

**A STUDY OF EARLY CHILDHOOD PRESERVICE TEACHERS' LOCUS OF
CONTROL AND SELF CONCEPT AS COMPARED TO THEIR
APPROACH TO DISCIPLINE**

by

Julia Raymond Lorenz

A Thesis
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Science
With a Major in
Home Economics

Approved: 2 Semester Credits

Dr. N. Amanda Branscombe

Investigation Advisor

**The Graduate College
University of Wisconsin-Stout
December, 2000**

The Graduate College
University of Wisconsin-Stout
Menomonie, WI 54751

ABSTRACT

Lorenz, Julia R.

A STUDY OF EARLY CHILDHOOD PRESERVICE TEACHERS' LOCUS OF CONTROL AND SELF CONCEPT AS COMPARED TO THEIR APPROACH TO GUIDANCE

Home Economics N. Amanda Branscombe December, 2000 72 pages

Style Manual of the American Psychological Association

The purpose of this study was to examine the locus of control and self concept of preservice teachers as it relates to the approach to guidance they might use in a particular situation.

Preservice teachers have been studied at length, giving both teachers and researchers a rich source of information. According to Berliner (1987), the efforts have attempted to clarify the nature of teaching expertise and to identify teacher education practices that facilitate its development. Thus, many studies have focused on the development of intending teachers' knowledge and beliefs about good teaching during the course of training (Hollingsworth, 1988; Lin, Taylor, and Gorrell, 1999; Wilson and Cameron, 1996).

Veenman (1984) states that research consistently indicates beginning teachers perceive discipline to be their most serious problem.

Locus of control generally refers to the extent to which an individual believes his or her behavior determines specific life events (Rotter, 1966; Rotter, Chance, and Phares, 1972; Lefcourt, 1981). People with an “internal” locus of control tend to believe they are in control of their destinies and are able to cause certain events. People with an “external” locus of control tend to believe that events are caused by factors beyond their control: fate, luck, or powerful others.

There is little research documenting preservice teachers’ locus of control, and none correlating preservice teachers’ locus of control with guidance practices. Internal locus of control has been correlated to a “less custodial attitude” in teachers (Henderson, 1982), but research correlating locus of control to specific approaches to guidance strategies in preservice teachers does not exist.

In very general terms, self concept is defined as “the image we hold of ourselves” (Hoge and Renzulli, 1993, p. 440). To go further, self concept can be defined as attitudes, feelings, and knowledge that individuals have about their skills, abilities, appearance, and social acceptability (Byrne, 1984). Like locus of control, self concept of preservice teachers has been studied over several decades, but no studies have specifically correlated self concept to their approach to a particular guidance situation.

The researcher combined three survey instruments in order to measure locus of control, self concept and preferred approach to guidance: the Tennessee Self Concept Test, the Locus of Control for Teachers survey, and a guidance scenario from the Early

Childhood Teacher Beliefs About Discipline Survey. A group of UW-Stout preservice teachers consisting of 35 Developmentally Appropriate Practice laboratory students and 11 student teachers participated in the study by completing a paper-and-pencil instrument.

The data collected was analyzed at the University of Wisconsin-Stout Academic Computing Center. Frequency counts and percentages were computed on all items of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. Mean scores were determined on the responses of the Locus of Control Scale for Teachers. Total response scores were entered and converted to percentages for the guidance scenario portion of the survey.

The data was analyzed using a Pearson Correlation Coefficient Matrix on all combinations of data. T-tests were also computed on selected variables.

Results of the data analysis determined that there is a statistically significant correlation between external locus of control and custodial or mandating guidance strategy in preservice teachers. The data analysis suggests that external locus of control is a significant predictor of custodial or mandating guidance strategies.

Acknowledgements

The author wishes to acknowledge the guidance and expertise of her thesis advisor, Dr. N. Amanda Branscombe. I appreciate her excitement about this project and her enthusiastic support of it. I wish to thank Dr. Marian Marion for the use of her coded guidance scenario which was integral to the study. I thank Dr. Karen Zimmerman for her advice and assistance with this project. Christine Ness of the Academic Computing Center of UW-Stout deserves acknowledgement for her prompt and knowledgeable assistance in analyzing the data. The students who participated in the study are appreciated. I thank my family for their patience as I completed my project (which seemed to take precedence over the laundry, for some reason). And finally, I am deeply grateful to my colleagues at the Child and Family Study Center, particularly Heidi Weber and Julie Scharlau, for their kindness to me and their good humor during this very strenuous time!

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	4
Assumptions	5
Limitations of the Study	6
Specific Objectives	6
Definition of Terms	7
Chapter 2 Review of Literature	9
Early Childhood Preservice Teachers Beliefs about Guidance and Discipline ..	10
Locus of Control in Teachers	16
Self Concept	21
Summary	23
Chapter 3 Methodology	24
Purpose	24
Participants	25
Instrumentation	26
Data Analysis	28
Chapter 4 Findings and Discussion	30
Findings	30
Research Question 1	30

Chapter 4, continued

Research Question 2	32
Research Question 3	32
Research Question 4	34
Research Question 5	34
Discussion	34
Chapter 5 Summary, Conclusions, Recommendations for Further Research	39
Summary	39
Conclusions	41
Recommendations for Further Research	42
References	44
Appendix A Table 1	53
Appendix B Table 2	55
Appendix C Table 3	57
Appendix D Table 4	59
Appendix F Introductory Letter and Research Survey	61
Appendix G Coding Scheme for Guidance Scenario	70

A STUDY OF EARLY CHILDHOOD PRESERVICE TEACHERS' LOCUS OF
CONTROL AND SELF CONCEPT AS COMPARED TO THEIR
APPROACH TO GUIDANCE

Chapter 1

Introduction

Preservice teachers are a unique population in that they embody, in a way, teacher educators' highest hopes for educational reform. Currently, most early childhood professionals represent the idea of reform through developmentally appropriate practice—DAP-- in the early childhood setting (Bredekamp, 1986; Bredekamp and Copple, 1997). As the movement towards that reform gains widespread support, early childhood preservice teachers become the bellwether of change.

Developmentally appropriate practice is a decidedly child-centered approach (Bredekamp and Copple, 1997); thus, guidance and classroom management practices of current preservice teachers should reflect that approach. According to Bredekamp and Copple, teachers of young children should

facilitate the development of social skills, self-control, and self-regulation in children by using positive guidance techniques, such as modeling and encouraging expected behavior, redirecting children to more acceptable activities, setting clear limits, and intervening to enforce consequences for unacceptable, harmful behavior (1997, p. 129).

The clear message to teachers is that developmentally appropriate practice requires reflective thinking to encourage humane treatment for children as they learn the boundaries of social behavior and interactions. Skillful teachers help to create responsible and self-directed children.

As developmentally appropriate practice becomes the standard in early childhood settings, guidance moves from a more custodial, or mandating approach to a constructive, or teaching approach.

The call to recognize and support developmentally appropriate practice encompasses a wide range of areas. Along with materials, curriculum, and program practices, teachers' beliefs and practices are being quantified as never before. In this way, we hope to arrive at the best possible environment to nurture young children's growth and development.

It follows, then, that one way to gauge the impact of current teacher education programs is to examine early childhood preservice teachers' beliefs about themselves, and to examine their practices in the realm of guidance and classroom management.

Of course, teacher education programs cannot completely account for the individual's actions. In addition to freshly-imparted classroom information, early childhood preservice teachers come to their experiences with other forms of background knowledge. Perhaps they have spent time in one or another early childhood setting, for example. Most importantly, students have personal experiences with a family of origin during their own childhood and adolescence. This last knowledge, personal history/personality, informs every thought and action—is a screen through which individual

perception is analyzed. For that reason, individual perception, as it relates to locus of control and self-concept, is addressed in this study.

Locus of control generally refers to the extent to which an individual believes his or her behavior determines specific life events (Rotter, 1966; Rotter, Chance, and Phares, 1972; Lefcourt, 1981). People with an “internal” locus of control tend to believe they are in control of their destinies and are able to cause certain events. People with an “external” locus of control tend to believe that events are caused by factors beyond their control: fate, luck or powerful others (Parkay, Greenwood, Olejnik, and Proller, 1986).

Locus of control, then, refers to an individual’s perception of how much influence he or she can exert over the circumstances of life.

How does locus of control influence a teacher’s approach? For one thing, “where one falls on a continuum ranging from external to internal locus of control appears to be related to the degree of stress one perceives and how well one is able to cope with that stress” (Parkay et al). Those with an external locus of control orientation “respond to stress with more anxiety, neurotic symptoms, and self-punitiveness” (Butterfield, 1964; Rotter, 1966; Watson, 1967; Hountras and Scharf, 1970).

In addition to perceived stress, locus of control orientation is related to classroom climate, teacher potential, attitudes towards students, and student achievement (Sadowski et al 1982).

While teachers’ locus of control has been studied to a significant degree (Sadowski, et al, 1982; Parkay et al, 1986; Piegge & Marso, 1994; Norton, 1997), there is little research documenting early childhood preservice teachers’ locus of control, and

none correlating early childhood preservice teachers' locus of control with guidance practices. Internal locus of control has been correlated to a "less custodial attitude" in teachers (Henderson, 1982), but research correlating locus of control to specific approaches to guidance in preservice teachers does not exist.

Self concept, the second characteristic explored in the study, has been defined in very general terms as "the image we hold of ourselves" (Hoge and Renzulli, 1993, p. 440). To go further, self concept can be defined as attitudes, feelings, and knowledge that individuals have about their skills, abilities, appearance, and social acceptability (Byrne, 1984).

Like locus of control, self concept is an aspect of the teacher's character that has been studied over several decades (Combs, 1965; Purkey, 1970; Brophy and Good, 1974; Tonelson, 1981; Jersild, 1985; Juhasz, A., 1990; Sherman and Christian, 1999, and others). According to Juhasz (1990), it is usually linked to students in some fashion. The assumption is that in order to build positive high self-esteem in others, one must also possess this attribute (Jersild, 1985).

According to Tonnelson (1981), teachers with high self concept treat students with dignity and worth, encourage self-acceptance, and serve as facilitators. Does the same hold true of early childhood preservice teachers? There has been some research regarding early childhood preservice teachers, but none that specifically corresponds self concept to a their actions in a particular guidance situation.

