**CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT STYLE AND KINDERGARTEN TEACHERS'
TOLERANCES, BELIEFS, AND RESPONSES TO CHILD BEHAVIOURS AND
MISBEHAVIOURS**

**Kimberley A. Arbeau
Carleton University**

A thesis

presented to Carleton University

in partial fulfillment of the

thesis requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Psychology

Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, 2004

September 21st, 2004

© copyright, 2004 Kimberley A. Arbeau

RUNNING HEAD: TEACHER ATTITUDES TOWARD CHILD BEHAVIOURS

Library and
Archives Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

ISBN: 0-612-98949-6

Our file Notre référence

ISBN: 0-612-98949-6

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

PAGINATION ERROR.

TEXT COMPLETE.

ERREUR DE PAGINATION.

LE TEXTE EST COMPLET.

Abstract

The goal of this study was to explore kindergarten teachers' attitudes and beliefs toward children's behaviours in the classroom. Participants were 202 teachers from New Brunswick, Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, and Ontario. Teachers responded to hypothetical vignettes describing children exhibiting shy, socially disinterested, aggressive, and prosocial behaviours. Beliefs assessed included teachers' tolerances of the behaviours, their behavioural attributions, their believed child costs as a result of these behaviours, and their responses toward the child behaviours. Teachers also completed a measure of classroom management styles (interventionist, interactionist, and non-interventionist). Results indicated that teachers had the harshest beliefs toward aggression. However, teachers made clear distinctions among all four of these child behaviours. For example, teachers reported more favourable beliefs toward social disinterest as opposed to shyness (previous research has confounded these behaviours). Moreover, complex interactions also emerged. Teachers' beliefs toward the behaviours also differed as a function of their classroom management styles, and for some beliefs also as a function of child gender (three-way interactions). The results are discussed in relation to previous research on parenting styles.

Acknowledgements

There are a number of people who I would like to thank for their help during this study. This thesis was made easier because of them, I hope they all know their help was appreciated. First of all, I would like to thank my thesis supervisor Dr. Robert Coplan for guiding me throughout the planning, the writing, and the speaking processes and for helping to fund this costly project. Thank you to my thesis committee for their helpful suggestions. Next, I wish to acknowledge my friends, especially Katie, Lana, Leanne, and Mandy who had to listen to my many hours of complaining throughout the last two years and who all have given me lots of support and advice. Thank you to Dr. Craig Leth-Steenson for helping me with the complicated analyses. Thank you also to the psychology administrative staff for answering my questions and for their willingness to help. I am sincerely grateful to the people who aided in the stuffing, sealing, and stamping of the 575 envelopes that were mailed for this study, these people are: Alberta, Lana, Leanne, and Mandy. I would also like to thank fellow Master's student Jacquie Wickett for driving me to a post office to mail some of the questionnaires. Thanks also to the kindergarten teachers, school principals, teacher associations, and school boards who agreed to participate in this study. In addition, I would like to express my gratitude to my family in New Brunswick, most of whom do not really know what I am doing at Carleton, (although I think I finally convinced them that I am not in law school), but support me anyways.

Finally, but most importantly I would like to thank the mouse in our lab for only allowing me to see him once, ... I wouldn't be here otherwise!

Table of Contents

Title Page	i
Acceptance Page	ii
Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents	v
List of Tables	vi
List of Appendices	vii
Introduction	1
Method	38
Results	51
Discussion	73
References	110
Appendices	134

List of Tables

Table 1: Child Behaviour Vignettes	44
Table 2: Correlations Between Classroom Management Style and Teacher Characteristics	52
Table 3: Means (and Standard Deviations) for Behaviour Main Effects	56
Table 4: Means (and Standard Deviations) for Behaviour x Gender of Child Interactions	58
Table 5: Means (and Standard Deviations) for Behaviour x Teacher Group Interactions for Teacher Tolerance	63
Table 6: Means (and Standard Deviations) for Behaviour x Teacher Group Interactions (for Girls) for Behaviour Attributions	65
Table 7: Means (and Standard Deviations) for Behaviour Main Effects (for Boys) for Behaviour Attributions	66
Table 8: Means (and Standard Deviations) for Behaviour x Teacher Group Interactions for Responses toward the Behaviours	68
Table 9: Means (and Standard Deviations) for Gender of Child x Teacher Group Interactions for Amends	71

List of Appendices

Appendix A: Example of Questionnaire Package	134
--	-----

Classroom Management Style and Kindergarten Teachers' Tolerances, Beliefs, and Responses to Child Behaviours and Misbehaviours

Next to parents, teachers can be considered one of the main adult influences in young children's lives. The most important resource that children have in their classrooms is their teachers (Pianta & Steinberg, 1992; Swap, 1974). Teachers serve as caregivers, playmates and educators to children five days a week during the school year. Teachers provide children with opportunities to examine new concepts (Howes, Phillips, & Whitebook, 1992) and are bases for children to explore their environments (Birch & Ladd, 1996). Teachers also promote social interaction, mediate disputes and provide discipline in response to inappropriate behaviours. In addition, teachers refer students with learning and problem behaviours to special education classes or provide other outside assistance if needed (Algozzine & Ysseldyke, 1986). Positive teacher-child relationships may serve as a buffer for negative adjustment outcomes, whereas stressful teacher-student relationships may hinder school adjustment (Birch & Ladd, 1996; Hamre & Pianta, 2001). As such, teachers are essentially responsible for children's learning, physical and emotional needs while in their classroom (Howes & Hamilton, 1992).

Even preschool children recognize the importance of teachers in their lives. Summers, Stroud, Stroud, and Heaston (1991) reported that most young children understood that teachers are important to society, and believed that teachers work hard or harder than individuals in other well-known professions. Armstrong and Sugawara (1989) found that 55% of the preschoolers interviewed enjoyed the caregiving involved in teaching and 17% enjoyed how teachers associated with children.

Teachers' attitudes and beliefs can influence their own behaviours toward children (Cunningham & Sugawara, 1988) as well as their students' behaviours (Birch & Ladd, 1998; Pianta, Steinberg, & Rollins, 1995). It is important for researchers to study teachers' beliefs, because beliefs influence decisions teachers make in the classroom (Fang, 1996; Vartuli, 1999). Admittedly, observations of teachers actual classroom behaviours would almost always be ideal, but collecting observational data is very time consuming and expensive. However, teachers' beliefs have been shown to be related to their behaviours in the classroom (Charlesworth, Hart, Burts, & Hernandez, 1991; Kagan & Smith, 1988; Muijs & Reynolds, 2002). For instance, Kagan and Smith (1988) found that kindergarten teachers who completed self-report measures of cognitive style, teaching beliefs, job stress and classroom behaviours were observed to behave consistently with their reported beliefs and behaviours. In addition, Charlesworth et al. (1991) found that teachers' reported developmentally appropriate beliefs were similar to their actual classroom practices.

Teachers will often make assumptions based on their beliefs to deal with the problems that occur in the classroom (Abelson, 1979; Cunningham & Sugawara, 1988). Teachers' belief systems also influence children's acquisition of knowledge, serve to provide children with rules, and generate a climate for learning (Alexander & Entwisle, 1988; Kagan & Smith, 1988). Thus, teachers' beliefs play a major role in children's developmental outcomes. The present study investigated kindergarten teachers' approaches to classroom management, as well as their tolerances and beliefs about certain child behaviours.

Teacher Beliefs

Researchers examining teacher beliefs have explored the ideas, preconceptions, and attitudes that teachers possess regarding instruction, the nature of the classroom, child development, and children's behaviours (Chang, 2003; Charlesworth et al., 1991; Halperin, 1976; Martin & Baldwin, 1994). In the present study, two types of teacher beliefs were explored. The first refers to teachers' general approach to teaching and the classroom (classroom management), whereas the second concerns teachers' responses and attitudes toward specific child behaviours. Literature pertaining to each of these constructs is reviewed in the following sections.

Classroom Management

One of the principle concerns of teachers is *classroom management* (Henson & Roberts, 2001; Johns, MacNaughton, & Karabinus, 1989), a term that is often used to describe disciplinary techniques. However, classroom management encompasses more than just discipline. Indeed, classroom management includes all teachers' efforts to monitor activities, social interaction, and learning that occurs in the classroom (Martin & Baldwin, 1994), whereas discipline refers to the rules and strategies that are used to maintain order in the classroom (Jones & Jones, 1981).

Only recently have teacher education programs included classroom management into their curriculum. In the past, the primary concern was on creating lesson plans. However, it has now been suggested that effective teaching of material and classroom management are both important, intertwined aspects of instruction (Brophy, 1988; Johns et al., 1989, & Karabinus, 1989; Kauffman, Pullen, & Akers, 1986). In this regard, teachers are similar to parents. They are responsible for shaping children's behaviour

through manipulation of children's physical and social world so that children can appropriately learn the required material (Kauffman et al., 1986). In the classroom, teachers are the individuals who are primarily responsible for maintaining order and control (Chang, 2003), although the children themselves do play a role in this duty as well (Kauffman et al., 1986). Therefore, if intervention is to occur in classroom management, it should begin with change in teacher behaviour (Kauffman et al., 1986).

In her review of the literature, Brophy (1988) concluded that teachers should think of classroom management as a means of creating a successful learning environment for students, instead of placing an increased emphasis on being an authority or disciplinary figure. Appropriate classroom management will vary for each classroom teacher, according to grade level, class size, and intentions of the teacher (Brophy, 1988). In essence, children in early elementary school will typically cooperate with their teachers, but because they are new to the school experience they require firm rules, procedures, and routines to familiarize them with the school setting. As a result, teachers of primary grades spend much of their time dealing with classroom management, but mainly with instructional aspects (teaching the children what to do) rather than on disciplinary aspects (correcting behaviour) (Brophy, 1988).

For the present study, classroom management was defined as the behaviours teachers use in their classrooms to perform daily activities (Martin & Shoho, 2000; Martin & Yin, 1997; Martin, Yin, & Baldwin, 1998), and included the following three broad dimensions: instructional management, people management, and behaviour management. *Instructional management* refers to teachers' attempts to monitor learning, including supervising students working, planning daily activities, and distributing

supplies. *People management*, on the other hand, refers to teachers attempts to know their students as people and to help them grow socially. Finally, *Behaviour management* is similar to discipline but distinct in that it entails the prevention of problem behaviour rather than focusing on it after it occurs.

Researchers typically describe three approaches to classroom management which include the non-interventionist, interventionist, and interactionist approaches (Glickman & Wolfgang, 1978; Glickman & Tamashiro, 1980; Wolfgang, 1995). Teachers who are high on the non-interventionist approach believe the child should be in control of their own development and their own behaviour, whereas teachers who are high on the interventionist approach believe the child is a product of the environment and therefore the environment should control their development. The interactionalist approach is in between the other two approaches. Teachers who primarily use this approach believe the child's behaviour and development is the result of a constant interplay between the child and the environment (Wolfgang & Glickman, 1986). Wolfgang and colleagues (Wolfgang & Glickman, 1980; 1986; Wolfgang, 1995) have argued that teachers use all three approaches in their classrooms but that one generally persists the majority of the time.

Loosely, one could argue that the teaching approaches to classroom management could parallel Baumrind's (1971) parenting styles. Indeed, authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive (also termed *laissez-faire*) parenting styles are linked with the amount of control parents have over their children. Permissive parents are those who are least in control of their children. They are tolerant and accepting of children's actions and allow children to regulate themselves. They also use as little punishment as possible.

Authoritarian parents, on the other hand, are those who are high in control but also low in warmth. These parents attempt to shape and control their children with set standards. They emphasize obedience and order in their children. In between these parenting styles lies the authoritative parenting style. Parents of this style have control over their children but are also warm to their children. In addition, these parents encourage their children's individuality, independence and are open to compromising. Communication is also an important element of authoritative parenting.

With these descriptions in mind, it seems logical to link the interventionist teaching approach with authoritarian parenting and the interactionalist teaching approach with authoritative parenting. Perhaps less of a connection can be made between the non-interventionist teaching approach and the permissive parenting style, but a link can still be made. Results from studies have shown that authoritative parenting is generally most strongly associated with children's positive developmental outcomes (Dornbusch, Ritter, Leiderman, Roberts, & Fraleigh, 1987). In her review of the literature, Brophy (1988) suggested that when it comes to teachers and discipline, authoritative teachers are more successful than either authoritarian or laissez-faire counterparts. However, the relations between classroom management styles and child outcomes have not been extensively explored to date.

Factors related to classroom management. Researchers have identified several factors that account for individual differences in teachers' classroom management. For instance, Martin and Baldwin (1994) found that novice teachers (defined in their study as teachers with zero to three years experience) were significantly more interventionists overall, as well as in instruction and discipline. The researchers acknowledged that it

takes time for teachers to get acquainted with the classroom setting, to plan efficient lessons, and to effectively manage the children in their classrooms.

