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ABSTRACT

Child guidance approaches, models, and strategies impact the quality of the classroom environment through teacher-child interactions, positive and negative climates, and the development of self-regulation and autonomy. Teacher beliefs about guidance and their actual guidance practices impact teacher-child interactions which may be further hampered by the administrative decisions and policies regarding classroom management and child guidance. This study proposed to look at both the teachers’ self-reported beliefs about guidance and their self-reported beliefs of their own guidance practices in early childhood guidance as measured by the Early Childhood Guidance Belief Survey (ECGBS-B) and the Early Childhood Guidance Belief Survey- Actual Practice (ECGBS-AP) as well as the quality of teacher-child interactions as measured by the Classroom Assessment Scoring System, Pre-K (CLASS Pre-K) for 46 Head Start and 10 non-Head Start classrooms within a metropolitan area. Correlations and hierarchical multiple regressions were computed to assess the strength of the relationships between predictor and criterion variables. Research question 1 asked about the relationship between early childhood teachers’ self-reported beliefs (ECGBS-B) and practice (EBCGS-AP) about early childhood guidance and actual observed practice (CLASS Pre-K). Findings indicated that when teacher’s beliefs and practices reflect more authoritative strategies of early childhood guidance CLASS scores were positively impacted resulting in greater positive teacher-child relationships. Teacher beliefs of early childhood guidance were found to be positively
statistically significant predictors of Total CLASS scores. Research question 2 asked are more positive interactions between children and teachers, as measured by CLASS, found in classrooms where the teachers’ beliefs of guidance are more consistent with their practice. While not statistically significant, teachers’ beliefs of their actual practice had a negative impact on Total CLASS score which may indicate that when teacher beliefs of early childhood guidance and their beliefs of their actual early childhood guidance practices are incongruent there are negative impacts on teacher-child relationships. Research question 3 asked do inconsistencies between administrative policy and teacher beliefs have an impact on teacher guidance practice. Through the addition of discrepancy scores between belief and practice to the hierarchical multiple regression model the explained variance in the total CLASS score was increased by 5.9% indicating that administrative policies may have a small effect on teacher-child relationships. This research will add to the body of literature surrounding teacher beliefs, teacher beliefs of their own practice, the impact of administrative policies and procedures on classroom guidance practices and teacher-child relationships impacted by teacher beliefs.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Nationally and internationally the educational focus has turned time and time again to classroom management and child guidance programming in an effort to alleviate the issues associated with the achievement gap and perceived problems in schools (Hester, Hendrickson, & Gable, 2009; Lemov, 2010; McClasin & Good, 1992; McFarland, Saunders, & Allen, 2009). Recently it has been reported that students of color and those with special needs receive more punitive discipline such as suspension and expulsion in our nation’s schools (Noguera, 2003). Child guidance is a topic that requires attention as teachers, administrators, policy makers, and families continue to strive to meet the needs of children while providing a safe learning environment that allows learners to engage in deep level exploration, discovery of knowledge and understanding, as well as develop the skills of self-regulation related to academic success (McClasin & Good, 1992).

Child guidance is complex and the research has been focused on aspects of child guidance, such as specific guidance programs (Calderella, Page, & Gunter, 2012; Carter, van Norma, & Tredwell, 2011; Stormant, Smith & Lewis, 2007), academic achievement (Chu, 2011; Delpit & White-Bradley, 2003; McClasin & Good, 1992), classroom management (Brown, 2003; Brown, 2005; McClasin & Good, 1992; Simonsen, Fairbanks, Briesch, Meyers & Sugai, 2008; Vartuli, 1987; Weiner, 2003), social-emotional development (Howes, 2000; Noguera, 2003; Rimm-Kaufman, Curby, Grimm, Nathanson, & Brock, 2009), teacher quality (Burchinal, Vandergrift, Pianta & Mashburn, 2010; Tal, 2010), and teacher-child interactions (Ah Lee & Herner-Patnode, 2010; Applebaum, 2005; Burchinal, Howes, Pianta, Bryant, Clifford & Barbarin, 2008; Curby, Grimm & Pianta, 2010; Doumen, Verschueren, Buyse, Germeij, Luyckx
Soenens, 2008; Howes, 2000; Jerome, Hamre & Pianta, 2008; McClasin & Good, 1992; Spilt & Koomen, 2009; Watson, 2003b). These studies indicate that theoretical understandings, group dynamics, individual differences and experiences, and adult need for power determine guidance practices (Earick, 2009; Hester et al., 2009; Kamii, 1984; Kohn, 1996, 2001; Mcclasin & Good, 1992; Tal, 2010). The components of guidance vary for the teacher as well as the child within different contexts.

Only a few guidance models have demonstrated positive results for child academic and social emotional development or the development of democratic values (Frieberg, 1999; Gartrell, 2001; McClasin & Good, 1992; Kohn, 1996). Two opposing views of child guidance represent points along the continuum of guidance beliefs and practices incorporating constructivist (authoritative) and behavioral (authoritarian) theory and strategies (Glickman & Tamashiro, 1980). The behavioral (authoritarian) approach follows the guidelines of operant conditioning and relies on a system of reward and punishment to achieve the goals of compliance and time on task (Frieberg, 1999; Kohn, 1996). Constructivist (authoritative) approaches on the other hand focus on the development of moral development in connection with social emotional and academic development (Kohn, 1996). Guidance approaches following the constructivist (authoritative) beliefs of shared decision-making and collaboration, meet the goals of developing moral reasoning, democratic values, critical thinking, and curiosity (Frieberg, 1999; Kamii, 1984; Kohn, 1996).

and obtaining submission to ‘reasonable’ authority without damaging students’ initiative and individuality” (McClasin & Good, 1992, p. 13). In the seventeenth century, John Locke believed that punishment would “thwart” the individual’s development of self-control (McClasin & Good, 1992). John Dewey believed that the purpose of education was to prepare the child for “leadership as well as for obedience” (Dewey, 1910, p.11). Followers of Jean Piaget take this idea one step further and believe that the “aim of education must be to develop the child’s autonomy” (Kamii, 1995, p. 21).

These views are not the only views of the aim of education or the guidance we provide children. B. F. Skinner’s work resulted in behavior modification approaches which place the adult in the authoritarian role (www.BFSkinner.com, 2014). Through the implementation of operant conditioning the individual is expected to learn what is acceptable and what is not as well as how to engage with others within society (Calderella et al., 2012). However, within this model, the authority figure is determining what acceptable behavior is and what the consequences of failing to meet or achieving that expectation are leaving little room for self-regulation, intrinsic motivation, and autonomy to develop (Freiberg, 1999; Kohn, 1996). “Conceptions of classroom management typically remain rooted in a behavioral conception of teaching that places the responsibility for student motivation and effort largely on the shoulders of teachers” (McClasin & Good, 1992, p. 10). Thus, the adult makes all of the decisions resulting in the teacher’s role being defined as authoritarian (Kohn, 1996; McClasin & Good, 1992).

The behavioral (authoritarian) and constructivist (authoritative) approaches to education and guidance result in teachers having a variety of strategies to implement within the classroom (Kohn, 1996). Sometimes, teachers begin to use both constructivist (authoritative) and
behavioral (authoritarian) strategies within the classroom in conjunction or in succession (McClasin & Good, 1992). While using a variety of approaches may assist teachers in meeting the needs of individual children, many of the strategies are in conflict with each other leaving the children confused (Bodrova & Leong, 2005b).

The approach to guidance implemented within the classroom reflects the power needs of the teacher and are manifest in decision-making, room arrangement, schedules, curriculum, and teacher-child interactions (Kohn, 1996). Constructivist (authoritative) approaches focus on teacher and student interactions, collaboration, shared decision-making, and the building of community (DeVries & Zan, 1994; Freiberg, 1999; Kohn, 1996; Weinstein, 1999). Behavioristic (authoritarian) approaches are characterized by the teacher making all decisions with little authentic collaboration among students or between teachers and students (Frieberg, 1999; Kohn, 1996).

Behavior modification strategies are often welcomed by administrators, policy makers, teachers and families as the result of the immediacy of the consequence and consistency from one classroom to the next within the school (McClasin & Good, 1992). Many of these programs “urge the teachers to lay down the law with children and coerce them into compliance” (Kohn, 1996, p. xiii).

With the passing of the Guns Free School Act in 1994, the adoption of guidance approaches based on behaviorist theory increased and zero tolerance policies went into effect (Skiba, 2014). The outcome of these decisions increased the numbers of children being suspended from schools (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009; Oakes & Lipton, 2007; Skiba, 2014). According to the National Center for Education Statistics student suspension rose
from 3.1 million in 2002 to 3.3 million in 2006 (about one in every fourteen students) (National Center for education Statistics, 2009).

Authoritarian methods continue to be adopted and implemented. However, classroom management and its support of the development of self-regulation in young children is lacking with this approach since teachers make all of the decisions. “Kindergarten teachers rank the level of self-regulation as one of the most important indicators of child school readiness” (Bodrova & Leong, 2005a, p. 203). They go on to state, “This lack of social-emotional self-regulation can stand in the way of a child’s ability to have positive teacher-child interactions in kindergarten, which, in turn, predicts poor academic performance as well as behavior problems in later years” (Bodrova & Leong, 2005a, p. 204). This same lack of development of academic and social skills has been connected to grade retention rates as the National Center for Education Statistics report of 2009 shares that ten percent of all children, kindergarten through eighth grade, had been retained at least once (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009, p. 46).

Teachers must be involved in students’ lives; accept that teaching and learning are holistic enterprises and teach knowledge and skills students need to negotiate in the society that currently exists, and to construct a better one for the future. They must always place students in learning environments and relationships that radiate unequivocal belief in their promise and possibility. They cannot wait until students are teenagers in middle and high school, or young adults in college, before beginning this pursuit. Justice-based and authentic caring must be an integral part of all students’ entire educational careers, starting when they begin their formal learning journeys.

(Gay, 2010, p. 52)
Classroom management strategies are affected by the teacher’s sense of efficacy in maintaining a classroom climate that supports the continued learning, development and growth of the learners. One of the most consistent reasons teachers leave the field of education is classroom management (Hester et al., 2009) and the lack of a “sense of control and competence” (Milner, 2011b, p. 495). Exploring teacher practices within the classroom may be one avenue of addressing the majority of challenging behaviors without the need to single out students for intervention strategies (Fox et al., 2003). One of the most effective ways to address issues of classroom management is through teacher decisions about meaningful learning that is relevant and by providing appropriate experiences (Vartuli, 1987).

The selection of curriculum is an important component related to appropriate classroom behavior management. With educational reforms, curricula focusing on teaching and learning begin to focus on deeper levels of understanding, while teachers and students continue to be evaluated on standardized tests to reflect accountability (McClasin & Good, 1992). “Students are asked to think and understand, but in too many classrooms they are asked to think noiselessly without peer communication or social exchange” (McClasin & Good, 1992, p. 12). With this expectation, teachers are placed in a position of maintaining the rules of the school which focuses attention on failure to comply rather than the progress of the learner to develop academic as well as social emotional skills (Dewey, 1910). This expectation may further hinder culturally responsive teaching as the diversity of the learning styles, prior experiences, and knowledge of the student population may not be reflected in the curriculum selected by the administration (Gay, 2010). Additionally, if the curricula reflect cultural bias or a position of deficit thinking concerning the student population additional issues of implementation may arise (Gay, 2010;
It is for these reasons this study proposed to explore the relationship between teacher beliefs about guidance and their actual practice within the classroom.

**Statement of Problem**

Educational acts such as No Child Left Behind have required school districts to demonstrate adequate yearly progress (www2.ed.gov/nclb/landing.jhtml). Many districts adopted authoritarian approaches to guidance and discipline and implemented policies and procedures detailing consequences for behaviors such as in-school suspension, out of school suspension and expulsion for even the youngest learners (Freiberg, 1999; Noguera, 2003; Oakes & Lipton, 2007). These youngest learners have had less opportunity to develop social and relationship skills and are the most in need of positive relationships with others including adults.

To address these concerns, guidance programs have been adopted at the district or state levels. This brings up the question; does the guidance method adopted by the school district match the teachers’ beliefs about guidance and /or their actual practice? This researcher posited that teacher beliefs or theories about authoritative child guidance must be consistent with their guidance practices in order to have a positive classroom climate and positive relationships with children (Kohn, 1996). Further, when teachers implement a program based on authoritarian principles, the climate can become negative and relationships between children and teachers become distant (Jerome, Hamre & Pianta, 2008; Thijs, 2008).

**Purpose of Study**

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between early childhood teachers’ beliefs about guidance and their actual classroom practice. Reviewing responses to statements about beliefs of early childhood guidance was an initial point with which to begin
reflection on “incongruities between beliefs and actions” (Glickman & Tamishiro, 1980). This exploration allowed teachers the opportunity to reflect on their beliefs about child guidance as well as their beliefs about their own guidance practices within the classroom.

The teacher’s actual practice may be impacted by the stance of the administrative agencies in determining guidance policies, procedures and adopted guidance approaches (Freiberg, 1999; Kohn, 1996; Slee, 1999; Buehl & Beck, 2015). McClasin and Good (1992) point out school reform initiatives are often determined for political reasons. As such teacher beliefs about guidance may or may not be consistent with the programming determined by the particular reform. This study allowed for further discussion concerning the impact of administrative decisions and policies on teacher practices and classroom climates (Buehl & Beck, 2015; Freiberg, 1999; Kohn, 1996; McClasin & Good, 1992; Oakes & Lipton, 2007; Slee, 1999; Wilcox-Herzog, Ward, Wong, & McLaren, 2015).

**Significance of Study**

The results of this study enhance the body of literature focused on child guidance, the importance of teacher-child relationships, and the impact of administrative guidance decisions on teacher’s beliefs and practices as “Teacher-student interactions are one of the nine conditions that impact school failure” (Valencia, 2010, p. 2). Valencia goes on to state, “Almost no significant research has been conducted on this important topic (classroom authority) in the last half century. In the White and Lippitt studies, students appeared to benefit more from democratic authority than they did from an authoritarian or a laissez-faire approach” (Valencia, 2010. P. 155).
This research provides an enhanced understanding of how teachers’ beliefs and guidance practice impact relationships between teachers and young children through the addition of classroom observations. Many researchers noted that classroom observations were missing from studies conducted of guidance practices and teacher beliefs and that there are few studies focusing on early childhood guidance practices (Ashton, 2015; Kohn, 1996; Polat et al., 2013; Skott, 2015; Wilcox-Herzog et al., 2015). While teacher and child relationships, guidance methods, and teacher beliefs about the guidance methods they implement are understudied, other areas of research continue to state that the earliest relationships with adults form the basis for future relationships, the development of resilience in children and school readiness (Blair & Raver, 2015). This research focused on teachers and children within preschool classrooms which is an understudied group in responding to child guidance issues but are becoming more visible as school districts are providing preschool classrooms within their schools (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009).

Research Questions

The research questions for this study were:

1) What is the relationship between early childhood teachers’ self-reported beliefs and practice about early childhood guidance and actual observed practice?

2) Are more positive interactions between children and teacher, as measured by the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS), found in classrooms where the teacher beliefs of guidance are consistent with their practice?

3) Do consistencies and inconsistencies between administrative policy and teacher beliefs have an impact on teacher guidance practice?
Methodology

This study was conducted in three delegate Head Start programs and three Non-Head Start Early Learning Centers within a large mid-western urban area who have volunteered to participate in this exploration. The three delegate agencies approach their work with children and families living at or below the poverty line in different ways. Two of the delegate agencies provide direct services to children and families. The third delegate agency works with partnership early learning centers. In order to qualify for participation in a Head Start program, the families of the children must be at or below the poverty line. According to the Office of Head Start, the 2013 poverty guidelines indicate that a family of four living in Missouri would make less than $24,500 annually (Office of Head Start, 2013). In addition, in order to participate in a full-day, full year program the parent(s) would need to be working or going to school full-time in order to qualify for Missouri Child Care Assistance through the state. Additional social service needs provide points for eligibility such as homelessness, an identified special need of the child, or the child being in foster care. These eligibility requirements are to ensure that the children and families with the greatest need are being served (Office of Head Start, 2013).

The three non-Head Start Early Learning Centers work with children and families living at or above the poverty line in a non-profit early learning environment. Two of the three non-Head Start centers are connected to one of the Head Start delegate agencies and are accredited through Missouri Accreditation. The third is part of a private parochial school and is accredited through the National Association for the Education of Young Children. Forty-six of the teachers work in centers overseen by the three Head Start delegate agencies and ten teachers work in non-Head Start programs.
This proposed study was designed as a quantitative study augmented by qualitative information. Teacher participants provided demographic information as well as completed a self-report Early Childhood Guidance Belief Survey (ECGBS-B) (Vartuli, 2014a) and an Early Childhood Guidance Belief Survey of Actual Practice (ECGBS-AP) (Vartuli, 2014b). The surveys were further enhanced by the qualitative information gained through teacher responses to an open-ended prompt concerning their belief of the impact of administrative policies and procedures on their actual guidance practices. The teacher-child interactions were observed using the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) (Pianta, LaParo & Hamre, 2008).

The data collected from the surveys and classroom observations were analyzed using correlations and hierarchical multiple linear regression following the procedures of multiple linear regression. Qualitative data were analyzed and coded into themes to provide insight and support for the quantitative findings.

**Sampling Frame**

This was a convenience sample consisting of Head Start and non-Head Start programs in a mid-western urban area. Mid-America Head Start, the Head Start grantee agency, agreed to allow the researchers to present the Head Start program directors with information regarding the study at a monthly meeting in May 2014. The three non-Head start programs agreed to participate in January 2015 as scheduling of initial data collection meetings took place. Three delegate agencies volunteered to participate in this study for three overarching reasons. The first reason was because of the importance of enhancing the body of knowledge surrounding child guidance in early learning. Secondly, to develop a greater understanding of the connection between teacher beliefs and actual practice regarding early childhood guidance in order to
possibly address issues of retention of quality staff. The third reason was to gain insight into the impact of administrative decisions on teacher beliefs and actual practice.

This exploration involved 56 classrooms, 56 classroom teachers, and 12 Head Start centers within three delegate agencies and 3 non-Head Start centers. With such a small number of participating teachers, choices for statistical models were carefully considered to increase interpretability and generalizability of the data.

Limitations of the Proposed Study

A small sample size was due to the cost and time commitment of observational research. As this study had no outside funding source, the researcher allocated her time and energies as well as those of her friends in the field to assist with the completion of the classroom observations. The Head Start grantee agency contributed observation hours due to their interest in the study.

Sample size limits the generalizability of the results from this study to the wider population. However, involving three delegate agencies and three early learning centers with differing approaches to their service to children and families may increase the ability to see differences between program decisions related to teacher beliefs and teacher practice as well as approved guidance methods, professional development opportunities and implementation of guidance procedures and policies. The sample size was limited to a convenience sample. Perhaps more accurate correlational information would have been obtained if the number of non-Head Start classrooms was equal to that of Head Start classrooms.

A second limitation to the statistical analysis of data points collected within this study was the reliance on self-report surveys. Self-report surveys depend upon the individual
responding to the surveys. Validity may be affected by response bias. Such biases include acquiescence, extreme or moderate responding, and social desirability (Furr & Bacharach, 2014). Acquiescence is responding in a positive or negative way without regard to the meaning of the statements. Extreme or moderate responding is responding at the very high end, very low end, or selecting the middle score through the entire survey. The third type of bias, social desirability may be the most difficult to address through survey creation. In this type of bias, individuals respond in a way that they feel they are expected to respond and they select answers based upon their desire to be liked or accepted (Furr & Bacharach, 2014; Buehl & Beck, 2015).

**Definitions of Terms**

*Authoritarian Discipline:* Authoritarian discipline practices and beliefs are based on obedience, punishment, and force to shape the individual’s actions and beliefs so that they are in congruence with the values, actions and beliefs of the authority figure. This type of discipline is intended to restrict autonomy and place the individual in a subordinate role (Baumrind, 1978). One example of an authoritarian discipline approach is *Assertive Discipline* (Gartrell, 1987).

*Authoritative Discipline:* Authoritative discipline practices and beliefs are based on the authority figures value of the importance of self-will and “disciplined conformity” (Baumrind, 1978, p. 245). “Such a parent (teacher) affirms the child’s present qualities, but also sets standards for future conduct using reason as well as power and shaping by regimen and reinforcement to achieve parental (adult) objectives” (Baumrind, 1978, p. 245).

*Autonomy:* Autonomy is the ability for the individual to govern themselves (Kamii, 1995). Autonomy refers to “self-determination, the experience of oneself as the origin of decisions rather than as the victim of things outside of one’s control” (Kohn, 1996, p. 9).
Behavior modification: Behavior modification strategies use positive and negative reinforcement to alter behavior. Behavior modification is based on the belief that behavior which results in pleasant outcomes will be repeated and behavior with negative results probably will not be repeated (Fields, Perry & Fields, 2010). Positive reinforcement is the presence of the reinforcement while negative reinforcement is the withdrawal of the reinforcement (B. F. Skinner, 1938). Negative reinforcement has been used more often than positive as individuals “have been punished when they have not done what is reinforcing to those who could punish them” (B. F. Skinner foundation website).

Caring for: In her various works on caring, Nel Noddings (2002) discusses the difference between caring about and caring for. In caring about, an individual is more removed from the issue, such as caring about children in poverty. In caring for, the carer becomes “engrossed” and experiences “motivational displacement” (Noddings, 2002). Noddings describes engrossment as “a form of attention that is acutely receptive and is directed at the cared-for” (Noddings, 2002, p. 28). Within this caring relationship, both the carer and the cared-for, caring must be provided and received.

Classroom Management: “Classroom management is defined as a multi-faceted processes that includes three broad dimensions—a person, instruction, and discipline” (Martin & Baldwin, 1994, p. 1).

Culturally Responsive Teaching: For the purpose of this study, culturally responsive teaching will be defined as “using knowledge, prior experiences, frames of reference, and performance styles of ethnically diverse students to make learning encounters more relevant to and effective for them” (Gay, 2010, p. 31).
Discipline: In referring to behavior, “Discipline is considered the ability of an individual pupil to work in a learning environment without impinging on the rights, freedoms, and responsibilities of other peers and adults” (Freiberg & LaPointe, 2011, p. 738). “In the context of the classroom, it may be viewed as ‘an action against’ as in disciplining or punishing someone” (Freiberg & LaPointe, 2011, p. 738).

Early Childhood: For this study, early childhood refers to children ages three to five years. More traditionally early childhood refers to children from birth to eight years of age (Copple & Bredekamp, 2009).

Extrinsic Motivation: Extrinsic motivation is “doing something for a reward or fear of punishment” (Fields et al. 2010, p. 205). Such rewards tend to be tangible such as stickers.

Guidance: For this study, guidance refers to strategies and techniques used to “build the desire of children to be cooperative and prosocial” through “building a responsive and nurturing relationship with them” by “finding nonpunitive ways to prevent children who are aggressive and controlling from harming others and to encourage self-reliance and confidence in those who are withdrawn are dependent” (Watson, 2003a, p. 12).

Head Start: Head Start is a comprehensive “federal program that promotes the school readiness of children ages birth through five from low-income families by enhancing their cognitive, social and emotional development” (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2012).

Intrinsic Motivation: Intrinsic motivation is “doing something for its own sake, without an external incentive” (Fields et al., 2010, p. 205).
**Logical Consequence:** “Logical consequences are structured by the adult and, whenever possible, arranged in advance through discussion with the child; they must be experienced by the child as logical in nature” (Dreikurs et al., 2004, p. 90). An example of a logical consequence is the loss of opportunity to use a piece of equipment that was not cared for properly.

**Multiple Linear Regression:** For the purpose of this study multiple regression refers to “an extension of simple regression in which an outcome is predicted by a linear combination of two or more predictor variables. The form is come is predicted by a linear combination of two or more predictor variables. The form is \( Y_i = b_0 + b_1 X_{1i} + b_2 X_{2i} + \ldots + b_n X_{ni} + \epsilon_i \) in which the outcome is denoted as \( Y \) and each predictor is noted at \( X \). Each predictor has a regression coefficient \( b_i \) associated with it, and \( b_0 \) is the value of the outcome when all predictors are zero” (Field, 2009, p. 790).

**Natural Consequence:** Natural consequences are those consequences which arise naturally through engagement in the behavior or activity. With natural consequences there is no imposed intervention. “They are called ‘natural’ because the outcome following a given behavior is a function of ‘reality’ (and in that sense ‘nature’)” (Dreikurs et al., 2004, p. 90). An example of a natural consequence is if a child decides to not wear their mittens in the winter during outside time, their hands get cold.

**Praise:** Praise “is a verbal statement that follows (and sometimes overlaps) a target behavior” (Hester et al., 2009, p. 515).

**Self-regulation:** Self-regulation is the ability to regulate emotions and thinking using deliberate behaviors (Bodrova & Leong, 2005a).
**Teacher pedagogical beliefs**: “Beliefs are the heart of teaching. Students and teachers have prior beliefs (mainly implicit) based on their experiences, knowledge, and values. These beliefs are often unconsciously held assumptions about children, classrooms, and content to be taught” (Vartuli, 2005, p. 82).

**Warm Demanders**: “Warm demanders expect a great deal of their students, convince them of their own brilliance, and help them to reach their potential in a disciplined and structured environment” (Delpit, 2012, p. 77). Through this definition, for this study, we believe that warm demanders would believe and practice an authoritative approach to child guidance.

**Organization of Remaining Chapters**

Chapter Two contains a literature review divided into three overarching arenas: guidance, teacher beliefs, and administrative leadership. The review focuses on the theoretical basis for this study including John Dewey, Jean Piaget, Lev Vygotsky, Albert Bandura, Diana Baumrind, and Nel Noddings as well as addresses the continuum of child guidance approaches, teacher-child relationships, teacher’s beliefs and administrative leadership pressures. Chapter Three focuses on the research methodology of this study, participant selection, data collection strategies, instrumentation, statistical modeling and ethical considerations. Chapter Four contains detailed information of data analysis and a summary of the results. Chapter Five provides a discussion of the study, conclusions, and recommendations for future research. The instruments used in the study, and the approval from the Social Sciences Institutional Review Board are presented in the Appendices.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

With the enactment of federal laws mandating safe schools and minimizing the achievement gap, child guidance and classroom management practices have had a greater focus on the use of zero tolerance and suspension as methods to address disappointing academic and behavioral outcomes reported in national databases (National Center of Education Statistics, 2009; Martinez, 2009; AAP, 2013, Rodriguez, 2013; Skiba, 2014). The results of the studies looking at these influencing events have revealed unintended consequences (NCES, 2009; Martinez, 2009). The National Center for Education Statistics reported that in 2006 “one out of every seven students was suspended from school at least once during the year” (NCES, 2009, p. 70). In addition to these suspensions, “one out of every 476 students was expelled from school” (NCES, 2009, p. 70).

Zero tolerance is one more political decision to address an issue that has been an ongoing basis of public concern. School Safety was the third major parental concern in 1971 and 1992 (Freiberg, 1999). In 1982, 1994 and 1998 school safety was the number one parental and societal concern (Freiberg, 1999). Researchers suggest that removing students exhibiting behaviors deemed inappropriate by school personnel does not alleviate the parental and societal concern but rather compounds the problem of students not being in school nor gaining social skills necessary to be reintegrated into the classroom (Freiberg, 1999; Slee, 1999; Weinstein, 1999). Thus, understanding the impact of child guidance approaches on learning and social outcomes, teacher attrition, and school climate is necessary to understanding how to best serve the children within our schools in order to enhance the development of academic and social
emotional outcomes to help students become members of a democratic society (NCES, 2009; Martinez, 2009; AAP, 2013, Rodriguez, 2013; Skiba, 2014).

In a review of studies on classroom management from both teacher and student perspectives, Anita Woolfolk Hoy and Carol Weinstein (2011) state, “We found a surprising lack of research on the connections among teachers’ beliefs about classroom management, their actual management practices, and the academic and social-emotional outcomes for students” (Woolfolk Hoy & Weinstein, 2011, p. 211). Most of the studies that have been conducted are quantitative and/or based solely on survey results. One study calls for additional research to be conducted using observations as a way of gaining insight into the components of child guidance such as teacher-child relationships, teacher practices and student outcomes (Ruhm, Magnuson, & Waldfogel, 2007). This study therefore responds to the call for a focus on teachers’ beliefs about child guidance, their actual guidance practices using teacher-report surveys as well as classroom observations using the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) to measure teachers’ pedagogical practices and teacher-child interactions. However, the construct of child guidance is complex, so this review of literature will involve discussions of guidance theories, a continuum of guidance approaches, teacher-child relationships, culturally relevant teaching practices, teacher beliefs, student outcomes as well as administrative leadership and pressures from outside the classroom.

Early Childhood Guidance

Theories Related to Guidance. The field of child guidance has received attention from and support through the work of many theorists looking at both cognitive development, moral development, and social-emotional development. To develop a framework for this study, the following theorists will be reviewed: John Dewey’s views on democratic education and social
responsibility; Jean Piaget’s understanding of cognitive and moral development of children; Lev
Vygotsky’s beliefs of intellectual development of children; Albert Bandura’s work on social
learning and self-efficacy; Diana Baumrind’s exploration of the effects of parenting practices;
and, Nel Noddings’ work as a care theorist.

John Dewey. This discussion begins with a review of John Dewey’s ideas as presented
in his work Ethical Principles Underlying Education (1897). The focus of his writings places
the emphasis of the student as a future member of a democratic society with obligations and
responsibilities. He looks to schools to provide not merely training for citizenship but for the
student to be able to “live his life as an integral unified being” (Dewey, 1897, p. 10). In his view
this includes not only obedience but leadership. “He must have the power of self-direction and
power of directing others, powers of administration, ability to assume responsibility (Dewey,
1897, p. 11).

The power of self-direction and directing others requires the ability of the individual to
think, reason logically and to make decisions in a variety of circumstances which may or may
not be different in society than it was in the classroom. Schools have a place in providing the
opportunity for children to develop these skills. “The only way to prepare for social life is to
engage in social life” (Dewey, 1897, p. 14).

Dewey shares that this work is often difficult as teachers have to meet the criteria of the
school as an institution. He states:

The teacher is necessarily forced into a position where his concern with the moral life of
the pupils takes largely the form of being on the alert for failures to conform to the school
rules and routine. These regulations, judged from the standpoint of the development of
the child at the time, are more or less conventional and arbitrary. They are rules which
have to be made in order that the existing modes of school work reflects itself in a feeling, on the part of the child, that the moral discipline of the school is somewhat arbitrary. Any conditions which compel the teacher to take note of failures rather than of healthy growth put the emphasis in the wrong place and result in distortion and perversion. (Dewey, 1897, p. 14)

Thus, Dewey is calling for a model of school and an approach to education that does not rely on arbitrary rules but one that focuses on self-regulation development and decision-making that reflects responsibility for the whole group not just the individual. He cautions the reader that when the child’s natural tendency to give is curtailed; he will find other motives for his actions (Dewey, 1897).

Educative discipline is to be informative so that the individual develops power to control his own behavior. Dewey goes on to state that culture should represent both the informative and the educative powers of discipline. He cautions against the use of “isolated moral lessons” and suggests engaging the student in “interpreting special incidents that occur and the particular situations that present themselves” (Dewey, 1897, p. 23).

Only a mind trained to grasp social situations, and to reduce them to their simpler and typical elements, can get sufficient hold on the realities of this life to see what sort of action, critical and constructive, it really demands. Most people are left at the mercy of tradition, impulse, or the appeals of those who have special and class interests to serve. (Dewey, 1897, p. 23)

John Dewey’s ideas that self-regulation is necessary for decision-making within a democratic society is further investigated in Jean Piaget’s working focusing on moral development, specifically autonomy.
Jean Piaget. Piaget’s view of moral development occurred in two stages, heteronomy and autonomy (Cam, Cavdar, Seydoogullari & Cok, 2012). The stage of heteronomous moral development involves an overriding understanding of right or wrong as imposed by others (Herman, 2012, p. 27). “During the preoperational stage, children view and accept rules as handed down from some higher authority—parents, God, the government. Justice is viewed in the light of living up to those rules. The child’s morality at the preoperational stage is one of obedience, what Piaget called unilateral respect” (Wadsworth, 1989, p. 108). At this stage children are “moral realists” meaning that rules are arbitrary impositions by authority figures, rules should be followed exactly as stated, and “acts are judged in terms of observable materials consequences” (DeVries & Zan, 1994, pp. 31-32).

As followers of Piaget, Constance Kamii, Rheta DeVries, Betty Zan and Barry Wadsworth have published several articles and books providing additional insight into the work of Piaget as well as extending his theories. According to Kamii, autonomy was Piaget’s aim of education (Kamii, 1995). Autonomy is that ability to “think for oneself and to decide between right and wrong in the moral realm and between truth and untruth in the intellectual realm by taking all relevant factors into account, independently of rewards or punishments” (Kamii, Clark & Dominick, 1994, p. 673) and make decisions based on the best outcome for all involved (Kamii, 1995). “Autonomy is moral and intellectual self-regulation” (DeVries & Zan, 1994, 31). Intellectual and moral autonomy are developed internally through the exchange of points of view within warm, respectful relationships with others of importance to the child (Kamii, 1991, Kamii et al., 1994). This ability to “consider the motivations for actions” is stage two of Piaget’s theory of moral development (Herman, 2012, p. 27). At this stage the child is moving away from the morality of obedience and toward cooperation (Wadsworth, 1989).
When autonomy is the goal of education, and all other goals for education fall within the realm of developing the moral and intellectual aspects of autonomy, then increasing graduation rates, demonstrating subject matter competency, becoming a responsible citizen, becoming lifelong learners, and having safe schools becomes possible (Kamii et al., 1994). In addition to these goals of education, the goal of autonomy focuses on the development of a sense of self, the ability to make sense of the world, dependability, initiative, and responsibility (Kamii et al., 1994).

A long-lasting successful democracy requires informed, autonomous citizens who consider relevant factors in voting for laws and representatives who make those laws. Autonomy goes far beyond equipping youngsters with the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy. (Kamii et al., 1994, p. 677)

The development of self-governance is hampered by teaching obedience. In a coercive situation, the adult uses their power of authority “to socialize and instruct the child” with rules and instructions determined by the individual wielding the power (DeVries & Zan, 1994, p. 46). This type of approach to guidance acts to reinforce reliance on others for regulation (DeVries & Zan, 1994). “If we want children to develop the morality of autonomy, we must reduce our adult power by refraining from using rewards and punishments, and encourage them to construct for themselves their own moral values” (Kamii, 1995, p. 76) through the exchange of points of view (Kamii, 1994).

Thus, we need to provide opportunities for the development of autonomy through sharing points of view, encouraging decision making and fostering intrinsic motivation (Kamii et al., 1994). However, our schools provide situations in which children learn to be governed by others
(heteronomy) which is reinforced by reward and punishment (Kamii, 1991, 1995; Kamii et al., 1994).

Wadsworth discusses two types of punishment, expiatory and punishment by reciprocity. “Expiatory punishment is strong punishment, administered to children by parents or other adult authorities for breaking rules” (Wadsworth, 1989, p. 89). This type of punishment is arbitrary and has no connection to the misbehavior (Wadsworth, 1989). Kamii shares that according to Piaget, there are three outcomes of expiatory punishment: avoid getting caught, obey the rule without thought, or revolt (Kamii, 1995). DeVries and Zan add that children led through coercion may develop an “unquestioning attitude” and “low motivation to think” (DeVries & Zan, 1994, p. 49). In contrast to expiatory punishment, punishment by reciprocity “is always related in some way to the content of the rule broken” (Wadsworth, 1989, p. 90). These may be considered natural consequences and are “guided by principles of cooperation and equality rather than adult authority and constraint” (Wadsworth, 1989, p. 90). DeVries and Zan suggest encouraging the child to have ownership of the consequence, monitor severity of consequence suggested by children, discuss the cause and effect of natural consequences, be selective in which natural consequences are allowed, offer opportunities for restitution, and if the child is excluded assist them in returning to the group (DeVries & Zan, 1994).

**Lev Vygotsky.** In the 1930s, influenced by the works of Piaget and others, Lev Vygotsky began to study young children and their intellectual development. Much of his work was published posthumously such as *Mind in Society* (1978) through the work of his followers. Interestingly, Vygotsky’s theory of the intellectual development of young children coincide with other researchers of that time. While he cautioned against the use of intelligence tests with young children to determine levels and placement in programs, he sought to understand the
processes of cognitive development which has provided insight into the work of this study. The zone of proximal development is defined by Vygotsky as “the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers” (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86).

With this understanding his research and thoughts can be connected to child guidance strategies in the belief that “what a child can do with assistance today she will be able to do by herself tomorrow” (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 87). This suggests that through guidance by an adult the child will be able to engage in self-regulation as they gain understanding in the reasons behind decisions, rules and outcomes of problem-solving activities.

As followers of Vygotsky, Bodrova and Leong studied self-regulation as a “key to school readiness” in connection to Head Start program participants entering kindergarten. “Self-regulation is the use of deliberate behavior” and allows a preschool child to make the necessary transition from learning that “follows the child’s own agenda” to “learning that follows the school agenda (Vygotsky, 1956)” (Bodrova & Leong, 2005a, pp. 213-212).

