

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/20734> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Jong, Romi de

Title: Student teachers' practical knowledge, discipline strategies, and the teacher-class relationship

Issue Date: 2013-04-11

Chapter 4

4.

Discipline strategies⁴

Teacher discipline strategies are well-documented when it comes to its effects on students and the working climate in the classroom. Although it is commonly acknowledged that for student teachers classroom discipline is a major concern, student teachers' use of discipline strategies are largely unknown. In this chapter, we examine student teachers' beliefs about classroom discipline in relation to their discipline strategies. Beliefs that were taken into account are self-images, pupil control orientation and anticipated student responses. Three clusters of discipline strategies are distinguished: sensitive, directive and aggressive discipline strategies.

All participants were student teachers of a one year teacher education programme for secondary education in the Netherlands. Student questionnaires were used to measure participants' discipline strategies ($n = 2506$). Student teachers' ($n=104$) self-images, pupil control orientation and anticipated student responses were measured with teacher questionnaires.

Results of the multiple regression analyses showed that student teachers' discipline strategies are explained best by beliefs about control (both self-images and anticipated student responses), pupil control orientation and in the case of aggressive discipline also self-images with regard to affiliation.

Apart from the possible academic interest in these particular findings, results might be useful in a practical sense, in particular for teacher education programmes.

⁴ This chapter has been submitted in adapted form as:

Jong, R.J. de., Tartwijk, J. van., Wubbels, T., Veldman, I., & Verloop, N. *Student teachers' discipline strategies: Relations with self-images, anticipated student responses and pupil control orientation.*

4.1 Introduction

Student misbehaviour impacts negatively on student learning time and academic achievements (Lewis, Romi, Qui, & Katz, 2005). Teachers use different discipline strategies to deal with student misbehaviour, however not always successfully. Problems with classroom discipline are one of the main reasons why teachers leave the profession (Evertson & Weinstein, 2006; Walker, 2009). For student and beginning teachers in secondary education, in particular, classroom discipline is a major concern (Ghaith & Shaaban, 1999; Liston, Whitcomb, & Borko, 2006; Veenman, 1984) which affects teacher stress, teacher well-being and teacher confidence (Spilt, Koomen, & Thijs, 2011).

Teachers' beliefs about students and their own roles as teachers are considered to be highly important for their practice (Pajares, 1992). We investigated how student teachers' discipline strategies are related to their beliefs. It seems likely that student teachers have beliefs about classroom life and classroom discipline (Balli, 2011), even though they do not have extensive teaching experience themselves. These beliefs are rooted in their experiences as students (Balli, 2011; Kaplan, 1992), often referred to with 'apprenticeship of observation' (Lortie, 1975). Beliefs in relation to discipline strategies are considered to be relevant because of the nature of the classroom situations. According to Calderhead (1987), the complexity and immediacy of many classroom situations may require teachers to make intuitive decisions which are based on their beliefs, rather than reflective decisions. With regard to disorderly situations in the classroom, beliefs are pivotal since those situations in particular require an immediate reaction (Kaplan, 1992). Kaplan (1992) investigated the relationship between teachers' own experiences with punishments in their families, their subsequent beliefs about discipline, and their selection of discipline strategies. Among 156 student teachers he found that student teachers' prior experiences were indeed predictive of their selection of discipline strategies. In particular student teachers with an authoritative upbringing were more likely to select punitive strategies. Besides beliefs about classroom discipline and student behaviour, teachers also have

beliefs of self-as-a-teacher (Pajares and Schunk, 2002). These self-images, just like anticipated student responses and pupil control orientation, are inextricably tied to teachers' thinking and functioning and become rules that govern their behaviour (Beijaard, Verloop & Vermunt, 2000; Korthagen, 2004; Pajares & Schunk, 2002).

Because of the importance of teachers' beliefs for their practice, specifically with regard to classroom discipline, the focus in this chapter is on the relationship between student teachers' discipline strategies and their beliefs about themselves as teachers, about student behaviour and about pupil control. In the following, discipline strategies and the three specific teacher beliefs will be discussed in more detail.

4.2 Theoretical framework

DISCIPLINE STRATEGIES

Discipline strategies of adults interacting with children or students are generally perceived as belonging to one of two categories: *sensitive* and *coercive* (Patterson, 1982; Bakermans-Kranenburg, Van IJzendoorn, & Juffer, 2003; Mainhard, Brekelmans, & Wubbels, 2011a). In research and practice these two ways of disciplining have been given various but comparable names; here we will stick to sensitive and coercive, because they are the most commonly used terms. Sensitive discipline refers to strategies like encouragement, setting limits, monitoring, troubleshooting and positive involvement. All these strategies are assumed to stimulate the development of pro-social behaviour of children. Coercive discipline includes negative reinforcement strategies, inconsistency and disproportional measures. Coercive interactions are characterized by frequent and extended exchange of aversive verbal and physical responses (Snyder & Patterson, 1995; Snyder, 2002). When frequently used, the people interacting risk getting caught in a coercive interaction pattern, as was investigated for teachers and students by Lewis and colleagues. Lewis (2001) and Lewis et al. (2005) examined the relationship between students' reports of teachers' sensitive and coercive discipline strategies and student misbehaviour, motivation, concentration and well-being.

