



### Keywords

Disciplinary Alternative  
Education Program,  
Middle School Students,  
Economic Status

Received: September 20, 2017

Accepted: November 9, 2017

Published: December 6, 2017

# Disciplinary Alternative Education Program Placement Inequities by the Economic Status of Texas Grade 6, 7, and 8 Students: A Multiyear, Statewide Investigation

Edward Lopez<sup>1</sup>, John R. Slate<sup>2</sup>, Cynthia Martinez-Garcia<sup>2</sup>,  
George Moore<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Montgomery Independent School District, Montgomery, USA

<sup>2</sup>Department of Educational Leadership, Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, USA

### Email address

elopez@misd.org (E. Lopez), profslate@aol.com (J. R. Slate),

cynthia3687@sbcglobal.net (C Martinez-Garcia), geomoores@shsu.edu (G. Moore)

### Citation

Edward Lopez, John R. Slate, Cynthia Martinez-Garcia, George Moore. Disciplinary Alternative Education Program Placement Inequities by the Economic Status of Texas Grade 6, 7, and 8 Students: A Multiyear, Statewide Investigation. *International Journal of Psychology and Cognitive Science*. Vol. 3, No. 5, 2017, pp. 59-71.

### Abstract

In this investigation, the extent to which inequities in Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements were present by economic status (i.e., Not Poor, Moderately Poor, or Extremely Poor) for Grade 6, 7, and 8 White, Hispanic, and Black students was ascertained. Archival statewide data were analyzed from a Public Information Request form that was fulfilled from the Texas Education Agency Public Education Information Management System on all middle school students for the 2012-2013, 2013-2014, 2014-2015, and 2015-2016 school years. Inferential statistical analyses revealed statistically significant differences in all four school years. A stair-step effect was present for each year and at each grade level. Grade 6, 7, and 8 White, Hispanic, and Black students who were Extremely Poor received statistically significantly higher rates of Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements than their peers who were Moderately Poor and their peers who were Not Poor. Grade 6, 7, and 8 White, Hispanic, and Black students who were Moderately Poor had statistically significantly higher rates of Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements than their peers who were Not Poor. Recommendations for research are provided, as well as implications for policy and practice.

## 1. Introduction

The formulation of laws such as the Federal Gun Free School Act of 1994 in which zero-tolerance policies were created resulted in the overuse and misuse of exclusionary discipline practices to address student misbehavior. Curtiss and Slate [1] recently contended that exclusionary discipline practices have been overused and misused and, as a result have resulted in inequities for all students regardless of their ethnicity/race, gender, or economic status. Noted by the [2], in a report to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights on the economic and racial disciplinary inequities of students, was that "A higher incidence of ethnic and racial minority students being affected by zero tolerance should not be the seen as disparate treatment or discrimination, but in terms of an issue of socioeconomic status" (p. 3). In agreement with that report were [3] who asserted one of

the greatest predictors of student school suspensions is that of low economic status.

In a recent study on inequities in disciplinary consequence assignment in the state of Texas, [4] analyzed discipline consequence data on Grade 5 and Grade 6 Texas elementary school students by their economic status in the 2013-2014 school year. They documented the presence of statistically significant differences in discipline consequence assignments by student economic status. Of the 13,469 disciplinary consequences that occurred in Grade 5 in their study, only 1,143 discipline consequences were given to students who were not economically disadvantaged. This statistic means that 12,326 discipline consequences in Grade 5 were assigned to students who were in poverty; more than 10 times the consequences that were assigned to Grade 5 students who were not in poverty. With respect to the 78,570 disciplinary placements given to Grade 6 students, approximately 7,000 disciplinary placements were assigned to students not in poverty, while more than 71,000 disciplinary assignments were assigned to students in poverty [6, 7].

In a related investigation, also conducted on students in Texas public schools, [5] specifically examined the degree to which Grade 7 and Grade 8 students were differentially assigned a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement as a function of their economic status. Lopez and Slate [5] established the presence of statistically significant differences in Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement for both Grade 7 and Grade 8 students on the basis on their economic status. Grade 7 students who were in poverty received this consequence 1,121 times whereas Grade 7 students who were not economically disadvantaged received this consequence 692 times. In addition, Grade 8 students were placed in a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program three times more often than Grade 8 students who were not economically disadvantaged [6, 7].

Not addressed in the [4] and in the [5] studies was the relationship of economic status within ethnic/racial groups. Khan and Slate [8], however, did analyze the degree to which economic status within three ethnic/racial groups (i.e., Black, Hispanic, and White) was related to the assignment of three major discipline consequences (i.e., in-school suspension, out-of-school suspension, and Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement). Although [8] analyzed data on in-school suspension and on out-of-school suspension, the interest in this article is on their Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement results. In their study, Black students who were economically disadvantaged received a total of 1,373 such consequences, compared to 205 Black students who were not in poverty and who received this consequence. As such, Black students in poverty received more than four times the rate of this consequence than did Black students who were not economically disadvantaged. Hispanic students in poverty were assigned a total of 3,192 Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements, compared to 309 Hispanic students who were not in poverty. These statistics were reflective that Hispanic students in

poverty were assigned this consequence almost three times more than Hispanic students who were not poor. Similar results were present for White students in that White students who were economically disadvantaged received this consequence almost five times more than did White students who were not poor.

Research results previously discussed are congruent with other researchers such as [9] who determined that students from low-income families or who were enrolled in high poverty schools were statistically significantly more likely to receive disciplinary consequences and Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements than their peers who were not economically disadvantaged. Poverty status is a contributing factor to increased suspension rates, to dropout rates, and to academic disengagement and incarceration [10]. Chapman et al. [11] reported students from low income families had a five times greater possibility of dropping out than students from higher income families.

### **1.1. Statement of the Problem**

Inequities in discipline consequence assignment have been established on the basis of student ethnicity/race, both for boys and for girls [e.g., 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17]. In recent years, evidence has been provided that inequities in discipline consequence assignment also exist on the basis of student poverty [4, 8, 5]. Inequities in discipline consequence assignment by student economic status, however, have not been as well documented as has inequities by student ethnicity/race. Moreover, the investigations that have been conducted were for a single school year, in each of the [4], [8], and [5] studies. As such, the extent to which their findings are generalizable over time is not known. The importance of knowing the degree to which the inequities that have been documented by student economic status are generalizable cannot be understated. Should consistencies be present in these violations of their civil rights to an appropriate education, then changes need to be made in discipline programs in schools.

### **1.2. Significance of the Study**

In this study, the degree to which differences were present in the receipt of a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement by economic status by Grade 6, 7, and 8 were examined for the 2012-2013, 2013-2014, 2014-2015, and the 2015-2016 school years. For Grade 6, 7, and 8 White, Hispanic, and Black students, the extent to which inequities were present in their Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement assignment as a function of their economic status was determined. Given the importance of instructional time for academic success, if students are removed from the instructional setting in an inequitable manner, then concerns arise regarding their civil rights. As such, this study may provide empirical data regarding inequities in the assignment of this discipline consequence by economic status for White, Hispanic, and Black students. The

extent to which economic status has influenced the placement of students in Grade 6, 7, and 8 in a Disciplinary Alternative Educational Program placement within the three grade levels over the latest four school years may bring to light disproportionalities that may provide useful information to aid educational leaders.

### 1.3. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to ascertain the extent to which inequities were present in Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements by economic status for Texas Grade 6, Grade 7, and Grade 8 students. By examining Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements for Grade 6, Grade 7, and Grade 8 White, Hispanic, and Black students, a comparison across grade levels was possible. Four school years of archival data from the Texas Education Agency Public Education Information Management System were analyzed to determine the degree to which Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements were differentially assigned to Grade 6, 7, and 8 White, Hispanic, and Black students by their economic status.

### 1.4. Research Questions

The following research questions were addressed in this empirical investigation: (a) What is the difference in Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements as a function of economic status for Grade 6 students?; (b) What is the difference in Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements as a function of economic status for Grade 7 students?; (c) What is the difference in Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements as a function of economic status for Grade 8 students?; and (d) What trends are present in the assignment of Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements for Grade 6, 7, and 8 students by their economic status? The first three questions were examined for the 2012-2013, 2013-2014, 2014-2015, and the 2015-2016 school years, separately for White, Hispanic, and Black students, whereas the fourth research question involved all four school years of data.