Vygotsky addresses the importance of play in the development of young children. He shares that when children engage in pretend play, “the imaginary situation of any form of play already contains rules of behavior” (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 94). The children engaged in the play follow these unwritten rules as they engage in their play situations. Play continues to become more intricate with children taking greater care to create and follow more precise rules for engagement. The more stringent the rule, the greater the demands on the child’s self-regulatory skills. “In one sense a child at play is free to determine his own actions. But in another sense this
is an illusory freedom, for his actions are in fact subordinated to the meanings of things, and he acts accordingly” (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 103).

**Albert Bandura.** Albert Bandura’s involvement in the study of learning which informed his development of “social learning” and self-efficacy theories (Bandura & McDonald, 1963) provides additional understanding connected to Vygotsky’s ideas of the importance of self-regulation and play in the development of young children and school readiness. In the children’s development of cognitive abilities and problem-solving skills, schools play a central role by teaching regulatory skills (Bandura, 1997). Bandura states that a goal of education is “to equip students with self-regulatory capabilities that enable them to educate themselves” (Bandura, 1997, p. 174). This statement is supported in a later article by Bandura where he states that “moral agency is embedded in a broader socio-cognitive self-theory encompassing affective self-regulatory mechanisms rooted in personal standards and linked to self-sanctions” (Bandura, 2002, p. 101). However, there are school practices that undermine this development such as comparing students to each other and following a “lock-step” curriculum rather than focusing on self-appraisal and individual instruction (Bandura, 1997, p. 175). Again, Bandura found this in his earlier study of children’s moral judgment where he sought to demonstrate that moral judgment could be “altered or reversed by manipulation of response-reinforcement contingencies” (Bandura & McDonald, 1963, p. 275). They found that strategies of behavior modification were “ineffective” when there were “strong dominant response tendencies” (Bandura & McDonald, 1963, p. 281).

These strong dominant response tendencies are related to cognitive efficacy which impacts social behaviors. A low sense of cognitive efficacy may result in a decrease in positive peer relationships and “alienating aggressive and transgressive behaviors” (Bandura, 1997, p.
In his work he looks at what it takes to be an efficacious school. In efficacious schools “high expectations and standards of achievement pervade the environment” (Bandura, 1997, p. 244). In efficacious schools, “students often work together in small groups and help one another in their school work” (Bandura, 1997, p. 245). “In efficacious schools, classroom behavior is managed successfully”; achieved through “promoting, recognizing and praising productive activities” (Bandura, 1997, p. 247). Diana Baumrind focuses on parental aspects of child guidance as a precursor to Bandura’s school responsibilities.

**Diana Baumrind.** Parental guidance practice is another reoccurring thread within the discussion of the theories of child guidance. Diana Baumrind (1967, 1978) focused her work on exploring parenting practices. Her adult/child categories have implications for classroom guidance. She began publishing studies in 1967 and has continued to publish for almost thirty years on the topic of parent discipline strategies, styles and practices. Baumrind divides adult/child styles into two categories: authoritarian, and authoritative.

Baumrind (1967) reported that parents practicing parenting strategies associated with being authoritarian were “less nurturant and involved with their children” and “exerted firm control and used power freely, but offered little support or affection” (Baumrind, 1967, p. 81). On the other hand parents’ practice strategies associated with an authoritative approach to child guidance, “expressed greater feeling of control over the behavior of their children and less internal conflict about disciplinary procedures” (Baumrind, 1967, p. 81). Within this study of young children and their families, Baumrind found that children with authoritarian parents were “dysphoric and disaffiliative” and children with authoritative parents were more “competent and mature” (Baumrind, 1967, p. 83).
In 1978, Baumrind published the results of another study on the authoritarian and authoritative parental discipline styles as they connect to the developing social competence of the child. Baumrind distinguishes these two types of parenting styles in their level of and approach to control.

“The authoritarian parent values obedience as a virtue and favors punitive, forceful measures to curb self-will at points where the child’s actions or beliefs conflict with what the parent thinks is right conduct” (Baumrind, 1978, p. 244). The authoritative parent “affirms the child’s present qualities, but also sets standards for future conduct, using reason as well as power and shaping by regimen and reinforcement to achieve parental objectives” (Baumrind, 1978, p. 245).

Several findings in Baumrind’s (1996) study connect directly to relationships within classrooms providing suggestions for appropriate guidance and cautions for unintended consequences. For instance, “explanations influence children to internalize their values more effectively than relying on power-assertive methods or withdrawal of love” (Baumrind, 1996, p. 410). The continued use of aversive discipline strategies such as those associated with authoritative approaches result in a “failure to obtain their compliance” (Baumrind, 1996, p. 409). In addition, Baumrind found that coercive parenting focused attention on the power of the adult rather than on the action to be corrected.

In connection to the social competence development of the child, Baumrind states that the authoritarian parenting style restricts the development of the child’s autonomy (Baumrind, 1978, p. 244). She points out that children who were raised in situations where they felt that expectations were too high or experienced neglect saw themselves as “victims” (Baumrind,
She states that “such children will have no reason to behave morally or conform since their interests are in fact antithetical to those of the group” (Baumrind, 1978, p. 264).

On the other side of the continuum, children who were exposed to authoritative parenting styles experienced guidance strategies and expectations of behavior based on culture, traditions and developmental stages of the child (Baumrind, 1978). Baumrind found that “firm control and high maturity demands promote self-efficacy and intrinsically motivated engagement in difficult tasks” (Baumrind, 1996, p. 409). At the same time this type of authoritative guidance resulted in a sense of justice.

Consistent, clear communication is the foundation of Baumrind’s approach to dealing with disciplinary issues (Baumrind, 1978, 1996). “Because the preschooler’s social-conventional reasoning is limited, it is not likely that under the age of five children profit much from the use of inductive disciplinary techniques that involve love withdrawal or explanations of the consequences of transgressions upon other persons” (Baumrind, 1978, p. 254). Therefore, it is most effective between toddlerhood and early school age to provide the child with a brief explanation of the rule, and a “consequence if the child persists in disobeying” (Baumrind, 1996, p. 408).

After the age of seven, Baumrind suggests that when adults clearly communicate the positive consequences associated with the child’s caring for others actions, the child’s internal locus of control is reinforced (Baumrind, 1978). Baumrind asserts that when adults use coercive tactics to deal with children’s behavior the child’s focus is placed on the authority of the adult rather than the negative consequence of the behavior the adult is trying to prevent (Baumrind, 1996). Within authoritarian parenting styles, children are not encouraged to share in the planning of the expectations or outcomes of their behavior. While in authoritative parenting
styles, expectations of behavior were based on the developmental level of the child and the children were allowed to share their opinions about their behavior and outcomes (Baumrind, 1967, 1978, 1996).

Diana Baumrind’s work has been utilized over the years. In 2009, Joan Walker conducted a study of three fifth grade teachers and their differing approaches to classroom management and guidance models focusing on relationships between teachers and students. One of the teachers in the study approached child guidance from an authoritarian stance. “In the authoritarian classroom, students fared well academically; however, they used avoidant, ego-protecting learning strategies. These results may stem from this teacher’s use of positive instructional practices within a highly controlling but non-nurturing context. Although she consistently demanded compliance, she rarely demanded student self-management” (Walker, 2009, p. 126).

The remaining two teachers implemented an authoritative approach to child guidance, Walker found that students in an authoritative classroom were “confident, engaged and made significant year-end achievement gains” (Walker, 2009, p. 126). Walker attributed this to the teacher’s use of “a highly controlling and nurturing context” in which the teacher made “consistent demands for compliance and frequent demands for self-management” (Walker, 2009, p. 126). In addition, the two teachers following an authoritative approach were reported as attributing their own creativity, motivation and persistence to the positive relationships they experienced with their students (Walker, 2009).

Nel Noddings. The idea of relationships affecting cognitive efficacy is central as teachers and children work within a classroom environment. Nel Noddings’ work as a care theorist provides more insight into the development of caring relationships and their connection
to positive teacher-child relationships within classrooms and schools. In 2002 she published *Educating Moral People: A Caring Alternative to Character Education*. In this text, she differentiates caring about and caring for. We can care about a lot of things without having a personal connection or commitment to the idea or individual. For instance we can care about animals in shelters. However, the personal connection does not require continued or committed action on our part. In contrast, caring for is when the carer is invested in providing appropriate care and enters into a relationship with the individual or group. Such caring relationships include “engrossment” by the carer, which is an enhanced version of attention (Noddings, 2002, p. 28).

Noddings points out that students complain of a lack of caring in schools and that teachers claim that they truly care. Taking a closer look at this incongruency suggests that perhaps schools hinder the sense of feeling cared for. She suggests that rather than focus on national assessments and standards, we need to “encourage the growth of competent, caring, loving and loveable people” (Noddings, 2002, p. 94). This involves teaching the ‘cared for’ how to be cared for so that they may care for others. One suggestion is to keep students and teachers together over time to assist in creating this sense of being cared for through consistency. The continuity allows children to recognize that the adult will be there for them and provide time for a stronger relationship to develop as “the heart of the educational enterprise is the relationship between teachers and students” (Noddings, 2002, p. 27).

Through extending the period of time that teachers and students are together, it is possible to develop trust, which is essential as students listen to those adults whom they trust (Noddings, 2002). Engaging in conversation is another critical feature in the development of trusting, caring relationships. Noddings speaks of real conversations involving engrossment with the attention focused on the other participant (Noddings, 2002). Through such conversations the
individual learns to engage in self-talk leading to deeper levels of self-reflection and self-understanding. Additionally, through working collaboratively and engaging in conversations, students learn to care for others and practice the skills of caring (Noddings, 2002).

Just as Noddings has provided insight into the importance of the caring relationship, she addresses common issues of child guidance and classroom management. Such actions as accusation, confession and forgiveness, rewards, and coercion have an adverse effect on the child and the relationship between the teacher and the child. She states that teachers should engage in confirmation rather than accusation as confirmation “brings out the best” in the other individual and demonstrates that “we believe the act in question is not the full reflection of the one who committed it” (Noddings, 2002, p. 20). This confirmation component links care-based theory and culturally responsive practice as teachers “conscientiously focus on and provide consistent reinforcement of the better self rather than attempts to focus on and control lesser acts and poorer selves” (Shevalier & McKenzie, 2012, p. 1100). Confession and forgiveness place a different focus on the relationship as it “suggests a relation of authority and subordinate” (Noddings, 2002, p. 21). Rewards remove the intrinsic motivation and sets up a competitive situation (Noddings, 2002, p. 21). Finally, in respect to coercion, Noddings looks to the work of John Dewey. Paraphrasing his words in *Ethical Principles Underlying Education*, she states, “Neither coercion nor permissiveness will promote the development of judgment” (Noddings, 2002, p. 79).

Nell Noddings makes a call for adults to rethink their view of child guidance and education practices as she states:

Children who are genuinely and continuously cared for usually turn out to be reasonably good people. Thus when things go wrong or threaten to do so, we have to reflect on our
own actions and beliefs. It is not just a matter of tightening up the rules, getting tougher, being consistent about penalties, teaching “them” what’s right. It is more a matter of bringing relations into caring equilibrium, balancing expressed and inferred needs, and helping children understand both our actions and their own. There are no guarantees in moral education just as there are none in, say, mathematics education. But happy, well-cared for people do not usually commit acts of violence, deceit, or neglect. To produce good people we must provide a morally good education. (Noddings, 2002, p. 154)

Within all of these theories there are common themes directing this proposal. Caring for others is a social skill that must be taught through instruction as well as modeling. Adults who have high expectations and communicate the how and why of the decisions that are made have a positive effect on the development of self-regulation. Including children, teachers and parents in the decision-making and problem solving process works to create greater cohesiveness within the community in which all are active participants with responsibility to other members of the group which supports the democratic process as well as the development of self-regulation.

Care-based theory and pedagogical practice converge when teachers view dialog and attention as integral parts of the teaching and learning relationship and work conscientiously and reflexively to cultivate them. It is important to note that attending to students’ wants does not mean catering to students’ wants; it means using meaningful dialog and receptivity to help them distinguish between wants and needs, determine when wants should be satisfied, and accept needs they may not recognize. (Shevalier & McKenzie, 2012, p. 1095)

**Historical Background of Guidance in Education.** In order to more fully understand the changes that have occurred and the impact the behavioral (authoritarian) and constructivist
(authoritative) movements have had on guidance practices in education a review of certain constructs is necessary. As such this discussion will focus on classroom management, authoritarian and authoritative discipline approaches, school guidance policies, respectful and caring communities, as well as rules and regulations.

According to Oakes and Lipton (2007) schools attempted to emulate the efficiency of factories during the 1900’s. To be efficient, all students were to complete the same academic tasks at the same time. Movement was not tolerated increasing the demands on the teacher and students for implementation of a stimulus-response approach to learning and behavior (Oakes & Lipton, 2007). As expected with an authoritarian approach “coercion was a central feature of these public school classrooms” (Oakes & Lipton, 2007, p. 253).

When the goal of education was to prepare workers for the factories and repetitive tasks, behavioral approaches met the expectation of the business men within the community. The interest in the work of Ivan Pavlov and later B. F. Skinner on behavior conditioning increased. Skinner focused on the use of “contingencies” to reinforce certain behaviors (Freiberg, 1999). Contingencies for appropriate behaviors were rewards from the teacher such as candies for engaging in quiet seatwork (Freiberg, 1999). Thus, the emphasis was on habit learning rather than self-regulation (Brophy, 2011).

A national focus was placed on behavioral approaches to guidance in the 1960’s (Freiberg, 1999). “Most of the commercially developed classroom management and discipline programs have built on B. F. Skinner’s developments in behavioral psychology to provide more-refined ‘scientific’ methods for using rewards and punishment to shape students’ classroom behavior” (Oakes & Lipton, 2007, p. 257). Such programs of guidance continue to be found in the marketplace and are adopted for use in schools to provide teachers with strategies for
classroom management such as consequences, negative and positive choice, punishment, and rewards (Kohn, 1996; Freiberg, 1999; Oakes & Lipton, 2007; Slee, 1999).

Research from the 1930’s indicated that young workers in an authoritarian environment were less personally involved, apathetic, and frustrated whereas those experiencing a democratic (authoritative) environment were responsive, spontaneous, and worked productively without supervision (Brophy, 2011). Again, in the 1950’s research looking at students in both authoritative and authoritarian environments demonstrated similar results. Students exposed to authoritarian management systems were found to be “docile” while students in a democratic system were alert, orderly, responsive, constructive, and participatory (Brophy, 2011, p. 24).

“Today, changed patterns of production, employment, and school enrollments all make traditional discipline attitudes even less appropriate—if possible—then they were” (Oakes & Lipton, 2007, p. 254). Movement to a humanistic approach began in the 1970’s with the work of Thomas Gordon and William Glasser. Their focus was placed on trust and positive relationships between teachers and children (Weinstein, 1999). Insight into how caring relates to creating positive relationships and building trust was provided by Nel Noddings’ work (2002, 2003, 2005; Weinstein, 1999).

This change in focus was reflected in alterations to the second edition of *Assertive Discipline* published by the Canters in 1992 (Weinstein, 1999). Having received criticism concerning some of their strategies they softened their approach to include some ideas from the humanistic movement (Weinstein, 1999). These changes included a change in subtitle *Positive Behavior Management for Today’s Classroom* from the original *A Take Charge Approach*. In this second edition student rights to learn were added to the teacher’s right to teach (Weinstein, 1999). In addition, teaching is stressed over communicating teacher needs as well as involving
students in determining classroom rules and consequences for appropriate and inappropriate behavior (Weinstein, 1999).

Some of the behavior modification approaches were adapted to include authoritative language but the changes were superficial rather than substantial (Brophy, 2011; Weinstein, 1999). The same results of lack of attendance, increased inappropriate behaviors, increased suspension, and decreased academic achievement as well as decreased social emotional development continued (Freiburg, 1999; Slee, 1999; Weinstein, 1999).

While the Canter’s sought to embed humanistic ideas into their model of classroom discipline, other approaches were being developed, published and studied within classrooms as well as school-wide. These include Classroom Organization and Management, Consistency Management and Cooperative Discipline, Judicious Discipline, The Three C’s (Everston & Harris, 1999; Freiberg, 1999; McEwan, Gathercoal & Nimmo, 1999; Johnson & Johnson, 1999) and Developmental Discipline (Watson, 2003a). The focus of these programs is on preventing disruptive behaviors through effective classroom management and the development of classroom communities based on trust (Weinstein, 1999; Watson, 2003a).

Child guidance and classroom management research studies over the past forty years have provided mixed reviews concerning the implementation and outcomes of child guidance strategies with the majority of studies focusing on aspects of behavior modification strategies. Thus, it appears logical that the majority of the studies reviewed were indeed behavioristic in approach resulting in misplaced empirical support for praise, ignoring, rules and reprimands which are central to behavioral and authoritarian approaches to guidance (Freiberg, 1999; Gable, Hester, Rock & Hughes, 2009; Slee, 1999; Weinstein, 1999).
Behavior modification approaches experienced resurgence in popularity with the passing of policy decisions to address the issue of continued and increased public anxiety over the safety of our schools (Freiberg, 1999; Slee, 1999; and Weinstein, 1999). One such policy decision that encourages an authoritarian approach to classroom management is zero-tolerance. This policy originated as a military reaction to drug use (Skiba, 2014). This bill was proposed in 1986 and finally passed in 1994 as the Gun Free Schools Act (Skiba, 2014).

Originally, these policies were “intended to address blatant safety threats such as weapons” and result in suspension or expulsion (Oakes & Lipton, 2007, p. 261). By 1999, “swearing, truancy, insubordination, disrespect and dress-code violations” were added to school policies on zero-tolerance (Martinez, 2009, p. 154). “The theory is that communities must react to even minor disruptions in the social order with relatively strong force in order to ‘send a message’ that certain behaviors will not be tolerated” (Skiba, 2014, p. 28). The implementation of zero-tolerance policies increased school suspension from 3.1 million students in 2002 to 3.3 million students in 2006 (NCES, 2009). The increase in suspensions with the enactment of zero-tolerance policies is an indication that the policy is not an “effective deterrent” (Martinez, 2009, p. 155). However, “a management system that orients students toward passivity and compliance undercuts the potential effects of an instructional system designed to emphasize active learning, higher order thinking, and the social construction of knowledge” (Brophy, 2011, p. 40). With such dire consequences and lack of student input or flexibility in interpretation of the policy, the practice falls within the authoritarian approach to guidance.

Constructivist education programs sought to provide more of an authoritative approach which includes building and maintaining trust, cooperation and community. “Trusting
relationships, cooperation, and a sense of community and caring take some time and require steady attention” (Oakes & Lipton, 2007, p. 253).

The authoritative approach to child guidance is supported by the call for effective instructional practices to achieve the goals of education such as democratic citizens. General guidelines include “having teachers plan rules and procedures in advance; making those rules and procedures very clear to students; letting students assume some responsibility for determining rules and consequences and lessons; returning to the rules occasionally to discuss new understandings and revisions, developing cooperative relationships with students; minimizing disruptions and delays; and planning independent activities as well as whole-class lessons” (Oakes & Lipton, 2007, p. 262).

In order to plan for individual students and student participation in cooperative learning situations, the teacher must know the students, including their interests and abilities. This requires a relationship of care. “Because caring encompasses the moral and cultural values of how people relate to others, caring is an alternative to traditional (authoritarian) discipline and classroom management” (Oakes & Lipton, 2007, p. 266).

Currently, with the call for increased focus on safe schools and academic achievement, the guidance methods and curriculum approaches are often incongruent. There is a greater call for critical thinking, higher order thinking and collaboration (Freiberg, 1999; Slee 1999). However schools and teachers are continuing to implement behavior modification approaches to classroom guidance limiting the ability for students to engage in authentic problem-solving, taking responsibility, and managing conflict resolution (Freiberg, 1999; Slee, 1999; Weinstein, 1999). To implement behavior modification approaches effectively requires constant, immediate and consistent reinforcement which is difficult in a classroom setting (Brophy, 2011; Oakes &
Lipton, 2007; Freiberg, 1999). As teachers attempt to implement both constructivist (authoritative) approaches to learning and behavioral modification (authoritarian) approaches to child guidance, they are sending mixed messages to the children which is both confusing and counterproductive (Kohn, 1996; Oakes & Lipton, 2007). “It seems quite paradoxical: a curriculum that urges problem solving and critical thinking and a management system that requires compliance and narrow obedience” (Kohn, 1996, p. 92).

Behavioral (authoritarian) and constructivist (authoritative) approaches and beliefs have very different goals for children. In the behavioral realm, obedience in order to learn appropriate behavior as determined by the authority figure is the goal of guidance approaches (Kohn, 1996). Constructivist (authoritarian) goals include critical reflective thinking; developing moral reasoning and autonomy; and becoming productive citizens within a democratic society with the ability to take the perspective of others into consideration in problem solving and negotiation (DeVries & Zan, 1994: Kohn, 1996). “All teachers will need to match their management approaches to their instructional systems and to the needs of students at their grade levels” (Brophy, 2011, p. 37).

**Guidance Models.** Through experiences in the classroom and with ideas from the previously mentioned theorists and others not mentioned in this review, guidance models have been developed. For the purpose of this study, the guidance models have been limited to the works of Marilyn Watson, Thomas Gordon, Rudolf Dreikurs, William Glasser, Lee and Marlene Canter, and Carol Weinstein. Each of these models contains guidelines on relationships, power, rules, and contracts. Within each model these guidelines are viewed differently with varied emphasis placed on long-term and short-term outcomes for the teacher and the students.
Marilyn Watson. Based on the works of John Bowlby and Mary Ainsworth in attachment theory, Marilyn Watson developed Developmental Discipline as a philosophy of guidance to assist teachers in transforming difficult classrooms (Watson, M., 2003a). Watson’s model connects to constructivist and caring theories as she finds ways to assist teachers in presenting a model or philosophy of child guidance that allows the teacher to teach in a manner that stresses problem solving and higher order thinking skills in connection with advancing social-emotional development with attention to building autonomy and self-regulation skills (Kohn, 2001; Watson, 2003a).

Watson’s model assumes that children’s behavior is contributable to the types of relationships children have experienced with important adults within their worlds (Watson, 2003a). Secure attachment with sensitive, responsive caregivers leads to finding others as trustworthy and themselves as worthy of care leading to the ability to create collaborative relationships and engage in problem solving (Watson, 2003a). If children experience “unresponsive, inconsistent, rejecting or frightening care” they may develop a sense of lack of self-worth and become untrusting of others which may result in over dependence on adults or a sense of having to survive on their own (Watson, 2003a, p. 272). “These children will sometimes be whiny, petulant, and demanding, sometimes aloof and withdrawn, and sometimes aggressive and domineering” (Watson, 2003a, p. 285).

Children with a lack of secure attachment may “seek to maintain relationships in inappropriate ways” (Watson, 2003, p. 283). Therefore, teachers should create a learning environment that is carefully structured “to match as much as possible the child’s limited social, emotional, and cognitive capacities” (Watson, 2003a, p. 283). In connection to this idea is the need to limit coercive strategies to guide children “who need to control harmful impulses and
encourage self-reliance and confidence in those who are withdrawn or overly dependent” (Watson, 2003b, p. 145).

The goal of Watson’s model of child guidance is to assist children in “developing enough trust in themselves to approach problems with a sense of competence and enough trust in adults to accept and seek our help when needed” (Watson, 2003b, p. 15). Thus, the goal for teachers becomes developing strong, supportive, secure and collaborative relationships between children and adults (Watson, 2003a). To enhance the children’s development of secure relationships a focus on the prosocial values of “fairness, responsibility and kindness” becomes a sub goal (Watson, 2003a, p. 95). A second sub goal of teachers using this model of guidance is to “gain compliance” with “reasonable requests without having to be coercive” (Watson, 2003a, p. 132). A third is to assist students in developing the “ability to cognitively represent and guide one’s behavior” (Watson, 2003a, p. 171).

Teacher-child relationships. Watson’s guidance model of developmental discipline based on attachment theory places the need for secure, warm, supportive relationships with and among children at the heart of any educational endeavor (Watson, 2003a). “Like families, teachers need to provide guidance, support and limits that children need to be successful” (Watson, 2003b, p. 13). In so doing, Watson suggests keys to building such strong, positive relationships. Foremost is to “remember that all children, even those who appear aloof and defiant, want to be loved and protected by caring adults and want to fit in with their peer group” (Watson, 2003a, p. 53). Additional reminders include the need for teachers to: reflect on how their own attitudes and understandings affect their working relationships with children; remember that children need a sense of autonomy, belonging, and competence; remember that each child is unique; find ways
natural ways to engage with children; get to know families and work with them; and, share your own life experiences with the children to show your care for them (Watson, 2003a).

Through building a sense of community, socialization may be seen as a collaborative process of interaction, instruction, support, guidance, joint action and modeling (Watson & Battistich, 2011). Research results involving the Child Development Project suggest that students adopted the norms emphasized within the classroom community when they felt bonded with and committed to their classroom (Battistich, Solomon, Watson & Schaps, 1997; Solomon, Battistich, Watson, Schaps & Lewis, 2000; Watson & Battistich, 2011).

**Power.** Watson stresses the balance between authority and allowance for the development of autonomy and competence within this guidance model. The “authority structure of the classroom may encourage either autonomous morality or heteronomous morality” (Battistich et al., 1997, p. 139). “One of the things that makes teaching especially difficult is that the need for autonomy and the ability to handle autonomy responsibly is different for different classes, for the same class across the year, and for different students within a class” (Watson, 2003a, p. 130). This balance exists between providing firm guidance to “keep children on the path that would lead to their competence” and flexibility to “make allowances for the difficulties” that individuals face in the world outside of school (Watson, 2003a, p. 112).

Watson recognizes that while the goal is to develop autonomy and include children in decision making processes, some things within the classroom setting are not negotiable such as kindness and safety (Watson, 2003a). The non-negotiable items should be stated clearly with structures in place to allow for smooth classroom management (Watson, 2003a). Power or authority should be designed and implemented in a way that allows students to “become personally responsible for their learning and behavior” (Watson, 2003a, p. 127). Again, coercion
must be kept to a minimum if used at all, as it “implies a view of student motivations inconsistent with respecting student autonomy and the positive view of children” (Watson & Battistich, 2011, p. 264).

As with each component of her model, Watson provides key points for meeting the need for development of autonomy and competence. These keys include: create learning activities that “match student skills” and provide scaffolding to enhance their development; connect learning to “students’ lives and interests” and allow to share learning experiences; assist students in recognizing their progress; “stand firm on the importance of learning”; provide as “much autonomy in their learning as they can handle”; “balance autonomy with authority”; “engage students in negotiation and problem solving”; “make allowances for students with strong autonomy needs”; and, “allow students freedom to grow” by adjusting rules in “response to student growth” (Watson, 2003a, p. 137).

Rules. “Because of some children’s mistrustful stance, teachers will need to work hard to avoid power assertion, looking instead for ways to guide, coach, and support each child’s efforts to cope with the social and academic challenges of the classroom” (Watson, 2003b, p. 20). A classroom environment implementing Developmental Discipline reflects consistency between the approaches to learning, teaching and guidance (Watson, 2003a; Watson & Battistich, 2011). When rules are designed and implemented by the teacher within this model, it is important that “students understand the reasons behind the rules and expectations” (Watson, 2003a, p. 4). However, in order to develop autonomy and competence, students should be engaged in determining rules or procedures for completion of tasks and interactions with others as their ability allows (Watson, 2003a; Watson, 2003b). As children in the classroom gain more
competence and autonomy, some rules will need to be adjusted to reflect the students’ readiness for additional responsibility for their own learning and behavior (Watson, 2003a).

Key points provided by Watson in dealing with rules and rule making, it is suggested that teachers “allow freedom to provide sufficient challenge for students to grow in self-management”; “discuss with students procedures for handling routine activities”; when students appear uncompliant “try to figure out what’s wrong and provide the help they need”; “help students anticipate social and emotional challenges” and “discuss ways they might meet those challenges”; and, “provide opportunities for students to practice and reflect on their use of social and emotional skills” (Watson, 2003a, p. 159).

Consequences. Within Watson’s guidance model it is important for the teacher to provide “a challenging but manageable environment, instruction, support for her students’ efforts, and opportunities for reflection, self-discovery, and correction or reparation” (Watson, 2003a, p. 143). Through collaborative learning opportunities and follow-up discussions, teachers have an opportunity to “model, guide, and help students to reflect on their social skills in a meaningful context (Battistich et al., 1997, p. 145). The Developmental Discipline model allows for non-punitive methods of externally controlling behavior but only when necessary (Watson, 2003a).

Watson also stresses the importance of understanding the results of teachers doing nice things for students. These actions show care and support as well as nurture the relationship between teacher and student (Watson, 2003a). If these nice things are used as a bribe or to bargain with students they are coercive and may result in negative repercussions to the development of the relationship between the teacher and the student (Watson, 2003a). When teachers do nice things “simply to be nice, teachers provide students with a model of kindness and consideration” (Watson, 2003a, p. 54).
When behavior concerns do arise, Watson suggests teachers “convey unconditional caring and trust; provide scaffolding and support for appropriate behavior; explicitly teach needed concepts and skills; and, provide opportunities for reflection and, where possible restitution” (Watson, 2003a, pp. 142-143). These actions fit with constructivist learning theory as well as attachment theory. The goal is to assist the student in learning from their actions, problem-solving corrective actions, planning methods of reacting in future situations and maintaining strong, supportive relationships with caring adults (Watson, 2003a).

As with any reaction to behavior, whether it is a natural or logical consequence, Watson stresses the need of the adult to balance the cost of the behavior and the cost of the consequence. In determining how to respond to various misbehaviors or student choices, this balance may have long-term effects on the development of social and emotional competence and the child’s sense of autonomy as well as the relationship between the adult and the child (Watson, 2003a).

Contracts. Marilyn Watson’s Developmental Discipline model addresses contracts through the continued work between teachers and students to set procedures for routine activities in a collaborative and community-based setting with students agreeing to be able to follow the procedures and guidelines that they helped create (Watson, 2003a). Individual meetings between teachers and students are suggested as follow-up conversations to reflect on choices and behaviors in order to make plans for future actions, make reparations, and to continue to build a strong relationship between teacher and child (Watson, 2003a).

Thomas Gordon. Thomas Gordon, influenced by the work of Carl Rogers, developed Teacher Effectiveness Training as a model of guidance focusing on teacher-student relationships and communication in the classroom (Gordon, 2003). This text was originally published in 1974 as teachers, parents and administrators were dealing child behavior outcomes from a
communicative model of child guidance. To provide additional understanding for parents and teachers, Gordon also published *Discipline That Works: Promoting Self-Discipline in Children* in 1989. Assumptions associated with this model of teacher effectiveness are that children are internally motivated to be good and have the capability to problem solve on their own. The support of a warm, respectful relationship with adults enhances the development of the child’s self-concept (Gordon, 2003). It follows then that the goals of this model are for teachers and children to engage in shared decision making and community building in order to develop the ability to problem solve and resolve conflicts while taking into consideration the needs of others (Gordon, 2002). Gordon emphasizes the value of active listening in working with students by “fostering communication, defuses feelings, and provides cathartic release” (Gordon, 2003, p. 90).

**Teacher-child relationships.** Gordon proposes that teacher-child relationships are the “missing link” (Gordon, 2003, p. 2). According to Gordon for the relationship between teacher and student to be good there must be openness, caring, interdependence, separateness and mutual satisfaction” (Gordon, 2003, p. 23). Active listening and using I-messages are two strategies used to enhance these relationships which lead to a “no-lose” method to child guidance (Gordon, 2003).

**Power.** Gordon discusses two types of authority, the authority of knowledge and the authority of power (Gordon, 2003). Authority of knowledge refers to the expertise of the teacher. “Real expertise does not diminish with time” and “almost never causes trouble in the classroom” (Gordon, 2003, p. 195). In contrast, “power-based authority” relates to the ability of the teacher to “dispense rewards” and to “inflict discomfort (punishment)” (Gordon, 2003, p. 195).
Unlike the power of knowledge or expertise, the power of authority should decrease as the child matures. Gordon states:

Teacher-student relationships at the junior high and high school levels are much more strained and stressful because teachers relied so heavily upon power (backed by rewards and punishment) when the children were younger. Then, when students are older, they begin to react to these techniques to an ever-increasing degree with anger, hostility, rebellion, resistance, and retaliation. (Gordon, 2003, p. 199)

Gordon lists several possible child outcomes from an authoritarian approach which includes: producing resentment; inhibiting the development of “self-responsibility and self-direction”; fostering dependence, compliance and submission; inhibiting creativity, exploration, and innovation, and requiring “the winner to resort to power and authority” (Gordon, 2003, pp. 189-190). In addition, he notes that “children who meekly submit to parental authority” react “aggressively to all adult authority” and “are incapable of any self-control or self-discipline” (Gordon, 1989, p. 8). However, when students are allowed to participate in decision making and rule setting, they develop self-discipline (Gordon, 1989).

To clarify this stance on power of authority and limit setting, Gordon states that “students want to limit their behavior themselves” (Gordon, 2003, p. 215). He goes on to state that “students, like adults, prefer to be their own authority over their behavior” (Gordon, 2003, p. 215). This is not to say that there should be no rules or limitations on behavior but that students want to be included in the process of determining the rules (Gordon, 2003). Gordon asserts that by giving up control over students, you will gain more influence over them and that “the more you use power to control people, the less real influence you’ll have on their lives” (Gordon, 1989, p. 7).
In order to provide the most influence on students, Gordon suggests engaging in participatory management which involves a sharing of power with the focus placed on the prevention of unacceptable behaviors (Gordon, 1989). “Where participatory, democratic leadership has been introduced and practices in schools, students made significant gains in study habits and scholastic achievement, improved their social skills, produced closer relationships with students of different color and background, increased their level of moral reasoning maturity, and had fewer disruptive behaviors” (Gordon, 1989, p. 226).

Participatory, democratic leadership is thus an authoritative approach to child guidance. It represents a middle ground between the adult being a “dictator” or a “doormat” (Gordon, 1989, p. 216). However, the ability to give up power or control appears to be difficult for many individuals. Common attitudes representing this reluctance to engage in less authoritarian approaches to management and guidance reflect a desire to maintain the traditional methods of education, guidance and management. Statements of these attitudes include that “groups can’t make decisions”, “democratic groups are inefficient”, and “someone has to be boss” (Gordon, 1989, p. 216). Citing Silberman, Gordon elaborates:

The preoccupation with order and control, the slavish adherence to the timetable and lesson plan, the obsession with routine, the absence of noise and movement, the joylessness and repression, the universality of the formal lecture or teacher-dominated ‘discussion’ in which the teacher instructs an entire class as a unit, the emphasis on the verbal and de-emphasis of the concrete, the inability of students to work on their own, the dichotomy between work and play---none of these are necessary; all can be eliminated. (Silberman, 1970 as cited by Gordon, 1989, pp. 223-224)
Rules. Gordon suggests teachers conduct rule setting class meetings. During these meetings, power is shared. The steps to rule setting during a class meeting include: listing activities “most likely to cause problems” (Gordon, 2003, p. 268); jointly create rules to support address each problem (Gordon, 2003); and creating a final list of rules to be shared (Gordon, 2003).

Setting rules in this manner has the increased benefits of student motivation to “follow the rules”; less enforcement of rules required by the teacher, and the resulting rules are “usually of a higher quality than those that the teachers set unilaterally, without the consideration for the students’ needs” (Gordon, 2003, p. 270). As each student participates in the creation of the rules they are committing to the group to follow the rules.

Consequences. Gordon addresses the use of consequences as proposed by authors of other guidance models. In his view, natural consequences are those which are natural outcomes for the behavior and may be pleasant or unpleasant (Gordon, 1989). These consequences are naturally occurring rather than implemented by the adult or authority figure. Pleasant consequences are “intrinsic rewards” which assist in the development of “inner control” (Gordon, 1989, p. 30).

In Gordon’s view, logical consequences are punishments as they are determined and enforced by the power of authority and have no place in his child guidance approach (Gordon, 1989). The logical consequence example Gordon provides to readers of Discipline That Works is if a child is late for dinner they go to bed without dinner which is punishment (Gordon, 1989). A natural consequence to being late for dinner might be that the child has a cold dinner or that they would need to reheat their own meal which is not punishment but a consequence imposed by nature not the authority figure (Gordon, 1989).
Contracts. Gordon asserts that contracts are a natural part of every relationship as commitments and agreements are made and carried out in day-to-day interactions with family members, friends, and in schools (Gordon, 1989). The commitment to follow rules becomes a contract for student behavior and extends into other problem-solving and cooperative learning situations in the classroom. “Students who participate in making decisions have a stake in them, a commitment to them, a responsibility to see that they get implemented” (Gordon, 2003, p. 243). Allowing students to have power to participate in decision making sends the message of trust to the student. They are trusted to understand others’ feelings, modify their own behavior, make decisions, follow through on decisions, and participate as members of the group (Gordon, 2003). The message to the students is that “they are capable of mature behavior” (Gordon, 2003, p. 250).