Martin and Shoho (2000) compared the classroom management beliefs between traditionally trained student teachers; novice alternative certification teachers (teachers who are typically older and have a Bachelor's degree in areas where teachers are needed); and experienced traditionally trained teachers. It was found that both the alternative certification teachers and the experienced teachers were significantly more interventionists in terms of people management and behavioural management than the traditionally trained student teachers. The authors explained the results in terms of the student teachers' lack of experience and their optimism towards teaching. It was further clarified that teachers cannot idealistically develop relationships with students (people management), nor can they actually respond to misbehaviour (behaviour management), until they actually are instructors of classrooms.

Martin and Yin (1997) reported that male teachers were more interventionist in instructional management and behaviour management than female teachers. In the same study, interventionists were found to be more dominant but also to be more perfectionist. The authors suggested that interventionists tend to be outspoken about their desires even in times when it might not be warranted, but are also well-organized, enjoy predictable situations, and do not deal well with uncertainty.

Teachers' Tolerances of Behaviours in the Classroom

Whereas classroom management refers to teachers' overall practices, researchers have also focused on how teachers deal with individual children. One way that this is done is by explaining teachers' tolerances and reactions to different behaviours. Indeed,

how well children are able to interact with their teachers depends in part on their teachers' tolerances of the behaviours that the children display.

Ecological theorists claim that it is the interaction between a behaviour and the environment that determine whether or not a behaviour is disturbing (Algozzine, 1977; Rhodes, 1970). Rhodes (1970) viewed a disturbing behaviour as a product of an interaction between the child's behaviour and the reaction the child receives because of the behaviour. Behaviours that may be seen as disturbing in one context may not be seen as a disturbance in another environment.

With this point in mind, Swap (1974) suggested that children may fare better when teachers are tolerant of their behaviours than when placed in classrooms with intolerant teachers, in effect, leading to fewer disturbances perceived in the classroom. If the behaviour is not seen as much of a disturbance, it may receive less attention. Indeed, Taylor and Romanczyk (1994) found that some problem behaviours are a product of the attention they receive as a consequence of the behaviour. Therefore, when selecting children for a classroom, the fit between the children and the teacher should be taken into consideration. It has been suggested that a treatment intervention of matching teachers' personalities with children's behaviours may aid in correcting behaviours that are most often seen as disturbing in the classroom (Algozzine, 1977; Swap, 1974).

Results from several studies have suggested that teachers are generally more tolerant of social immaturity (i.e. social withdrawal, lack of self-confidence, anxiety, etc.) than they are of social defiance (i.e. fighting, destructiveness, inattentiveness, etc.; Algozzine, Ysseldyke, Christenson, & Thurlow, 1983; Cunningham & Sugawara, 1988; Safran & Safran, 1984). For instance, Algozzine, Ysseldyke, and Christenson (1983) reported that

teachers were more tolerant of children who exhibited social immature behaviours than children who exhibited unmanageable behaviours (i.e., defiant, rude, lack of motivation). Moreover, more tolerant teachers of social immature behaviours had higher expectations for socially immature children in terms of academic achievement, memory skills, motor performance, attending behaviours, completion of assignments, and the ability to follow directions. In contrast, unmanageable behaviours were viewed less favorably across all of these dimensions, regardless of teachers' tolerance of unmanageable behaviours. Kedar-Voivodas and Tannenbaum (1979) have suggested that these differences in expectations may be due to the fact that acting out behaviours are inconsistent with the pupil role while withdrawn behaviours are close to what is expected from children in the classroom setting.

It has been argued that the behaviours that are perceived to be most often seen in girls (i.e., shyness) are seen as less deviant than behaviours that are thought to be typically seen in boys (i.e., destructiveness) (Schlosser & Algozzine, 1979). According to the results of a number of studies, teachers find aggressive behaviours to be the most disturbing in the classroom (e.g., Hutton & Roberts 1983; Safran & Safran, 1985), because of this behaviours's tendency to produce a "rippling effect" - the fear that the behaviour would contagiously spread to the other students (Safran, 1982; Safran & Safran, 1984, 1985, 1987). In contrast, social withdrawal is seen to have little interference with other children's learning (Safran & Safran, 1984).

More recently, however, Salkind et al. (2000) compared the tolerances of teachers and non-teachers. Both teachers and non-teachers rated behaviours that were most salient to them as being the most serious. For example, teachers rated 'disobeying teacher',

‘incomplete work’ and ‘talking back to the teacher’ as the most serious behaviour problems, whereas the non-teachers rated ‘drug use’, ‘drug selling’, and ‘profanity’ as the most serious behaviour problems. Surprisingly, physical aggression was rated last on both the teachers’ and non-teachers’ lists. It should be noted, however, that withdrawn behaviours and peer-related behaviours were not included in this survey.

Researchers have identified several behaviours that are generally disturbing to teachers, including poor peer cooperation (Safran & Safran, 1984), distractibility, listening problems, demands for teacher attention, and an inability to remain on task (Stephenson, Linfoot, & Martin, 2000). On a positive note, Hutton (1984) found that teachers were more concerned about problem behaviours than they were disturbed by them. Aggressive behaviours were both the most concerning to teachers as well as the most disturbing to them. Interestingly, teachers were least concerned and disturbed about children who avoided their peers. It was as if children who may need help might not receive it because their behaviours are not seen as very disturbing or concerning to teachers, since teachers are important in referring children to special education classes (Mamlin & Harris, 1998). These problems may also benefit from intervention (Hutton, 1984).

Causal Attributions of Behaviours in the Classroom

One reason why teachers might respond to and tolerate different kinds of child behaviours is because they have different beliefs about the underlying “causes” of these different behaviours. Research on helping behaviour suggests that people in society are more likely to give aid to another person when they believe that person’s behaviour to be uncontrollable, because they see the person as not responsible for their misfortunes

(Weiner, 1980). For example, Nishikawa and Takagi (1989) found that undergraduate students were more likely to lend class notes to an acquaintance or a close friend when the cause for missing the notes was due to an external rather than an internal locus of causality.

Individuals' beliefs about the origins of a behaviour are known as their *causal attribution* of the behaviour. Weiner (1979) proposed three constructs related to causality: locus of causality, controllability, and stability. Locus of causality refers to the initiator of the behaviour. Behaviours can either have internal or external locus of causality. If a behaviour is thought to be internally attributed, it is hence believed to be caused by the person. If, on the other hand, the behaviour is believed to have an external attribution, then a source outside the person is thought to have caused the behaviour. Controllability refers to whether or not the person can stop or initiate the behaviour at their own will. Finally, if a behaviour is believed to be stable then it is thought to be enduring and unchanging. However, a behaviour that is perceived as unstable is believed to be temporary and changeable.

Most research on causal attribution has been conducted with parents. Results indicate that parents make different attributions toward different kinds of child behaviours (e.g. shyness vs. aggression). For example, parents are generally "developmental optimists," demonstrating more internal attributions for their children's positive behaviours and more external attributions for their children's negative behaviours (Coplan, Hastings, Lagace-Seguin, & Moulton, 2002; Dix, Ruble, Grusec, & Nixon, 1986). Parents have also been found to have more external attributions for their young shy children (Mills & Rubin, 1990). On the other hand, Coplan et al. (2002) found

that mothers attributed aggressive and shy behaviours to more external factors than prosocial behaviours. Although mothers attributed both aggressive and shy behaviours to external sources, aggressive behaviours were seen to evoke more parent-centered goals and they responded more angrily towards the behaviour while shyness evoked more empathetic goals and less anger and embarrassment.

In addition, there have been studies conducted relating parenting styles and attributional causes. For example, Hastings and Rubin (1999) found that authoritarian mothers were likely to believe aggressive behaviours are due to internal sources. Similarly, Coplan et al. (2002) found that authoritarian mothers did not have a positive bias toward their own children that is typically found in parents; in actuality they attributed positive behaviours to more external causes and negative behaviours to more internal causes. It was suggested that parenting styles may be more noticeable during incidents that require disciplinary actions.

Very few studies have been conducted related to the attributions of teachers. Brophy and Rohrkemper (1981) examined elementary school teachers' attributions of behaviours in the classroom. Similar to the results found for parents' causal attributions, teachers attributed aggressive behaviours to internal, controllable, and stable causes, whereas social withdrawn behaviours were seen as less internal, less controllable, but stable. The teachers did not perceive the problems as a product of their own behaviours. As a result, teachers claimed they would use restrictive management strategies (e.g. punishment and threats) on the aggressive behaviour while they would use a combination of restrictive and helping strategies (e.g. rewards and punishments) on the socially withdrawn behaviour. Thus, teachers' causal attributions of behaviours appear to have an

effect on the strategies that teachers would use to improve the behaviour. Cunningham and Sugawara (1988) reported that preservice teachers believed that both social defiance and social immaturity behaviours were internal, controllable, and unstable. They argued that this contrary finding may be the result of novice teachers' inexperience with different types of problem behaviours. It was therefore implied that as teachers become more experienced with different behaviours in the classroom they would have different causal attributions for different types of behaviours.

Costs of Behaviours

Another method for exploring teachers' attitudes toward disturbing child behaviours is to assess the perceived "costs" of these behaviours. Although this was not directly assessed in their studies, Brophy and Rohrkemper (1981) and Safran and Safran (1985) described the costs of various problem behaviours. They discussed costs to the teacher, costs to the problem student, costs to the class, and indirect costs. Costs to the *teacher* included such issues as loss of time, energy and emotional involvement due to the problem behaviour. Potential costs of the *problem behaviour to the student* included concerns of maladjusted social, physical, and academic development. Costs to the *class* referred to lost teaching time and imitated problematic behaviour in the other students. Finally, the *indirect costs* included such issues as being seen as a poor teacher to the principle, other teachers, and students' parents.

Social defiance has been found to be perceived as significantly more costly than social immaturity in terms of costs to the class, costs to the teacher, and indirect costs. In terms of cost to the student, social immature behaviours have been reported to be perceived as more harmful (Cunningham & Sugawara, 1989). Teachers' choice of

strategy for dealing with problem behaviours may be related to their perceived costs of the behaviour. For instance, Cunningham and Sugawara (1989) found that the costs to the teacher, the costs to the class, and the indirect costs were significant predictors of preservice teachers' choice of strategy for dealing with problem behaviours. For socially defiant behaviour, it was found that preservice teachers were more likely to choose a restrictive strategy when the indirect costs to the teacher were high but were likely to choose a helping strategy when these costs were low. Therefore, preservice teachers would only help a child who displayed social defiance when the indirect costs of that behaviour to them were low. It was thus suggested that teachers are more concerned about their own status than they are with helping a child with a socially defiant problem. For social immaturity, the study found that teachers would help these children only when the costs to the class were low. That is, teachers may be more concerned with the welfare of the entire class than that of an individual socially immature child.

Child Behaviours in the Classroom

The present study explored kindergarten teachers' perceived responses, tolerances, attributions, and negative child costs for four child behaviours: aggression, shyness, social disinterest (unsociability), and prosocial behaviour. Although previous research has studied teachers' perceptions of aggression and social withdrawal, not much research exists concerning child prosocial behaviours. Moreover, previous studies related to social withdrawal have typically confounded shyness and social disinterest. Thus, teacher beliefs about unsociable behaviours remains uninvestigated. In the following sections, a brief review is provided for each of these behaviour types and how they are perceived and responded to by teachers.

Prosocial Behaviour

Definition and theory. Prosocial behaviours are actions that are performed voluntarily that benefit another individual (Bar-Tal, Raviv, & Goldberg, 1982; Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998). Although prosocial acts have been found to occur infrequently in children from ages 3 to 7 ½, they do occur in almost every child (Radke-Yarrow, Zahn-Waxler, Barrett, Darby, King, Pickett et al., 1976). Typically, females are presumed to be more prosocial than males (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998; Ladd & Profilet, 1996), especially in distressed situations (Kienbaum, Volland, & Ulich, 2001). Modeling has been shown to increase the amounts of altruistic behaviours a child displays (Rosenhan & White, 1967), especially in sociable children (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998).

Indeed, sociable children tend to be more prosocial than unsociable children (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998). In fact, Suda and Fouts (1980) performed a study on sixth grade introverts and extroverts in an “emergency” situation and found that extroverts were more likely to give active help to the victim such as offering assistance while the introverts offered passive help such as discussing the situation afterwards. However, it has been further shown that sociability is related to children’s helping of strangers, but not to their helping of familiar individuals (Stanhope, Bell, & Parker-Cohen, 1987). Hence, unsociable children may be hesitant to interact with people in general but even more so with strangers. It was suggested that shy children may be too inhibited to offer help to strangers but not to people in their home with their family.

