TEACHERS' SENSE OF EFFICACY AND THEIR

ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE USE OF PHYSICAL

PUNISHMENT IN SCHOOLS

By

TALLEY M. NOLAND

Bachelor of Science in Human Development and

Family Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

2013

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
May, 2014

TEACHERS' SENSE OF EFFICACY AND THEIR

ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE USE OF PHYSICAL

PUNISHMENT IN SCHOOLS

Thesis Approved:

Julia Atiles
———————————————————————
Thesis Adviser

Toni Ivey
———————————————————————

Amy Tate
———————————————————————

Name: TALLEY NOLAND

Date of Degree: MAY, 2014

Title of Study: TEACHERS' SENSE OF EFFICACY AND THEIR ATTITUDES
TOWARDS THE USE OF PHYSICAL PUNISHMENT IN SCHOOLS

Major Field: HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AND FAMILY SCIENCE

Abstract: The purpose of this study was to determine whether teachers' sense of efficacy influences their attitude towards the use of physical punishment in schools. There were two groups of participants in the study, pre-service and in-service early childhood teachers. The sample was made up of 78 in-service teachers from two different school districts and 61 pre-service teachers from a Midwestern university early childhood education preparation program. There were multiple significant findings in the study. It was found that the higher the overall teacher efficacy, the more frequently the participant was to agree with positive discipline practices and more likely to use appropriate classroom guidance techniques. However, overall referral to principal for negative discipline (corporal punishment) did not seem to be related to teacher efficacy, thus suggesting that teacher efficacy and teachers' attitude towards physical punishment are unrelated, and may be two different constructs.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Researchers have examined teachers' sense of efficacy and the impact that it has on the students'

in their classroom attitudes, achievement, and motivation (e.g., Ciyer, Nagasawa, Swadener, &

Patet, 2010; Hoy, 2005). The term efficacy is used when describing the way people see their

ability to handle different occurrences in their life (Bandura, 1994). Bandura explained that

beliefs about self-efficacy affect decisions people make in their lives, their motivation levels, and

how they deal with daily stress. As a teacher, having a positive sense of efficacy in a classroom is

linked to positive experiences and outcomes, including the use of more developmentally

appropriate teaching practice, such as positive classroom management techniques (Cousins &

Walker, 1995; Guskey, 1987). However, it is unknown whether a teacher's sense of efficacy is

related to his/her attitude toward physical punishment. Kennedy (1995) suggested that the biggest

predictor of a teacher's use of physical punishment was a history of physical punishment

administered by the teacher's parents. In order to understand the behaviors of a teacher with a

positive sense of efficacy and the known outcomes of those actions, the term self-efficacy needs

to be understood from a theoretical perspective as well as that of existing research.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to determine whether teachers' sense of efficacy influences their

attitude towards the use of physical punishment in schools.

Definitions

Self-Efficacy- the way people see their ability to handle different occurrences in their life as well as how they think, feel, are motivated, and behave (Bandura, 1993, 1994).

Physical Discipline- "the use of physical force with the intention of causing a child to experience bodily pain or discomfort so as to correct or punish the child's behavior" (Gershoff 2008, p. 9).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to determine whether teachers' sense of efficacy influences their attitude towards the use of physical punishment in schools. This review of the literature will provide a background on the topic and give a brief history. It will address the following topics: self-efficacy, developmentally appropriate practice, NAEYC Code of Ethics, the legality and prevalence of physical punishment in schools, and the gap between teacher sense of efficacy and their attitude towards physical punishment.

Self-efficacy

Albert Bandura has been the leader in forming the theoretical framework of self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is defined as the way people see their ability to handle different occurrences in their life as well as how they think, feel, are motivated, and behave (Bandura, 1993, 1994). According to Bandura (1977), if people do not feel a positive sense of efficacy about certain situations, they tend to stay away from those types of conditions because they do not believe they have the skills necessary to manage them appropriately. Classroom guidance and discipline can be a challenging area for many teachers. According to Baker (2005), teachers often give an account of experiencing "discipline related stress" when trying to manage children's misbehaviors. However, people do get involved in activities and situations that they personally feel confident in handling and could potentially look intimidating to others (Bandura, 1977). Not only does the way people view their efficacy influence their activities and surroundings, but it can help with the way they handle the situation if they also expect themselves to be successful (Bandura, 1977).

Bandura explained that the expectation of being successful or unsuccessful controls how much energy people apply and the amount of time they spend facing the difficult or uncomfortable experience. If the person is in fact successful in the face of an obstacle, the individual's sense of efficacy is positively reinforced. The opposite is also true, when individuals end their efforts before they are successful, their fear and lack of efficacy are reinforced and can hinder efforts in future difficult situations (Bandura, 1977). Just because individuals view themselves as being capable of performing successfully, does not mean that they will be successful, as there are other determining factors for a desired outcome. If the person is lacking necessary skills or capabilities, expecting to be successful is not going to be enough to actually perform successfully (Bandura, 1977). However Bandura (1977) makes it clear that efficacy is a large determining factor in what situations a person will engage in, as well as their attitude towards it.

Researchers have defined teachers' sense of efficacy as their belief in their ability to have a positive effect on student learning (e.g. Ashton, 1985; Dembo & Gibson, 1985; Hoy & Spero, 2005; Rimm-Kaufman & Sawyer, 2004; Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990) or "teachers' belief or conviction that they can influence how well students learn, even those who may be difficult or unmotivated" (Guskey & Passaro, 1994, p.4). In an empirical review conducted by Ross (1998), teacher efficacy was found to be a predictor of student self-esteem and prosocial attitudes, teachers' professional commitment, teacher stress, and classroom management strategies. Teachers who view themselves as capable of teaching challenging or uninterested students are considered to have internal control, and teachers who view the environment as having more of an impact on student learning than their own personal teaching skills are considered to have external control (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000). Additionally, research studies indicate that teachers who have a high sense of efficacy display more developmentally appropriate practices (e.g. Ciyer et al., 2010; Henson, 2001; Hoy & Spero, 2005).

Values and Beliefs

Whether or not a teacher has a positive or negative attitude towards corporal punishment depends greatly on their beliefs and values. Borg (2001) states that a belief is a thought or idea that is held to be true by an individual consciously or unconsciously but the individual also recognizes that others may hold a different belief. Beliefs and values assist individuals in making sense of the world by shaping how new events or pieces of information are viewed. The term "teacher belief" is usually used when referring to "beliefs of relevance to an individual's teaching" (Borg, 2001, p 187). Teacher beliefs are influenced by the person's experiences as a student, which can shape how they choose to teach within the classroom (Pajares, 1992) as well as their professional preparation (Riojas-Cortez, Alanis, & Bustos Flores, 2013). Personal experiences greatly influence teachers' values and beliefs and go on to impact the way that they instruct their classroom and their views of education (Xiang, Lowry, & McBride, 2002). These values and beliefs that teachers hold are the heart of their daily decision-making and have an unswerving impact on the methods and practices they choose to utilize in their classroom (Xiang et. al, 2002). Pajares (1992) also specified that pre-service teachers often hold strong commitments to past beliefs that were developed based on knowledge, but may be changed after experiencing a new event. However, what a teacher believes and holds to be true and the actions the teacher actually takes can be very different. Pajares (1992) stated that teachers' actions in a classroom might not always align with their values and beliefs. But, it is known that what early childhood teachers believe, what they know, and what they are able to do strongly guide the teaching practices taking place, which in turn are greatly influential on the development and growth of the children (Chang, Hedy, Muckelroy, Pulido-Tobiassen, & Dowell, 2005; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Flores, 2001).