## 2. Method

### 2.1. Research Design

For this study, a causal comparative research design was employed. In this investigation, statewide archival data that were previously obtained from the Texas Education Agency Public Education Information Management System were analyzed. As such, the independent and dependent variables had already occurred and could not be manipulated. For these reasons, the research design used herein was a causal comparative research design [18]. The data included Grade 6, Grade 7, and Grade 8 students by their economic status and whether they had received a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement. The independent variable of economic status for students consisted of three groups: (a) Students who did not qualify for the free/reduced lunch

program (i.e., the Not Poor group); (b) students who qualified for the reduced lunch program (i.e., the Moderately Poor group); and (c) students who qualified for the free lunch program (i.e., the Extremely Poor group). For each school year (i.e., 2012-2013, 2013-2014, 2014-2015, 2015-2016), the dependent variable was receipt or non-receipt of a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement.

### 2.2. Participants and Instrumentation

Students for whom data were analyzed were Grade 6, 7, and 8 students who were enrolled in Texas public middle schools in the 2012-2013, 2013-2014, 2014-2015, and 2015-2016 school years. Archival data were requested and obtained from the Texas Education Agency Public Education Information Management System for the 2012-2013, 2013-2014, 2014-2015, and 2015-2016 school years. The Texas Education Agency deems students as being eligible for the federal free-and reduced-lunch based on family income of 130% or less of the federal poverty line, and as being eligible for the reduced-lunch program based on family incomes of 131% to 185% of the federal poverty line [19]. Students who were eligible for the free lunch program were referred to as Extremely Poor. Students who were eligible for the reduced lunch program were referred to as Moderately Poor. Students who did not qualify for either program were referred to as Not Poor in this investigation. For the purposes of this study, the following definition is used as defined by [20]: Disciplinary Alternative Education Placement is a discretionary in-district alternative education setting assigned to students who commit non-criminal offenses or persistent misbehaviors,

Through submission of a Public Information Request form to the Texas Education Agency, data on Grade 6, 7, and 8 students by their economic status were requested. Data were provided for all Texas Grade 6, 7, and 8 students by their economic status (i.e., Not Poor, Moderately Poor, and Extremely Poor). Specifically provided by the Texas Education Agency were: (a) student economic status; (b) student grade level; and (c) whether the student had received a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement. Four school years of data were requested and obtained: 2012-2013, 2013-2014, 2014-2015, and 2015-2016. Once the Texas Education Agency provided these data, they were converted into Statistical Package for the Social Sciences data files. Then data were analyzed separately for Grade 6, Grade 7, and Grade 8 White, Hispanic, and Black students by their economic status.

## 3. Results

To address the research questions regarding Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements by degree of economic disadvantage, Pearson chi-square procedures were calculated. This statistical procedure was the ideal analysis to calculate because frequency data were present for both economic status and for Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement assignments for all 4 school years. A

large sample size was available, providing a sample size that was more than five responses per cell. Therefore, the assumptions for using a Pearson chi-square procedure were met for each research question [21]. Results will now be provided, beginning with the 2012-2013 school year and with Grade 6 students and ending with the 2015-2016 school year and with Grade 8 students.

### 3.1. Results for Grade 6 White Students

In the 2012-2013 school year for Grade 6 White students, a statistically significant difference was present in Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements,  $\chi^2(2) = 839.89$ ,  $p < .001$ , by economic status. The effect size for this finding, Cramer's V, was below small, .08 [22]. Revealed in the results was the presence of a stair-step effect [23] (Carpenter, Ramirez, & Severn, 2006) in Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements. Grade 6 White students who were Extremely Poor were assigned to a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement almost five times more often than White students who were Not Poor. Grade 6 White students who were Moderately Poor were assigned to a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program more than two times more often than White students who were Not Poor. Grade 6 White students who were Extremely Poor were more than twice as likely assigned a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement than Grade 6 White students who were Moderately Poor. Frequencies and percentages of Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements by economic status for Grade 6 White students in the 2012-2013 school year are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Frequencies and Percentages of Disciplinary Alternative Education Program Placements by Economic Status for Grade 6 White Students in the 2012-2013 Through the 2015-2016 School Years.

School Year and Economic Status	Received a DAEP Placement <i>n</i> and %age of Total	Did Not Receive a DAEP Placement <i>n</i> and %age of Total
2012-2013		
Not Poor	( <i>n</i> = 414) 0.5%	( <i>n</i> = 84,268) 99.5%
Moderately Poor	( <i>n</i> = 93) 1.3%	( <i>n</i> = 7,061) 98.7%
Extremely Poor	( <i>n</i> = 744) 2.4%	( <i>n</i> = 29,967) 97.6%
2013-2014		
Not Poor	( <i>n</i> = 393) 0.5%	( <i>n</i> = 82,850) 99.5%
Moderately Poor	( <i>n</i> = 67) 1.0%	( <i>n</i> = 6,691) 99.0%
Extremely Poor	( <i>n</i> = 668) 2.2%	( <i>n</i> = 29,464) 97.8%
2014-2015		
Not Poor	( <i>n</i> = 362) 0.4%	( <i>n</i> = 84,188) 99.6%
Moderately Poor	( <i>n</i> = 66) 1.0%	( <i>n</i> = 6,394) 99.0%
Extremely Poor	( <i>n</i> = 561) 2.0%	( <i>n</i> = 27,851) 98.0%
2015-2016		
Not Poor	( <i>n</i> = 328) 0.4%	( <i>n</i> = 83,460) 99.6%
Moderately Poor	( <i>n</i> = 48) 0.8%	( <i>n</i> = 5,812) 99.2%
Extremely Poor	( <i>n</i> = 636) 2.2%	( <i>n</i> = 28,282) 97.8%

With respect to the 2013-2014 school year, a statistically significant difference was present in the Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements,  $\chi^2(2) = 724.31$ ,  $p < .001$ , by student economic status. The effect size for this finding, Cramer's V, was below small, .08 [22]. Revealed in

the results was the presence of a stair-step effect [23]. Grade 6 White students who were Extremely Poor were placed more than four times more often in a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program than White students who were Not Poor. Grade 6 White students who were Moderately Poor were placed in a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program twice as often as White students who were Not Poor. Grade 6 White students who were Extremely Poor were more than twice as likely assigned a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement than students who were Moderately Poor. Delineated in Table 1 are the descriptive statistics for this analysis.

Concerning 2014-2015, a statistically significant difference was present in Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements,  $\chi^2(2) = 622.28$ ,  $p < .001$ , by Grade 6 White student economic status. The effect size, Cramer's V, was below small, .07 [22]. Revealed was the presence of a stair-step effect [23]. As presented in Table 1, Grade 6 White students who were Extremely Poor were assigned to a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement five times more often than were Grade 6 White students who were Not Poor. Grade 6 White students who were Moderately Poor were assigned a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement more than twice as often than Grade 6 White students who were not Poor. White students in Grade 6 who were Extremely Poor were twice as likely assigned a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement than were Grade 6 students who were Moderately Poor.

Regarding 2015-2016, a statistically significant difference was present in Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements,  $\chi^2(2) = 830.39$ ,  $p < .001$ , by Grade 6 White student economic status. A below small effect size, Cramer's V of .08, was present [22]. Revealed was the presence of a stair-step effect [23]. As presented in Table 1, Grade 6 White students who were Extremely Poor were assigned more than five times more often to a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement than were Grade 6 White students who were Not Poor. Grade 6 White students who were Moderately Poor were assigned a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program twice as often than White students who were not Poor. Finally, Grade 6 White students who were Extremely Poor were almost three times more likely to be assigned a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement than were Grade 6 White students who were Moderately Poor.