Prosocial behaviours at school. School is a relatively familiar institution for most children and is an example of a place where children may benefit from prosocial behaviours. Prosocial children have a tendency to demonstrate higher IQ scores than less

prosocial children (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998) as well, popular children have fewer academic difficulties than average or rejected children (Coie & Dodge, 1988). In addition, prosocial children generally have positive interactions with their peers (Dodge, 1983). Children who are prosocial in nature have higher peer acceptance and perceived social competence (Bagwell, Newcomb, & Bukowski, 1998). They are more popular with their peers (Rubin & Daniels-Beirness, 1983), engage in more socially normative behaviours (Coie & Kupersmidt, 1983) and are less likely to be withdrawn and rejected (Ladd & Profilet, 1996). In addition, they are often viewed as leaders and cooperative and refrain from aggressive acts (Dodge, 1983; Ladd & Profilet, 1996).

Peer interactions are important for the development of prosocial behaviours (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998). Positive social relationships are related to helping behaviours even for preschool children (Farver, Husby, & Branstetter, 1994). In essence, more social children receive more positive reactions than less social children for prosocial actions which may further reinforce these behaviours and produce a cycle of positive and negative interactions, respectively (Eisenberg, Cameron, Tryon, & Dodez, 1981; Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998). Children who are sociable and outgoing have more experiences in developing skills on how to interpret, identify and respond to peers' needs (Farver et al., 1994). Therefore, the more experience children have with their peers, the more likely they will act prosocially (Farver et al., 1994). It may be helpful for child-care institutions to actively promote prosocial behaviours (Farver et al., 1994).

Correlates and outcomes. Prosocial behaviours are considered to be relatively stable (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998). Children initially develop concern for other people both within and outside the family at about two-years-old (Zahn-Waxler, Radke-Yarrow,

Wagner, & Chapman, 1992) and increasingly become more prosocial with age (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998; Eisenberg, Shell, Pasternack, Lennon, Beller, & Mathy, 1987). Prosocial behavior has been shown to be related to prosocial moral reasoning, perspective taking, and sympathy in early (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998; Eisenberg, Fabes, Miller, Shell, Shea, & May-Plumlee, 1990), and middle childhood (Eisenberg et al., 1987), as well as in adolescence (Eisenberg, Carlo, Murphy, & Van Court, 1995; Eisenberg, Miller, Shell, McNalley, & Shea, 1991) and early adulthood (Eisenberg et al., 1995). For instance, ten and 11-year-old prosocial children have been shown to demonstrate a high level of concern for the victim in an unfortunate incident as well as attempt to understand the perpetrator's point of view (Bengtsson & Johnson, 1992). The use of empathy in prosocial behaviours increases with age (Eisenberg et al., 1987), and is particularly salient in adolescence and adulthood (Eisenberg & Miller, 1987).

Prosocial behaviours are related to a number of positive characteristics, including social competence (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998; Rubin & Daniels-Beirness, 1983), a marginal amount of assertion, high self-esteem, low impulsivity (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998) and positive moods (Eisenberg et al., 1990) and has been shown to be a beneficial characteristic for high-quality friendships (Berndt, 1981; Berndt, Hawkins, & Hoyle, 1986; Costin & Carlson Jones, 1992; Eisenberg, Lundy, Shell, & Roth, 1985; Lipps Birch & Billman, 1986). Prosocial behaviour is even important in adult relationships (Huston & Burgess, 1979, Kelley, 1979).

For the most part, the literature suggests that no response should be given to individuals who engage in prosocial behaviours. Praise has been described as a technique that is often used to reinforce prosocial behaviour (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998). However,

Ascione and Sanok (1982) found that second and third grade children who observed others donating to charity and receiving praise for their actions did not differ significantly from a control group in donations made to charity after the observation. Not only praise but rewards in general may not reinforce prosocial behaviours. For example, Szynal-Brown and Morgan (1983) found that children in the third grade who were promised a reward for tutoring younger children if these children performed well were less likely to tutor in subsequent opportunities than those tutors who were not promised rewards for their behaviours.

Previous studies suggest that children who receive rewards for prosocial behaviours are more likely to attribute these behaviours to external, not intrinsic motivation, and may in essence cause these children to act prosocially less frequently (Fabes, Fultz, Eisenberg, May-Plumlee, & Christopher, 1989; Radke-Yarrow et al., 1976; Szynal-Brown & Morgan; 1983). Indeed, when rewards are given for prosocial behaviours, children may help only when they believe they may be rewarded for the endeavor (Fabes et al., 1989). In fact, Grusec (1991) found that 4-year-old children who received no response for their prosocial behaviours from their parents were more prosocial in general than children who received social approval for their behaviours.

Prosocial behaviours and teachers. Very little research has been conducted regarding teachers beliefs, attitudes, and reactions to prosocial behaviours. This may be due to the fact that more attention in the classroom is typically given to more disruptive behaviours (Warden, Christie, Kerr, & Low, 1996). In fact, it has been found that sociable children spend less time with their teachers (Coplan & Prakash, 2003), which may be a result of teachers' dealings with problematic behaviours. In general, teachers

view prosocial behaviours positively (Chang, 2003). Indeed, Ladd and Price (1987) found that children who were cooperative in preschool were seen as more sociable in kindergarten by their teachers.

Teachers' relationships with their students may have an influence on children's prosocial behaviours. For instance, it has been shown that preschool children who have nurturant caregivers are more helpful and sympathetic (Radke-Yarrow, Scott, & Zahn Waxler, 1973). As well, children who are socially competent have secure attachments with their teachers (Mitchell-Copeland-Mitchell, Denham, & DeMulder, 1997) and are well liked by them (LaFreniere & Sroufe, 1985). Indeed, children are more likely to be prosocial when they have warm and supportive relationships with their teachers (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998).

Not surprisingly, since classrooms display many types of behaviours, prosocial behaviours are often not remarked upon by teachers (Warden et al., 1996), and are rarely reinforced by them (Eisenberg, Cameron, Tryon, & Dodez, 1981; Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998). Warden and colleagues (1996) found that when teachers were asked what they would do in incidents of prosocial behaviours, 19% said that the behaviour was appropriate so they would not do anything as a result of the behaviour, while some participants actually criticized the behaviours. The authors suggested that these non-rewarding and inhibiting responses may hinder prosocial acts in children. However, it was also found that 25% of the teachers in their study claimed they would praise prosocial behaviours.

Research has not yet studied teachers' beliefs and attitudes toward prosocial behaviours in relation to its costs, causal attributions, and tolerance level. In the present

study, prosocial children were used as a comparison group for more problematic child behaviours (i.e., aggression and shyness).

Aggression

Definition and theory. Aggression is a very salient behaviour, especially in early childhood (Crick, Casas, & Mosher, 1997). The literature often describes two main types of aggression: relational aggression and overt aggression. Relational aggression is characterized by an individual's attempts to harm another person by excluding them from the peer group, and by spreading gossip and untrue rumors (Crick, 1996). This type of aggression has typically been associated with girls more so than boys (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995). Overt aggression, on the other hand, is characterized by hurting another individual physically by hitting, punching, kicking, slapping, and/or pushing (Coie & Dodge, 1998; Crick et al., 1997). Boys are usually rated as more overtly aggressive than girls (Coie & Dodge, 1988, 1998; Crick et al., 1997; Hudley, 1993; Ladd & Profilet, 1996). The present study concentrated on overt aggression rather than relational aggression because overt aggression is very noticeable in the classroom (Brophy & Evertson, 1981; Burns & Owen, 1990; Goldstein, Tisak, & Boxer, 2002). Also, there is some debate as to the nature of relational aggression in young children (Henington, Hughes, Cavell, & Thompson, 1998; Heyman & Legare, 2004; McEvoy, Estrem, Rodriguez, & Olsen, 2003).

Aggression at school. A substantial amount of aggression occurs while children are at school. Indeed, Pepler and Craig (1995) found that overtly aggressive children displayed physical aggression once every 8 minutes on the playground. Overtly aggressive children have been shown to be at risk for school failure (Coie & Dodge,

1998; Patterson, 1986), have a tendency to be off-task in class (Coie & Dodge, 1988) and face rejection by their peers (Chang, 2003; Coie & Kupersmidt, 1983; Dodge, 1983; Ladd & Price, 1987). Peer rejection is a well-known consequence of aggression in childhood (Chang, 2003; Coie & Kupersmidt, 1983; Dodge, 1983; Hymel, Rubin, Rowden, & LeMare, 1990; Rubin & Daniels-Beirness, 1983). In fact, aggression is the behaviour problem that is most often characterized by peer rejection (Coie & Dodge, 1998). Not surprisingly, aggressive children also tend to have difficult relationships with their teachers (Naas & Howse, 2003).

Since aggression is a very observable behaviour, it may have repercussions on classmates' behaviours (Goldstein, Arnold, Rosenberg, Stowe, & Ortiz, 2001). Goldstein et al. (2001) have shown that aggressive behaviours in a daycare classroom can be contagious. These behaviours have been found to be especially contagious if children observe aggressive children receiving reinforcement for the behaviours. Consistent with the vicarious learning theory, Puleo (1978) found that children who watched a video of a child who had received praise for his aggressive acts engaged in more frequent aggressive acts than children who did not watch the video. Negative attention has also been found to be positively correlated with contagion (Goldstein et al., 2001). However, when teachers are close in proximity, fewer aggressive acts tend to occur (Goldstein et al., 2001).

Correlates and outcomes. Overt aggression is probably the most noticeable behaviour in the school setting and is associated with the most negative maladjustment (Crick, 1996; Parker & Asher, 1987). Indeed, aggression in childhood is more consistently related to negative outcomes than is shyness in childhood (Parker & Asher,

1987). Aggression has been shown to be relatively stable, from toddlerhood through to adulthood (Crick, 1996; Coie & Dodge, 1983; 1998; Naas & Howse, 2003; Olweus, 1979) and is associated with peer rejection (Ladd & Price, 1987), social unacceptance (Phillipsen, Deptula, & Cohen, 1999), lack of prosocial skills (Crick et al., 1997; Ladd & Profilet, 1996), a high rate of dropping out of school (Parker & Asher, 1987) and committing crimes and delinquent acts (Walker, Stiller, Severson, Feil, & Golly, 1998) in adolescence and in young adulthood. Even though early childhood shows the most incidents of aggressive behaviour, the most dangerous period for aggression is late adolescence and early adulthood. At this time, children who were aggressive in childhood have been shown to engage in serious acts of violence (Coie & Dodge, 1998).

Aggression and teachers. It has been found that aggressive children are likely to have negative teacher-child relationships (Birch & Ladd, 1998). Teachers tend to be angry and punishing toward aggressive children (Coie & Koeppel, 1990) and have less warm interactions with these children compared to their peers (Birch & Ladd, 1998). In addition, aggressive children are less likely to have securely attached relationships with their teachers (Howes, Hamilton, & Matheson, 1994). However, positive teacher-student relationships have been found to be beneficial for aggressive children (Meehan, Hughes, & Cavell, 2003), indeed it has been suggested that positive teacher-student relationships may act as a buffer from negative adjustment outcomes (Hamre & Pianta, 2001; Ladd & Burgess, 2001). Aggressive children who have positive relationships with their teachers have been shown to be less aggressive a year later (Hughes, Cavell, & Jackson, 1999). Teachers who are tolerant of aggressive behaviours may display more acceptance of the

behaviour to aggressive children's peers and therefore these children may be more positively accepted by their classmates (Chang, 2003).

Teachers spend most of their non-teaching time dealing with disruptive behaviours, including aggression (Brophy & Evertson, 1981; Nelson & Roberts, 2000) and in general teachers have been shown to not tolerate these behaviours. Teachers' intolerance of aggression is a problem because aggressive acts do occur fairly frequently in the classroom. Atlas and Pepler (1998) observed the behaviours of aggressive and non-aggressive children in classrooms. These researchers found that bullying (one form of overt aggression) occurred about twice an hour, but the incidents were short in duration. The results of their study indicated that bullying does occur in the classroom and that teachers are generally unaware of such behaviours. Aggressive behaviours were more likely to occur when children were not under close supervision of the teacher. It was found that teachers intervened in only 18% of the bullying episodes in their study, but that they were more likely to intervene when they were aware of the aggressive behaviours. It was suggested that teachers should try to be more observant of aggressive behaviours in their classrooms.

Teachers spend a lot of time disciplining aggressive behaviours in the classroom (Coie & Dodge, 1988). Goldstein et al. (2001) have suggested that teachers should not overlook any act of aggression in the classroom. By dealing with misbehaviours teachers may prevent other acts of aggression in the classroom. Teachers should also avoid reinforcing the behaviours, as such could lead to contagion of the behaviour. However, Goldstein et al. (2001) found that teachers reinforced aggressive acts just as frequently as they punished the acts. Even publicly attempting to correct the behaviour may not be

beneficial to aggressive children. Indeed, aggressive children have been shown to feel positively about their social skills in classes where they receive negative attention from their teachers (Chang, 2003). On the contrary, it has also been shown that aggressive children may need more teacher attention than non-aggressive children to stay on classroom tasks (Roberts, Pepler, & Craig, 1998 as cited in Atlas & Pepler, 1998).