Developmentally Appropriate Practices and Alignment with the NAEYC Code of Ethics

Developmentally Appropriate Practice (DAP) involves teachers meeting children's needs socially, cognitively, and physically, both individually and within a group, as well as helping

5

children plan and meet achievable learning goals. DAP considers each child's home life, cultural values, and individual traits to best meet their needs (Copple & Bredekamp, 2009; McMullen, 1999). Teachers have to make hard decisions every single day within a classroom. Skillful decision-making is a necessity in effective teaching. According to Copple and Bredekamp (2009), children receive the most developmentally appropriate teaching from teachers who have the wisdom, judgment, and ability to use good classroom management strategies and are able to effectively use them.

The first principle of the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) Code of Ethics states, "Above all, we shall not harm children. We shall not participate in practices that are emotionally damaging, physically harmful, disrespectful, degrading, dangerous, exploitative, or intimidating to children. *This principle has precedence over all others in this Code*" (Copple & Bredekamp, 2009, p. 3). The NAEYC Code of Ethics supports Developmentally Appropriate Practice. NAEYC discourages any physically or emotionally damaging practices such as physical punishment. If a teacher engages in developmentally appropriate practice, his/her attitude toward classroom management should reflect the first principle of the Code of Ethics (Copple & Bredekamp, 2009; & NAEYC Code of Ethics, 2011). The teacher's attitude should influence his/her practices with classroom management and should look developmentally appropriate. Examples of developmentally appropriate classroom management techniques would be pointing out positive behavior of a child rather than always pointing out misbehavior, or discussing with the child why the misbehavior is not allowed and thinking together of alternatives (Copple & Bredekamp, 2009).

Developmentally inappropriate practices such as shaming a child, the use of physical punishment, being disrespectful, or being emotionally degrading or damaging do not align with the NAEYC Code of Ethics (Copple & Bredekamp, 2009). Physical punishment is deemed as an inappropriate practice and while the leaders in the field of early childhood exhort professionals to

abide by the NAEYC Code of Ethics, the fact that physical punishment is legal in some states exemplifies how divided all opinions are about this form of discipline.

Legality and Prevalence of Physical Punishment

In the United States, corporal punishment (i.e., physical punishment) in schools is legal in 19 of the 50 states, including the Midwestern state where this research was conducted. The first state to ban corporal punishment in schools was New Jersey in 1867 and the latest to ban it was New Mexico in 2011. The states that allow corporal punishment in the schools are predominantly in the southern part of the United States. Just as the legality of physical punishment is divided, so are researchers' findings regarding the effects of spanking. For example, Holden and colleagues (Holden & Edwards, 1989; Holden, Coleman, & Schmidt, 1995; Holden, Miller, & Harris, 1999; and Vittrup, Holden, & Buck, 2006) strongly oppose physical punishment; while other researchers, including Larzelere (1986) caution that there are unresolved issues about the effects of spanking. Little is known about the relationship between teachers' attitudes toward spanking and their responses to children's misbehaviors in the classroom. The literature does point out that teachers with a high sense of efficacy "were not as likely as low efficacy teachers to appear angered or threatened by the misbehavior of students" (Dembo & Gibson, 1985, p. 177). Thus, it seems important to understand the concept of efficacy and investigate its relationship to attitudes toward spanking.

Teacher's Sense of Efficacy in Relation to Classroom Management Practices

Some research indicates that early childhood and elementary teachers who have a greater sense of efficacy use teaching strategies or practices that align with developmentally appropriate practice, such as: more developmentally appropriate classroom management techniques (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000), being less critical of students who make a mistake, working longer with those who are not understanding, building student autonomy, and setting achievable goals (Dembo & Gibson, 1985). Classroom management is defined as "teachers' beliefs in their capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required maintain classroom order"

(Brouwers & Tomic, 2000, p. 242). Being able to effectively manage a classroom is an important element in any scholastic situation because time for instruction is lost if misbehavior is not dealt with accordingly (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000). Teachers who do not believe in their abilities to effectively guide a classroom are challenged by their ineffectiveness every single day and reminded of how important it is to have effective classroom management in order to successfully reach their students and educational goals (Brouwers &Tomic, 2000). Research has shown that teachers who have a more traditional (custodial) attitude toward classroom management provide a more rigid and highly controlled classroom setting (e.g., Rimm-Kaufman & Sawyer, 2004; Willower, Eidell, & Hoy, 1967; Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990). However, there has been little research conducted on whether a teacher's sense of efficacy is related to a teacher's responses to students' misbehavior and whether their attitudes predict the use of physical punishment.

The Current Study: Research Questions

1. Is there a relationship between pre-service and in-service early childhood teachers' responses to children's misbehavior and their sense of teaching efficacy?

2. Is there a relationship between pre-service and in-service early childhood teachers' sense of teaching efficacy and their values and beliefs regarding discipline practices?

3. Is there a relationship between pre-service and in-service early childhood teachers' responses to children's misbehavior and their values and beliefs regarding discipline practices?

4. Are there differences in the three scales (Teacher Response to Student Misbehavior, Values and Beliefs Regarding Discipline Practices, Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale) between pre and in-service samples?

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to determine whether teachers' sense of efficacy influences their attitude towards the use of physical punishment in schools.

General Procedures

Selection of participants was facilitated via collaboration with the Early Childhood Education course instructors and school administrators. The researchers, course instructors, and school administrators organized a time that was convenient to ask individuals for participation and completion of the survey. The survey contains a short demographic questionnaire, the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale-long form (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001), questions assessing values and beliefs regarding discipline practices (Atiles, 2012), and a modified version of George W. Holden's Parent Response to Child Misbehavior, to address teacher responses instead of parent responses, with author's permission (Holden & Zambarano, 1992; Holden, Coleman, & Schmidt, 1995) which in this study is called Teacher Response to Student Misbehavior (TRSM).

In-Service Teachers

The researcher contacted the administrators to seek the cooperation and approval of the school systems. The researcher met with District A teachers during a break in one of their professional development meetings and District B teachers at the beginning of their weekly faculty meeting.

Pre-Service Teachers

The researcher recruited all Early Childhood Education majors enrolled in semesters 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the program. The researcher contacted course instructors of the courses for each semester, to solicit 20 minutes of their class time to explain the survey to the Early Childhood students and administer it to those willing to participate.

In-Service and Pre-Service Groups

The researcher explained to all potential participants the purpose of the study, how they would be involved as participants, that there were no payments or incentives, and no consequences if they chose to forego participation. The researcher then invited the individuals to participate and handed out an "information sheet" that highlighted the key points of the project and that there were no identified risks connected with the research project. In the information sheet, an explanation was given stating that participation was completely voluntary and participants could terminate the research activity at any time without consequence. On the information sheet, at the end of the page, the participant read, "*I have read and fully understand the information sheet. I also understand that all information I provide is strictly confidential and will be used for this research study purpose only. I also understand that I will remain anonymous throughout the course of this research study. I am free to discontinue participation during data collection at any time.* **My agreement to participate in this research study is signified by my participation."** Appendix A includes a copy of the information sheet.