Rudolf Dreikurs. Based on Adlerian theory, Rudolf Dreikurs’ work builds on the understanding of needs of children provided by Adler. The assumptions associated with Dreikurs’ work are that children are social beings with purposeful behavior, and function within their own perspective of reality. Dreikurs et al. (2004) contend that misbehavior is actually the result of mistaken goals. These goals are:“(1) to get attention; (2) to get power; (3) to get revenge and (4) to purposefully display inadequacy” (Dreikurs et al., 2004, p. 38). His suggestion for guidance is to examine the perspective of the adult and change the goal of the child misbehavior to a goal of “striving to contribute” (Dreikurs et al., 2004, p. 39). To gain insight into the reason for the behavior and to assist the student(s) in creating solutions to the issue Dreikurs et al. (2004) provide steps for teachers. First, observe the behavior and the frequency of occurrences, determine the goal the child is trying to achieve, confront the goal at
the next class discussion, and follow it up with corrective procedures such as natural and logical consequences (Dreikurs et al., 2004).

**Teacher-child relationships.** Dreikurs et al. address teacher-child relationships through the teacher evaluating themselves in order to be “more effective and self-confident in the classroom” (Dreikurs et al., 2004, p. 17). Components of this self-evaluation include emotional stability, physical health, intelligence, firmness, imagination, kindness, and democratic leadership qualities (Dreikurs et al., 2004).

As teachers continue to engage in self-assessment, they are to engage in reflection and assessment of the child’s “mistaken goals” (Dreikurs et al., 2004). Through this reflection and providing the appropriate response, the relationship between the teacher and child will focus on encouragement rather than punishment.

Kohn points out that the impact on the relationship between the teacher and child is damaged through the implementation of choice when choices are in favor of the adult need and negatively connected to the need of the child. Children respond with resentment toward the authority figure who provides the uncomfortable situation, or punishment, which may make the problem worse (Kohn, 1996). The child gains no new skills in self-regulation (Kohn, 1996).

External rewards, praise, and punishment are time consuming, may result in loss of teaching time, and may increase teacher stress to ensure that they are distributed consistently and fairly. Lack of consistent and timely distribution of these external methods of discipline negatively affects the relationship between the child and the adult and may adversely affect peer relationships (Dreikurs et al., 2004).

**Power.** “Granted the exercise of power, pressure and punishment to demand cooperation was traditionally viewed as the correct approach in the profession” (Dreikurs, et al., 2004, p. 13).
Students experiencing this type of authoritarian approach to classroom management and child guidance “retaliate with mockery, stubbornness, temper tantrums, disobedience, argument, and refusal to learn” (Dreikurs et al., 2004, p. 14).

Sharing power and responsibility through democratic leadership is an alternative to this authoritarian power approach. A democratic leader is “a leader who is kind but firm, who motivates pupils to learn what they ought to learn, who encourages pupils when they make mistakes, who maintains order and routine by letting each child participate in decision making” (Dreikurs et al., 2004, p. 16).

This shift in position of power changes the teacher’s view of the own actions within the classroom as well as their relationship with children. Dreikurs et al. (2004) suggest that the teacher encourage group discussion, view themselves “as a group leader”, “think of guiding the child” and refrain from taking “sole responsibility and demand the children’s obedience” (Dreikurs et al., 2004, pp. 27-28).

Rules. “Democracy does not mean that everybody can do as he pleases. It requires leadership to integrate and to win mutual consent” (Dreikurs et al., 2004, p. 99). Dreikurs et al., suggest creating rules as a group in much the same manner as Thomas Gordon. “Both you and the pupils may propose rules that are necessary to maintain order” (Dreikurs et al., 2004, p. 116). The rules should be “reasonable and understandable”, “accepted by consensus”, and “posted where all pupils can quickly refer to them” (Dreikurs et al., 2004, p. 116).

Creating rules through group meetings enhances the likelihood that they will be adhered to. The group has agreed to them through mutual consent which increases their responsibility for maintaining them. This extends to determining consequences if a rule is broken. In such cases,
Dreikurs et al. (2004) suggest that the consequence is determined with the children at class meeting following the infraction.

*Consequences.* Dreikurs suggests that “By not falling for the child’s provocations, by use of logical and natural consequences rather than reward and punishment, by practicing mutual respect and by encouraging the child, a teacher can help him to overcome his mistaken goals and correct his behavior” (Dreikurs et al., 2004, pp. 50-51). To be effective, the use of encouragement and logical consequences requires a mutual, respectful relationship between the teacher and child.

Natural consequences are those which are natural consequences to the exhibited behavior and occur each time the behavior or action is exhibited, thus it is viewed as fair and just (Dreikurs et al., 2004). Logical consequences are connected to the behavior but imposed by someone else (Dreikurs et al., 2004). To be effective a logical consequence must be consistent, fair and just. The child must understand that this consequence is connected to the behavior or action and its connection is discussed prior to being imposed (Dreikurs et al., 2004).

Dreikur’s work has been criticized by others including Alfie Kohn (1996). According to Kohn (1996), the use of natural and logical consequences are a form of punishment which are simply delivered in a different tone but remain strategies of punishment with the desired result of having the child comply with the adult’s requests (Kohn, 1996). Nucci, on the other hand, sees reciprocity as a logical consequence which may be more appropriately implemented as a strategy when dealing with moral issues or transgressions (Nucci, 2011). Dreikurs supports the use of natural consequences as such experiences provide children with valuable lessons connecting their behaviors and actions with natural outcomes (Dreikurs et al., 2004). However, he disagrees with the appropriateness and value of logical consequences which equate to punishment.
(Dreikurs et al., 2004). Maurice Elias and Yoni Schwab (2011) contend that in order for natural and logical consequences to be effective to increase intrinsic motivation, self-control and personal responsibility they must be “rooted in a caring relationship between teachers and students” (Elias & Schwab, 2011, p. 332). Another strategy under criticism is the use of choice or “pseudochoice” (Kohn, 1996, p. 48). Pseudochoices provide the child with a choice that is the adult’s desired outcome and one that is painful for the child (Kohn, 1996). Such choices are labeled by Kohn as “obey or suffer”, “you punished yourself” and “choose…and suffer” (Kohn, 1996, pp. 48-51). As punishment, these have a negative impact on teacher-child relationships (Kohn, 1996).

Contracts. Dreikurs et al. (2004) suggest the use of classroom discussions to build shared responsibility and increase the commitment of each participant within the classroom. Each discussion ends with responsibilities and future plans (Dreikurs et al., 2004). “Conflicts cannot be resolved without shared responsibility, without full participation in decision-making of all participants in a conflict” (Dreikurs et al., 2004, p. 99). One of the principles for creating and maintaining harmony in the classroom is to reach agreement (Dreikurs et al., 2004). This agreement increases shared responsibility. “Responsibility is taught by giving responsibility” (Dreikurs et al., 2004, p. 125).

William Glasser. Similarly, William Glasser, using his findings in the field of mental health and psychotherapy, sought to provide additional insights into classroom management issues through focusing attention on the needs of teachers and students to have power within their environment and to be able to engage in deeper levels of learning. The resulting works, Schools Without Failure (1969, revised 1975), Choice Theory in the Classroom (1988, revised 1998), and Choice Theory: A New Psychology of Personal Freedom (1998) provide guidance to
being able to understand the role of positive relationships in the success and achievement of individuals and the negative effects of control on the development of relationships.

Glasser’s work as a therapist brought him into close working contact with individuals who were failing. He turned to schools as the way to help all children succeed. Glasser cautions the use of guidance programs that “demand that they (teachers) do something to or for students to get them to stop behaving badly in unsatisfying classes” (Glasser, 1998, p. 61).

Assumptions associated with Glasser’s work are that children are capable of responsibility, they are rational, have a need of self-worth and love, and will make a commitment to a plan of action when they are involved in the decision making process (Glasser, 1998). Goals of this approach to guidance are for children to develop self-regulation, a commitment to a democratic society, and recognize that through choice the individual is able to have control over his or her own achievement (Glasser, 1998). He contends that “only a discipline program that is concerned with satisfaction will work” (Glasser, 1998, p. 61) and that “unless we can provide schools where children, through reasonable use of their capacities, can succeed, we will do little to solve the major problems of our country” (Glasser, 1969, p. 6).

Teacher-child relationships. Glasser stresses the need for people in society to be able to both give and receive love as well as to be considered worthwhile. “We must ensure that the child’s major experience in growing up, the most constant and important factor in his life, school, provides within it the two necessary pathways: a chance to give and receive love and a chance to become educated and therefore worthwhile” (Glasser, 1969, p. 14). He goes on to state that when a child is unable to create an identity through love and self-worth, the child will turn to “delinquency and withdrawal” (Glasser, 1969, p. 15). After initiating Choice Theory in several schools, Glasser noted that “using choice theory, we were able to build relationships with
them (students), and through these relationships, they began to picture themselves satisfying their needs in school with people” (Glasser, 1998, p. 50). Students and teachers want to be treated with respect, warmth and support (Glasser, 1998).

**Power.** Choice Theory is “an internal control psychology; it explains why and how we make the choices that determine the course of our lives” (Glasser, 1998, p. 7). External control is “an attempt to force us to do what we may not want to do. We end up believing that other people can actually make us feel or do the things we do. This belief takes away the personal freedom we all need and want” (Glasser, 1998, p. 5). Thus, in an external control situation the power is with others. In Choice Theory the power lies within ourselves and those in our “quality” worlds.

Using his experience in working with adults experiencing failure, Glasser suggests the use of class meetings as a method for addressing the students’ and teachers’ needs of power and a sense of belonging in their relationships with in the classroom setting. He provides guidelines to serve as a basis for starting and conducting class meetings. These include: topics may include a problem relative to the class as a group or to an individual, the discussion focuses on solving the problem not assigning blame, the teacher remains nonjudgmental but allows the students to form judgments to lead to a united solution, everyone in the meeting should be seated closely in a circle and these meetings should be short lasting under thirty minutes (Glasser, 1969). Glasser expands this use of classroom meetings to include the use of the “learning-teams” to increase student and teacher attainment of power through long-term projects (Glasser, 1998, p. 78).

The use of learning teams is supported by Gordon as a method for changing the power structure in classrooms to assist with school improvement (Gordon, 1989). Gordon cites Glasser’s work in his summary of the benefits of students engaging in learning teams. In this
summary it is shared that students gain a “sense of belonging”; a sense of knowledge as power; a sense of being a contributing member of a group, responsibility to assisting students needing support; and the ability to depend on each other and reduce dependence on the teacher (Gordon, 1989, pp. 140-141).

**Rules.** “Rules should be reasonable; they should be changed when conditions change; they should, when possible be decided upon jointly by faculty and students; and they should be enforced” (Glasser, 1969, p. 203). Only necessary rules should exist (Glasser, 1969). Student participation in rule setting increases their understanding of their responsibility as a member of the classroom (Glasser, 1969).

**Consequences.** Glasser’s Choice Theory provides strategies for teachers to deal with difficult behavior issues (Glasser, 1988). These strategies reflect the consequences of the child’s disruptive behavior. Glasser suggests that the goal is to keep the child in class and engaged in quality learning (Glasser, 1988). However, Glasser concedes that there are situations where the disruptive individual requires time away from the group in order to calm down and work on a solution to the problem with the teacher (Glasser, 1988). It is stressed that during these times the door is left open for the individual to return to the group when they are ready to begin to work on a solution to the problem (Glasser, 1988). The focus of the consequence is to assist the individual in developing a solution with the support of the “lead-manager teacher” rather than punishment by the “boss-manager teacher” (Glasser, 1988).

**Contracts.** Commitment is a necessary part of developing the ability to be responsible. In this model, teachers help students create plans for future behavior and expect the student to make and commit to the plan of future behavior. Students “need teachers who will not excuse
them when they fail their commitments, but who will work with them again and again as they
commit and recommit until they finally learn to fulfill a commitment” (Glasser, 1969, p. 24).

**Lee and Marlene Canter.** Assertive Discipline by Canter and Canter is a behaviorist
guidance method. *Assertive Discipline: A Take Charge Approach* was published in 1976. This
first version focused on the rights of the teacher over the rights of the students (Weinstein, 1999).
In this approach, the teacher “has the right to define and enforce rules for student behavior”
(Oakes & Lipton, 2007, p. 258). Students are aware of the “escalating ‘consequences’
punishments) for undesirable behavior, and that misbehaving students will be identified
publicly” (Oakes & Lipton, 2007, p. 258).

Following criticism of this focus on adult power and teacher rights, the Canters published
revisions in 1992 and 2002. These revisions incorporated the language of a more humanistic
approach to child guidance in an attempt to address criticism of their focus on teacher rights over
Today’s Classroom* will be discussed. The authors state that this version stresses a “proactive
approach to behavior management” and “the value of building positive relationships with
students” (Canter & Canter, 2001, p. vi). The basic principles of their model focuses on the
needs of students: their need “to know your behavioral expectations”, “to be taught responsible
behavior”, “limits”, and “positive recognition and support” (Canter & Canter, 2001, pp. 6-7).
Assumptions of this model include that the behavior is the focus, the needs of the adult override
the needs of the child, and that behavior is shaped through the environment, rewards, bribes,
threats and punishment (Kohn, 1996). With these assumptions it follows that the goals of this
model are time on task and obedience (Kohn, 1996).
Teacher-child relationships. The behavioral approach to working with students is evident in the suggestions that Canter and Canter provide for building positive relationships with children. They suggest that teachers “make it their goal to establish positive relationships with even the most difficult students” (Canter & Canter, 2001, p. 191). They suggest that this can be done through having students complete an “interest inventory”, “give one-on-one attention by sharing your own time with students”, “attend school activities to see your students perform”, and “call students at home after a particularly difficult day” (Canter & Canter, 2001, p. 191).

Power. The Canter’s guidance approach places the power with the teacher in a behavioral role. Teachers maintain the power in all decisions within the classroom. As a reminder for teachers using this approach, the Canters state “about five to ten percent of your students can be considered difficult because they have not responded to your discipline plan” (Canter & Canter, 2001, p. 181).

Rules. The Canters suggest the basic principles of this model are best met through preplanning by the teacher meaning that all routines, rules, expectations and discipline plans are created by the teacher prior to engagement with students (Canter & Canter, 2001). A discipline plan includes rules, supportive feedback strategies for those following the rules and consistent corrective actions for misbehavior. Canter and Canter suggest that over the course of the year the teacher adjusts the strategies they propose as their “effectiveness diminishes” (Canter & Canter, 2001, p. 20). Little is discussed in this approach about working with students to create and maintain the rules of the classroom.

Strategies for positive recognition of following rules include verbal recognition, positive notes and phone calls home, awards, privileges, and rewards. These may be used individually
with students but a class wide support plan is suggested wherein the entire class works toward the recognition as a whole (Canter & Canter, 2001).

Corrective actions of misbehavior are hierarchical, beginning with a reminder and ending with suspension (Canter & Canter, 2001). Additionally, the principal may require the parents visit the classroom for a day (Canter & Canter, 2001). When parents visit the classroom they are expected to spend “all day—in every class with the child” (Canter & Canter, 2001, p. 214). The idea is that the parents will see how the child acts throughout the day and that peer pressure will help the child “choose more appropriate behavior” (Canter & Canter, 2001, p. 214).

While it is expected that the hierarchical steps will be followed, there is a severe clause. “Severe misbehavior calls for an immediate corrective action that removes the student from the classroom” (Canter & Canter, 2001, p. 68). The severity of the misbehavior is a teacher decision. They list several behaviors that may be considered severe such as “defying a teacher or in some way stopping the entire class from functioning” (Canter & Canter, 2001, p. 68).

**Consequences.** Consequences are a form of punishment intended to create a painful situation for students in order to gain compliance with teacher demands and expectations (Kohn, 1996). The teacher decides the consequences maintaining an authoritarian position of child guidance (Kohn, 1996). Most often logical consequences appear arbitrary to the child but meet the teacher’s need to reduce anxiety, guilt or stress over the punishment in much the same way as providing the child with choices for actions (Kohn, 1996). According to Kohn (1996), commonly used logical consequences include the use of time-out where the child is excluded from the group, not being allowed to use instructional materials if they were not cared for properly, as well as being the center of a class discussion on the child’s behaviors or actions to invoke peer pressure (Kohn, 1996). Logical consequences are punishment and achieve the same
student outcomes of anger and resentment (Kohn, 1996). Nucci takes a different view on the implementation of logical consequences as a guidance technique, as he takes into consideration the “educative value of the use of logical consequences stemming from their correspondence to moral reciprocity” (Nucci, 2011, pp. 721-722).

Choice is another form of punishment when created through unequal power within authoritarian classrooms. Kohn (1996) refers to these as “pseudochoice” as they are not real choices (Kohn, 1996, p. 48). Such choices may actually be coercion rather than decision making as the teacher determines the choices, one is the outcome they want and the other is painful to the child (Kohn, 1996). The underlying intentions of such choices are “obey or suffer”, “you punished yourself” or “choose….and suffer” (Kohn, 1996, pp. 49-51).

Punishment has been found to be an ineffective strategy for long-term behavior changes (Freiberg, 1999; Slee, 1999; Weinstein, 1999). No matter the tone of the issued punishment, the same students are the recipients of punishment repeatedly indicating that punishment is ineffective no matter the tone with which the pseudoconsequence, pseudochoice or punishment is delivered (Kohn, 1996). The underlying assumption of implementing a punishment-based guidance strategy is that children need to feel pain before changing their behaviors (Kohn, 1996).

Limitations to the effectiveness of punishment for long-term behavior changes include: mild punishments are effective for a short time, behaviors recur with the teacher is absent, misbehaviors increase in strength, avoidance of school and anxiety increase, inappropriate behaviors are modeled for the students, the relationship between teacher and child is adversely affected, student attention is focused on avoidance of punishment, and effective punishments must be severe and immediate (Freiberg, 1999; Kohn, 1996).
**Rewards.** Positive behavior is also rewarded in the stimulus-reinforcement method. “Whole-class rewards (parties, candy, etc.) for everyone’s good behavior are meant to reinforce those behaviors, as well as to bring social control to bear on individual students who might prevent the class from getting its reward” (Oakes & Lipton, 2007, p. 258).

As punishment has limitations as a deterrent of inappropriate behaviors, the distribution of rewards has limitations for reinforcing appropriate behaviors. It is a time consuming process that removes time from the act of teaching and learning (Freiberg, 1999) and provides temporary compliance (Kohn, 1996). As an extrinsic source of motivation, the amount and type of reward is always increasing (Oakes & Lipton, 2007), and when the reward is gone so is the compliant behavior (Kohn, 1996). B.F. Skinner acknowledged that teachers are unable to provide reinforcement at a pace to be effective for operant conditioning (Freiberg, 1999). In addition, offering rewards can be “counterproductive” (Kohn, 1996). Studies have shown that work completed by individuals offered a reward for completing a task well is of lower standards than the same work completed by individuals with no such offer of reward (Kohn, 1996). One outcome for children in reward situations is they become “less generous and cooperative than those who aren’t rewarded “which is a natural outcome of competition as the children in the reward situation compete for the reward (Kohn, 1996, p. 33). Other outcomes of the use of rewards include increased peer pressure to receive the group award and the adverse effect manipulation has on the teacher-child relationship (Kohn, 1996).

**Contracts.** Canter and Canter’s approach to guidance focus on behavioral power including their plan for individual behavior. In this model, the Canters address the use of Individualized Behavior Plans rather than contracts or commitments. This process begins with a one-on-one conference with the goal of helping the child “choose more appropriate behavior”
(Canter & Canter, 2001, p. 194). With the child, the adult engages in questioning the child to find “why there is a problem”, discuss your suggestions for addressing the problem, ask “how the student can behave differently in the future”, “agree on a course of action” and “state that you expect the student to change his behavior” (Canter & Canter, 2001, pp. 195-197). In this model, the teacher writes the contract or behavior plan and the child approves and promises to abide by the new plan.

**Carol Weinstein and Molly Romano.** Carol Weinstein has demonstrated disagreement with the classroom management techniques and strategies provided by the Canters’ model of assertive discipline. In *Elementary Classroom Management: Lessons from Research to Practice*, 6th edition, (2015), Carol Weinstein and Molly Romano place a focus of child guidance on culturally responsive classroom management. Previous versions appeared in 1996, 2003, 2007 and 2011. In each edition Weinstein paired with a different co-author. However, Weinstein’s premises remain the same, teachers in culturally diverse classrooms should “become critically conscious of their own cultural biases; acquire knowledge of the cultural heritages of ethnically diverse students; understand the broader sociopolitical and economic contexts of schools; develop culturally responsive classroom management strategies; and create caring learning environments (Gay, 2011, p. 347).

Weinstein and Romano define classroom management as the “actions teachers take to establish and sustain a caring, orderly environment that fosters students’ academic learning as well as their social-emotional growth” (Weinstein & Romano, 2015, p. 5). In this model, “Caring is not just about being affectionate and respectful; it is also about monitoring behavior, teaching and enforcing norms, and providing organization and structure” (Weinstein & Romano, 2015, p. 1).
The classroom is viewed as having multiple dimensions as teachers and students in engage in a wide variety of activities such as reading, discussing, test taking, settling disputes, counseling, and meeting with parents (Weinstein & Romano, 2015). Guiding principles for classroom management are provided by Weinstein and Romano to assist teachers in meeting the needs inherent in the multidimensionality of a classroom. These principles include: 1) the need to “foster self-discipline and personal responsibility”; 2) through fostering positive relationship with students, implementing engaging instruction and using preventive strategies teachers may avoid disruptions; 3) “the need for order must not supersede the need for meaningful instruction”; 4) “teachers must become culturally responsive classroom managers”; 5) social-emotional competence is required; and, 6) “knowledge, reflection, hard work, and experience in the classroom” is required (Weinstein & Romano, 2015, p. 7).

An assumption of this model of child guidance is that some teachers experience difficulty finding a balance between wanting to care and needing to have order within the classroom. “One of the main ways in which teachers create an orderly environment is by treating students with warmth and respect (Weinstein & Romano, 2015, p. 1). Another assumption is that “students have a fundamental need for a sense of belonging, trust, and safety” (Weinstein & Romano, 2015, p. 72). These needs may be met through the development of communities which requires teachers to “provide opportunities for students to learn about one another; to interact in respectful, support ways; and to share experiences” (Weinstein & Romano, 2015, p. 72).

Some beginning and experienced teachers may experience difficulties within classrooms due to the students’ lack of experiences with expectations of the American education system. “Young children who are just beginning school and students who are raised in cultures with dissimilar goals and values to those espoused by American educational institutions might need
explicit guidance with respect to the school-related goals they are expected to achieve” (Wentzel, 2011, p. 626). Teachers as facilitators of the social development of children need to be cognizant of the values and expectations of the cultures of students within their classrooms. This development of “multicultural competence” may lead teachers to question the “traditional assumptions of what works in classroom management and be alert to possible mismatches between conventional management strategies and students’ cultural backgrounds” (Weinstein, Tomlinson-Clarke & Curran, 2004, p. 32).

Thus the goals for this model focus on caring, concern, and personal responsibility (Weinstein & Romano, 2015). A goal of this model is for teachers to “provide an environment in which students behave appropriately, not out of fear of punishment or for desire for reward but out of a sense of personal responsibility” (Weinstein & Romano, 2015, p. 6). A second goal is to “provide a safe time and place for everyone to develop an attitude of caring and concern for others and to learn the skills necessary for cooperation and problem solving” (Weinstein & Romano, 2015, pp. 76-77). In order to achieve these goals within diverse classrooms, teacher must “acquire the knowledge, skills, and predispositions to work with students from diverse racial, ethnic, language, and social class backgrounds” Weinstein & Romano, 2015, p. 7). They go on to state, “Teachers must become culturally responsive classroom managers” (Weinstein & Romano, 2015, p. 7).

*Teacher-child relationships.* Positive teacher-child relationships are a necessary component for this model of classroom management and guidance. In an earlier work, Weinstein, Curran, and Thomlinson-Clarke (2003), pointed out that to engage in positive teacher-child relationships within a culturally responsive classroom management system, “we must recognize that we are all cultural beings, with our own beliefs, biases, and assumptions
about human behavior” (Weinstein et al., 2003, p. 270). In addition, teachers need to acknowledge the cultural, racial and ethnic differences that do exist, as well as “understand the ways school “reflect and perpetuate discriminatory practices of the larger society” (Weinstein et al., 2003, p. 270).

The social-emotional competence of the adult “underlies a teacher’s ability to develop positive relationships with students and to create a caring, respectful classroom environment (Weinstein & Romano, 2015, p. 8). “Research shows that elementary students, kindergarten through fourth grade, who were picked on by the teachers (defined by such behaviors as scolding, criticizing, or shouting) were more likely to display behavior problems in young adulthood” (Weinstein & Romano, 2015, p. 54).

Weinstein and Romano (2015) suggest that teachers learn about the students’ lives and interests, be sensitive to the concerns of the students, establish and enforce clear expectations, be fair, use humor, be a real person as well as a teacher, promote autonomy by sharing responsibility, reduce use of extrinsic control, be inclusive, search for strengths of students, and develop communication skills. Inviting students to make choices and decisions about classroom activities, and teachers modeling respect for diversity assists the development of moral reasoning as well as the sense of a member of a community (Kohn, 1996, Weinstein et al., 2003). Among their cautions for teachers are ensuring that when humor is used that students understand the difference between “laughing at” and “laughing with” someone (Weinstein & Romano, 2015, p. 56). Another caution related to being a real person and sharing personal stories. They suggest that teachers should reflect on the reason for sharing particular stories and to be cognizant of the amount of personal information made available to children and families through personal interactions and social media outlets (Weinstein & Romano, 2015).
In order to be fair in dealing with students, Weinstein and Romano suggest that teachers understand that fair does not mean the same for everyone. Fair may look different depending on the individual needs of the learner. In their view of students needing additional support for individual needs and differences Weinstein and Romano include children with learning disabilities, physical disabilities, attachment issues, learning English as a second language, Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder, emotional disturbances, behavioral disorders, Autism spectrum disorders, past experiences from substance abuse, abuse and neglect, living in poverty as well as those students who are gifted and talented (Weinstein & Romano, 2015). Each of these members of the caring, respectful community have needs that may or may not require special consideration or understanding from the teacher as well as their fellow students. This special need is brought out in the work of Watson as she shared that children with insecure attachments believe that “relationships are conflictual in nature”, and “are likely to be anxious, withdrawn, and passive or angry, aggressive, and controlling” which requires that teachers “help them learn how to be cooperative and prosocial, as well as gain the desire to be so” (Watson, 2003a, p. 11).

*Power.* Power within this model is shared in some of the choices and decisions that are offered and made within the caring community of learners with a focus on maintaining classroom management without removing the focus on meaningful learning experiences (Weinstein & Romano, 2015). Beliefs associated with power and learning tasks are distinctly different between the authoritarian traditional approach and more community based authoritative approach. When it is believed that students learn through direct instruction, explanation and practice with an emphasis on rules, authoritarian rule and compliance are valued (Woolfolk Hoy & Weinstein, 2011). Through research it has been demonstrated that authoritarian approaches to
child guidance and classroom management “is actually related to more student misbehavior” (Weinstein & Romano, 2015, p. 285). However, an authoritative approach and social skill development is valued when learning is believed to take place in cooperative groups, inquiry, and group projects (Woolfolk Hoy & Weinstein, 2011). Teachers implementing an authoritative approach to child guidance and classroom management are “more able to establish respectful classroom climates and achieve better outcomes for students” (Weinstein & Romano, 2015, p. 285). Hence, “Culturally responsive classroom managers understand that the ultimate goal for classroom management is not to achieve compliance or control, but to provide all students with equitable opportunities for learning” (Weinstein et al., 2003, p. 275).

Another view of power within the classroom deals with the repercussions of lack of power for many students. “For too many students, school is a place where they feel humiliated, threatened, ridiculed, tormented and powerless. Teachers who are mindful that school can be awful are better able to create caring, respectful relationships” (Weinstein & Romano, 2015, p. 69).

Within the discussion of power of Weinstein and Romano’s management model, it is important to note that there is a cycle of power that exists between students and teachers that may make creating a sense of community and respect difficult. According to Woolfolk Hoy and Weinstein (2011), “students withhold their cooperation until teachers ‘earn it’ with their authentic caring” (Woolfolk Hoy & Weinstein, 2011, p. 209). At the same time, teachers withhold caring until students demonstrate respect for authority. In this cycle, students who expect unfair treatment react defensively and teachers increase punishment (Woolfolk Hoy & Weinstein, 2011). Students come to believe that they are “correct in mistrusting” the adult, and the teacher feels “correct in mistrusting and becoming more controlling and punitive” (Woolfolk
Hoy & Weinstein, 2011, p. 209). As this cycle continues attempts at creating a community environment with shared decision making and power will become increasingly difficult to establish and maintain. They do point out that “lessons that encourage students’ active participation and address their interests, needs and backgrounds are not only likely to foster academic achievement; they are much more likely to generate the good will, respect, and cooperation that is needed for a productive learning environment” (Woolfolk Hoy & Weinstein, 2011, p. 210).

**Rules.** Rules or classroom norms play a large part in creating caring, respectful relationships and a community of learners. Through “decreasing the complexity of the classroom” clear expectations “can help to dispel the ‘what-ifs’ and enhance feelings of safety, security and competence” (Weinstein & Romano, 2015, p. 89). These classroom norms include those for behavior as well as those for daily routine procedures of classroom management.

Weinstein and Romano provide four guidelines for rules within any classroom: the rule must be reasonable and necessary; clear and understandable; consistent with instructional goals and what is understood about how children learn; and consistent with school rules. “Even students with behavioral disorders call for teachers to impose limits, and they acknowledge that these limits enable them to behave in more appropriate productive ways (Woolfolk Hoy & Weinstein, 2011, p. 185). Rules created with students may be more clearly understood which may, in turn, increase the likelihood that they will be followed (Weinstein & Romano, 2015). Within the process of including students in the creation of rules, it is cautioned that teachers reflect on the rules to determine if the rules “facilitate or hinder the learning process” (Weinstein & Romano, 2015, p. 92).
Hand in hand with rules are classroom routines. These routines include procedures for completing administrative, instructional, and interactive tasks. Weinstein and Romano remind the teachers that for “rules and routines to be effective, you must actively teach them and then review them on a regular basis” (Weinstein & Romano, 2015, p. 108).

**Consequences.** The discussion of dealing with inappropriate behaviors, Weinstein and Romano provide six guiding principles. The first is to choose strategies that are “consistent with the goals of creating a safe, caring classroom environment and preserving the dignity of each student” (Weinstein & Romano, 2015, p. 286). Secondly, be proactive and preventative in planning for addressing disruptions to keep the instructional program from being disrupted. Third, “consider the context when deciding whether or not a particular action constitutes misbehavior” in order to discern if it is an issue of “teacher tolerance level or school standard” (Weinstein & Romano, 2015, p. 289). The fourth guideline is to be “timely and accurate when responding to inappropriate behaviors” to avoid “targeting mistakes” (Weinstein & Romano, 2015, p. 290). The fifth guideline is to match the severity of the strategy with the severity of the behavior. Lastly, “be culturally responsive because differences in norms, values, and styles of communication can have a direct effect on student behavior” (Weinstein & Romano, 2015, p. 290). In order to be culturally responsive, they suggest teachers reflect on the behaviors the teachers deem to be inappropriate and “consider how they might be related to race and ethnicity” (Weinstein & Romano, 2015, p. 290).

Weinstein and Romano suggest teaching consequences for rule violation when teaching the rules and procedures. Cautions about selecting consequences for behaviors include the need to have a respectful, caring environment and positive teacher-child relationship so that “students will interpret the penalties not as punishments imposed by a hostile dictatorial adversary, but as
reasonable consequences enacted by a teacher who cares enough to insist that students behave the best they can” (Weinstein & Romano, 2015, p. 298). When imposition of consequences and enforcement of rules differs due to the special needs of the individual, the consequences may be considered appropriate to other students within the classroom as long as the “differential treatment is not because of racism or classism” (Woolfolk Hoy & Weinstein, 2011, p. 191).

**Contracts.** Weinstein and Romano suggest the use of contingency contracts for behavior issues and concerns which are negotiated between the teacher and the student. “A contingency contract or behavior contract is an agreement between a teacher and an individual student that specifies what the student must do to earn a particular reward” (Weinstein & Romano, 2015, p. 310). These contracts are made in collaboration between the student and the teacher. “Both parties must agree on the behaviors the student is to exhibit, the period of time involved, and the rewards that will result” (Weinstein & Romano, 2015, p.310).

The models of child guidance and classroom management provided by Marilyn Watson, Thomas Gordon, Rudolf Dreikurs, William Glasser, Lee and Marlene Canter, and Carol Weinstein have been developed through research, interpretation and understanding of the works of Dewey, Piaget, Vygotsky, Bandura, Baumrind and Noddings. These theories and models work in connection to provide an understanding that a focus on authoritative approaches to guidance may be needed if the aim of education is to have autonomous individuals, capable of making decisions with the group needs at the center of this focus, and who are able to participate in society as well as lead others. The child guidance power continuum of approaches is included in Table 1. Models with the majority of guidance strategies in which the adult and child share power in the relationship are listed as authoritative and those with the majority of guidance strategies where the adult has all of the power are placed in the authoritarian column.
Table 1

*Power Continuum for Guidance Models*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authoritative</th>
<th>Authoritarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gordon, 2003</td>
<td><em>Teacher Effectiveness Training</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watson, 2003</td>
<td><em>Developmental Discipline</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreikurs et al., 2004</td>
<td><em>Discipline without Tears</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasser, 1988</td>
<td><em>Choice Theory</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weinstein et al., 2015</td>
<td><em>Elementary Classroom Management</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canter &amp; Canter, 2001</td>
<td><em>Assertive Discipline</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Continuum of Guidance Strategies**

While this discussion has separated the authoritarian and authoritative approaches on the continuum of guidance strategies many models in publication and use today implement strategies across the continuum. When a majority of strategies within the authoritarian or authoritative approach are used it determines which end of the continuum the actual classroom management and child guidance model is placed. As strategies associated with authoritarian and authoritative approaches are mixed, confusion by both the teachers and the students may result (Oakes & Lipton, 2007). For instance, federal and state programs require curricular programs that stress higher order thinking skills, collaboration and problem solving which would be supported within authoritative approaches. At the same time, initiatives like Zero Tolerance and Safe Schools Acts call for authoritarian approaches to guidance (Fields et al., 2010; Freiberg, 1999; NCES, 2009; Slee, 1999; Weinstein, 1999). The incongruence of having the goals of education focus on skills of collaboration and problem solving relying on the development of autonomy and the goals of compliance and obedience which stifle the development of autonomy create a situation
of ambiguity for teachers and children in their quest for success within the classroom community (Kamii, 1991; Battistich et al., 2004; Weinstein & Romano, 2015).

Teacher beliefs of child guidance and appropriate behaviors are deeply rooted in teachers’ prior experiences (Martin, 2004; Polat et al., 2013; Hachfeld, Hahn, Schroeder, Anders, Stanat, & Kunter, 2011; Siwatu, 2011). Teachers bring beliefs about children, learning, instruction, social interaction and their roles as they enter the field of education (Martin, 2004). “Beliefs are formed from personal experiences, education, and values. They are a major determinant of behavior as teachers respond to questions and make classroom decisions” (Vartuli, 2005, p. 76). The belief of the roles that the teacher plays in the classroom and the level of power believed to be necessary reflects the theory of guidance being implemented (Kohn, 1996; Onwuegbuzie, Witcher, Filer & Downing, 2000).

Teacher research has provided information that continues to guide guidance and management practices and reflection focusing on communication (Ballenger, 1999; Brice-Heath, 1983; Brown, 2003, 2005; Howard, 2006), community (Brown, 2003; Chu, 2011; Shevalier & McKenzie, 2012), engagement (Delpit & White-Bradley, 2003; Earick, 2009; Howard, 2006), understanding one’s own cultural biases (Earick, 2009; Howard, 2006), and social justice (Applebaum, 2005; Milner, 2011a). Many teachers implement guidance strategies that are reflective of both authoritarian and authoritative approaches (Onwuegbuzie et al., 2000). “Most teachers adopt the approach to guidance that best reflects their beliefs about the most appropriate discipline strategies” (Onwuegbuzie et al., 2000, p. 11). It has been found that pre-service teachers in early childhood programs agreed with statements of belief consistent with authoritative approaches to guidance (Polat et al., 2013). Interestingly, pre-service teachers in
elementary education programs identified with statements of belief consistent with authoritarian approaches to child guidance (Polat et al., 2013).

In a circular path, the way teachers respond to children may be predicted from what the teacher believes about the children with whom they are teaching as well as their role as an educator (Kohn, 1996; Onwuegbuzie et al., 2000; Martin, 2004; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007). Teacher perceived roles include leader, facilitator, mentor, coach, guide and warm demander (Martin, 2004; Onwuegbuzie et al. 2000). When teachers believe that their students are incapable of engaging in higher order thinking, educational achievement, or self-control, the resulting approach may be more authoritarian or behavioral in nature (Bandura, 1997; Kohn, 1996; Onwuegbuzie et al., 2000). On the other hand, when teachers are more positive in their beliefs of children’s capabilities they will be more authoritative or constructivist in their approaches to guidance (Bandura, 1997; Kohn, 1996; Onwuegbuzie et al., 2000).

