

Length of Time in Student Teaching: Effects on Classroom Control
Orientation and Self-Efficacy Beliefs

Sharon M. Chambers

James C. Hardy

Texas A&M University - Commerce

Classroom management has long been an area of concern for new teachers. Based on a framework developed by Wolfgang and Glickman (1980, 1986) there are three approaches to classroom management interaction—non-interventionist, interventionist, and interactionalist. Non-interventionist classroom management is the least directive and controlling, and the non-interventionist style teacher believes the child has intrinsic motivation and needs to be expressive. On the other hand, the interventionist is most controlling and emphasizes more behavior modification practices. Mid-way between these two extremes is the interactionalist who strives to resolve issues in a way that is satisfactory to both teacher and students. Bush and Achilles (1986) found that humanistic-authoritarianism personality characteristics are closely related to attitudes toward discipline. Their research indicated that humanistic methods of classroom management and discipline were more successful than authoritarian ones whose style of classroom control is a more harsh and ineffective approach. They found that when control was only suppressive and not corrective, it does not have educational value, and as a result, “violates principles of democracy, and has negative long-range effects both for the classroom learning environment and for the student personally” (13).

Teacher education programs introduce many effective management strategies to prospective teachers (Emmer, 1986). Identification of classroom management style is important in order to promote humanistic, positive styles among those with interventionist orientations.

Teacher self-efficacy refers to a specific self-referent belief in a teacher’s ability to organize and execute the actions necessary to reach certain attainments. Teacher self-efficacy has been found to be an important link with effective classroom management, teaching and learning (Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Henson, in press; Podell & Soodak, 1993; Tschannen-Moran, WoolfolkHoy, & Hoy, 1998). Students of efficacious teachers have outperformed students of other teachers on a variety of achievement tests (Anderson, Greene, & Loewen, 1998; Moore

& Esselman, 1992; Ross, 1992). Watson (1991) observed greater achievement in rural, urban, majority Black, and majority White schools for students of efficacious teachers. Regarding classroom management behaviors, efficacious teachers persist with struggling students and criticize less after incorrect student answers (Gibson & Dembo, 1984). They are also more likely to agree that a low SES student should be placed in a regular education setting and less likely to refer students for special education (Meijer & Foster, 1998; Podell & Soodak, 1993; Soodak & Podell, 1993). Teachers with high efficacy tend to experiment with methods of instruction, seek improved teaching methods and experiment with instructional materials (Allinder, 1994; Guskey, 1988; Stein & Wang, 1988). The idea that teacher's self-beliefs are determinants of teaching behavior is valuable information for educator programs.

Woolfolk and Hoy (1990) examined the relationship between pre-service teachers' sense of efficacy and their beliefs of pupil control. Using the Teacher Efficacy Scale (Gibson & Dembo, 1984) and the Pupil Control Ideology form (Willower, Eidell, & Hoy, 1967), they reported that

Prospective teachers with high teaching efficacy are more humanistic in their pupil control ideology than those with low teaching efficacy; however, the relationship exists only among prospective teachers who believe that they have the ability to make a difference in student achievement—that is, only among those who also have high personal efficacy. (p 88)

It is possible, then, those pre-service teachers who are confident in their capabilities display more humanistic, less interventionist, classroom management strategies. Due to the recent lack of qualified teachers to fill classrooms, quicker routes to teacher certification have emerged through alternative and emergency education programs; the question arises whether the length of time for student teaching makes a difference in teacher self-efficacy and classroom control issues?

Purpose of the Study

Because of the potential role efficacy beliefs play in teachers' attitudes toward control in classroom management, the purpose of this study was to determine if there are differences in self-efficacy beliefs and classroom control orientation between student teachers participating in either a one or two semester student teaching experience. The following research questions guided the study: a) Is there a difference between students who have been in one semester of student teaching and those who have been in two semesters of student teaching in regards to classroom

management and self-efficacy beliefs? b) Can classroom control orientation and length of student teaching experiences predict teacher efficacy?

Methodology

Participants and Procedures

Fifty-five secondary teacher education students enrolled in a mid-sized Texas university participated in the study. Participants included 28 students completing a two-semester student teaching experience and 27 students in a one-semester student teaching experience. During the spring and fall semesters of 2001, participating students were administered two questionnaires. Both questionnaires were completed during regularly scheduled classes.