It also seems possible that those with a good self concept would have an internal locus of control. How do these two factors correlate with one another?

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to determine the relationship between preservice teachers' locus of control as measured by the Locus of Control Scale for Teachers, their self concept as measured by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, and their approach to a particular guidance situation, as measured by a coded guidance scenario from the Early Childhood Teacher Beliefs About Discipline Survey.

Assumptions

For the purposes of this study, the researcher made certain assumptions about guidance strategies. Answers to the guidance scenario were coded into twenty-three categories according to work done by Marion & Swim (2000) (See Appendix H). The researcher made the assumption that the following behaviors could be classified as constructive or teaching strategies: attending to the victim; acknowledging/labeling/validating the feelings of the child or children; giving the child or children words to use; model appropriate behavior; provide reinforcement for appropriate behaviors; help children play together; reflect on practices and/or create an environment that prevents problems; generate or impose consequences (natural or logical); talk with one child about behavior or how to solve the problem; assist both children with solving the problem; and attempt to arouse empathy in aggressor. The researcher made the assumption that the following behaviors could be classified as custodial or mandating behaviors: solve the problem for both children; negate the problem; make the aggressor apologize or make the aggressor comfort the victim (deals

with child only); punish the child by: threatening to remove from area, actually removing from the area, threatening to put in time-out, or actually putting in time out; and other forms of punishment. The researcher made the assumption that the following behaviors were unclear or would need more information to determine a category: ask question of child who is the aggressor (question clearly is not as part of no-lose problem solving); state or review classroom rules; redirect the child or children; ignore behavior of child or children; talk with parents; items that do not fit into any other category.

Limitations of the Study

The study is limited in a number of ways. First of all, the population sample is small (46 completed surveys). Secondly, the study participants are all students at the same university. Thirdly, the 23 guidance scenario responses were classified into three main categories: teaching/positive guidance, custodial/punishment, and unclear/need more information to decide. This classification is based on assumptions about discipline held by the researcher and her advisor.

Specific Objectives

The purpose of this study was to examine locus of control and self-concept in early childhood preservice teachers as it related to their approach to guidance in a specific situation. Research questions included:

(1) Is there a relationship between the locus of control of early childhood preservice teachers and their approach to guidance in a given situation?

- (2) Is there a relationship between the self-concept of early childhood preservice teachers and their approach to guidance in a given situation?
- (3) Is locus of control a significant predictor of early childhood preservice teachers' approach to guidance in a given situation?
- (4) Is self-concept a significant predictor of early childhood preservice teachers' approach to guidance in a given situation?
- (5) Is there a relationship between locus of control and self-concept in early childhood preservice teachers?

Definition of Terms

Early Childhood Preservice Teachers are defined, for this study, to be undergraduate university students, enrolled in an Early Childhood Education major.

Early Childhood Program is any group program in a center, school, or other facility that serves children from birth through age 8. Early childhood programs include child care center, family child care homes, private and public preschools, kindergartens, and primary-grade schools.

Locus of Control is defined as the extent to which an individual believes his or her behavior determines specific life events (Rotter, 1966; Rotter, et al 1972; Lefcourt, 1981). People with an "internal" locus of control tend to believe they are in control of their destinies and are able to cause certain events. People with an "external" locus of control tend to believe that events are caused by factors beyond their control: fate, luck or powerful others (Parkay, Greenwood, Olejnik, and Proller, 1986).

Self concept is defined as attitudes, feelings, and knowledge that individuals have about their skills, abilities, appearance, and social acceptability. (Byrne, 1984) Global self concept is defined as the way (positive or negative) people feel about themselves in general. Coppersmith (1981) refers to self-esteem as being an individuals' judgment of his or her worthiness, successfulness, significance, and capability. Self-esteem and self concept are used synonymously in this study. They are defined in very general terms as "the image we hold of ourselves" (Hoge et al, 1993, p. 440).

Developmentally Appropriate Practice is defined as the process of professionals making decisions about the well-being and education of children based on at least three important kinds of knowledge: (1) what is known about child development and learning; (2) what is known about the strengths, interests, and needs of each individual child in the group; and (3) knowledge of the social and cultural contexts in which children live (Bredekamp and Copple, 1997, pp. 8-9).

Custodial or mandating orientation is defined as "a rigid and highly controlled setting concerned primarily with the maintenance of order" (Lunenburg and Cadavid, 1992).

Constructive or teaching orientation is defined as "helping children to learn personal responsibility for their behavior and to judge between right and wrong for themselves" (Fields and Boesser, 1994).

Chapter 2

Review of Literature

There is a wide body of research which examines teachers' attitudes, beliefs, and practices in the classroom. Locus of control orientation has been studied in relation to teachers and preservice teachers. Self concept has been studied as well. Likewise, there are many research papers that explicate preservice teachers' feelings about first encounters with guidance and/or classroom management.

In order to conduct a study correlating early childhood preservice teachers' locus of control orientation and self concept with guidance strategies, the researcher will investigate three main areas of educational research to discover how they are linked to the current study.

First, there is the matter of preservice teachers' own beliefs and perceptions about guidance--classroom management, motivating students, and handling challenging situations. All of the students have had similar courses, so one might predict that their beliefs would be similar. But the students come to their classroom experience with varying backgrounds and personalities, factors that heavily influence their perceptions of this highly personal issue. This review will focus on preservice teacher's understanding of classroom guidance and discipline as they progress through actual classroom experiences.

The second area of research to be reviewed is the matter of locus of control orientation in teachers. This topic (which encompasses both preservice and experienced

teachers) has resulted in a fairly diverse body of research. This review will focus on typical characteristics found inherent to each control “type,” and their perceived impact on the educational setting.

Thirdly, the researcher will investigate self concept in teachers—how it has been defined, how it impacts the educational process, and how it plays into guidance and classroom management.

Early Childhood Preservice Teachers Beliefs about Guidance and Discipline

According to Kenneth E. Smith (1997), the student teaching experience may be one of the most important points at which to examine teacher beliefs. Certainly it is an opportunity to see whether the academic preparation of students will correspond with their experiences in the classroom—whether theory and practice coincide—and to gauge how well preservice teachers can translate academic knowledge into effective teaching. Given the universal background of academic training, it is also an opportunity to gauge how a preservice teacher’s personality characteristics—specifically, locus of control or self concept-- might influence decisions about guidance and discipline.

Where discipline is concerned, the goal of teacher education is to help individuals develop the expertise necessary to effectively manage a learning environment. Brophy (1988) states:

Good classroom management implies not only that the teacher has elicited the cooperation of the students in minimizing misconduct and can intervene effectively when misconduct occurs, but also that worthwhile academic activities are occurring more or less continuously and that the classroom management

system as a whole (which includes but is not limited to the teacher's disciplinary interventions) is designed to maximize student engagement in those activities, not merely to minimize misconduct." (p. 5)

How does successful management and discipline factor into the preservice teacher's experience in a classroom? Emmer and Hickman (1991) have called attention to the fact that "a considerable amount of teacher attention is focused on behavioral outcomes that are not immediately linked to student learning but rather to achieving order and cooperation" (p. 757). In other words, the ability to create an environment conducive to learning is a somewhat different skill than the ability to influence learning or achievement outcomes, although the two are certainly linked. Thus classroom management/discipline exists as a separate entity to be evaluated in preservice teaching experience and provides information helpful in assessing other preservice teaching skills.

In their study entitled "Teacher Efficacy in Classroom Management and Discipline," Emmer and Hickman (1991) indicate that teacher beliefs predict preferences for certain strategies to deal with problems presented in vignettes, and might help account for differences in teacher effort, and preferences for particular discipline strategies. In fact, teacher's beliefs about their abilities to influence student outcomes have been identified as predictors of teacher effort, attitudes, and perceptions, and of teacher success in promoting student achievement (Ashton and Webb, 1986; Berman, McLaughlin, Bass, Pauly, and Zellman, 1977). Such beliefs appear to be tied to positive discipline strategies as well.

Most of the research indicates that classroom management is a particularly galvanizing aspect of preservice teaching. In studies exploring preservice teachers' perceptions about their initial teaching experience (e.g. Kropp, 1990, Mahlios and Maxson (1995) Spodak and Saracho, 1993), classroom management and discipline issues often rank high among the stresses preservice teachers report. Pigge and Marso (1986) and Beyerbach and Smith (1990) drew similar conclusions about preservice teachers' concerns with management and discipline.

Early childhood preservice teachers sometimes have an additional burden as they take up their classroom duties. In his article entitled "Preservice teachers' thoughts and fears about disciplining children," Erwin (1998) pointed out that

"preservice teachers in early childhood education programs face an additional challenge because current guidelines for best practice advocate for a child-centered approach which is often different than the styles and approaches most familiar to students (p. 55)".

So the disparity between academic preparation for early childhood teaching and the actual practices in classrooms sometimes places a strain on preservice teachers. Carter (1992) gave a poignant first-person view of her dive into preservice teaching. Trying to apply developmentally appropriate practices and still meet the expectations of a custodial-minded supervising teacher left her feeling compromised and caught in the middle of an evolution (Carter, p. 68). In a like manner, many preservice teachers must tailor their academic ideals to a less halcyon reality.

On the other hand, some research shows that management and discipline are of lesser concern. Silvernail and Costell (1983) and Evans and Tribble (1986) found teacher candidates more concerned with traditional academic issues and the emotional growth of their students. Evans et al (1986) attributed this lack of concern for potential problems to inadequate perspective taking. Weinstein (1988, 1989) found preservice teachers optimistic about their ability to maintain discipline and respond to misbehavior—even “unrealistically optimistic.” She reported that intending teachers believed strongly in the importance of a teacher’s affective characteristics, perhaps feeling the friendship would foster cooperation.

So findings are somewhat contradictory, a factor that might be explained by the progression from neophyte to experienced preservice teacher.

Another issue surrounding preservice teachers’ thoughts on guidance has to do with the amount of time spent on academic instruction versus direct experience. Preservice teachers in early childhood must rely on developmental theory typical of most early childhood teacher programs; the lack of direct experience seems to leave many preservice teachers feeling unprepared for issues surrounding guidance and classroom management (Erwin, 1998). This concern appears to be realistic—in the traditional model of training, students on ‘teaching practice’ are sometimes regarded as a threat to classroom discipline. According to Brooks (2000), even pupils who are by and large biddable and motivated see student teachers as “fair game,” a welcome diversion from the serious business of learning.