The two guidance approaches utilized within this study fall along the authoritarian and authoritative continuum. These approaches represent differences in the beliefs about power in the teacher-child relationship and classroom. At the authoritarian end of the continuum, power is placed solely with the adult. The adult is the main participant within the classroom to make decisions, set rules, and determine consequences of appropriate and inappropriate behaviors. At the authoritative end of the continuum, power is shared between the adult and the children. Together rules are set, consequences may be determined, and problems are solved with the child and adult actively involved and sharing responsibility. Each of these approaches will be discussed in respect to teacher beliefs, culturally responsive teaching, classroom community, student and adult engagement, respect, developmentally appropriate practice, goals within the classroom, and administrative leadership.
Authoritarian Approach. The authoritarian approach is an adult-centered approach. The adult has sole responsibility and decision making power. Practices and strategies of this approach focus on obedience, compliance, submission, and an adult-centered power structure of a system relying on rewards and penalties (Baumrind, 1967; Glasser, 1998; Dreikurs, 2004; Cornelius-White, 2007; Fields et al., 2010; Weinstein & Romano, 2015). In order to better understand the authoritarian approach, we will examine the goals, beliefs, culturally responsive teaching, community, engagement, respect, teacher-child interactions, classroom organization, child outcomes, developmentally appropriate practices, and administrative leadership associated with or results of this approach to child guidance and classroom management.

Goals. The goal of the authoritarian approach is compliance (Kohn, 1996). The use of reward and punishment to gain compliance are ineffective in long-term behavior change and require ever increasing rewards and harsher punishments (Frieberg, 1999; Canter & Canter, 2002). When the goals of education are critical thinking skills, higher academic achievement and autonomy, authoritarian guidance models are ineffective (Frieberg, 1999; Simonsen et al., 2008; Slee, 1999; Weinstein & Romano, 2015). Thus the goal of the authoritarian approach to guidance and the goals of a constructivist approach to education are incongruent which leads to confusion on the part of the students, lack of engagement in collaborative activities, lower academic achievement, and increased classroom disruptions (Solomon et al., 2000; Battistich, Schaps, & Wilson, 2004).

Culturally Responsive Teaching. Geneva Gay (2010) defines culturally responsive teaching as “using knowledge, prior experiences, frames of reference, and performance styles of ethnically diverse students to make learning encounters more relevant to and effective for them” (Gay, 2010, p. 31). In contrast, egalitarian beliefs focus on finding common ground from which
all individuals may be treated equally irrespective of cultural differences (Hachfeld et al., 2011). Since only commonalities between members of the group are sought within an egalitarian system, this approach more closely resembles an authoritarian approach to child guidance (Hachfeld et al., 2011). It has been found that teachers who exhibit egalitarian and authoritarian beliefs show “higher approval for hierarchical school structures, and are less open to emancipated teacher-student relationships” (Hachfeld et al., 2011, p. 991).

The expectation that all members of a school environment will adhere to the values and behaviors of the dominating culture of power may impact the connection between home and school of many students as well as the teacher’s expectations of appropriate behaviors within the classroom (Tyler, Uqdah, Dillihunt, Beatty-Hazlebaker, Conner, Gadson, Henchy, Hughes, Mulder, Owens, Roan-Belle, Smith & Stevens, 2008). As the culture of power is prevalent, many student behaviors embedded in the student’s culture are viewed as problematic resulting in requiring all students conform to the cultural norms of the school (Gay, 2010; Tyler et al., 2008). Within the values of the culture of power is the belief that “children of Color have poor or low self-esteem and are endanger of failing therefore, assimilating to the dominant language and customs will boost the child’s self-esteem and test scores” (Earick, 2009, p. 96).

According to Tyler et al. (2008), “mainstream cultural values” include individualism, and competition (Tyler et al., 2008, p. 284). In order to achieve these ends, some elementary teachers have reported “feeling pressure to maintain controlled, quiet classrooms where students worked by themselves” and that these conditions were “optimal for student learning” (Tyler et al., 2008, p. 284). However, not all cultures value individualism and competition. Indeed, communalism, collectivism, sharing and cooperation are values within African American, Asian American, Latin American, and Native American cultures (Tyler et al., 2008). This lack of
differences of cultural values being represented within an egalitarian belief system may lead to greater issues of conflict between students and teachers resulting in lower academic achievement and seeming appropriate behavior within some classrooms and schools (Tyler et al., 2008). “Those responsible for the education of an increasingly diverse student population can no longer hold the attitude that it is the culturally and linguistically different students and families who must change and be made to fit existing school environments” (Chu, 2011, p. 207).

In addressing the need to recognize the differences within and between students and teachers of diverse populations Cynthia Ballenger (1999) shared her own experiences while teaching in a Haitian community the strategies she implemented in child guidance and classroom management did not provide the sense of control she expected. When she used praise where others could hear, it “would often lead to the singled-out child’s becoming extremely uncomfortable” rather than boosting their self-esteem and motivation to meet her expectations (Ballenger, 1999, p. 31). The tendency for the teacher to take on the problems of the students and label their feelings for them was another area of concern she voiced from her experiences in the classroom (Ballenger, 1999). The Haitian teachers within her school valued assisting the child in recognizing their issues and supporting them in finding their own solutions. Ballenger realized that the guidance strategies she was using were “based on deep cultural assumptions” (Ballenger, 1999, p. 40).

A lack of focus on social emotional development within the authoritarian approach to child guidance may lead to issues of community building and a sense of belonging in schools with the culture of the teacher being different from the culture of the students. “In schools serving poor and African American children there is typically little or no focus on developing the
humanity, the integrity, or the thinking and leadership capacity of the children served” (Delpit & White-Bradley, 2003, p. 286).

Communication is a key component of relationships between children and teachers as well as building a mutually respectful community. Research has found that ordering, moralizing, interpreting, reassuring and questioning act as roadblocks to effective communication (Brown, 2005; Gordon, 1989).

Authoritarian approaches to guidance place all of the control with the teacher. The values and expectations of the teacher including their cultural experiences and biases become the dominant ideology within the classroom which becomes “common sense and is widely accepted” (Earick, 2009, p. 19). “Currently in the U.S. public schools, White racial hegemony is practiced and supported through behaviorist (authoritarian) or outcomes-based professional development that deems you deficient if you do not accept their interpretation of knowledge” (Earick, 2009, p. 44).

Community. Within an authoritarian classroom, the adult is the only powerful force in the room (DeVries & Zan, 1994). It is less about a sense of community among all participants than it is about the classroom following the teacher, adopting the teacher’s values and obediently following the “inflexible and strictly enforced” rules set by the teacher for the community (DeVries & Zan, 1994, p. 12). Rather than a community, this grouping may be considered a collective or a “pseudocommunity” (Kohn, 1996, p. 108).

A teacher working at the authoritarian end of the continuum may be an assimilationist (Ladson-Billings, 2009). Within a community led by an assimilationist teacher the relationships between teachers and students is “hierarchical and limited to formal classroom roles” (Ladson-Billings, 2009, p. 60). In such classroom communities, the “teacher demonstrates relationships
with individual students”, “encourages competitive achievement” and “encourages children to learn individually, in isolation” (Ladson-Billings, 2009, p. 60). These behaviors result in peer pressure. As a community focused on following rules and behavior being managed through coercion and punishment, students become part of the classroom management plan resulting in peers reprimanding peers for lack of rule compliance or task completion (Kohn, 1996). “The overall socialmoral atmosphere of this direct-instruction classroom is one of oppression, anger, anxiety, and social isolation” (DeVries & Zan, 1994, p. 14) with the classroom teacher being “an unelected authority” (Valencia, 2010, p. 155).

This atmosphere of oppression, anxiety and social isolation is felt by the authoritarian adult as well as the children (Gordon, 1989). According to Gordon, authoritarian leaders may feel threatened by loss of power or authority as those they lead fail to comply with the stated rules (Gordon, 1989). The sense of isolation stems from the lack of supportive relationships with those whom the authoritarian leader oversees either from a desire to not be viewed as having favorites or from the individuals being controlled not feeling warm toward the authority figure (Gordon, 1989). “Subordinates of power-oriented (authoritarian) leaders are reluctant to reveal their problems for fear of punishment or having the boss impose some distasteful solution” (Gordon, 1989, p. 76).

**Engagement.** Using the authoritarian approach the teacher engagement with children focuses on the maintenance of the classroom environment, ensuring that students remain on task and the enforcement of classroom rules (Simonsen et al., 2008). Praise, group reinforcement, behavior contracts and token economies are implemented to acknowledge students exhibiting appropriate behaviors (Hester et al., 2009; Simonsen et al., 2008). Authoritarian strategies for addressing misbehavior include “brief, contingent, and specific error correction”, “performance
feedback”, “differential reinforcement”, “planned ignoring”, “response cost” and “time out from reinforcement” (Simonsen et al., 2008, pp. 364-365). The last four strategies are considered to be “more intrusive” (Simonsen et al., 2008, p. 366). Teachers provide the feedback both positive and negative without input from the students. The teacher’s engagement with the children and the children with the teacher maintain the hierarchical roles set by the teacher (Ladson-Billings, 2009; Simonsen et al., 2008).

**Respect.** Respect is mentioned in several studies as one of the differences in the quality of classroom climates (Curby, Grimm & Pianta, 2010; Fields et al., 2010; Pianta, Howes, Burchinal, Bryant, Clifford, Early & Barbarin, 2005; Simonsen et al., 2008). The obedience model of child guidance which focuses on “molding behavior via reward and punishment” is at the authoritarian end of the guidance continuum (Fields et al., 2010, p. 10). It may be that the issue with the teacher determined disobedience or misbehavior is actually due to the teacher’s need for power, their lack of trust in the students (Kohn, 1996), or their lack of understanding the diverse backgrounds of the students within the classroom (Weinstein & Romano, 2015). Using rewards and punishment with all adult power is associated with student demonstrations of “anger and depression as well as low self-esteem and the inability to make self-directed choices” and increased student misbehavior (Fields et al., 2010, pp. 11-12; Weinstein & Romano, 2015).

**Teacher-child interactions.** The quality of teacher-child interactions have been found to be lower when the majority of the participants were from families living below the poverty line and when teachers lacked formal training in early childhood education and were less child-centered in their beliefs (Pianta et al., 2005). Conversations between adults and children without “conscious effort to learn about the other’s interests, life or culture does not build meaningful relationships” (Shevalier & McKenzie, 2012, p. 1095). The authoritarian teacher-child
relationships and problem behavior in preschool have been found to predict aggression, disruptive behaviors and social withdrawal in second grade (Howes, 2000).

In speaking of teachers in today’s urban schools, Lisa Delpit and Paula White-Bradley state, “They are rote, robotized and ruled by outside forces” (Delpit & White-Bradley, 2003, p. 286). As the focus of education is on ‘caring about’ academic success, greater attention is focused on test scores and behaviors leading to the implementation of selective interventions which inhibits the development of meaningful relationships (Shevalier & McKenzie, 2012).

Teacher’s punitive reactions “create an adversarial relationship with students who are confused about the teachers’ expectations” (Brown, 2005, p. 14). As more reprimands are given, more disruptive behaviors occur which leads to a cycle of increased teacher-child conflict, more aggressive child behaviors and back to more reprimands and commands (Doumen et al., 2008). This cycle continues to increase throughout the year with more reprimands and more aggressive behavior by the end of the school year (Doumen et al., 2008).

To expend so much of a teacher’s energy on keeping track of noninstructional tasks, and to prevent any kind of deep instruction about what is being studied, can lead only to the lowest level of academic development. This is the reason we never see these pre-packaged “teacher –proofed” programs in affluent schools, only in schools serving low-income children and children of color. (Delpit, 2012, p. 35)

**Classroom organization.** In classrooms with high levels of teacher-structure and teacher-directed activity, “children were observed to behave positively toward the teacher, in terms of cooperation and compliance, but to be more negative in overall mood and affect” (NICHD, 2003, pp. 1652-1653). It was also noted that in high structure classrooms students “engaged in less prosocial behavior toward peers” and that this high structure was unrelated to “independent task
persistence” (Simonsen et al., 2008, p. 357). As students experience instruction that is not meaningful to them, they “become bored and the only way to keep them motivated was to take privileges away” (Earick, 2009, p. 46).

**Child outcomes.** With the recurrence of classroom behavior as the primary concern for parents, educators and school administrators, authoritarian approaches to child guidance are not effective in achieving lasting change (Freiberg, 1999; Glasser, 1988; Oakes & Lipton, 2007; Slee, 1999). In 2007, ten percent of all kindergarten through eighth grade students had been retained at least once for lack of social skill development and/or academic achievement (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009). In 2006, 3.3 million students were suspended from school (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009). The students that are punished through exclusionary methods are the very students who have “the greatest academic, social, economic, and emotional needs” (Noguera, 2003, p. 341). When students are not in school, or are not provided with additional training or experiences in developing social skills, it is unlikely that their behaviors will alter due to the suspension (Hemphill & Schneider, 2013).

“Over five decades of study, behavioral psychologists have amassed data that should lead us to be highly skeptical of the effectiveness of punishment for changing the behavior of children” (Skiba, 2014, p. 31). Behavioral, or authoritarian, methods may result in short-term changes in behavior. Punishment may lead students to determine what they can “get by with” rather than to make more appropriate choices (DeVries & Zan, 1994; Kamii, 1991; Kamii et al., 1994; Freiberg, 1999; Oakes & Lipton, 2007). Other outcomes include increased aggression as adults are modeling the very behaviors that they wish to extinguish (aggression) (Gordon, 1989). Another issue with the use of punishment is that the authority figure eventually runs out of punishments and loses the power of authority (Gordon, 1989).
Planned ignoring is an authoritarian strategy to address unwanted or disruptive behaviors. However, the behavior may escalate before it begins to decrease (Hester et al., 2009). Providing students with external rewards, including praise, for appropriate behavior decreases their intrinsic motivation to learn or follow social norms (Hester et al., 2009; Oakes & Lipton, 2007).

Praise is associated with guidance approaches focusing on authoritarian practices. Praise is an evaluation of the individual’s achievement (Gordon, 1989). While intended to demonstrate approval, praise can communicate criticism, enhance competitiveness, impede decision-making skills, and hamper the development of self-reliance (Gordon, 1989).

**Developmentally appropriate practice.** The developmental level of each child should be included in the determination of appropriate guidance and classroom management strategies to be implemented within the classroom (Copple & Bredekamp, 2009). “All the domains of development and learning—physical, social and emotional, and cognitive—are important, and they are closely interrelated” (NAEYC, 2009). Understanding appropriate and inappropriate teacher expectations and reactions to developmental processes is a key component to selecting and implementing child guidance and classroom management strategies (Copple & Bredekamp, 2009).

Teacher behaviors such as focusing on maintaining control, viewing child conflicts and “undesired behaviors” as problems for direct intervention to be solved by the adult, and providing “too few opportunities for meaningful social interaction with other children” are considered developmentally inappropriate practices (Copple & Bredekamp, 2009). These behaviors may be found within an authoritative approach to guidance. Other inappropriate practices related to an authoritarian approach include guidance practices that “control children rather than promote their self-regulation”, “disciplining children in ways unrelated to their
actions”, and children are not included in rule setting discussions (Copple & Bredekamp, 2009, p. 159).

**Authoritative Approach.** The authoritative approach reflects more of a constructivist view of teaching and learning. Many teachers enter the field of education in order to have a positive influence on children’s lives (Gordon, 1989). “You acquire more influence with young people when you give up using your power to control them” (Gordon, 1989, p. 7). Shared power between adults and children as observed in shared decision-making, community development and participation allow for authentic opportunities to develop self-regulation and autonomy as well as a development of the ability to understand the perspectives of others (DeVries & Zan, 1994; Kohn, 1996). “Children will use self-control to follow rules when they have been given the chance to join with adults in deciding what those rules should be” (Gordon, 1989, p. 8).

**Goals.** Goals of authoritative approaches to guidance include “self-determined, responsible behavior, reflecting concern for the good of others and for oneself” (Fields et al., 2010, p. 11). The relationship between student and teacher is central to the authoritative approach. The authoritative teacher “is still the adult in charge, responsible for setting necessary limits and keeping children safe” (Fields et al., 2010, p. 11). Teachers and students are able “to see one another as people” as students are allowed to have “responsible freedom and choice within the classroom” and teachers through the use of “responsible consequences with the goal of self-discipline” are able to change their perspective from “I am in control” to “we are in control” (Freiberg & Lamb, 2009, pp. 104-105).

**Culturally Responsive Teaching.** Culturally responsive teaching “legitimates the cultures and experiences of ethnically diverse students”; uses “cultural legacies, traits, experiences, and orientations of ethnically diverse students as filters through which to teach them
academic knowledge and skills”; builds “moral commitment, critical consciousness, and political competence needed to promote social justice and social transformation”; and, teaches “students style-shifting skills so that they can move back and forth between their home and school cultures with ease” (Gay, 2011, p. 356).

“Multicultural beliefs recognize that, because individuals have engaged with different socio-cultural contexts, they have legitimately different perspectives and beliefs” which should be “embraced and viewed as enriching” (Hachfeld et al., 2011, 987). Teachers should be “mindful of whom they are teaching and the range of needs the student brings to the classroom” (Milner, 2011, p. 67) through focusing on the students and learning “who they are in their lived cultures; their interests; and their intellectual, political and historical legacies” (Delpit, 2012, p. 49). In addition, “culturally responsive teaching uses the child’s culture to build a bridge to success in school achievement” (Chu, 2011, p. 205). These beliefs would be consistent with an authoritative approach to child guidance as the focus is on inclusion rather than exclusion, celebrating differences rather than recognizing only similarities (Hachfeld et al., 2011; Tyler et al., 2008). Teachers espousing multicultural beliefs were found to be less “likely to agree with prejudiced statements, having more integrative views on acculturation and showing a lower tendency toward an authoritarian teaching style” (Hachfeld et al., 2011, p. 993).

The impact of creating positive relationships with children has been noted throughout this literature review. It has been discussed that quality teachers know their students and listen to their voices within the classroom (Cornelius-White, 2007; DeVries & Zan, 1994; Glasser, 1969, 1988, 1998; Gordon, 2002; Kohn, 1996; Ladson-Billings, 2009; Walker, 2009). Students want teachers who are fair and respectful, allow them to have responsibility for classroom management decisions, and recognize their achievements (Lewis, 2011; Shevalier & McKenzie,
“The more teachers engage students in efforts to shape their own futures, the more the conditions of hope and meaning are met” (Valencia, 2010, p. 154).

Fairness, responsibility for decisions and recognition of achievements may be demonstrated in the manner in which problems are approached. When classroom problems occur, the problem may be owned by the student, teacher or both depending upon the context or the specific problem in an authoritative approach to child guidance. Cynthia Ballenger noted that a Haitian teacher, with whom she worked in a Haitian community, shared that “her goal would be to make the child feel comfortable with the group” as a way of assisting the individual with the problem rather than stating the problem and the cause for the child (Ballenger, 1999, p. 35). When teachers listen rather than judge, “students begin to understand that they are responsible for reflecting on their behavior and resolving it themselves, rather than having teachers solve their problems…This realization can encourage social growth as students begin internally reviewing how their actions affect others (Brown, 2005, p. 14). The child’s problem remains with the child which coincides with the guidance Thomas Gordon provides in Teacher Effectiveness Training.

Another point that many of the culturally responsive teaching and multicultural education studies make is that when teachers begin to recognize that their own behaviors are “based on deep cultural assumptions” (Ballenger, 1999, p. 40), they are beginning the first step in approaching differences in cultural assumptions and biases (Howard, 2006; Earick, 2009). In Ballenger’s case she began to change her opinion of the behaviors of the Haitian teachers from harsh to being full of “moral value and intentions” leading her to reflect more fully on her “culturally based strategies” (Ballenger, 1999, p. 40). As teachers engage in reflection of the cultural basis of their strategies for classroom management and child guidance, the emphasis
needs to be placed on the relationships between groups and outcomes “that expose and conform with unjust social patterns” (Applebaum, 2005, p. 287). Creating safe, caring and inclusive environments within an authoritative approach requires that teachers engage in self-reflection of their attitudes and beliefs as well as the experiences and strengths of the children (Chu, 2011; Earick, 2009; Howard, 2006).

Communication plays a large role in the development of an environment that is accepting and mutually respectful of various cultures (Brown 2003, 2005). Brown states, “The result of being aware of and responding to students’ communication needs is a classroom in which the opportunities for genuine growth are greatly increased” (Brown, 2005, p. 15). This thought is reflected in the work of Howard (2006), “Our clear communication of beliefs in our students’ intelligence is a critical factor in freeing them to connect with their intelligence” (Howard, 2006, p. 124). Through the use of congruent communication, explicit expectations, and assertiveness mutual respect within the classroom may be enhanced (Brown, 2003, 2005).

Congruence in communication as well as between approaches to guidance and expected outcomes such as critical thinking are necessary components of a culturally responsive classroom. The use of student-initiated research is a level of inquiry that may fit with the authoritative approach to child guidance (Earick, 2009). The “experiences must be relevant to the student for conceptual learning to occur” (Earick, 2009, p. 52). Earick does caution that as teachers move away from authoritarian approaches to child guidance and classroom management that their actual practice is not “masking inequities because equity and democratic language such as individual learning styles, alternative assessment, differentiated teaching and fairness are used in this paradigm” (Earick, 2009, pp. 53-54). She goes on to state that “inquiry as a viable
pedagogy for equity is only as effective as the level of power and control students are allowed to practice” (Earick, 2009, p. 54).

“High expectations that are seamlessly linked to a deep and persistent commitment to the power of belief in our students’ intelligence can provide the only real foundation for school change (Howard, 2006, p. 125). Understanding that behavior may be influenced by the child’s culture may lead teachers and school administrators to learn more about cultural expectations, building respectful relationships with children and families, explicitly teach rules and expected behavior within caring communities, provide varying support to meet needs of individuals and involve families in “mutually supportive ways” (Metropolitan Center for Urban Education, 2008, p. 7).

**Community.** Culturally relevant teaching practices connect with the authoritative approach to child guidance as the emphasis is placed upon creating a community (Ladson-Billings, 2009) wherein the teacher respects children’s interests, feelings, values and ideas (DeVries & Zan, 1994). The teachers are connected to the students and the students have a responsibility to and for each other including assisting with teaching each other (Ladson-Billings, 2009). A study of urban teachers found that when these teachers demonstrated genuine interest in their students creating a caring community, they gained cooperation through assertiveness, and explicit expectations for behavior and academic achievement (Brown, 2003).

All participants within the classroom share responsibility and are members of the same community of learners (Frieberg & Lamb, 2009). As members of a learning community, teachers and students share in the responsibility for creating and maintaining an effective learning environment that allows students to feel “safe enough to challenge” their peers and teachers (Kohn, 1996, p. 77). Pro-social learner dynamics of a person-centered program include “(a)
social-emotional emphasis; (b) school connectedness; (c) positive school and classroom climate; and (d) student self-discipline” (Frieberg & Lamb, 2009, p. 99). The relationship between teachers and students is “fluid”, “humanely equitable” (Ladson-Billings, 2009, p. 60) and has a positive impact on the academic, social and emotional success of the students (Freiberg & Lamb, 2009). In classrooms with teachers with college degrees in early childhood the emotional climate received a higher rating than in classrooms with teachers lacking formal training in early childhood education (Pianta, et al., 2005). Early childhood teachers “may benefit from an increased awareness of the importance of the social emotional climate of the classroom” (Howes, 2000, p. 203).

According to Valencia, characteristics of an “optimum learning environment” include “instilling a sense of competence in all students”; “building a learning community where conscientious effort is made to equally encourage all students to become members”; “creating opportunities for all students to put what they have learned to use”; “making the classroom a secure place” for taking risks and expressing opinions; “eliminating unnecessary discomforts – excessive boredom, humiliation, and loneliness”; “inspiring home and meaning”; and, “bringing the excitement of discovery and a sense of creativity” (Valencia, 2010, pp. 154-155).

Engagement. In order to engage the children and to assist them in their continued development as a member of a society of thinkers with the ability to engage in self-regulation, teachers “must first be willing to develop a relationship with them individually and as a group. They must foster the building of a family, a family that is deeply respectful of the development of each individual and of individuals’ contributions to the integrity of the group” (Delpit & White-Bradley, 2003, p.288). The goal is not assimilation but “rather a process of deep engagement with authentic identity and one’s own intellectual efficacy” which may lead to the
entire community “getting smarter together, while at the same time maintaining, strengthening, and honoring our differences” (Howard, 2006, p. 133).

Adult responsibilities include monitoring, teaching, reinforcing expectations, actively engaging students, and using “a continuum of strategies” for responding to appropriate and inappropriate behaviors (Simonsen et al., 2008, p. 359). Active supervision has been shown to have a positive impact on student behavior both within and outside of the classroom (Simonsen et al., 2008). Outcomes of authoritative approaches to guidance include assisting the child in learning to “negotiate solutions to problems and resolve their own conflicts and self-direct their learning activity” (Fields et al., 2010, p. 12). Students experience a personal connection, shared responsibilities for leadership, empowerment, a climate supportive of risk-taking, and an opportunity to develop a sense of community which promote the development of self-discipline (Freiberg & Lamb, 2009).

**Respect.** Guidance models using authoritative approach strategies of child guidance may be referred to as respect models which include constructivist, community and democratic approaches (Fields et al., 2010). The person-centered approach is one of these guidance models (Doyle, 2009). Opportunities to respond and share in discussions are increased within guidance models at the authoritative end of the continuum. Responsive opportunities have been found to have a positive effect on achievement and success (Simonsen et al., 2008). Thus, allowing students to have an active role in discussions, opportunities to reflect and share, and have joint responsibility toward learning student achievement rises and behavior issues decline. Through such activities, adults demonstrate the value placed on “the personal dignity and integrity of students” (Doyle, 2009, p. 156).
As an authoritative approach, person-centered classrooms must provide teachers and students with a “continuing sense that they are valued and respected” (Doyle, 2009, p. 158). Such classrooms “engender the kind of personal allegiance and affiliations necessary for creating and sustaining productive learning communities” (Doyle, 2009, p. 158).

Empathy, warmth, and the encouragement of thinking and learning were common features of teachers who implement effective guidance approaches (Cornelius-White, 2007). Through empathy teachers were able to avoid power struggles while encouraging self-initiated learning (Cornelius-White, 2007). When teachers engage with participants in empathic ways, student participation increases as well as student success and cooperation (Cornelius-White, 2007). As student participation, cooperation and success increases, teacher behaviors may become more positive (Cornelius-White, 2007).

**Teacher-child interactions.** An analysis of studies conducted between 1948 and 2004 indicated that “secure and reciprocal attachments are important for students to engage in their relationships with teachers, peers, and subject matter and develop healthy self-concepts and sense of well-being” (Cornelius White, 2007, p. 115). Positive relationships appeared to reduce non-compliant student behaviors (Cornelius-White, 2007) and enhance “children’s prosociality” (Palermo, Hanish., Martin, Fabes, &Reiser, 2007, p. 418). These prosocial skills are likely to increase teacher-child closeness thus creating a cycle where teachers are attracted to children who are more positive and children are drawn to teachers who are more positive and less negative (Palermo et al., 2007). Additionally, research has shown when teachers expressed a sense of closeness in their relationship with the children; subsequently teachers also reported increased closeness with those students (Jerome et al., 2008). When the students feel the teacher
is sensitive and responsive to the needs, feelings and problems of the students, they will respond with more sensitivity and responsiveness (Gordon, 1989).

**Classroom management.** Highly organized classrooms have been found to prevent behavior problems through optimizing opportunities to learn, minimizing wasted time, and the teacher’s use of proactive strategies and ability to help children focus on the learning objectives (Curby, LoCasale, Crouch, Konold, Pianta, Howes, Burchinal, Bryant, Clifford, Early & Barbarin, 2009). In these situations, when misbehavior does occur, the teachers with high-quality management are able to effectively reestablish order and reengage learners (Curby et al., 2009). Higher levels of classroom management have been associated with higher levels of emotional support suggesting that “one pathway to a better managed classroom is through having an emotionally supportive classroom” (Curby et al., 2010, p. 384).

**Child outcomes.** In the authoritative approach, children are included in the rule setting process to provide students with clear understanding, ownership and responsibility (Freiberg, 1999; Glasser, 1988; Hester et al., 2009; Oakes & Lipton, 2007; Slee, 1999; Watson, 2003a). This shared responsibility has a positive impact on the teacher-child relationship which is a key component to providing appropriate guidance for young children (Hester et al., 2009). Through shared decision making students “children feel better about themselves, have higher self-esteem and self-confidence” as they feel more “personal control over their lives” (Gordon, 1989, p. 147).

Authoritative, or person-centered approaches, to teaching and guidance promotes critical thinking and creativity (Cornelius-White, 2007). Positive effects on student cognitive abilities, participation, satisfaction, motivation to learn, self-esteem and social skills have been found when teachers model higher-order thinking and respect for other viewpoints (Cornelius-White, 2007).
Gordon, 1989, stresses the importance of individuals being in democratic relationships with teachers and parents where decision-making power is shared and students are provided with the necessary social-emotional and cognitive skills to engage in problem-solving and conflict resolution situations. Gordon listed several outcomes for children who participate in classrooms and families with more authoritative, or democratic, approaches to child guidance. These outcomes include: “less aggressive behavior”; “less vandalism”; “less child-child violence”; higher self-esteem”; “more social initiative”; “fewer depressions”; “less worry”; and, “less guilt” (Gordon, 1989, p. 203).

**Developmentally appropriate practice.** During the preschool years it is important that children “establish positive and caring relationships with adults and other children; receive carefully planned, intentional adult guidance and assistance; and explore interesting environments with many things to do and learn” (Copple & Bredekamp, 2009, p. 111). Development may be enhanced when children are allowed to see how their behavior and contributions affect the well-being and learning of others (Copple & Bredekamp, 2009). The key feature of classroom guidance approach that is authoritative in nature is that with the assistance and support of the adult, “children learn how to make better decisions the next time” (Copple & Bredekamp, 2009, p. 35).

Teacher behaviors associated with authoritative approaches to guidance and are developmentally appropriate include community building, providing opportunities for collaboration, and creating a classroom reflective of the diversity of the community (Copple & Bredekamp, 2009). Within the authoritative approach, developmentally appropriate practices include “facilitating self-regulation by supporting children in thinking ahead and planning activities”, supporting self-regulation through scaffolding to support increased maturity in
interactions with others, and “involving children in considering rules of group behavior and responsibility” (Copple & Bredekamp, 2009, pp. 158-159).

**Teacher Beliefs**

The integration of teacher beliefs in a study of early childhood guidance and actual practice as measured by teacher-child interactions and relationships brings another level of complexities to the study. Teacher beliefs are “subjective, personal, and reflect individual judgement” and are “influenced by the social, cultural, political and historical contexts teachers experience during their careers” (Levin, 2015, p. 49). However, issues creating a discrepancy between belief and practice include education, cultural factors, tension between teacher need for power and developing autonomy within the child (Wilcox-Herzog et al., 2015, p. 422).

“Conflicting beliefs may exist within a teacher and differentially related to the teacher’s practice depending on the context” (Buehl & Beck, 2015, p. 72). Buehl and Beck, 2015, created an ecological view of supports and hindrances to teacher beliefs and actual practice. In their model external factors include: school, state, and national factors. For instance lack of resources, mandated curricula and curricula standards impact the level in which teacher beliefs and their practice within the classroom are congruent (Buehl & Beck, 2015). Internal factors include their experiences, other beliefs, self-awareness and self-reflection (Buehl & Beck, 2015).

These internal and external factors impacting teacher belief and actual practice are disconcerting as teachers use their beliefs as the reason for the decisions that they make (Levin, 2015). “When teachers are required to implement practices that are at odds with their beliefs about teaching and what is best for students, teacher satisfaction and well-being may be adversely affected” (Buehl & Beck, 2015, p. 73). Thus, their sense of self-efficacy may be
negatively impacted when beliefs and practices are incongruent. However, when they are congruent, it may be found that teachers find their work more satisfactory (Buehl & Beck, 2015).

**Authoritarian Teacher Beliefs.** Teacher beliefs are divided into three categories: pedagogical beliefs, self-efficacy beliefs, and beliefs concerning societal expectations (Vartuli, 2005). Teachers with a lower self-efficacy belief in their own instructional capabilities and a lower sense of the capabilities of their students tend to implement a more authoritarian approach to child guidance and instruction in the classroom (Bandura, 1997; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007; Vartuli, 2005). These teachers may focus more on their deficiencies which may lead to viewing discipline issues as a threat to their capability to be an effective teacher (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007).

Teachers experiencing a lower self-efficacy belief in their own abilities as a teacher “favor a custodial orientation that takes a pessimistic view of student’s motivation, emphasizes control of classroom behavior through strict regulation, and relies on extrinsic inducements and negative sanctions to get students to study” (Bandura, 1997, p. 241). “Teachers with low instructional self-efficacy tend to spend more time on containment and control or nonacademic activities, give up on children if they do not get quick results, and criticize children for failures” (Vartuli, 2005, p. 78).

When teachers with a less positive self-efficacy belief experience failure, they have a tendency to blame outside forces (Henson, 2001). Fewer “mastery experiences” may lead to “an increase in discipline problems and lower student achievement expectations” (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007, p. 10). It has not been determined if limited teaching skills influence the implementation of an authoritarian approach or if authoritarianism beliefs limit the development of teaching skills (Henson, 2001).
Teacher’s pedagogical beliefs impact their approach to child guidance and classroom management and are “derived from experiences that took place long before teachers entered college” (Vartuli, 2005, p. 80). Teachers believing that their students are “conditioned by their environment” and incapable of making “rational decisions” tend to implement an authoritarian approach to guidance (Onwuegbuzie et al., 2000). The authoritarian teacher believes that they must take control of the classroom and all decisions thereby retaining all decision making and enforcement of rules and consequences (Glickman & Tamashiro, 1980; Onwuegbuzie et al., 2000). Canter and Canter’s approach to assertive discipline is a model likely to be implemented within such an authoritarian classroom (Onwuegbuzie et al., 2000).

Teacher beliefs of societal expectations are reflected in student teachers who “often strive to fit in rather than try out new ideas” (Martin, 2004, p. 409). Research indicates that as teachers experience school systems and the school culture they may experience changes in their beliefs of societal expectations which adversely affect their ability to implement developmentally appropriate practices concerning child guidance, instruction, and classroom management (Vartuli, 2005, p. 82). As school administrators make decisions about instructional and guidance approaches to be implemented within the schools, the inability to teach and guide students in ways congruent with teacher beliefs may decrease teacher self-efficacy (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007). It has been found that “without articulating, reflecting and acting on one’s beliefs, it is too easy for teachers to be influenced by the ever-changing political and policy climate experienced during a career” (Levin, 2015, p. 61).

**Authoritative Teacher Beliefs.** The three categories of teacher beliefs are self-efficacy, pedagogy and societal expectations. “Beliefs are instrumental in defining tasks and selecting the cognitive tools with which to interpret, plan, and make decisions regarding such tasks; hence,
they play a critical role in defining behavior and organizing knowledge and information” (Pajares, 1992, p. 325). When teachers hold a positive self-efficacy belief in their capabilities to teach and guide students, they tend to implement guidance models reflecting a more authoritative approach as they believe that all students are capable of learning through effort and appropriate approaches (Bandura, 1997; Onwuegbuzie et al., 2000; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007; Vartuli, 2005).

Due to their positive belief in their own abilities, they are “less threatened by failure” and have a decreased desire for control (Henson, 2001). Moreover, “Teachers who believe strongly in their instructional efficacy tend to rely on persuasory means rather than authoritarian control and to support development of their students’ intrinsic interest and academic self-directedness” (Bandura, 1997, p. 241). Teachers with high teacher self-efficacy beliefs tend to “mirror positive reflections back to the child, showing that all children can learn” as well as develop positive interactions building trust and social competencies (Vartuli, 2005, p. 77). Thus, teachers with a more positive belief in their own abilities are less likely to refer students to special education programming and more likely to experiment with instructional methods and materials (Henson, 2001).

Teacher pedagogical beliefs are related to their teacher self-efficacy beliefs. Teachers with a positive conception of student motivation and ability believe that students desire to do well and that their behavior is a result of inner processes and feelings (Glickman & Tamashiro, 1980; Onwuegbuzie, et al., 2000). Teachers believing in the capabilities of their students may believe that reciprocal interactions with students is important in meeting the needs of the students and that both teachers and students need to be willing to compromise and share responsibility to
resolve conflicts in a respectful climate (Glickman & Tamashiro, 1980; Onwuegbuzie et al., 2000; Vartuli, 2005).

The guidance models of Gordon, Watson, Weinstein, and to some extent Driekurs et al. and Glasser, reflect promotion of autonomy, provide reasons for rules, involve students in democratic decision making and are more likely to be implemented by teachers with a higher sense of student ability, student motivation, the teacher’s own positive sense of teaching self-efficacy, beliefs of societal expectations, and pedagogy (Onwuegbuzie et al., 2000; Vartuli, 2005). These same teachers may be more open to using “current research and knowledge of effective teaching” to address concerns of societal expectations which are not in agreement with their own beliefs concerning teaching, child guidance, and classroom management (Vartuli, 2005, p. 8).

Administrative Leadership

Within the review of teacher beliefs and the variables that impact the congruence of belief and practice issues of school district, state, and national level leadership were mentioned (Buehl & Beck, 2015; Levin, 2015). However, within the Handbook of research on educational leadership for equity and diversity edited by Linda Tillman and James Scheurich, 2013, only one mention was made of early childhood research. Most of the focus of educational leadership research is placed primarily on middle and high school populations.