Compared to students who were disciplined sensitively, students who were subjected to coercive discipline were more distracted from their work and showed less responsible behaviour in the classroom. Based on observational data, Clunies-Ross, Little and Kienhuis (2008) concluded that teachers' strategies, such as listening to students and negotiating commitments, were related significantly to on-task student behaviour. Conversely, strategies like using punishment (including corporal punishment) had a negative correlation with on-task student behaviour. Golish & Olson (2000) found that students are less responsive when teachers use coercive strategies, whereas teachers' use of reward was positively related to pro-social student behaviour such as honesty and effort.

Although coercive strategies are not recommended, they do appear in classrooms and play a significant role in influencing students' behaviour and attitudes (Lewis, 2001; Lewis et al., 2005; Lewis & Riley, 2009; Mainhard et al., 2011a). In a recent study, Roache and Lewis (2011) investigated the effect of discipline strategies on students' motivation, engagement, connectedness to their schoolwork and teachers, misbehaviour, responsibility, and well-being. With regard to these student variables, sensitive strategies were the most effective, while aggressive strategies were so evidently ineffective that the authors labelled them a 'functionally negative set of strategies'. Interestingly, punishment turned out to be ambivalent in its effects. Roache and Lewis (2011) therefore propose that punishment, in terms of its effect on students, might best be considered as 'neutral'. According to these authors, it comes as no surprise that teachers sometimes use punishment of some kind to prevent or restrict student behaviour that is a risk to classroom (working) climate. The effects of punishment are dependent on how appropriate and proportional the teacher disciplines in general (Roache & Lewis, 2011).

Unfortunately, little is known about why teachers use specific discipline strategies. Merrett and Wheldall (1993) interviewed 176 secondary school teachers in the UK and found that classroom behaviour management is of prime importance in the thinking of teachers. In addition, the majority of the teachers acknowledged that it is better to be encouraging than to be repressive with students. However, Clunies Ross et al. (2008) found that in practice many

teachers use strategies that are not recognised as being effective in managing student misbehaviour, and even if teachers report that they favour positive reinforcement, they are more likely to make use of punishments and threats. In an attempt to explain teachers' use of aggressive strategies for maintaining classroom discipline, Riley, Lewis and Brew (2010) asked 233 teachers who admitted using aggressive strategies why they did so. Their results indicate that aggressive strategies are common among many teachers. Teachers appeared to be attracted to three theoretical explanations for their use of aggressive strategies: explanations based on attribution, efficacy or attachment theory. However, there was no clear support for any one of the three theories over the others: 14% of teachers supported all theories simultaneously and 27% of teachers rejected all theories. These teachers may be working without a coherent theory of classroom discipline in general and aggressive discipline in particular. As Riley et al. (2010) put it, when it comes to classroom discipline, apparently many teachers are more re-active than pro-active.

Given that student teachers are still developing their own teaching style, we wanted to obtain a detailed picture of their discipline strategies. We therefore not only took sensitive and aggressive strategies into account, but also the more neutral strategies (Roache & Lewis, 2011). Beliefs that are thought to be of relevance to discipline strategies are described in the following sections.

SELF-IMAGES

Beliefs are based on prior experiences and influence subsequent interactions through what are known as schemas (Moskowitz, 2005). Schemas help us process information as effortlessly as possible, thus helping people to adapt to their environment efficiently and effectively. Schemas that relate to interpersonal experiences are called relational schemas, consisting of images of self and other, together with a script for an expected pattern of interaction (Baldwin, 1992; Baldwin, 1999). In this thesis, images of self are conceptualised as self-images, whereas images of others are conceptualised as beliefs about student behaviour.

According to Pajares and Schunk (2002), self-images relate to how individuals perceive their selves in different contexts and situations, rather than

a global perception of self. As a consequence, self-images differ across different domains of functioning; for instance, a person's self-belief as a volleyball trainer, teacher, sister and colleague are plainly different. Self-images in specific areas of people's lives are most likely to guide them in that particular area. We adopted this view of self-images and focused on teachers' self-images about their behaviour as teachers. In addition, based on Cooley's notion of the *looking glass self* (Yeung & Martin, 2003), self-images are viewed as teachers' beliefs on how they think they will be perceived by their students. The notion of the looking glass self implies that people rely on social processes to shape their selves, seeing themselves as they imagine others will see them (Yeung & Martin, 2003). Specifically, student teachers will rely on social processes in the classroom, since their self-as-a-teacher is still developing. For this reason we investigated their beliefs on how they will be perceived by their students.

Based on the Model of Interpersonal Teacher Behaviour (Créton & Wubbels, 1984; Wubbels, Créton, & Hooymaaiers, 1993; Wubbels, Brekelmans, Brok, & Tartwijk, 2006), teachers' self-images in this thesis were conceptualised in terms of affiliation (e.g., warmth and care) and control (e.g., authority or control). These dimensions are assumed to be both necessary and sufficient to describe the interpersonal meaning of human behaviour and worldwide have been used for other participants than teachers and students (Kiesler, 1983; Leary, 1957; Moskowitz, Ringo Ho, & Turcotte-Tremblay, 2007; Tiedens & Fragale, 2003; Tracey, 1994). Generally speaking, the two dimensions are conceptualised as asserting an individual's status relative to others and as promoting interpersonal ties (Mainhard, Brekelmans, den Brok, & Wubbels, 2011b). In the context of educational research, and more specifically classroom discipline, the two dimensions are recognised as a valuable tool for measuring the teacher-class relationship (Ertesvåg, 2011; Walker, 2009; Wentzel, 2002; Wubbels et al., 2006). Affiliation refers to behaviours such as listening to students, asking what they want, encouraging them and generally being responsive; whereas control refers to attention-seeking behaviour and pursuing high standards (Mainhard, et al., 2011a). The control dimension describes the extent to which teachers believed they were

perceived as in control of what happens in the classroom, while the affiliation dimension describes how emotionally close teachers believed to be perceived by their students.