Not surprisingly, students feel that opportunities to work in real classrooms were the most valuable aspect of their education. Garmon (1993) found that students expressed highly negative attitudes about the heavy emphasis on educational and developmental theory in their coursework. They worried about the lack of structured opportunities to spend time in real classrooms, and insufficient preparation for the realities of classroom management. Because classroom management and discipline is a skill that must be honed through practice, preservice teachers appear to value the “hands-on” classroom learning opportunities highly, and to crave experience with real groups of students as they progress through their coursework.

Another stress factor in the acquisition of guidance and classroom management skills is represented by the supervising teacher. As suggested by Weinstein, Woolfolk, Dittmeier, and Shanker (1994), the ability to establish and maintain order is often viewed by supervisors as the hallmark of competence, making it a matter of much attention for student teachers. Discipline (or the lack thereof) is, in fact, a major factor in student teacher failure (Rickman et al, 1981). The pressure to appear competent is enormous.

This pressure to appear competent when observed by the supervisor is exacerbated by the preservice teacher’s sensitivity regarding comments about their teaching. According to McDermott, Gormley, Rothernberg, and Hammer (1995), student teachers revealed themselves to be very sensitive and impressionable about what others said about their teaching. The opinions of others—cooperating teachers and supervising teachers, for example-- was something they regarded as highly important in

their student teaching experience. Therefore, the opportunity to gain experience in the area of classroom management and discipline, so that comments about their teaching would be more positive, was prized by preservice teachers.

A number of studies have documented preservice teacher beliefs about topics related to child guidance and discipline. Researchers have looked at preservice teachers' beliefs about developmentally appropriate practice in general (Snider and Fu, 1990; Spidell, 1988; Wing, 1989), comparing experiences in the classroom to the knowledge base gained in academic preparation. Studies have quantified preservice teachers' perception of discipline (Veenman, 1984; Johnson, V.G., 1994; Erwin, 1998;) and their understanding of classroom management (Silvernail and Costello, 1983; Evans and Tribble, 1986; Weinstein, 1988, 1989). A fairly recent study by Tully and Chiu (1995) examines particular guidance strategies used by preservice teachers and their effectiveness (as decided by the preservice teachers). All of these studies help to give a realistic picture of preservice teachers and their perception of guidance and classroom management as they enter and make their way through student teaching.

According to Veenman (1984) research consistently indicates that beginning teachers perceive discipline to be their most serious problem, expressing doubts about their ability to successfully maintain order and guide behavior. This view is supported by the research of Charles (1989) and Edwards (1993) as well. Effective guidance continues to be one of the most universal and troubling aspects of preservice teaching.

In their article entitled "Student Teachers and Classroom Discipline," Tully and Chiu (1995) listed five types of discipline problems encountered by student teachers—

disruption, defiance, inattention, aggression, and miscellaneous (crying, stealing, etc.)— and the strategies preservice teachers used to handle those problems. Despite the differences in the ages of the students with whom they interacted (elementary through secondary levels), there was much similarity in the types of discipline problems identified by the student teachers. By far the most common problems were concerned with disruption, defiance and inattention (91%) with disruptions accounting for over half of the discipline problems. Students who could develop strategies for effectively managing these behaviors found many or most discipline problems solved.

It is not surprising that preservice teachers' perception of discipline has a major impact on their behavior and organizational strategies in the classroom. Johnson (1994) found that most preservice teachers held a rule-based conception of management that is consistent with the management practices of effective teachers. However, Brophy's research (1988) suggests that a power misconception (dominance) or a nurturance misconception (a romanticized notion of human nature) might interfere with a well-run classroom. In the case of a power misconception, the preservice teacher might try to rule by fear; a nurturance misconception might lead the preservice teacher to fail to provide necessary structure and authority. Either of these might result in chaos in the classroom, and that, according to Rickman and Hollowell (1981) can be a major factor in student teacher failure. No wonder effective guidance and discipline inevitably turns up as a universal stress of student teaching.

Preservice teachers have many thoughts and beliefs about guidance and discipline. They feel that academic preparation is not always adequate, and that real life

situations do not always mesh with what they have learned in college courses. They sometimes lack basic understanding of how to effectively manage a learning environment; they certainly long for practical experience to do so. The pressure to successfully apply guidance and discipline strategies in a real classroom setting is one of the most stressful aspects of preservice teaching.

Locus of Control in Teachers

Working from a social learning perspective, J.B. Rotter (1966) defined locus of control of reinforcement orientation as a generalized expectancy of internal versus external control over behavioral outcomes. In his study entitled “Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement,” Rotter (1966) described a proposed relationship between perceived locus of control and life events. Generally, locus of control refers to the extent to which an individual believes his or her behavior determines specific life events (Rotter, 1966; Rotter, Chance and Phares, 1972; Lefcourt, 1982). A person who believes his actions have a major impact on deciding events in life has an internal locus of control. By contrast, a person with an external locus of control believes that life events are decided by random chance, destiny, or others with more power.

While locus of control is closely related to another personality characteristic, efficacy (Parkay et al, 1982), Bandura (1977) distinguished between the two. According to Bandura (1977, p. 193), locus of control represents an outcome expectancy that “. . . is defined as a person’s estimate that a given behavior will lead to certain outcomes,” while

an efficacy expectation is “. . . the conviction that one can successfully execute the behavior required to produce the outcome.”

In the academic setting, locus of control in teachers has generated and refined its own body of measurement devices (Sadowski, Taylor, Woodward, Peacher, and Martin, 1982; Rose and Medway, 1981; Guskey, 1980; Rose, 1979; Armor, Condry-Oseguera, Cox, King, McDonnell, Pascal, Pandey, and Zellman, 1976; Barfield and Burlingame, 1974). These include forced choice format (Guskey, 1980; Rose, 1979; and Vasquez, 1974) and a likert-type format (Sadowski et al, 1982; Armor et al, 1976; Barfield and Burlingame, 1974).

Locus of control in teachers, then, has been studied a number of times and using various forms of measurement over the years. Lefcourt (1982) and Spector (1982) both reviewed locus of control research in its relationship to other teacher attributes. Czubaj (1996) studied locus of control as it relates to teacher motivation. Cheng (1994) related it to job attitudes. Parkay et al (1988) studied locus of control and its relationship to stress. Alderman (1990) linked locus of control to teacher efficacy. Kremer and Lifmann (1982) correlated teachers' locus of control to chronological age, with somewhat surprising results.

Lefcourt (1982) explored a number of data realms and compared them to locus of control. His research seems to suggest that internally controlled people have more of the characteristics of successful teachers: internally controlled people are described as “bright,” “intelligent,” and “successful,” while people exhibiting external control are labeled “dull,” “inadequate,” and “failure ridden.” Lefcourt (1982) and Spector (1982)

both determined that locus of control may be an important personality variable in understanding teachers and their role in the classroom.

In her article “Maintaining Teacher Motivation,” Czubaj (1996) identified locus of control as one major construct of motivation, with internal locus of control a factor that reduced teacher stress and therefore increased motivation. She went on to say, “When the working conditions of teachers remain conducive to the interactive dynamics of motivation, highly motivated teachers teach students to become highly motivated themselves, repeating a positive, productive cycle” (Czubaj, 1996, p.379). Thus it appears that locus of control can have a profound impact on teacher-student dynamics.

Cheng (1994) found locus of control to be a powerful indicator of teachers’ job attitudes and organizational perceptions. According to Cheng,

Teachers with a belief in internal control tend to have a more positive job attitude in terms of organizational commitment, intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction, social satisfaction, influence satisfaction, role clarity, and feeling of job challenge. They also tend to have more positive perceptions of the school organization in terms of principal’s leadership, organizational structure, teachers’ social norms, and organizational culture and effectiveness (from Abstract) .

While relating to teachers in Hong Kong, the findings were remarkably consistent with findings about populations in Western societies (Cheng, 1994).

Parkay et al (1986) found that “. . . (W)here one falls on a continuum ranging from external to internal locus of control appears to be related to the degree of stress

one perceives and how well one is able to cope with that stress.” Those with an external orientation, for example, tend to respond to stress with more anxiety, neurotic symptoms, and self-punitiveness (Butterfield, 1964; Rotter, 1966; Tolar and Rezinkoff, 1967; Platt and Eisneman, 1968; Goss and Morisko, 1966; Hountras and Scharf, 1970). On the other hand, internal locus of control correlates negatively with stress (Parkay et al, 1986). Two additional studies support this finding; Meadow, 1981, and Kyriacou and Sutcliffe, 1979, reported significant positive correlations between external locus of control and self-reported stress.

Alderman (1990) found that an internal locus of control correlated with high efficacy in teachers.

The foregoing body of research seems to indicate that locus of control plays an important role in the teacher’s perception of his or her perceived job, in job satisfaction, in student and teacher relationships, and even in the ability to teach well and motivate. Not surprisingly, a person’s place on the continuum ranging from external to internal locus of control has been shown to be related to the preservice teacher’s success in student teaching as well (Radford, Cashion, and Latchford, 1993). Locus of control has been correlated to anxiety level (Pigge and Marso, 1994), self concept as a teacher (Thomson and Handley, 1990) and reflective thinking (Norton, 1994). Kenneth Smith (1997) notes that in general, the preservice teacher with an internal locus of control orientation is less anxious, seen as more successful, and is more reflective than the student teacher with an external orientation.

Locus of control orientation has also been studied to determine its impact on classroom management and discipline. According to Henderson (1982), experienced teachers with an internal locus of control were seen as having a “less custodial attitude” towards their students. (Lunenburg, F. and Cadavid, V. (1992) defined a custodial orientation as an atmosphere with a rigid and highly controlled setting concerned primarily with the maintenance of order. Martin and Baldwin (1992) correlated an internal locus of control in preservice teachers to a “less intrusive discipline style.” Thus internal locus of control appears to have a positive correlation to NAEYC’s developmentally appropriate style of classroom management propounded by Bredekamp and Coppler (1997).