No matter the age of the children involved in a school, its leaders are charged with the tasks of creating school environments that meet national and state standards as well as fostering collaborative relationships between teachers to enhance productive beliefs (Tschannen-Moren, Salloun & Goddard, 2015). Additionally, teachers have noted that they “are unable to practice their beliefs due to barriers such as administrators” (Wilcox-Herzog et al., 2015, p. 427). Some
of the impacts on administrators stems from national decisions such as No Child Left Behind, The Head Start Act of 2008, as well as grant funding requirements and stipulations.

Historically, educational leadership has been seen as a top-down, authoritarian approach to providing policies and procedures to ensure that the school’s mission, goals, and culture were maintained (Blount, 2013; Lortie, 2002). Teachers follow the direction of the principal who in turn follows the direction of the superintendent of schools. Over the years complaints of administrators by teachers include not enough support and too much interference in the daily operations of a classroom (Lortie, 2002). As educational leadership continues to evolve, other forms of administrative leadership are emerging such as community-based leadership (Sergiovanni, 1996). Sergiovanni describes community-based leadership as “idea-based” with the goal being “to develop a broad-based commitment to shared values and conceptions that become a compelling source of authority” (Sergiovanni, 1996, p. 83).

Authoritarian Administrative Leadership. The leadership style and administrative perspective of a school has an impact on teacher beliefs, pedagogy, and actual teacher practice related to developmentally appropriate practice and child guidance strategies. Authoritarian approaches to guidance are influenced by bureaucratic, personal, and technical-rational authority systems. “Bureaucratic authority relies heavily on hierarchy, rules, and regulations, mandates and clearly communicated role expectations as a way to provide teachers with a script to follow” (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993, p. 25). Students within a bureaucratic authority system are expected to follow school wide rules and procedures for behavior with consequences for violations (Marzano, 2003). Common consequences move from verbal reprimand to expulsion with no discussion of reciprocity (Marzano, 2003). Personal authority is based on the supervisor’s expertise and is coercive as it depends upon a reward which in turn “creates
dependency among followers” (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993, p. 28). Within this approach teachers are expected to “behave appropriately” due to their response to the personality of the leader (Sergiovanni, 1992, p. 30). Teacher performance becomes narrowed as they begin to receive rewards upon meeting the administrative expectations of following the approved script (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993). This is also true when administrators adopt a technical-rational authority stance requiring teachers to conform to policies and procedures in conflict with their beliefs. “When forced to conform, teachers are likely to respond as technicians executing predetermined steps and their performance becomes increasingly narrowed” and tend to conform as long as “they are being rewarded” (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993, p. 29).

As an organization, schools following an authoritarian approach to guidance focus on tasks and achievements that can be counted and measured as a method of obtaining and maintaining legitimacy within the community outside of the school (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993). This control is demonstrated through the use of organizational charts, rules and regulations, monitoring and supervising, and systems of evaluation (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993). Through such an approach to administrative leadership “values such as uniformity, predictability, efficiency, obedience, and conformity can tend to override other human values such as freedom of conscience, creativity, diversity, inventiveness, risk-taking and individuality” (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993, p. 62).

**Authoritative Administrative Leadership.** As discussed in authoritarian approaches, the style of administrative leadership has an effect on the adoption and implementation of child guidance and classroom management models. Sergiovanni and Starratt outline several styles of administrative leadership (Sergiovanni, 1992; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993). The two connected to authoritative guidance approaches are professional authority and moral authority. Within
professional authority, authority is achieved through “seasoned craft knowledge and personal expertise” (Sergiovanni, 1992, p. 31). “Teachers respond in part to personal expertise and in part to internalized professional values and accepted tenets of practice that define what it means to be a teacher” (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993, p. 31). As teachers respond to professional norms, “their performance becomes more expansive” (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993, p. 31).

Administrative leaders should provide for collegiality and professionalism through “establishing governance structures that allow for teacher involvement in decisions and policies for the school” (Marzano, 2003, p. 65).

Moral authority refers to obligation and duties derived from widely shared values, ideas and ideals (Sergiovanni, 1992, p. 31) which is possible as an administrative stance when professional norms are combined with shared community values (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993). Teachers increasingly become self-managers within a moral authority administrative leadership stance and the school moves from an organization to a community (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993). As shared values and beliefs become the norms that govern teacher behavior, focus switches from control through external forces to a community of learners responding to duties and obligations of membership within the community (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993). The role of the administrator becomes more of stewardship (Sergiovanni, 1992).

Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) provide 21 responsibilities for administrative leadership. However, when an authoritative approach to supervision is used, only seven responsibilities remain. These include: 1) being knowledgeable of how an innovation may affect curriculum, instruction, and assessment; 2) being a driving force and supporting beliefs that innovation can create exceptional results; 3) providing intellectual stimulation; 4) being a change agent by challenging the status quo; 5) monitoring and evaluating the impact of innovations; 6)
being directive or nondirective as the situation dictates; and 7) operating in a manner consistent with ideas and beliefs (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005).

**Instruments**

In order to explore teacher beliefs about early childhood guidance, teacher beliefs of their actual practice in early childhood guidance and teacher observed practice within the classroom several tools will be used. These tools include a teacher demographic survey to gather information such as education level, teaching experience, teaching experience in Head Start, and age which may add value to the interpretation of findings associated with the other tools in use. The Classroom Assessment Scoring System for Pre-K (CLASS Pre-K) (Pianta, LaParo, & Hamre, 2008) will be used as a standardized tool for interpreting the observed practice within each individual classroom. Finally, the Early Childhood Guidance Belief Survey (ECGBS-B) (Vartuli, 2013) and the Early Childhood Guidance Belief Survey (Actual Practice) (ECGBS-AP) (Vartuli, 2013) are teacher self-report surveys which will be completed prior to the classroom observation.

**Early Childhood Guidance Belief Surveys.** Exploring specific teacher beliefs through appropriate assessment and investigation may be “the single most important construct in educational research” (Pajares, 1992, p. 329). In the creation and selection of Vartuli’s ECGBS-B and ECGBS-AP scales to be used within this study, several other belief scales were reviewed and discussed including Glickman and Wolfgang’s (1978) Beliefs on Discipline Inventory, Emmer and Hickman’s (1991) Teacher Self-Efficacy of Classroom Management and Discipline revised edition, and Martin’s (1995) Inventory of Classroom Management Style.
Glickman and Wolfgang’s instrument focused on non-interventionalist, interactionalist and interventionalist theories of child guidance (Glickman & Tamashiro, 1980). Glickman and Tamashiro posit that these theories exist on a continuum of the level of teacher and/or child control with non-interventionalists placing more control in the hands of the child, the interventionalist placing the control in the hands of the teacher and interactionalist having a shared control. This self-report instrument was divided into three sections: prediction, forced-choice, and self-scoring. The predication items “represent one’s hypotheses about discipline” which are later compared to beliefs determined by responses in the forced choice section (Glickman & Tamashiro, 1980, p. 460). Each forced choice item is posed in two ways with each connected to one of the three approaches (interventionalist, non-interventionalist, and interactionalist) in order for the responder to select a statement that is most closely related to their personal belief (Glickman & Tamashiro, 1980). This inventory is organized in this manner to allow for shifts between schools of thought as Glickman and Tamashiro assume that “individuals believe in and use techniques from all three schools of thought, although usually one predominates” (Glickman & Tamashiro, 1980, p. 461).

Glickman and Wolfgang’s tool is self-scored in order to provide reflection opportunities for the responder and may be used as an assessment of guidance preferences within in a school or program to inform professional development planning focusing on child guidance (Glickman & Tamashiro, 1980). Information from this survey tool was instrumental in the development of Vartuli’s Early Childhood Guidance Beliefs Survey and Early Childhood Guidance Beliefs Survey (Actual Practice). However, one major shift was the movement from three schools of thought to the use of the two approaches to child guidance: authoritarian and authoritative.
Another is the movement to focusing on specific practices rather than scenarios to depict beliefs and practices.

Likewise, Emmer and Hickman’s scale for Teacher Efficacy in Classroom Management and Discipline is a teacher-self report instrument. The purpose of the creation of this tool was “to determine whether teacher efficacy in classroom management and discipline is distinct from other dimensions of teacher efficacy” (Emmer & Hickman, 1991, p. 757). This instrument contains 36 items rated on a 6-point scale with response choices ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree (Emmer & Hickman, 1991). Each item is scored by the responder as their belief in their own capabilities concerning classroom management and discipline. In their study to determine effectiveness of the scale they found that “Classroom Management/Discipline efficacy and the Personal Teaching efficacy subscales are positively correlated with preference for Positive strategies” (Emmer & Hickman, p. 763).

Through a comparison of items on the Teacher Efficacy in Classroom Management and Discipline instrument and the Early Childhood Guidance Belief Survey it is notable that several items are related. While the Emmer and Hickman instrument focuses on the respondents’ classroom management self-efficacy, the Vartuli surveys focus on their belief of guidance and their belief of their actual classroom practice associated with aspects of early childhood guidance associated with either an authoritative or authoritarian approach. The Emmer and Hickman instrument is constructed for 40 fairly global items while the Vartuli instruments are 18 items in length with a greater representation of specific guidance strategies with responders making selections of levels of importance for the strategy to be used within a classroom.
Table 2

Comparison of Belief Survey Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Efficacy in Classroom Management and Discipline (1991) Scored as: Strongly disagree to Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Early Childhood Guidance Belief Survey (2013) Scored as: Not at all Important to Extremely Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I know what kinds of rewards to use to keep students involved.</td>
<td>It is ______ for teachers to use treats, sticker, and/or staffs to encourage appropriate behavior. It is ________ for children to have competitive activities and for teachers to praise winners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If students stop working in class, I can usually find a way to get them back on track.</td>
<td>It is _____ for teachers to use time out and/or reprimands to encourage appropriate behavior. It is ___ for students to limit talking to peers in the classroom. It is ____ appropriate for me to use praise to change students’ behavior. It is ____ for me to state that the child’s misbehavior is wrong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can keep a few problem students from ruining an entire class.</td>
<td>It is ____ when students are defiant they be sent to the principal’s office. It is ____ for children to understand the feelings and viewpoints of others. It is _____ to emphasize shared values and the moral community when discussing misbehavior.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 reflects commonalities and differences between the two approaches to gathering information concerning classroom management and guidance beliefs that teachers may hold. For the purposes of the proposed study, greater detail is warranted as the goal is to find whether and where teacher’s early childhood guidance beliefs and their beliefs about their actual practice are consistent with results of a standardized observation of their classroom interactions.

The third scale reviewed is Martin’s Inventory of Classroom Management Styles (ICMS). This scale was designed in three dimension subscales: personal, instruction, and discipline to gain greater insight into teacher characteristics, teacher beliefs and management styles (Martin, 1997). Using the terms associated with Glickman and Wolfgang’s instrument of
interventionalist, interactionalist, and non-interventionalist Martin sought to “reflect the degree of teacher power over students” (Martin, 1997, p. 1). Following the instrument format of the forced choice section of Glickman and Wolfgang, the ICMS has a forced choice of two statements per item throughout the 24-item survey (Martin, 1997, pp. 29-32). For example, within the discipline dimension a responder is asked to select which of the following two statements they agree with the most “During the first week of class, I will most likely announce the classroom rules and inform students of the penalties for disregarding the rules” or “During the first week of class, I will discuss class rules with the student” (Martin, 1997, p. 32). In the Early Childhood Guidance Belief Survey, the item dealing with rule formation is “It is ____ for children to be involved in establishing rules for the classroom” (Vartuli, 2014, p. 1, np). Rather than having a forced choice, the responder is able to select a response along a continuum of not at all important to extremely important allowing for the responder to reflect their belief in greater detail.

The forced choice aspect of the ICMS may be thought of in terms of Pajares (1992) caution concerning the study of teacher beliefs. “Belief inventories cannot encompass the myriad of contexts under which specific beliefs become attitudes or values that give fruition to intention and behavior. Individual items fall prey to ‘it depends’ thinking, and responses fail to provide either accurate or useful inferences of behavior” (Pajares, 1992, p. 327). It was posited that the level of detail provided through both the ECGBS-B and the ECGBS-AP in combination with actual classroom observations would assist in the exploration of the relationships between teachers’ beliefs of guidance, teachers’ beliefs of actual practice and actual observation of two distinct guidance approaches thereby providing for deeper understanding of the relationship between beliefs about guidance, beliefs about actual practice and observed practice.
Another feature of the ECGBS-AP that was hoped to provide information at a deeper level of understanding and exploration was the ability for teachers to specify which items reflect where their practice does not align with their beliefs of early childhood guidance but follow school administrative or school district mandates. This allowed the researcher to take into account the discrepancy between teacher beliefs of early childhood guidance, teacher belief of actual practice, and teacher observed practice.

**Classroom Assessment Scoring System Pre-K (CLASS Pre-K).** During the study conducted by Emmer and Hickman (1991) to determine teacher beliefs of classroom management and discipline efficacy, they found that the pre-service teachers’ beliefs of their abilities did not match those of their supervising instructors. Emmer and Hickman suggest that to further understand, “It may be useful to inquire why some student teachers who experience more managerial/behavior difficulties possess relatively high Classroom Management/Discipline self-efficacy. It may be that for these teachers, high self-efficacy is a form of denial and permits them to avoid the negative feelings that an honest self-assessment could produce” (Emmer & Hickman, 1991, p. 763).

This statement expressing the need to explore the possible discrepancy between teacher beliefs concerning their practice and their actual practice is one of reasons that CLASS Pre-K (Pianta et al., 2008) was selected as the standardized observation tool for this proposed study. Where other tools such as the Environmental Rating Scale-Revised (ECERS-R) (Harms, Clifford, & Cryer, 2005) and the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale-Extension, Revised (ECERS-E) (Sylva, Siraj-Blatchford, & Taggart, 2006) focus on the environment, classroom and program organization, prevalence of activities and materials, the CLASS Pre-K “focuses on interactions between teachers and children and what teachers do with the materials
they have” as an indication of quality early childhood programming (Pianta et al., 2008, p. 1). There is no need to use both the ECERS-R and CLASS Pre-K as “CLASS scores are significantly correlated with the Interactions Factor in the ECERS-R” (Dobbs-Oates, Kaderavek, Guo, & Justice, 2011, p. 423).

CLASS Pre-K is divided into three global domains: Emotional Support, Classroom Organization and Instructional Support (Curby et al., 2009). Each domain is further divided into dimensions.

**Emotional Support.** Emotional Support includes positive climate which “reflects the enthusiasm enjoyment, and respect displayed during interactions” (Curby et al., 2009, p. 356). Conversely, Negative Climate reflects the negative tension and tone of a classroom which may be noted in anger, aggression, and harshness (Curby et al., 2009). The third dimension within Emotional Support is that of teacher sensitivity which is “the extent to which teachers provides comfort, reassurance, and encouragement” (Curby et al., 2009, p. 356). The fourth dimension is Regard for Student Perspectives which “captures the degree to which the teacher’s interactions with students and classroom activities place an emphasis on students’ interests, motivations, and points of view and encourage student responsibility and autonomy” (Pianta et al., 2008, p. 22). In using CLASS Pre-K to research children’s development of social skills, it was found that “observed quality of emotional interactions measured by CLASS was positively related to children’s development of social competence and negatively related to children’s development of problem behaviors during Pre-K” (Mashburn, Pianta, Hamre, Downer, Barbarin, Bryant, Burchinal, Early and Howes, 2008, p. 742).
**Classroom Organization.** Dimensions within the Classroom Organization Domain include Behavior Management, Productivity and Instructional Learning Formats (Pianta et al., 2008). Behavior Management is concerned with the “teacher’s ability to use effective methods to prevent and redirect children’s misbehaviors” (Curby et al., 2009, p. 356). “A high behavior management rating reflects a classroom where rules and expectations are clearly stated, there are few if any instances of student misbehavior, and where the teacher is consistently proactive and prevents problems from developing and redirects misbehavior by focusing on positive and using subtle cues” (Dobbs-Oates et al., 2011, p. 423).

The second dimension within the Classroom Organization domain is that of Productivity which “reflects how well the teacher manages instructional time and routines” (Curby et al., 2009, p. 356). The third dimension is Instructional Learning Format which focuses on materials, use of groups, activities and presentation methods employed by the teacher (Curby et al., 2009).

**Instructional Support.** Finally, Instructional Support includes Concept Development, Quality of Feedback and Language Modeling (Pianta et al., 2008). “Concept Development considers the strategies teachers employ to promote children’s higher order thinking skills and creativity through problem solving, integration, and instructional discussions” (Curby et al., 2009, p. 356). Quality of Feedback refers to the teacher’s verbal evaluations of students’ comments, ideas and work (Curby et al., 2009). Language Modeling reflects teacher-child conversations, practices associated with using questioning to extend exploration of ideas, extension of ideas, demonstrating thinking processes through self- and parallel-talk, and providing a variety of words for greater connection to ideas (Pianta et al., 2008).
In addition, the Office of Head Start has endorsed the use of this observational tool for use within grant funded programs to ensure high quality teacher-child interactions within classrooms serving Head Start eligible participants as well as a tool used by the Office of Head Start (OHS) as a part of their review system for grantees (Office of Head Start, 2013a). In the call to improve teacher-child interactions, OHS suggests that more effective Emotional Support will lead to stronger social and emotional development, more effective Classroom Organization will lead to stronger self-regulation and more effective Instructional Support will lead to stronger early academic development in math, language and literacy (OHS, 2013a).

The review of studies implementing CLASS Pre-K as a viable instrument to observe, record, and provide standardized information concerning teacher-child interactions supports the selection of this tool for use with this proposed research (Curby et al., 2009; Dobbs-Oates et al., 2011; Mashburn et al., 2008; Pianta et al., 2008). The implementation of the belief surveys in combination with the CLASS Pre-K standardized classroom observation may provide greater exploration of how teacher beliefs of guidance approaches and teacher beliefs of their actual practice impact the interactions within the classroom.

Conclusion

This chapter presented the literature and theory that form the basis for this proposed study. To provide theoretical basis for understanding teachers’ beliefs about early childhood guidance and children’s development the review included key ideas from John Dewey, Jean Piaget, Lev Vygotsky, Albert Bandura, Diana Baumrind, and, Nel Noddings. This was followed by an exploration of the historical path of beliefs about early childhood guidance leading into a detailed discussion of guidance models informing today’s classroom practices. These models
were limited to those of Marilyn Watson, Thomas Gordon, Carol Weinstein, Rudolf Dreikurs, William Glasser, and Lee and Marlene Canter. As these models were placed on a continuum of guidance approaches ranging from authoritarian to authoritative the following dimensions were discussed in relation to approaches to guidance: goals, teacher beliefs, culturally responsive teaching, community, engagement, respect, teacher-child interactions, classroom organization, child outcomes, developmentally appropriate practice, and administrative leadership. The literature review concluded with a discussion of instruments proposed to be implemented within this study. The intent of this study is to explore early childhood teachers’ beliefs of early childhood guidance, teachers’ beliefs of their own practice and teachers’ observed practice within the classroom. Chapter three will address the design and methodology implemented to address the proposed research questions of the study in addition to describing participants, procedures, instrumentation, proposed analysis and ethical considerations.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter will address the project design and methodology to answer the following research question and subsequent hypotheses. Additional sections address methods, participants, procedures, instrumentation, proposed analysis, and ethical considerations.

Research Questions

The research questions for this study were:

1) What is the relationship between early childhood teachers’ self-reported beliefs and practice about early childhood guidance and actual observed practice?

2) Are more positive interactions between children and teacher, as measured by CLASS, found in classrooms where the teacher beliefs of guidance are consistent with their practice?

3) Do inconsistencies between administrative policy and teacher beliefs have an impact on teacher guidance practice?

Hypotheses

Research Hypothesis 1: Early childhood teachers with higher guidance scores reflecting an authoritative approach on the Early Childhood Guidance Belief Survey (ECGBS-B) and higher guidance scores reflecting an authoritative approach on the Early Childhood Guidance Belief Survey (Actual Practice) (ECGBS-AP) will have higher scores for teacher-child interaction scores, as measured by CLASS.
Research Hypothesis 2: Early childhood teachers with higher discrepancy scores between the ECGBS-B and the ECGBS-AP will have lower teacher-child interaction scores, as measured by CLASS.

Research Hypothesis 3: The higher the number of items indicating that the teacher’s actual practice does not match their beliefs but he/she follows administrative or school district mandates will result in lower CLASS scores.

Methods

This correlational field study used quantitative data augmented by qualitative information in a concurrent embedded approach with the qualitative information providing support for the quantitative findings. Creswell (2009) defines this strategy as having “a primary method that guides the project and a secondary database that provides a supporting role in the procedures (Creswell, 2009, p. 214). In the case of this study, the quantitative strategies were used to drive the project with the qualitative sources providing support, further information and perhaps a greater understanding of the dynamics within the classroom observed, the teachers’ beliefs as well as their perceptions concerning the administrative directives or shared vision with the school, center or district. This purpose fit with the use of the model to “gain broader perspective as a result of using the different method as opposed to using the predominant method alone” (Creswell, 2009, pp. 214-215).

Participants

Ideally, this study would have included all Head Start programs within large metropolitan areas. However, the time intensity of observational research made this an unrealistic goal at the time this study was conducted. The population that was accessible was the Head Start classrooms within three Head Start delegate agencies within the same Head Start grantee. This
study proposed to collect survey information and classroom observations of 50 teachers within the three delegate agencies. The three delegate agencies had differing child guidance policies which may have enhanced the results of the study.

One delegate agency was a large Midwestern urban school district, the second was a large non-profit agency in both urban and rural sections of a metropolitan area and the third was comprised of classrooms in other non-profit centers located throughout the metropolitan area. These three agencies agreed to participate in this project. The school district served over 600 children with 30 teachers in 30 part-day classrooms. The first nonprofit agency provided direct services to over 600 Head Start children with 24 teachers, 10 of these classrooms provided part-day school-year preschool experiences with the remaining 14 providing full-day full-year preschool programming. The second nonprofit agency provided oversight for partnership centers providing full-day full-year services to over 500 Head Start children with 25 teachers. Part-day programs may have had teachers working with one group of students in the morning and a second group of students in the afternoon. In this case in any classrooms selected to participate only one session per teacher was observed.

**Procedures**

In order to gain permission to conduct the study, administrators representing the three delegations met with the researchers and adviser. This was a thirty-minute meeting during which plans for the study, tools to be used, and goals were shared. The researchers answered questions posed by the group concerning the confidentiality of all information gained, timelines, and use of any data collected. The non-profit delegate agency provided oversight to partnership locations held a second meeting in which administrative representatives of the partnership centers received this information and a call for participation.
Following the approval of this study through the University of Missouri at Kansas City Institutional Review Board (IRB), the grantee director was contacted to schedule the meeting time and date at the Mid-America Head Start office. The researchers contacted the administrative representatives of the delegate agencies and extended the invitation. If the date and time was not conducive to a group of participants, the researcher worked in collaboration with the administrative representatives of the particular delegate agency to schedule a date, time, and location for additional meetings which met the needs of the classroom staff within the centers.

During this brief meeting, teachers were given a brief overview of the project, an agreement to participate, a demographic questionnaire with an open-ended prompt concerning guidance practices, the Early Childhood Guidance Belief Survey (Vartuli, 2014), and the Early Childhood Guidance Belief Survey of Actual Practice (Vartuli, 2014). The teachers were asked to complete these items during the meeting. Each classroom with a completed agreement to participate and the two completed surveys were observed for two hours following the guidelines of the CLASS protocol by CLASS approved observers during the months of February and March 2015.

**Instrumentation**

**Quantitative information.** A brief questionnaire was distributed to participating teachers. This questionnaire provided information concerning teacher gender, teacher age, teacher ethnic group, experience teaching preschool, experience working within the Head Start program, educational level, and the guidance method currently adopted by the program in which they currently teach. Two self-report surveys were completed by all teachers participating in the proposed study and provided the two independent variables for this exploration: Early Childhood
Guidance Beliefs (Vartuli, 2014) and Early Childhood Guidance Beliefs about Actual Practice (Vartuli, 2014).

The Early Childhood Guidance Belief Survey is an 18-item Likert-type scale designed to determine if the teacher’s beliefs are consistent with a more authoritative approach the focus or a more authoritarian approach. The response scale range from “extremely important” to “not important at all”. The 2005 version of this scale included 20 items with the intent of determining whether the teachers’ beliefs reflected a teacher-centered or student-centered approach to early childhood guidance.

This 2005 scale was completed by 15 graduate and undergraduate students in the Fall of 2012 at a small Midwestern university located in a large urban area enrolled in a child guidance course. The students were asked to rate the statements based on their beliefs of early childhood guidance. The Cronbach’s alpha for the total scale was .75 (n = 15).

The original scale and collected responses were reviewed by three experts. The scale was revised for clarity, the ability to reflect culturally responsive teaching, as well as a change in focus in teacher beliefs of early childhood guidance between authoritarian and authoritative approaches to early childhood education. The scale was reduced to 18 items on two subscales (authoritarian and authoritative).

The revised scale was completed by 17 graduate and undergraduate students in the Spring of 2014 at the same small Midwestern university located in a large urban area enrolled in a child guidance course. The students were asked to rate the statements based on their beliefs of early childhood guidance. The reliability for the subscales was completed. The Cronbach’s alpha for the authoritative scale with nine items was .78 (n = 17). The Cronbach’s alpha for the authoritarian scale with nine items was .71 (n = 17). These results indicate that the instrument is
a reliable tool to measure authoritative and authoritarian teacher beliefs of early childhood guidance.

The use of Cronbach’s alpha as an appropriate measure of estimates of reliability has been supported through theory and actual practice (Furr & Bacharach, 2014). “The estimates from alpha are likely to be accurate more often than those that would have been obtained from methods such as the split-half approach” (Furr & Bacharach, 2014, p. 143). Thus, the use of alpha to estimate reliability reduced the need for other methods of estimating reliability such as parallel forms and split-half (Furr & Bacharach, 2014).

The Early Childhood Guidance Belief Survey (Actual Practice) (ECGBS-AP) self-report survey was created for this proposed study as a method of measuring if teachers believe that their beliefs about child guidance are evident in their actual practice. The questions for the ECGBS-AP were created by modifying the questions of the ECGBS-B survey.

Teachers participating in this project were asked to rate the 18-items constituting the ECGBS-AP on a 5-point Likert-type scale indicating how often they employ the guidance strategy to address common behaviors and activities within the classroom. The scale responses range from “never” to “always”.

With districts and schools adopting guidance programs to meet federal and state mandates for school improvement or school reform, teacher beliefs may not be reflected in their actual practice which may create a discrepancy between belief and practice concerning early childhood guidance affecting the classroom environment and student achievement. Teachers were instructed to circle any items on this survey where they viewed that their actual practice did not follow their own beliefs about early childhood guidance but rather the teachers’ believed that their current practice reflected the administrative policies, procedures and/or adopted method of
child guidance. The ECGBS-AP was created for this study; therefore, no prior publication of reliability was available at the time of the present study. Reliability of this instrument will be reported upon completion of the study in Chapter 4.

The Classroom Observation Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) (Pianta, LaParo, & Hamre, 2008) is a tool to measure classroom effectiveness adopted by the Office of Head Start. All of the classrooms in this proposed study have the opportunity to be evaluated using this tool both through the self-assessment process, grantee assessments and federal reviews conducted by the Office of Head Start. It is a familiar tool for administrators, education coordinators, and teachers participating within this proposed study. This tool will be used to provide the dependent variables included within this proposed study.

This study was designed to explore teacher practice outcomes as measured through classroom observations. The CLASS covers three different domains which are included in understanding classroom environments and teacher practice: Emotional Support, Classroom Organization, and Instructional Support.

Emotional Support looks at Positive Climate, Negative Climate, Teacher Sensitivity and Regard for Student Perspectives (Pianta, LaParo, & Hamre, 2008). Information gained through this portion of the CLASS instrument should provide detailed exploration of and support for whether or not the teachers ‘self-reported belief of early childhood guidance and the teachers’ self-reported beliefs of their actual practice are consistent with observed actual practice.

The second CLASS Pre-K domain that was of importance to this exploration was Classroom Organization. The dimensions within this domain are Behavior Management, Productivity, and Instructional Learning Formats (Pianta et al., 2008). Of primary interest was the teacher’s method of behavior management. Information gained through this portion of the
tool should support the teachers’ beliefs of being authoritarian or authoritative in their approaches to early childhood guidance as well as if their self-reported beliefs concerning their actual early childhood guidance practice matches the observed practice within their classroom.

The final CLASS Pre-K domain of interest in this exploration was Instructional support. The dimensions in this domain include: Concept Development, Quality of Feedback and Language Modeling (Pianta et al., 2008). Information gained from this portion of the assessment tool should provide additional support for understanding the manner in which the teacher’s belief of early childhood guidance and their belief of their current practice in connection with administrative decisions concerning early childhood guidance and classroom management are reflected in the relationship and interactions between teachers and children.

The developers of CLASS require that all raters meet rigorous standards for implementation. “It is essential that all individuals interested in using the CLASS to collect standardized data on classrooms or for research, accountability, or evaluation purposes attend official training workshops” (Pianta et al., 2008, p. 7). All researchers, who were not currently certified as raters for CLASS, involved with this proposed project attended two days of CLASS approved training. In order to achieve rater status, all participants scored within one scale point of the gold-standard responses at least 80% of the time (Pianta et al., 2008; Downer, Lopez, Grimm, Hamagami, Pianta & Howes, 2012).

The CLASS observations were scheduled for two hours per classroom in keeping with the recommendations of the instrument developers in order that four complete cycles of 20 minutes of observation and 10 minutes of scoring be completed in each classroom for each teacher participating in this research (Pianta, et al., 2008). This schedule of four cycles is reported as providing the greatest reliability estimates using Cronbach’s alpha for each CLASS
dimension. The following are the reported alphas for each dimension and the overall domain to be assessed in this project based on a sample of 240 preschool classrooms: Positive Climate (.89), Negative Climate (.86), Teacher Sensitivity (.90), Regard for Student Perspective (.80), Behavior Management (.89), Productivity (.82), Instructional Learning Formats (.79), Concept Development (.83), Quality of Feedback (.84), and the Emotional Support (.91), Classroom Management (.87), and Instructional Support (.86) domains (Pianta et al., 2008, 98). Thus each domain and dimension within this tool are considered to demonstrate reliability of the measure if used in a manner consistent with approved training and by raters achieving 80% of the CLASS approved standards for inter-rater reliability. In keeping with strict inter-rater reliability standards, 10-20% of all classroom observations in this study were inter-rated. The researcher concurrently rated one of every five observations conducted by each observer assisting with data collection. If the inter-rater standard of 80% of all scores being within one point of the researcher’s score was not achieved during any of these inter-rater observations, the researcher conducted concurrent observations with the observer for every observation until the reliability score was met.

Items within each dimension were scored using a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from “1 (minimally characteristic) to 7 (highly characteristic)” (Pianta et al., 2008, p. 9). In 2013, OHS published the National Overview of Grantee CLASS Scores. All scores were collected during the 2012-2013 program year from observations conducted at 359 Head Start grantees. The reported mean global domain scores obtained across all 359 grantees were: Emotional Support, 5.99 (SD= .34); Classroom Organization 5.63 (SD = .43); and, Instructional Support 2.72 (SD = .50) (OHS, 2013a). The dimension scores for each domain were reported as: Positive Climate, 5.97 (SD=.41); Negative Climate 1.05 (SD=.08); Teacher Sensitivity, 5.70
According to The Office of Head Start, “classrooms need to have fairly high levels of Emotional Support and Classroom Organization, at or around a score of 5 on the CLASS, to promote positive social development and reduce problem behaviors” (OHS, 2013b, p. 7). “When classroom interactions are characterized by CLASS Instructional Support scores of 3 or above, children demonstrate greater gains in early academic and language skills” (OHS, 2013b, p. 7). Thus, even by the threshold standards, Head Start programs nationally are in need of additional focus on program improvement through systematic and standardized classroom observation leading to greater understanding of classroom interactions.

As the tools suggested for use within this study demonstrate reliability, it is important to demonstrate the connections between the three instruments and the approaches to guidance which may be represented within their classrooms and self-report surveys. For this purpose the following crosswalk between a sample of items on each instrument is presented. To determine if the teachers’ response to an item is either authoritarian or authoritative in approach for the purpose of this crosswalk, the item is included if the response would be “very important” or “extremely important” on the ECGBS-B and “frequently” or “always” on the ECGBS-AP.
Table 3

Crosswalk of Instrument Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Childhood Belief Survey</th>
<th>Early Childhood Belief Survey (Actual Practice)</th>
<th>CLASS Pre-K</th>
<th>Approach to Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is ___ for the child to participate in establishing classroom rules.</td>
<td>I ___ involve children in establishing rules for the classroom.</td>
<td>Emotional Support: Respect for Student Perspective</td>
<td>Authoritative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is ___ for the teacher to use time out or negative comments or reprimands to teach appropriate behavior.</td>
<td>I ___ use time out and/or reprimands to encourage appropriate behavior.</td>
<td>Emotional Support: Negative Climate</td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is ___ for children to limit talking with peers.</td>
<td>I ___ limit student talking to peers in the classroom.</td>
<td>Emotional Support: Regard for Student Perspective</td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is ___ for children to understand the feelings and perspectives of others.</td>
<td>I ___ have children understand the feelings and viewpoints of others.</td>
<td>Emotional Support: Teacher Sensitivity</td>
<td>Authoritative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is ___ for children to do what adults ask and not question authority.</td>
<td>I ___ ask children to do what adults ask and not question authority.</td>
<td>Classroom Organization: Behavior Management</td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is ___ for teachers to take class time to teach social, communication, and self-regulation skills, and conflict resolution.</td>
<td>I ___ take class time to teach social, communication, and self-regulation skills, and conflict resolution.</td>
<td>Classroom Organization: Behavior Management</td>
<td>Authoritative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is ___ for me to use praise to change students’ behavior.</td>
<td>I ___ use praise to change students’ behavior</td>
<td>Instructional Support: Quality of Feedback</td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is ___ to state that the child’s misbehavior is wrong.</td>
<td>I ___ state the child’s misbehavior is wrong.</td>
<td>Instructional Support: Quality of Feedback</td>
<td>Authoritative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qualitative information.** Qualitative information augmented the quantitative survey data collection, helping add clarity and provide support for findings of the quantitative data. The qualitative data collected included an open-ended prompt added to the demographic information
Sheet. The open-ended prompt read “Teacher guidance practices are impacted in many ways. How have administrative policies influenced your guidance practices?” This prompt was given prior to the completion of the ECGBS-B and the ECGBS-AP surveys. The timing of this prompt was to ensure that the response was not influenced by reactions of the participants to their reflections of their guidance beliefs and practices stimulated through the completion of the surveys. Each of the responses were recorded on an excel spreadsheet to maintain information and to begin the coding process using pattern analysis (Miles, Huberman & Saldana, 2014). Data were coded at the first and second levels to identify emergent themes. First level coding, defined as, “a way to initially summarize segments of data” was implemented (Miles et al., 2014, p. 86). Within this first coding several themes began to emerge. These include: curricula, guidance models, administrative responsibilities, teacher practices and a group of miscellaneous comments. The initial codes were entered next to the statements in the excel spreadsheet and consisted of the following labels: Admin for Administrative responsibilities, T for training, TC for curriculum training, TG for guidance training, P for practice, M for miscellaneous comments and NR for no response. As this gathering of data involved 56 individuals with 51 written responses, this level of coding provided the guidance necessary to take the coding to the next level. During the second level of coding, a matrix was designed to collapse first-level codes into the primary themes of the responses from the teacher participants within this study. Emergent themes included administrative responsibilities (policies, decisions, regulations and programming), training in curriculum, training in guidance model, teacher practice, and miscellaneous comments. These statements were further analyzed for positive impact, negative impact, or no impact by +, -, and x, in order to gain additional insight into the perceptions of the
teachers within the classrooms and their beliefs of consistencies or inconsistencies of their beliefs and practices.

Analysis

Preliminary analysis. This research involved the collection of data on continuous variables with the exception of demographic information. Teacher beliefs of early childhood guidance were collected using the ECGBS-B with responses ranging from a score of 1 “Not at all important” to a score of 5 “Extremely Important”. The teachers’ beliefs of their actual classroom practice of child guidance will be collected using the ECGBS-AP. The response scores for each of the 18 items will range from a score of 1 “Never” to a score of 5 “Always”. To ensure the appropriateness of the data collected to continue with the analysis process, the major variables were reviewed for normality, linearity, and the co-linearity between variables. Preliminary tests were conducted to ensure that assumptions of multiple regression were met. These assumptions include normally distributed outcome scores, linear relationships among pairs of variables, and homogeneity (Warner, 2013). As such the researcher looked for outliers, multicollinearity, normality, as well as skew and kurtosis. Following the quantitative data analysis of the research questions and hypotheses, the data were used in connection to the qualitative data in order to see if additional support for the findings can be established.

Descriptive analysis. The descriptive analysis was provided information concerning the correlations between variables and all instruments. The descriptive analysis included charts and tables of the demographic information such as age, experience teaching preschool, and educational level from the teacher participants and centers, schools as well as delegate agencies. Means and standard deviations will also be shared.