The researcher then distributed the questionnaires from an envelope and asked the individuals to return them back into the envelope once they were completed. The researcher stayed in the room to answer questions from the participants; however, once questions had been resolved the researchers exited the room and stayed in the hall as participants completed the surveys. One individual participant was asked to tell the researcher when every survey had been completed and turned into the envelope and then the researcher picked up the envelope with the

questionnaires inside. Participants' responses to the surveys were anonymous, as participants were not asked to share their name.

Participants

This study included two groups of participants, in-service and pre-service early childhood teachers who were recruited through convenience sampling. The in-service teachers were from 12 elementary schools in two different school districts in the Midwest. Pre-service teachers' were enrolled in a Midwestern university's Early Childhood Education teacher preparation program. A total of 151 responded to the questionnaire. However, 12 questionnaires were deleted due to incomplete data, therefore leaving 139 total questionnaires. The data analysis conducted is based on the information provided by 139 participants, specifically, 78 in-service teachers and 61 pre-service teachers. All in-service teachers were females, and there was 1 male and 60 females pre-service teachers. In-service teachers' age ranged from 22-61 years with a mean of 37.1. The average number of years teaching was 11.01, and the average class size was 27.23 children. Pre-service teacher's age ranged from 19-25 years (M= 21.23). Table 1 summarizes the distribution among ethnic groups.

Table 1

Distribution Among Ethnic Groups for In-Service and Pre-Service Participants (N=139)

Ethnicity	In-Service Participants N= 78	Pre-Service Participants N= 61
American Indian/Alaska Native	3	6
Asian	0	1
Black/African American	0	0
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	0	0
White	74	51
Other	1	3

The 61 in-service participants had a wide range of experience in different grades; 4 had taught 3 year olds and younger; 24 had taught or were teaching Pre-kindergarten, 33 had taught or were teaching Kindergarten; 20 had taught or were teaching 1st grade; 17 had taught or were teaching 2nd grade; and 13 had taught or were teaching 3rd grade. The pre-service sample was made up of 30 juniors and 31 seniors.

The two school districts that participated in the study are located in very different areas of the Midwestern state. District A is significantly larger than District B, and though it is located in a rural area, it is a growing city with a large diverse population. District B is significantly smaller and is located in a rural county with a small population. Included in Table 2 are demographics based on 2012 school report cards of the districts (Office of Educational Quality and Accountability, 2012).

Table 2

Ethnic Distribution of the Two Participating School Districts

Ethnic Makeup	District A	District B
Asian	8%	0%
Black	6%	3%
Caucasian	64%	80%
Hispanic	17%	3%
Native American	5%	13%
Students eligible for free/reduced lunch	71.2%	48.2%
District Population (Census 2010)	44,870	7,744

(Office of Educational Quality and Accountability, 2012)

Measures

The demographic survey asks for the participant's age, gender, and race. Pre-service teachers also indicated how far along they are in the teacher-training program. In-service teachers specified grade levels they have taught or were currently teaching, number of children in their

current class, and if they had a teacher assistant in the classroom (See Appendix B for a full version of the questionnaire).

The Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale-long form (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001) was used to measure efficacy. The scale contains 24-items that measure the following efficacy constructs: student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management. This questionnaire is a Likert type scale with responses ranging from nothing (1) to a great deal (9). Unweighted means of the following items yield a score for each subscale. Efficacy of student engagement is measured through responses to items 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 12, 14, and 22. Efficacy in instructional strategies is measured through responses to items 7, 10, 11, 17, 18, 20, 23, and 24. Finally, efficacy in classroom management is measured through responses to items 3, 5, 8, 13, 15, 16, 19, and 21. Table 3 includes reliability information about this measure.

Table 3

Reliability of Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale- long form

	Reported by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001)			Calculated with current study data		
	Mean	SD	alpha	Mean	SD	alpha
TSES	7.1	.94	.94	7.60	.75	.94
Engagement	7.3	1.1	.87	7.56	.80	.85
Instruction	7.3	1.1	.91	7.65	.79	.89
Management	6.7	1.1	.90	7.59	.83	.88

Teacher Response to Student Misbehavior

The Teacher Response to Student Misbehavior (based on the work by Holden & Zambarano, 1992; Holden, Coleman, & Schmidt, 1995) had resulted in a reliability coefficient of .80 in a previous study conducted by Atiles (2012). This is a 12-item Likert questionnaire that asks how frequently a participant would use different discipline responses with his or her

students. These responses range from never (1) to very frequently (6) (See Appendix B for a full version of the questionnaire).

Values and Beliefs Regarding Discipline Practices

Some questions assessing values and beliefs regarding discipline practices were included in the assessment packet. Atiles (2012) used the same questions on a previous study and reported a reliability coefficient of .85. There are 18-item Likert type questions where responders indicate their agreement or disagreement with a series of statements. Responses range from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (6) (See Appendix B for a full version of the questionnaire).

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

After the data were collected, coded and recoded for accuracy, they were analyzed. An exploratory factor analysis was run for the Teacher Response to Student Misbehavior Scale, the Values and Beliefs Regarding Discipline Practices Scale, and the Teacher Self Efficacy Scale.

Teacher Response to Student Misbehavior

After running an exploratory factor analysis, both a two factor and a three-factor solution were rotated. The eigenvalues (factor 1=2.50, factor 2=1.09, factor 3=0.91, factor 4=0.57, factor 5=0.14) initially suggested a two-factor solution but upon rotation the three factor solution had greater substantive meaning. The Teacher Response to Student Misbehavior items loaded onto 3 factors resulting in three subscales: Positive Discipline, Discipline, and Negative Discipline. Items 1, 2, and 3 loaded onto the subscale Positive Discipline. The alpha of this subscale equals .52. Items 5, 6, 7, and 8 loaded on the subscale Discipline. The alpha of this subscale equals .61. Items 10, 11, and 12 strongly loaded onto the subscale Negative Discipline with an alpha of .80. The overall alpha of the Teacher Response to Student Misbehavior scale is .62. Items 4 and 9 were deleted due to not strongly loading onto the three factors. Table 4 illustrates the loading of the different items per factor.

Table 4

Rotated Factor Loading Matrix of the Teacher Response to Student Misbehavior Items (N=139)

	Factor		
Item	1	2	3
Positive Discipline			
1. Reasoning/Explaining	-0.05	-0.10	**0.52**
2. Negotiating	0.00	-0.03	**0.50**
3. Redirecting/Distraction	0.04	0.08	**0.54**
Discipline			
5. Time-out	-0.00	**0.44**	-0.12
6. Withdrawing privileges	-0.07	**0.56**	-0.16
7. Threatening	-0.07	**0.60**	-0.10
8. Yelling in anger	0.06	**0.62**	0.18
Negative Discipline			
10. Referral to principal for spanking with hand	**0.90**	-0.01	0.06
11. Referral to principal for spanking with object	**0.69**	0.11	-0.11
12. Referral to principal for slapping child's hand	**0.72**	-0.12	-0.02
Deleted Items			
4. Ignoring	<u>-0.03</u>	<u>0.38</u>	<u>0.23</u>
9. Referral to principal for non physical discipline	<u>0.27</u>	<u>0.39</u>	<u>0.02</u>

Note: Loadings in bold are values greater than .40 and are retained for that factor. Underlined

values indicate items that were deleted.

Values and Beliefs Regarding Discipline Practices

The exploratory factor analysis for the Values and Beliefs Regarding Discipline Practices

scale loaded onto 18 factors. The eigenvalues (factor 1=3.16, factor 2=2.39, factor 3=0.64 factor

4=0.62) suggested a two-factor solution. Those results were rotated using an oblique rotation

looking at two factors resulting in two subscales: Punishment and Guidance. Items 3, 7, 9, 13, and

17 loaded onto the subscale Corporal Punishment with an alpha of .81. Item 7 was reverse coded.