So locus of control appears to represent an important determiner of preservice teachers’ behavior in the classroom.

Self concept

Super (1957, p. 196) stated that “In choosing an occupation one is, in effect, choosing a means of implementing a self concept.” Self concept literature supports the notion that how individuals perceive themselves can impact all phases of their lives (Sherman et al, 1999). This seems to point to the idea that self concept directs much of the individual’s motivation; thus it follows that self concept would also represent an important determiner of preservice teachers’ classroom behavior.

In this study, self concept and self-esteem are used synonymously, as they are in the 1993 Hoge and Renzulli study entitled “Exploring the link between giftedness and self concept.” Self concept, or self-esteem, has been defined in very general terms as

“the image we hold of ourselves” (Hoge and Renzulli, 1993, p. 440). To go further, self concept can be defined as attitudes, feelings, and knowledge that individuals have about their skills, abilities, appearance, and social acceptability (Byrne, 1984).

Like locus of control, self concept is an aspect of the teacher’s character that has been studied over several decades (Combs, 1965; Purkey, 1970; Brophy and Good, 1974; Tonelson, 1981; Jersild, 1985; Juhasz, A., 1990; Sherman and Christian, 1999, and others). The studies, predictably, have been related to their behaviors in the classroom and/or student behaviors or outcomes.

According to Juhasz (1990), self concept in teachers is usually linked to students in some fashion. That is, teachers’ esteem is studied in relationship to their ability to teach and interact with students in ways which enhance student self-esteem. The assumption is that in order to build positive high self-esteem in others, one must also possess this attribute (Combs, 1965; Jersild, 1985).

Wylie (1979) determined that academic success and achievement may have a causal role in determining global self concept. This theory is also supported by Purkey, Raheim & Cage (1983) and Rosenberg (1979). These researchers used a skills-development approach and contended that enhancement of skills in a certain area . . . would lead to success in that area, and thereby enhance self concept. According to this approach, a teacher’s self concept impacts his or her ability to achieve successful learning outcomes with students and may indeed impact students’ self concept.

How might a preservice teacher’s self concept affect the strategies used in a particular guidance scenario? According to Glasser (1984) people strive to be consistent

with themselves and their own internally-held beliefs regarding themselves—that is, self concept should be a reflection of our action towards others. As Glasser says, “We are as we act” (1984). If this is true, we might expect that teachers with a healthy self concept treat others as though they matter, too. And this seems to be the case.

Tonnelson (1981) found that teachers with high self concept treat students with dignity and worth, encourage self-acceptance, and serve as facilitators. They also display warmth, acceptance, and permissiveness in the classroom and are secure enough to see the students’ point of view (Juhasz, 1990). These attributes tie into developmentally appropriate practice (Bredekamp et al, 1997) in that they allow teachers to approach students positively, looking at children as competent individuals who can work independently and act as problem-solvers in daily situations.

The research points toward a hypothesis that preservice early childhood teachers who exhibit a high self concept will use positive (constructive or teaching) guidance strategies. But as yet no research has been done that specifically correlates preservice early childhood teachers’ self concept with their approach to discipline in a particular instance.

Summary

Locus of control and self concept appear to be related to many aspects of a preservice early childhood teacher’s experience in the classroom. There is no research that specifically correlates these characteristics to a preservice teacher’s approach to guidance in a particular situation in an early childhood program. This, then, identifies a need for the intended study.

Chapter 3

Methodology

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine preservice teachers' locus of control and their self concept as compared to their approach to guidance used in a particular situation. Research questions included:

- (1) Is there a relationship between the locus of control of early childhood preservice teachers and their approach to guidance in a particular situation?
- (2) Is there a relationship between self concept of early childhood preservice teachers and their approach to guidance in a particular situation?
- (3) Is locus of control a significant predictor of early childhood preservice teachers' approach to guidance in a particular situation?
- (4) Is self concept a significant predictor of early childhood preservice teachers' approach to guidance in a particular situation?
- (5) Is there a relationship between locus of control and self concept in preservice early childhood teachers?

In examining locus of control and its possible relationship to specific guidance techniques, both qualitative and quantitative research techniques were employed. Although these two paradigms have been considered philosophically incompatible by some academicians (Norton, 1997), many investigators now view a combination of

methodologies and data (triangulation) as a logical method of conducting educational research (Anderson & Burns, 1990).

In this study triangulation was achieved through the use of the following measures:

- (1) numerical indices of locus of control; and
- (2) numerical indices of self concept; and
- (3) content analysis of written paragraphs answering a specific question related to guidance strategies in a particular situation, converted to percentages.

According to Norton (1997), this triangulation

. . . alleviates several traditional research concerns. The issues of validity, reliability, and generalizability have frequently plagued quantitative studies with small samples and qualitative studies in general. Triangulation, with its multiple perspectives and data sources, forms a network base of supporting, corroborative evidence. This network base enhances validity and reliability and allows generalizability of the research findings to other populations with increased confidence (p. 403).

Participants

To successfully complete the Early Childhood Education program at University of Wisconsin-Stout, students interact with children directly in a preschool classroom for at least two courses. One of these is a Developmentally Appropriate Practice laboratory, during which the student spends three hours each week in a preschool classroom setting. This is considered the introductory experience of the student in a preschool

setting, and includes key experiences: planning developmentally appropriate curriculum, working formally and informally with small groups, and practicing guidance and room management skills. A second experience is student teaching, during which the student spends one quarter (about eight weeks) in a preschool classroom environment, and gradually takes over complete control of the classroom for at least two weeks. This is a culminating experience, where the student is evaluated in key areas such as classroom management, guidance and interactions, curriculum development abilities, and general professional demeanor.

Early Childhood Education students at these two key points in their education were thought to be a logical population from which to gather data about preservice teaching beliefs and practices regarding guidance strategies.

In order to gather data regarding preservice teachers' beliefs and practices regarding guidance strategies and locus of control, a survey was handed out to 38 Developmentally Appropriate Practice (DAP) laboratory students and 13 student teachers during the Spring 2000 and Summer 2000 semesters of UW-Stout. The researcher handed out the survey in the DAP morning lab meetings and individually or in small groups to the student teachers. Participants were assured that completion of the survey was voluntary and that the results would be kept confidential. Envelopes holding the completed surveys were gathered after each group of students completed the survey. Thirty-five DAP students and 11 student teachers completed and returned the survey.

Instrumentation

In this study, three testing instruments were combined to develop a survey. The first instrument is the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, Second Edition, developed by Western Psychological Services. This scale was developed in the 1960s and is well-respected, averaging over 200 references annually in a wide variety of publications in the fields of education, psychology, and the social and health sciences (Fitts and Warren, 1996). The scale was used to determine the participants' self concept in a number of areas including family, academic, physical, moral, personal and social. These were summarized in a total self concept score. The test includes four sub-tests to quantify validity: inconsistent responding, self-criticism, faking good, and response distribution. Supplementary scores include identity, satisfaction, and behavior scores.

The second instrument is the Locus of Control Scale for Teachers, developed by Sadowski, Taylor, Woodward, and Martin in the early 1980s. The scale was developed because the researchers determined that other scales available to them contained too few pieces of data to adequately determine true locus of control in teachers. The researchers initially asked 100 questions relating to a teacher's locus of control and, through testing for reliability and internal validity, narrowed the number of questions down to twenty, which comprises the current scale. This Likert-type scale was tested for validity, reliability, and internal consistency, and was used in several studies by various combinations of the authors. This scale was developed especially to determine the locus of control of classroom teachers.

The third, qualitative part of the instrument was taken from coded guidance scenario in the Early Childhood Teacher Beliefs About Discipline Survey. This scenario was developed in 1999 by Marion and Swim to assist in their research regarding discipline patterns of classroom teachers. The scenario consists of a purported guidance situation for which participants are asked to give an open-ended response as to how best to handle it. Responses were coded into 23 different categories for the purposes of the Marion and Swim study.

For the purpose of this survey, the 23 response categories were further coded into three categories: responses that were considered teaching (or constructive) responses, mandating (or custodial) responses, and responses which were unclear, or for which more information was needed. (See Assumptions in Chapter 1.) These responses were tallied for each participant and the total number in each category converted to a percentage.

Data Analysis

The data collected was analyzed at the University of Wisconsin-Stout Academic Computing Center. Frequency counts and percentages were computed on all items of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. Mean scores were determined on the Likert-type scaled responses of the Locus of Control Scale for Teachers. Total response scores were entered and converted to percentages for the guidance scenario portion of the survey.

The data was then analyzed using a Pearson Correlation Coefficient matrix on all combinations of data for the total group of respondents. This approach allowed all

factors in the study to be compared to one another to determine whether there was significant correlation between any of the factors.

T-tests were also computed on selected variables. The first t-test was computed in order to analyze differences in responses based on the participant's age. A second t-test was computed to analyze differences in responses based on the participant's level of university coursework completed (i.e. whether a DAP lab student or a student teacher). The third t-test was computed to analyze differences in responses based on the amount of classroom experience participants had prior to the survey. A fourth t-test was computed to analyze individual responses to the locus of control questions (items 83 to 102) based on the participant's level of university coursework completed (DAP or student teacher). The fifth t-test was computed to analyze individual responses to the locus of control questions (items 83 to 102) based on the participant's classroom experience prior to the survey.

The findings and conclusions of the data analysis follows in chapter 4.

Chapter 4

Findings and Discussion

Results of the survey entitled “A Study of Early Childhood Preservice Teachers’ Locus of Control and Self concept as Compared to Their Approach to Guidance” are presented in this chapter. The data pertains to the responses from 46 surveys, 35 completed by Developmentally Appropriate Practice (DAP) students and 11 completed by student teachers. The findings have been highlighted with tables and grouped according to the corresponding research question. Discussion of the findings follows.

Findings

Research Question 1: Is there a relationship between the locus of control of early childhood preservice teachers and their approach to guidance in a given situation?

Correlations were computed between the locus of control scale total mean response (for internal, external, and total locus of control scores) and the percentage of constructive or custodial behaviors. A t-test correlated responses to all items with the level of university experience (DAP student or student teacher). No significant statistical differences were found. A t-test correlated responses to all items with the years of experience in an early childhood program, less than two years compared to two years or more. Several of these combinations resulted in a significant degree or close to significant degree of correlation between a subject’s level of outside experience and locus of control, percent of mandating/custodial behaviors, self concept total raw and t-score, and self concept sub-scores in three areas.