Regression and correlational analysis. It was predicted that teacher beliefs about their actual classroom practice of early childhood guidance would be a moderator in the beliefs and
/or interaction relationships within the classroom. The relationship between the authoritative predictor variables was expected to have a positive correlation with the criterion variable CLASS scores. Conversely, the relationship between the authoritarian predictor variables was expected to have a negative correlation with the criterion variable CLASS scores. Thus, it was expected that when teacher beliefs of an authoritarian guidance approach were high, and when teacher beliefs that their actual practice reflected an authoritarian approach to child guidance were high, their CLASS scores would be low. Conversely, when teacher beliefs of child guidance reflected an authoritative approach to child guidance and their beliefs of their actual practice reflected an authoritative approach to child guidance, the CLASS scores in these classrooms would be high. Additionally, it was expected that when teacher beliefs of early childhood guidance reflect authoritative approaches to guidance but their actual practice beliefs reflect inconsistency with an authoritative approach due to administrative guidance and classroom management policies, the resulting CLASS scores would be low.

There were four multiple regression equations for this study. The first one dealt with the total CLASS score. The second through fourth equations focused on the CLASS score for each domain of Emotional Support, Classroom Organization and Instructional Support respectively. The first equation was \( Y' = b_0 + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 \) where \( X_1 \) was the ECGBS-B score, \( X_2 \) was the ECGBS-AP score, and \( X_3 \) was the discrepancy score. This equation allowed that for one-unit increase in scores on the ECGBS-B a \( b_1 \)-point increase would be made in the CLASS score while controlling for changes in the ECGBS-AP scores, and discrepancy scores. It was expected that actual practice scores would be impacted by administrative policies. These incongruent beliefs were believed to relate to the CLASS outcome scores. Higher error variance was expected due to the inability to control for variables in a non-experimental field study.
This study included three predictor variables (teacher beliefs of child guidance, teacher beliefs of actual guidance practice, and scores indicating discrepancy between belief and practice due to administrative policies) for each outcome variable (total CLASS outcome score, CLASS outcome score for Emotional Support, CLASS outcome score for Classroom Organization, and CLASS outcome score for Instructional Support). As such hierarchical multiple regression was used as an inferential statistical test to find a predicted Y value of CLASS scores from independent variables of teacher beliefs of guidance, teacher beliefs of actual practice, and the congruence of administrative policies concerning child guidance. This was compared to actual CLASS scores. A coefficient of determination, $R^2$, was used to represent the proportion of variance explained the combination of variables. This study was only be able to suggest relationships and correlations. Following the quantitative data analysis of the research questions and hypotheses, the data were used in connection to the qualitative data in order to see if additional support for the findings could be established.

**Ethical Considerations**

Approval from the University of Missouri at Kansas City Institutional Review Board (IRB) was obtained prior to this study being conducted. This study has a low risk to participants as this was an exploration rather than a study involving experimental treatments.

Teachers were considered a vulnerable population in this study. However, they were not individually identified within this study nor were changes made to their environment. In addition, since CLASS Pre-K is the adopted assessment tool for Head Start programs, these classroom teachers are regularly observed using CLASS for federal review of the program and professional development purposes.
Observers have the potential of changing the environment. However, consistent with the approved CLASS training, observers made every effort to remain undisruptive during the two hour observation within each classroom in order to obtain clear and consistent results of the scoring of the instrument. The risk to benefit ratio should be considered low for this proposed study.

Permission was gained from the Head Start grantee (Mid-America Head Start), the delegate agencies within Mid-America Head Start and consent forms were signed by the classroom teacher participants. The study’s premise, risk and benefits were explained to administrative representatives for all delegate agencies prior to presenting any information to classroom teachers. Classroom teachers were given an overview of the proposed study prior to gaining their decision to voluntarily participate. Administrative representatives from the grantee and delegate agencies as well as participating classroom teachers were provided with the researcher’s and the research supervisor’s contact information. There were no penalties for individuals not volunteering to participate in the study. There is always inconvenience associated with having someone observe in the classroom as well as time to attend the overview meeting and completion of the self-report surveys and demographic questionnaire. A thank you was given at the end of the study. The Head Start grantee agency was able to provide hours for the completion of the observations due to their interest in the study.

As a final ethical consideration, teachers working within the center supervised by the researcher were not included in the request for participation in the study in order to avoid any possibility of coercion to participate or conflict of interest. Likewise, none of the other classroom observers had oversight or supervisory responsibilities for any participating center or classroom.
Limitations

There were several limitations to this study. First, the proposed study had no funding to support observations, meetings, or to cover stipends for classroom observers and/or teachers. The participation in the project from the teachers to the observers was completely voluntary. In the case of two individuals volunteering to support with classroom observations, their inter-rater CLASS training and materials were provided by the researcher. Therefore, the sample size was limited.

A second limitation was the time consuming process of conducting CLASS observations. Five observers completed all of the CLASS observations within this study. The observers engaged in continued interrater observations in which the research and one observer at a time observed the same classroom at the same time to ensure that all observations met the requirements of CLASS master coding (Pianta et al., 2008).

Fifty-six teachers participated. This required 112 hours of actual observation time. Volunteers to assist with the data collection did so out of kindness and a belief in the importance of the information to be gained. This group of observers was able to conduct these 56 observations. However, more observations would not have been feasible in the time allotted with the observers available. It was hoped that the results of this project may provide support for future research looking at teacher beliefs of child guidance, teacher beliefs of their actual practice and the impact of administrative decisions concerning child guidance approaches, models and strategies and their impact on early childhood classroom quality.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter provides a review of the research questions and hypothesis followed by a description of the participants and a review of the results of the current study. The results associated with each research question follows. The chapter concludes with a discussion of supplemental analysis of data. Additionally, to assist in understanding information presented within this chapter references will be made to tables and appendices.

The purpose of this investigation was to explore the relationship between early childhood teachers’ beliefs about child guidance (ECGBS-B, Early Childhood Guidance Belief Survey-Beliefs, Vartuli, 2014), early childhood teachers’ beliefs about their own practice (ECGBS-AP, Early Childhood Guidance Belief Survey-Actual Practice, Vartuli, 2014) and their actual observed classroom practice (CLASS, The Classroom Assessment Scoring System, Pianta, LaParo & Hamre, 2008).

Multiple hierarchical regression, correlational analyses and analysis of qualitative statements and observations were used to address the following research questions.

1) What is the relationship between early childhood teachers’ self-reported beliefs and practice about early childhood guidance and actual observed practice?

2) Are more positive interactions between children and teachers, as measured by CLASS, found in classrooms where the teacher beliefs of guidance are consistent with their practice?

3) Do inconsistencies between administrative policy and teacher beliefs have an impact on teacher guidance practice?
Hypotheses

Research Hypothesis 1: Early childhood teachers with higher guidance scores reflecting an authoritative approach on the Early Childhood Guidance Belief Survey (ECGBS-B) and higher guidance scores reflecting an authoritative approach on the Early Childhood Guidance Belief Survey-Actual Practice (ECGBS-AP) will have higher scores for teacher-child interaction scores, as measured by CLASS.

Research Hypothesis 2: Early childhood teachers with higher discrepancy scores between the ECGBS-B and the ECGBS-AP will have lower teacher-child interaction scores, as measured by CLASS.

Research Hypothesis 3: The higher the number of items indicating that the teacher’s actual practice does not match their beliefs but he/she follows administrative or school district mandates will result in lower CLASS scores.

Participants

It was proposed that the teachers recruited for participation in this exploration would be from classrooms which were overseen by Mid-America Head Start. However, with a lower number of Head Start teachers being able to participate, additional teachers were recruited from early learning centers within the greater metropolitan area. Head Start teachers accounted for 46 (82%) of the participants and the remaining 10 (18%) teacher participants were from not-for-profit early learning centers in the same geographical region as the Head Start classrooms.

Of the total of 56 teachers, 19 (34%) held state teaching certification. Of those 19, 12 (63%) held certification in early childhood. The mean years in early education was $M = 10.65$ (SD = 8.72), with a range of three months to 32 years. Years employed with the current employer ranged from two months to 18 years with $M = 4.40$ (SD = 4.72). Fifty-four (96.4%) of
the teachers were employed in full-time positions with two (3.6%) working between 20 and 35 hours per week. Thirty-seven teachers (66.6%) taught in full-day classrooms while the remaining 19 (33.9%) taught in part-day classrooms. Half of the teachers were between the ages of 24 and 47 years. All but three of the participants were female (94.6%). Twenty-two (39.3%) of the participants self-identified as Black while 24 (42.9%) selected White, 5 (8.9%) selected Hispanic, one (1.8%) selected Native American, and 4 (7.1%) selected the designation of Other.

In order to explore the characteristics of these two groups of teachers more fully, a comparison of the Head Start teachers and non-Head Start teachers was conducted. As mentioned above 46 of the teachers were Head Start and 10 were Non-Head Start. The education levels of the two groups were similar with 85% of the Head Start Teachers having a BA or less in any field and non-Head Start teachers having 100% at the same level. Four Head Start teachers had degrees higher than a BA. Twenty-six percent of the Head Start teachers held teaching certification as compared to 50% of the non-Head Start teachers. Years in the field of education were comparable with 85% of Head Start teachers and 90% of the non-Head Start teachers being in the field for 20 years or less with 76% of the Head Start teachers and 80% of the non-Head Start teachers being in the same position for six years or less. Eighty percent of the Head Start teachers and 100% of the non-Head Start teachers are between the ages of 18 and 47. The largest difference in the two program types appears with race of teachers with only one teacher or 10% of the teachers in non-Head Start classrooms identifying as black while the 68% Head Start Teachers self-identified as black. Additionally, 39% of the Head Start classrooms were identified as being part-day classrooms while only 10% of the non-Head Start classrooms were part-day. Due to the differences between the Head Start and non-Head Start teachers in education levels, certification, length of time with employer, length of time in their present
position, and CLASS scores the researcher decided to continue with the discussion focusing on only the Head Start teacher participants. See Table 1 for complete demographic information.

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of Teacher Participants (n = 56, Head Start (n = 46), Non-Head Start (n = 10))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Head Start</th>
<th>Non-Head Start</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 56</td>
<td>n = 46</td>
<td>n = 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest education level completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than BA in any field</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BS in early childhood or other field</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher than a BA in any field</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood/Elementary Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Certification</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 1

**Demographic Characteristics of Teacher Participants (n = 56, Head Start (n = 46), Non-Head Start (n = 10)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Head Start</th>
<th>Non-Head Start</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 56</td>
<td>n = 46</td>
<td>n = 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in the early education field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 months – 10 years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1 years – 20 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.1 years – 32 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years with current employer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 months – 3 years</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 years – 10 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1 years – 18 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in current position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 months – 1 year</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 years – 6 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 years – 25 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of Teacher Participants \((n = 56, \text{ Head Start } (n = 46), \text{ Non-Head Start } (n = 10))\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Head Start</th>
<th>Non-Head Start</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 56)</td>
<td>(n = 46)</td>
<td>(n = 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present employment status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full day</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part day</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (Years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-47</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 – 60+</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of Teacher Participants (n = 56, Head Start (n = 46), Non-Head Start (n = 10))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Total n = 56</th>
<th>Head Start n = 46</th>
<th>Non-Head Start n = 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>22 (39.3%)</td>
<td>21 (46%)</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>24 (42.9%)</td>
<td>15 (33%)</td>
<td>9 (90%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>5 (8.9%)</td>
<td>5 (11%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4 (7.1%)</td>
<td>4 (9%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preliminary Analysis

Descriptive statistics were run to assure the normality of all major variables. Bivariate scatterplots were used to check for the linearity of correlations. There were three values missing due to participants leaving an item blank on the ECGBS-S and ECGBS-AP forms. Scale means were substituted for these missing items. Between ECGBS-B, ECGBS-AP, and CLASS instruments, multicollinearity was not found to be an issue as the correlations were below .75.

Instrumentation Results

In addition to completing the demographic survey, participants completed the Early Childhood Guidance Belief Survey (ECGBS-B, Vartuli, 2014) and the Early Childhood Guidance Belief Survey of their Actual Practice (ECGBS-AP, Vartuli, 2014). Observers
completed classroom observations using the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS, Pianta et al., 2008). All instruments are included in Appendix A.

The evaluation of the Early Childhood Guidance Belief Survey (ECGBS-B).

Participants were asked to rate their belief of eighteen items of early childhood guidance representing both authoritarian and authoritative beliefs on a scale of one to five representing “not at all important” to “extremely important”. The total early childhood guidance belief mean score and standard deviation on the ECGBS-B, for n = 46, was 75.18 (5.45). When computing the mean and standard deviation for this instrument, the items associated with authoritarian approaches to child guidance were reversed. The total possible score had a range of 54-90. Higher scores indicated more authoritative beliefs of early childhood guidance.

Reliability of this instrument was tested using Cronbach’s alpha, α = .62. In quoting Kline (1999), Fields (2009) states that "when dealing with psychological constructs values below even .7 can realistically be expected because of the diversity of the constructs being measured" (Fields, 2009, p. 675). Reliability could be increased by deleting two different belief statements from the survey. If item 14, “It is ___ for teachers to use praise to change students’ behavior”, were removed the reliability value would increase to α = .669. Additionally, if item 17, “It is ___ to state that a student’s misbehavior is wrong”, were removed the reliability value would increase to α = .624. Table 2 has complete mean and standard deviation results for ECGBS-B.
Table 2

*Mean and Standard Deviations for each ECGBS-B response (n = 46)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It is ___ for students to be involved in establishing rules for the classroom.</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It is ___ for teachers to use time out and/or reprimands to encourage appropriate behavior. (Reversed)</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It is ___ for teachers to use treats, stickers, and/or stars to encourage appropriate behavior. (Reversed)</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It is ___ for students to limit talking to peers in the classroom. (Reversed)</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It is ___ for students to understand the feelings and viewpoints of others.</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. It is ___ for teachers to develop caring relationships with all children.</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. It is ___ for students to do what adults ask and not question authority. (Reversed)</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. It is ___ for students to have competitive activities and for teachers to praise winners. (Reversed)</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It is ___ for teachers to facilitate, and encourage peer interactions and cooperative group learning opportunities.</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. It is ___ when students are defiant they be sent to the principal’s office. (Reversed)</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. It is ___ for teachers to ignore home situations to keep the focus on the learning tasks and plans. (Reversed)</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. It is ___ for teachers to communicate and collaborate with families and listen to family members’ perspectives.</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. It is ___ for teachers to take class time to teach social, communication, and self-regulation skills and conflict resolution.</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. It is ___ for teachers to use praise to change students’ behavior. (Reversed)</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. It is ___ for students to express emotions in non-hurtful ways.</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. It is ___ for teachers and students to set up a system of logical consequences to match classroom rules.</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. It is ___ to state that a student’s misbehavior is wrong. (Reversed)</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. It is ___ to emphasize shared values and the moral community when discussing behavior.</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 2

*Mean and Standard Deviations for each ECGBS-B response (n = 46)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Scale Score</td>
<td>75.18</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: 5 point scale*

The results of the self-reported beliefs included in the ECGBS-B revealed a negative skew, \(-.981 (SE = .350)\) and a positive kurtosis of \(1.187 (SE = .688)\). This indicates near symmetrical distributions in the participant’s scores. The results of the self-reported beliefs of their own practice related to early childhood guidance show a negligible negative skew of \(-.664 (SE = .350)\) and a kurtosis of \(0.212 (SE = .688)\).

There was a moderate statistically significant correlation between the Early Childhood Guidance Belief Survey- Beliefs and the Total CLASS score \((r = .30, p < .05)\). The domains of CLASS did not have statistically significant correlations with ECGBS-B. Table 9 has complete correlation data.

**The evaluation of the Early Childhood Guidance Belief Survey (ECGBS-AP).**

Participants were asked to rate their belief of their own practice representing both authoritarian and authoritative beliefs on a scale of one to five representing “never” to “always (multiple times daily)” respectively. The total early childhood guidance belief of actual practice mean score and standard deviation on the ECGBS-AP was 74.52 (6.46). When computing the mean and standard deviation for this instrument, the items associated with authoritarian approaches to child guidance were reversed. The total possible score had a range of 54-90. Higher scores indicated
early childhood guidance practices more closely associated with authoritative practices.

Reliability of this instrument was tested using Cronbach’s Alpha, $\alpha = .74$. While tests of intelligence are expected to achieve a value of .8 or above, ability tests may have a value of .7 and be considered reliable, and tests involving psychological constructs may have a value below .7 (Field, 2009). The value of this instrument could be increased by deleting three items. If item 7, “I ___ set up a system of logical consequences to match classroom rules with the children”, were deleted Cronbach’s alpha would increase to .76. If item 8, “I ___ state that students’ misbehavior is wrong”, were deleted Cronbach’s alpha would increase to .76 and if item 9, “I ___ emphasize shared values and the moral community when discussing misbehavior”, were deleted Cronbach’s alpha would increase to .76. Table 3 has complete mean and standard deviation results for ECGBS-AP.

Table 3

*Mean and Standard Deviations for each ECGBS-AP response (n = 46)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief of Practice</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I ___ send students to the principal’s office when they are defiant. (Reversed)</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I ___ ignore home situations to keep the focus on the learning tasks and plans. (Reversed)</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I ___ communicate and collaborate with families and listen to family members’ perspectives.</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I ___ take class time to teach social, communication, and self-regulation skills and conflict resolution.</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I ___ use praise to change students’ behavior. (Reversed)</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I ___ want students to express emotions in non-hurtful ways.</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I ___ set up a system of logical consequences to match classroom rules with the children.</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I ___ state that students’ misbehavior is wrong (Reversed)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I ___ emphasize shared values and the moral community when discussing misbehavior.</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 3

*Mean and Standard Deviations for each ECGBS-AP response (n =46)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief of Practice</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. I ___ have students to understand the feelings and viewpoints of others.</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I ___ develop caring relationships with all students.</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I ___ ask students to do what adults ask and not question authority. (Reversed)</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I ___ have competitive activities and praise winners. (Reversed)</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I ___ facilitate, and encourage peer interactions and cooperative group learning opportunities.</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I ___ involve children in establishing rules for the classroom.</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I ___ use time out and/or reprimands to encourage appropriate behavior. (Reversed)</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I ___ use treats, stickers, and/or stars to encourage appropriate behavior. (Reversed)</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I ___ limited talking to peers in the classroom. (Reversed)</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Scale Score**  
74.52  6.46  

*Note: 5 point scale*

There was a strong statistically significant positive correlation between ECGBS-B and ECGBS-AP ($r = .59, p < .01$). The remaining correlations involving this instrument were not significant. Complete correlation data is found in Table 9.

**The evaluation of the Discrepancy between ECGBS-B and ECGBS-AP.** As participants rated their belief of their own practice representing both authoritarian and authoritative beliefs on a scale of one to five, they were asked to circle items which they believed demonstrated their practice did not match their beliefs. The total discrepancy mean score and standard deviation was .52 (1.55). The total possible score had a range of 0 to 18 as each item was scored 0 or 1. Some participants did not indicate any discrepancies between their belief of early childhood guidance and their practice of early childhood guidance in the classroom. The
The frequency of each item selection is shared in Table 4 to provide additional analytical information.

Table 4

*Frequency and Percentage of Selection for Discrepancy Scores (n = 46)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discrepancy of Belief and Practice</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I ___ send student to the principal’s office when they are defiant.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I ___ ignore home situations to keep the focus on the learning tasks and plans.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I ___ communicate and collaborate with families and listen to family member perspectives.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I ___ take class time to teach social, communication, and self-regulations skills and conflict resolution.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I ___ use praise to change students’ behavior.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I ___ want students to express emotions in non-hurtful ways.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I ___ set up a system of logical consequences to match classroom rules with children.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I ___ state that students’ misbehavior is wrong.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I ___ emphasize shared values and the moral community when discussing misbehavior.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I ___ have students to understand the feelings and viewpoints of others.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I ___ develop caring relationships with all students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I ___ ask students to do what adults ask and not question authority.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I ___ have competitive activities and praise winners.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I ___ facilitate, and encourage peer interactions and cooperative group learning opportunities.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I ___ involve children in establishing rules for the classroom.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I ___ use time out and/or reprimands to encourage appropriate behavior.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I ___ use treats, stickers, and/or stars to encourage appropriate behavior.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I ___ limited talking to peers in the classroom.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( Frequency/ 46)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Discrepancy scores were examined in relation to total CLASS scores to provide another view of the connection between teacher-child interactions, as measured by CLASS, and the teacher’s beliefs of early childhood guidance, their beliefs of their actual practice and their belief of the discrepancy between their belief and their practice as it plays out within their classroom. The total CLASS score is comprised of the scores for the three domains of CLASS: Emotional Support, Classroom Organization, and Instructional Support. Each domain has a total possible score of 7 points. Thus, total CLASS score has a total possible score of 21 points. Discrepancy scores were coded as 0 or 1 for each item. If the item was selected by the teacher to indicate that their actual practice on that item was different from their belief the item was scored as 1. There are 18 items of the ECGBS-AP survey that may have been selected; therefore, the total possible discrepancy score for each teacher participant was 18. Table 5 has information concerning total CLASS scores, and the number of items self-reported to indicate the discrepancy between teacher belief and their actual practice of early childhood guidance.

Table 5

Percentages of ECGBS-AP scores identified as discrepant per individual CLASS score (n=46)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total CLASS Score (21 possible)</th>
<th>Total Discrepancy Score (18 possible)</th>
<th>Percentage of Discrepancy (Total Discrepancy/18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 5

Percentages of ECGBS-AP scores identified as discrepant per individual CLASS score (n=46)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total CLASS Score (21 possible)</th>
<th>Total Discrepancy Score (18 possible)</th>
<th>Percentage of Discrepancy (Total Discrepancy/18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.83</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.08</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.88</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.83</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 5

Percentages of ECGS-AP scores identified as discrepant (n=46)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total CLASS Score (21 possible)</th>
<th>Total Discrepancy Score (18 possible)</th>
<th>Percentage of Discrepancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.83</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.03</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 5

Percentages of ECGBS-AP scores identified as discrepant (n=46)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total CLASS Score (21 possible)</th>
<th>Total Discrepancy Score (18 possible)</th>
<th>Percentage of Discrepancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.92</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of items selected as differing between belief and practice are present at a higher rate when total CLASS scores are lower. The lowest one-third of the total CLASS scores ranged from 8.88 to 13.42 (n = 15). Below a total CLASS score of 13.42 (n = 15), 18 items were selected as discrepant between early childhood guidance belief and belief of actual practice. The highest total CLASS scores ranged from 15.31 to 18.41 (n =16). Within this group, 16 items were selected to indicate that belief and practice were inconsistent. Thus, it appears that the majority of issues of teacher belief of early childhood guidance not matching practice occurred at both spectrums of the CLASS scores.

Total discrepancy had a moderate statistically significant negative correlation with ECGBS-B ($r = -.33, p <.05$). Total discrepancy did not have a significant correlation with any other instrument. Table 9 has complete correlation data.

The Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS). The CLASS (Pianta, LaParo & Hamre, 2008) assessment tool was used to observe 56 teachers. Interrater reliability was maintained throughout this study by double coding at least one cycle for nine (16%) of the 56
classrooms observed following reliability requirements stated in the instrument coding protocol. When there was an issue with coding, the researcher and the observer discussed their scores and the reasons behind each one. In addition, the two raters continued to engage in double coding until 80% or greater agreement was achieved. Detailed scoring results are displayed in Table 6.

### Table 6

**Inter-rater Results, Winter 2015**

#### Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Climate</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Climate</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Sensitivity</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regard for Student Perspectives</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Management</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Learning Format</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept Development</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Feedback</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Modeling</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: * indicates matching scores, + indicates scores within 1, and – indicates scores not in agreement.*
Each teacher was observed in four 20 minute observations with 10 minute scoring cycles between each observation. All observations occurred between February and May 2015. Teacher scores were averaged across their four cycles. Two subgroups of scores were compared as the administration and eligibility for each program was very different. Forty-six of the classrooms were from Head Start programs providing services to children and families at or below the poverty line and overseen by the grantee, Mid-America Head Start. The remaining 10 classrooms were from non-Head Start early childhood programs providing services for children and families in a parent-pay tuition-based program. Table 7 lists means and standard deviations for the three CLASS domains and their dimensions as a total for the study as well as in the two subgroups of Head Start and non-Head Start.

Table 7

CLASS Means and Standard Deviations of Domains and Dimensions – Winter 2015 (n =56)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total (n = 56)</th>
<th>Head Start (n = 46)</th>
<th>non-Head Start (n = 10)</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Support</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Climate</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 7

**CLASS Means and Standard Deviations of Domains and Dimensions – Winter 2015 (n = 56)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total (n = 56)</th>
<th>Head Start (n = 46)</th>
<th>non-Head Start (n = 10)</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M    SD</td>
<td>M    SD</td>
<td>M    SD</td>
<td>LL         UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Climate (Reversed)</td>
<td>6.91 .20</td>
<td>6.90 .22</td>
<td>7.00 .00</td>
<td>-.250       .033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Sensitivity</td>
<td>5.60 1.00</td>
<td>5.55 1.08</td>
<td>5.80 .50</td>
<td>-.948       .457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regard for Student Perspectives</td>
<td>5.02 1.00</td>
<td>4.89 1.03</td>
<td>5.63 .30</td>
<td>-1.417      -.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Organization</td>
<td>5.45  .80</td>
<td>5.39  .86</td>
<td>5.75  .29</td>
<td>-.914       .195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Management</td>
<td>5.74  .96</td>
<td>5.65  1.00</td>
<td>6.18  .29</td>
<td>-1.173      .119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>5.65  .86</td>
<td>5.61  .91</td>
<td>5.80  .52</td>
<td>-.789       .417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Learning Formats</td>
<td>4.99 1.03</td>
<td>3.67 1.02</td>
<td>4.03  .76</td>
<td>-1.065      .374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Support</td>
<td>3.29  .88</td>
<td>3.17  .89</td>
<td>3.81  .62</td>
<td>-1.231      -.039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 7

.CLASS Means and Standard Deviations of Domains and Dimensions – Winter 2015 (n =56)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total (n = 56)</th>
<th>Head Start (n = 46)</th>
<th>non-Head Start (n = 10)</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept Development</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Feedback</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Modeling</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 7 point scale

These CLASS scores are consistent with CLASS scores found in Head Start centers as reported by the Office of Head Start (OHS) as part of their overview of data collected on 359 Head Start grantees in 2013 (Office of Head Start, 2013). Additionally, Pianta et al. (2008) include mean and standard deviation results in the technical appendix of the CLASS Manual (p. 93). This information included the results of observations of 164 preschools participating in My Teaching Partner Study (MTP) conducted by Pianta in 2007. The results of the means and standard deviations of CLASS dimensions for these two studies involving larger numbers of preschool classrooms were comparable to the data gathered in this exploration. See Table 8 for complete comparison.
Table 8

*CLASS Means and Standard Deviations of CLASS Dimensions – OHS (n = 359), MTP (n = 164) and the present study (n = 46)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>OHS (n = 359)</th>
<th>MTP (n = 164)</th>
<th>Present Study Head Start Only (n = 46)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Climate</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Climate</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Sensitivity</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regard for Student Perspectives</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Management</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Learning Formats</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept Development</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Feedback</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Modeling</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: 7 point scale*

Total CLASS score had a moderate statistically significant correlation with ECGBS-B ($r = .30$, $p < .05$) and no statistically significant correlations with either ECGBS-AP or total discrepancy. As expected, total CLASS had statistically significant correlations with Emotional
Support ($r = .87, p < .01$), Classroom Organization ($r = .88, p < .01$), and Instructional Support ($r = .79, p < .01$) as these domains are all included in the total CLASS score. Table 9 has complete correlation data.

The CLASS observation data were checked for normalcy. The Emotional Support domain was negatively skewed, -.800 (SE = .350) with a kurtosis of .212 (SE = .688). Classroom Organization had a low negative skew, -.304 (SE = 3.50) and a kurtosis of -.211 (SE = .688). Instructional Support had a negligible skew of .139 (SE = .350) and kurtosis of .305 (SE = .688). This information is consistent with research findings indicating that across the United States there are generally moderately high positive emotional climates, and moderate to high scores on the dimensions within Classroom Organization (OHS, 2013a; Pianta, et al., 2008).

As the two groups of teachers (Head Start and non-Head Start) represent varying administrative oversight, policies and procedures independent sample t-tests were conducted to see if there were significant differences between the two groups. On average there was no significant differences between the two groups for early childhood guidance beliefs, Head Start ($m = 75.18$, SE = .80) than non-Head Start ($m = 77.84$, SE = 1.85). This difference was not significant $t(54) = -1.38, p > .05$; however, it did represent a small sized effect, $r^2 = .036$. This suggests that 3.6% of the variance in teacher beliefs is accounted for by whether the teacher participant was a Head Start teacher or a non-Head Start teacher.

Similarly, it was found that on average there was no significant difference between groups on teacher beliefs of their actual practice of early childhood guidance, Head Start ($m = 74.52$, SE = .95) and non-Head Start ($m = 76.20$, SE = 1.70). The difference was not significant at $t(54) = -.766, p > .05$. However, it did represent a small-sized effect, $r^2 = .01$. This suggests
that 1% of the variance in teacher beliefs of their actual practice is accounted for by whether the teacher participant is a Head Start or non-Head Start teacher.

The third area in which no significant difference between the groups was found was in the CLASS Instructional Support domain, Head Start (m = 3.17, SE = .13) and non-Head Start (m = 3.81, SE = .20). This difference was not significant, \( t(54) = -2.136, p > .05 \); however, it did represent a small-sized effect, \( r^2 = .06 \). Thus, 6% of the variance in CLASS Instructional Support domain score is accounted for by whether the teacher participant is a Head Start teacher or a non-Head Start teacher.

Independent t-tests indicated significant differences between Head Start and non-Head Start teacher participants for total CLASS, CLASS Emotional Support, CLASS Classroom Organization and total discrepancy. The first area of significant differences was total CLASS, Head Start (m = 14.32, SE = 2.11) and non-Head Start (m = 15.71, SE = .71). This difference was significant, \( t(54) = -2.042, p < .01 \). The second area of significant difference was CLASS Emotional Support, Head Start (m = 5.76, SE = .74) and non-Head Start (m = 6.15, SE = .28). The difference was significant, \( t(54) = -1.642, p < .05 \). The third area of significant difference was CLASS Classroom Organization, Head Start (m = 5.39, SE = .86) and non-Head Start (m = 5.75, SE = .29). The difference was significant, \( t(54) = -1.299, p < .05 \). The final area is significant difference is total discrepancy, Head Start (m = .52, SE = 1.55) and non-Head Start (m = .00, SE = .00). This difference was significant, \( t(54) = 1.060, p < .01 \). Due to these differences only Head Start information will be shared throughout the remainder of this chapter.

The correlations between the total CLASS, CLASS Domains (Emotional Support, Classroom Organization, and Instructional Support), ECGBS-B, ECBGS-AP, and total discrepancy were run. Since the CLASS Domains are subsections of the CLASS tool, it was
expected that the domains would have statistically significant correlations to each other and to the total CLASS score at \( p < .01 \). As ECGBS-AP is closely related to ECGBS-B it was expected that they would have a high correlation. These two scales have a statistically significant correlation at \( p < .01 \). ECGBS-B had a statistically significant correlation with total CLASS (\( p < .05 \)). ECGBS-B did not have a statistically significant correlation with Emotional Support (\( p = .06 \)), Classroom Organization (\( p = .133 \)), or Instructional Support (\( p = .09 \)). The correlations for ECGBS-B and Total CLASS and CLASS domains suggest that teacher beliefs account for 9% of the variance in Total CLASS score, 8% of CLASS Emotional Support, 5% of CLASS Classroom Organization, and 6.5% of CLASS Instructional Support scores. ECGBS-AP had a significant statistical correlation with ECGBS-B only. Total discrepancy was negatively correlated to ECGBS-B and ECGBS-AP with a statistically significant correlation for ECGBS-B at \( p < .05 \).

Detailed correlation results are displayed in Table 9.

Table 9

*Pearson Correlations of CLASS Domains, ECGBS-B, ECGBS-AP and Total Discrepancy for Head Start (n = 46)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Total CLASS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS Domains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Emotional Support</td>
<td>.871**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Classroom Organization</td>
<td>.888**</td>
<td>.784**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4. Instructional Support                     | .788** | .476** | .486** |     |     |     | (continued)
Table 9

*Pearson Correlations of CLASS Domains, ECGBS-B, ECGBS-AP and Total Discrepancy for Head Start (n = 46)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ECGBS-B</td>
<td>.297*</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ECGBS-AP</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>.590*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Total Discrepancy</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>-.328*</td>
<td>-.123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

In addition to correlations between the instruments, statistical power for the sample population of Head Start and non-Head Start teachers was calculated. For Total CLASS score with $\alpha = .05$, power for these two samples was .80. Thus, there was an 80% chance that the null hypothesis would be correctly be rejected when false. According to Warner (2013), “statistical power of .80 is suggested as a reasonable goal” (Warner, 2013, p. 108). Statistical power for the domains of CLASS, ECGBS-B and ECGBS-AP were all less than .80. Statistical power for each of the additional scales are as follows: Emotional Support, .63; Classroom Organization, .47; Instructional Support, .76; ECGBS-B, .38; and, ECGBS-AP, .20. It is believed that statistical power will increase with a larger sample population.

**Qualitative prompt response.** Included in the demographic survey was an open-ended prompt to gain further insight into the manner in which administrative policies and procedures may impact teacher beliefs of their actual classroom practice and provide further exploration of the discrepancy scores. The prompt was stated as “Teacher guidance practices are impacted in
many ways. How have administrative policies influenced your guidance practices?” Through careful pattern analysis (Miles et al., 2014), comments were divided into the following themes: administrative, training, practices, and miscellaneous. Comments rated as administrative included administrative policies, decisions, regulations and programming. Those comments rated as training specifically mentioned training that the teacher-participant received in early childhood guidance and other professional development opportunities such as Head Start Trauma Smart, Conscious Discipline, and ways to handle various situations. Comments that mentioned classroom practices or strategies implemented within the classroom were coded as practices. The miscellaneous code arose from comments that did not mention administrative practices or policies, training received, or classroom practices implemented. After first level coding, the same comments were further analyzed to deduce whether or not the themes had a positive, negative, or no impact by +, -, and x. To ensure that the responses were properly coded, the researcher shared the responses with her research advisor. All codes were discussed between the researcher and her advisor. Corroboration for the coding of each item was attained by analyzing the data with the theoretical framework of sociocultural perspectives in mind (Smagorinsky, 2008). Comments and topics are displayed in Table 10.
Table 10

Administrative Influences on Guidance Practices ($n = 46$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Practices</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th>No Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARC strategies, Head Start Trauma Smart Training, these have both influenced the guidance of my children and how I support them in my class.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When questionable behaviors arise we talk to the parent, education coordinator, advocate and therapist if needed to find a solution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been to many professional development trainings that have helped me to learn to grow in preschool with a child and finding the antecedent to the problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are given and trained on a curriculum (Creative Curriculum) as well as discipline/behavior management policies like ARC, Conscious Discipline, and BIST. We also follow Head Start and NAEYC regulations regarding practice.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It does not affect my guidance practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making sure that it has positive structure. Also, the interest of the children is a key I teach by.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 10

*Administrative Influences on Guidance Practices (n = 46)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Practices</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th>No Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They influence the classrooms to be sure that there is consistency and child retention in our programs to effectively prepare children for kindergarten readiness.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some administrative policies can hinder my capabilities because procedures are more focused on general population vs. individual children.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative policies have influenced my classroom practice. The policies and procedures that the center has implemented help the day to day operation of the classroom run smoothly and ensure child safety.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They have helped implement the strategies used in my classroom and have provided trainings on what we are expected to do.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative policies highly influence my guidance practices as well as my own personal beliefs and values.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing there are more than one way to any given situation. Also helpful to have more than one way to handle certain situations and policy have influenced my beliefs.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 10

Administrative Influences on Guidance Practices (n = 46)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Practices</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th>No Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicate to students in complete sentences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No time. Children need to be happy in the environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has allowed me to be more consistent in allowing the student to use Conscious Discipline practices when children need to relieve aggression.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They really haven't we are just told of policy and procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of money, time and support. Less free time with all documentation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significantly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainings I have attended, also observing them interact with difficult behavior.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being safe at school. Setting goals for the children and the families to contribute their beliefs what they want to contribute in the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 10

*Administrative Influences on Guidance Practices (n = 46)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Practices</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th>No Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It makes you be more creative to get specific tasks accomplished.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Curriculum is not being followed to its true potential.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my experience administrative policies have been completely different than what I was taught in college.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a past location I was treated as a number instead of a teacher. I am known better at my current location.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't believe that we shouldn't be able to not celebrate birthdays and holidays in the school. Due to that they are getting that at home and most families now do believe in this celebration and holidays traditional.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretty good. Following guidelines and policies taught by training at the YMCA, however, using my background in working as a behavioral therapist, and knowledge of behavioral science to manage behaviors.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 10

*Administrative Influences on Guidance Practices (n = 46)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Practices</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th>No Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We have been given resources to use in the classroom that follow the beliefs of the employer. Our policies and procedures align with the beliefs of the employer.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Conscious Discipline in the class has changed the way I interact with children. It is all about connection and making a classroom family.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscious Discipline has changed how I manage children in the classroom and my own children. I was skeptical at first but it really works!</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I value positive interactions. I have positive intent for the actions of others. I am able to assist/support conflict. I have learned new ways to manage my own emotions and guide others through that process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While working in early childhood the two different centers I have worked at using Conscious Discipline with lots of training.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 10

*Administrative Influences on Guidance Practices (n = 46)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Practices</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th>No Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guidance begins with the teacher. Being calm, find out from the child what are you feeling, then we can talk to the child and change behavior through nurturing and being concerned.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When hired, we went through a lot of trainings to teach us the methods/correct ways to handle situations.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes teachers tend to impose their beliefs on others. When discipline and guiding children that don't belong to you, we as teachers have to refer to administrative policies could be challenging at times. But however like the students we are also learning.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS, Project Construct, open-ended conversations, child-directed.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative policies has influenced my guidance practices by giving us a curriculum to go by. Be it Conscious Discipline or Second Steps.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My current administrator is very supportive and open to my ideas. I feel comfortable being myself, and sharing my ideas and beliefs. I think this has made me a more confident teacher.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 10

Administrative Influences on Guidance Practices (n = 46)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Practices</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th>No Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They have influenced me in a positive way. It has helped me in the classroom form my own beliefs.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To maintain control and observation of all situations. Using conscious discipline strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We practice lots of Conscious Discipline with our Safe Spot. Feelings with the Feeling Buddies and Trauma Smart</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I love what I do!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Practices</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th>No Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As noted in Table 10, many of the respondents’ comments included more than one topic relevant to the exploration of the impact of administrative decisions upon teachers’ early childhood practice. Positive comments about the impact of administrative policies were made by 35% (n = 18) of the participants, conversely comments about negative impacts appeared 17.8% (n = 9) of the time. Positive comments included reference to following “Head Start and the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) regulations” and “The policies and procedures that the center has implemented help the day to day operation of the classroom run smoothly and ensure child safety.” Negative impact comments concerning administrative decision making and policies included “Some policies can hinder my capabilities because procedures are more focused on general population versus individual children”. Four percent (n = 2) of the participants’ comments indicated that the administration had no effect on their classroom practices or beliefs. These statements were “It does not affect my guidance practices” and “They (the administration) really haven’t, we are just told of policy and procedures”.