ANTICIPATED STUDENT RESPONSES

Through the process of socialization (Lortie, 1975), experiences with recurring teacher-class interactions, such as classroom discussions or correcting disruptive student behaviour, are internalised in cognitive schemas of both teachers and students and shape expectations about interactions (Locke, 2005). Expectations are considered important since they consciously and unconsciously guide the perceptions and subsequent behaviour of the people interacting (Baldwin, Kiviniemi & Snyder, 2009; Snyder & Stukas, 1999; Snyder & Klein, 2005).

With regard to teachers' expectations of the ability of their students, Brophy (1985) hypothesized that teachers' class-level expectations might be more important for student learning than expectations on an individual level. More recently, Rubie (2004) showed that teachers with high expectations of their high ability students had similar high expectations of their average and below average students, illustrating that high expectations can be a teacher characteristic that involves the whole class, not a single group of students. Based on the evidence for the influence of teachers' class level expectations on student outcomes, teachers' beliefs about student behaviour were explored at class level.

PUPIL CONTROL ORIENTATION

Pupil control orientation is conceptualised as beliefs about pupil control along a continuum, with custodial at one extreme and humanistic at the other (Willower, Eidell, & Hoy, 1967). A humanistic orientation indicates a perspective stressing the importance of the individuality of each student and the creation of a climate to meet a wide range of student needs. Teachers with a humanistic orientation have an accepting, trusting view of students, and have confidence in students' ability to be self-disciplining and responsible. Teachers with a more custodial orientation tend to be more authoritarian and dogmatic in

their belief systems and are less progressive in their educational attitudes. Students are perceived as irresponsible and undisciplined persons who must be managed through punitive measures (Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990).

Results of validity studies indicate that the pupil control orientation predicts much instructional and managerial behaviour as well as students' perceptions of their teachers (Packard, 1988). In line with the work of Woolfolk and Hoy (1990), student teachers with a more custodial orientation are expected to show higher levels of aggressive discipline, whereas those with a more humanistic orientation are expected to be associated with higher levels of sensitive discipline strategies.

4.3 Research question

The overall research question of this chapter was how student teachers' beliefs are related to their discipline strategies. Specifically, we investigated how student teachers' self-images on control and affiliation, anticipated student responses in terms of control and affiliation, and pupil control orientation were related to their sensitive, punishment and aggressive strategies.

4.4 Method

Sample

Participants were 104 student teachers enrolled in the teacher preparation programme of three university graduate schools in the Netherlands. 40.8% of participants were female. The age of participants ranged between 22 and 57 years ($M = 30.4$ years, $SD = 8.3$). The distribution of participants over the subject matter areas was as follows: 42% in social studies, 36% in language, 17% in science and mathematics, and 5% in arts. The majority of participants (80.8%) had no experience teaching in secondary education, 13.4% of them had one to three years' experience, and the remaining 5.8% had more than four years' experience.

The teacher education programmes of all graduate schools prepare students with appropriate master degrees in the subject they will teach for teaching at all

levels in secondary education. The programme takes a year full-time and includes a traineeship that starts immediately at the beginning of the programme. Per week, student teachers spent two to three days at a school, where they were engaged in observations, teaching and other assignments. Per student teacher one class participated in the study (with on average 22.6 students per class; 2,506 students in total). Of these classes, 34% were the first two years of secondary education; the other 66% were higher-level classes. The majority (94%) were classes from the higher levels of secondary education; only 6% were classes in pre-vocational secondary education. Since all participants taught at least two classes, they were asked to select a class for the student questionnaire that was their least favourite in terms of interaction. This was motivated by the finding that data on teacher-class interaction differentiated more between teachers when gathered in least favourite instead of favourite classes (de Jong, van Tartwijk, Verloop, Veldman, & Wubbels, 2012).

Instruments

Participants filled in a questionnaire with background questions, and questionnaires about pupil control, anticipated student responses and self-image. The student and teacher questionnaires were administered after the participants had independently taught that particular class for at least two months. Both teachers' self-images and anticipated student responses were examined with the dimensions derived from interpersonal theory, so that both self-images and anticipated student responses refer to the level of control and affiliation.

Self-images were measured with the Questionnaire on Teacher Interaction (QTI, Créton & Wubbels, 1984) consisting of 50 items on how the teacher believes their students perceive their behaviour on control and affiliation (Brekelmans, Wubbels, & Tartwijk, 2005). Examples of QTI items are "This teacher can take a joke" or "This teacher's standards are very high." The items are answered on a five-point Likert scale (never to always). We analysed teachers' self-belief on the basis of dimension scores on control and affiliation. The higher the scores, the more the teacher thinks to be perceived by students

as in control and friendly. The reliability (Cronbach's α) of the dimension scores was .88 on control and .88 on affiliation.