In addition, t-tests measured participants' responses on each individual locus of control scale item based on two factors: level of university experience completed, and level of outside experience in an early childhood program setting. Several of these combinations resulted in a significant degree or close to significant degree of correlation between locus of control of early childhood preservice teachers and their approach to guidance.

On the Pearson Correlation Coefficient Matrix, two factors correlated to a significant degree (.05). The percent of custodial behaviors correlated with external locus of control (significant to .028) and total locus of control (significant to .030). See Table 1, Appendix A, for statistical data.

On the t-test which correlated locus of control with years of experience, three factors correlated to a significant degree (.05). Participants with two years or less of experience in an early childhood program scored higher on external locus of control (.018) and total locus of control (.027). A related factor is the percent of custodial behavior, which was not significant to .05, but was fairly close at a degree of significance of .062, higher for participants with less than two years experience in an early childhood program. Participants with two years or less of experience also scored significantly higher (.027) on the negative items subscale of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. See Table 2, Appendix B, for statistical data.

On the t-test for individual locus of control items that related responses to an individual's years of experience in an early childhood program, three items registered as significantly different to .05, and one item registered as significantly different to .01.

Question 083 (see Appendix F) was significant to .024. Question 095 (see Appendix F) was significant to .023. Question 098 (Appendix B) was significant to .042. Question 102 (see Appendix F) was significant to .009. See Table 3, Appendix C, for statistical data.

On the t-test for individual locus of control items that related responses to an individual's level of university experience (DAP student or student teacher) one item registered as significant to .05, and one item was close but not significant to .05. Question 090 (see Appendix F) was significant to .05. Question 083 (see Appendix F) was rated significant to .094 (not statistically significant but close). See Table 4, Appendix D, for statistical data.

Research Question 2: Is there a relationship between the self concept in preservice teachers and their approach to guidance in a given situation?

Correlations were computed between all subscales of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale and the percentage of constructive or custodial behaviors. While no scores were statistically significant, the correlation between the TSCS self-criticism scale and the percent of constructive/teaching behaviors was close to significant at .070.

Research Question 3: Is locus of control a significant predictor of early childhood preservice teachers' approach to guidance in a given situation?

Correlations were computed between the locus of control scale total mean response (for internal, external, and total locus of control scores) and the percentage of constructive or custodial behaviors. T-tests correlated the locus of control scale total mean response and the percentage of constructive or custodial behaviors as related to

years of experience in an early childhood program, and level of university experience. In addition, t-tests measured participants' responses on each individual locus of control scale item based on two factors: level of university experience completed, and level of outside experience in an early childhood program.

On the Pearson Correlation Coefficient Matrix, two factors correlated to a significant degree (.05). The percent of custodial behaviors correlated with external locus of control (significant to .028) and total locus of control (significant to .030). See Table 1, Appendix A, for statistical data. On the t-test which correlated locus of control with years of experience, two factors correlated to a significant degree (.05).

Participants with two years or less of experience in an early childhood program scored higher on external locus of control (.018) and total locus of control (.027). See Table 2, Appendix B, for statistical data.

On the t-test which correlated locus of control with level of university experience, no significant statistical differences were found.

On the t-test for individual locus of control items that related responses to an individual's years of experience in an early childhood program, three items registered as significantly different to .05, and one item registered as significantly different to .01. Question 083 (see Appendix F) was significant to .024. Question 095 (see Appendix F) was significant to .023. Question 098 (Appendix B) was significant to .042. Question 102 (see Appendix F) was significant to .009. See Table 3, Appendix C, for statistical data.

On the t-test for individual locus of control items that related responses to an individual's level of university experience (DAP student or student teacher) one item registered as significant to .05. Question 090 (see Appendix F) was significant to .034. See Table 4, Appendix D, for statistical data.

Research Question 4: Is self concept a significant predictor of early childhood preservice teachers' approach to guidance in a given situation?

Correlations were computed between all subscales of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale and the percentage of constructive or custodial behaviors. On the Pearson Correlation Coefficient Matrix, no scores were statistically significant. On the t-test correlating responses to all items with the level of outside experience in an early childhood program, no statistically significant differences were found. On the t-test correlating responses to all items with the level of university experience (DAP or student teacher) no statistically significant differences were found.

Research Question 5: Is there a relationship between locus of control and self-concept in early childhood preservice teachers?

Correlations were computed between the total t-score of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale and the mean scores for internal, external, and total locus of control of the participants. On the Pearson Correlation Coefficient Matrix, there was no significant correlation between total t-score and locus of control mean scores.

Discussion

The researcher found statistically significant information in response to two of the questions in the test—research question 1 and research question 3.

Research question 1 (“Is there a correlation between early childhood preservice teacher’s locus of control and their approach to discipline in a particular situation?”) can be answered yes, there is a correlation between the external locus of control mean score and the percent of custodial/mandating behavior. There is also a significant correlation between total locus of control mean score and the percent of custodial/mandating behavior. One can make the connection that students who participated in this survey tend toward having an external locus of control. Also, the external locus of control correlating to custodial/mandating behavior is somewhat related to earlier research, if from the opposite direction. Henderson (1982) identified teachers with an internal locus of control as having a “less custodial attitude (where ‘custodial orientation’ is an atmosphere with a rigid and highly controlled setting concerned primarily with the maintenance of order)”. Martin and Baldwin (1992) correlated internal locus of control to a “less intrusive discipline style.” Researchers have not correlated external locus of control in early childhood preservice teachers to a particular discipline style. This research clearly correlates external locus of control to a custodial/mandating approach to discipline. See Table 1 for a statistical representation of this information.

An individual’s years of experience in an early childhood program also correlated to an external locus of control to a significant degree, and was closely related (although not significantly correlated) to a custodial/mandating approach to discipline. Individuals with less than two years of experience were more likely to operate under an external locus of control, and to use the custodial/mandating approach to discipline

more often than those with more than two years of experience in an early childhood program. See Table 2, Appendix B, for a statistical representation of this information.

The t-test for individual locus of control items as compared to an individual's years of experience in an early childhood program revealed those with less years of experience to be strongly external in their locus of control on three items. Item 083 (Once a child gets headed in the wrong direction, it is not up to me to straighten him or her out), 095 (I don't feel there is much a teacher can do to influence the standardized test scores which are dropping each year), and 098 (I feel like I cannot accomplish anything in the teaching profession) were significantly correlated to higher agreement by the less experienced group. This may simply be an expression of their lack of the skills needed to influence young children, or may be related to true external locus of control in teaching. Interestingly, the less experienced students also showed a much stronger agreement with one very positive statement than those with more years of experience in an early childhood program: Item 102 (If I consistently practice appropriate techniques, even the most difficult behavior problems can be managed). This seems like a somewhat sophisticated message; does it reflect their understanding and acceptance of the early childhood department's guidance philosophy, or perhaps their hopes for future success? See Table 3, Appendix C, for statistical representation of this data.

The t-test which compared individual locus of control items to level of university experience (DAP student or student teacher) had one statement (090, A teacher has a great amount of influence on the personality and attitudes of students) which correlated

significantly with level of university experience. The DAP students had a stronger agreement to this statement. This information seems conflicted-- that the same students who agree so strongly that they can have influence on personality and attitudes of students also feel that they cannot accomplish anything in the teaching profession. Once again, one feels that there is a dichotomy between the students' perceived abilities in the classroom currently, and the way they hope to interact with young children in the future. Table 4, Appendix D, shows statistical representation of this data.

Research question 3 ("Is locus of control a significant predictor of early childhood preservice teachers' approach to guidance in a given situation?") can be answered yes, at least as far as external locus of control is concerned. That is, the study revealed that there is a significant correlation between the external locus of control mean score and the percent of custodial/mandating behavior. There is also a significant correlation between total locus of control mean score and the percent of custodial/mandating behavior. As stated previously, the external locus of control correlating to mandating/custodial behavior is somewhat related to earlier research of Henderson (1982) and Martin and Baldwin (1992). These researchers correlated internal locus of control to less intrusive discipline and a less custodial attitude on the part of the teacher. Researchers have not correlated external locus of control in early childhood preservice teachers to a particular discipline style. The current study clearly correlates external locus of control to a custodial/mandating approach to discipline. See Table 1 for a statistical representation of this information.

The data from this study did not support any evidence of an internal locus of control correlating to early childhood preservice teachers' approach to guidance. Since the studies cited were almost always tied to internal locus of control, this lack of results was disappointing. The data from this study did not support any evidence of self concept being correlated to early childhood preservice teachers' approach to guidance, or to locus of control and self concept being linked.

The data from this study did not support any evidence of an internal locus of control correlating to early childhood preservice teachers' approach to guidance. Since the studies cited were almost always tied to internal locus of control, this lack of results was disappointing.

As to research questions 2, 4, and 5, no significant correlations were discovered. The data from this study did not support any evidence of self concept being correlated to early childhood preservice teachers' approach to guidance, or to locus of control and self concept being linked in early childhood preservice teachers.

Chapter 5

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations for Further Research

This chapter contains a summary of the research conducted. In addition, conclusions have been drawn based upon the findings, and recommendations made regarding future research.

Summary

The researcher began the study with five questions about locus of control and self concept, and their possible correlation to early childhood preservice teachers' approach to guidance. A review of the literature indicated that while both locus of control and self concept have been studied in relation to teachers, no research has attempted to correlate either locus of control or self concept to early childhood preservice teacher's approach to guidance in a particular situation. The researcher hoped that gathering information regarding this correlation might help to clarify how early childhood preservice teachers see themselves and how this affects their approach to guidance of young children.

The purpose of the research was to determine the relationship between preservice teachers' locus of control, their self concept, and their approach to a particular guidance situation. The objective of the research was to gain insight into the ways early childhood preservice teachers view themselves, and how this might affect their approach to discipline in an early childhood program setting.

