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The purpose of this study was to examine the possibility of a relationship between locus of control of early childhood teachers and their behavior management skills. Subjects in the study were 55 group teachers in child care centers serving children ages 3 to 5 in low, middle and high socio-economic communities in Camden County New Jersey. The teachers were rated by their supervisors on the Classroom Management Rating Scale (CMRS), a 13 item Likert-like scale developed for this study. Teachers completed a self-rating on the CMRS and Rotter's I-E Locus of Control Scale. The Rotter I-E scores and the mean of the self-ratings and the teacher ratings were compared in a T test for paired samples. A correlation of .395 at p=.003 was found. Further research may be indicated to examine ways that internal locus of control can be increased and to study the effects of such increases on teacher's behavior management skills.
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The purpose of this study was to examine the possible correlation between internal-external locus of control of early childhood teachers and classroom behavior management skills. A significant correlation was found between a classroom management rating and Rotter's I-E Scale scores.
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Chapter I
The Problem

Children with behavior problems are a concern of many early childhood child care programs. Many teachers in early childhood programs have difficulty controlling the behavior of children who exhibit aggressive, defiant and acting out behaviors. In service trainings, workshops and conferences for early childhood teachers often focus on techniques for working with children who exhibit these behaviors. Program directors often ask parents to remove their children from the child care program because of the child's behavior. Efforts to teach new child management techniques to teachers vary in their effectiveness. Additional information that can shed light on how to help teachers appropriately and effectively teach children to control their behavior is needed to improve the quality of care offered to young children.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between internal and external locus of control of teachers in early childhood programs and their ability to control the behavior of children in their classrooms. The results of the study may influence hiring and training practices.

Hypothesis

The hypothesis to be tested in this study is: there is a correlation between ratings on the CMRS and scores on Rotter's I-E Scale at p=.05 for early childhood teachers.

Null hypothesis: no correlation exists between ratings on the CMRS and scores on Rotter's I-E Scale for early childhood teachers.

Teacher scores on an internal-external locus of control measure will be compared to supervisor and self reports of degree of success in classroom behavior management. The subjects will be group teachers in child care programs serving children ages 3 to 5 in a cross section of rural, suburban and urban communities in New Jersey.

Theory

Internal-external locus of control is a component of Rotter's Social Learning theory which contains four major concepts: behavior potential, expectancy, reinforcement value, and the psychological situation. The concept of expectancy, according to Rotter (Ryckman, 1993), explains that a person's goal or reinforcement driven behavior will be modified by how likely it seems to the subject that the reinforcement will occur. A child,
for example, may want very strongly to receive praise from a teacher, but if past experience has shown that the teacher will not praise that child, no matter how good his work is, the child’s low expectancy of receiving the reward will prevent him from trying.

Within the general theory of expectancy, Rotter’s theory includes a construct called internal-external control of reinforcement. According to Rotter, people acquire generalized expectancies to perceive reinforcing events as either dependent on their own behavior or as being beyond their control. Internally oriented people tend to believe that reinforcers are subject to their own control and occur as a result of their own efforts and skills. Externals, in contrast, see little or no connection between their behavior and various reinforcers. They perceive the occurrence of reinforcers as determined by fate, luck, or powerful others. (Ryckman, 1993) People who believe primarily in their own internal control of events and reinforcers are said to have an internal locus of control, while those who believe that outside forces have greater control over their lives are considered to have an external locus of control.

The question to be addressed in this study is, “Does the type of locus of control of an adult caregiver have an influence on the caregiver’s ability to influence the behavior of the children?” Since people with an internal locus of control attribute large parts of their success to ability and hard work, they may have a greater willingness to persist at tasks than externals. Their directives to other people may be more effective because of the manner in which they are given. Externals, however, often employ defensive strategies to rationalize failures and blame them on conditions outside of their control. Do these differences in attitude toward success and failure have an effect on the ability of a caregiver to influence the behavior of children in their care? Does some of the lack of ability to control the children in their care arise more from the caregiver’s lack of belief in their ability to influence events in general, rather than a lack of knowledge of specific techniques and how they should be carried out? In the training of caregivers, should greater attention be paid to their belief systems and their locus of control than to skill in the use of specific techniques?