Anticipated student responses were measured with the Teacher Interpersonal Schema Questionnaire (TISQ; de Jong, van Tartwijk, Veldman, Verloop, & Wubbels, 2012), based on an instrument developed in the US (ISQ; Hill & Safran, 1994). The TISQ is a multiple choice instrument consisting of twenty vignettes describing teacher behaviour in classroom situations, each with four answer categories describing student behaviour on affiliation and control. Each item of the TISQ had a particular set of four answer categories, for example the vignette "A group of girls are talking and giggling. You look sternly at their direction and one by one call out their names." had the following answer categories: A. They give me an angry look, but they do listen; B. They are not impressed, and continue what they were doing; C. They stop and urge each other to pay attention; D. Say "Sorry, we're wrong.", sit up and actively participate in the lesson. Thus it measures beliefs about student behaviour on control and affiliation in response to teacher behaviour vignettes. To reflect the position of an answer category within the circumplex model weights are applied to the answer categories (i.e., theoretical factor loadings; for a comprehensive discussion of the model see den Brok, Brekelmans, & Wubbels, 2006). As a result, scores of Control and Affiliation dimensions range between -0.92 and +0.92.

*Table 4.1. Factor descriptives of student teachers' anticipated student responses and pupil control orientation (N=103)**

Factor name	No of items	Mean	Sd.	α
Anticipated student responses: control	9	.00	.32	.68
Anticipated student responses: affiliation	9	-.35	.37	.68
Pupil control orientation	16	2.65	.34	.67

* One of the participants did not return the questionnaires on anticipated student responses and pupil control orientation

Only anticipated responses with a positive contribution to the Alpha on both scales were included in the analysis. The first two lines of Table 4.1 show

the number of items, reliabilities (Cronbach's α), scale mean and standard deviations for the two scales control and affiliation.

The Pupil Control Inventory form (PCI; Willower et al., 1967) was developed in the US and has been used in over 200 studies worldwide (Hoy, 2001), with generally high internal reliabilities (Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990). The Dutch translation of the PCI (Willower et al., 1967) is also a five-point Likert-type scale questionnaire (strongly disagree to strongly agree), consisting of twenty items such as "Pupils are usually not capable of solving their problems through logical reasoning". Theoretically, scores can range from 20 to 100. Higher scores refer to a more custodial pupil control orientation.

Although reliability is generally high (internal consistencies ranging from .70 to .93; Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990), it tends to be somewhat lower for student teachers (Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990). As Gaffney and Byrd-Gaffney (1996) stated, this might be due to the fact that student teachers have not had extensive teaching experience and represent a more homogenous population than in-service teachers. Reliability (Cronbach's α) in our sample was .64 with twenty items, but improved to .67 by discarding four items. The remaining items included the PCI items that were used in the short PCI constructed by Hoy (2001) based on their high discriminative power in the original Willower et al. (1967) study. Our results are reported based on sixteen PCI items. Descriptives are provided in Table 4.1 (bottom line).

To measure discipline strategies the 24 item discipline strategies questionnaire (Lewis, 2001) was used. This is a five-point Likert response scale ('never' to 'always') questionnaire with three factors: Sensitive, Directive and Aggressive (see Table 3.1). Example items are: "Rewards individual students who behave properly" (Sensitive); "Imposes consequences on students who misbehave (e.g., move their seats, detention)" (Punishment); and "Deliberately embarrasses students who misbehave." (Aggressive).

4.5 Analyses

If the predictors (i.e., self-images, anticipated student responses and pupil control orientation) turned out to be highly intercorrelated, the assumption of

no multicollinearity would be violated. In the case of multicollinearity, the estimate of the impact of one predictor on discipline strategies while controlling for the others tends to be less precise than if predictors are not correlated with one another. Another problem of multicollinearity is that the standard errors of the b coefficients increase as a result of high multicollinearity between predictors, making it less likely that the b 's in our sample would represent the population. In our case, correlations between predictors were $<.30$, except for correlations between anticipated student responses on control and affiliation ($-.55$). To check if this collinearity is a problem for our regression model, we calculated two collinearity statistics, i.e., the variance inflation factor (VIF) and the related tolerance statistic, both indicating that multicollinearity in our case was not biasing the regression model (as a rule of thumb: VIF should not be greater than 10, and tolerance should not be less than 0.2, see O'Brien, 2007).

To check for effects of the background variables gender and experience on discipline strategies and student teachers' beliefs, an ANOVA was conducted. Group means of male and female student teachers, and student teachers with no experience versus more than a year's experience, were compared. Group means on the three discipline strategies were not significantly different for males and females, or for student teachers with none versus more than a year experience. Gender did not produce significantly different scores on self-images, anticipated student responses and pupil control orientation. Group means for zero versus more than a year experience were not significantly different for anticipated student responses, and pupil control orientation and for self-images on affiliation. However, student teachers with more than a year experience believed students to perceive them as more controlling than student teachers with no experience ($F(1, 102) = 6.78, p < .05$). Cohen's d was 0.57, indicating a medium effect size.

4.6 Results

In this section we report the answers to our research question on the relations between student teachers' discipline strategies and their self-images, anticipated student responses and pupil control orientation.