In Spring and Summer 2000, the researcher compiled a survey composed of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, the Locus of Control Scale for Teachers, a coded guidance scenario from the Early Childhood Teacher Beliefs About Discipline Survey. Additional questions covered demographic data such as level of university experience and years of experience in an early childhood program setting. The survey was distributed to 51 DAP early childhood preservice teachers attending the University of Wisconsin-Stout. Forty-six surveys were returned.

The completed surveys were analyzed at the University of Wisconsin-Stout Academic Computing Center. Responses were analyzed using the Pearson Correlation Coefficient Matrix on all combinations of the data for the total group of respondents. T-tests were computed on selected variables.

Within the limitations of the study, two of the five research questions were verified. Research question 1 (Is there a relationship between the locus of control of early childhood preservice teachers and their approach to guidance in a given situation?) was shown to be true in that an external locus of control was correlated to a custodial/mandating approach to discipline. Research question 3 (Is locus of control a significant predictor of early childhood preservice teachers' approach to guidance in a given situation?) was also shown to be true in that external locus of control was correlated to a significant (.05) degree to a custodial/mandating approach to discipline.

The other three research questions were not verified by the research done in this study. Self concept was neither correlated to early childhood preservice teachers' approach to discipline, nor to being a significant predictor of that approach. Also, self

concept and locus of control in early childhood preservice teachers showed no correlation.

In the t-tests, level of university experience correlated with locus of control to a significant degree (.05) on three locus of control items, and to a very significant degree (.001) on one of the locus of control items. Years of experience in an early childhood program correlated with locus of control to a significant degree (.05) on one locus of control item.

In the t-test correlating years of experience in an early childhood program to all responses, participants with less than two years of experience scored significantly higher on the external locus of control measure than those having two or more years of experience. The more experienced group scored significantly higher (.05) on self concept as it related to academic or work settings.

Conclusions

Within the limitations, this research study supports earlier studies in which locus of control is correlated with classroom management and discipline styles. Specifically, custodial attitude (Henderson, 1982) and discipline style (Martin and Baldwin, 1992) have been correlated to locus of control. This research study is unique in that it correlates external locus of control to a custodial or mandating approach to discipline, whereas the earlier studies correlated internal locus of control to “a less custodial attitude” (Henderson, 1982) and “a less intrusive discipline style” (Martin and Baldwin, 1992).

An interesting aspect of the research is that it correlates locus of control of teachers to the level of university experience and the years of experience in an early childhood program. In each of these cases the data suggests that participants with less experience in either area had more responses indicating significantly higher external locus of control on the Locus of Control Scale for Teachers than the participants with more experience those areas. Whether this lack of experience accounts for the external locus of control in these instances cannot be determined from the data. But it would make sense that as a teacher gains more knowledge and experience, the feelings of being in control would strengthen.

Recommendations for further research

The results obtained from studying the correlation between early childhood preservice teachers' locus of control, self concept, and approach to discipline has indicated that further research should be done. The following recommendations are made toward a more thorough study of the subject.

- A larger sample of participants should be included in future studies.
- A study which compares DAP students at the very beginning of their laboratory experience and student teachers at the end of their three student teaching placements might yield more dynamic results.
- A longitudinal study that compares early childhood preservice teachers at the beginning of their DAP laboratory experience and at the end of their three student teaching placements might help to answer the question of whether locus of control in teachers changes with experience.

- In future studies, either more guidance scenarios or a list of forced-choice questions to determine guidance approach would be helpful to give respondents more opportunities to display their approach to guidance.
- This study could be carried out on other campuses.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, L.W., & Burns, R. B. (1990). *Research in classrooms: the study of teachers, teaching, and instruction*. New York: Pegamon Press.
- Armor, D., Condry-Oseguera, P., Cox, M., King, N., McDonnell, L., Pascal, A. Pauly, E., & Zellman, G. (1976). Analysis of the school preferred reading program in selected Los Angeles minority schools. Santa Monica: Rand.
- Ashton, P., & Webb, R. (1986). Making a difference: Teacher's sense of efficacy and student achievement. New York: Longman.
- Barfield, V., & Burlingame, M. (1974). The pupil control ideology of teachers in selected schools. Journal of Experimental Education, 42 (4), 6-11.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavior change. Psychological Review, 84, 191-215.
- Berman, P., McLaughlin, M., Bass, G., Pauly, C., & Zellman, G. (1977). Federal programs supporting educational change. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation (ERIC Document No. 140432).
- Brand, S.F. (1990). Undergraduates and beginning preschool teachers working with young children: Educational and Developmental issues. Young Children, 45 (1), 19-24.
- Bredekamp, S. (Ed.), (1984). *Developmentally appropriate practice in early childhood programs*. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Bredekamp, S. & Copple, C. (Eds.), (1997). Developmentally appropriate practice in early childhood programs (Rev. ed.). Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Brophy, J. (1988). Educating teachers about managing classrooms and students. Teaching and Teacher Education, 4 (1), 1-18.

Brophy, J., & Good, T. (1974). Teacher-student relationships: Causes and consequences. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Butterfield, E.C. (1964). Locus of control and teacher expectancy as related to achievement of young school children. Dissertation Abstracts International, 30, Sec. A, 4674.

Byrne, B.M. (1984). The general/academic self-concept nomological network: A review of construct validation research. Review of Educational Research, 54 (3), 427-456.

Caruso, J. J. (1977). Phases in student teaching. Young Children, 32, 57-63.

Charles, C.M. (1989). Building classroom discipline: From models to practice (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.

Cheng, Yin Cheong (1994). Locus of control as an indicator of Hong Kong teachers' job attitudes and perceptions of organizational characteristics. Journal of Educational Research, 87 (3), 180-188.

Combs, A. (1965). The professional education of teachers: A perceptual view of teacher preparation. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Czubaj, C. (1996). Maintaining teacher motivation. Education, 116 (3), 372-378.

Edwards, C.H. (1993). Classroom discipline and management. New York: Macmillan.

Erwin, E.J. (1998). Preservice teachers' thoughts and fears about disciplining children. Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education , 19 (1), 55-61.

Erwin, E.J. (1997). Fear and exhilaration: Students reflect on their first practicum experience. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Evans E. D., & Tribble, M. (1986). Perceived teaching problems, self-efficacy, and commitment to teaching among preservice teachers. Journal of Educational Research, 80, 81-85.

Fields, M. & Boesser, C. (1994). Constructive Guidance and Discipline. New York: Merrill.

Garmon, M. A. (April, 1993). Preservice teachers' perceptions of the first year of a teacher preparation program. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, Georgia.

Glasser, W. (1984). Control theory. New York: Harper & Row.

Goss, A. & Morisko, T. E. (1970). Relation between a dimension of internal-external control and the MMPI with an alcoholic population. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 34, 189-192.

Hoge, R.D., & Renzulli, J.S. (1993). Exploring the link between giftedness and self-concept. Review of Educational Research, 63 (4), 449-465.

Houtras, P. T., & Scharf, M. C. (1970). Manifest anxiety and locus of control of low achieving college males. *Journal of Psychology*, 74, 95-100.

Jersild, A. (1985). *When teachers face themselves*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Juhasz, A. McCreary. Teacher self-esteem: A triple-role approach to this forgotten dimension.

Johnson, V.G. (1994). Student teachers' conceptions of classroom control. *Journal of Educational Research*, 88 (2), 109-117.

Katz, L. G. (1977). *Talks with teachers*. Washington, DC: NAEYC.

Kremer & Lifman

Kropp, J. (1990). Practicum students' weekly self-assessments of their performance. A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Association for the Education of Young Children, Kansas City, Missouri.

Kyriacou, C., & Sutcliffe, J. (1979). A note on teacher stress and locus of control. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 52, 227-228.

Lefcourt, H. (1982). Locus of control: current trends in theory and research (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Lefcourt H. (1981). Research with the locus of control construct, Vol. I. New York: Academic Press.

Lin, H., Taylor, J., Gorrell, J., Hazareesingh, N., Carlson, H.L., & Asche, M. (1999). Early childhood and elementary preservice teachers' beliefs. Paper presented at the meeting of American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.

Mahlis, M. & Maxson, M. (1995). Capturing preservice teachers' beliefs about schooling, life, and childhood. Journal of Teacher Education, 46, 192-199.

Martin, N., & Baldwin, B. (1992). Beliefs regarding classroom management style: The difference between preservice and experienced teachers (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 355213).

McDermott, P., Gormley, K., Rothenberg, J. & Hammer, J. (1995). The Influence of Classroom Practica on Student Teachers' Thoughts About Teaching. Journal of Teacher Education, 46 (3), 184-191.

Meadow, K. P. (1981). Burnout in professionals working with deaf children. American Annals of the Deaf, 2, 13-22.

Norton, J.L. (1997). Locus of control and reflective thinking in preservice teachers. Education, 117 (3), 401-410.

Norton, J.L. (1994). Creative thinking and locus of control as predictors of reflective thinking in preservice teachers. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 366 579).

Parkay, F.W., Olejnik, S., & Proller, N. (1986). A study of the relationships among teacher efficacy, locus of control, and stress. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Pigge, F., & Marso, R. (1994). Relationships of prospective teachers' personality type and locus of control orientation with changes in their attitude and anxiety about teaching. Midwestern Educational Researcher, 7 (2), 2-7.

Piland, D. & Anglin, J. (1993). It is only a stage they are going through: the development of student teachers. Action in Teacher Education, 15 (3), 19-26.

Platt, J.J., & Eisenman, R. (1968). Internal-external control of reinforcement, time perspective, adjustment, and anxiety. Journal of General Psychology, 79, 121-128.

Purkey, W. (1970). Self-concept & school achievement. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Purkey, W., Raheim, A. & Cage, B. N. (1983). Self-concept as a learner: An overlooked part of self-concept theory. The Journal of Humanistic Education and Development, 22, (2), 52-57.

Radford, K., Cashion, M., & Latchford, S. (1993). Locus of control and teachers: A preliminary report of an investigation of locus of control in preservice teachers. Teacher Educator, 29 (1), 43-52.

Rickman, L.W., & Hollowell, J. (1981). Some causes of student teacher failure. Improving College and University Teaching, 29, 176-179.

Rose, J. S. (1979). Relationships among teacher locus of control, teacher and student behavior, and student achievement. (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, Columbia, 1978). Dissertation Abstracts International, 39, 7250A-7251A. (University Microfilms No. 79-11, 856).