Items 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 14, and 15 loaded onto Guidance with an alpha of .71. Table 5

illustrates the loading of the different items per factor.

Table 5

Rotated Factor Loading Matrix of the Values and Beliefs Regarding Discipline Practice Items

	Factor	
Items	1	2
Punishment		
3. Corporal punishment is necessary in order to maintain discipline at school.	**0.80**	0.03
7. Corporal punishment increases aggression in students.	**-0.48**	0.18
9. Corporal punishment can be justified from a religious point of view.	**0.67**	0.05
13. Corporal punishment available in schools teaches students to respect the teacher.	**0.77**	0.10
17. Corporal punishment is the best form of punishment because it is over quickly.	**0.74**	-0.04
Guidance		
1. Sending students out of the class removes the problem but does not solve it.	-0.06	**0.36**
2. Organized/prepared teachers have less discipline problems.	0.18	**0.45**
5. If students respect the teacher, they will behave better in class.	0.13	**0.61**
6. Teachers should discipline students in a calm manner.	-0.17	**0.46**
8. Approaching the school counselor is an effective way of solving behavior problems.	-0.05	**0.38**
11. If the teacher gives students interesting and challenging work, there will be less discipline problems in class.	0.11	**0.70**
12. If a teacher is liked, students tend to behave better in class.	0.01	**0.64**
14. Discipline problems should be solved together with students in order to teach them to take responsibility.	-0.12	**0.49**
15. When children are afraid, they do not learn as well.	-0.18	**0.34**
Deleted Items		
4. Students tend to disregard a teacher's threat of punishment.	<u>0.35</u>	<u>0.18</u>
10. It is morally correct that a person who has done wrong should be punished.	<u>0.46</u>	<u>0.19</u>
16. If corporal punishment is used, it should be a last resort.	<u>-0.03</u>	<u>0.23</u>
18. Female students should not be punished as harshly as male students.	<u>0.35</u>	<u>-0.04</u>

Note: Loadings in bold are values greater than .34 and are retained for that factor. Underlined values indicate items that were deleted.

A simple bivariate correlation of .01 indicated that it was not appropriate to run the reliability of the full scale of the Values and Beliefs Regarding Discipline Practices. In other words, because the guidance subscale and the punishment subscale do not have a relationship, it is not appropriate to add them up to form just one single score measure; they are two different constructs. The deleted items of this questionnaire are items 16, due to not strongly loading onto a factor, and items 4, 10, and 18 due to construct validity.

Findings to Research Questions

Table 6 illustrates the results of the covariance matrix for variables of interest for the entire sample.

_____

Insert Table 6 here

_____

The focuses are on the correlations between constructs and across four populations. However, for the remainder of the results individualized tables reporting just the correlations of interest for the specific research questions will be presented.

Research Question 1:

Is there a relationship between pre-service and in-service early childhood teachers' responses to children's misbehavior and their sense of teaching efficacy?

Correlations were calculated between the total sample, the pre-service, and the in-service teachers regarding their use of the different responses to children's misbehavior and their sense of efficacy. Table 4 summarizes the results of the correlational analysis.

Table 6

Covariance Matrix for Variables of Interest for the Entire Sample (N=139)

	Values and Beliefs Regarding Discipline Practices		Teacher Response to Student Misbehavior			Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale			
	Punishment	Guidance	Positive Discipline Subscale	Discipline Subscale	Negative Discipline Subscale	Efficacy	Student Engagement Subscale	Instructional Strategies Subscale	Classroom Management Subscale
Punishment	1.00								
Guidance	0.00	1.00							
Positive Discipline Subscale	0.18*	0.36**	1.00						
Discipline Subscale	0.41**	0.11	0.21	1.00					
Negative Discipline Subscale	0.31**	0.11	0.12	0.26	1.00				
Efficacy	0.08	0.36**	0.16	0.21**	0.02	1.00			
Student Engagement Subscale	0.11	0.36**	0.20*	0.25**	0.02	0.92	1.00		
Instructional Strategies									

Subscale	0.07	0.35**	0.17*	0.12	-0.01	0.93	0.77	1.00	
Classroom Management Subscale	0.04	0.30**	0.09	0.21*	0.04	0.94	0.80	0.81**	1.00

$^{*} p < 0.05;$ $^{**} p < 0.01$

Table 7

Relationship between Total Sample and Pre-Service Early Childhood Teachers' Responses to Children's Misbehavior and Their Teacher Sense of Efficacy (N=139)

	Efficacy	Student Engagement Subscale	Instructional Strategies Subscale	Classroom Management Subscale
Entire Sample Positive Discipline	0.16*	.20*	.17*	.09
Entire Sample Negative Discipline	0.21**	.25**	.12	.21*
Pre-Service Sample Positive Discipline	0.22	.25	.22	.17
Pre-Service Sample Negative Discipline	0.24	.26*	.11	.29*

*$p < .05$; **$p < .01$

Overall, the negative discipline subscale does not seem to be related to teacher efficacy because it is not statistically significant for any population. Thus, those results are omitted in Table 7. A correlation analysis of District A and B was run, and there were no significant findings. Thus, those correlations are also omitted in Table 7. The higher the overall teacher efficacy the more likely the participant was to use positive discipline ($r = 0.16$, $p = 0.05$) and discipline practices ($r = 0.21$, $p = 0.01$). A more specific look at efficacy subscales indicated the higher the efficacy in regards to student engagement, the more likely the participant was to use positive discipline ($r = 0.20$, $p = 0.02$) and discipline ($r = 0.25$, $p = 0.00$). The pre-service sample, specifically, indicated a significant relationship between efficacy of student engagement and the use of discipline practices ($r = 0.26$, $p = 0.04$). The higher the efficacy in regards to instructional strategies showed a significant relationship with the use of positive discipline by the entire sample ($r = 0.17$, $p = 0.04$). Finally, efficacy regarding classroom management had a significant positive correlation regarding the use of discipline for the entire sample ($r = 0.21$, $p = 0.02$) and for the pre-service teachers ($r = 0.29$, $p = 0.02$).

Research Question 2:

Is there a relationship between pre-service and in-service early childhood teachers' sense of teaching efficacy and their values and beliefs regarding discipline practices?

Correlations were calculated for the total sample, all the in-service teachers, in-service teachers by district, and all of the pre-service teachers regarding their agreement or disagreement with statements regarding punishment and guidance. Table 8 includes the results of the correlational analysis.

Table 8

Relationship Between Pre-Service and In-Service Early Childhood Teachers' Sense of Teaching Efficacy and Their Guidance Scores in the Values and Beliefs Regarding Discipline Practices Subscale (N=139)

	Entire Sample	District A	District B	All In-Service	Pre-Service
Teacher Efficacy	0.36**	0.32**	0.68**	0.39**	0.33**
Student Engagement Subscale	0.36**	0.38**	0.60**	0.42**	0.32**
Instructional Strategies Subscale	0.35**	0.29*	0.61**	0.36**	0.34**
Classroom Management Subscale	0.29**	0.22	0.63**	0.31**	0.30*

*$p< .05$; **$p<.01$

Across all populations, there is no statistically significant relationship between the subscale punishment and overall teacher efficacy, thus, not included in Table 8 above. However, across all populations it was found that the higher teacher sense of efficacy (overall and specific to student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management) the more likely to use guidance practices. The only sample group that differed was District A in regards to efficacy of classroom management and guidance practices. Please refer to Table 8 above for specific correlational and *p* values.