### 3.2. Results for Grade 7 White Students

Regarding 2012-2013 for Grade 7 White students, a statistically significant difference was present in the Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements,  $\chi^2(2) = 1144.11$ ,  $p < .001$ , by economic status. The effect size, Cramer's V, was small, .10 [22]. Revealed was the presence of a stair-step effect [23]. Grade 7 White students who were Extremely Poor were assigned to a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement almost four times more often than were Grade 7 White students who were Not Poor. Grade

7 White students who were Moderately Poor received twice as many Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements than Grade 7 White students who were Not Poor. Grade 7 White students who were Extremely Poor were assigned a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program Placement almost twice as often as their White peers who were Moderately Poor. Delineated in Table 2 are the descriptive statistics for this analysis.

**Table 2.** Frequencies and Percentages of Disciplinary Alternative Education Program Placements by Economic Status for Grade 7 White Students in the 2012-2013 Through the 2015-2016 School Years.

School Year and Economic Status	Received a DAEP Placement n and %age of Total	Did Not Receive a DAEP Placement n and %age of Total
2012-2013		
Not Poor	(n = 846) 1.0%	(n = 87,052) 99.0%
Moderately Poor	(n = 142) 2.0%	(n = 6,939) 98.0%
Extremely Poor	(n = 1,157) 3.9%	(n = 28,371) 96.1%
2013-2014		
Not Poor	(n = 713) 0.8%	(n = 86,019) 99.2%
Moderately Poor	(n = 122) 1.9%	(n = 6,308) 98.1%
Extremely Poor	(n = 995) 3.5%	(n = 27,148) 96.5%
2014-2015		
Not Poor	(n = 726) 0.8%	(n = 85,506) 99.2%
Moderately Poor	(n = 66) 1.0%	(n = 6,394) 99.0%
Extremely Poor	(n = 561) 2.0%	(n = 27,851) 98.0%
2015-2016		
Not Poor	(n = 651) 0.8%	(n = 84,782) 99.2%
Moderately Poor	(n = 97) 1.6%	(n = 5,938) 98.4%
Extremely Poor	(n = 938) 3.3%	(n = 27,220) 96.7%

Concerning Grade 7 White students in 2013-2014, a statistically significant difference was present in Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements,  $\chi^2(2) = 1282.46$ ,  $p < .001$ , by student economic status. The effect size, Cramer's V, was small, .10 [22]. Present was a stair-step effect [23]. Grade 7 White students who were Extremely Poor were assigned a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement more than four times more often than were White students who were Not Poor. Grade 7 White students who were Moderately Poor were placed in a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement more than two times more often than Grade 7 White students who were Not Poor. Grade 7 White students who were Extremely Poor were assigned this consequence almost two times more often than Grade 7 White students who were Moderately Poor. Table 2 contains the descriptive statistics for this analysis.

With respect to 2014-2015, a statistically significant difference was present in Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements,  $\chi^2(2) = 1030.98$ ,  $p < .001$ , by Grade 7 White student economic status. The effect size, Cramer's V, was below small, .09 [22]. Revealed was a stair-step effect [23]. Grade 7 White students who were Extremely Poor were assigned this consequence two and one half times more often than were Grade 7 White students who were Not Poor. Grade 7 White students who were Moderately Poor were assigned a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement one and a quarter times more often than White students who were Not Poor. Grade 7 White students who were Extremely Poor

received a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement two times as often as Grade 7 White students who were Moderately Poor. Descriptive statistics for this analysis are revealed in Table 2.

Regarding 2015-2016, a statistically significant difference was present in Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements,  $\chi^2(2) = 1007.83$ ,  $p < .001$ , by Grade 7 White student economic status. The effect size, Cramer's V, was below small, .09 [22]. Revealed was the presence of a stair-step effect [23]. Grade 7 White students who were Extremely Poor received this consequence more than four times more often than Grade 7 White students who were Not Poor. Grade 7 White students who were Moderately Poor were assigned this consequence two times more often than Grade 7 White students who were Not Poor. Grade 7 White students who were Extremely Poor were assigned this consequence two times more often than Grade 7 White students who were Moderately Poor. Revealed in Table 2 are the descriptive statistics for this analysis.

### 3.3. Results for Grade 8 White Students

In 2012-2013 for Grade 8 White students, a statistically significant difference was present in Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements,  $\chi^2(2) = 1303.46$ ,  $p < .001$ , by economic status. The effect size, Cramer's V, was small, .10 [22]. Revealed was the presence of a stair-step effect [23]. Grade 8 White students who were Extremely Poor were assigned this consequence more than three and one half times more often than Grade 8 White students who were Not Poor. Grade 8 White students who were Moderately Poor were assigned this consequence more than two times more often than Grade 8 White students who were Not Poor. Grade 8 White students who were Extremely Poor were assigned this consequence more than one and one half times more often than Grade 8 White students who were Moderately Poor. Delineated in Table 3 are the descriptive statistics for this analysis.

**Table 3.** Frequencies and Percentages of Disciplinary Alternative Education Program Placements by Economic Status for Grade 8 White Students in the 2012-2013 Through the 2015-2016 School Years.

School Year and Economic Status	Received a DAEP Placement n and %age of Total	Did Not Receive a DAEP Placement n and %age of Total
2012-2013		
Not Poor	(n = 1,326) 1.5%	(n = 87,431) 98.5%
Moderately Poor	(n = 217) 3.2%	(n = 6,563) 96.8%
Extremely Poor	(n = 1,507) 5.3%	(n = 27,086) 94.7%
2013-2014		
Not Poor	(n = 1,221) 1.4%	(n = 88,785) 98.6%
Moderately Poor	(n = 179) 2.7%	(n = 6,465) 97.3%
Extremely Poor	(n = 1,502) 5.3%	(n = 26,642) 94.7%
2014-2015		
Not Poor	(n = 1,142) 1.3%	(n = 84,378) 98.7%
Moderately Poor	(n = 139) 2.2%	(n = 6,215) 97.8%
Extremely Poor	(n = 1,391) 5.0%	(n = 26,258) 95.0%
2015-2016		
Not Poor	(n = 1,102) 1.3%	(n = 86,126) 98.7%
Moderately Poor	(n = 155) 2.6%	(n = 5,771) 97.4%
Extremely Poor	(n = 636) 2.2%	(n = 28,282) 97.8%

With respect to 2013-2014, a statistically significant difference was present,  $\chi^2(2) = 1499.62, p < .001$ , by student economic status. The effect size, Cramer's V, was small,.11 [22]. Revealed was the presence of a stair-step effect [23]. Grade 8 White students who were Extremely Poor were assigned this consequence more than three and one half times more often than Grade 8 White students who were Not Poor. Grade 8 White students who were Moderately Poor were assigned this consequence almost two times more often than Grade 8 White students who were Not Poor. Grade 8 White students who were Extremely Poor were assigned this consequence almost two times more often than Grade 8 White students who were Moderately Poor. Table 3 contains the descriptive statistics for this analysis.

Concerning 2014-2015, a statistically significant difference was present,  $\chi^2(2) = 1407.59, p < .001$ , by Grade 8 White student economic status. The effect size, Cramer's V, was small,.11 [22]. Revealed was a stair-step effect [23]. Grade 8 White students who were Extremely Poor were assigned this consequence more than three and one half times more often than Grade 8 White students who were Not Poor. Grade 8 White students who were Moderately Poor were assigned this consequence one and one half times more often than Grade 8 White students who were Not Poor. Grade 8 White students who were Extremely Poor received this consequence more than one and one half times more often than Grade 8 White students who were Moderately Poor. Descriptive statistics are revealed in Table 3.

Regarding 2015-2016, a statistically significant difference was present,  $\chi^2(2) = 1234.08, p < .001$ , by Grade 8 White student economic status. The effect size, Cramer's V, was small,.10 [22]. Revealed was a stair-step effect [23] by student economic status. Grade 8 White students who were Extremely Poor received this consequence almost two times more often than Grade 8 White students who were Not Poor. Grade 8 White students who were Moderately Poor were assigned this consequence twice as often as Grade 8 White students who were Not Poor. Grade 8 White students who were Extremely Poor and Grade 8 White students who were Moderately Poor had similar percentages of students who were assigned this consequence. Table 3 contains the descriptive statistics for this analysis.