People with a strong internal locus of control generally believe that other people are also responsible for their own behavior. Internals may believe more strongly than externals that attempts to help a child change inappropriate behaviors will succeed. They may have greater faith in the child’s ability to learn new behaviors and increase their self control. People with a strong external locus of control may rely more heavily on outside reinforcers to bring about changes, and they may not have as strong an expectation that children will be able to learn to control their behavior. Since training and best practices for child care teachers are based on positive methods of behavior control which encourage children to
learn to internalize control of their behavior, care givers with an external locus of control may have a difficult time effectively carrying out procedures that are more internally focused.

Definitions of Terms:

Internal locus of control - a rating 11 or below on Rotter's I-E Scale which indicates a belief in personal control over the reinforcers of goal directed behavior.

External locus of control - a rating of 12 or higher on Rotter's I-E Scale which indicates a belief that control of reinforcers for actions is determined by fate, luck or other agents outside the individual's control.

Group teachers - child care employees with a two year degree or its equivalent and the responsibility for the instruction of a group of children.

Aggressive behaviors - hitting, pushing, biting or otherwise physically harming other people.

Defiant behaviors - ignoring a teacher directive, verbally refusing to comply with a directive or acting in a manner contrary to the directive.

Acting out behaviors - loud talking at inappropriate times, misuse of toys and other material in ways that direct attention away from a teacher directed activity.

Assumptions

A major assumption of the study is that the teachers can accurately and consistently rate themselves on their ability to implement behavior management techniques. It is also assumed that child care program supervisors will also be able to accurately rate the teachers on the same abilities in order to provide corroboration of the teachers' self ratings.

Limitations

The sample size will be small and limited to group teachers in programs serving children ages 3 to 5. The generalisability of the results will be limited to similar teaching staff members. The validity of Rotter's I-E Scale will be documented, but the questions on the Classroom Management Rating Scale(CMRS) have been adapted from another source, and no validity studies have been done on his instrument.

Overview

The background of the application of the Locus of Control theory in instructional and social situations will be explored in the literature overview to be presented in Chapter
2. In Chapter 3, the design of the study will be described in detail and the hypothesis will be stated in testable form. The results of the study will be presented and analyzed in Chapter 4, and the conclusions of the study will be presented and discussed in Chapter 5. A number of studies have looked at Locus of Control, its impact on personality and its relation to the overall success of individuals. A look at these studies will provide background for understanding the implications of internal and external locus of control theory for child care teachers and their ability to influence the behavior of the children in their classes.
A review of related literature shows support for the efficacy of examining Locus of Control of teachers as a personal attribute that may be associated with the ability of teachers to control the behavior of children who exhibit aggressive and acting-out behaviors in the preschool classroom. No studies were found that examined the relationship directly, but several studies were found that examined the relationship between internal-external locus of control and academic success and between locus of control and the ability to influence others.

If the correlation between locus of control and classroom control proves to be significant, it could have implications for pre-service and in-service trainings and for hiring practices. Many in-service sessions are devoted to teaching new techniques for student control. In many cases, teachers may already know the skills, but may not apply them effectively because of their personal locus of control beliefs. Teacher preparation courses may need to include more emphasis on increasing teacher efficacy beliefs and their confidence in their ability to influence children's behavior in addition to the information on specific skills and techniques. According to Rotter's Locus of Control theory (Rotter, 1966), if people have an internal locus of control, they believe that they control the events in their lives through their own actions. If they have an external locus of control, they believe that the things that happen to them are caused primarily by fate, luck or chance. People fall along a range between strongly internal through a mixed stage to strongly external. No one is totally internal or external in their thinking.

**Locus of Control and Influencing Abilities**

The ability of experimenters with an internal locus of control to exert greater influence on others was demonstrated in an experiment conducted with 54 college students who tried influence fellow students to change their responses to a College Opinion Survey which they had taken several months earlier (Phares, 1965). The subjects for the study were psychology students at Kansas State University. Rotter's I-E Scale was administered to over two hundred students. The mean of the scores was 16.45 for males and 16.30 for females on a scale of 0 to 23 with 23 being strongly external. Two groups of 27 male students were chosen to be the experimenters who would try to influence the subjects of the study. One group represented males who scored near the internal end of the scale. The other group represented males who scored near the external extreme. Two groups of female students who scored at the middle of the scale were chosen to be the
subjects to be influenced. Extremes in scores were avoided for the subjects because people who are strongly internal are theoretically harder to influence than externals.