Research Question 3:

Is there a relationship between pre-service and in-service early childhood teachers'
responses to children's misbehavior and their values and beliefs regarding discipline practices?
Correlations were calculated for the total sample, all the in-service teachers, in-service teachers
by district, and all of the pre-service teachers regarding their frequency of use of positive
discipline, discipline and negative discipline. Table 9 includes the results of the correlational
analysis.

Table 9

Relationship Between Pre-Service and In-Service Early Childhood Teachers' Frequency of use of

Positive Discipline, Discipline, and Negative Discipline as Responses to Student Misbehavior

(N=139)

		Positive Discipline	Discipline	Negative Discipline
Entire Sample	Guidance	0.36**	.11	0.11
	Punishment	0.18*	0.41**	0.31**
District A	Guidance	0.41**	0.18	0.18
	Punishment	-0.00	0.36**	0.19
District B	Guidance	0.32	0.64**	0.40
	Punishment	0.02	0.51*	0.28
In-Service	Guidance	0.35**	0.25*	0.20
	Punishment	0.09	0.42**	0.30**
Pre-Service	Guidance	0.41**	-0.03	-0.19
	Punishment	0.17	0.16	0.31*

*p< .05; **p<.01

Across the entire sample, teachers who reported using positive discipline responses (e.g.
reasoning, explaining) also disagreed with the use of punishment (*r* = 0.19, *p* = 0.03) and agreed
with the use of guidance (*r* = 0.00, *p* = 0.00). Teachers who reported utilizing discipline practices
(e.g. withdrawing privileges, threatening) were more likely to respond in agreement with
punishment statements regarding values and beliefs (*r* = 0.41, *p* = 0.00). Finally, teachers who
reported using negative discipline (e.g. referral to principal for physical punishment) were more

likely to respond in agreement with punishment statements regarding values and beliefs ($r = 0.31$, $p = 0.00$).

Overall, in-service teachers who reported using positive discipline were also more likely to respond in agreement with guidance ($r = 0.35$, $p = 0.00$). In-service teachers who reported using discipline practices were more likely to respond in agreement to punishment ($r = 0.42$, $p = 0.00$) and in agreement with guidance ($r = 0.25$, $p = 0.03$). Finally, in-service teachers who reported using negative discipline practices were more likely to agree with punishment statements ($r = 0.30$, $p = 0.01$). More specifically, teachers from District A, who reported using positive discipline practices, agreed with the use of guidance ($r = 0.41$, $p = 0.00$) and those that reported using discipline practices were more likely to respond in agreement with the use of punishment ($r = 0.36$, $p = 0.00$). Teachers from District B who reported using discipline practices more often responded in agreement to the use of punishment ($r = 0.51$, $p = 0.03$) and agreement with the use of guidance ($r = 0.64$, $p = 0.01$).

Pre-service teachers who reported using positive discipline were more likely to respond in agreement with guidance ($r = 0.41$, $p = 0.00$) and those that reported using more negative discipline practices were more likely to respond in agreement with punishment ($r = 0.31$, $p = 0.02$).

Research Question 4:

Are there differences in the three scales (Teacher Response to Student Misbehavior (TRSM), Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES), and Values and Beliefs Regarding Discipline Practices (VBRDP) between pre- service teachers and the two in-service teacher samples? Tables 10, 11, and 12 present the results from three t-tests to determine if there were significant differences between the sample groups and the three scales.

Tables 10

Differences in the TRSM and VBRDP in District A and District B In-Service Teachers' Responses

(N=78)

	District B		District A		
	M	SD	M	SD	*t*
VBRDP: Punishment	3.32	0.93	4.30	1.01	-3.58***
VBRDP: Guidance	5.13	0.62	4.97	0.53	1.03
TRSM: Positive Discipline	4	0.73	4.38	0.69	-1.99*
TRSM: Discipline	3.37	0.56	3.66	0.68	-1.63
TRSM: Negative Discipline	2.75	0.36	2.97	0.26	-2.87**

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

Tables 11

Differences in the TRSM and VBRDP Between Pre-Service Teachers and District B In-Service

Teachers' Responses (N=78)

	District B		Pre-Service		
	M	SD	M	SD	*t*
VBRDP: Punishment	3.32	0.93	4.83	0.91	-6.08***
VBRDP: Guidance	5.13	0.62	4.99	0.51	0.95
TRSM: Positive Discipline	4	0.73	4.61	0.71	-3.10***
TRSM: Discipline	3.37	0.56	4.17	0.69	-4.38***
TRSM: Negative Discipline	2.75	0.36	2.98	0.09	-4.65***

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

Tables 12

Differences in the TRSM and VBRDP Between Pre-Service Teachers and District A In-Service Teachers' Responses (N=122)

	Pre-Service		District A		
	M	SD	M	SD	*t*
VBRDP: Punishment	4.83	0.90	4.30	1.01	3.11***
VBRDP: Guidance	4.99	0.51	4.97	0.53	0.17
TRSM: Positive Discipline	4.61	0.71	4.38	0.69	1.78
TRSM: Discipline	4.17	0.69	3.66	0.68	4.11***
TRSM: Negative Discipline	2.98	0.09	2.97	0.26	0.47

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

   T-tests were conducted to determine how pre-service teachers and in-service teachers agree or disagree with statements regarding use of punishment and guidance. In addition, t-tests were also conducted to determine how frequently pre-service and in-service teachers use positive discipline, discipline, and negative discipline. Results indicated that there was a significant difference ($p = 0.00$) between the two groups, with pre-service teachers ($M = 4.83$) valuing less use of punishment than in-service teachers ($M = 4.08$). However, there was no significant difference between pre-service and in-service teachers in regards to the use of guidance. There was a significant difference ($p = 0.01$) between the two groups regarding positive discipline, with the pre-service teachers ($M = 4.61$) indicating more use of positive discipline than in-service teachers ($M = 4.30$). There was a significant difference ($p = 0.00$) between the two groups regarding discipline practices with the pre-service teachers ($M = 4.17$) indicating less use of discipline practices than in-service teachers ($M = 3.60$). There were no significant differences between pre-service and in-service teachers in regards to the use of negative discipline. There were no significant differences between pre-service and in-service teachers regarding teacher efficacy or any of the efficacy subscales.

For a closer look at these relationships, t-tests were conducted between all groups. Results indicated that there was a significant difference ($p = 0.00$) between District A and District B, with District A teachers ($M = 4.30$) valuing less use of punishment than District B teachers ($M = 3.32$). There was a significant difference ($p = 0.00$) between pre-service teachers and District B teachers, with pre-service teachers ($M = 4.83$) valuing less use of punishment than District B teachers ($M = 3.32$). A significant difference ($p = 0.00$) was also found between pre-service teachers and District A, with District A ($M = 4.83$) valuing less use of punishment than pre-service teachers ($M = 4.30$). There were no significant differences between groups in regards to the use of guidance. There was a marginally significant ($p = 0.05$) difference between District A and District B when reporting how frequently positive discipline is used, with District A ($M = 4.38$) reporting more frequent use than District B ($M = 4.00$). However, there was a significant difference ($p = 0.00$) found between pre-service teachers and District B when reporting the frequency of use of positive discipline, with pre-service teachers ($M = 4.61$) reporting more frequent use than District B ($M = 4.00$). There was no significant difference found between pre-service teachers and District A teachers in regards to positive discipline.