The relations between self-images and discipline strategies are illustrated in Table 4.2 (first two lines). The more student teachers believed to be perceived as controlling, the more they employed sensitive and directive discipline strategies according to their students ($r = .34, p < .01$ and $r = .31, p < .01$ respectively). The second line of Table 4.2 demonstrates that the more student teachers believed they were perceived by their students as emotionally close, the more they disciplined sensitively and the less they disciplined aggressively according to their students ($r = .26, p < .05$ and $r = -.35, p < .01$ respectively).

Table 4.2. Correlations between discipline strategies and self-images, anticipated student responses and pupil control orientation (n=103)

	Discipline strategies		
	Sensitive	Directive	Aggressive
Self-images: control	.34**	.31**	-.06
Self-images: affiliation	.26*	-.07	-.35**
Anticipated student responses: control	-.31**	-.04	.09
Anticipated student responses: affiliation	.16	.01	.01
Pupil control orientation	-.21*	.19	.29**

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

How student teachers' anticipated student responses were related to their sensitive, directive and aggressive strategies is demonstrated in the middle two lines of Table 4.2: the more student teachers believed that student would react in a controlling way, the less they employed sensitive strategies according to their students ($r = -.31, p < .01$).

How student teachers' pupil control orientation was related to their sensitive, directive and aggressive strategies is illustrated in the bottom line of Table 4.2: the more custodial the student teachers' pupil control orientation, the more they employed aggressive strategies, and less sensitive strategies ($r = .29$, $p < .01$ and $r = .21$, $p < .05$ respectively).

Table 4.3. Summary of results of the regression analysis of student teachers' beliefs on sensitive discipline strategies (N = 103)

	B	SE B	β	P	R ²
Step 1					.12
(Constant)	2.76	0.04			
Anticipated student responses: control	-0.41	0.12	-.35	.001	
Step 2					.18 ^a
(Constant)	2.78	0.42			
Anticipated student responses: control	-0.35	0.12	-.30	.005	
Self-images: control	0.24	0.10	.24	.023	
Step 3					.22 ^b
(Constant)	3.43	0.33			
Anticipated student responses: control	-0.28	0.13	-.24	.03	
Self-images: control					
Pupil control orientation	0.27	0.10	.28	.01	
	-0.25	0.12	-.21	.05	

^a $\Delta R^2 = .06$; $p < .05$.

^b $\Delta R^2 = .04$; $p < .05$.

In order to understand the relative role that these beliefs played in relation to discipline strategies, multiple stepwise regression analyses were conducted with each of the discipline strategies as criterion variables, and self-images, anticipated student responses and pupil control orientation as predictors.

Sensitive discipline (Table 4.3) was significantly related to anticipated student responses in terms of control, the self-image to be perceived as in control by students, and a humanistic pupil control orientation ($F(3, 78) =$

7.27, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .22$). Together these three beliefs explained 22% of the variance on sensitive discipline. Taking these variables into account, the partial correlation of the self-image of being perceived as emotionally close with sensitive discipline appeared to be not significant.

Table 4.4. Summary of results of the regression analysis of studentteachers' beliefs on directive discipline strategies (N = 103)

	B	SE B	β	p	R2
Step 1					.11*
(Constant)	2.90	0.05			
Self-images: control	0.36	0.11	.33	.002	

* $p < .01$

With respect to directive discipline (Table 4.4), the belief to be perceived by students as in control explained 11% of the variance ($F(1, 80) = 9.95$, $p < .01$, $R^2 = .11$). The other predictors did not have a significant effect on directive discipline strategies and were excluded from the regression model.

Table 4.5. Summary of results of the regression analysis of student teachers' beliefs on aggressive discipline strategies (N = 103)

	B	SE B	β	p	R2
Step 1					.12*
(Constant)	0.65	0.33			
Pupil control orientation	0.42	0.13	.35	.001	
Step 2					.18a
(Constant)	1.05	0.36			
Pupil control orientation	0.33	0.13	.28	.01	
Self-belief: affiliation	-0.24	0.10	-.26	.02	

* $p < .01$

a $\Delta R^2 = .06$; $p < .05$

With regard to aggressive discipline (Table 4.5), a custodial pupil control orientation and the belief to be perceived by students as emotionally distant ($F(2, 79) = 8.91, p < .000, R^2 = .18$) explained 18% of variance on aggressive discipline strategies.

4.7 Discussion

In this chapter the results were reported of a study on relationships between student teachers' discipline strategies on the one hand, and their self-images, pupil control orientation and anticipated student responses on the other.

We found that all teachers' beliefs correlated significantly with at least one of the discipline strategies, with the exception of beliefs about student behaviour in terms of affiliation. In other words, with regard to teachers' discipline strategies, self-images about how students perceive them in terms of affiliation and control, anticipated student responses in terms of control and pupil control orientation were relevant, but anticipated student responses in terms of affiliation were not. This finding, and the finding that self-images in terms of affiliation had lower correlations with sensitive discipline strategies than self-images in terms of control, is in line with results of research by Markey and Kurtz (2006) and Moskowitz et al. (2007). With an interpersonal model similar to ours they investigated communication between people in work and non-work settings, and between people with different social role status. They found that in work settings and in hierarchical relationships the control-dimension had more explanatory power than the affiliation-dimension. The same mechanism might be applicable to our case: being in a professional and hierarchical relationship with students, teachers' self-images and beliefs about student behaviour were primarily related to control and less to affiliation. Apart from the possible academic interest in these particular findings, this result showed that student teachers' discipline strategies were not significantly related to their beliefs about students' behaviour in terms of affiliation. Previous studies, for instance McLaughlin (1991) and Weinstein (1998), showed that student teachers' conceptions of friendliness and control are not well-balanced:

they feel a tension between the wish to be nice, and the need to be mean (Weinstein, 1998). This might cause them to hesitate to discipline, especially when they believe students to be emotionally close. The current study not only showed additional student teachers' beliefs about classroom discipline, but also showed how these beliefs are related to student teachers' behaviour in terms of discipline strategies.