The strategies teachers use to deal with aggressive behaviours have a profound impact on children's development. Warden et al. (1996) found that the most common response that teachers suggested to inhibit antisocial acts was verbal intervention. Teachers also claimed they would intervene physically (remove the child from the situation, hold the aggressive child back from the victim), send the child to the guidance counselor, notify the child's parents, and have discussions about the behaviour in the class. Teachers were also likely to make contingent responses such as monitoring the child's future behaviours and finding out why the child behaved in this manner. Children who bully have also been shown to be placed out of mainstream classrooms (Haapasalo, Tremblay, Boulerice, & Vitaro, 2000).

As mentioned above, teachers have previously been found to use restrictive and monitoring strategies when dealing with aggression. Socially defiant behaviours have also been found to be perceived by teachers as having more costs to the class, costs to the teacher and indirect costs compared to socially immature behaviours. In addition, it has previously been reported that teachers believe that aggressive behaviours are the result of internal sources, are controllable, and are stable. Finally, teachers also tend to be more intolerant of socially defiant behaviours compared to socially immature behaviours.

Shyness

Definition and theory. The following terms are often used in the literature when describing shy behaviours: social withdrawal, reticence, shyness, and inhibition. Each word does refer to relatively the same behaviour, yet often indicates a different context for which it occurs. In the present study, shyness was defined similarly to Asendorpf (1990), thus it referred to children's lack of interaction due to a conflict between a desire for approaching the peer group and a fear that triggers an avoidant response. However, the literature examined in the present study used a number of the above-mentioned terms.

Typically, a small amount of shyness is seen as a beneficial characteristic in very young children. It allows them to be cautious in unfamiliar surroundings and to be wary of strangers. However, shyness is problematic when it becomes so intense that it impairs children's lives, it is then that it may be indicative of concurrent problems (Bowen, Vitaro, Kerr, & Pelletier, 1995). Negative moods, worries and fears have been associated with high shyness in preschool (Stevenson-Hinde & Glover, 1996). Yet, shyness may not be identified in early childhood because socially-anxious children may not appear to be different from other children (Rubin & Mills, 1988). For instance, peers or adults do not see playing by oneself in preschool as abnormal. At this age, children typically engage in solitary play (Rubin & Mills, 1988). It is not until middle childhood and adolescence that children are expected to form close peer relationships. If this fails to occur, children may be at risk for negative outcomes (Caspi, Elder, & Bem, 1988; Ladd & Burgess, 1999).

Shyness at school. At school shy children may be characterized as displaying reticent behaviours, that is, they may engage in onlooking, wary behaviour in the presence of their classmates (Coplan, 2000; Coplan, Prakash, O'Neil, & Armer, 2004).

Shy children are also detected by their tendency to speak less frequently than their peers and by having a longer latency period when they first speak in new social and structured settings (Evans, 1993, 2001; Crozier & Perkins, 2002). Asendorpf and Meier (1993) have shown that children who are shy speak less upon arrival at school, in discussions, at break, and upon leaving for home. These children take longer to warm up and display more reticence than non-shy children (Crozier & Perkins, 2002). In addition, shy children have a tendency to feel anxious in social settings (Crozier, 1999). Since school is a social setting, shy children often feel socially anxious in the company of their peers and teachers (Evans, 2001). Such fears and unsociability can have a huge impact on a child's future adjustments, including the possibility that the child may face peer rejection (Boivin, Hymel, & Bukowski, 1995).

Correlates and outcomes. There is a significant amount of research on shyness in preschool and kindergarten. Coplan, Rubin, Fox, Calkins, and Stewart (1994) found that reticence was related to poor performance in social settings on speeches (children were asked to tell about their last birthday party) and ticket-sorting (children were asked to sort tickets by color) for kindergarten children. Coplan, Gavinski-Molina, Lagace-Seguin, and Wichmann (2001) found that reticence was negatively related to teacher rated social competence and negatively related to academic achievement in kindergarten. It was suggested that the display of anxiety may inhibit children from acquiring and demonstrating academic skills. Rubin, Daniels-Beirness, and Bream (1984) also found that extremely withdrawn preschoolers and kindergarteners offered few suggestions to hypothetical social problems but were above the mean on seeking adult intervention as a suggestion.

Similar to aggression, shyness is a fairly stable trait (Asendorpf, 1989; Fordham & Stevenson-Hinde, 1999; Hegvik, McDevitt, & Carey, 1982; Pedlow, Sanson, Prior, & Oberklaid, 1993). In contrast, however, shyness is not viewed as overly deviant in the eyes of peers in early childhood (Rubin & Asendorpf, 1993). As withdrawn behaviours become more salient to shy children and their peers the more it becomes related to negative effects on shy children (Younger & Boyko, 1987). Shyness has been suggested to be problematic from childhood into adulthood (Crozier, 2000). Shyness has been found to be related to unpopularity, lack of leadership skills, (Rubin, Chen, & Hymel, 1993) lower global self-worth, (Fordham & Stevenson-Hinde, 1999), peer rejection, victimization (Boivin, Hymel, & Bukowski, 1995; Olweus, 1993) lower classmate acceptance (Ladd, 1981; Lemerise, 1997; Phillipsen, Bridges, McLemore, & Saponaro, 1999), loneliness (Boivin et al., 1995), academic difficulties (Evans, 2001), low social self-confidence, low social skills, and anxiety (Fordham & Stevenson-Hinde, 1999; Kerr, 2000). Coplan and colleagues (2004) found in their study on preschool children that shyness was related to negative-emotionality and lower perceived competence. Also, shyness was positively related to peer exclusion for boys but not for girls (as rated by teachers). Therefore, there is some evidence that peer rejection does occur early in childhood, however, this was indicated by teacher ratings, which may be different from what the children perceive. Shyness in childhood can lead to anxiety problems in adolescence (Prior, Smart, Sanson, & Oberklaid, 2000) and adulthood (Cheek & Krasnoperova, 1999).

In North America, some negative outcomes have been found to be more severe for shy boys than shy girls. This may be due to the theory that shyness is more appropriate

for females in Western society than it is for males (Mills & Rubin, 1993; Rubin et al., 2002; Stevenson-Hinde & Glover, 1996). For example, Stevenson-Hinde and Glover (1996) found that extremely shy boys engaged in more acting out behaviours. In addition, Rubin et al. (1993) found that withdrawn boys had more internalizing problems than aggressive children, average children, and withdrawn girls. In particular, withdrawn boys had lower views of their social skills and were more lonely than these other groups of children. Gender differences are not unique to childhood and adolescence. Caspi et al. (1988) found that American shy men who were also shy in childhood married later, had a delay in fatherhood, and experienced career instability, while shy women who were shy girls did not show delays in marriage or parenthood.

Shyness and teachers. Shyness is a behaviour that is not given much attention by adults (Crozier & Perkins, 2002), especially by teachers because aggressive children are seen as more of a behavioural problem in their classrooms than are shy children (Evans, 2001). Ladd and Profilet (1996) found that kindergarten children who were anxious-fearful were less likely to be involved in aggressive acts (Ladd & Profilet, 1996). It was suggested that this may reinforce teachers liking of the behaviour and the children who display these behaviours. Most teachers may not mind having shy children in their classes because they are not disruptive. However, shy students may be at risk for lower academic achievement (Evans, 2001). For instance, Rubin et al. (1993) found that teachers rated grade 5 children who were withdrawn as having a higher amount of learning difficulties.

It is an unfortunate reality that shy children are viewed as less competent than their peers because they talk less frequently (Evans, 2001) and are more dependent on the teacher (Coplan & Prakash, 2003; Ladd & Burgess, 1999). Crozier and colleagues

(Crozier, 2001, Crozier & Perkins, 2002) suggest that teachers need to recognize that children may be quiet in the classroom because of a fear of speaking, rather than a lack of interest or understanding of the topic. Crozier (2001) recommends that shy children would benefit from teachers who are sensitive and responsive to their needs. Indeed, Kienbaum et al. (2001) found that boys who had uncaring teachers were more likely to display inhibition and avoidance and to be less sympathetic-prosocial in response to distressed situations. This finding was explained in terms of the more negative consequences of boys who are shy than girls and thus they may fair worse in response to an uncaring teacher.

Teacher-child relationships are important for shy children. Perhaps interventions in early childhood that help develop positive teacher-child relationships with shy children could lead to fewer negative outcomes (Hamre & Pianta, 2001; Pianta, Steinberg, & Rollins, 1995). Ladd and Burgess (1999) have shown that withdrawn kindergarten children are more dependent on teachers compared to a control sample. It has also been found that shy and/or anxious children more frequently receive initiations from their teachers, in contrast to aggressive children who tended to initiate more interactions, and sociable children who engaged in more infrequent interactions with their teachers (Coplan & Prakash, 2003).

A concern in the research is implementing ways in which these children can be made more “visible” (Evans, 2001). Brophy and Bohrkemper (1989) (as cited in Crozier, 2001) found that the experienced elementary teachers in their study believed that shyness could be aided through a gradual process of guidance in a non-pressuring environment. Teachers who were regarded as exceptional at their job preferred to give withdrawn

children praise, small jobs, and positive expectations. These teachers also tried to minimize these children's embarrassment by gradually giving them more attention in the classroom. Praise is a reinforcement that will often work with shy children, however, some research suggests that discretion should be used (Paget, Nagle, & Martin, 1984). Comadena and Prusank (1988) also recommended that shy children not be punished for their lack of speech and they stressed the importance of informing these children of the acceptability of making mistakes. Optimistically, Cunningham and Sugawara (1988) found that preservice teachers were oriented toward helping children with social immature problems.

To summarize, previous research has found that teachers favour helping shy children, which may include the use of positive reinforcement such as praise and guidance. The behaviour has also been perceived by teachers as having costs to the shy student more so than the other types of costs. In addition, teachers have previously been shown to believe that socially withdrawn behaviours when compared to aggressive behaviours are attributed to be less internal, less controllable, but stable. Finally, it has been found that socially immature behaviours are more tolerable than aggressive behaviours.

Unsociability/ Social Disinterest

Definition and theory. Asendorpf (1990) described children who have a preference for solitary behaviour as having a low approach motivation but as not necessarily having a high avoidance motivation. That is, these children may prefer to play alone but do not have difficulties playing with their peers when they choose to interact with them (Rubin, 1982) and will most likely not turn down an invitation for social interaction (Asendorpf,

1993). As compared to shyness, there has been relatively little research to date related to unsociable children, this may be due to the fact that most previous research has confounded shyness and unsociability.

Harrist, Zaia, Bates, Dodge, and Petit (1997) reported that kindergarten children that had been labeled as unsociable (defined in their study as children who were low in approach motivation) differed from their non-withdrawn peers only by being less interactive with their peers during free play and by having higher levels of sociometric neglect. However, compared to the other subtypes of withdrawn children, unsociable children had the social abilities to interact with the other children if they so desired. In another study, Asendorpf and Meier (1993) found that unsociable children spent less time conversing with other children, but when unsociable children did have conversations with other children they did not differ in the amounts of time they spent talking when compared to their non-withdrawn peers.

Most recently, in their study on preschoolers, Coplan et al. (2004) found that social disinterest was positively related to attention-span and inversely related to negative emotionality. They explained that these results were consistent with previous research that suggested that unsociable children may be object-oriented (Jennings, 1975) and be well emotionally regulated (Rubin, Coplan, Fox, & Calkins, 1995). In addition, Coplan et al. (2004) found that social disinterest was related to a preference for alone play, but not to children's perceived competence or teacher-rated anxiety.

The distinction between those who enjoy versus those who do not enjoy solitary activities can still be made in adulthood (Leary et al., 2003). Indeed, Eisenberg, Fabes, and Murphy (1995) found that shyness in college was related to low regulation, high

negative emotionality, and low positive affect, whereas low sociability was found to be unrelated to negative emotionality, related with low positive emotional intensity, low physiological reactivity, and high inhibition control.

Unsociability at school. At school, it has been suggested that unsociable children frequently engage in solitary-passive behaviour. Solitary-passive play is characterized by a silent preoccupation with exploratory and constructive activities while in the presence of peers (Coplan et al., 2001). In general, this kind of play has been found to be relatively harmless for preschool and kindergarten children (Coplan, 2000; Rubin, 1982). In fact, solitary-constructive play has often been suggested as a beneficial behaviour for young children. For instance, Rubin (1982) found that four-year-old children who engaged in parallel-constructive behaviours were popular with their peers, and performed well on both social and non-social problems. Jennings (1975) also found that children who spent more time with objects performed better on classification and organization tests than more sociable children. In addition, Ladd and Profilet (1996) found that the asocial kindergarten children in their study were not rejected by their classmates. Results from studies have also shown that children who engage in solitary-passive behaviours are socially competent (Rubin, 1982), mature (Moore, Evertson, & Brophy, 1974) and do not suffer from anxiety (Coplan et al., 1994). However, Coplan et al. (2004) recently reported that social disinterest was not predictive of solitary-passive play in preschool, although it was predictive of infrequent initiations made to peers.