**3.4. Results for Grade 6 Hispanic Students**

In 2012-2013 for Grade 6 Hispanic students, a statistically significant difference was present in the Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements,  $\chi^2(2) = 371.97, p < .001$ , by economic status. The effect size, Cramer's V, was below small,.05 [22]. Grade 6 Hispanic students who were Extremely Poor were assigned to a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement more than two times more often than were Grade 6 Hispanic students who were Not Poor. Grade 6 Hispanic students who were Extremely Poor were assigned a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement more than two times more often than were Grade 6 Hispanic students who were Moderately Poor. In this school year, similar percentages of Grade 6 Hispanic students

who were in the Not Poor and Moderately Poor groups were assigned to this disciplinary consequence. Descriptive statistics for this analysis are presented in Table 4.

*Table 4. Frequencies and Percentages of Disciplinary Alternative Education Program Placements by Economic Status for Grade 6 Hispanic Students in the 2012-2013 Through the 2015-2016 School Years.*

School Year and Economic Status	Received a DAEP Placement n and %age of Total	Did Not Receive a DAEP Placement n and %age of Total
2012-2013		
Not Poor	(n = 451) 1.1%	(n = 40,901) 98.9%
Moderately Poor	(n = 144) 0.9%	(n = 15,394) 99.1%
Extremely Poor	(n = 2,822) 2.4%	(n = 114,230) 97.6%
2013-2014		
Not Poor	(n = 399) 1.0%	(n = 41,314) 99.0%
Moderately Poor	(n = 143) 0.9%	(n = 15,561) 99.1%
Extremely Poor	(n = 2,499) 2.2%	(n = 112,952) 97.8%
2014-2015		
Not Poor	(n = 424) 0.9%	(n = 46,078) 99.1%
Moderately Poor	(n = 157) 1.1%	(n = 14,769) 98.9%
Extremely Poor	(n = 2,407) 2.0%	(n = 116,455) 98.0%
2015-2016		
Not Poor	(n = 393) 0.8%	(n = 47,198) 99.2%
Moderately Poor	(n = 113) 0.8%	(n = 13,878) 99.2%
Extremely Poor	(n = 2,914) 1.6%	(n = 181,862) 98.4%

With respect to 2013-2014, a statistically significant difference was present in Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements,  $\chi^2(2) = 724.31, p < .001$ , by student economic status. The effect size, Cramer's V, was below small,.08 [22]. Grade 6 Hispanic students who were Extremely Poor were assigned a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement more than two times more often than were Hispanic students who were Not Poor. Grade 6 Hispanic students who were Extremely Poor were assigned a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement more than two times more often than Hispanic students who were Moderately Poor. Similar to the previous results, similar percentages of Grade 6 Hispanic students who were in the Not Poor and Moderately Poor groups were assigned to this disciplinary consequence. Delineated in Table 4 are the descriptive statistics for this analysis.

Concerning 2014-2015, a statistically significant difference was present in the Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements,  $\chi^2(2) = 622.28, p < .001$ , by Grade 6 Hispanic student economic status. The effect size, Cramer's V, was below small,.07 [22]. Revealed was the presence of a stair-step effect [23]. As revealed in Table 4, Grade 6 Hispanic students who were Extremely Poor were assigned to a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement more than two times more often than were Grade 6 Hispanic students who were Not Poor. Grade 6 Hispanic students who were Moderately Poor were assigned a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement almost one and a quarter times more than Hispanic students who were Not Poor. Grade 6 Hispanic students who were Extremely Poor were assigned a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement almost two times more often than Grade 6 Hispanic students who were Moderately Poor.

Regarding 2015-2016, a statistically significant difference was present in the Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements,  $\chi^2(2) = 622.28$ ,  $p < .001$ , by Grade 6 Hispanic student economic status. The effect size, Cramer's V, was below small, .07 [22]. Grade 6 Hispanic students who were Extremely Poor were assigned to a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement two times more often than were Grade 6 Hispanic students who were Not Poor and two times more often to Grade 6 Hispanic students who were Moderately Poor. Similar to the first two school year results, similar percentages of Grade 6 Hispanic students who were in the Not Poor and Moderately Poor groups were assigned to this disciplinary consequence. Delineated in Table 4 are the descriptive statistics for this analysis.

### 3.5. Results for Grade 7 Hispanic Students

Regarding 2012-2013 for Grade 7 Hispanic students, a statistically significant difference was present in the Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements,  $\chi^2(2) = 496.99$ ,  $p < .001$ , by economic status. The effect size, Cramer's V, was below small, .05 [22]. Grade 7 Hispanic students who were Extremely Poor were assigned this consequence almost two times more often than were Grade 7 Hispanic students who were Not Poor and more than two times more often than Grade 7 Hispanic students who were Moderately Poor. Similar percentages of Grade 7 Hispanic students who were in the Not Poor and Moderately Poor groups were assigned this consequence. Table 5 contains the descriptive statistics for this analysis.

**Table 5.** Frequencies and Percentages of Disciplinary Alternative Education Program Placements by Economic Status for Grade 7 Hispanic Students in the 2012-2013 Through the 2015-2016 School Years.

School Year and Economic Status	Received a DAEP Placement <i>n</i> and %age of Total	Did Not Receive a DAEP Placement <i>n</i> and %age of Total
2012-2013		
Not Poor	( <i>n</i> = 908) 2.1%	( <i>n</i> = 42,678) 97.9%
Moderately Poor	( <i>n</i> = 277) 1.8%	( <i>n</i> = 14,852) 98.2%
Extremely Poor	( <i>n</i> = 4,555) 4.1%	( <i>n</i> = 107,657) 95.9%
2013-2014		
Not Poor	( <i>n</i> = 823) 1.9%	( <i>n</i> = 43,618) 98.1%
Moderately Poor	( <i>n</i> = 293) 1.8%	( <i>n</i> = 15,795) 98.2%
Extremely Poor	( <i>n</i> = 4,460) 3.8%	( <i>n</i> = 113,025) 96.2%
2014-2015		
Not Poor	( <i>n</i> = 906) 1.9%	( <i>n</i> = 47,571) 98.1%
Moderately Poor	( <i>n</i> = 211) 1.4%	( <i>n</i> = 14,604) 98.6%
Extremely Poor	( <i>n</i> = 3,999) 3.5%	( <i>n</i> = 111,872) 96.5%
2015-2016		
Not Poor	( <i>n</i> = 796) 1.6%	( <i>n</i> = 48,267) 98.4%
Moderately Poor	( <i>n</i> = 174) 1.2%	( <i>n</i> = 13,852) 98.8%
Extremely Poor	( <i>n</i> = 3,899) 3.2%	( <i>n</i> = 116,171) 96.8%

Concerning Grade 7 Hispanic students in 2013-2014, a statistically significant difference was present in the Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements,  $\chi^2(2) = 501.94$ ,  $p < .001$ , by economic status. The effect size, Cramer's V, was below small, .05 [22]. Grade 7 Hispanic students who were Extremely Poor were assigned this

consequence two times more often than were Hispanic students who were Not Poor and more than two times more often than Grade 7 Hispanic students who were Moderately Poor. Similar percentages of Grade 7 Hispanic students who were in the Not Poor and Moderately Poor groups were assigned this consequence. Revealed in Table 5 are the descriptive statistics for this analysis.

With respect to 2014-2015, a statistically significant difference was present in the Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements,  $\chi^2(2) = 468.47$ ,  $p < .001$ , by Grade 7 Hispanic student economic status. The effect size, Cramer's V, was below small, .05 [22]. Grade 7 Hispanic students who were Extremely Poor were assigned this consequence almost two times more often than were Grade 7 Hispanic students who were Not Poor and more than two and one half times more often than Grade 7 Hispanic students who were Extremely Poor. Similar percentages of Grade 7 Hispanic students who were in the Not Poor and Moderately Poor groups were assigned this consequence. Descriptive statistics for this analysis are delineated in Table 5.