The two groups of males were given precise instructions to read to the female students as they answered the eleven questions on the College Opinion Survey. The degree and frequency of change in survey responses were compared for the two groups. The internal control experimenters exerted greater influence than the externals as measured in magnitude and frequency of change. "In fact," the article reports, "the influence exerted by externals was no greater than the changes exhibited by a control group of subjects who merely retook the LOS without any attempt at influencing them."

The experimenters had been matched on the strength of their responses to the survey questions, and they were instructed to read the statements to the subjects just as they were written and not to add any verbal comments during the interviews. No attempt was made in the study to determine the specific techniques by which internals were better able to exert influence; however, it was theorized that the influence may have been exerted through differences in tone of voice, gestures or facial expressions.

While this study examined the ability of people with an internal locus of control to influence the opinions of subjects on survey questions rather than their ability to influence them to change their behavior, it does support the concept that teachers who have an internal locus of control will be more successful in influencing the behaviors of children than teachers who have an external locus of control.

**Theoretical Support for Locus of Control and Influencing ability**

Teacher efficacy is strongly related to student achievement (Berman, 1977), and teacher efficacy and internal locus of control may be very similar constructs (Hall, 1992). Phares (1974) states, "Traditionally, locus of control has been defined as a generalized expectancy [of success] that cuts across specific content areas." Personal and general teacher efficacy were both related to teachers' beliefs that they personally, and all teachers generally, could influence children's learning. Phares also stated (1965), "Internals, having the generalized expectancy that they are in control of their own behavior reinforcement sequences, should be more effective agents in the induction of change than individuals not having such expectancy [externals]."

There is a strong theoretical construct that supports a relationship between internal locus of control and the ability to influence the behavior of others. Internals have been shown to:

- make more attempts at controlling others or mastering their environment,
- perceive success to be the result of their own skill and efforts.
* resist social influence attempts,
* take steps to improve environmental conditions,
* be more achievement oriented and able to defer gratification,
* and to prefer skill rewards.

Externals have lower expectancies for success, devalue tasks that they have difficulty with, and show a preference for tasks that have built in rationalizations for failure (Phares, 1974, Martin, 1993, & Rotter, 1966). However, under conditions of very low expectancy, internals may become more depressed and frustrated than externals (Phares, 1974).

**Locus of Control and Student Achievement**

The relationship between locus of control and student achievement was investigated by Rose and Medway (1981) as part of a study of a four step link between teacher beliefs (locus of control), teacher behavior, student behavior, and student achievement. The experimenters predicted that internal teachers would produce higher achieving students by utilizing predominantly direct instruction methods and by maintaining a controlled learning environment.

While the results of the study confirmed statistically significant difference in achievement in math scores for students taught by teachers with an internal locus of control, the observations of teacher behaviors did not conform to the predictions that the internal locus of control teachers would use more controlling techniques. In fact, the internal teachers used techniques which were humanistic and gave the students opportunities to develop internal controls for their own behaviors. The students did spend more time-on-task in the higher achieving classrooms, but not for the predicted reasons. The study also did not show significant differences in teacher internal locus of control and student achievement in several other subject areas included in the study.

In another study, Midgley, Feldhaufer and Eccles (1989) also found that internal teachers could be differentiated from external teachers in their effect on student achievement.

**Locus of Control and Teacher Effectiveness**

In a study comparing 88 Teachers of the Year with 92 in service teachers, Agne (1994) found a higher correlation of humanistic pupil control beliefs, internal locus of control and higher teacher efficacy beliefs for the Teachers of the Year than for the inexperienced teachers.

The use of Locus of Control scores as a predictor of student teacher success was explored in a study reported by Marso and Pigge (1991). The student teachers completed
The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and Rotter's I-E Scale prior to their student teaching experience. These scores, in addition to High School and College GPA's and self-reported levels of anxiety about their upcoming student teaching experience, were evaluated as possible indicators of student teacher success as rated by their college professors.