Correlates and outcomes. Almost nothing is known about the longer-term outcomes of childhood unsociability. Children who are more object-oriented have a tendency to be more adult-directed than peer-directed (Jennings, 1975; Moore, Evertson, & Brophy,

1974). Jennings (1975) questioned whether or not object-oriented children are more dependent, however in their study dependency was found to be unrelated to orientation. Since they do not frequently engage in social interaction with peers, these children may be deficient in mature social thinking, including adequate perspective taking (Rubin & Asendorpf, 1993).

Due to the lack of research on socially disinterested children beyond kindergarten, the long-term consequences of this behaviour are not yet clear. It has been argued that solitary-passive behaviours eventually merge with shy/anxious behaviours (Asendorpf, 1991). Indeed, Rubin and Mills (1988) found that children who displayed passive isolation when they were in the second grade had a tendency to feel lonely and depressed when they were in the fifth grade. At this time, passive withdrawal was also positively related to peer rejection and negatively related to peer acceptance. Rubin and Mills (1988) suggested that passive withdrawn behaviours may become problematic when children reach middle and late childhood. In support of this notion, Younger and his colleagues (Younger & Boyko, 1987; Younger & Daniels, 1992; Younger, Schwartzman, & Ledingham, 1986) have argued that these behaviours become more salient to peers with age as being a deviation from the norm. Hence, those children who choose to remain alone in situations that require social interaction become increasingly noticeable with time resulting in negative peer reputations and even rejection (Fordham & Stevenson-Hinde, 1999; Snyder, Horsch, & Childs, 1997).

Unsociability and teachers. Taking the above findings into account, what are childhood teachers' attitudes toward socially disinterested behaviours in their classrooms? Indeed, it has been shown that teachers can make the distinction between

shyness and social disinterest (Coplan et al., 2004). In fact, Harrist et al. (1997) found that teachers rated unsociable children as having the least amounts of adjustment problems compared to the children in the other withdrawn subtypes. Consistent with the above literature, Ladd and Profilet (1996) found children rated as asocial by their teachers spent more time alone. However, it was also reported that these teacher ratings were related to withdrawn behaviours and attention problems, but no relation was found between the *Asocial With Peers* subscale and aggression. Coplan et al. (2004) found that preschool teachers believed that socially disinterested children were withdrawn but not anxious. A few studies have suggested that solitary-constructive behaviours are typically encouraged by preschool and kindergarten teachers because these children are not disruptive and they are usually engaging in educationally appropriate activities (Moore, Evertson, & Brophy, 1974; Rubin, 1982). One could predict that teachers would not negatively perceive these types of behaviours. In fact, parallel play is a common occurrence in early childhood, therefore playing by oneself should not be seen as abnormal (Ladd & Burgess, 1999).

However, as mentioned previously, there may be gender effects when it comes to teacher's attitudes toward children who play by themselves. For instance, teachers may perceive this type of behaviour as acceptable for girls but not for boys. In this regard, they may be more willing to believe that the behaviour has internal causes, may be more stern towards the behaviour, and may be more intolerant of boys who are socially disinterested than girls who are also socially disinterested. These predictions are exploratory due to the lack of research on teachers' attitudes and beliefs toward socially disinterested children.

The Present Study

The primary goal of the present study was to explore teachers' attitudes and beliefs toward different types of behaviours (i.e., prosocial behaviour, aggression, shyness, and social disinterest) that are typically seen in kindergarten classrooms. In order to accomplish this goal, teachers were asked to respond to questions concerning vignettes that depicted the four specific child behaviours. These questions assessed teachers' strategies used to deal with the behaviours, their perceptions of the costs of the behaviours to the child, their attributions of the behaviours, and their tolerance of the behaviours. Hypotheses for how teachers would respond to each of these behaviours are now described.

Prosocial Behaviour. It was expected that overall, prosocial behaviour would be perceived by the teachers as being the least problematic. In particular, it was hypothesized that teachers would report using all intervention strategies the least in response to this behaviour. It was also predicted that prosocial behaviour would not be perceived to have any costs to the child. Since this behaviour is generally positively evaluated, it was expected that prosocial behaviour would be perceived by teachers as internal, stable, and controllable. Finally, it was hypothesized that this behaviour would be the most tolerable of the behaviours.

Aggression. In contrast, it was hypothesized that teachers would be the least tolerant of aggressive behaviour and would believe that this behaviour is the most problematic. Specifically, it was predicted that in response to aggression, teachers would report, intervene, monitor, and promote social skills more than in response to the other child behaviours in this study. For having children make amends, it was hypothesized that

teachers would report using this strategy significantly more for aggression than the other behaviours. No differences were predicted between the other behaviour types, nor were interaction effects expected for this teacher response. As well, aggression was predicted to be rated similarly to shyness in terms of costs to the child, since both behaviours have been previously shown to be disruptive to the child's learning and social development (Coie & Dodge, 1998; Coplan et al., 2001; Evans, 2001; Ladd & Price, 1987; Parker & Asher, 1987; Phillipsen et al., 1999). Also, teachers were expected to attribute aggressive behaviours to internal, stable, and controllable causes. It was predicted that these attributions would be more salient for aggressive boys as compared to aggressive girls.

Shyness. As for shy behaviour, it was hypothesized that teachers would highly report wanting to monitor the behaviour as a strategy for dealing with this behaviour. It was further expected that costs to the student would be a high concern to the teachers for shy behaviour. It was also predicted that teachers would attribute shy behaviour to external, instable, and uncontrollable causes. For teachers' tolerance of shyness, it was believed that they would be more tolerant of this behaviour compared to aggression, and less tolerant compared to social disinterest and prosocial behaviours. These differences were expected to be the most pronounced for shy boys compared to shy girls.

Unsociability/ Social Disinterest. Finally, due to the lack of research on teachers' reactions toward social disinterest, the predictions concerning this behaviour were more speculative in nature. First, it was expected that teachers would highly report monitoring (i.e., will watch these children closely for any signs of adjustment difficulties) unsociable behaviours. Next, it was predicted that teachers would perceive unsociable behaviours as having less costs to the student than shy behaviours. It was also hypothesized that

teachers would believe that social disinterest is external, instable, and controllable. In addition, this behaviour was predicted to be more tolerable than aggressive behaviour and shy behaviour but less than prosocial behaviour. Similar to shyness, these differences were predicted to be the most pronounced for disinterested boys compared to disinterested girls.

The second goal of the proposed study was to explore individual differences in teachers' beliefs and attitudes as a function of classroom management. Specifically, for classroom management, it was hypothesized that compared to interactionalist and non-interventionist teachers, interventionist teachers would report 1) harsher strategies for dealing with misbehaviours; 2) more costs to the child for all behaviour types; 3) less of a tendency to perceive the prosocial behaviour as resulting from internal sources and more of a tendency to perceive the aggressive behaviour as resulting from external causes; and 4) less tolerance for all behaviours. Since non-interventionists believe that children should be in control of their own behaviours, it was also hypothesized that non-interventionists would attribute all behaviours to internal causes. Further, it was predicted that the differences would be more pronounced between the interactionalist teachers and the interventionist teachers. Similar to Coplan et al.'s (2002) study on parenting styles, it was hypothesized that differences between the interactionalist and the interventionist teaching styles would be most apparent for the aggression scenarios. Speculatively, it was predicted that interventionists would report the harshest beliefs toward children who were not engaging in gender stereotypical behaviours.

Method

Participants

Approval was first obtained from the Carleton University Ethics Committee for Psychological Research. Proposals were then sent to a number of school boards and associations in Canada that had contacts with kindergarten teachers. The proposals were sent out in October and November of 2003. The participants in the current study were recruited from four provinces in Canada. Permission was obtained from the New Brunswick Teachers' Association, the Newfoundland and Labrador Teachers' Association, the Prince Edward Island Department of Education, and the Ottawa-Carleton District School Board.

Two questionnaire packets were mailed to every school with kindergarten programs in Newfoundland/Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Ottawa-Carleton (schools that were a part of the Ottawa-Carleton District School Board) and every English speaking school in New Brunswick. Thus, 575 schools were sent questionnaires. Kindergarten teachers were asked to complete the enclosed questionnaire packet and mail it back in the stamped-addressed envelope provided.

Responses were received from $N = 202$ female kindergarten teachers from four provinces in Canada (New Brunswick $n = 66$, Newfoundland $n = 48$, Ontario $n = 50$, Prince Edward Island $n = 36$, undeclared $n = 2$). Responses were also received from three male kindergarten teachers, however they were not included in the study. The ethnic distribution of the sample was as follows: 187 Caucasian, 1 Hispanic, 1 Other, and 13 undeclared. The ages of the participants ranged from 23 to 60 years old ($M = 40.78$, $SD = 9.71$). The frequencies of the participants' highest degrees obtained were as

follows: B.A. $n = 19$, B.Sc. $n = 1$, B.Ed. $n = 136$, M.A. $n = 3$, M.Ed $n = 12$, ECE $n = 21$, Other $n = 7$, undeclared $n = 3$. Years of teaching ranged from 1 year to 39 years experience ($M = 14.27$, $SD = 8.72$). There were 146 teachers who were presently teaching only kindergarten, 10 who had previously taught kindergarten within the last 5 years, and 46 who were currently teaching kindergarten plus one or more other grades.

Measures

Demographics and Background Information. A demographics and background questionnaire (the complete questionnaire package is in Appendix A) was included in the study to gain some general knowledge about the participants and their experience in the education field. First, the participants were asked to indicate their age, gender and ethnicity. Questions asking them to indicate their last degree earned, the year it was obtained and the institution that granted the degree were also included. This section also asked the participants to indicate the number of years they had been teaching. The final questions pertained to their current teaching position, these questions asked the participants to name the school they were currently employed, the location of the school, and the grades they were currently teaching. The last question asked participants who were not currently teaching kindergarten to indicate when they last taught this grade.

Attitudes toward classroom management. Beliefs regarding classroom control and management were assessed using the 26-item *Attitudes and Beliefs of Classroom Control (ABCC) Inventory* (Martin et al., 1998). The ABCC Inventory classifies beliefs toward classroom management on a continuum that indicates the amount of power that teachers have over their students (Martin et al., 1998). The beliefs are based on Wolfgang and

Glickman's (1980, 1986) notions of teachers' beliefs toward discipline, but Martin et al. (1998) have adapted them to comprise all of classroom management.

The ABCC Inventory assesses three broad dimensions, which are used to measure the degree of interventionist style, these include: Instructional Management, People Management, and Behaviour Management. The Instructional Management subscale consists of 14 items, including "I believe the teacher should direct the students' transition from one learning activity to another," and "I believe teachers should require student compliance and respect for law and order." The People Management dimension contains 8 items, which includes "I believe students will be successful in school if allowed to pursue their own interests," and "I believe friendliness, courtesy, and respect for fellow students is something that students have to learn first-hand through free interaction." The Behaviour Management subscale is comprised of 4 items, including "When students behave appropriately, I will provide a reward of some kind such as points toward a party or free time," and "I believe students should choose the learning topics and tasks."

The items for the ABCC Inventory were rated on the following 4-point response scale: 1 – "describes me not at all," 2 – "describes me somewhat," 3 – "describes me usually," and 4 – "describes me very well." Total scores were calculated for each participant for each subscale by summing the relevant scale items scores. High scores on each subscale indicated a more interventionist management style, whereas low scores indicated a more non-interventionist management style. Intermediate scores were indicative of an interactionalist management style.

Martin et al. (1998) performed a factor analysis on the original set of 48 items in which they found the three originally hypothesized dimensions. Only those items that had

loadings higher than .35 and were loaded on one factor only were retained, leaving the scale with 26 items. The Cronbach's coefficient alphas for the original study for the Instructional Management, the People Management, and the Behaviour Management factors were .82, .69, and .69, respectively. Martin et al. (1998) also showed that the Instructional Management subscale was uncorrelated with the other two factors (People Management $r = -.21$, Behaviour Management $r = -.21$), however, the People Management and the Behaviour Management subscales were moderately correlated ($r = .48$). These correlations made sense because the People Management and the Behaviour Management subscales both measure issues that pertain to people, while the Instructional Management subscale measures issues surrounding how material is taught. For the purposes of the present study the Instructional Management subscale was not used in the analyses because the main interest of the current study was how kindergarten teachers interacted with their students and how they managed behaviours in the classroom rather than how they taught their lessons. Instead, the People and Behaviour Management subscales were summed together to create a subscale, this has also been done in previous studies (Henson, 2001; Martin, Shoho, & Yin, 2003). The combination of the scales seemed reasonable since the subscales were found to be significantly correlated ($r = .46$, $p < .001$). The combined subscale was named the Student Management subscale, as it was named by Martin et al. (2003), and was found to have a Cronbach's $\alpha = .68$.