Rose, J.S., & Medway, F. J. (1981). Measurement of teachers' beliefs in their control over student outcome. Journal of Educational Research, 74, 185-190.

Rosenberg, M. (1979). Conceiving the self. New York: Basic Books.

Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 80, 1-28.

Rotter, J.B., Chance, J., & Phares E.J. (Eds.) (1972). Application of a social learning theory of personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Sadowski, C. J., Blackwell, M. W., & Willard, J. L. (1986). Locus of Control and Student Teacher Performance. Education, 105 (4), 391-393.

Sadowski, C.J., Taylor, R. C., Woodward, H. R., Peacher, R. K., & Martin, B. J. (1982). The reliability and validity of a Likert-type locus of control scale for teachers. JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 12 (32). (Ms. No. 2475).

Sherman, H.J. & Christian, M. (1999). Mathematics attitudes and global self-concept: An investigation of the relationship. College Student Journal, 33 (1), 95-101.

Sherman, H.J. & Richardson, L.I. (1995). Elementary school teachers' beliefs and practices related to teaching mathematics with manipulatives. Educational Research Quarterly, 18 (4), 27-36.

Silvernail, D. L., & Costello, M. H. (1983). The impact of student teaching and internship programs on preservice teachers' pupil control perspectives, anxiety levels, and teaching concerns. Journal of Teacher Education, 34 (4), 32-26.

Smith, K. E. (1997). Student teachers' beliefs about developmentally appropriate practice: pattern, stability, and the influence of locus of control. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 12 (2) , 221-243.

Spector , P.E. (1982). Behavior in organizations as a function of employee's locus of control. Psychological Bulletin, 91, 482-497.

Spodek, B. & Saracho, O. N. (1990). Preparing early childhood teachers. in B. Spodek and O.N. Saracho (Eds.), Early childhood teacher preparation: Yearbook in early childhood education, 1, 23-44. New York: Teachers College Press.

Super, D. E. (1957). "The psychology of careers." New York: Harper & Brothers.

Thomson, J., & Handley, H. (1990). Relationship between teacher self-concept and teacher efficacy (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 327 508).

Tolar, A., & Resnikogg, M. (1967). Relation between insight, repression-sensitization, internal-external locus of control, and death anxiety. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 71, 426-430.

Tonelson, S. (1981). The importance of teacher self concept to create a healthy psychological environment for learning. Education, 102, 96-100.

Tully, M., & Chiu, L. H. (1995) Student teachers and classroom discipline. Journal of Educational Research, 88, 3, 164-171.

Vasquez, J. A. (1974). The relation of teacher locus of control to teacher characteristics and student reading gains. (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 34, 7058A-7059A. (University Microfilms No. 74-11,586).

Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. Review of Educational Research, 54 (2), 143-178.

Weinstein, C. S. (1988). Preservice teachers' expectations about the first year of teaching. Teaching and Teacher Education, 4 (1), 31-40.

Weinstein, C. S. (1989). Teacher education students' preconceptions of teaching. Journal of Teacher Education, *40*, 53-60.

Weinstein, C., Woolfolk, A., Dittmeier, L., & Shanker, U. (1994). Protector or prison guard? Using metaphors and media to explore student teachers' thinking about classroom management. Action in Teacher Education, *16*, 1, 41-54.

Williams, K.C. (1996). Preservice teachers' perceptions of early childhood programs. Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education, *17*, 39-49.

Wylie, R. G. (1979). *The self-concept: theory and research on selected topics* (rev. ed.). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska.

APPENDIX A

Table 1
Correlations between Percent Constructive and Percent Custodial Guidance
Compared to Locus of Control

	Internal	External	Total
Percent Constructive	.475	.651	.942
Percent Custodial	.297	.028 *	.030 *

*significant to .05%

APPENDIX B

Table 2
T-test correlating all factors of the survey
With years of experience in an early childhood program setting

Significant or close to Significant variables	Group 1 2 years or more		Group 2 < 2 years		t-value	df	exact probability	significance level
	Mean	St. Dev.	Mean	St. Dev.				
Self concept family sub-score	48.3158	5.3857	51.8000	6.5903	1.802	37	.080	
Self concept academic/ Work sub-score	44.5263	4.7066	48.2500	4.2535	2.595	37	.013	.05 *
Self concept negative item Sub-score	149.000	14.4491	159.950	15.1257	2.309	37	.027	.05 *
Self concept total raw . Score	293.000	24.7252	309.500	27.9915	1.947	37	.059	
Self concept total t score	48.79	8.63	54.30	9.30	1.916	37	.063	
Self concept behavior Sub-scale	77.4211	8.2887	882.050	7.5287	1.827	37	.076	
External locus of control Mean score	38.26	3.54	41.00	3.16	2.475	35	.018	.05 *
Total locus of control Mean score	78.68	4.58	82.61	5.70	2.316	35	.027	.05 *
Percent custodial Guidance mean score	14.2105	14.8071	25.0000	19.7129	1.925	37	.062	

APPENDIX C

Table 3
 Significant Differences in Locus of Control Items
 Grouped by Experience in an Early Childhood Program

Survey Statement	Group 1 2 years or more		Group 2 < 2 years		t-value	df	exact probability	significance level
	Mean	St. Dev.	Mean	St. Dev.				
083 Once a child gets headed the wrong direction, it is not up to me to straighten him or her out.	4.26	.99	4.85	.37	2.428	22.614	.024	.05 *
095 I don't feel there is much a teacher can do to influence the standardized test scores which are dropping each year.	4.00	.58	4.45	.60	2.377	36.999	.023	.05 *
098 I feel like I cannot accomplish anything in the teaching profession.	4.16	1.34	4.85	.37	2.169	20.533	.042	.05 *
102 If I consistently practice appropriate techniques, even the most difficult behavior problems can be managed.	4.05	.23	4.40	.50	2.799	26.882	.009	.001 **

APPENDIX D

Table 4

Significant Differences in Locus of Control Items
Grouped by Level of University Experience

Survey Statement	Group 1 student teachers		Group 2 DAP students		t-value	df	exact probability	significance level
	Mean	St. Dev.	Mean	St. Dev.				
083 Once a child gets headed the wrong direction, it is not up to me to straighten him or her out.	4.73	.47	4.34	1.03	-1.719	37.814	.094	
090 A teacher has a great amount of influence on the personality and attitudes of students.	4.18	1.17	4.74	.56	2.183	44	.034	.05 *

APPENDIX E

University of Wisconsin-Stout
Early Childhood Preservice Teacher Personality and Discipline Survey

Dear Early Childhood Preservice Teacher,

Discipline presents unique challenges to preservice teachers. I am interested in finding out how personality style might impact a decision about discipline. To learn more about this issue, I have developed a survey instrument that compares personality style to a discipline situation. I am gathering data from preservice teachers and student teachers at UW-Stout.

I would very much appreciate it if you would participate in this study. Please take about twenty minutes to complete this survey. Return your completed survey to me in the enclosed envelope. Your answers will be confidential and anonymous. The following statement is the university's official assurance that your participation is both valued and protected:

I understand that by returning this questionnaire, I am giving my informed consent as a participating volunteer in this study. I understand the basic nature of the study and agree that any potential risks are exceedingly small. I also understand the potential benefits that might be realized from the successful completion of this study. I am aware that the information is being sought in a specific manner so that no identifiers are needed and so that confidentiality is guaranteed. I realize that I have the right to refuse to participate and that my right to withdraw from participation at any time during the study will be respected with no coercion or prejudice.

I would be happy to talk with you about the results of this survey when the study has been completed. Please feel free to contact me about the results of the survey.

Thank you for your help on this important project!

Julia Lorenz
Department of Child Development, Family Living, and Community Education
Services
University of Wisconsin-Stout
Menomonie, Wisconsin

For information contact: Julia Lorenz, 715-232-1478, email: Lorenzj@uwstout.edu.

Questions or concerns about participation in this research may also be addressed to Ted Knous, Chair, UW-stout Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research, 11 HH, UW-Stout, Menomonie, WI 54751, phone 715-232-1126.

Typewritten Copy of Tennessee Self Concept Scale
(self-scoring sheets actually used)

Directions: This scale asks you to describe how you feel about yourself. There are no right or wrong answers, so please just describe yourself as honestly as you can. When you are ready to begin, read each statement and decide how well it describes you according to the scale below. Read each statement carefully. Then circle the number that shows your answer. Circle only one number for each statement, using this scale:

- Answer 1 if the statement is ALWAYS FALSE.
 Answer 2 if the statement is MOSTLY FALSE.
 Answer 3 if the statement is PARTLY FALSE AND PARTLY TRUE.
 Answer 4 if the statement is MOSTLY TRUE.
 Answer 5 if the statement is ALWAYS TRUE.

If you wish to change a response, cross it out with an X, and circle the new response you have chosen.

- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|-----|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. | I am an attractive person. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 2. | I am an honest person. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3. | I am a member of a happy family. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4. | I wish I could be more trustworthy. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5. | I do not feel at ease with other people. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6. | Math is hard for me. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 7. | I am a friendly person. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8. | I am satisfied with my moral behavior. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 9. | I am not as smart as the people around me. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 10. | I do not act the way my family thinks I should. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 11. | I am just as nice as I should be. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 12. | It is easy for me to learn new things. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 13. | I am satisfied with my family relationships. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 14. | I am not the person I would like to be. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 15. | I understand my family as well as I should. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 16. | I despise myself. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 17. | I don't feel as well as I should. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 18. | I do well at math. |

Answer 1 if the statement is ALWAYS FALSE.
 Answer 2 if the statement is MOSTLY FALSE.
 Answer 3 if the statement is PARTLY FALSE AND PARTLY TRUE.
 Answer 4 if the statement is MOSTLY TRUE.
 Answer 5 if the statement is ALWAYS TRUE.