The University student teacher supervisors provided a numerical evaluation of the performance of the prospective teachers at the end of their student teaching experience. An eight point Likert type rating scale with six questions and a total of 42 possible points was used to rate teacher performance. The six items included presentation of material, classroom planning, learning climate, student behavior, professional behavior, and good judgment in dealing with other professionals. Teachers were rated in comparison to all other teachers that the professors had supervised.

The eight point comparison scale was used to avoid problems with halo effects reported with previous student teacher performance ratings. On previously employed five point scales which did not differentiate between skill areas, the raters did not use the lower end of the scales and the mean ratings ranged from 4.47 to 4.89. A six point scale with 13 questions and a possible total score of 65 has been prepared for this study. See Appendix A.

Locus of Control and Years of Teaching Experience, Sex and Grade Level

Generally, experienced teachers exhibit a greater degree of internal locus of control than inexperienced teachers (Hall, 1992, Martin & Pigge, 1991, Martin, 1992). In Sherman and Giles (1981), teachers with five or more years of experience were more internal than pre-service teachers and those with five years or less of experience. The latter two groups scored at 10.76 and 10.23 respectively which is very near the midpoint between internal and external scores on the Rotter I-E Scale. Experienced teachers scored 8.85 which was significantly more internal. Scores range from 0 to 23 with 0 being the internal extreme and 23 being the highest external score.

In Barros, Neto and Barros (1989), no correlation was found between years of experience and scores on the Rotter I-E Scale; however, no pre-service teachers were included in the study, and years of experience were defined differently. The years of experience were grouped from 1 to 10 years, 11 to 20 years, and 20 years or more. The first span of ten years encompassed both inexperienced and experienced teachers as they were defined in the other studies. No differences were found in grade levels taught, but that is not a factor in this study which includes only teachers that are working with children ages 3 to 5.

Differences in locus of control between male and females teachers was not significant in most of the studies reported. In Barros (1981), females had a slightly higher
ratio of accepting responsibility for their successes more than their failures than men did, but females did not score significantly higher in internal locus of control. In Marso & Pigge (1991), the mean score for men was more external than the mean for women, but in Marso (1991), Hall (1992), Martin (1993), Agne (1994) and Sherman and Giles (1981) scores were not reported separately for men and women. In most of the studies no rationale was given for not reporting scores separately for men and women. In Hall's (1992) study of personal vs. professional locus of control, however, the rationale was provided for combining scores for all subjects. Lack of evidence of any sign of difference in result between experienced vs. inexperienced teachers or males vs. females in subsamples was sited as the reason for combining all subgroups.

Pupil Control as a Viable Area of Study

The persistence of the problem of pupil control among educators is supported in articles by Lunenberg (1993) and Packard (1988) who discuss the problems with control that are inherent in programs such as hospitals and schools who serve "conscripted" clients.

Locus of Control as a Teachable Attribute

According to Scherer and Kimmel (1993) in their report of a study on the viability of a workshop on attitude changes, teachers' expectations of student success can be changed. This study demonstrates the efficacy of a one-day workshop to modify teachers' attribution styles in a direction considered to be more adaptive from the perspectives of health, achievement and risk for depression. The changes in attribution styles and the increased sensitivity to and awareness of the importance of attributions would lead to improved student achievement through changes in teacher expectations (Scherer & Kimmel, 1993 p. 20).

Sherman and Giles (1981) also support the concept of locus of control being an attribute that can be taught. They conclude, "Teacher training programs may need to focus more heavily on the development of a sense of personal control in order to improve the probability of teachers remaining in the teaching profession" (Sherman & Giles, 1981 p. 42).

Locus of Control and Early Childhood Education

The concept of Locus of Control has implications for the early childhood field which can be traced back to Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi, one of the earliest proponents of
early childhood education (Hewes, 1992). His theories and practices grew out of his own strong sense of internal control and were designed to develop internal control in children. The focus of early education changed when the Kindergarten concept was brought to the United States, and most 19th Century early childhood education in this country stressed external control and authoritarian discipline. The internal control philosophy was revived in this country by John Dewey and other supporters of the Progressive Education movement and has remained strong over the years among some segments of the early childhood community. The National Association of the Education of Young Children, the largest early childhood professional organization, supports the use of developmentally appropriate practices which encourage age appropriate decision making and personal control for young children.