Only positive comments were made in reference to training in guidance methods being provided. These were made by 17% (n = 8) of the participants. One of these statements listed the training that was received in several models representing authoritative approaches to child guidance. “ARC strategies, Head Start Trauma Smart Training, these have both influenced the guidance of my children and how I support them in my class.” This statement indicates that the individual is provided with guidance strategies and training that support her work with children and may indicate that these strategies align with her beliefs of early childhood guidance.

The largest number of comments (50%) (n = 23) were positive and referred to actual practices. One of these statements pointed to training as well as administrative decisions having
a positive effect on their practice. The participant states, “I value positive interactions. I have positive intent for the actions of others. I am able to assist/support conflict. I have learned new ways to manage my own emotions and guide others through that process”. This statement refers to several strategies included in both Head Start Trauma Smart and Conscious Discipline training sessions indicating that the individual is implementing authoritative approaches to guidance and has a positive sense of their efficacy as a teacher implementing these models.

While the majority were pleased with practices, 4% (n = 2) of the comments spoke negatively about actual practice. One teacher’s statement stood out as indicating a negative impact of the administration on their practice at the current time. The teacher stated, “Sometimes teachers tend to impose their beliefs on others. When discipline and guiding children that don’t belong to you, we as teachers have to refer to administrative policies (which) could be challenging at times. But, however, like the students we are also learning.”

It was interesting to note that one guidance model was mentioned several times by name within these responses to a prompt concerning administrative impact on their practice. Conscious Discipline was mentioned by 7 participants (15%) in a positive context. For instance one teacher stated, “It (the administration) has allowed me to be more consistent in allowing the student to use Conscious Discipline practices when children need to relieve aggression”. Another stated, “Using Conscious Discipline in the class has changed the way I interact with children. It is all about connection and making a classroom family”. This last statement may indicate that through training and exposure to this model implementing some authoritative practices has impacted her beliefs of early childhood guidance.

Issues in analyzing this information included answers that seem to speak to aspects of classroom practice that may not have been the intended response of the researcher. As such,
26% (n = 12) of the comments appeared to include miscellaneous ideas or topics. As an example, one teacher simply stated “I love what I do”. Another stated, “Children need to be happy in the environment”. A second complication was that of non-responding. In this exploration, five of the participants did not respond to the open-ended prompt. There may be several reasons for this lack of response including a fear that the information would somehow come back to the individual or it may be that the potential respondent agreed with the administrative decisions and policies resulting in a lack of comment to be made.

**Inferential Analysis**

**Research hypothesis one results.** Research Hypothesis 1: Early childhood teachers with higher guidance scores reflecting an authoritative approach on the Early Childhood Guidance Belief Survey (ECGBS-B) and higher guidance scores reflecting an authoritative approach on the Early Childhood Guidance Belief Survey–Actual Practice (ECGBS-AP) will have higher scores for teacher-child interaction scores, as measured by CLASS.

To explore the possible relationship between teacher beliefs of early childhood guidance (ECGBS-B), teacher beliefs of their own classroom practice in relation to early childhood guidance (ECGBS-AP) and teacher-child relationships in early learning classrooms (CLASS), a hierarchical multiple regression analysis was performed with the data from the 46 teacher participants. The variables of ECGBS-B and ECGBS-AP were entered in two steps. In step 1, CLASS scores were the dependent variable and the ECGBS-B scores were the independent variable. In step 2, the ECGBS-AP scores were entered into the step 1 equation. Examination for collinearity of the independent variables was conducted. Results of collinearity tolerance (model 1, 1.000; model 2, .651) and the variance of inflation factor (model 1, 1.0; model 2, 1.535) suggest that the estimated Betas are well established in the following regression model as
none of the tolerance ratings are below 0.2 and all of the variance of inflation factors are greater than one.

Table 11

Hierarchical Linear Regression of CLASS Teacher-Child Classroom Relationships, Head Start only (N = 46)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Block 1</th>
<th>Block 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B(\text{SE})$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>5.693(4.198)</td>
<td>7.434(4.342)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECGBS-B</td>
<td>0.115 (0.056)*</td>
<td>0.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECGBS-AP</td>
<td>-0.080(0.058)</td>
<td>-0.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$F(df_1, df_2)$

|               | 4.247(1,44)*  | 3.124(2,43)  |

Note. Block 1: Adjusted $R^2 = .067$ and the regression is significant $F(1, 44) = 4.247, p < .05$.
Block 2 $\Delta R^2 = .086, F(2, 43) = 1.912, p = .174$.

The results of this model indicate that the variance accounted for (Adjusted $R^2$) in step one with one predictor variable, teacher beliefs of early childhood guidance (ECGBS-B), equaled .067 with the $F$ ratio being significantly different from zero ($F(1, 44) = 4.247, p < .05$). This indicates that 6.7% of the variance in Total CLASS scores is explained. Additionally, when step two is added Adjusted $R^2 = .086$ with the $F$ ratio being significantly different from zero ($F(2, 43) = 3.124, p = .054$) indicating when teacher beliefs of their own practice in early childhood guidance (ECGBS-AP) is added to the model a total of 8.6% of the variance in total CLASS
scores is explained. $R^2$ minus adjusted $R^2$ at step two provides us with a difference of .041. Thus, ECGBS-AP accounts for 4.1% more variance above that accounted for my ECGBS-B.

The unstandardized regression coefficients ($B$) and intercept, the standardized regression coefficients ($\beta$), for the full model are reported in Table 11. Controlling for teacher beliefs of early childhood guidance, the teacher beliefs of their own early childhood guidance practices did not significantly contribute to the explanation of teacher-child relationships within the classroom (CLASS). However, as expected if the teacher participants’ scores on their practice reflected a discrepancy between what they believed and the administrative policies and guidelines they were to follow there would be a negative impact on CLASS scores.

**Research hypothesis two results.** Research hypothesis 2: Early childhood teachers with higher discrepancy scores between the ECGBS-B and the ECGBS-AP will have lower teacher-child interaction scores, as measured by CLASS.

An analysis of the total CLASS scores and the number of discrepancies selected was conducted. It was found that the 15 lowest total CLASS scores ranged from 8.88 to 13.42 out of 21 possible points. Overall the teacher participants receiving scores of 8.88-13.42 (n =15) on total CLASS had 18 items of discrepancy between belief and practice. In the middle range of scores, 13.47-14.92 (n = 15) only 4 items were selected indicating that their practice was different from their belief of early childhood guidance. Of the highest total CLASS scores ranging from 15.31-18.33 (n =16), 16 items of discrepancy were selected by teacher participants. Thus, the teachers with the lowest total CLASS scores selected more items of discrepancy indicating the lowest scoring teacher-child relationships had the highest discrepancy issues between teacher belief of early childhood practice and teacher belief of actual practice. However, teachers with the highest CLASS scores had a high range of discrepancy scores.
compared to those teachers scoring in the middle ranges. Further, it is interesting to note that the teachers scoring in the middle range of this sample population had significantly fewer areas of discrepancy which may relate to teaching experience, education, and certification levels.

To explore this hypothesis a third step was added to the hierarchical multiple regression performed to respond to hypothesis one. As mentioned previously step one included ECGBS-B and step two included ECGBS-AP. In step three the discrepancy score is added. The discrepancy score is reflective of the items that the teacher participants noted as indicating guidance beliefs that were different in practice from their self-reported belief of early childhood guidance. Examination for collinearity of the independent variables was conducted. Results of collinearity tolerance (model 1, 1.000; model 2, .651; model 3, .885) and the variance of inflation factor (model 1, 1.0; model 2, 1.535 model 3, 1.130) suggest that the estimated Betas are well established in the following regression model as none of the tolerance scores are below 0.2 and all of the variance of inflation factors are above one.

As noted in response to the first research hypothesis, independent samples t-tests revealed that there were significant differences between Head Start and non-Head Start teachers in respect to total CLASS scores and total Discrepancy scores. For this reason, this regression model was run using only Head Start teacher participants (n = 46). The detailed results of this regression model are displayed in Table 12.
Table 1

Hierarchical Linear Regression of CLASS Teacher–Child Classroom Relationships (N = 46)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Block 1</th>
<th>Block 2</th>
<th>Block 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B(SE)</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>B(SE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>5.693(4.198)</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>7.434(4.342)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECGBS-B</td>
<td>0.115(0.056)*</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>0.171(0.068)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECGBS-AP</td>
<td>-0.080(0.058)</td>
<td>-0.244</td>
<td>-0.088(0.057)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrepancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.310(0.203)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F(df_1, df_2, df_3)$</td>
<td>4.247(1,44)*</td>
<td>3.124(2,43)</td>
<td>2.923(3,42)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Block 1: Adjusted $R^2 = .067$ and the regression is significant $F(1, 44) = 4.247, p < .05$. Block 2 $\Delta R^2 = .086, F(2, 43) = 1.912, p = .054$. Block 3 $\Delta R^2 = .114, F(3, 42) = 2.329, p < .05$. *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

The results of this three step model analyzing Head Start teacher participant data indicate that the variance accounted for Adjusted $R^2$ in step one with one predictor variable, teacher beliefs of early childhood guidance (ECGBS-B), equaled .067) with the $F$ ratio being significantly different from zero ($F(1, 44) = 4.247, p < .05$). This indicates that 6.7% of the variance in Total CLASS scores is explained. Additionally, when step two is added Adjusted $R^2 = .086$) with the $F$ ratio not significantly different from zero ($F(2, 43) = 3.124, p = .054$). In step three, the discrepancy score is introduced resulting in Adjusted $R^2 = .114$) with the $F$ ratio being significantly different from zero ($F(3, 42) = 2.923, p < .05$) indicating that when discrepancy
between teacher belief of early childhood guidance and their actual classroom practice is added to the model 11% of the variance in total CLASS scores is explained. \( R^2 \) minus adjusted \( R^2 \) at step three provides us with a difference of .059. Thus, total discrepancy accounts for 5.9% more variance above that accounted for by ECGBS-B and ECGBS-AP.

The unstandardized regression coefficients \( (B) \) and intercept, the standardized regression coefficients \( (\beta) \), for the full model are reported in Table 12. Controlling for teacher beliefs of early childhood guidance and the teacher beliefs of their own early childhood guidance practices, discrepancy scores between the two did not significantly contribute to the explanation of teacher-child relationships within the classroom (CLASS).

**Research hypothesis three results.** Research Hypothesis 3: The higher the number of items indicating that the teacher’s actual practice does not match their beliefs but he/she follows administrative or school district mandates will result in lower CLASS scores.

On Table 4 (page 143), it is noted that items representative of authoritarian beliefs of early childhood guidance were marked as the practice being different from the belief on the ECGBS-AP survey form. “Sending children to the principal’s office when they are defiant as a method of classroom management” was selected by nine (19.6%) participants as a classroom practice different from their belief. Other authoritarian items were selected at a rate of 5% or above were: ignoring the home situation, \( (n = 5, 10.9\%) \); using praise to change behavior, \( (n = 6, 13\%) \); allowing children to express their emotions in non-hurtful manners, \( (n = 3, 6.5\%) \); working with children to create a system of logical consequences to match classroom rules \( (n = 6, 13\%) \); stating the misbehavior is wrong, \( (n= 5, 10.9\%) \); emphasizing shared values, \( (n = 4, 8.7\%) \); asking children to not question authority, \( (n = 4, 8.7\%) \); competition with praise for the winners, \( (n = 4, 8.7\%) \); using time out and reprimands to encourage appropriate behavior, \( (n = \)
10, 21%); using stickers and treats to encourage appropriate behavior, (n = 10, 21%); and, limit talking to peers in the classroom, (n = 8, 17.4%).

To provide additional understanding of the impact of administrative policies or procedures on the relationship between children and teachers in respect to early childhood guidance beliefs and practices, an open-ended statement was included at the end of the demographic survey. All participants were asked to respond to the prompt “Teacher guidance practices are impacted in many ways. How have administrative policies influenced your guidance practices?”

As expected not all of the 46 participants provided a response to this prompt. Five of the 46 (10.8%) did not respond. Positive comments about the administrative policies were provided in 16 responses (35%), two of these responses indicated that under their current employer’s administration they view the impact of policies as positive while expressing a negative impact in previous situations. Nine (19.5%) of the respondents indicated negative impacts on their classroom practice due to administrative policies. Conscious Discipline, a published method of child guidance was mentioned by 7 (15%) of the respondents. Eight (17%) respondents commented that they received training in guidance methods without mentioning a specific guidance method. Classroom practice was mentioned 23 times (50%) in a positive manner while 2 (8.6%) of the responses were negative.

This qualitative data appears to support the quantitative findings within the regression model conducted to address the second research hypothesis. In the regression model it was found that adding discrepancy scores to the model increased the explained variance in total CLASS scores by 5.9%. Thus, some information was provided by including discrepancy scores
to the model indicating that administrative policies may have a small effect on teacher-child relationships.

**Supplementary Analysis**

As CLASS consists of three domains to provide greater insight into the classroom interactions between teachers and children, it was deemed necessary to look at the three domains (Emotional Support, Classroom Organization, and Instructional Support) in greater detail. Therefore to explore the relationships between early childhood guidance beliefs, teacher beliefs of their own early childhood guidance practices, the discrepancies between beliefs and practices in connection to teacher–child relationships as measured by CLASS three additional hierarchical multiple regressions were conducted to see the impact of the predictor variables on CLASS domains of Emotional Support, Classroom Organization, and Instructional Support. As mentioned earlier, there were significant differences found between Head Start and non-Head Start teacher participant responses using an independent t-test for total CLASS, CLASS Emotional Support, CLASS Classroom Organization and total discrepancy score. Therefore, only Head Start information was entered into the regressions run for each of the three CLASS domains presented in the supplementary data analyses to provide greater detail of the data collected during this study.

**Supplemental hierarchical regression model one.** CLASS Emotional Support was the dependent variable in the first of these supplemental hierarchical multiple regressions. ECGBS-B was entered at step one followed by ECGBS-AP in step two and total discrepancy was entered in step three. Examination for collinearity of the independent variables was conducted. Results of collinearity tolerance and the variance of inflation factor were the same as the first multiple regression model as the independent variables are the same. Thus, the estimated Betas are well
established in the following regression model as none of the tolerance scores are below 0.2 and all of the variance of inflation factors are above one. The results of this hierarchical multiple regression are displayed in Table 13.

Table 13

Hierarchical Linear Regression of CLASS Emotional Support, Head Start only (N = 46)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Block 1</th>
<th>Block 2</th>
<th>Block 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B(\text{SE})$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$B(\text{SE})$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.912(1.479)</td>
<td>3.583(1.523)</td>
<td>2.964(1.594)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECGBS-B</td>
<td>.038(0.020)</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td>0.059(0.024)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECGBS-AP</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.031(0.020)</td>
<td>-0.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrepancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.089(0.072)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F(df_1, df_2, df_3)$</td>
<td>3.727(1,44)</td>
<td>3.074(2,43)</td>
<td>2.584(3,42)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Block 1: Adjusted $R^2 = .057$ nor the regression is significant $F(1, 44) = 3.727, p = .06$.

Block 2 $\Delta R^2 = .084$, $F(2,43) = 2.311, p = .06$. Block 3 $\Delta R^2 = .096$, $F(3,42) = 1.528, p = .07$.

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

The results of this three step model indicate that the variance accounted for (Adjusted $R^2$) in step one with one predictor variable, teacher beliefs of early childhood guidance (ECGBS-B), equaled .057 with the $F$ ratio being significantly different from zero ($F_{(1, 44)} = 3.727, p = .06$). This indicates that 5.7% of the variance in CLASS Emotional Support scores is explained.
When step two is added Adjusted $R^2 = .084$) with the $F$ ratio being different from zero ($F_{(2,43)} = 3.014, p = .06$) indicating when Teacher Beliefs of their own practice in early childhood guidance (ECGBS-AP) is added to the model a total of 8.4% of the variance in the total CLASS Emotional Support score is explained. In step three, the discrepancy score is introduced resulting in Adjusted $R^2 = .096$) with the $F$ ratio being different from zero ($F_{(3,42)} = 2.584, p = .07$) indicating that when discrepancy between teacher belief of early childhood guidance and their actual classroom practice is added to the model 9.6% of the variance in the total CLASS Emotional Support score is explained. $R^2 (.156)$ minus Adjusted $R^2 (.096)$ at step three provides us with a difference of .06. Thus, total discrepancy accounts for 6% more variance above that accounted for by ECGBS-B and ECGBS-AP.

The unstandardized regression coefficients ($B$) and intercept, the standardized regression coefficients ($\beta$), for the full model are reported in Table 13. In this regression of Head Start teacher participants only, none of the predictor variables were found to be statistically significant predictors of CLASS Emotional Support. However, when controlling for teacher beliefs in Block 2 and 3, teacher beliefs became statistically significant predictors of CLASS Emotional Support. Controlling for teacher beliefs of early childhood guidance, the teacher beliefs of their own early childhood guidance practices resulted in a negative impact on CLASS Emotional Support scores which were not found to be statistically significant. The discrepancy scores between the ECGBS-B and ECGBS-AP did not significantly contribute to the explanation of the emotional support within the classroom, as measured by CLASS Emotional Support.

**Supplemental hierarchical regression model 2.** Since teacher beliefs had a significant impact on CLASS Emotional Support scores in Block 2 and 3 of the regression, a second supplemental regression was conducted to see if CLASS Classroom Organization scores would
be similarly impacted. CLASS Classroom Organization became the dependent variable and the independent variables (ECGBS-B scores, ECGBS-AP scores and total discrepancy scores) were added in the same block design as in Supplemental Regression Model 1.

As CLASS Classroom Organization was one of areas in which Head Start and non-Head Start populations were deemed to be significantly different following independent t-tests, the regression model includes only Head Start teacher participant information. The results of this hierarchical regression model are presented in Table 14.

Table 14

*Hierarchical Linear Regression of CLASS Classroom Organization, Head Start Only (N = 46)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Block 1</th>
<th>Block 2</th>
<th>Block 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B(SE)$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$B(SE)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.727(1.745)</td>
<td>2.865(1.843)</td>
<td>2.088(1.927)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECGBS-B</td>
<td>0.035(0.023)</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>0.040(0.029)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECGBS-AP</td>
<td>0.024(0.020)</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrepancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.112(0.087)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted $R^2$ 0.029 0.008 0.023

$F(df_1, df_2, df_3)$ 2.340(1,44) 1.178(2,43) 1.347(3,42)

*Note.* Block 1: Adjusted $R^2$ = .029 nor the regression is significant $F(1,44) = 2.340, p = .133$.

Block 2 $\Delta R^2$ = .008 $F(2,43) = .067, p = .317$. Block 3 $\Delta R^2$ = .023, $F(3,42) = 1.649, p = .272$.

*p < .05. **p = < .01.*
This hierarchical regression model does not provide statistical significance. This is not surprising as the only statistically significant correlations between CLASS Classroom Organization and other variables included in this study was with total CLASS ($r = .888$, $p < .01$), CLASS Emotional Support ($r = .784$, $p < .01$) and CLASS Instructional Support ($r = .486$, $p < .01$). The dimensions within CLASS Classroom Organization include behavior management, productivity and instructional learning formats. With this said it is interesting to note that Early Childhood Guidance Beliefs-Actual Practice scores have a negative, but not significant, impact on total Classroom Organization scores.

The unstandardized regression coefficients ($B$) and intercept, the standardized regression coefficients ($\beta$), for the full model are reported in Table 14. Controlling for teacher beliefs of early childhood guidance, the teacher beliefs of their own early childhood guidance practices resulted in a negative impact on CLASS Classroom Organization scores which were not found to be statistically significant. The discrepancy scores between the ECGBS-B and ECGBS-AP did not significantly contribute to the explanation of the Classroom Organization, as measured by CLASS Classroom Organization.

**Supplemental hierarchical regression model 3.** As supplemental regression model 2 did not result in statistical significance, would instructional support as measured by CLASS have statistical significance since none of the predictor variables had statistically significant correlations with CLASS Instructional Support? The same regression steps were followed with CLASS Instructional Scores becoming the dependent variable. The results of this hierarchical regression model are presented in table 15.
### Table 15

**Hierarchical Linear Regression of CLASS Instructional Support, Head Start only (N = 46)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Block 1</th>
<th>Block 2</th>
<th>Block 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B(SE)$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$B(SE)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.054 (1.798)</td>
<td>.986 (1.836)</td>
<td>.223 (1.921)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECGBS-B</td>
<td>.041 (0.024)</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>0.071 (0.029)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECGBS-AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrepancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F(df_1, df_2, df_3)$</td>
<td>3.026 (1,44)</td>
<td>3.114 (2,43)</td>
<td>2.638 (3,42)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Block 1: Adjusted $R^2 = .043$ nor the regression is significant $F(1,44) = 3.026, p = .089$.

Block 2 $\Delta R^2 = .105, F(2,43) = 3.061, p = .055$. Block 3 $\Delta R^2 = .108, F(3,42) = 1.598, p = .062$.

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

In this model, using Head Start data only, the regression was not significant. Neither Adjusted $R^2$ nor $F$ was statistically significant. In blocks 2 and 3 of this model, ECGBS-B becomes significant. ECGBS-AP has a negative although not statistically significant impact on CLASS Instructional Support. It is interesting to note that total discrepancy did not have a negative impact on CLASS Instructional Support.
Conclusion

Information presented in Chapter 4 included characteristics of the sample of teacher participants, analysis results, analysis of research hypotheses and supplementary analysis. This information included both quantitative and qualitative data.

The first research hypothesis about the relationship between early childhood guidance beliefs of teachers and their beliefs of their actual guidance practice would increase their CLASS scores if their guidance beliefs and practices represented an authoritative approach to early childhood guidance found that teacher beliefs were statistically significant predictors of classroom teacher-child relationships as measured by CLASS for this Head Start sample population. While not statistically significant, teacher beliefs of their own early childhood guidance practice had a negative impact on teacher-child relationship scores as measured by CLASS. This negative impact is as expected in that if policies impair their ability to practice guidance methods that match their beliefs, they would be less effective at creating a teacher-child relationship that would be positive as measured by CLASS.

The second research hypothesis addressed the issue of possible discrepancy between teacher beliefs of early childhood guidance and their actual practice. It was posited that teachers with higher discrepancy scores between ECGBS-B and ECGBS-AP would have lower teacher-child relationship scores, as measured by CLASS. While controlling for ECGBS-B and ECGBS-AP scores, the addition of the total discrepancy scores were not statistically significant in the regression run for the Head Start only sample population. However, review of the actual total CLASS scores and number of items teachers selected to indicate discrepancy between belief and practice demonstrated that teachers with lower total CLASS scores had more items selected as discrepant between their belief and their actual practice in early childhood guidance.
The third hypothesis was addressed using qualitative data collected on the demographic survey as well as asking participants to self-report which early child guidance practices did not meet their early childhood guidance beliefs by circling the items on the ECGBS-AP survey form. Sixteen (35%) of the prompt responses were positive about administrative policies regarding their practice of early childhood guidance strategies.

In reviewing the information counted as discrepancy on the survey form it was interesting to note that the nine items reflecting authoritarian early childhood guidance beliefs were circled at a rate of more than 8.7% with the largest being 21.7% for using time out or reprimands and stickers or treats to encourage appropriate behavior. This indicates that to follow, actual or perceived, administrative policies and procedures, teachers practiced more authoritarian strategies than they believed in.

To further explore the possible predictability of beliefs, practice and discrepancies between beliefs and practices on teacher-child relationships additional regressions were conducted to look at CLASS domains of Emotional Support, Classroom Organization, and Instructional Support. No statistical significance was found for the predictability of early childhood guidance beliefs and teacher beliefs of their actual practice for the Head Start sample population.

Chapter 5 will delve into the discussion of the study results, reveal limitations of this study and provide recommendations for future investigations.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

Information presented in Chapter 5 will include an overview of results of the statistical analyses presented in Chapter 4 followed by a discussion of the conclusions and limitations of the study. The chapter will conclude with suggestions for future research and the educational significance of studying teacher beliefs of early childhood guidance, teacher beliefs of their actual practice in early childhood guidance and the relationship between teacher beliefs and administrative policies and procedures related to early childhood guidance strategies.

This exploration of teachers’ beliefs of early childhood guidance, actual practice of early childhood guidance and the connection with administrative policies and procedures included information gained from 56 teachers in both Head Start and non-Head Start centers took place in a large Midwestern city. Each teacher participant completed a demographic survey with a qualitative informational prompt. In addition they completed two belief surveys. The first survey consisted of 18 statements representing both authoritative and authoritarian beliefs of early childhood guidance. The second survey had two parts. The first part dealt with teacher beliefs of their actual practice through responses to 18 statements representing authoritative and authoritarian approaches to early childhood guidance. In the second part teachers were asked to circle all of the items in which their practice did not match their beliefs. Once all of the survey data were collected, each classroom was observed for four cycles of 20 minute observation and 10 minute scoring periods, resulting in a two-hour observation per classroom.

Using Levene’s test for Equality of Variances it was determined that there were significant differences between the Head Start teacher participants and those from non-Head Start early learning programs. Specifically issues of difference were noted for total CLASS,
CLASS Emotional Support, CLASS Classroom Organization and total discrepancy between early childhood guidance belief survey and teacher beliefs of actual practice of early childhood guidance strategies. As the premise of this study was that discrepancy between teacher beliefs of early childhood guidance and their actual classroom guidance practices would impact teacher-child relationships as measured by CLASS, it was determined that the non-Head Start sample population (n = 10) be removed from further analyses for the present study.

To examine the relationships between teacher beliefs of early childhood guidance, teacher’s self-reported actual practice of early childhood guidance, the discrepancy between their actual practice and beliefs and the teacher-child relationships within each classroom, correlational analyses and regressions were conducted for the Head Start only sample population (n = 46). A discussion of the conclusions and implications of these analyses follows.

Conclusions

Research hypotheses conclusions. Research hypothesis 1: Early childhood teachers with higher guidance scores reflecting an authoritative approach on the Early Childhood Guidance Belief Survey (ECGBS-B) and higher guidance scores reflecting an authoritative approach on the Early Childhood Guidance Belief Survey (Actual Practice) (ECGBS-AP) will have higher scores for teacher-child interaction scores, as measured by CLASS.

To conduct this examination, correlations for the Head Start sample population (n = 46) were run. Statistical significance was found for Total CLASS and teacher beliefs, $r = .297, p < .05$ (two-tailed). No statistical significance was found for Total CLASS score and teacher beliefs of their actual practice, $r = .016, p = .915$ (two-tailed).

Since there was statistical significance between teachers beliefs of early childhood guidance and total CLASS a hierarchical multiple regression was conducted. In the Head Start
sample population (n = 46) it was found that teacher beliefs of early childhood guidance were statistically significant as a predictor of total CLASS scores. This finding was not surprising as many theorists of early childhood guidance addressed issues of authoritative and authoritarian approaches to child guidance with positive relationships connected most closely with authoritative approaches (Dewey, 1897; Piaget as presented by Kamii, 1994; Vygotsky, 1978; Baumrind, 1967, 1978, & 1996; and Noddings, 2002). In looking at the mean scores for the 18 belief survey items, the nine items that were associated most closely with authoritative approaches to guidance had a mean rating of 3.87 (sd= 1.07) to 4.91 (sd = .28) on a five-point scale with 1 indicating that the item was not important and 5 indicated that it was extremely important. Thus, higher scores were associated with authoritative approaches to child guidance and lower scores were associated with authoritarian guidance approaches. Those items most closely associated with authoritarian approaches to guidance had a mean rating of 2.22 (sd =1.13) to 4.63 (sd = .64) on a five-point scale. These items were reverse-coded so that a score of one indicates extremely important and a score of five indicates that the item is not important at all. Therefore a lower score indicates authoritative beliefs of early childhood guidance on these items and a higher score indicates authoritarian guidance beliefs.

Having higher means on the belief scale indicates that teacher beliefs about early childhood guidance are more authoritative. This may indicate that children’s voices are heard in the classroom (Cornelius-White, 2007; DeVries & Zan, 1994; Glasser, 1967, 1988, 1998; Gordon, 2002; Kohn, 1996; Ladson-Billings, 2008; Walker, 2009). It is possible that within a classroom with higher teacher belief scores a focus on inclusion, celebration of differences, and an increased likelihood that the child’s culture will be used as a bridge for success (Chu, 2011; Hachfield, 2008; Tyler, 2008).
Through the hierarchical regression model, it was discovered that Early Child Guidance Belief Survey scores were statistically significant predictors of total CLASS scores. More specifically, with one standard deviation increase in ECGBS-B score, total CLASS score would increase by 2.45 points for the Head Start sample population (n = 46).

While not statistically significant, ECGBS-AP had a negative impact on total CLASS scores. This suggests that there are authoritarian practices that are occurring on a regular basis which are inconsistent with the beliefs the teachers hold of child guidance.

It appears that possibly the discrepancy between what teachers’ believe and what they are required to use as guidance methods may be a contributing factor as tension may arise between “a perceived need for teacher control and child-directedness” (Wilcox-Herzog, Ward, Wong & McLaren, 2015, p. 422). When teacher beliefs and actual practice are incongruent teachers and students may become confused (Oakes & Lipton, 2007). Incongruence between a collaborative, problem solving focus of education leading to autonomy development and a focus of obedience is confusing and may negatively impact school success (Kamii, 1994; Battistich et al., 2004; Weinstein & Romano, 2015). This possible issue of discrepancy paved the way for research hypothesis two.

Research hypothesis 2: Early childhood teachers with higher discrepancy scores between the ECGBS-B and the ECGBS-AP will have lower teacher-child interaction scores, as measured by CLASS.

To address this hypothesis, correlations were run for teacher beliefs of early childhood guidance, teacher beliefs of their actual practice in early childhood guidance, a discrepancy score between beliefs and practices, and total CLASS score. Teacher beliefs of early childhood
guidance and total discrepancy were found to have a statistically significant negative correlation for the Head Start sample population (n = 46).

With the statistically significant correlation between teacher beliefs of early childhood guidance and total discrepancy scores between teacher beliefs of early childhood guidance and teacher beliefs of their actual guidance practice, a third step was added to the hierarchical multiple regression from research hypothesis one. In this model, ECGBS-S scores were found to be statistically significant predictors of total CLASS scores. While ECBGS-AP scores were not found to be statistically significant predictors of total CLASS scores, they did have a negative impact on total CLASS scores. In this third step, discrepancy scores between belief and practice were not found to be statistically significant. This additional step did increase the significance levels of both ECGBS-S and ECGBS-AP scores as predictors with ECGBS-AP scores remaining not statistically significant.

For this model one standard deviation increase in ECGBS-B score would result in an increase of 2.94 points in total CLASS score using data from the Head Start sample population (n = 46). Holding ECGBS-B score constant, a one standard deviation increase in ECGBS-AP would decrease the total CLASS score by 1.69 points for the Head Start sample population (n = 46). Finally, holding both ECGBS-B and ECGBS-AP scores constant, the discrepancy score would increase the total CLASS score by .32 points for the Head Start sample population (n = 46).

This was surprising as it was expected that the difference between belief and practice would be statistically significant. We refer to the items that were circled on the ECGBS-AP as indicators of discrepancy between belief and actual practice which are outlined in Table 4, Chapter 4.
As an illustration, the use of rewards for reinforcing desired behavior is associated with authoritarian approaches to child guidance (Kohn, 1996). In the ECGBS-B survey this was item 3 “It is ____ for teachers to use treats, stickers, and/or stars to encourage appropriate behavior”. Through the descriptive analysis of the data in Chapter 4 it was revealed the mean score was closer to a ranking of “not very important”. On the ECGBS-AP survey, this was associated with item 17 “I ____ use treats, stickers, and/or stars to encourage appropriate behavior” which had a mean score indicating that the teacher uses this method not at all. This is more interesting in light of the data indicating that 10 of the 46 teachers (21.7%) selected this item as their belief not matching their practice.

The second highest ranking practice that was discrepant was that of sending children to the principal’s office for defiant behavior. According to the ECGBS-B survey results teachers believed that this strategy was not very important. On the ECGBS-AP survey the results indicated that teachers used this approach “rarely or one or two times per month”. However, 9 of the 46 individuals (19.6%) selected this item, representing an authoritarian approach to child guidance, as their belief not matching their practice.

Six (13%) of the participants selected using praise to change behavior and eight (17.4%) selected limiting talking to peers as methods employed which were inconsistent with their belief as teacher belief of early childhood guidance not matching actual classroom practice. The question now becomes why teachers are practicing authoritarian methods for child guidance when their beliefs reflect greater authoritative beliefs.

Perhaps the low impact of discrepancy scores and the lack of statistically significant impact of ECGBS-AP scores as a predictor of total CLASS scores may be due to the narrow margin between beliefs and practices as scored on the surveys. Teacher beliefs of early
childhood guidance scores ranged from 80.63 to 69.73. Teacher beliefs of their actual practice scores ranged from 80.98 to 68.06. Other studies have found similarly narrow margins between teacher beliefs and teacher practice (Buehl & Beck, 2015; Skott, 2015).

Another possibility for the low impact of discrepancy scores is administrative changes in approaches to early childhood guidance. Administrative policies may have shifted toward a more authoritative approach of early childhood guidance with less emphasis placed upon behavior modification as a strategy for encouraging appropriate behavior following reviews of suspension and expulsion rates of preschool aged children following guidance from the United States Department of Health and Human Services in the Policy Statement on Expulsion and Suspension Policies in Early Childhood Settings (www.2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/school-discipline/fedefforts.html, 2011).

However, the number of individuals selecting these survey items as indicating that their practice does not match their beliefs may provide a stronger indication that their beliefs are indeed more authoritative than their practice and that their practice is compounded by administrative policies, procedures and expectations (Wilcox-Herzog et al, 2015). Previous research has indicated that beliefs are clustered in such a way that “conflicting beliefs may exist within a teacher and be differentially related to the teacher’s practice depending on context” (Buehl and Beck, 2015, p. 72).

Research hypothesis 3: The higher the number of items indicating that the teacher’s actual practice does not match their beliefs but he/she follows administrative or school district mandates will result in lower CLASS scores.

This research hypothesis was addressed using qualitative data collected from the open-ended prompt on the demographic survey as well as the number of items indicated as
discrepancies and total CLASS score. The total CLASS score is made up of scores in the three domains of Emotional Support, Classroom Organization and Instructional Support. Each domain has a possible score of seven resulting in the total possible CLASS score of 21 points.

The lowest one-third teacher total CLASS scores (n = 15) ranged from 8.88 to 13.42 points while the highest one-third (n = 16) ranged from 15.31 to 18.41 points out of a total possible of 21 points. The 15 teachers with the lowest total CLASS scores selected 18 survey items as indicative of incongruence between their belief of early childhood guidance and their actual practice. This may indicate that the discrepancy between teacher beliefs of early childhood guidance and teacher beliefs of their actual practice of early childhood guidance may have an effect on teacher-child relationships, emotional support, classroom organization and instructional support within the classroom setting.

To explore the possibility that administrative leadership, policies and procedures impacted the inconsistency between belief and practice, qualitative information was gathered through inclusion of a prompt on the demographic survey. Teacher participants were asked to respond to “Teacher guidance practices are impacted in many ways. How have administrative policies influenced your guidance practices?”