- 1 2 3 4 5 19. I am satisfied to be just what I am.
- 1 2 3 4 5 20. I get along well with other people.
- 1 2 3 4 5 21. I have a healthy body.
- 1 2 3 4 5 22. I consider myself a sloppy person.
- 1 2 3 4 5 23. I am a decent sort of person.
- 1 2 3 4 5 24. I try to run away from my problems.
- 1 2 3 4 5 25. I am a cheerful person.
- 1 2 3 4 5 26. I am a nobody.
- 1 2 3 4 5 27. My family would always help me with any kind of trouble.
- 1 2 3 4 5 28. I get angry sometimes.
- 1 2 3 4 5 29. I am full of aches and pains.
- 1 2 3 4 5 30. I am a sick person.
- 1 2 3 4 5 31. I am a morally weak person.
- 1 2 3 4 5 32. Other people think I am smart.
- 1 2 3 4 5 33. I am a hateful person.
- 1 2 3 4 5 34. I am losing my mind.
- 1 2 3 4 5 35. I am not loved by my family.
- 1 2 3 4 5 36. I feel that my family doesn't trust me.
- 1 2 3 4 5 37. I am not good at the work I do.
- 1 2 3 4 5 38. I am mad at the whole world.
- 1 2 3 4 5 39. I am hard to be friendly with.
- 1 2 3 4 5 40. Once in a while I think of things too bad to talk about.
- 1 2 3 4 5 41. Sometimes when I am not feeling well, I am cross.

Answer 1 if the statement is ALWAYS FALSE.
 Answer 2 if the statement is MOSTLY FALSE.
 Answer 3 if the statement is PARTLY FALSE AND PARTLY TRUE.
 Answer 4 if the statement is MOSTLY TRUE.
 Answer 5 if the statement is ALWAYS TRUE.

- 1 2 3 4 5 42. I am neither too fat nor too thin.
- 1 2 3 4 5 43. I'll never be as smart as other people.
- 1 2 3 4 5 44. I like to work with numbers.
- 1 2 3 4 5 45. I am as sociable as I want to be.
- 1 2 3 4 5 46. I have trouble doing the things that are right.
- 1 2 3 4 5 47. Once in a while I laugh at a dirty joke.
- 1 2 3 4 5 48. I should have more sex appeal.
- 1 2 3 4 5 49. I shouldn't tell so many lies.
- 1 2 3 4 5 50. I can't read very well.
- 1 2 3 4 5 51. I treat my parents as well as I should.
- 1 2 3 4 5 52. I am too sensitive about the things people in my family say.
- 1 2 3 4 5 53. I should love my family more.
- 1 2 3 4 5 54. I am satisfied with the way I treat other people.
- 1 2 3 4 5 55. I ought to get along better with people.
- 1 2 3 4 5 56. I gossip a little at times.
- 1 2 3 4 5 57. Sometimes I feel like swearing.
- 1 2 3 4 5 58. I take good care of myself physically.
- 1 2 3 4 5 59. I try to be careful about my appearance.
- 1 2 3 4 5 60. I am true to my religion in my everyday actions.
- 1 2 3 4 5 61. I sometimes do very bad things.
- 1 2 3 4 5 62. I can always take care of myself in any situation.
- 1 2 3 4 5 63. I do as well as I want to at almost any job.
- 1 2 3 4 5 64. I feel good most of the time.

Answer 1 if the statement is ALWAYS FALSE.
Answer 2 if the statement is MOSTLY FALSE.
Answer 3 if the statement is PARTLY FALSE AND PARTLY TRUE.
Answer 4 if the statement is MOSTLY TRUE.
Answer 5 if the statement is ALWAYS TRUE.

- 1 2 3 4 5 65. I take a real interest in my family.
- 1 2 3 4 5 66. I try to understand the other person's point of view.
- 1 2 3 4 5 67. I'd rather win a game than lose one.
- 1 2 3 4 5 68. I am not good at games and sports.
- 1 2 3 4 5 69. I look fine just the way I am.
- 1 2 3 4 5 70. I do not know how to work well.
- 1 2 3 4 5 71. I have trouble sleeping.
- 1 2 3 4 5 72. I do what is right most of the time.
- 1 2 3 4 5 73. I am no good at all in social situations.
- 1 2 3 4 5 74. I solve my problems quite easily.
- 1 2 3 4 5 75. I am a bad person.
- 1 2 3 4 5 76. I am satisfied with my relationship with God.
- 1 2 3 4 5 77. I quarrel with my family.
- 1 2 3 4 5 78. I see something good in everyone I meet.
- 1 2 3 4 5 79. I find it hard to talk with strangers.
- 1 2 3 4 5 80. Sometimes I put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today.
- 1 2 3 4 5 81. It's easy for me to understand what I read.
- 1 2 3 4 5 82. I have a lot of self-control.

Test continued on next page.

Below are a number of statements about teachers and teaching. There are no right or wrong answers to the statements. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement by circling the one answer which reflects your opinion. Please read each item carefully and indicate the response which most closely corresponds to the way you personally feel.

MARK: SA if you Strongly Agree
 A if you Agree somewhat
 U if you are Undecided
 D if you Disagree somewhat
 SD if you Strongly Disagree

- SA A U D SD 83. Once a child gets headed in the wrong direction, it is not up to me to straighten him or her out.
- SA A U D SD 84. If the majority of my class does poorly on a test, the poor grades are generally because I did not teach the related concepts well.
- SA A U D SD 85. It is impossible to raise the current academic standards of public education.
- SA A U D SD 86. I believe I can help each student in my classes to experience success and self worth in some area.
- SA A U D SD 87. Some personalities just naturally clash and there is no way a particular student and teacher can get along.
- SA A U D SD 88. It seems as if absolutely nothing can be done about having to use physical punishment on students.
- SA A U D SD 89. When I can spend extra time with a slow learner, I soon see positive results.
- SA A U D SD 90. A teacher has a great amount of influence on the personality and attitudes of students.
- SA A U D SD 91. There will always be classroom fights among students regardless of how hard teachers try to prevent them.
- SA A U D SD 92. Many student who seem overly passive undergo drastic personality changes when a teacher designs an activity which challenges them.
- SA A U D SD 93. On days when my class is calm, I know the calmness has nothiing to do with my influence.
- SA A U D SD 94. If a child is being teased a lot, I can often think of something to do to get the teasing to stop.
- SA A U D SD 95. I don't feel there is much a teacher can do to influence the standardized test scores which are dropping each year.
- SA A U D SD 96. I often see a child who is a pawn and there is nothing I can to do help.
- SA A U D SD 97. A child's behavior problem can be adequately modified providing the teacher finds the correct solution.

MARK: SA if you Strongly Agree
 A if you Agree somewhat
 U if you are Undecided
 D if you Disagree somewhat
 SD if you Strongly Disagree

- SA A U D SD 98. I feel like I cannot accomplish anything in the teaching profession.
- SA A U D SD 99. Realistically, a teacher can invest time in a particular student to the point of diminishing returns, at which time further instruction is not productive.
- SA A U D SD 100. If I study the situation hard enough, there are few classroom problems I cannot solve.
- SA A U D SD 101. If a student comes to me in time, I can help with almost any problem.
- SA A U D SD 102. If I consistently practice appropriate techniques, even most difficult behavior problems can be managed.

103. Scenario:

Matt is 4 years old and attends Honeyvale Child Care Center. He has been at the center for a year with the same teacher, Ms. Hanson. Matt is an energetic child who seems to enjoy participating in many activities at the center. On this day, Matt is in the block area with two other children. Suddenly, Ms. Hanson hears Matt yell to one of the other children, "Give me that block." Ms. Hanson sighs as this is not the first time she has had to intervene when Matt plays with other children. As she hurries towards the block area, she sees Matt and the other child struggling over the block. Before she can actually reach the area, she observes Matt pushing the other child down and taking the block.

Please describe what you would do in this situation.

Demographic Information. Please mark an X in each space that describes you.

104. My gender is

Male
 Female

105. My age is

Under 21
 21 to 25
 26 to 30
 31 to 35
 36 to 40
 Over 40

106. My grade point average is

3.51 to 4.0
 3.01 to 3.5
 2.75 to 3.0

107. I have taken a class in Child Guidance.

Yes
 No

108. I have taken a class in Advanced Child Guidance.

Yes
 No

109. My position in the classroom is

Developmentally Appropriate Practice lab student
 Student Teacher

110. How much experience have you had in a formal early childhood setting (preschool, day care, before- or after-school care, bible camp, Sunday School, etc.)?

years, months

APPENDIX F

Coding Scheme for
Early Childhood Teacher Beliefs about Discipline survey
Scenario (#103 on questionnaire)
Marian Marion, Robin Muza, and Terri Swim

Teacher reported that she would:

Attend to the victim	10
Acknowledge/Label/Validate feelings of child or children	11
Give child or children words to use	12
Model appropriate behavior coach children from inside play episode	13
Provide reinforcement for appropriate behavior Make sure I acknowledge Matt when he is doing his best with his peers	14
Help children play together	15
Reflect on practices and/or create an environment that prevents the problems review number of children that can be in the block area	16
use physical guidance or her physical presence to neutralize/maintain a safe environment get down on the children's level I would be near that area where Matt is playing Teacher holds the block while the children talk Removes children from the area so they can talk w/out distractions	17
Generate or impose consequences (natural or logical) for behavior	18
Talk with ONE child about behavior or how to solve the problem Tell aggressor appropriate steps to get block in the future	19
Assist BOTH children with solving the problem define conflict, help children tell their stories, generate solutions	20
Solve the problem for BOTH children Tell the children to take turns	21
Negate the problem I would then tell the boys that we do not need to fight overf blocks because we have lots of blocks to play with	22
Ask question of child who si the aggressor (question clearly is not as part of no lose problem solving) Ask, Why did you push?	23
State or review classroom rules	24

Attempts to arouse empathy in aggressor I would explain that it hurts people when we hit or push them	25
Make the aggressor apologize or make the aggressor comfort the victim (deals with child only) Ask him to apologize for pushing	26
Punish the child or children by: threatening to remove from area, actually removing from the area, threatening to put in time-out, or actually putting in time-out Remove child from area for the rest of the day Give him the choice of either choosing another area in the room to play – or allow him to continue playing in the area as long as nothing like this occurs again His choice is to be cooperative or sit at the table Return object	27
Redirect the child or children's behavior (classic redirection) I would ask the children what we can make with the blocks	28
Ignore behavior or child or children	29
Talk with parents	30
Other: items that do not fit into any other category	80
Missing Data: respondent did not write an answer to the question	99