Regarding 2015-2016, a statistically significant difference was present in Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements,  $\chi^2(2) = 473.37$ ,  $p < .001$ , by Grade 7 Hispanic economic status. The effect size, Cramer's V, was below small, .05 [22]. Grade 7 Hispanic students who were Extremely Poor received this consequence two times more often than Grade 7 Hispanic students who were Not Poor and more than two and one half times more often than Grade 7 Hispanic students who were Moderately Poor. Similar percentages of Grade 7 Hispanic students who were in the Not Poor and Moderately Poor groups were assigned this consequence. Revealed in Table 5 are the descriptive statistics for this analysis.

### 3.6. Results for Grade 8 Hispanic Students

In 2012-2013 for Grade 8 Hispanic students, a statistically significant difference was present in the Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements,  $\chi^2(2) = 397.82$ ,  $p < .001$ , by economic status, with a below small Cramer's V, .05 [22]. Grade 8 Hispanic students who were Extremely Poor were assigned this consequence more than one and half times more often than Grade 8 Hispanic students who were Not Poor and almost two times more often than Grade 8 Hispanic students who were Moderately Poor. Similar percentages of Grade 8 Hispanic students who were in the Not Poor and Moderately Poor groups were assigned this consequence. Delineated in Table 6 are the descriptive statistics for this analysis.

**Table 6.** Frequencies and Percentages of Disciplinary Alternative Education Program Placements by Economic Status for Grade 8 Hispanic Students in the 2012-2013 Through the 2015-2016 School Years.

School Year and Economic Status	Received a DAEP Placement <i>n</i> and %age of Total	Did Not Receive a DAEP Placement <i>n</i> and %age of Total
2012-2013		
Not Poor	( <i>n</i> = 1,275) 2.9%	( <i>n</i> = 43,088) 97.1%
Moderately Poor	( <i>n</i> = 14,462) 2.5%	( <i>n</i> = 14,462) 97.5%

School Year and Economic Status	Received a DAEP Placement <i>n</i> and %age of Total	Did Not Receive a DAEP Placement <i>n</i> and %age of Total
Extremely Poor 2013-2014	( <i>n</i> = 5,138) 4.8%	( <i>n</i> = 102,016) 95.2%
Not Poor	( <i>n</i> = 1,356) 2.9%	( <i>n</i> = 45,022) 97.1%
Moderately Poor	( <i>n</i> = 345) 2.2%	( <i>n</i> = 15,159) 97.8%
Extremely Poor 2014-2015	( <i>n</i> = 5,322) 4.7%	( <i>n</i> = 107,423) 95.3%
Not Poor	( <i>n</i> = 1,361) 2.7%	( <i>n</i> = 49,883) 97.3%
Moderately Poor	( <i>n</i> = 320) 2.1%	( <i>n</i> = 14,727) 97.9%
Extremely Poor 2015-2016	( <i>n</i> = 5,230) 4.5%	( <i>n</i> = 110,099) 95.5%
Not Poor	( <i>n</i> = 1,184) 2.3%	( <i>n</i> = 49,731) 97.7%
Moderately Poor	( <i>n</i> = 265) 1.9%	( <i>n</i> = 13,659) 98.1%
Extremely Poor	( <i>n</i> = 4,835) 4.2%	( <i>n</i> = 110,742) 95.8%

With respect to 2013-2014, a statistically significant difference was present in Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement,  $\chi^2(2) = 417.04$ ,  $p < .001$ , by student economic status, with a below small effect size, Cramer's V of .05. Grade 8 Hispanic students who were Extremely Poor were assigned this consequence more than one and one half times more often than Grade 8 Hispanic students who were Not Poor and more than two times more often than Grade 8 Hispanic students who were Moderately Poor. In this school year, Grade 8 Hispanic students who were Moderately Poor were assigned this consequence almost one quarter more often than were Grade 8 Hispanic students who were Not Poor. Table 6 contains the descriptive statistics for this analysis.

Concerning 2014-2015, a statistically significant difference was present,  $\chi^2(2) = 468.47$ ,  $p < .001$ , by Grade 8 Hispanic student economic status, with a below small effect size, Cramer's V of .05. Grade 8 Hispanic students who were Extremely Poor were assigned this consequence more than one and one half times than Grade 8 Hispanic students who were Not Poor and more than two times more often than Grade 8 Hispanic students who were Moderately Poor. Similar to the previous school year, Grade 8 Hispanic students who were Moderately Poor were assigned this consequence more than a quarter times more often than Grade 8 Hispanic students who were Not Poor. Descriptive statistics for this analysis are revealed in Table 6.

Regarding 2015-2016, a statistically significant difference was present,  $\chi^2(2) = 474.947$ ,  $p < .001$ , by Grade 8 Hispanic student economic status, with a below small effect size, Cramer's V of .05. Grade 8 Hispanic students who were Extremely Poor received this consequence more than one and one half times more often than Grade 8 Hispanic students who were Not Poor and more than two times more often than Grade 8 Hispanic students who were Moderately Poor. Similar to the previous two school years, Grade 8 Hispanic students who were Moderately Poor were assigned this consequence more than a quarter times more often than Grade 8 Hispanic students who were Not Poor. Table 6 contains the descriptive statistics for this analysis.

### 3.7. Results for Grade 6 Black Students

In 2012-2013 for Grade 6 Black students, a statistically significant difference was present in Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement,  $\chi^2(2) = 222.10$ ,  $p < .001$ , by economic status, with a below small effect size, Cramer's V of .07 [22]. Grade 6 Black students who were Extremely Poor were assigned to a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement more than almost two and one half times more often than were Grade 6 Black students who were Not Poor and more than two and one half times more often than Grade 6 Black students who were Moderately Poor. Similar percentages of Grade 6 Black students in the Not Poor and the Moderately Poor groups were assigned this consequence. Descriptive statistics for this school year are presented in Table 7.

*Table 7. Frequencies and Percentages of Disciplinary Alternative Education Program Placements by Economic Status for Grade 6 Black Students in the 2012-2013 Through the 2015-2016 School Years.*

School Year and Economic Status	Received a DAEP Placement <i>n</i> and %age of Total	Did Not Receive a DAEP Placement <i>n</i> and %age of Total
2012-2013		
Not Poor	( <i>n</i> = 249) 1.9%	( <i>n</i> = 12,677) 98.1%
Moderately Poor	( <i>n</i> = 76) 2.0%	( <i>n</i> = 3,767) 98.0%
Extremely Poor	( <i>n</i> = 1,546) 4.6%	( <i>n</i> = 32,038) 95.4%
2013-2014		
Not Poor	( <i>n</i> = 214) 1.7%	( <i>n</i> = 12,713) 98.3%
Moderately Poor	( <i>n</i> = 85) 2.2%	( <i>n</i> = 3,742) 97.8%
Extremely Poor	( <i>n</i> = 1,358) 4.1%	( <i>n</i> = 31,664) 95.9%
2014-2015		
Not Poor	( <i>n</i> = 224) 1.6%	( <i>n</i> = 13,688) 98.4%
Moderately Poor	( <i>n</i> = 68) 1.9%	( <i>n</i> = 3,556) 98.1%
Extremely Poor	( <i>n</i> = 1,352) 4.3%	( <i>n</i> = 30,330) 95.7%
2015-2016		
Not Poor	( <i>n</i> = 232) 1.7%	( <i>n</i> = 13,691) 98.3%
Moderately Poor	( <i>n</i> = 63) 1.8%	( <i>n</i> = 3,434) 98.2%
Extremely Poor	( <i>n</i> = 1,238) 3.8%	( <i>n</i> = 31,043) 96.2%

With respect to 2013-2014, a statistically significant difference was present,  $\chi^2(2) = 724.31$ ,  $p < .001$ , by student economic status, with a below small effect size, Cramer's V of .08 [22]. Revealed was the presence of a stair-step effect [23] in Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements by student economic status. Grade 6 Black students who were Extremely Poor were assigned to a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement more than two and one half times more often than were Black students who were Not Poor and almost two times more often than were Grade 6 Black students who were Moderately Poor. Grade 6 Black students who were Moderately Poor were assigned this consequence almost a quarter times more often than were Grade 6 Black students who were Moderately Poor. Delineated in Table 7 are the descriptive statistics for this analysis.

