, D. (2015). Culturally responsive practices as whole school reform. *Journal of Instructional Pedagogies*, 16 (1), 2-17. University of Colorado, Denver.
- McCaffrey, D. F., Han, B. & Lockwood, J. R. (2008, November 14). *Value-Added Models: Analytic Issues*. Prepared for the National Research Council and the National Academy of Education, Board on Testing and Accountability Workshop on Value-Added Modeling.
- Monroe, C. R. (2006). Misbehavior or misinterpretation? Closing the discipline gap through cultural synchronization. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 42(4).
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00228958.2006.10518021>
- Pounder, J. (2014). Quality teaching through transformational classroom leadership. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 22(3), 273-285.
- Prior, L. M., & Tuller, R. (1991). In-school suspension: Des Moines Middle and High Schools. Program elevation. ED337869 EA 023394
- Rafa, A. (2019). Policy analysis: The status of school discipline in state policy. *Education Commission of the States*. <https://www.ecs.org/the-status-of-school-discipline-in-state-policy/>
- Rapp, N., & Duncan, H. (2012). Multi-dimensional parental involvement in schools. A principal's guide. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ971515).
- Raffaele Mendez, L. M. (2003). Predictors of suspension and negative school outcomes: A longitudinal investigation. *Wiley Periodicals, Inc.*, 2003, 17-33. doi:10.1002/yd.52
- Rausch, M., & Skiba, R. (2005). *The academic cost of discipline: The relationship between suspension/expulsion and school achievement*. Center for Evaluation and Education Policy, School of Education, Indiana University.
<http://www.agi.harvard.edu/search/searchallpapers.php>
- Ryan, E., & Kallio, K. A. (2021). *School discipline*. Salem Press Encyclopedia.
- Ryoo, J., & Hong, S. (2011). Investigating the effectiveness of SW-PBIS on school's accountability at both elementary and middle schools. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED528760).

- Sanders, W. L. & Horn, S. P. (1994). The Tennessee value-added assessment system (TVAAS): Mixed-model methodology in educational assessment. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 8, 299-311. <https://doi.org/10.10007/BF00973726>
- Scelso, A. K. (2013). The effects of out-of-school suspension on high school students: An inside view. ProQuest LLC, [Ed.D. Dissertation, Widener University]. ED555797 ISBN: 978-1-3035-0406-8
- Skiba, R. J., Chung, C. G., Trachok, M., Baker, T. L., Sheya, A., & Hughes, R. L. (2014). Parsing disciplinary disproportionality: Contributions of infraction, student, and school characteristics to out-of-school suspension and expulsion. *American Educational Research Journal*, 51(4), 640-670. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831214541670>
- Smith, E. J., & Harper, S. R. (2015). Disproportionate impact of k-12 school suspension and expulsion on Black students in southern states. University of Pennsylvania, Center for the Study of Race and Equity in Education. ISBN: 978-3031-1952-1.
- VanLone, J., Freeman, J., LaSalle, T., Gordon, L., Polk, T., & Neves, J. R. (2019). A practical guide to improving school climate in high schools. *Hammill Institute on Disabilities*, 55, 39-45. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1053451219832988>
- Vossekuil, B., Fein, R., Reddy, M., Borum, R., & Modzeleski, W. (2002). *The final report and findings of safe school initiative: Implications for the prevention of school attacks in the United States*. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program and U.S. Secret Service. National Threat Assessment Center, Washington, D.C.
- Wang, M., & Sheikh-Khalil, S. (2014). Does parental involvement matter for student achievement and mental health in high school? Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ1027459).
- Williams III, J.A., & Wiggan, G. (2016). Models of success, teacher quality and student disciplinary infraction: A critical analysis of Chicago's urban preparatory academics and Harlem children's zone. *Journal of Educational Issues*, 2, 73-89. <https://doi.org/10.5296/jei.v2i2.9788>
- Wormington, S. V., Anderson K. G., Schneider A., Tomlinson K. L., & Brown S. A. (2016) Peer victimization and adolescent adjustment: Does school belonging matter? *J Sch Violence*. 15(1):1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2014.922472>.