The ABCC Inventory has been shown to have acceptable construct and concurrent validity (Martin et al., 1998). The validity of the scale was previously shown by correlating the subscales of the ABCC Inventory with the subscales from the *16 Personality Factor (PF) Questionnaire*. Small significant correlations, both positive and

negative, were found between five out of the six 16 PF subscales and the three subscales of the ABCC Inventory for the dimensions of the construct. The only 16 PF subscale that failed to show a significant relation with the dimensions of the ABCC Inventory was the Impression Management subscale. Thus, it was believed that there was no relation between the ABCC Inventory subscales and that of a socially desirable response set. Therefore, previous research has shown that the instrument is a reliable and valid measure of classroom management. The ABCC Inventory had been used previously with preservice teachers (Henson & Roberts, 2001; Martin & Shoho, 2000; Sokal, Smith, & Mowat, 2002), with alternative certification teachers (Martin & Shoho, 2000; Sokal, Smith, & Mowat, 2002) and with experienced traditionally trained teachers (Martin & Shoho, 2000).

Child behaviour scenarios. The kindergarten teachers who participated in the current study were asked to read 8 short scenarios that depicted children engaged in the following 4 behaviours: prosocial behaviour, aggression, shyness, and social disinterest. Two scenarios illustrated each type of behaviour. Three of the eight scenarios were revised versions of scenarios that had been used in previous studies (Coplan et al., 2002; Hastings & Grusec, 1998; Mills & Rubin, 1990) to assess parents' beliefs about certain behaviours that could be displayed in their own children. Hastings and Grusec (1998) and Hastings and Rubin (1999) established the factor structure and also confirmed that the scenarios are reliable and valid measures for assessing parental beliefs about particular behaviours. The scenarios in the current study that were based on this previous research are one of the shyness, aggression, and prosocial scenarios. Each of these behaviour types was depicted in a second scenario that was based on previous research concerning the

constructs of shyness (Asendorpf, 1989, 1990, 1991, 1993; Rubin, Burgess, & Coplan, 2002), aggression (Crick et al., 1997; Coie & Dodge, 1988, 1998) and prosocial behaviours (Bagwell et al., 1998; Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998; Ladd & Profilet, 1996). However, the current study was also interested in assessing teachers' beliefs about socially disinterested behaviours. Due to the fact that we were unable to find previous scenarios concerning socially disinterested behaviours, scenarios were devised based on previous studies of this construct (Asendorpf, 1994; Coplan et al., 2004; Jennings, 1975; Rubin, 1982).

Gender of the child in the descriptions was assessed in the present study to determine whether or not the kindergarten teachers had different attitudes toward children's behaviours as a function of their gender. Participants received 4 male child descriptions and 4 female child descriptions. The participants received a male and a female version of each behaviour type. The scenarios were presented counterbalanced for gender. The text for each scenario is displayed in Table 1.

The vignettes were preceded by instructions that asked the participants to imagine that the children in the descriptions were students in their kindergarten classrooms. In addition, they were asked to imagine what it would be like to be in that situation and to see a child behaving in that manner. Further, they were asked not to share their answers with other people until they had returned their questionnaires.

Based on previous research on teacher responses (Kemple, David, & Hysmith, 1998; Martin, Linfoot, & Stephenson, 1999; Serbin, O'Leary, Kent, & Tonick, 1973; Warden et al., 1996), a rating scale was derived to assess teachers' classroom strategies

Table 1

*Child Behaviour Vignettes***Aggressive Child.**

Scenario 1: One of the other children has a toy that Steven wants, and you see Steven grab the toy and push the other child down. You have seen him do this a few times before.¹

Scenario 2: Heather is drawing a picture with crayons. Another child reaches toward one of the crayons in front of Heather. Heather hits the child and grabs the crayon. Heather has displayed this type of behaviour before.

Shy Child.

Scenario 1: Sarah is standing against the wall, watching some of the other children playing but looking somewhat nervous. She seems interested, but stays against the wall, keeps her chin down, and does not attempt to join in. You have seen this girl act like this at other times.¹

Scenario 2: George is hovering near a group of children who are playing a game. He appears somewhat anxious. He inches closer to the other children but does not try to join in. You have seen George behave like this in the past.

Unsociable/Social Disinterested Child.

Scenario 1: Caitlin is playing alone, drawing a picture with some crayons. She seems to be quite content in this activity, and does not often initiate play with the other children. You have seen her engage in this type of behaviour in the past.

Scenario 2: Henry is playing quietly away from the other children. He does not appear anxious or upset. If left undisturbed Henry would happily continue playing on his own. You have seen Henry behave similarly on other occasions.

¹ Scenarios are revised versions of scenarios that have been used in previous research (Coplan et al., 2002; Hastings & Grusec, 1998; Mills & Rubin, 1990).

Table 1. (continued)

*Child Behaviour Vignettes***Prosocial Child.**

Scenario 1: Several children are playing a game and Brad seems to be one of the leaders. One of the other children trips over something, and starts crying. Brad goes to the crying child, helps him to sit up, and sits together with the other child until he stops crying. He has done this kind of thing before.¹

Scenario 2: Laura is playing with some of the children in the classroom with building blocks. You notice that Laura spontaneously offers another child some of her blocks. Laura has demonstrated this behaviour in the past.

for dealing with child behaviours. Below every scenario, participants were asked to answer the following question: “What would you be likely to do in response to (Child’s Name)’s behaviour?” Following this question, a list of 7 possible responses, each with the endpoints “not at all likely” to “very likely”, were given. These responses were a) Nothing, b) Intervene to stop the behaviour, c) Report (Child’s Name)’s behaviour to other authorities so they can correct the behaviour, d) Promote social skills, e) Have (Child’s Name) make amends, f) Monitor the situation, and g) Verbal encouragement. For the present study “Nothing” and “Verbal encouragement” were excluded from the analyses.

Next, participants were asked to answer the following question on a scale from 1 (“not at all tolerant”) to 5 (“very tolerant”), “How tolerant (accepting) would you be of (Child’s Name)’s behaviour if it were displayed in your classroom?” This question was based on previous research that has studied teachers’ tolerances of social immaturity and social defiant behaviours (Algozzine, 1977; Cunningham & Sugawara, 1988). For the *Teacher Tolerance Scale*, Cunningham and Sugawara (1988, 1989) reported a Cronbach’s $\alpha = .92$ for the social immaturity factor and a Cronbach’s $\alpha = .91$ for the social defiance factor.

In addition, participants were asked some attribution questions concerning the behaviours in the scenarios. These attributional questions were previously used in Coplan et al. (2002). Each of these questions was placed on a five-point scale. The items were: “This child might have acted this way because it was in his/her nature or personality to act this way, or it might have been due to the situation” (from 1 – *completely due to personality* to 5 – *completely due to situation*), “This child might have acted this way on

purpose, or this child might not have meant to act this way” (from 1 – *definitely did this on purpose* to 5 – *definitely did not mean to do this*), and “This child might be going through a phase or stage that will end soon, or this child might keep on acting this way” (from 1 – *definitely a stage that will pass* to 5 – *definitely will act this way in future*). Similar to Coplan et al. (2002), the current study created a summary variable for each scenario in which high scores indicated more external attributions (stage, unintentional, and due to situational factors) and low scores indicated more internal attributions (stable, intentional, and due internal characteristics). Coplan et al. (2002) have shown that the scale has sufficient reliability, the summary scores for their study had Cronbach’s alpha coefficients that ranged from .71 to .83. In the present study the Cronbach’s α s (calculated across gender) for shy, socially disinterested, aggressive and prosocial behaviours were .43, .50, .62, and .75, respectively. The above-mentioned questions were included so that we could examine teachers’ beliefs about the responses they would make toward children who display these types of behaviours as well as their beliefs about the origins of these behaviours.

Then, for each scenario participants answered two questions based on a subscale of the *Costs Scale* (Cunningham & Sugawara, 1988, 1989). Cunningham and Sugawara (1988, 1989) developed a 12-item scale by gathering the various costs of problem behaviours from Brophy and Rohrkemper (1981), Safran and Safran (1984), and colleagues. However, the present study only used two of the questions on Cunningham and Sugawara’s scale. The questions referred to the most recent scenario the participants had read. The participants responded to the questions in terms of how likely they felt the statement was of the child in the previous scenario.

The scale contains items concerning four types of costs: costs to the teacher, costs to the class, costs to the child with the behaviour, and indirect costs of the behaviour. Each cost-type has three items on the scale. Although all four types of costs would have been interesting to examine, due to the length of the questionnaire, only costs to the child were explored in the present study. The questions on this subscale are: "Will this behaviour negatively interfere with this child's physical development?", "Will this behaviour negatively interfere with this child's social development?" and "Will this behaviour negatively interfere with this child's academic development?" These items were on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 ("not at all likely") to 5 ("very likely"). However, due to the question's irrelevance for some of the scenarios in the current study, the question, "Will this behaviour negatively interfere with this child's physical development?" was not analyzed in this study.

Similar to Cunningham and Sugawara's (1988) study, the participants in the current study were given a total score on the subscale. Cunningham and Sugawara (1988) only reported a Cronbach's α of .23 for the costs to the child subscale, but this alpha was calculated with the costs to physical development question included. In the present study, the Cronbach's α s (collapsed across gender) were .77, .78, .78, and .75 for shyness, social disinterest, aggression, and prosocial behaviours, respectively. Further, the higher the teachers' beliefs that the behaviours would bear negative costs to the child the higher their scores on the subscale.

Procedure

Upon approval from the Carleton University Ethics Committee for Psychological Research, a pilot study was conducted with 16 Child Studies students at Carleton

University to test the wording and the length of the questionnaire. The students were encouraged to give feedback on the questionnaire concerning the wording of the questions. A few changes to the phrasing of some of the questions were made after examining the pilot questionnaires. An additional question was added to each of the scenarios for the pilot study. This question was: "In one or two words, describe this child's behaviour." This question was included to ensure that the scenarios were adequately portraying the appropriate behaviours. For the shy behaviours 13 Child Studies students correctly identified the behaviours. Fourteen of the students accurately described the unsociable behaviours. For the aggressive behaviours, 11 of the Child Studies students accurately identified the behaviours. Not surprisingly, all of the pilot participants correctly described the prosocial behaviours.

Once permission was obtained from the associations and the Ottawa-Carleton District School board the questionnaires were mailed to the schools. The questionnaires were addressed to the school principals with a cover letter telling them briefly about the study, the association that had given us permission to send the questionnaires and asking them to give the two questionnaires to the kindergarten teachers at their schools or to teachers who had taught kindergarten within the last 5 years.

Each participating kindergarten teacher was required to complete a consent form, which was included in the questionnaire booklet. The consent letter described the purpose of the study, informed the kindergarten teachers that the study was anonymous, that they were free to withdraw from the study at any time and that they could omit any questions they felt uncomfortable answering. In addition, the consent letter informed the teachers that permission had been obtained from their school board, department of education or

their associated teachers' federation. The consent letter also included the researchers', the chair of Carleton University's Ethics Committee's and the Chair of Carleton University's Department of Psychology's e-mail addresses. Finally, the consent form asked the kindergarten teachers to initial (since the study was anonymous) and to date the form if they agreed to be participants in the study. The consent form also asked them to include an e-mail or a mailing address if they wanted to receive a summary of the findings.

The questionnaires began with the consent form and were followed by the demographics and background information section. Next, the questionnaire booklets contained the *Attitudes and Beliefs of Classroom Control Inventory* (ABCC Inventory). Finally, the questionnaire booklets concluded with the scenarios and their corresponding questions and scales, which included response questions, a tolerance question, an attribution scale, and two questions concerning negative child costs. Although all participants did receive both male and female versions of the behaviours, gender was counterbalanced in which some participants received one version of the scenarios for a male child and the other version for a female child while other participants received the same versions of the questionnaires but with the opposite gendered child.

The kindergarten teachers who participated in the study were given a stamped-addressed envelope in which they sent their completed questionnaires. A summary of the findings will be sent to the participating teachers' federations, the Ottawa-Carleton School board, the Prince Edward Island Department of Education as well as to the participants and the schools who requested summaries.

Results

Preliminary Analyses

Control variables. Preliminary analyses were conducted to explore associations between classroom management style and age of participant, highest degree achieved, years of teaching, and kindergarten teaching experience. Results are displayed in Table 2. No significant results were found. As such, these variables were not controlled for statistically in subsequent analyses.