Concerning 2014-2015, a statistically significant difference was present,  $\chi^2(2) = 622.28$ ,  $p < .001$ , by Grade 6 Black student economic status, with a below small effect size, Cramer's V of .07 [22]. Grade 6 Black students who were Extremely Poor were assigned to a Disciplinary Alternative



Education Program placement more than two and one half times more often than were Grade 6 Black students who were Not Poor and more than two times more often than Grade 6 Black students who were Moderately Poor. Similar percentages of Grade 6 Black students who were in the Not Poor and Moderately Poor groups were assigned this consequence in this school year. Table 7 contains the descriptive statistics for this analysis.

Regarding 2015-2016, a statistically significant difference was present,  $\chi^2(2) = 622.28$ ,  $p < .001$ , by Grade 6 Black student economic status, with a below small effect size, Cramer's V of .07 [22]. As revealed in Table 7, Grade 6 Black students who were Extremely Poor were assigned to a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement more than two times more often than were Grade 6 Black students who were Not Poor and more than two times more often than Grade 6 Black students who were Moderately Poor. Congruent with the previous school year results, similar percentages of Grade 6 Black students who were in the Not Poor and Moderately Poor groups were assigned this consequence in this school year.

### 3.8. Results for Grade 7 Black Students

Regarding 2012-2013 for Grade 7 Black students, a statistically significant difference was present,  $\chi^2(2) = 243.83$ ,  $p < .001$ , by economic status, with a below small effect size, Cramer's V of .07 [22]. Grade 7 Black students who were Extremely Poor were assigned to a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement almost two times more often than were Grade 7 Black students who were Not Poor and more than two times more often than Grade 7 Black students who were Moderately Poor. Similar percentages of Grade 7 Black students who were in the Not Poor and Moderately Poor groups were assigned this consequence in this school year. Revealed in Table 8 are the descriptive statistics for this analysis.

**Table 8.** Frequencies and Percentages of Disciplinary Alternative Education Program Placements by Economic Status for Grade 7 Black Students in the 2012-2013 Through the 2015-2016 School Years.

School Year and Economic Status	Received a DAEP Placement <i>n</i> and %age of Total	Did Not Receive a DAEP Placement <i>n</i> and %age of Total
2012-2013		
Not Poor	( <i>n</i> = 470) 3.4%	( <i>n</i> = 13,392) 96.6%
Moderately Poor	( <i>n</i> = 120) 3.1%	( <i>n</i> = 3,789) 96.9%
Extremely Poor	( <i>n</i> = 2,182) 6.6%	( <i>n</i> = 30,787) 93.4%
2013-2014		
Not Poor	( <i>n</i> = 413) 3.0%	( <i>n</i> = 13,303) 97.0%
Moderately Poor	( <i>n</i> = 115) 2.9%	( <i>n</i> = 3,815) 97.1%
Extremely Poor	( <i>n</i> = 2,160) 6.5%	( <i>n</i> = 31,258) 93.5%
2014-2015		
Not Poor	( <i>n</i> = 424) 2.9%	( <i>n</i> = 14,131) 97.1%
Moderately Poor	( <i>n</i> = 111) 3.1%	( <i>n</i> = 3,477) 96.9%
Extremely Poor	( <i>n</i> = 1,828) 5.7%	( <i>n</i> = 29,981) 94.3%
2015-2016		
Not Poor	( <i>n</i> = 400) 2.7%	( <i>n</i> = 14,320) 97.3%
Moderately Poor	( <i>n</i> = 102) 2.8%	( <i>n</i> = 3,477) 97.2%
Extremely Poor	( <i>n</i> = 1,799) 5.8%	( <i>n</i> = 29,437) 94.2%

Concerning Grade 7 Black students in 2013-2014, a statistically significant difference was present,  $\chi^2(2) = 279.10$ ,  $p < .001$ , by student economic status, with a below small effect size, Cramer's V of .07 [22]. Grade 7 Black students who were Extremely Poor were assigned this consequence more than two times more often than Grade 7 Black students who were Not Poor and more than two times more often than Grade 7 Black students who were Moderately Poor. Similar percentages of Grade 7 Black students who were in the Not Poor and Moderately Poor groups were assigned this consequence. Table 8 contains the descriptive statistics for this analysis.

With respect to 2014-2015, a statistically significant difference was present,  $\chi^2(2) = 200.90$ ,  $p < .001$ , by Grade 7 Black student economic status, with a below small effect size, Cramer's V of .06 [22]. Revealed was a stair-step effect [23] in Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements by student economic status. Grade 7 Black students who were Extremely Poor were assigned this consequence almost two times more often than were Grade 7 Black students who were Not Poor and more than one and one half times more often than Grade 7 Black students who were Moderately Poor. Commensurate with the previous school year, similar percentages of Grade 7 Black students who were in the Not Poor and Moderately Poor groups were assigned this consequence in this school year. Descriptive statistics for this analysis are revealed in Table 8.

Regarding 2015-2016, a statistically significant difference was present,  $\chi^2(2) = 237.09$ ,  $p < .001$ , by Grade 7 Black student economic status, with a below small effect size, Cramer's V of .07 [22]. Grade 7 Black students who were Extremely Poor were assigned this consequence more than two times more often than were Grade 7 Black students who were Not Poor and more than two times more often than Grade 7 Black students who were Moderately Poor. Congruent with the previous two school years, similar percentages of Grade 7 Black students who were in the Not Poor and Moderately Poor groups were assigned this consequence in this school year. Revealed in Table 8 are the descriptive statistics for this analysis.

### 3.9. Results for Grade 8 Black Students

In 2012-2013 for Grade 8 Black students, a statistically significant difference was present,  $\chi^2(2) = 265.74$ ,  $p < .001$ , by economic status, with a below small effect size, Cramer's V of .07 [22]. Grade 8 Black students who were Extremely Poor were assigned this consequence more than one and one half times more often than Grade 8 Black students who were Not Poor and more than two times more often than Grade 8 Black students who were Moderately Poor. Grade 8 Black students who were Moderately Poor were assigned this consequence almost one quarter times more often than were Grade 8 Black students who were Not Poor. Delineated in Table 9 are the descriptive statistics for this analysis.

**Table 9.** Frequencies and Percentages of Disciplinary Alternative Education Program Placements by Economic Status for Grade 8 Black Students in the 2012-2013 Through the 2015-2016 School Years.

School Year and Economic Status	Received a DAEP Placement <i>n</i> and %age of Total	Did Not Receive a DAEP Placement <i>n</i> and %age of Total
2012-2013		
Not Poor	( <i>n</i> = 643) 4.4%	( <i>n</i> = 14,057) 95.6%
Moderately Poor	( <i>n</i> = 141) 3.8%	( <i>n</i> = 3,597) 96.2%
Extremely Poor	( <i>n</i> = 2,528) 8.0%	( <i>n</i> = 29,095) 92.0%
2013-2014		
Not Poor	( <i>n</i> = 573) 3.9%	( <i>n</i> = 14,023) 96.1%
Moderately Poor	( <i>n</i> = 139) 3.5%	( <i>n</i> = 3,843) 96.5%
Extremely Poor	( <i>n</i> = 2,377) 7.3%	( <i>n</i> = 30,343) 92.7%
2014-2015		
Not Poor	( <i>n</i> = 541) 3.5%	( <i>n</i> = 14,881) 96.5%
Moderately Poor	( <i>n</i> = 131) 3.5%	( <i>n</i> = 3,642) 96.5%
Extremely Poor	( <i>n</i> = 2,295) 7.3%	( <i>n</i> = 29,294) 92.7%
2015-2016		
Not Poor	( <i>n</i> = 568) 3.7%	( <i>n</i> = 14,723) 96.3%
Moderately Poor	( <i>n</i> = 120) 3.4%	( <i>n</i> = 3,378) 96.6%
Extremely Poor	( <i>n</i> = 2,158) 6.9%	( <i>n</i> = 28,894) 93.1%

With respect to Grade 8 Black students in 2013-2014, a statistically significant difference was present,  $\chi^2(2) = 247.71$ ,  $p < .001$ , by student economic status, with a below small effect size, Cramer’s V of .07 [22]. Grade 8 Black students who were Extremely Poor were assigned this consequence more than one and one half times more often than Grade 8 Black students who were Not Poor and more than two times more often than Grade 8 Black students who were Moderately Poor. Grade 8 Black students who were Moderately Poor were assigned this consequence almost a quarter times more often than were Grade 8 Black students who were Not Poor. Table 9 contains the descriptive statistics for this analysis.