These qualitative open-ended comments by teacher participants may provide support for this idea. Positive comments about the administrative policies were provided by 34.7% of the participants while only 19.5% indicated that administrative policies had a negative impact on their classroom guidance practices. In 15% of the responses Conscious Discipline by Becky Bailey, a published method of child guidance, was mentioned by name as the guidance approach implemented within the school, center or classroom with a positive impact. This approach focuses on seven discipline skills: composure, assertiveness, choices, encouragement, positive
intent, empathy and consequences which fall within the scope of authoritative practices (Bailey, 2000). Following the enactment of No Child Left Behind, many school districts adopted authoritarian guidance approaches (Frieberg, 1999; Noguera, 2003; Oaks & Lipton, 2007). In light of 15% of the teacher participants in this study mentioning an approach based on many models and theories, perhaps administrative policies have changed the adopted guidance approaches. Thus, administrative policies may be closer to the actual beliefs teachers hold about early childhood guidance.

Eight (17%) of the responses mentioned trainings on guidance methods and/or curricula being provided to staff members. In a study of teachers with one to six years teaching experience, Levin (2015) reported that 28% attributed their beliefs to their educational programs and 12% attributed them to professional development. In a separate study of beliefs in and implementation of developmentally appropriate practices in preschools Wilcox-Herzog et al. (2015) found that training had an impact on implementation of developmentally appropriate practice.

Of additional interest was a more concentrated review of the circled items on the ECGBS-AP which indicated that the practice of these items did not match their belief of early childhood guidance. The nine items reflecting authoritarian approaches to child guidance were circled by four to ten respondents (8-22%). Items associated with authoritative approaches were circled by one to six individuals (2.1-13%). This suggests that the teacher participants viewed their practice, as mandated by administrative policies and procedures, to be inconsistent with their beliefs of early childhood guidance.

This exploration involved a small number of teacher participants. Perhaps more differentiation would have been noted in a larger sample population covering a larger
geographical area. Twenty-one (45.6%) teacher participants in Head Start classrooms selected any practice as being different from their beliefs. In addition to possible clarification through a larger sample size, quantitative studies of teacher beliefs have revealed “weak to moderate” results through self-reports alone resulting in a call for adding qualitative aspects to such studies (Wilcox-Herzog et al, 2015, p. 68).

**Supplementary analysis conclusions.** It was deemed that looking more closely at the CLASS domains of Emotional Support, Classroom Organization, and Instructional Support as dependent variables and ECGBS-B, ECGBS-AP, and discrepancy scores may provide more insight into the relationships between guidance practices and teacher-child relationships within these smaller subscales of the CLASS observation tool. To address this query three additional hierarchical multiple regressions were run. Each CLASS Domain is the focus of one hierarchical multiple regression model.

**Hierarchical Multiple Regression with CLASS Emotional Support as outcome.** The first of these regressions was determined to look at CLASS Emotional Support as this seemed to be the domain that might have the highest connection to guidance approaches. Using the Head Start sample population (n = 46) data, the correlation between CLASS Emotional Support and ECGBS-B was not statistically significant. The domain of Emotional Support included the following dimensions: Positive Climate, Negative Climate, Teacher Sensitivity, and Respect for Student Perspectives. Each of the predictor variables (ECGBS-B, ECGBS-AP, and total discrepancy) were entered into the regression model in the same steps as the original regression. In this model the predictor variables were not found to be statistically significant predictors of CLASS Emotional Support.
The findings indicated that as authoritative beliefs of early childhood guidance increase, CLASS Emotional Support scores increase. This is as expected since authoritative practices provide affirmation of present qualities, provide standards for future expectations, assist in the development of self-regulation skills, and support children in thinking ahead and supporting interactions with others (Baumrind, 1978; Copple & Bredekamp, 2009; Wilcox-Herzog et al, 2015). Teachers with positive self-efficacy to teach and guide students are more likely to implement an authoritative approach to child guidance stressing the development of social-emotional skills, self-regulation, and autonomy (Bandura, 1997; Onewuegbuzie et al, 2000; Rubie-Davies, 2015; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007; Vartuli, 2005). Such practices include adults sharing power with children through shared decision-making, constructivist approaches to teaching and learning, and authentic opportunities to develop self-regulation, autonomy, and understanding the perspectives of others (DeVries & Zan, 1994; Gordon, 1989; Kohn, 1996).

Additionally, as authoritarian approaches in actual practice increase, CLASS Emotional Support scores decrease. Authoritarian adults have been noted to be less nurturing as they used power with little support or affection as this approach is adult-centered (Baumrind, 1967). It was expected that as the discrepancy between practice and belief increased the CLASS Emotional Support score would decrease as authoritarian practices include rewards, penalties, top-down decision making, and consequences that are adult determined and enforced (Baumrind, 1967; Glasser, 1998; Dreikurs, 2004; Cornelius-White, 2007; Fields et al, 2010; Weinstein & Romano, 2015).

While decreases in CLASS Emotional Scores were noted, they were not statistically significant. Perhaps this lack of statistical significance is in part due to the limitations of using self-reports as a method of gathering clarifying information concerning beliefs of practice.
Studies involving self-report should include observations to determine relationships between teachers’ beliefs and their actual practices (Wilcox-Herzog et al., 2015). In twelve studies of developmentally appropriate beliefs and practices only seven studies found beliefs and behaviors to be moderately correlated and only four of the studies included observations (Wilcox-Herzog et al, 2015). In this study, it was noted that 15 teachers with the lowest total CLASS scores had the highest number of items selected to indicate that their actual early childhood guidance practices did not match their beliefs of early childhood guidance. These 15 teachers selected 18 items as inconsistent between beliefs and practice which is more than the total number of items selected as inconsistent by the highest scoring teacher participants. Looking at CLASS Emotional Support scores and discrepancy scores it was again noted that 15 teachers with the lowest Emotional Support scores continued to have high discrepancy scores through their selection of 20 items marked as inconsistent between belief and actual practice. The teachers with the top 16 Emotional Support scores had a total discrepancy score of 15 items. The margin between teacher beliefs of early childhood guidance and their beliefs of their actual practice of early childhood guidance narrows for this domain of the CLASS assessment tool which may account for part of the lack of statistical significance for this predictor variable. Additionally, it may partially account for the limited impact of total discrepancy scores on total CLASS scores.

**Hierarchical Multiple Regression with CLASS Classroom Organization as outcome.**

The second additional regression took a closer look at CLASS Classroom Organization as predicted by ECGBS-B, ECGBS-AP and discrepancy scores. The Classroom Organization domain is comprised of the dimensions of behavior management, productivity, and instructional learning formats. In the planning of this study it was hoped that this domain would be highly correlated to both teacher beliefs of early childhood guidance and their beliefs of their actual
practice. Following initial analysis of the correlations between the ECGBS-B and ECGBS-AP it was no longer expected that this dimension would be significantly impacted by teacher beliefs and practices. The correlations were not statistically significant for the Head Start sample population for ECGBS-B and Classroom Organization. Similarly, ECGBS-AP and Classroom Organization were not significantly correlated for the Head Start sample population. As expected, the three predictors were found to be not statistically significant as predictors of CLASS scores for the Classroom Organization domain.

While teacher beliefs of early childhood practice, teacher beliefs of actual practice and the total discrepancy score were not found to be statistically significant predictors of Classroom Organization scores it is worth noting the differences in total discrepancy between the teachers with the 15 lowest and the 16 highest Classroom Organization scores. The highest scoring teacher participants experienced more discrepancy issues than the lowest scoring teacher participants.

In order to more fully understand why this occurred, a review of the dimensions and scoring prompts within the domain is necessary. Behavior Management focuses attention on clear expectations, consistency, anticipation of problem behaviors with proactive strategies, and redirection of misbehavior. As noted in the training manual, “if there is no evidence of student misbehavior, it is assumed that effective behavioral strategies are in place” (Pianta et al, 2008, p. 44). There is no mention in this section of authoritative or authoritarian guidance practices as the focus is on prevention and redirection.

The dimension of Productivity focuses on time management and routines. As stated in the training manual, “Productivity ratings should not consider the quality of instruction or student engagement, which are considered in other dimensions” (Pianta et al, 2008, p. 49). This
dimension focuses on students knowing what to do, effective completion of managerial tasks, and teacher preparation rather than on the quality of the learning opportunities. As such, no distinction is made for authoritative or authoritarian guidance practices as the goal for this dimension is to have a smooth running classroom environment in which “everybody knows what is expected of them and how to go about doing it” (Pianta et al, 2008, p. 53).

The final dimension within Classroom Organization is Instructional Learning Formats. This dimension focuses on “the ways in which the teacher maximizes students’ interest, engagement, and ability to learn from lessons and activities” through effective facilitation, variety of modalities and materials, student interest, and clarity of learning objectives make up the areas of focus for this dimension (Pianta et al, 2008, p. 55). Thus, the indicators do not reflect either authoritarian or authoritative practices of early childhood guidance.

**Hierarchical Multiple Regression with CLASS Instructional Support as outcome.** This final regression was not statistically significant. As a predictor of Classroom Instructional Support, ECGBS-AP was found to have a negative impact on CLASS Instructional Support. Both ECGBS-AP and discrepancy scores were not statistically significant for Instructional Support with actual practice which was surprising as this domain includes concept development, quality of feedback, and language modeling.

In a review of the total discrepancy scores related to the lowest and highest CLASS Instructional Support scores it was revealed that the number of items selected as incongruent between belief of early childhood guidance and belief of actual practice of early childhood guidance were fairly consistent. The 15 teachers with the lowest Instructional Support scores selected 13 items as belief and practice being incongruent. The 16 teachers with the highest Instructional Support scores selected 20 items indicating teacher belief of early childhood
guidance and actual practice were incongruent. The margin of discrepancy is expanded to 7 items when analyzing discrepancy in connection with the scores of the Instructional Support Domain of the CLASS assessment tool. It is surprising that the teachers with the highest scores for Instructional Support selected the most items indicating that their practice was incongruent with their belief of early childhood guidance. However, the scores for both groups were low compared to other sample population (OHS, 2013b; Pianta et al., 2008).

It would appear that the items included in the Instructional Support Domain of CLASS are impacted by the teacher-child relationship and the authoritative or authoritarian approaches to child guidance approaches and instructional methods implemented. The focus of this domain is to measure “the teacher’s use of instructional discussions and activities to promote students’ higher-order thinking skills and cognition and the teacher’s focus on understanding rather than on rote instruction” (Pianta et al, 2008, p. 62). Indicators representing more authoritative approaches are included such as: prediction, experimentation, brainstorming, planning together, integrating previous knowledge, and connections related to students’ lives (Pianta et al, 2008).

Discussion

This exploration focused on the impact of teacher beliefs of early childhood guidance and their belief of their practice of early childhood guidance strategies which may be impacted by administrative mandates. The background and supporting theories and constructs were based on three pillars of guidance theories and models, teacher beliefs and administrative leadership.

It was posited that when guidance beliefs are incongruent with practice the relationship between teachers and children would not be as positive. This premise was based on the theories of John Dewey, Jean Piaget, Lev Vygotsky, Albert Bandura, Diana Baumrind and Nel Noddings for early childhood guidance, democratic education practices, and teacher beliefs. John Dewey
brought attention to the inconsistency between wanting children to develop the skills of decision-making and the requirement of conformity to school rules (Dewey, 1897). Piaget picks up this same need for the development of autonomy which is curtailed by teaching obedience (DeVries & Zan, 1994; Kamii, 1994). Lev Vygotsky’s work was used by Bodrova and Leong in their study of Head Start participants and school readiness. They found the key was the development of self-regulation which allows the child to move from following their “own agenda” to following the “school agenda (Bodrova & Leong, 2005, p. 213). Again the theme of self-regulation arises in the work of Albert Bandura (1997). In his theory, schools are to assist students in developing self-regulation to allow them to develop the ability to educate themselves which is negatively impacted by “lock-step” curricula and “response-reinforcement contingencies” (Bandura, 1997, p. 175; Bandura & MacDonald, 1963, p. 275). The addition of Baumrind as a theorist explored for this study brings the understanding of the differences between authoritative and authoritarian aspects of early childhood guidance strategies used within families for the youngest learners. Authoritative parenting styles allow for the individual development level of the child and place a focus on developing self-efficacy and autonomy whereas the authoritarian parenting style places the focus on the authority of the adult which in turn reduces the expectations of the child to participate or be responsible for their own behaviors (Baumrind, 1967, 1978, 1996). Nel Noddings’ work begins in the ideas of caring for and caring about. Noddings addresses the need for children to feel a sense of being cared for which is hindered within school settings (Noddings, 2002). Thus, these theorists are concerned with the development of autonomy, self-efficacy, caring for, perspective-taking and decision-making. Each of these works noted that there are parts of the desired development of these skills that may be hindered by school administrative policies and procedures.
To gain understanding of leadership and administrative practices the works of Thomas Sergiovanni and Robert Starratt were explored. For instance, authoritarian leadership places an emphasis on following rules and regulations from a bureaucratic stance (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993). Within the authoritarian style of administrative leadership the ability of the teacher to follow their own beliefs of education and guidance are limited as they are expected to conform to authority as the children are expected to conform to the authority of the teacher (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993). Conversely, in an authoritative approach to administrative leadership the focus is placed on professional authority and personal expertise with teachers being involved in policy and procedural decision-making (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993).

Another facet of understanding the inconsistencies between teacher beliefs of early childhood guidance, their beliefs of their actual practice, and the administrative policies and procedures is that of culturally responsive teaching and social justice. For this study, the works of Lisa Delpit, Geneva Gay, Gloria Ladson-Billings and Richard Valencia were included. The authoritarian approach to early childhood guidance and administrative leadership place the focus on the mainstream culture which allows maintenance of the status quo, deficit thinking, and may lead to a lack of a sense of community and belonging (Delpit & White-Bradley, 2003; Earick, 2009; Gay 2000; Tyler et al., 2008; Valencia, 2010, 2015). On the other hand, authoritative approaches to guidance and administrative leadership provide opportunities to legitimize different perspectives, focus on individuals, allows for children’s voices to be heard, and clear communication concerning teacher beliefs of the abilities of the student (Delpit, 2012; Earick, 2009; Hachfeld et al., 2011; Howard, 2006; Milner 2011; Tyler et al., 2008; Valencia; 2015).

The research questions and hypothesis were addressed through teacher self-report surveys of teacher beliefs of early childhood guidance, teacher beliefs of their actual practice of early
childhood guidance, teacher reported discrepancies between their belief and their actual practice, teacher responses to an open-ended prompt concerning the impact of administrative policies on their classroom practice and observations using the Classroom Assessment Scoring System tool (CLASS).

CLASS was used to provide information through classroom observation of teacher-child relationships. To provide additional understanding of the CLASS scores obtained in this local, convenience sample population a comparison was conducted between the scores of this study and those of three national studies. While the scores were lower for this exploration than the OHS grantee review (2013), they were higher than both MS SWEEP (Pianta et al, 2008) and MTP (Pianta et al., 2008). The higher scores achieved by OHS and the present study may be due to the decision of the Office of Head Start to use the CLASS assessment tool as a professional development and program improvement tool within the past few years (OHS, 2013).

Throughout this exploration, Early Childhood Teacher Beliefs were positive statistically significant predictors of total CLASS scores. Early childhood teacher beliefs of their actual practice negatively impact the CLASS scores in all domains: Emotional Support, Classroom Organization and Instructional Support. While ECGBS-AP was not statistically significant, it was found to have a negative impact as a predictor of teacher-child interactions, as measured by CLASS. A review of items that teachers selected as their belief and practice being different focused on issues of rule creation, consequences, and rewards. When looking more closely at the lowest CLASS scores for Emotional Support, Classroom Organization and Instructional Support it is clear that teachers with the lowest CLASS scores had selected the most items indicating their practice did not match their belief.
Limitations

This exploration encountered several limitations. The first limitation was finding volunteer teacher participants. Working with the Head Start Grantee for the area it was hoped that 50 Head Start teachers from the four delegate agencies would participate. However, one school district delegate declined to participate. The other three delegate agencies agreed to participate. One of those three was another school district. They have two Head Start centers. As a second study was being conducted simultaneously, only one of the school district centers was able to participate decreasing the expected Head Start teacher participation. This required additional recruitment of participants. Three early learning centers in the area agreed to participate resulting in 10 classrooms which were not a part of a Head Start program. However, the classrooms were all located in centers that were accredited either through Missouri Accreditation or the National Association for the Education of Young Children. This resulted in having 56 participating teachers rather than the original plan of 50 teacher participants increasing time spent in recruitment, scheduling, and observation. Additionally, this may have impacted the results as the ten teacher-participants had higher CLASS scores and fewer items marked as practice not matching belief on the surveys. Additionally, using the Levene’s test of Equality of Variances it was determined that the Head Start and non-Head Start groups were significantly different in respect to Total CLASS scores, CLASS Emotional Support scores, CLASS Classroom Organization Scores, and total Discrepancy scores. The amount and type of administrative oversight, policies and procedures may have had an impact on this difference.

A second issue with the data collection was raised as another agency was observing classrooms using CLASS for an assessment tool for grant project they were completing. The researchers of both projects worked together to ensure interrater reliability. The issue arose
when it became noted that the other organization was conducting only three cycles of CLASS observations rather than the four required by CLASS for appropriate data collection for research purposes. These teacher participants were asked to allow the researcher of this project to come in and complete a fourth cycle. All of the teachers agreed resulting in additional scheduling, classroom disruptions by having visiting observers in the classroom on more than occasion, and added stress to teachers being observed for a separate cycle within 13 Head Start classrooms included in the study.

This second study may have had an impact on teacher beliefs as well as administrative policies and procedures as they provided training with modeling in a specific method of early childhood guidance (Wilcox et al, 2015). These researchers and therapists implemented Head Start Trauma Smart in 26 (56.5%) of the 46 Head Start classrooms within eight centers involved in this project. Head Start Trauma Smart is funded by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and provided centers with a therapist to work with select children with challenging behaviors both within the classroom and in private therapeutic sessions. “The model gives all Head Start staff and parents training to create calm, connected classrooms and home environments that recognize and address behavioral and other problems triggered by trauma, and provide the supports for children to learn and thrive” (http://www.rwjf.org/en/how-we-work/grants/grantees/head-start-trauma-smart.html, 2015). The specific model implemented in these centers involved 20 hours of teacher training. Therapists provided coaching on implementing Head Start Trauma Smart strategies for developing resilience among young children for a team of teachers within the center as well as provide additional therapeutic services for up to four children for seven of the eight centers participating in the Head Start Trauma Smart project. As modeling and training have been found to be connected with belief and practice development perhaps the Head Start
Trauma Smart program of intensive training and classroom modeling of strategies may have impacted the outcomes of this exploration (Buehl & Beck, 2015; Levin, 2015; Wilcox-Herzog et al, 2015).

A third limitation is using self-report for beliefs of practices and the discrepancy between teacher beliefs of early childhood guidance and actual practice as individuals may provide responses they feel are expected (Furr & Bacharach, 2014). The results of the self-reported discrepancy between belief and actual practice indicate a positive skew of 4.728 (SE = .319) and kurtosis of 25.622 (SE = .628). As the items of Total Discrepancy are coded one for a discrepancy between the teacher’s reported belief of early childhood guidance and the teacher’s belief of their actual practice affected by administrative or center policies and standards this may not be the best way to report this information. Providing more qualitative research strategies may assist in providing greater understanding of what teachers perceive as differences in their belief and their practice as well as sources of this discrepancy. Skott (2015) suggests adding observations of team meetings, department meetings, interviews with administration, as well as less formal activities such as staff room conversations to gather information that may have less complications with individuals reporting what they think others want to hear or what is the expected response.

In addition to these limitations found once the exploration began, several possible limitations were outlined in chapter one. These included small sample size, reliance on self-report surveys to provide information for the predictor variables, and appropriate methods to gain information exploring perceived administrative restrictions on the guidance methods that teachers used within the classroom.

**Implications**
The results of this study suggest that additional information may be gained by conducting this study with a larger sample population. The statistical power for each domain and the early childhood belief surveys may be increased using a larger population. The sample population for this study achieved a power of .80 for Total CLASS scores. However, this was the only instrument where this was the case as all other scores ranged in power from .20 to .76.

Additionally, some of the discrepancies between teacher beliefs of early childhood guidance and their own practice revealed that the 10 teachers in non-Head Start programs did not report any discrepancies whereas the Head Start teacher population had a mean of .52 with a standard deviation of 1.55 indicating that there were instances of discrepancy between belief and practice. These differences raise questions for future researchers. For instance, how much of the discrepancy between belief and practice was due to teacher perception of what the administrative policies and expectations were or were they due to actual policies favoring a guidance approach dissimilar to the teacher’s beliefs?

Child outcomes have been shown to be connected to teacher-child relationships and interactions within classrooms (Pianta et al., 2005, 2009). This study explored teacher beliefs of early childhood guidance and CLASS scores. The findings indicate that teacher beliefs have a positive impact on classroom teacher-child interactions as measured by CLASS and teacher beliefs of their own practice had a negative impact. The more that is understood about teacher beliefs and teacher beliefs of their actual practice related to child guidance and the impact of administrative policies and procedures impacting those beliefs the greater will be the impact of child outcomes for both social emotional development but academic achievement as well.

With the understanding that teacher beliefs of their own practice may be due to their perception of administrative policies rather than the actual policies indicates an need for
professional development opportunities for both teachers and administrators have an accurate understanding of expectations for guidance practices. This will require a more detailed look into actual administrative policies and beliefs of early childhood guidance as well as adopted approaches to child guidance. Training provided to teachers was mentioned by several of the teachers responding to the open-ended prompt. In a few of these comments it was mentioned that teachers felt that their beliefs of early childhood guidance were the same as the administration of their program. Perhaps this occurred due to continued professional development opportunities focusing on guidance. In two of the programs both Conscious Discipline and Head Start Trauma Smart trainings were provided which are offered over the course of a school year with each session of the training building upon strategies, techniques and understanding presented in previous sessions.

As a final implication, it was noted that the non-Head Start teachers achieved higher CLASS scores in total CLASS and the domains and dimensions than did Head Start teachers. Looking at teacher perception of ability of students may be another area in which additional understanding is needed. For instance, is it possible that the teachers in Head Start had lowered expectations for their students’ abilities due to the income and social need requirements for participation in Head Start? Teachers in non-Head Start programs often have fewer opportunities for continued professional development offered by the center but have a clientele which does not qualify for participation in Head Start due to income. Additionally, one of the locations was connected to a parochial school with members of the parish making up the majority of the participants in that program. Were their expectations for the students different from the expectations of teachers working with children who are living at or below the poverty line?
Suggestions for Future Research

With the positive impact of ECGBS-B scores on and the negative impact of ECGBS-AP scores on CLASS scores of teacher-child interaction conducting this study a second time with a larger population may be warranted. This exploration was limited to a convenience sample of Head Start and non-Head Start teachers within the same geographical region. Perhaps greater impact would be found in a larger population with a wider variety of programs and guidance method implementation (Levin, 2015).

An increase in the qualitative data collected may prove to add valuable insight into the connection between administrative policies and teacher perception of their actual practice of early childhood guidance methods within the classroom (Skott, 2015). This exploration was limited to the one open-ended comment. If this study were to be replicated increasing interview opportunities may yield information that would assist in unraveling some of the complexity involved in measuring teacher beliefs as well as gaining deeper understanding of the decisions of the administration and teachers in providing social skill development and emotional support for the children within the classroom setting (Buehl & Beck, 2015; Wilcox-Herzog et al, 2015). Expanding this study to include student outcomes may provide additional insight into the impact of incongruent teacher beliefs of early childhood guidance and their actual classroom practices on teacher–child relationships and interactions.

This need for additional qualitative data to determine differences in administrative oversight may extend to looking at the size and scope of the administrative agencies. There was noted significant differences between Head Start and non-Head Start sample populations. While the programs maintained accreditation and licensing guidelines there may be additional bureaucratic decisions or performance standards such as federal and state mandates that place
additional barriers prohibiting teachers from being able to implement their beliefs of early childhood guidance within their actual practice.

A greater focus on connecting teacher-child relationships to authoritarian and authoritative beliefs and practices as well as type, longevity and intensity of training provided may yield additional understanding (Levin, 2015; Wilcox-Herzog et al, 2015). Many of the respondents mentioned that they had received training in guidance models but did not clearly state which models they were exposed to, the hours of training received or whether the training was provided by the administration or was training that the teacher participant sought on their own. One response indicated that the guidance methods learned in their college preparation differed from the model they were expected to implement within the classroom.

A final area of focus would be to explore the connection between beliefs of early childhood guidance and the chosen method of instruction from both the teacher-participant perspective and that of administration. Practice of beliefs has been reported as being hindered in other studies due to perceived barriers including administration, resources, parents and cultural contexts (Wilcox-Herzog et al, 2015). Gaining more information at the administrative level may provide information that would assist in unraveling some of the complexities (Buehl and Beck, 2015; Skott, 2015). Including a survey for administrative personnel and or interviews may provide valuable insight into expectations and adopted guidance models including whether the guidance model being implemented matches the administrator’s belief of early childhood guidance (Ashton, 2015; Buehl & Beck, 2015; Levin, 2015).

**Educational Significance**

This present study will add to the literature on teacher beliefs and practices as well as methods of early childhood guidance and early childhood classroom climates. The classrooms
included in this study indicate that early learning programs are paying closer attention to child
guidance strategies and practicing more authoritative approaches to child guidance as they
participate in providing additional training for teachers through such programs as Head Start
Trauma Smart and implementing strategies from guidance approaches based on authoritative
approaches such as Conscious Discipline. The use of threats rarely occurred during the
observations. In some classrooms children’s voices were heard more and they were engaged in
more collaborative type activities with teachers which seem to follow John Dewey’s call for the
essential characteristics of a democratic education (Dewey, 1897).

While the observers in this study rarely heard threats and occasionally heard children’s
voices there remains the need to explore the consistencies and inconsistencies between what
teachers believe and what their actual practice reflects. To investigate and possibly explain some
of the factors impacting teachers’ decisions within the classroom, Buhl and Beck (2015) created
a model of internal and external supports impacting teacher beliefs and practices based on
Bronfenbrenner’s ecological model. External factors in this model include: classroom factors,
school factors, district factors, and national and state level factors. The culture of the school may
support or impede teachers’ abilities to practice their beliefs (Buehl and Beck, 2015). When
teachers did not feel supported “their practices did not accurately reflect their beliefs” (Buehl and
Beck, 2015, p. 77). Through the responses to the open-ended prompt to gain insight into
administrative policy impact on early childhood guidance practices it appears that teachers are
receiving training and feel that the administration is impacting their practice in a positive
manner.

As the quest continues to find ways to support students’ development of autonomy,
decrease suspension and expulsion rates and increase student graduation rates, understanding the
connections between teacher beliefs and practices related to early childhood guidance strategies and the role of administrative decision making in this process remains an area of concern. The relationship between teachers and children during the early childhood years has a lasting impact on the relationships between children and teachers throughout their education (Hamre & Pianta, 2001; Rubies-Davies, 2015). The positive affect of this relationship may be enhanced through increased authoritative guidance approaches and strategies that foster self-regulation, social emotional skill development, autonomy, and a sense of community.

The quality of the teacher-child relationship in kindergarten was an even stronger predictor of behavioral outcomes at Grade 8 then was the association with academic outcomes. Hence, negative relational styles of early grade teachers appear to be strong predictors of subsequent behavioral problems and can lead to long-term consequences for students.

Rubie-Davies, 2015, p. 270
APPENDIX A

INSTRUMENT COPIES
Demographic information

1) What is the highest educational level you have completed?

- H.S. or GED
- Some early childhood college courses
- Some college courses
- CDA
- BA/BS in early childhood
- BA/BS other
- MA/MS in early childhood
- MA/MS other
- Ed. Sp. in early childhood
- Ed. Sp. other
- Ph.D./Ed.D. in early childhood
- Ph.D./Ed.D. other
- Other: (please specify)

2) Do you currently hold certification?  □ Yes  □ No

2a) If yes, please mark all certifications that are held

- Early Childhood
- Elementary
- Early Childhood/Elem.
- Secondary
- Other (please specify) ______________________

3) How long have you worked in the field of early childhood? _____years _____months

4) How long have you worked for your present employer? _____years _____months

5) How long have you worked in your present position? _____years _____months

6) Indicate the category that most nearly describes your present employment:

- Employed full-time (more than 35 hours per week)
- Employed part-time (20 to 35 hours per week)
- Employed part-time (10 – 19 hours per week)

7) Indicate the type of classroom in which you are currently working:

- Full day
- Part day

8) What are the ages of the children in your classroom?

- 18-23
- 24-29
- 30-35
- 36-41
- 42-47
- 48-53
- 54-59
- 60+

9) Gender

- Male
- Female

10) Race

- Native American
- Asian
- Black
- Hispanic
- White
- Other: ______________________

11) Teacher guidance practices are impacted in many ways. How have administrative policies influenced your guidance practices?

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________
Early Childhood Guidance Belief Survey

Please respond to the following items by checking the numbered box that most nearly represents YOUR PERSONAL BELIEFS about the importance of that item in an early childhood classroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all Important</td>
<td>Not very Important</td>
<td>Fairly Important</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>Extremely Important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. It is _____ for students to be involved in establishing rules for the classroom.*
2. It is _____ for teachers to use time out and/or reprimands to encourage appropriate behavior.*
3. It is _____ for teachers to use treats, stickers, and/or stars to encourage appropriate behavior.*
4. It is _____ for students to limit talking to peers in the classroom.
5. It is _____ for students to understand the feelings and viewpoints of others.
6. It is _____ for teachers to develop caring relationships with all students.
7. It is _____ for students to do what adults ask and not question authority.
8. It is _____ for students to have competitive activities and for teachers to praise winners.
9. It is _____ for teachers to facilitate, and encourage peer interactions and cooperative group learning opportunities.
10. It is _____ when students are defiant they be sent to the principal’s office.
11. It is _____ for teachers ignore home situations to keep the focus on the learning tasks and plans.
12. It is _____ for teachers communicate and collaborate with families and listen to family members perspectives.
13. It is _____ for teachers to take class time to teach social, communication, and self-regulation skills and conflict resolution.
14. It is _____ for teachers to use praise to change students’ behavior.
15. It is _____ for students to express emotions in non-hurtful ways.
16. It is _____ for teachers and students to set up a system of logical consequences to match classroom rules.
17. It is _____ to state that students’ misbehavior is wrong.
18. It is _____ to emphasize shared values and the moral community when discussing misbehavior.


Early Childhood Guidance Belief Survey Actual Practice

Please respond to the following items by checking the numbered box that most nearly represents what practices you follow in your early childhood classroom. Some of the following guidance practices might not align with your philosophy. Circle the number of the practice item that is not aligned with your philosophy but the administration or school district mandates influence your practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely (1 or 2 times a month)</td>
<td>Sometimes (Weekly)</td>
<td>Frequently (Daily)</td>
<td>Always (Multiple Times Daily)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I _____ send students to the principal’s office when they are defiant.
2. I _____ ignore home situations to keep the focus on the learning tasks and plans.
3. I _____ communicate and collaborate with families and listen to family members perspectives.
4. I _____ take class time to teach social, communication, and self-regulation skills and conflict resolution.
5. I _____ use praise to change students’ behavior.
6. I _____ want students to express emotions in non-hurtful ways.
7. I _____ set up a system of logical consequences to match classroom rules with the children.
8. I _____ state that students’ misbehavior is wrong.
9. I _____ emphasize shared values and the moral community when discussing misbehavior.
10. I _____ have students to understand the feelings and viewpoints of others.
11. I _____ develop caring relationships with all students.
12. I _____ ask students to do what adults ask and not question authority.
13. I _____ have competitive activities and for teachers to praise winners.
14. I _____ facilitate, and encourage peer interactions and cooperative group learning opportunities.
15. I _____ involve children in establishing rules for the classroom.
16. I _____ use time out and/or reprimands to encourage appropriate behavior.
17. I _____ use treats, stickers, and/or stars to encourage appropriate behavior.
18. I _____ limit talking to peers in the classroom.
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Teacher Consent for Participation in a Research Study

An Exploration of Head Start Teacher Guidance Beliefs and Practices on Child Behavioral Outcomes

Sue Vartuli, Ph.D, Melisa Smitson, IPh.D candidate, and Ayesha Usman, IPh.D candidate

Request to Participate

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted in classrooms overseen by the Mid-America Head Start Program.

The study team is asking you to take part in this research study because you have experience as a classroom teacher within the Head Start program. Research studies only include people who choose to take part. This document is called a consent form. Please read this consent form carefully and take your time making your decision. The researcher or study staff will go over this consent form with you. Ask her to explain anything that you do not understand. Think about it and talk it over with your family and friends before you decide if you want to take part in this research study. This consent form explains what to expect: the risks, discomforts, and benefits, if any, if you consent to be in the study.

Background

This study is an exploration of teachers’ early childhood guidance beliefs and actual practice within Head Start classrooms. The researchers will gather and analyze early childhood guidance beliefs, teacher beliefs of their actual guidance practices, adherence to the Project Approach curriculum, and student outcomes through self-report surveys and observations.

You will be one of about 50 teachers in the study in Head Start classrooms within the Mid-America Head Start Program.

Purpose

This study will explore the relationship between teacher beliefs about guidance and their actual practice within the classroom. Research indicates a strong relationship between children’s academic and social outcomes and children’s interactions with teachers, peers, and tasks (Buhs, Ladd & Herald, 2006; Downer et al., 2010; O’Connor & McCartney, 2007; Ponitz, Rimm-Kaufman, Grimm, & Curby, 2009).

Procedures

1. In January 2015, at a one-time 45 minute meeting, you will receive a brief description of the project and complete the following paperwork: consent form, Early Childhood
Guidance Belief Survey-Beliefs (2013), Early Childhood Guidance Belief Survey-Actual Practice (2013), and a demographic information form.

2. In January 2015, you will be asked to distribute parental permission forms for the children in your classroom to be observed. Four children will be randomly selected to be observed from the signed parental permission forms received.

3. During the study, you will be observed using the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) (2008) and the Early Childhood Project Approach Fidelity-Revised (2014). Four children, with signed parental permission forms, will be randomly selected in each classroom and will be observed using the Individual Classroom Assessment Scoring System (inCLASS) (2008). Classroom observations will be conducted over at least a two day period. Scheduling of these observations will be made at the convenience of the school, you and observer.

4. If you agree to take part in this study, paperwork completion and observations will take place between January 15, 2015 and May 30, 2015.

Participation in this research is voluntary. You may refuse to participate in certain activities or answer certain questions. If you wish to withdraw from the study, contact Dr. Sue Vartuli at 913-384-5076 or vartulis@umkc.edu or Melisa Smitson at 816-591-4030 or smitsonm@umkc.edu.

Risks and Inconveniences

This research is considered to be minimal risk. The only risk is the potential loss of confidentiality.

Benefits

The study may improve the understanding of the relationship between teacher beliefs and practice in early childhood guidance as impacted by administrative policies, curriculum, and outcomes for children as well as improving classroom practices.

Fees and Expenses

There is no financial support for this research.

Compensation

As there is no financial support for this research there is no compensation for participants of this study.

Alternative to the Study

The alternative is not to take part in the study.
Confidentiality

While we will do our best to keep the information you share with us confidential, it cannot be absolutely guaranteed. Individuals from the University of Missouri-Kansas City Institutional Review Board (a committee that reviews and approves research studies), Research Protections Program, and Federal regulatory agencies may look at records related to this study to make sure we are doing proper, safe research and protecting human subjects. The results of this research may be published or presented to others. You will not be named in any reports of the results.

In order to maintain confidentiality, you will be assigned a number that will be used when working with the data. Numbers will be assigned to each participant according to the agency in which they are employed, and by the center in which they are working. Data will be stored in a locked file cabinet in a locked office. After seven years, the surveys and observation notes will be disposed of through the use of a paper shredder.

In Case of Injury

The University of Missouri-Kansas City appreciates people who help it gain knowledge by being in research studies. It is not the University’s policy to pay for or provide medical treatment for persons who are in studies. If you think you have been harmed because you were in this study, please call the researcher, Dr. Sue Vartuli at 913-384-5076 or Melisa Smitson at 816-591-4030. If there is an emergency, where you feel that you need to contact the researcher immediately, instead of waiting until regular office hours, you should call Dr. Sue Vartuli at 913-384-5076 or Melisa Smitson at 816-591-4030.

Contacts for Questions about the Study

You should contact the Office of UMKC’s Institutional Review Board at 816-235-5927 if you have any questions, concerns or complaints about your rights as a research subject. You may call the researcher Dr. Sue Vartuli at 913-384-5076 or Melisa Smitson at 816-591-4030 if you have any questions about this study. You may also call either of them if any problems come up.

Voluntary Participation

Taking part in this research study is voluntary. If you choose to be in the study, you are free to stop participating at any time and for any reason. You will be told of any important findings developed during the course of this research.

You have read this Teacher Consent Form or it has been read to you. You have been told why this research is being done and what will happen if you take part in the study, including the risks and benefits. You have had the chance to ask questions, and you may ask questions at any time in the future by calling Dr. Sue Vartuli at 913-384-5076 or Melisa Smitson at 816-591-4030. By signing this consent form, you volunteer and consent to take part in this research study. Study staff will give you a copy of this consent form.
Signature (Volunteer Subject)  Date

Printed Name (Volunteer Subject)

Signature of Person Obtaining Consent  Date

Printed Name of Person Obtaining Consent
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