Creation of teacher groups. The teacher groups were created by transforming the participants' scores on the Student Management subscale (the combination of the People and Behaviour Management subscales of the ABCC) into percentile ranks and then categorizing these scores into three groups created by grouping the scores into thirds, thus creating groups with similar sample sizes.¹ Previous studies that have used the ABCC have either viewed the teachers' scores on a continuum (e.g., Martin et al., 1998, 2003) or have labeled the teachers as either low controlling or high controlling using a median split (N.K. Martin, personal communication, June 21, 2004). Although previous researchers have described three types of teachers (non-interventionists, interventionists, and interactionalists), they have not shown that the ABCC can distinctly categorize the three types of teachers. However, upon e-mail discussions with the first author of the scale, the author suggested that if the findings in the present study indicated that the three groups were significantly different from one another on the ABCC, then it would indicate

¹ The results were also analyzed by grouping the participants scores on the Student Management subscale into extreme scores - one standard deviation above and one standard deviation below, and by creating a third group of the remaining participants' scores. The results of this grouping were virtually identical to the results found with the groups created by thirds. The grouping by thirds was chosen for the present study because it resulted in more similar group sample sizes.

Table 2

Correlations Between Classroom Management Style and Teacher Characteristics

	Teacher Characteristics			
	Age	Degree	Teaching Experience	Kindergarten Experience
<i>Classroom Management Style</i>	.11	-.09	.07	-.09

that the three groupings are reasonable (N.K. Martin, personal communication, July 7, 2004). Moreover, results from a one-way analysis of variance indicated that all three groups differed significantly on the Student Management subscale, $F(2, 198) = 354.52, p < .001, MS_e = .01, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .78$. The interventionist teachers ($M = 3.02, SD = .02$) scored significantly higher on the subscale than both the interactionalist teachers ($M = 2.59, SD = .02$) and the non-interventionist teachers ($M = 2.12, SD = .02$). In addition, the interactionalist teachers scored significantly higher than the non-interventionist teachers on the Student Management subscale. Thus, the current study analyzed the data using three groups of teachers created by grouping the teachers' scores on the Student Management subscale into thirds. To ease presentation, the teacher groups were labeled as high (equivalent to interventionist teachers), medium (equivalent to interactionalist teachers), and low (equivalent to non-interventionist teachers) controlling in the results section. The appropriate names are again used in the discussion section.

Testing of Assumptions

There are three major assumptions that should to be examined when dealing with repeated measures designs. The assumption of independence of observations assumes that each participant has their scores entered into the data only once (participants participate only once) (Green, Salkind, & Akey, 2000). In the current study this assumption was protected from violation by numbering all questionnaires returned and ensuring that each questionnaire was entered only once into the data file. The sphericity assumption is quite frequently violated when dealing with repeated measures designs (Green et al., 2000). The assumption assumes that the variances of the differences for all pairs of repeated measures (main effects and interactions) are equal (Stevens, 2002). The

Mauchley test is one test that examines whether or not the sphericity assumption is met, for all the analyses in the current study the Mauchley test showed that the sphericity assumption was violated. Therefore, for the present study, the univariate results were reported with the Greenhouse-Geisser estimator. The assumption of normality assumes that all of the dependent variables are normally distributed for each combination of the independent variables (Green et al., 2000; Stevens, 2002). However, studies that have moderate to large sample sizes are robust to this assumption (Green et al., 2000; Stevens, 2002). Moreover, the current study does have a large sample size so violation of this assumption was not a major concern. A statistical test for multivariate normality is not available on SPSS, but Stevens (2002) believes that by looking at the distributions you can for the most part tell whether or not your data satisfies the assumption and by checking for bivariate normality. The graphs were examined and for the most part they resembled normality.

Main Analyses

Overview. The current study had two main questions. The first question was, do kindergarten teachers, in general, have different responses, tolerances of, attributions toward, and perceptions of different costs for children who display different types of behaviours (prosocial, aggression, shyness, and social disinterest)? The second question extended upon the first question by asking whether or not different types of teachers (who differed in terms of control) differed in their responses, tolerances of, attributions toward, and perceptions of different costs of the four behaviour types? Whether or not gender of the hypothetical child would have an effect was also of interest in the current study. In order to accomplish these goals, a series of 3 x 4 x 2 Mixed Repeated Measures

ANOVAs was performed with teacher group (non-interventionist, interventionist, interactionist) as a between-subjects variable, and behaviour type (aggression, prosocial, shyness, social disinterest) and gender of the child as within-subjects variables. The dependent variables were teachers' tolerance of the behaviours, their attributions toward the behaviours, their perceptions of negative costs to the children, and their responses to the behaviours (5 specific responses). Thus, 8 separate equations were computed.

The following two sections present the results of the study. First, the results related to effects of child behaviours and sex of the child are described. The subsequent section describes the results involving main effects and interactions including teacher groups. Univariate results were reported and follow-up comparisons were analyzed when appropriate.

Effects involving Behaviour and Gender of the Child

Teacher tolerance. A significant main effect of Behaviour type was found for teacher tolerance, $F(2.33, 444.27) = 1022.86, p < .001, MS_e = 1.07, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .84$. However, there was no significant Gender of Child main effect, $F(1, 191) = .42, p = .52, MS_e = .42, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .00$, and no significant Behaviour x Gender of Child interaction, $F(2.54, 484.77) = .49, p = .66, MS_e = .44, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .00$, for teacher tolerance.

Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) test ($p < .05$) revealed significant differences between all four of the behaviour types on teacher tolerance (means are displayed in Table 3). Teachers found aggression to be the least tolerable, followed by shyness, social disinterest, and were most tolerant of prosocial behaviour.

Table 3

Means (and Standard Deviations) for Behaviour Main Effects

Belief/Attitude	Aggression	Vignette		
		Shyness	Disinterested	Prosocial
<i>Teacher Tolerance</i>	1.59 _a (.91)	3.97 _b (.99)	4.35 _c (.66)	4.97 _d (.13)
<i>Behaviour Attributions</i> ¹	2.78 _a (.42)	2.86 _a (.42)	2.75 _a (.42)	2.03 _b (.55)
<i>Negative Costs to the Child</i>	3.44 _a (.83)	3.36 _a (.79)	2.74 _b (.88)	1.12 _c (.41)
<i>Responses toward the Behaviours</i>				
Have Child Make Amends	4.59 _a (.78)	1.14 _b (.36)	1.03 _b (.18)	1.01 _b (.05)
Intervene	4.65 _a (.62)	2.09 _b (1.02)	1.87 _b (.90)	1.02 _c (.16)
Monitor	4.80 _a (.38)	4.47 _b (.72)	4.09 _c (1.02)	1.51 _d (.95)
Report	2.78 _a (1.34)	1.99 _b (1.05)	1.77 _b (.90)	1.24 _c (.70)
Promote Social Skills	4.87 _a (.31)	4.51 _b (.74)	3.75 _c (1.17)	1.51 _d (.98)

- all responses measured on a 5-point scale

- means with different subscripts differ significantly at the .05 level on Tukey's HSD test

- ¹ higher scores indicate more external attributions

Attributions. For teacher attributions, a significant Behaviour main effect, $F(2.57, 493.87) = 281.15, p < .001, MS_e = .24, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .59$, a significant Gender of Child main effect, $F(1, 192) = 7.69, p < .01, MS_e = .14, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .04$, and a trend for the Behaviour x Gender of Child interaction, $F(2.81, 538.69) = 2.67, p = .05, MS_e = .10, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .01$, were revealed.

Boys ($M = 2.63, SD = .30$) were attributed more external causes for their behaviours than girls ($M = 2.58, SD = .32$). For the main effect of Behaviour (means displayed in Table 3), results from post-hoc tests indicated that the prosocial children were thought to have significantly more internal causes for their behaviours than disinterested children, aggressive children and shy children (who did not differ from each other).

These main effects were qualified by a trend in the Behaviour x Gender of Child interaction (relevant means are displayed in Table 4). Results from post-hoc tests indicated that teachers did not differ significantly in their attributions of prosocial behaviour and unsociable behaviour in boys versus girls. However, teachers attributed shyness and aggression to more external causes for boys as compared to girls.

Negative costs to the child. Only a significant main effect of Behaviour, $F(2.65, 515.94) = 678.62, p < .001, MS_e = .76, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .78$, was found for negative child costs. The main effect of Gender of Child, $F(1, 195) = .01, p = .94, MS_e = .40, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .00$, and the Behaviour x Gender of Child interaction, $F(2.86, 556.81) = 1.98, p = .12, MS_e = .27, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .01$, were both nonsignificant.

Follow-up post hoc comparisons (means are indicated in Table 3), using Tukey's HSD test ($p < .05$), indicated that the prosocial behaviour was rated significantly lower

Table 4

Means (and Standard Deviations) for Behaviour x Gender of Child Interactions

Belief/Attitude	Vignette					
	<u>Aggression</u> Boys	<u>Shy</u> Boys	<u>Disinterested</u> Boys	<u>Prosocial</u> Boys	<u>Disinterested</u> Girls	<u>Prosocial</u> Girls
<i>Behaviour Attributions</i> ¹	2.83 _a (.41)	2.91 _a (.38)	2.75 _a (.42)	2.04 _a (.58)	2.75 _a (.43)	2.02 _a (.53)
<i>Responses toward the Behaviours</i>						
Report the Behaviour	2.80 _a (1.53)	1.93 _a (1.23)	1.87 _a (1.13)	1.27 _a (.83)	1.67 _b (.93)	1.20 _a (.75)
Promoting Social Skills	4.83 _a (.43)	4.49 _a (.90)	3.84 _a (1.33)	1.59 _a (1.29)	3.65 _b (1.39)	1.43 _a (1.09)

- all responses measured on a 5-point scale

- means with different subscripts differ significantly at the .05 level on Tukey's HSD test

- ¹ higher scores indicate more external attributions

than all three of the other types of behaviours. Although rated significantly higher than the prosocial behaviour, the disinterested behaviour was rated significantly lower than both shyness and aggression. There was no significant difference between shyness and aggression for negative costs to the child.

Intervention. The next five analyses describe the results of the responses the teachers may make towards the behaviour types. For intervention, there was a significant main effect of Behaviour, $F(2.34, 416.13) = 993.36, p < .001, MS_e = 1.14$, partial $\eta^2 = .85$, but no main effect of Gender of Child, $F(1, 178) = .30, p = .59, MS_e = .80$, partial $\eta^2 = .00$, and no significant Behaviour x Gender of Child interaction, $F(2.01, 357.16) = .72, p = .49, MS_e = 1.05$, partial $\eta^2 = .00$.

Post-hoc tests revealed that aggression was believed by teachers to warrant intervention significantly more than the three other types of behaviours (relevant means are displayed in Table 3). On the other hand, prosocial behaviour was believed to be the least in need of intervention compared to the other behaviour types. There was no significant difference between shyness and social disinterest for this teacher response.

Report. For reporting the behaviour, a significant main effect of Behaviour, $F(2.21, 405.06) = 123.99, p < .001, MS_e = 1.65$, partial $\eta^2 = .40$, and a trend for the Behaviour x Gender of Child interaction, $F(2.65, 485.49) = 2.72, p = .05, MS_e = .65$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$, were found. The main effect of Gender of Child was nonsignificant, $F(1, 183) = .80, p = .37, MS_e = .87$, partial $\eta^2 = .00$.

As indicated in Table 3, aggression was most likely to be reported, followed by shyness and social disinterest. The kindergarten teachers were least likely to report

prosocial behaviours. There was no significant difference found between shyness and social disinterest. However, this main effect was qualified by an interaction with gender (trend). For the Behaviour x Gender of Child trend it was found that teachers would report boys who display disinterested behaviour significantly more than girls. However, teachers did not differ in their beliefs regarding the reporting of aggression, shyness, and prosocial behaviour for boys versus girls (relevant means are displayed in Table 4).

Promotion of social skills. For promoting social skills, a significant main effect of Behaviour, $F(2.40, 442.35) = 757.73, p < .001, MS_e = 1.40, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .81$, as well as a significant Behaviour x Gender of Child interaction, $F(2.31, 425.54) = 3.48, p < .05, MS_e = .67, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .02$, were found. The Gender of Child main effect, $F(1, 184) = 1.59, p = .21, MS_e = .70, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .01$, was nonsignificant.

Post-hoc tests revealed that the kindergarten teachers believed that the aggressive behaviour merited social skills training more than any other behaviour in the current study (relevant means are displayed in Table 3). Aggression was followed by shyness, then social disinterest, and prosocial behaviour was believed to be the least in need of social skills training. However, this main effect was qualified by an interaction with gender. Results from post-hoc tests indicated that teachers believed that disinterested behaviour in boys warranted more social skills training than disinterested behaviour in girls. Teachers did not differ in these beliefs for aggression, shyness, and prosocial behaviours with regards to gender (means are displayed in Table 4).

Make amends. A significant main effect of Behaviour, $F(1.44, 269.73) = 3128.07, p < .001, MS_e = .79, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .94$, was revealed for having children make amends. There was neither a main effect of Gender of Child, $F(1, 187) = .19, p = .66$,

$MS_e = .14$, partial $\eta^2 = .00$, nor a Behaviour x Gender of Child interaction, $F(2.08, 388.13) = .64$, $p = .53$, $MS_e = .20$, partial $\eta^2 = .00$, for this teacher response.