Summary

Locus of Control has been postulated to an important element of teacher effectiveness. "A sense of personal control appears to be important for teachers because the basic responsibility of teaching is to promote change in children... Thus it appears that teachers ideally should perceive themselves as in control of events in their own lives and in the classroom, therefore exhibiting a relatively strong sense of personal control" (Sherman and Giles, 1981). In their study, Sherman and Giles found a stronger sense of personal control (internal scores on the Rotter I-E Scale) in teachers with five years or more of experience than inexperienced teachers or teacher trainees. Other studies have established a relationship between locus of control and teacher effectiveness as rated by supervisors or as measured by pupil academic success (Agne, 1994, Rose & Medway, 1981, & Marso & Pigge, 1991). Several studies have examined the relationship between locus of control and beliefs about pupil control (Agne, 1994) and found a correlation between internal locus of control, teacher efficacy and humanistic classroom management styles. No studies were found that directly examined the relationship between teacher locus of control and effective control of pupil behavior. This study examines the correlation between internal and external locus of control and scores on a Classroom Management Rating Scale.
Chapter 3
Design

Scores of early childhood group teachers on Rotter's I-E Scale will be compared to the mean of scores on supervisor and self-reports on the Classroom Management Rating Scale (CMRS). The hypothesis to be tested is: there is a correlation between ratings on the CMRS and scores on Rotter's I-E Scale at $p = .05$ for early childhood teachers.

Null hypothesis: no correlation exists between ratings on the CMRS and scores on Rotter's I-E Scale for early childhood teachers.

Scores on the Rotter I-E Scale will be compared to the average of the self-ratings and the supervisor ratings on the CMRS. Data will also be collected on the teacher's years of experience, the socio-economic level of the families served and the type of community.

Subjects

The subjects consist of 55 group teachers in early childhood programs serving children ages 3 to 5 in urban and suburban communities in Camden County, New Jersey representing low, middle and high socio-economic levels. Teachers will complete Form B of the CMRS which will ask for information on their years of experience, but not on age or sex. The study will not be evaluating the cause of the internal or external locus of control, but only whether it correlates with the rating on the CMRS. All subjects in the study will be chosen from centers with a full time head teacher who will complete Form A, the supervisor's rating scale. A Pearson r analysis will be run to establish a correlation coefficient for the two forms of the test to establish inter-rater reliability.

Setting

The testing will be done in the child care programs. The forms will be completed by the teachers under the direction of their supervisor. Supervisors will receive written directions (Appendix D) for administering the test. The test materials will be coded to allow the teacher's completed forms to be returned confidentially.

Variables

The independent variable in the study will be the locus of control rating of the teachers. The dependent variable will be the rating on the CMRS.
Procedures

The testing materials will be mailed to supervisors who have been contacted by telephone to elicit their cooperation in participating in the study and provide them with a verbal explanation of the purpose of the project. The supervisors will complete Form A and explain the procedures for completing Form B and Rotter's I-E Scale to the group teachers. The test materials will be coded to allow for comparison of matched pairs of scores yet allow the teachers to submit their responses confidentially.

Instruments

Rotter's I-E Scale (Appendix C) contains 23 forced choice items measuring locus of control and 6 filler questions. Low scores on the scale indicate greater internal locus of control; higher scores indicate greater external locus of control. While scores are often divided into internals and externals for discussion purposes, no actual dichotomy exists between the two types. The tests purports to measure a greater or lesser degree of locus of control. Everyone has both beliefs. The tests measures a difference in degree rather than a dichotomy between the two.

The Classroom Management Rating Scale (CMRS) contains 13 questions related to behavior management skills on Form A, the supervisor's form, (Appendix A) and Form B, the teacher's form, (Appendix B). The scale contains six steps on a scale of 1 = superior, 2 = very good, 3 = good, 4 = average, 5 = below average, and 6 = poor. Questions on the CMRS were written after examination of several existing elementary school teacher evaluation tools. The questions were revised for use with the preschool age group. No reliability or validity data are available for the scale.

Test Validity

Rotter's I-E Scale has an internal consistency within a range of .65 to .76 on ten trials. Test-retest reliability was reported between .49 and .83 on 7 trials. The scale has had predictive validity when used with peace corp volunteers as compared to a general college population. It has also shown a positive correlation with economic status which would be expected by the theoretical construct of the test (Rotter, 1966).