Participants in each group were similar in regards to age and prior experiences. Slightly more than 60% of each group were under 28 years of age. In relation to gender, the two groups were markedly different. Two-thirds of the one-semester student teachers were female compared to one-half of the two-semester group. Fifteen of the two semester group and 11 of the one semester group performed their student teaching duties in rural communities, with 13 two semester and 16 one semester students located in urban/suburban communities. Various teaching fields and levels were represented in each group.

Two-Semester Student Teaching Overview

The two-semester student teacher group completed the first semester of internship in public schools spending two full days each week for 15 weeks. Under the mentorship of the regular classroom teacher and university supervisor, students participated in various teacher related activities including lesson planning, microteaching, grading papers, and classroom management. For these students the second semester, residency was a typical student teaching experience.

One Semester Student Teaching Overview

In a compressed format, the one-semester student teacher group was provided the same experiences as the two-semester group. The coursework requirements were based on the same syllabus and followed the same standards/competencies. Both groups completed similar coursework and classroom observations prior to student teaching.

Instrumentation

Students' self-efficacy and classroom control orientation was determined by the use of two instruments. The Attitudes and Beliefs on Classroom Control Inventory (ABCC) (Martin, Yin, & Baldwin, 1998) assessed classroom control orientation. The ABCC includes 26 items with

a 4-point Likert scale and proposed to measure three orthogonal dimensions of classroom management control: instructional, people, and behavioral management. Each scale was derived to assess a continuum of control (cf. Glickman & Tamashiro, 1980; Wolfgang, 1995) ranging from interventionist to interactionist to non-interventionist, with interventionists expressing the greatest need/desire to control and manipulate the classroom environment. According to Martin, et. al. (1998, p 7), the instructional management scale (14 items) "includes aspects such as monitoring seatwork, structuring daily routines, and allocating materials," the people management scale (8 items) "pertains to what teachers believe about students as persons and what teachers do to develop the teacher-student relationship," and the behavioral management scale (4 items) "includes setting rules, establishing a reward structure, and providing opportunities for student input." Although Martin, et. al. (1998) argued for a three factor orthogonal solution, the people and behavioral management factors had a moderate interfactor correlation ($r = .48$) in their study and some items appear to share similar characteristics. Henson and Roberts (2001) also provided evidence of unity between these factors in a confirmatory factor analysis of the ABCC with preservice teachers. Hoy and Woolfolk (1993) revised 10-item version of Gibson and Dembo's (1984) 16-item Teacher Efficacy Scale (TES) will be used to measure personal and general teaching efficacy. Participants respond to a 7-point Likert scale anchored at "strongly agree" and "strongly disagree." The revised TES purports to measure two orthogonal dimensions: general teaching efficacy and personal teaching efficacy. Recent research reports that the TES general teaching efficacy really describes internal vs. external locus of control rather than outcome expectancy which was the original intent of the scale. Therefore, the 5-item personal teaching scale was used to measure each student teacher's self-efficacy, which is a report of one's confidence in his or her ability to positively impact student learning.

Results

Comparing Management and Efficacy Beliefs Between One and Two-Semester Student Teachers.

To determine if there were any differences between the one-semester and two-semester student teachers regarding classroom management and teacher efficacy, mean subscale scores were compared using the independent samples t-test statistic. T-test results revealed no significant differences between one and two-semester student teachers on:

a) instructional management, $t(52) = -1.439$, $p = .156$ b) people management, $t(52) = -.647$, $p = .520$, and c) behavioral management, $t(50) = -1.678$, $p = .099$. No significant difference was found between one and two-semester student teachers on self-efficacy, $t(50) = -.737$, $p = .465$. Descriptive statistics for each group is provided in Table 1.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics for One vs. Two Semester Student Teacher Groups

| Variable | Track | N | M | SD |
|---------------|-------|----|------|------|
| Instructional | One | 27 | 43.0 | 4.42 |
| | Two | 27 | 44.7 | 4.46 |
| People | One | 27 | 45.2 | 3.37 |
| | Two | 27 | 45.7 | 2.91 |
| Behavior | One | 27 | 20.5 | 1.52 |
| | Two | 27 | 21.2 | 1.53 |
| TES | One | 26 | 25.4 | 3.46 |
| | Two | 26 | 26.1 | 3.30 |

Predicting Teacher Efficacy from Classroom Orientation and Student Teaching Experience

A hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to ascertain the predictive characteristics of program length, instructional management, people management, and behavioral management on teacher efficacy. The full model (all predictors) explained 19.4% of the variance in teacher efficacy, $F(4, 45) = 2.716$, $p = .041$. However, only one predictor, instructional management, uniquely predicted teacher efficacy and accounted for 16.1% of the variance.