When looking at the discipline subscale, there was a significant difference ($p = 0.00$) found between pre-service teachers and District B when reporting the frequency of use of discipline practices, with pre-service teachers ($M = 4.17$) reporting less use of discipline practices than District B ($M = 3.37$). A significant difference ($p = 0.00$) was found between pre-service teachers and District A, with pre-service teachers ($M = 4.17$) reporting less use of discipline practices than District A ($M = 3.66$). However, there was no significant difference found for discipline practices between District A and District B.

There were significant differences found between groups for the negative discipline subscale. A significant difference ($p = 0.01$) was found between District A and District B for negative discipline practices, with District A ($M = 2.97$) reporting less use of negative discipline practices than District B ($M = 2.75$). There was a significant difference ($p = 0.00$) found between

pre-service teachers and District B for negative discipline, with pre-service teachers ($M = 2.98$) reporting less use of negative discipline practices than District B ($M = 2.75$). There was no significant difference found between pre-service teachers and District A teachers for negative discipline. There were no significant differences between pre-service teachers, District A teachers, and District B teachers regarding teacher efficacy or any of the efficacy subscales.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to determine whether teachers' sense of efficacy influences their attitude towards the use of physical punishment in schools.

Results showed a positive relationship between pre-service and in-service early childhood teachers' response to misbehavior and their sense of efficacy regarding positive discipline and discipline responses. However, negative discipline responses such as referrals to the principal for physical punishment did not have a relationship with the teachers' sense of efficacy. In the Midwestern state where the research took place corporal punishment is legal and influenced by the southern culture. The states where physical punishment has not been outlawed are typically in the south. Physical punishment remains a fairly common practice in Alabama, Arkansas, and Mississippi and more of a routine practice in a minority of schools typically in rural or small towns in Georgia, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Texas (Farrell, 2014). Each school varies in its implementation, the use of corporal punishment ranges anywhere from being outlawed to frequently being used. It is important to note that part of our sample, District B, is located in a small rural town where physical punishment is regularly used in the schools. Many of the pre-service teachers that responded to the survey are also from rural communities in the Midwestern state perhaps influencing their opinion on punishment. Thus, it seems that physical punishment in the Midwestern state where this research took place seems to be unrelated to teacher efficacy, in this sample of teachers and, is perhaps perceived as a totally separate value.

Results showed a strong positive relationship between both pre-service and in-service teachers' values and beliefs regarding discipline practices and their sense of overall efficacy. The more the teacher agreed with statements indicating guidance of the student rather than punishment of the student, the higher their efficacy. These findings ratify previous research by Charlesworth, Hart, Burts, and Hernandez (1991) who found that teachers with higher ratings on developmentally appropriate beliefs felt more in control of planning and implementation of instruction, in essence efficacious, than did the teachers with lower ratings.

Findings suggest a strong positive relationship between the use of positive discipline (e.g. reasoning/explaining, negotiating, redirecting/distraction) and guidance values and beliefs, not including corporal punishment, for all subjects excluding those in-service teachers in District B.. Perhaps because physical punishment is an option, the teacher may use it as an opportunity to pass the responsibility to the principal to manage the problem. They may see guidance techniques such as reasoning and explaining as too time consuming or a weak approach to teaching. Teachers who rely on a punishment and reward system may get students to comply, but they don't help students develop self-discipline and responsibility. In essence, when teachers rely on punishment and praise, the students never develop an understanding of social responsibility (Kohn, 1996; Willis, 1996). Helping students develop conflict resolution skills is far more time consuming than imposing a punishment on a student.

The discipline questions on the questionnaire (e.g., time-out, withdrawing privileges, threatening, and yelling in anger) strongly correlated with punishment for the entire sample. When looking more specifically, that was not the case for pre-service teachers. This indicates that pre-service teachers still favor the use of more positive discipline practices. Pajares (1992) found that pre-service teachers often hold strong commitments to past beliefs that were developed based on knowledge, but may be changed after experiencing a new event; perhaps their limited experience has kept them from facing a very challenging situation causing them to reshape their values and beliefs. Whereas more experienced teachers may become very frustrated, resulting in

30

the use of threats or yelling in anger because their values and beliefs have been reshaped (Pajares, 1992). Both in-service and pre-service teachers use of negative discipline (referral for corporal punishment) correlated strongly with the agreement of punishment values and beliefs as would have been expected.

All groups differ significantly with agreement/disagreement regarding punishment items, indicating that the issue of appropriateness of punishment is perceived in many different ways. Since 94 of the participants (68%) indicated that they had experienced physical punishment at home, and because it is known that the personal experiences that people have growing up play a role in shaping their teaching values and beliefs (Xiang, Lowry, & McBride, 2002) perhaps this may have colored their interpretation of the appropriateness of this practice.

Future Research

The study has limitations. The limitations include a small sample size, both in-service groups coming from rural communities, and low reliability on two of the subscales of the Teacher Response to Student Misbehavior questionnaire. Replicating the study with a larger number of participants may yield different results. Because the sample was from the southern Midwest and mostly rural communities, future research is needed to include urban and suburban settings, in the northern, eastern and western United States. This may contribute to a better understanding of the relationship between physical punishment and teacher efficacy. There is much work to be done in two areas: (a) there is a need for more understanding of why physical punishment still has a role in some schools, communities, and states and, (b) to eliminate this practice.

Implications

These conflicting views indicate that the construct of physical punishment is elusive, which shows how important it is for early childhood educators to provide trainings where positive guidance techniques can be taught and raise awareness for what is considered ethical behavior in our profession. Because the National Association for the Education of Young Children Code of Ethics states, "Above all, we shall not harm children. We shall not participate in practices that are

emotionally damaging, physically harmful, disrespectful, degrading, dangerous, exploitative, or intimidating to children. *This principle has precedence over all others in this Code"* (Copple & Bredekamp, 2009, p. 3) it should be communicated to present and future early childhood educators across the United States. If the present educators are not aware of the ethical guidelines that the National Association for the Education of Young Children stands for, how are they supposed to uphold and practice them? Likewise, future educators need to be made aware that the NAEYC Code of Ethics and the teaching practices that are taking place within the schools are incongruent. According to Riojas-Cortez, Alanis, and Bustos Flores (2013), teachers' professional preparation influences and shapes their teaching values and beliefs. Therefore, if future educators are taught how to uphold the ethical guidelines in a school that does not, once they enter the school system they can model appropriate guidance practices which could eventually end the cycle of conflicting views and practices.

REFERENCES

Ashton, P.T. (1985). Motivation and the teacher's sense of efficacy. In C. Ames & R. Ames

(Eds.), *Research on motivation in education*: *Vol. 2. The classroom milieu* (pp. 141-174).

Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Atiles, J. T. (2012). [Early childhood preservice teachers' beliefs regarding corporal

punishment]. Unpublished raw data.

Baker, P.H. (2005). Managing student behavior: How ready are teachers to meet the challenge?

American Secondary Education: 33, 51-64.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological

Review, 84,* 119-215.

Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning.

Educational Psychologist, 28, 117-148.

Bandura, A. (1994). Efficacy. In V.S. Ramachaudran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior*

(Vol. 4, pp. 71-81). New York: Academic Press. (Reprinted in H. Friedman [Ed.],

Encyclopedia of mental health. San Diego: Academic Press, 1998).