The CMRS was developed for this study from a composite of questions from several teacher performance scales used in public schools. The test will be used as a self rating instrument and a supervisor rating tool and the two results will be averaged. The scale was designed for comparison purposes within this study and does not purport to be a standardized measure of classroom behavior control.
The study has been designed to look for a correlation between classroom behavior management skills and internal-external locus of control of early childhood teachers. If a significant correlation is found, it may provide the impetus for additional research to look for a cause and effect relationship.

Summary

A correlation of the mean of the two forms of the CMRS and teachers' locus of control scores will be examined for group teachers in programs serving 3 to 5 year old children.
Chapter 4
Results

Hypothesis: there is a correlation between ratings on the CMRS and scores on Rotter's I-E Scale at \( p = .05 \) for early childhood teachers.

Null hypothesis: no correlation exists between ratings on the CMRS and scores on Rotter's I-E Scale for early childhood teachers.

Scores on the CMRS served as the dependent variable; scores on Rotter's I-E Scale were the independent variable. A correlation of .395 was found on a T test of dependent pairs with significance at .003 (\( p = .003 \)). The results reject the null hypothesis.

Scores on the CMRS ranged from a perfect score of 13 (a rating of excellent on all 13 items) to 46 (average). Scores on Rotter's I-E Scale ranged from 2 (extremely internal) to 17 (significantly external) of a possible range of 0 to 23. The mean of the CMRS scores was 29.09; the mean of the I-E scores was 9.54.

Further examination of the data revealed that CMRS Scores of internals (I-E Scores of 11 or below) ranged from 13 to 46. Scores of externals (12 or above) ranged from 25 to 40. Since low scores on the CMRS represented better skill ratings, external locus of control scores correlated negatively with CMRS scores. No externals received scores below 25. The scatterplot in Table 4-1 shows the distribution of the CMRS scores across the range of internal and external scores.

Table 4-1

![CMRS Scores and LOC](chart.png)
A Pearson r coefficient of .4186 (p= .001) was found between Form A and Form B of the CMRS indicating a significant inter-rater reliability between the teachers' self ratings and the supervisors' ratings.

Data collected on years of experience, community type and socio-economic level is presented in Appendix E.
Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine the possibility of a relationship between locus of control of early childhood teachers and their behavior management skills. Subjects in the study were 55 group teachers in child care centers serving children ages 3 to 5 in low, middle and high socio-economic communities in Camden County New Jersey. The teachers were rated by their supervisors on the Classroom Management Rating Scale (CMRS), a 13 item Likert type of scale developed for this study. Teachers completed a self-rating on the CMRS and Rotter's I-E Locus of Control Scale. The Rotter I-E scores and the mean of the self-ratings and the teacher ratings were compared in a T test for paired samples. A correlation of .395 at p = .003 was found.

Conclusions

Early childhood group teachers with an external locus of control have a greater probability of having difficulty with behavior management in their classrooms than teachers who have an internal locus of control. The lesser ability of externals to control the responses of college students on a questionnaire was demonstrated by Phares in 1965 (Phares, 1965). This study produced similar results for early childhood teachers who have the task of influencing the behavior of children in their classes. Externals, who do not have a strong sense of control over the reinforcers in their own lives, have more difficulty exerting influence over others.

Discussion

An external locus of control may be a predictor of poor behavior management skills in early childhood teachers. While an internal locus of control is not always an indicator of good behavior management, its absence is a strong predictor of poor skills in this area. Teachers who have a combination of knowledge of good classroom management techniques and an internal locus of control are likely to be the most successful in their behavior management efforts. An internal locus of control, by itself, did not serve as a strong predictor of success.

Modifications of existing employment screening instruments to test for locus of control may be helpful in improving the general level of classroom behavior. In-service programs that provide in-depth trainings that focus on techniques such as problem solving
which increase internal locus of control may be able to provide improvements in classroom management skills.

This study was limited to childcare teachers with a two year degree in early childhood or its equivalent in training and experience who work with children ages 3 to 5. The results may not apply to other populations.