Student teachers' beliefs about how much students will perceive them as in control were the most important predictor of directive discipline strategies. The fact that none of the other beliefs contributed to directive discipline strategies might be an effect of the ambiguous nature of these strategies. Sensitive and aggressive strategies are opposite ends and directive strategies are literally in-between. As Roache and Lewis (2011) stated, since punishments (in this thesis incorporated in the set of directive discipline strategies) are ambivalent in their effects on students well-being, motivation and engagement, they are actually a neutral set of strategies, whereas sensitive and aggressive strategies have been shown to have positive and negative effects on students. This 'neutrality' of directive strategies might be an explanation for the lack of direct relationships with the other beliefs.

With regard to aggressive discipline strategies, it was found that the more student teachers had a humanistic pupil control orientation and the more they believed their behaviour would be perceived as emotionally close, the less they disciplined aggressive according to their students. Research has clearly shown that the use of aggressive strategies has negative effects: it fails to encourage responsible student behaviour, it diminishes student engagement and motivation and on-task student behaviour and it may actually increase students' misbehaviour (Clunies-Ross et al., 2008; Golish & Olson, 2000; Lewis et al, 2005; Roache & Lewis, 2011). Even though teachers acknowledge that sensitive strategies are a better way to discipline students, in practice aggressive strategies are still employed (Clunies-Ross et al. 2008; Lewis & Riley, 2009; Riley et al., 2010). Our data, derived from student teachers, indicated that whereas the scale mean for aggressive discipline was the lowest of the three scales, the scale mean for directive discipline strategies was the highest. That indicates that there is room for improvement, namely to make

more use of sensitive discipline strategies. An interesting issue for future research is how teachers shift between different strategies, and which shifts are more likely to occur than others. For instance: it might be more likely to proceed from directive to aggressive, than to shift from directive to sensitive strategies.

A suggestion for future research is related to the cultural context of the respondents. In this chapter, beliefs of Dutch student teachers were investigated. Both self-images and beliefs about student behaviour refer to the level of control and affiliation. These dimensions are strongly related to dimensions that represent culturally described behaviours and cognitions: immediacy, collectivism and power distance (den Brok, Levy, Rodriguez, & Wubbels, 2004; den Brok & Koopman, 2007; Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). It was found that immediacy is reflected in behaviour that is supportive, friendly and occasionally emotional. A collectivist class is characterized by students who prefer small group work and who do not speak in class until they are called upon. In classes with high power distance, teachers receive great respect from their students, and students are rarely challenging or critical (den Brok & Koopman, 2007). Cultural dimensions like power distance, immediacy and collectivism affect students' and teachers' perceptions, and as a result teacher beliefs are likely to be different across cultures. This means that we should be careful to generalize our findings about the beliefs of Dutch student teachers to student teachers worldwide. Future research should compare the differences in beliefs between (student) teachers in several cultural settings. The theoretical framework, the instrument, and the routines we developed in this thesis can be useful in such research.

Just like for instance Kaplan (1992) and Balli (2011), we too recommend that teacher education programmes provide plentiful opportunities for student teachers to learn about their beliefs. Also they should be helped to explore the relations between beliefs about teaching, pupil control orientation, student behaviour, self-as-a-teacher and their subsequent teaching practice. This way, student teachers may be able to make more informed choices about classroom discipline and in particular discipline strategies instead of, as Riley et al. (2010) put it, 'working blind', without a coherent theory of classroom discipline.

Insights of the study described in this chapter might be helpful to teacher education. For instance, considering the positive relation between sensitive strategies and student behaviour and outcomes, it seems reasonable to teach student teachers to make use of sensitive strategies whenever and as much as possible, to use punishment only when strictly necessary, and to avoid the use of aggressive strategies (Clunies-Ross et al., 2008; Roache and Lewis, 2011). Another finding that might be helpful for teacher education is that with regard to sensitive discipline, it seems contra-productive to expect more dominant student behaviour, and have a more custodial pupil control orientation.

Student teachers with discipline problems might benefit from an exploration of their beliefs with regard to control, student behaviour, and their own self-images. Classroom discipline is a major concern in the minds of teachers. Strikingly, according to Merrett and Wheldall (1993), three-quarters of teachers were dissatisfied with the preparation on classroom behaviour management that was provided during the initial teacher preparation. The vast majority (95%) believed that a course on positive classroom behaviour management would help beginning teachers to cope during their first year of teaching. We hope that this study may provide some relevant insights for the development of a teacher training programme on classroom discipline.