Borg, M. (2001). Teachers' beliefs. *English Language Teaching, 55,* 186-188.

Brouwers, A. & Tomic, W. (2000). A longitudinal study of teacher burnout and perceived self-

efficacy in classroom management. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 16,* 239-253.

Chang Hedy, N.L., Muckelroy, A., Pulido-Tobiassen, D., & Dowell, C. (2005). Redefining

childcare and early education in a diverse society: Dialogue and reflection. In L. Diaz

Soto (Ed.), *The politics of early childhood education, 143-164).*

Charlesworth, R., Hart, C. H., Burts, D. C. & Hernandez, S. (1991). Kindergarten teachers beliefs
and practices. *Early Child Development and Care*, *70*(1), 17-35.

Ciyer, A., Nagasawa, M., Swadener, B., & Patet, P. (2010). Impacts of the Arizona System Ready
Child Ready Professional Development Project on preschool teachers' efficacy. *Journal
of Early Childhood Teacher Education, 31*, 129-145.

Copple, C., & Bredekamp, S., (Eds. 2009). *Developmentally appropriate practice in early
childhood programs serving children from birth through age 8*. Washington, DC:
NAEYC.

Copple, C., & Bredekamp, S. (2005). Code of ethical conduct and statement of commitment.
National Association for the Education of Young Children. Washington, DC: NAEYC.

Cousins, J., & Walker, C. (1995). Predictors of educators' valuing of systemic inquiry in schools.
Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation, Special Issue, 25-35.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (Eds). (2005). *Preparing tachers for a changing world:
What teachers should learn and be able to do.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey:Bass.

Dembo, M. H., & Gibson, S. (1985). Teachers' sense of efficacy: An important factor in school
improvement. *The Elementary School Journal*, *86*, 173-184. doi:10.1086/461441

Farrall, C. (2014). *Corporal punishment in U.S. schools*. Retrieved from
http://www.corpun.com/counuss.htm

Farrall, C. (2013). *Paddling and spanking: Official rules from current school handbooks.*
Retrieved from http://corpun.com/usscr2ax.htm#oklahoma

Flores, B, & Riojas-Cortez, M. (2010). Measuring early childhood teacher candidates'
conceptualizations of culturally responsive classroom ecology. *Journal of Classroom
Interaction, 44,* 4-13.

Gershoff, E.T. (2008). Report on Physical Punishment in the United States: What Research Tells
Us About Its Effects on Children. Columbus OH: Center for Effective Discipline.

Gusky, T.R. (1987). Context variables that affect measures of teacher efficacy. *The Journal of*

Educational Research, 81, 41-47.

Guskey, T.R., & Passaro, P.D. (1994). Teacher efficacy: A study of construct dimensions.

    American Educational Research Journal, 31, 627-643.

Henson, R.K. (2001). The effects of participation in teacher research on teacher efficacy.

    Teaching and Teacher Education, 17, 819-836.

Holden, G.W. & Edwards, L.A. (1989). Parental attitudes toward child rearing: instruments,

    issues, and implications. *Psychological Bulletin, 106,* 29-58.

Holden, G.W. & Zambarano, R.J. (1992). Passing the rod: Similarities between their parents and

    their young children in orientation toward physical punishment. In: Sigel IE,

    McGillicuddy-DeLisi AV, Goodnow JJ, editors. Parental belief systems: The

    psychological consequences for children. 2. Hiilsdale, NJ: Erlbaum; 1992. pp. 143–172.

Holden, G.W., Coleman, S.M., & Schmidt, K.L. (1995). Why 3-year-old children get spanked:

    parent and child determinants as reported by college-educated mothers. *Merrill-Palmer*

    Quarterly, 41, 431-452.

Holden, G.W., Miller, P.C., & Harris, S.D. (1999). The instrumental side of corporal punishment:

    parents' reported practices and outcome expectancies. *Journal of Marriage and Family*

    Therapy, 61, 795-808.

Hoy, A. P., & Spero, R. B. (2005). Changes in teacher efficacy during the early years of teaching:

    A comparison of four measures. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *21*, 343-356.

    doi:10.1016/j.tate.2005.01.007

Kennedy, J. (1995). Teachers, student teachers, paraprofessionals, and young adults' judgments

    about the acceptable use of corporal punishment in the rural south. *Education &*

    Treatment of Children, 18, 53.

Kohn, A. (1996). *Beyond discipline: From compliance to community*. Alexandria, VA:

    Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Larzelere, R.E. (1986). Moderate spanking: Model or deterrent of children's aggression in the

family? *Journal of Family Violence, 1,* 27-36.

McMullen, M. B. (1999). Characteristics of teachers who talk the dap talk and walk the dap walk. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, *13*, 216-230. doi:10.1080/02568549909594742

Office of Educational uality & Accountability (n.d.). *School report card.* Retrieved from http://www.schoolreportcard.org/oeip-ds-county.asp

Pajares, F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and education research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research, 62,* 307-332.

Rimm-Kaufman, S. E., & Sawyer, B. E. (2004). Primary-grade teachers' self-efficacy beliefs, attitudes toward teaching, and discipline and teaching practice priorities in relation to the "responsive classroom" approach. *The Elementary School Journal*, *104*, 321-341. doi:10.1086/499756

Ross, J.A. (1998). Antecedents and consequences of teacher efficacy. *Advances In Research On Teaching, 7,* 49-74.

Saluja, G., Early, D.M., & Clifford, R.M. (2002). Demographic characteristics of early childhood teachers and structural elements of early care and education in the united states. *Early Childhood Research & Practice, 4.*

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing and elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17,* 783-805.

Vittrup, B., Holden, G.W., & Buck, J. (2006). Attitudes predict the use of physical punishment: A prospective study of the emergence of disciplinary practices. *Pediatrics, 117,* 2055-2064.

Willis, S. (1996, September). Managing today's classroom finding alternatives to control and compliance. *Education Update*. Retrieved April 28, 2014, from http://www.ascd.org/publications/newsletters/education-update/sept96/vol38/num06/Managing-Today%27s-Classroom.aspx

Willower, D.J., Eidell, T.L., & Hoy, W.K. (1967). *The school and pupil control ideology.* (Penn State Studies Monographs No. 24). University Park: Pennsylvania State University.

Woolfolk, A.E., & Hoy, W.K. (1990). Prospective teachers' sense of efficacy and beliefs about control. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 82*, 81-91. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.82.1.81

Xiang, P., Lowry, S., & McBride, R. (2002). The impact of a field-based elementary physical education methods course on preservice classroom teachers' beliefs. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 21,* 145-161.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Informed consent permission form

Participant Information Sheet

Project Title:	***Early Childhood Teacher Efficacy, Teaching Style, and Attitudes Towards Physical Punishment***
Investigators:	Dr. Julia Atiles, Jara Griffin, and Talley Noland
Purpose:	The purpose of this study is to examine whether there is a relation between pre-service and in-service early childhood teachers' sense of efficacy and their responses to children's misbehavior, their attitudes toward physical punishment, and their teaching style.
Procedures:	As a participant you will be asked to complete a survey questionnaire and provide demographic information with an anticipated completion time of about ***20 minutes***.
Risks of Participation:	There are ***no known risks*** associated with this project which are greater than those ordinarily encountered in daily life.
Benefits:	Dr. Atiles, Ms. Griffin, and Ms. Noland hope to generate research knowledge that will help understand the characteristics of teachers who are likely to use positive classroom management strategies and those likely to resort to less effective methods. Understanding the characteristics of teachers, will help develop more effective staff development in the area of classroom management.