Concerning 2014-2015, a statistically significant difference was present,  $\chi^2(2) = 307.56$ ,  $p < .001$ , by Grade 8 Black student economic status, with a below small effect size, Cramer’s V of .08 [22]. Grade 8 Black students who were Extremely Poor were assigned this consequence more than two times more often than were Grade 8 Black students who were Not Poor and more than two times more often than Grade 8 Black students who were Moderately Poor. Similar percentages of Grade 8 Black students who were in the Not Poor and Moderately Poor groups were assigned this consequence in this school year. Descriptive statistics for this analysis are in Table 9.

Regarding 2015-2016, a statistically significant difference was present,  $\chi^2(2) = 235.46$ ,  $p < .001$ , by Grade 8 Black student economic status, with a below small effect size, Cramer’s V of .07 [22]. Grade 8 Black students who were Extremely Poor were assigned this consequence more than one and one half times more often than Grade 8 Black students who were Not Poor and more than two times more often than Grade 8 Black students who were Moderately Poor. Congruent with the previous school year, similar percentages of Grade 8 Black students who were in the Not Poor and Moderately Poor groups were assigned this consequence in this school year. Table 9 contains the

descriptive statistics for this analysis.

Concerning the research question involving the presence of trends, in all four school years, in all three grade levels, and for each ethnic/racial group, students, regardless of their ethnicity/race, who were Extremely Poor were assigned higher rates of Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements than their peers who were either Moderately Poor or Not Poor. Students who were Moderately Poor had statistically significantly higher rates of Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements than their peers who were Not Poor. These results were consistent across grade levels, across ethnic/racial groups, and across the four years of data.

### 4. Discussion

In this study, the degree to which differences were present in the receipt of a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement by economic status by Grade 6, 7, and 8 students were examined for the 2012-2013, 2013-2014, 2014-2015, and the 2015-2016 school years. For Grade 6, 7, and 8 White, Hispanic, and Black students, inequities were clearly established in Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements by student economic status. Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement rates for Grade 6-8 White students who were Extremely Poor ranged from 2.0% to 5.3%. For White students who were Moderately Poor, Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement rates ranged from 0.8% to 3.2%, and for White students who were Not Poor, the Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement rates ranged from 0.4% to 1.5% within the 4-year study. The presence of a stair-step effect [23] was clearly present in the assignment of this consequence by student degree of poverty. Readers are directed to Table 10 for a summary of effect sizes for Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement rates by economic status for Grade 6-8 White students across the four school years.

**Table 10.** Summary of Disciplinary Alternative Education Program Placement Results by Economic Status for Grade 6-8 White Students in the 2012-2013 Through the 2015-2016 School Years.

Grade Level and School Year	Cramer’s V	Effect Size Range	Highest DAEP Rate
Grade 6			
2012-2013	.09	Below Small	Extremely Poor
2013-2014	.08	Below Small	Extremely Poor
2014-2015	.07	Below Small	Extremely Poor
2015-2016	.08	Below Small	Extremely Poor
Grade 7			
2012-2013	.10	Small	Extremely Poor
2013-2014	.10	Small	Extremely Poor
2014-2015	.09	Below Small	Extremely Poor
2015-2016	.09	Below Small	Extremely Poor
Grade 8			
2012-2013	.10	Small	Extremely Poor
2013-2014	.11	Small	Extremely Poor
2014-2015	.11	Small	Extremely Poor
2015-2016	.10	Small	Extremely Poor

Hispanic students in Grades 6-8 who were Extremely Poor

were assigned Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement rates from 1.6% to 4.8% in these four school years. For Hispanic students who were Moderately Poor, Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement rates ranged from 0.8% to 2.5% and from 0.8% to 2.9% for Hispanic students who were Not Poor. Table 11 contains a summary of effect sizes for Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement rates by economic status for Grade 6, 7, and 8 Hispanic students across the four school years.

**Table 11.** Summary of Disciplinary Alternative Education Program Placement Results by Economic Status for Grade 6-8 Hispanic Students in the 2012-2013 Through the 2015-2016 School Years.

Grade Level and School Year	Cramer's V	Effect Size Range	Highest DAEP Rate
Grade 6			
2012-2013	.05	Below Small	Extremely Poor
2013-2014	.04	Below Small	Extremely Poor
2014-2015	.04	Below Small	Extremely Poor
2015-2016	.04	Below Small	Extremely Poor
Grade 7			
2012-2013	.05	Below Small	Extremely Poor
2013-2014	.05	Below Small	Extremely Poor
2014-2015	.05	Below Small	Extremely Poor
2015-2016	.05	Below Small	Extremely Poor
Grade 8			
2012-2013	.05	Below Small	Extremely Poor
2013-2014	.05	Below Small	Extremely Poor
2014-2015	.05	Below Small	Extremely Poor
2015-2016	.05	Below Small	Extremely Poor

Black students who were Extremely Poor had the highest rates of Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements. Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement rates for Black students who were Extremely Poor ranged from 3.8% to 8.0% in these four school years. For Black students who were Moderately Poor, Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements ranged from 1.8% to 3.8% within the four school years. For Black students who were Not Poor, Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement rates ranged from 1.6% to 4.4% in these four school years. The presence of a stair-step effect [23] in Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements by student economic status was clearly established for Grade 6 Black students. Table 12 contains a summary of effect sizes for Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements by economic status for Grade 6-8 Black students across the four school years.

**Table 12.** Summary of Disciplinary Alternative Education Program Placement Results by Economic Status for Grade 6-8 Black Students in the 2012-2013 Through the 2015-2016 School Years.

Grade Level and School Year	Cramer's V	Effect Size Range	Highest DAEP Rate
Grade 6			
2012-2013	.07	Below Small	Extremely Poor
2013-2014	.06	Below Small	Extremely Poor
2014-2015	.07	Below Small	Extremely Poor
2015-2016	.06	Below Small	Extremely Poor
Grade 7			
2012-2013	.07	Below Small	Extremely Poor

Grade Level and School Year	Cramer's V	Effect Size Range	Highest DAEP Rate
2013-2014	.07	Below Small	Extremely Poor
2014-2015	.06	Below Small	Extremely Poor
2015-2016	.07	Below Small	Extremely Poor
Grade 8			
2012-2013	.07	Below Small	Extremely Poor
2013-2014	.07	Below Small	Extremely Poor
2014-2015	.08	Below Small	Extremely Poor
2015-2016	.07	Below Small	Extremely Poor

#### 4.1. Connections with Existing Literature

In this multiyear statewide analysis, results were commensurate with the results of previous researchers [e.g., 4, 8, 5, 6] regarding the presence of inequities in the assignment of discipline consequences. Khan and Slate [8] established the presence of strong disproportionalities in the assignment of discipline consequences to Black, Hispanic, and White students on the basis of their economic status. Results delineated here were in strong agreement with [8]. In a previous investigation, [9] determined that students from low-income families or who were enrolled in high poverty schools were statistically significantly more likely to receive disciplinary consequences and Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements than their peers who were not economically disadvantaged. Similar consistencies were also revealed in a related investigation by [5] in which they established the presences of statistically significant higher rates of assignments to a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement for both Grade 7 and Grade 8 students who were economically disadvantaged in comparison to their grade level peers who were not economically disadvantaged. In this 4-year statewide investigation, Black students who were Extremely Poor had the highest rates of Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement; rates that ranged from 3.8% to 8.0% across the three grade levels. Strongly evident in this investigation was the presence of a stair-step effect [23] in the assignment of Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements by student economic status.