The CMRS was administered by supervisors with only mailed instructions. While the results were highly significant (p = .003), they were based on a comparison of locus of control with an unproven instrument that was administered by with a minimum of instruction to the teachers on how to complete the test. While the test is not difficult to administer, a more controlled setting for the testing might be warranted.

Further research may be indicated to examine ways that internal locus of control can be increased and to study the effects of such increases on teachers' behavior management skills.
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APPENDIX A
CMRS FORM A
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT RATING SCALE

Teacher ID # __________ (must match ID on teacher's self-test)

Our program serves families primarily in a low __ middle ____ or high ____ economic bracket.
We are located in a rural ___ urban ____ or suburban ____ community.

Rate the teacher in comparison to other teachers that you have observed over the years. Circle the number of your response.

1 Superior  In the top 5% of teachers you have observed
2 Very Good  In the top 15 to 5% of teachers
3 Good Abilities are above the average teacher - in the top 30 - 15%
4 Average In the middle range - 40 to 70 %
5 Below Average In the 15 - 40% range - teachers who have difficulty in the area described
6 Poor In the bottom 15% of all teachers that you have observed.

Poor .... Superior

6 5 4 3 2 1 A. Classroom routines are administered effectively.
6 5 4 3 2 1 B. Teacher encourages children to help solve problems.
6 5 4 3 2 1 C. The teacher considers children's developmental ages in choosing behavior management approaches.
6 5 4 3 2 1 D. Pupils show respect for the teacher.
6 5 4 3 2 1 E. Teacher planned activities create high interest.
6 5 4 3 2 1 F. Voice level and volume are pleasant and controlled.
6 5 4 3 2 1 G. Firmness and consistency exist in applying of classroom rules.
6 5 4 3 2 1 H. Impartially is evident in treatment of students.
6 5 4 3 2 1 I. Student achievements are praised effectively.
6 5 4 3 2 1 J. Only constructive criticism is used.
6 5 4 3 2 1 K. Respect is shown for student opinions.
6 5 4 3 2 1 L. Behavior problems are handled without emotional extremes.
6 5 4 3 2 1 M. Aggressive and defiant behaviors are handled well and are not allowed to get out of control.

Total_____

-22-
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT RATING SCALE

Teacher ID #

Experience (full time equivalent) - Less than 3 years ___ 3 to 5 years ____
6 to 10 years ____ 10 years or more ____

Rate yourself in comparison to other teachers that you have observed over the years.

1 Superior In the top 5% of teachers you have observed
2 Very Good In the top 15 to 5% of teachers
3 Good Abilities are above the average teacher - in the top 30 - 15%
4 Average In the middle range - 40 to 70 %
5 Below Average In the 15 - 40% range - teachers who have difficulty in the area described
6 Poor In the bottom 15% of all teachers that you have observed.

Circle the number of your response.

Poorest . . Superior

A. My classroom routines are administered effectively.
B. I encourage children to help solve their own problems.
C. I consider children's developmental ages in choosing behavior management approaches.
D. Pupils show respect for me and other adults in the classroom.
E. My "teacher planned" activities create high interest.
F. My voice level and volume are pleasant and controlled.
G. I use firmness and consistency in applying of classroom rules.
H. I am impartial in my treatment of students.
I. Children's accomplishments are praised effectively.
J. Only constructive criticism is used.
K. Respect is shown for student opinions.
L. I handle behavior problems without displaying emotional extremes.
M. Aggressive and defiant behaviors are handled well and are not allowed to get out of control.

Total______
APPENDIX C

LOCUS OF CONTROL SCALE
The Rotter I-E Scale

Instructions

This is a questionnaire to find out the way in which certain important events in our society affect different people. Each item consists of a pair of alternatives lettered a or b. Please select the one statement of each pair (and only one) which you more strongly believe to be the case as far as you’re concerned. Be sure to select the one you actually believe to be more true rather than the one you think you should choose or the one you would like to be true. This is a measure of your personal belief; obviously there are no right or wrong answers.

Please answer these items carefully, but do not spend too much time on any one item. Be sure to give an answer for every question. In some instances you may discover that you believe both statements or neither one. In such cases, be sure to select the one you most strongly believe to be the case as far as you are concerned. Also try to respond to each item independently when making your choices; do not be influenced by your previous choices.

Your answers to the items on this inventory are to be recorded on a separate answer sheet.