Confidentiality: Confidentiality protections the investigators plan to use include:

- Research records will be stored securely in a locked file of the Principal Investigator and no one other than principal, and co-principal investigators will have any access to the data obtained;
- Data files will be destroyed after the completion of 1 year;
- Data reported in any written results will discuss group findings and will not include information that will identify you.

There are no foreseeable risks in maintaining confidentiality.

Compensation:	Compensation will not be offered for this research study.
Contacts:	***Julia T. Atiles, Ph.D. (PI):*** *342 HS, 405-744-4166,* *Julia.atiles@okstate.edu*

Jara Griffin (Co-PI)**:** Jara.griffin@okstate.edu
Talley Noland (Co-PI): Talley.noland@okstate.edu
If you have any questions about your rights as a research volunteer, you may contact ***Dr. Shelia Kennison***, IRB Chair, 219 Cordell North, Stillwater, OK 74078, 405-744-3377 or irb@okstate.edu.

Participant Rights: Participation is voluntary and subjects can discontinue the research activity at any time without reprisal or penalty. There are no risks to subjects who might withdraw. However, we hope that you will answer all questions as truthfully as you can.

_____

I have read and fully understand the information sheet. I understand that all information I provide is strictly confidential and will be used for this research study purpose only. I also understand that I will remain anonymous throughout the course of this research study. I am free to discontinue participation during data collection at any time. **My agreement to participate in this research study is signified by my participation.Demographic Questionnaire**

Appendix B

Demographic Questionnaire

1. What is your age? _____

2. Are you male or female?

   ☐   Male   ☐   Female

3. How would you classify your race?

   ☐   American Indian/Alaska Native   ☐   Asian

   ☐   Black/African American   ☐   Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander

   ☐   White   ☐   Other (specify)

                                      _____

4. If a pre-service teacher, what ECE block are you currently in?

   ☐ Block 1 (semester 1)   ☐ Block 3 (semester 3)

   ☐ Block 2 (semester 2)   ☐ Block 4 (student teaching semester)

5. If an in-service teacher, what grade levels have you taught during your teaching experience? Check all that apply.

   ☐ 3 or younger   ☐ 1st

   ☐ Pre-Kindergarten   ☐ 2nd

   ☐ Kindergarten   ☐ 3rd

6. How many students do you have in your current class? _____

7. Do you have a teaching assistant?

   ☐ Yes   ☐ No

Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale* (long form)

Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk (2001)

Teacher Beliefs	How much can you do?				
Directions: This questionnaire is designed to help us gain a better understanding of the kinds of things that create difficulties for teachers in their school activities. Please indicate your opinion about each of the statements below by shading the appropriate box. Your answers are confidential.	Nothing	Very Little	Some Influence	Quite a Bit	A Great Deal

1. How much can you do to get through to the most difficult students?

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9

2. How much can you do to help your students think critically?

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9

3. How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9

4. How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in school work?

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9

5. To what extent can you make your expectations clear about student behavior?

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9

6. How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in school work?

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9

7. How well can you respond to difficult questions from your students?

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9

8. How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9

9. How much can you do to help your students' value learning?

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9

10. How much can you do to gauge student comprehension of what you have taught?

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9

11. To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9

12. How much can you do to foster student creativity?

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9

13. How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9

14. How much can you do to improve the understanding of a student who is failing?

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9

15. How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9

16. How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9

17. How much can you do to adjust your lessons to the proper level for individual students?

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9

18. How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies?

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9

19. How well can you keep a few problem students from ruining an entire lesson?

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9

20. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation, for example, when students are confused?

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9

21. How well can you respond to defiant students?

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9

22. How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9

23. How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9

24. How well can you provide appropriate challenges for very capable students?

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9

TEACHER RESPONSE TO STUDENT MISBEHAVIOR

Please indicate how frequently you would use the following discipline responses with your students:

Please indicate how frequently you use the following discipline responses with children in your class in the past week:	Never	Very Rarely- in less than 10% of the chances	Rarely- in about 30% of the chances	Occasionally- in about 70% of the chances	Frequently- in about 90% of the chances	Very Frequently
Reasoning/Explaining	1	2	3	4	5	6
Negotiating	1	2	3	4	5	6
Redirecting/Distraction	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ignoring				Item deleted		
Time-out	1	2	3	4	5	6
Withdrawing privileges	1	2	3	4	5	6
Threatening	1	2	3	4	5	6
Yelling in anger	1	2	3	4	5	6
Referral to principal for non physical discipline				Item deleted		
Referral to principal for spanking with hand	1	2	3	4	5	6
Referral to principal for spanking with object	1	2	3	4	5	6
Referral to principal for slapping child's hand	1	2	3	4	5	6

Based on Holden & Zambarano, 1992; Holden, Coleman, & Schmidt, 1995

Values and Beliefs Regarding Discipline Practices

Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements by circling the corresponding number.	Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
1. Sending students out of the class removes the problem but does not solve it.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Organized/prepared teachers have less discipline problems.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Corporal punishment is necessary in order to maintain discipline at school.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Students tend to disregard a teacher's threat of punishment.	Item deleted					
5. If students respect the teacher, they will behave better in class.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Teachers should discipline students in a calm manner.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Corporal punishment increases aggression in students.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. Approaching the school counselor is an effective way of solving behavior problems.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. Corporal punishment can be justified from a religious point of view.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. It is morally correct that a person who has done wrong should be punished.	Item deleted					

Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements by circling the corresponding number.	Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
11. If the teacher gives students interesting and challenging work, there will be less discipline problems in class.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. If a teacher is liked, students tend to behave better in class.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. Corporal punishment available in schools teaches students to respect the teacher.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. Discipline problems should be solved together with students in order to teach them to take responsibility.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. When children are afraid, they do not learn as well.	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. If corporal punishment is used, it should be a last resort.	Item deleted					
17. Corporal punishment is the best form of punishment because it is over quickly.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. Female students should not be punished as harshly as male students.	Item deleted					

1. Did you personally experience physical punishment at home?

    ☐   Yes   ☐   No

2. Did you personally experience physical punishment at school?

    ☐   Yes   ☐   No

3. Do you belief you may use physical punishment with your own children?

    ☐   Yes   ☐   No

4. Do you agree or disagree with the legal abolition of corporal punishment in schools?

    Agree ☐   Disagree ☐

Please explain.

_____

_____

Please list any suggestion you have for alternative methods to corporal punishment. Feel free to use the back of this page.

_____

_____

Adaptation of S. Cohen (1996) questionnaire used for unpublished master research. University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

VITA

Talley Michelle Noland

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: TEACHERS' SENSE OF EFFICACY AND THEIR ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE USE OF PHYSICAL PUNISHMENT IN SCHOOLS

Major Field: Human Development and Family Science

Biographical:

Education:

Completed the requirements for the Master of Science in Human Development and Family Science at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in May, 2014.

Completed the requirements for the Bachelor of Science in Human Development and Family Science at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in 2013.

Experience:

Hired as an Early Childhood teacher at Bridge Creek Elementary School beginning August 2014.

Staff at the Child Development Lab in Stillwater, Oklahoma from August 2013-May 2014.

Student teacher in 3rd grade classroom January 2013-May 2013.