References

- Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., Van IJzendoorn, M. H., & Juffer, F. (2003). Less is more: meta- analyses of sensitivity and attachment interventions in early childhood. *Psychological Bulletin* 129, 195-215.
- Baldwin, M. W. (1992). Relational Schemas and the processing of social information. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 461-484.
- Baldwin, M. W. (1999). Relational Schemas. Research into Social-Cognitive Aspects of Interpersonal Experience. In D. Corvone and Y. Shoda (Eds.), *Coherence of personality: Social-cognitive bases of consistency, variability, and organisation* (pp. 127-155). New York: Guilford Press.
- Baldwin, A. S., Kiviniemi, M. T., & Snyder, M. (2009). A subtle source of power: The effect of having an expectation on anticipated interpersonal power. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 149, 82-104.
- Balli, S. J. (2011). Student teachers' episodic memories of classroom management. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27, 245-251.
- Beijaard, D., Verloop, N., & Vermunt, J. D. (2000). Teachers' perceptions of professional identity: an exploratory study from a personal knowledge perspective. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16, 749-764.
- Brekelmans, M., Wubbels, T., & Tartwijk, J. van (2005). Teacher-student relationships across the teaching career. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 43, 55-71.
- Brok, P. den, Levy, J., Rodriguez, R. & Wubbels, T. (2002). Perceptions of Asian-American and Hispanic-American teachers and their students on interpersonal communication style. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18, 447-467.
- Brok, den, P., Brekelmans, M., & Wubbels, T. (2004). Interpersonal teacher behavior and student outcomes. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 15(3/4), 407-442.
- Brok, den, P., Brekelmans, M., & Wubbels, T. (2006). Multilevel issues in studies using students' perceptions of learning environments: the case of the Questionnaire on Teacher Interaction. *Learning Environments Research*, 9, 199-213.
- Brok, P. den, & Koopman, G. J. (2007). Interpersonal teacher behaviour in international education. In M. Hayden, J. Levy and J. Thompson (Eds.), *International handbook of research on international education* (pp. 233-246). London: Sage publications.
- Brophy, J. E. (1985). Teacher-class Interaction. In J.B. Dusek (Ed.), *Teacher expectancies* (pp. 303-328). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Calderhead, J. (1987). *Exploring teachers' thinking*. London: Cassell.
- Clunies-Ross, P., Little, E., & Kienhuis, M. (2008). Self-reported and actual use of proactive and reactive classroom management strategies and their relationship with teacher stress and student behaviour. *Educational Psychology, 28*, 693–710.
- Créton, H., & Wubbels, T. (1984). *Discipline problems with beginning teachers*. Utrecht, the Netherlands: W.C.C.
- Ertesvåg, S. K. (2011). Measuring authoritative teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*, 51-61.
- Evertson, C. M., & Weinstein, C. S. (2006). Classroom management as a field of inquiry. In C. M. Evertson & C. S. Weinstein (Eds.), *International handbook of classroom management. Research, practice, and contemporary issues* (pp.3-17). United States, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gaffney, P., & Byrd-Gaffney, S. (1996). *An investigation into the test reliability of the pupil control ideology form* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED397 098).
- Ghaith, G., & Shaaban, K. (1999). The relationship between perceptions of teaching concerns, teacher efficacy, and selected teacher characteristics. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 15*, 487-496.
- Golish, T. D., & Olons, L. N. (2000). Students' use of power in the classroom: An investigation of student power, teacher power, and teacher immediacy. *Communication Quarterly, 48*, 293-310.
- Hill, C. R., & Safran, J. D. (1994). Assessing interpersonal schemas: Anticipated responses of significant others. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 13*, 366-379.
- Hofstede, G., & Hofstede, G. J. (2005). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hoy, W. K. (2001). The pupil control studies. A historical, theoretical and empirical analysis. *Journal of Educational Administration, 39*(5), 424-441.
- Jong, de, R. J., Tartwijk, van, J., Verloop, N., Veldman, I., & Wubbels, T. (2012). Teachers' expectations of teacher-class interaction: Complementary and distinctive expectancy patterns. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 28*, 948-956.
- Kaplan, C. (1992). Teachers' punishment histories and their selection of disciplinary strategies. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 17*, 258-265.

- Kiesler, D. J. (1983). The 1982 interpersonal circle: A taxonomy for complementarity in human transactions. *Psychological Review*, 90, 185-214.
- Korthagen, F. A. J. (2004). In search of the essence of a good teacher: towards a more holistic approach in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20, 77-97.
- Leary, T. (1957). *An interpersonal diagnoses of personality*. New York: The Ronald Press Company.
- Lewis, R. (2001). Classroom discipline and student responsibility: the student's view. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 307-319.
- Lewis, R., Romi, S., Qui, X., & Katz, Y. J., (2005). Teachers' classroom discipline and student misbehavior in Australia, China and Israel. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21, 729-741.
- Lewis, R., & Riley, P. (2009). Teacher misbehaviour. In L. J. Saha & A. G. Dworkin (Eds.), *The new international handbook of teachers and teaching* (pp. 417-431). Norwell, MA: Springer.
- Liston, D., Whitcomb, J., & Borko, H. (2006). Too little or too much: Teacher preparation and the first years of teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 57, 351-328.
- Locke, K. D. (2005). Interpersonal problems and interpersonal expectations in everyday life. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 24, 915-931.
- Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. London: University of Chicago Press.
- Mainhard, M. T., Brekelmans, M., & Wubbels, T. (2011a). Coercive and supportive teacher behaviour: Within- and across- lesson associations with the classroom social climate. *Learning and Instruction*, 21, 345-354.
- Mainhard, M. T., Brekelmans, M, Brok, den, P., & Wubbels, T. (2011b). The development of the classroom social climate during the first months of the school year. *Contemporary Educational Psychology* 36, 190–200.
- Markey, P. M., & Kurtz, J. E. (2006). Increasing acquaintanceship and complementarity of behavioural styles and personality traits among college roommates. *Personality and Social Psychology bulletin*, 32, 907-916.
- McLaughlin, H. J. (1991). Reconciling care and control: Authority in classroom relationships. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 42(3), 182-195.
- Merrett, F., & Wheldall, K. (1993). How do teachers learn to manage classroom behaviour? A study of teachers' opinion about their initial training with special reference to classroom behaviour management. *Educational Studies*, 19, 91-106.