Discussion

This study used the classroom management framework conceptualized by Wolfgang and Glickman (1980, 1986) to explain the various dimensions of classroom management. This framework defines three broad areas, instructional management, people management, and behavior management. It appears that the lengthened student teaching experience does not impact classroom management styles and/or self-efficacy. Results support the continued use of the one-semester student teaching option.

The authors recommend further study, particularly pre/post test studies examining the impact of student teaching experiences on classroom management skill acquisition.

Initiating data collection efforts during program induction is suggested. Additional research regarding instructional management and self-efficacy is also encouraged.

References

- Allinder, R. M. (1994). The relationships between efficacy and the instructional practices of special education teachers and consultants. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 17, 86-95.
- Anderson, R., Greene, M., & Loewen, P. (1988). Relationships among teachers' and students' thinking skills, sense of efficacy, and student achievement. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 34(2), 148-165.
- Bush, D. W. & Achilles, C. M. (1986). Predicting effective disciplinary styles of teachers. *Catalyst for Change*, 15(3), 10-13.
- Emmer, E. (1986, December). *Effects of teacher training in disciplinary approaches*. Final draft of report submitted to the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC.
- Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76, 569-582.
- Glickman, C. D., & Tamashiro, R. T. (1980). Clarifying teachers' beliefs about discipline. *Educational Leadership*, 37, 459-464.
- Guskey, T. R. (1988). Teacher efficacy, self-concept, and attitudes toward the implementation of instructional innovation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 4, 63-69.
- Hoy, W. K., & Woolfolk, A. E. (1993). Teachers' sense of efficacy and the organizational health of schools. *The Elementary School Journal*, 93, 356-372.
- Henson, R. K., & Roberts, J. K. (2001, February). A confirmatory factor analysis of preservice teachers' responses to the Attitudes and Beliefs on Classroom Control Inventory. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, New Orleans. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. forthcoming)

- Martin, N. K., Yin, Z., & Baldwin, B. (1998). Construct validation of the Attitudes and Beliefs on Classroom Control Inventory. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 33(2), 6-15.
- Meijer, C., & Foster, S. (1988). The effect of teacher self-efficacy on referral chance. *Journal of Special Education*, 22, 378-385.
- Moore, W., & Esselman, M. (1992, April). *Teacher efficacy, power, school climate and achievement: A desegregating district's experience*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- Podell, D., & Soodak, L. (1993). Teacher efficacy and bias in special education referrals. *Journal of Educational Research*, 86, 247-253.
- Ross, J. A. (1992). Teacher efficacy and the effect of coaching on student achievement. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 17(1), 51-65.
- Soodak, L., & Podell, D. (1993). Teacher efficacy and student problems as factors in special education referral. *Journal of Special Education*, 27, 66-81.
- Stein, M. K., & Wang, M. C. (1988). Teacher development and school improvement: The process of teacher change. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 4, 171-187.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk Hoy, A., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research*, 68, 202-248.
- Watson, S. (1991). A study of the effects of teacher efficacy on academic achievement of third-grade students in selected elementary schools in South Carolina. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, South Carolina State College, Orangeburg. (University Microfilms No. UMI 9230552)
- Willower, D. J., Eidell, T. L., & Hoy, W. K. (1967). The school and pupil control ideology. (Penn State Studies Monograph No. 24). University Park: Pennsylvania State University.
- Wolfgang, C. H. (1995). *Solving discipline problems: Strategies for classroom teachers* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Wolfgang, C.H., & Glickman, C.D. (1980). *Solving discipline problems: Strategies for classroom teachers*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Wolfgang, C.H., & Glickman, C.D. (1985). *Solving discipline problems: Strategies for classroom teachers* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Woolfolk, A. E., & Hoy, W. K. (1990). Prospective teachers' sense of efficacy and beliefs about control. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82, 81-91.