#### 4.2. Implications for Policy and for Practice

Several implications for policy and for practice can be made from the results of this multiyear, empirical statewide investigation. First, educational leaders and school administrators should analyze their school campus and their school district discipline data to ascertain the degree to which disproportionalities might be present. Specifically examined should be the consequences of in-school suspension, out-of-school suspension, Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements, expulsions, and Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program placements. In the audits that are conducted, educational leaders are encouraged to examine the degree to which disproportionalities might be present in their school assignment of disciplinary consequences on the basis of student economic status, ethnicity/race, or gender. Through the program evaluation information that is obtained, the information could be used to improve existing discipline programs or to development new discipline programs. A

second implication is that education leaders and school administrators need to have disciplinary codes of conduct structured to eliminate disproportionate discipline methods as well as minimizing the presence of any subjectivity of in assignment this discipline consequence. Another implication would be to analyze the history of students who are assigned discipline consequences. Do these students misbehave repeatedly over a multiyear period such that they receive several in-school suspensions, followed by several out-of-school suspensions, and then by a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement or a Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program placement? If so, this process would suggest a failure in the discipline methods that were used. A final recommendation is for policymakers in Texas to require a statewide analysis of discipline consequences to determine the degree to which inequities might be present. Such inequities could be construed as being violations of students' civil rights to have an appropriate and free education.

### 4.3. Recommendations for Future Research

Based upon the results of this multiyear, statewide investigation, several suggestions for future research can be made. First, researchers are encouraged to examine the degree to which inequities might be present in Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements as a function of student ethnicity/race. Such studies could be conducted separately for boys and for girls, rather than analyzing both groups of students together. The extent to which inequities might be different for boys and for girls is not known. A third recommendation would be for researchers to extend this investigation to students in other grade levels. Analyzing data at the elementary school level could provide useful information regarding the frequency with which this consequence is administered to young children. Extending this investigation to students at the high school level could also provide valuable information to education leaders and policymakers.

Because this investigation was based entirely on Texas data, researchers are encouraged to extend this study into other states. The degree to which the findings delineated herein are generalizable to students in other states is not known. In this investigation, only the discipline consequence of Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placement was analyzed. Researchers are encouraged to examine other discipline consequences such as in-school suspension, out-of-school suspension, and Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program placements. More empirical information is needed regarding the presence or absence of inequities in the assignment of these discipline consequences to students based on their economic status, ethnicity/race, or gender. A final recommendation for future research is to examine the reasons why students are assigned discipline consequences. Are students assigned different consequences for the same misbehavior due to their economic status, their ethnicity/race, or gender?

## 5. Conclusion

The purpose of this research was to determine the extent to

which inequities were present in Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements by the economic status of Texas Grade 6, 7, and 8 White, Hispanic, and Black students. Four school years of archival data from the Texas Education Agency Public Education Information Management System were analyzed. In each of the school years, White, Hispanic, and Black students who were Extremely Poor were assigned statistically significantly higher rates of Disciplinary Alternative Education Program placements than their peers who were either Moderately Poor or who were Not Poor. As such, a stair-step effect [23] was clearly present in the assignment of this consequence by student degree of poverty. Findings of this 4-year Texas statewide investigation were congruent with the results of previous researchers [e.g., 4, 8, 5, 16, 6] regarding the presence of inequities in the assignment of discipline consequences.

## References

- [1] Curtiss, K., & Slate, J. R. (2015). *Differences in disciplinary consequences and reasons for Texas elementary students by gender*. Poster presented at the Hawaii International Conference on Education, Honolulu, HI.
- [2] National Association of Secondary School Principals. (2000). *Statement on Civil Rights Implications of Zero Tolerance Programs*. Testimony presented to the United States Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, DC.
- [3] Butler, B., Lewis, C., Moore, J., & Scott, M. (2012). Assessing the odds: Disproportional discipline practices and implications for educational stakeholders. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 81, 11-24.
- [4] Barnes, M. J., & Slate, J. R. (2016). Grade 4 and 5 inequities in disciplinary consequences by ethnicity/race and gender. *Journal of Global Research in Education and Social Science*, 5, 216-221. Retrieved from <http://www.ikpress.org/issue633>
- [5] Lopez, E., & Slate, J. R. (2016). Differences in disciplinary alternative educational placement as a function of economic status for White students. *Journal of Global Research in Education and Social Sciences*, 6 (2), 75-79.
- [6] Texas Education Agency. (2014a). *Recoded Economic Status, Recoded Disciplinary Consequence Assigned Crosstabulation*. Retrieved from [http://tea.texas.gov/Reports\\_and\\_Data/Data\\_Submission/PEIMS/PEIMS\\_Data\\_Standards/PEIMS\\_Data\\_Standards/](http://tea.texas.gov/Reports_and_Data/Data_Submission/PEIMS/PEIMS_Data_Standards/PEIMS_Data_Standards/)
- [7] Texas Education Agency. (2014b). *Recoded Economic Status, Recoded Reason for Discipline Consequence*. Retrieved from [http://tea.texas.gov/Reports\\_and\\_Data/Data\\_Submission/PEIMS/PEIMS\\_Data\\_Standards/PEIMS\\_Data\\_Standards/](http://tea.texas.gov/Reports_and_Data/Data_Submission/PEIMS/PEIMS_Data_Standards/PEIMS_Data_Standards/)
- [8] Khan, M. Q., & Slate, J. R. (2016). Disciplinary consequence differences in Grade 6 students as a function of race/ethnicity and economic status. *Journal of School Administration Research and Development*, 1, 39-46.
- [9] Gregory, A., Skiba, R. J., & Noguera P. A. (2010). The achievement gap and the discipline gap: Two sides of the same coin? *Educational Researcher*, 39 (1), 59-68. doi: 10.3102/0013189X09357621.

- [10] Harlow, C. W. (2003). *Education and correctional population*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved from <http://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=814>
- [11] Chapman, C., Laird, J., Ifill, N., & Kewal Ramani, A. (2011). *Trends in High School Dropout and Completion Rates in the United States: 1972-2009* (NCES 2012-006). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch>
- [12] Carrell, S. E., & Hoekstra, M. L. (2010). Externalities in the classroom: How children exposed to domestic violence affect everyone's kids. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 2 (1), 211-228.
- [13] Hilberth, M. R. (2010). *Black and White Texas middle school student discipline referral consequences and their relationship to academic achievement* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (UMI 3448047).
- [14] Hilberth, M. R., & Slate, J. R. (2014). Middle school Black and White student assignment to disciplinary consequences: A clear lack of equity. *Education & Urban Society*, 46, 312-328. doi: 10.1177/0013124512446218.
- [15] Jones, M. C. (2013). *White and Hispanic Texas middle school student' discipline consequence type and academic achievement: A statewide analysis* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text. (UMI No 3571403).
- [16] Skiba, R. J., & Peterson, R. (2000). School discipline at a crossroads: From zero tolerance to early response. *Exceptional Children*, 66 (3), 335-345.
- [17] Wallace, J. M., Jr., Goodkind, S., Wallace, C. M., & Bachman, J. G. (2008). Racial, ethnic, and gender differences in school discipline among U.S. school students: 1991-2005. *The Negro Educational Review*, 59, 47-62.
- [18] Johnson, R. B., & Christensen, L. (2012). *Educational research*. Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches (4th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- [19] Burney, V. H., & Beilke, J. R. (2008). The constraints of poverty on high achievement. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 31, 171-197.
- [20] Maughan, S. (1999). Policy and implementation of the juvenile justice alternative programs throughout the state of Texas. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 50, 124-129.
- [21] Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- [22] Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- [23] Carpenter, D., Ramirez, A., & Severn, L. (2006). Gap or gaps—Challenging the singular definition of the achievement gap. *Education and Urban Society*, 39 (1), 113-127. doi: 10.1177/0013124506291792.