- Moskowitz, G. B. (2005). *Social cognition. Understanding self and others*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Moskowitz, D. S., Ringo Ho, M., & Turcotte-Tremblay, A. (2007). Contextual influences on interpersonal complementarity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33, 1051-1063.
- O'Brien, R. M. (2007). A caution regarding rules of thumb for variance inflation factors. *Quality and Quantity*, 41(5), 673-690.
- Packard, J. S. (1988). The pupil control studies. In N. J. Boyan (Ed.), *Handbook of Research in Educational Administration* (pp. 185-200). New York: Longman.
- Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(3), 307-332.
- Pajares, M. F., & Schunk, D. H. (2002). Self and self-belief in psychology and education: a historical perspective. In J. Aronson (Ed.), *Improving academic achievement. Impact of psychological factors on education* (pp. 5-21). San Diego, California: Academic Press.
- Patterson, G. R. (1982). *Coercive family process: A social learning approach*. Eugene, OR: Castilia.
- Riley, P., Lewis, R., & Brew, C. (2010). Why did you do that? Teachers explain the use of legal aggression in the classroom. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 957-964.
- Roache, J. E., & Lewis, R. (2011). The carrot, the stick, or the relationship: what are the effective disciplinary strategies? *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 34, 233-248.
- Rubie, C. M. (2004). Expecting the best: Instructional practices, teacher beliefs and student outcomes (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Auckland, New Zealand, 2004). *Digital Dissertations*, AAT 3129406.
- Snyder, J. J., & Patterson, G. R. (1995). Individual Differences in Social Aggression: A Test of a Reinforcement Model of Socialization in the Natural Environment. *Behavior Therapy*, 26, 371-391.
- Snyder, J. J. (2002). Reinforcement and coercion mechanisms in the development of antisocial behaviour: Peer relationships. In J. B. Reid, G. R. Patterson, & J. J. Snyder (Eds.), *Antisocial behavior in children and adolescents: A developmental analysis and model for intervention* (pp. 101-122). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Snyder, M., & Stukas, A. A. (1999). Interpersonal processes: The interplay of cognitive, motivational, and behavioral activities in social interaction. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 50, 273-303.

- Snyder, M., & Klein, O. (2005). Construing and constructing others: On the reality and generality of the behavioral confirmation scenario. *Interaction Studies*, 6, 53-67.
- Spilt, J. L., Koomen, H. M. Y., & Thijs, J. T. (2011). Teacher wellbeing: The importance of teacher-class relationships. *Educational Psychology Review*, 23(3), 457-477.
- Tiedens, L. Z., & Fragale, A. R. (2003). Power moves: Complementarity in dominant and submissive nonverbal behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, 558-568.
- Tracey, T. J. G. (1994). An examination of the complementarity of interpersonal behaviour. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 864-878.
- Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 54(1), 51-67.
- Walker, J.M.T. (2009). Authoritative classroom management: How control and nurturance work together. *Theory Into Practice*, 48, 122-129.
- Weinstein, C. S. (1998). "I want to be nice, but I have to be mean": Exploring prospective teachers' conceptions of caring and order. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 14(2), 153-163.
- Wentzel, K.R. (2002). Are effective teachers like good parents? Teaching styles and student adjustment in early adolescence. *Child Development*, 73(1), 287-301.
- Willower, D. J., Eidell, T. L., & Hoy, W. K. (1967). *The school and pupil control ideology*. Penn States Studies Monograph No. 24. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University.
- Woolfolk, A. W., & Hoy, W. K. (1990). Prospective teachers' sense of efficacy and beliefs about control. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82(1), 81-91.
- Wubbels, T., Créton, H., & Hooymaaiers, H. P. (1993). Comparison of teachers' and students' perceptions of interpersonal behavior. In T. Wubbels & J. Levy (Eds.), *Do you know what you look like? Interpersonal relationships in education*. (pp. 64-80). London: Falmer Press.
- Wubbels, T., & Levy, J. (1993). *Do You Know What You Look Like? Interpersonal Relationships in Education*. London: Falmer Press.
- Wubbels, T., Brekelmans, M., Brok, P. den, & Tartwijk, J. van (2006). An interpersonal perspective on classroom management in secondary classrooms in the Netherlands. In C. M. Evertson & C. S. Weinstein (Eds.), *International handbook of classroom management. Research, practice and contemporary issues* (pp. 1161-1193). United States, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Yeung, K., Martin, J. L. (2003). The looking glass self: An empirical test and elaboration. *Social Forces*, 81(3), 843-879.