1. a. Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.
   b. The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them.
2. a. Many of the unhappy things in people’s lives are partly due to bad luck.
   b. People’s misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.
3. a. One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don’t take enough interest in politics.
   b. There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.
4. a. In the long run, people get the respect they deserve in this world.
   b. Unfortunately, an individual’s worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries.
5. a. The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.
   b. Most students don’t realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.
6. a. Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.
   b. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.
7. a. No matter how hard you try some people just don’t like you.
   b. People who can’t get others to like them don’t understand how to get along with others.
8. a. Heredity plays the major role in determining one’s personality.
   b. It is one’s experiences in life which determine what they’re like.
9. a. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
   b. Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.
10. a. In the case of the well prepared student there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.
    b. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is really useless.
11. a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work; luck has little or nothing to do with it.
    b. Getting a job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.
12. a. The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.
    b. This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.
13. a. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.
   b. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a
      matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.
14. a. There are certain people who are just not good.
   b. There is some good in everybody.
15. a. In my case, getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
   b. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.
16. a. Who gets to be the boss often depends upon who was lucky enough to be in the
   right place first.
   b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability; luck has little or nothing
      to do with it.
17. a. As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can
      neither understand nor control.
   b. By taking an active part in political and social affairs the people can control world events.
18. a. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental
      happenings.
   b. There really is no such thing as luck.
19. a. One should always be willing to admit mistakes.
   b. It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.
20. a. It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.
   b. How many friends you have depends upon how nice a person you are.
21. a. In the long run the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.
   b. Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.
22. a. With enough effort, we can wipe out political corruption.
   b. It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.
23. a. Sometimes I can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.
   b. There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get.
24. a. A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.
   b. A good leader makes it clear to everybody what their jobs are.
25. a. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
   b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.
26. a. People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.
   b. There's not much use in trying too hard to please people, if they like you, they like you.
27. a. There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.
   b. Team sports are an excellent way to build character.
28. a. What happens to me is my own doing.
   b. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.
29. a. Most of the time I can't understand why politicians behave the way they do.
   b. In the long run, the people are responsible for bad government on a national as well
      as on a local level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score

Identification Number ________
I-E Scale Answer Sheet

1. 
2. a
3. b
4. b
5. b
6. a
7. a
8. a
9. a
10. b
11. b
12. b
13. b
14. 
15. b
16. a
17. a
19. 
20. a
21. a
22. b
23. a
24. 
25. a
26. b
27. 
28. b
29. a

Score ____________ (total of underlined answers)
APPENDIX D

DIRECTIONS
INSTRUCTIONS

1. The Classroom Management Rating Scale Form A (CMRS-A) should be completed by the appropriate supervisor (Head Teacher or Director) for each participating Group Teacher. The rating should be based on general knowledge of a teacher's abilities, not on a single classroom observation. If you do not have enough knowledge about a teacher's performance in this area (they may be too new, etc.) either omit the teacher from the study or write "unable to rate" on her form and let her complete the self rating forms.

2. The Group Teachers should rate themselves on the CMRS- Form B.

3. The Group Teachers should rate themselves on the Rotter I-E Scale. The number on their forms must match the number on the form completed by the supervisor. Answers should be marked on the I-E Scale answer sheets. Answers should be based on how the teacher feels about the question, not on how they think they should feel. There are no right or wrong answers, and the best results are obtained when questions are answered based on the first reaction to the questions rather than giving the questions a lot of thought.

4. The forms should be returned to me in the enclosed envelopes.

Thank you for your help. Please call me at 609-292-8444 if you have any questions.

Enclosed:
Instructions
CMRS Form A
CMRS Form B
Rotter I-E Rating Scale
Rotter I-E Rating Scale Answer Sheets
Return Envelopes
APPENDIX E

DATA ON
YEARS OF SERVICE
COMMUNITY TYPE
SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS
### DATA

#### Years of Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>All Subjects</th>
<th>Internals*</th>
<th>Externals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48**</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Community Type***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>All Subjects</th>
<th>Internals</th>
<th>Externals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Socio-Economic Level***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>All Subjects</th>
<th>Internals</th>
<th>Externals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Subjects who scored 11 or below on Rotter's I-E Scale
** Not all subjects responded
*** As reported by programs