Tukey's HSD test ($p < .05$) indicated that teachers believed they would have children make amends in response to aggressive behaviours significantly more than they would for shy, disinterested or prosocial children (means are displayed in Table 3). All other differences were nonsignificant.

Monitoring. For monitoring the behaviour, there was a main effect of Behaviour, $F(2.30, 425.12) = 872.47$, $p < .001$, $MS_e = 1.26$, partial $\eta^2 = .83$. The Gender of Child main effect, $F(1, 185) = 1.75$, $p = .19$, $MS_e = .55$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$, and the Behaviour x Gender of Child interaction, $F(2.82, 521.94) = 1.83$, $p = .15$, $MS_e = .45$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$, for this teacher response were found to be nonsignificant.

Results from post-hoc tests revealed that kindergarten teachers' beliefs about monitoring significantly differed for all of the behaviour types. The kindergarten teachers believed that aggression should be monitored the most, followed by shyness and social disinterest. The teachers believed that prosocial behaviour was considered the least in need of monitoring (relevant means are displayed in Table 3).

Effects involving Teacher Groups

Teacher tolerance. For teacher tolerance, there was no significant main effect for Teacher Group, $F(2, 191) = 2.37$, $p = .10$, $MS_e = 1.96$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$, no Gender of Child x Teacher Group interaction, $F(2, 191) = .50$, $p = .61$, $MS_e = .42$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$, and no Behaviour x Gender of Child x Teacher Group interaction, $F(5.08, 484.77) = .99$, $p = .43$, $MS_e = .44$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$. However, there was a trend for the Behaviour x Teacher Group interaction, $F(4.65, 444.27) = 2.12$, $p = .07$, $MS_e = 1.07$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$.

Follow-up post-hoc comparisons (relevant means are displayed in Table 5) indicated that the low controlling teachers were more tolerant of aggression than the high controlling teachers. The teacher groups did not differ in their tolerance of shy, disinterested, and prosocial children.

Attributions. For teacher attributions, the main effect of Teacher Group, $F(2, 192) = .78, p = .46, MS_e = .62, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .01$, the Behaviour x Teacher Group interaction, $F(5.14, 493.87) = 1.59, p = .16, MS_e = .24, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .02$, and the Gender of Child x Teacher Group interaction, $F(2, 192) = .97, p = .38, MS_e = .14, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .01$, were all nonsignificant findings. On the contrary, the Behaviour x Gender of Child x Teacher Group interaction, $F(5.61, 538.69) = 2.38, p < .05, MS_e = .10, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .02$, was revealed to be significant.

To analyze the three-way interaction, ANOVAs were recomputed separately for girls and boys. For girls, the results revealed a significant Behaviour main effect, $F(2.73, 530.33) = 187.99, p < .001, MS_e = .16, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .49$, and a significant Behaviour x Teacher Group interaction, $F(5.47, 530.33) = 2.27, p < .05, MS_e = .16, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .02$. The Teacher Group main effect, $F(2, 194) = 1.36, p = .26, MS_e = .41, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .01$, was nonsignificant. For boys, there was only a significant main effect of Behaviour, $F(2.54, 495.58) = 197.51, p < .001, MS_e = .18, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .50$, the Teacher Group main effect, $F(2, 195) = .10, p = .90, MS_e = .37, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .00$, and the Behaviour x Teacher Group interaction, $F(5.08, 495.58) = 1.35, p = .24, MS_e = .18, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .01$, was not significant.

Tukey's HSD tests ($p < .05$) were performed as follow-up tests. For girls, it was found that the low controlling teachers believed that shyness was more externally caused

Table 5

Means (and Standard Deviations) for Behaviour x Teacher Group Interactions for Teacher Tolerance

Child Behaviour: Teacher Group: Belief/Attitude	Vignette							
	<u>Aggression</u>		<u>Shy</u>		<u>Disinterested</u>		<u>Prosocial</u>	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
Teacher Tolerance	1.40 _a (.67)	1.80 _b (1.17)	3.77 _a (1.06)	4.05 _a (.81)	4.37 _a (.74)	4.27 _a (.63)	4.98 _a (.09)	4.91 _a (.12)

- all responses measured on a 5-point scale

- means with different subscripts differ significantly at the .05 level on Tukey's HSD test

than both the high and medium controlling teachers. In addition, low and high controlling teachers believed that disinterested behaviours were significantly more externally caused than medium controlling teachers. Teacher groups did not differ in their attributions of girls' prosocial and aggressive behaviours (relevant means are displayed in Table 6).

For boys, there was a Behaviour main effect because the teachers believed that shyness in boys was more externally caused than disinterested and prosocial behaviours. It was also found that the teachers believed that aggression and disinterested behaviours in boys were more externally caused than prosocial behaviours in boys. There was no significant difference found for teachers' attribution beliefs between boys' aggression and shyness (relevant means are displayed in Table 7).

Negative costs to the child. The Teacher Group main effect, $F(2, 195) = .44, p = .65, MS_e = 2.52$, partial $\eta^2 = .00$, the Behaviour x Teacher Group interaction, $F(5.29, 515.94) = 1.02, p = .41, MS_e = .76$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$, the Gender of Child x Teacher Group interaction, $F(2, 195) = 1.59, p = .21, MS_e = .40$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$, and the Behaviour x Gender of Child x Teacher Group interaction, $F(5.71, 556.81) = .81, p = .56, MS_e = .27$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$, were all found to be nonsignificant for negative costs to the child.

Intervention. For intervention, the main effect of Teacher Group, $F(2, 178) = .85, p = .43, MS_e = 1.85$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$, the Gender of Child x Teacher Group interaction, $F(2, 178) = .47, p = .63, MS_e = .80$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$, and the Behaviour x Gender of Child x Teacher Group interaction, $F(4.01, 357.16) = .77, p = .55, MS_e = 1.05$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$, were nonsignificant. On the other hand, there was a trend found for the Behaviour x Teacher Group interaction, $F(4.68, 416.13) = 2.25, p = .05, MS_e = 1.14$, partial $\eta^2 = .03$.

Table 6

Means (and Standard Deviations) for Behaviour x Teacher Group Interactions (for Girls) for Behaviour Attributions

Child Behaviour: Teacher Group:	Vignette											
	Aggression			Shy			Disinterested			Prosocial		
	High	Med.	Low	High	Med.	Low	High	Med.	Low	High	Med.	Low
<i>Behaviour Attributions¹</i>	2.71 _a (.37)	2.72 _a (.45)	2.79 _a (.49)	2.78 _a (.38)	2.72 _a (.51)	2.93 _b (.44)	2.80 _a (.39)	2.66 _b (.49)	2.81 _a (.39)	2.02 _a (.51)	2.06 _a (.54)	1.97 _a (.53)

- all responses measured on a 5-point scale

- means with different subscripts differ significantly at the .05 level on Tukey's HSD test

- ¹ higher scores indicate more external attributions

Table 7

Means (and Standard Deviations) for Behaviour Main Effects (for Boys) for Behaviour Attributions

Belief/Attitude	Vignette			
	<i>Aggression</i>	<i>Shyness</i>	<i>Disinterested</i>	<i>Prosocial</i>
<i>Behaviour Attributions¹</i>	2.82 (.42) _a	2.91 (.38) _{ab}	2.75 (.42) _a	2.06 (.59) _c

- all responses measured on a 5-point scale
- means with different subscripts differ significantly at the .05 level on Tukey's HSD test
- ¹ higher scores indicate more external attributions

Results from post-hoc comparisons indicated that low controlling teachers believed that shyness warranted intervention significantly more than medium controlling teachers. Teacher groups did not differ on their beliefs of intervention for aggression, social disinterest, and prosocial behaviours (relevant means are displayed in Table 8).

Report. The main effect of Teacher Group, $F(2, 183) = .35, p = .71, MS_e = 4.75$, partial $\eta^2 = .00$, the Behaviour x Teacher Group interaction, $F(4.43, 405.06) = .55, p = .72, MS_e = 1.65$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$, the Gender of Child x Teacher Group interaction, $F(2, 183) = .17, p = .85, MS_e = .87$, partial $\eta^2 = .00$, and the Behaviour x Gender of Child x Teacher Group interaction, $F(5.31, 485.49) = 1.02, p = .41, MS_e = .65$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$, were all found to be nonsignificant for reporting.

Promotion of social skills. The results indicated a nonsignificant main effect of Teacher Group, $F(2, 184) = 1.31, p = .27, MS_e = 2.53$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$, a nonsignificant Gender of Child x Teacher Group interaction, $F(2, 184) = 1.73, p = .18, MS_e = .70$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$, a significant Behaviour x Teacher Group interaction, $F(4.81, 442.35) = 2.58, p < .05, MS_e = 1.40$, partial $\eta^2 = .03$, and a trend for the Behaviour x Gender of Child x Teacher Group interaction, $F(4.63, 425.54) = 2.04, p = .08, MS_e = .67$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$, for promotion of social skills.

Follow-up post-hoc comparisons (relevant means are displayed in Table 8) indicated that teacher groups did not differ in their beliefs of promoting social skills as a response for aggressive, shy, and prosocial behaviours. On the contrary, significant differences were found for teacher group in regards to social disinterest behaviour. Moreover, medium and low controlling teachers were more in favour of using social skills training on disinterested children than were high controlling teachers. Due to the

Table 8

Means (and Standard Deviations) for Behaviour x Teacher Group Interactions for Responses toward the Behaviours

Child Behaviour: Teacher Group: Belief/Attitude	Vignette							
	<u>Aggression</u>		<u>Shy</u>		<u>Disinterested</u>		<u>Prosocial</u>	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
<i>Responses toward the Behaviours</i>								
Intervention	4.77 _a (.48)	4.53 _a (.72)	2.13 _a (1.03)	2.28 _a (1.11)	1.81 _a (.86)	1.94 _a (1.05)	1.01 _a (.07)	1.03 _a (.14)
Social Skills	4.82 _a (.39)	4.90 _a (.22)	4.47 _a (.74)	4.53 _a (.79)	3.40 _a (1.33)	3.86 _b (1.15)	1.56 _a (1.03)	1.54 _a (1.06)

- all responses measured on a 5-point scale

- means with different subscripts differ significantly at the .05 level on Tukey's HSD test

complexities of interpreting three-way interactions the trend for social skills training was not followed-up with post-hoc comparisons.

Make amends. There was no significant main effect of Teacher Group, $F(2, 187) = .80, p = .45, MS_e = .41, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .01$, no significant Behaviour x Teacher Group interaction, $F(2.89, 269.73) = .86, p = .46, MS_e = .79, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .01$, and no significant Gender of Child x Teacher Group interaction, $F(2, 187) = 1.15, p = .32, MS_e = .14, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .01$, for amends making. However, there was a significant Behaviour x Gender of Child x Teacher Group interaction, $F(4.15, 388.13) = 2.49, p < .05, MS_e = .20, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .03$, for this teacher response.

For the significant three-way interaction, four separate ANOVAs were computed, one for each of the different types of behaviours. For aggression, there was no significant main effect of Teacher Group, $F(2, 195) = .98, p = .38, MS_e = 1.18, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .01$, no significant main effect of Gender of Child, $F(1, 195) = .92, p = .34, MS_e = .22, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .01$, and no significant Gender of Child x Teacher Group interaction, $F(2, 195) = 1.32, p = .27, MS_e = .22, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .01$. Similarly for prosocial behaviour, the main effect of Teacher Group, $F(2, 192) = .51, p = .60, MS_e = .00, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .01$, the main effect of Gender of Child, $F(1, 192) = 2.03, p = .16, MS_e = .00, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .01$, and the Gender of Child x Teacher Group interaction, $F(2, 192) = .51, p = .60, MS_e = .00, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .01$, were all found to be nonsignificant. For shyness, the main effect of Teacher Group, $F(2, 189) = 1.65, p = .20, MS_e = .29, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .02$, and the main effect of Gender of Child, $F(1, 189) = .44, p = .51, MS_e = .26, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .00$, were not significant. However, a trend was revealed for the Gender of Child x Teacher Group interaction, $F(2, 189) = 2.65, p = .07, MS_e = .26, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .03$. For social disinterest behaviour, there was no significant

main effect for Teacher Group, $F(2, 194) = .03, p = .97, MS_e = .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .00$, and no significant main effect for Gender of Child, $F(1, 194) = .14, p = .71, MS_e = .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .00$. However, similar to shyness, there was a trend found for the Gender of Child x Teacher Group interaction, $F(2, 194) = 2.66, p = .07, MS_e = .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .03$, for social disinterest.

Follow-up Tukey's HSD tests ($p < .05$) were performed on the trends that were revealed in the above analyses. For shyness, the medium and high controlling teachers did not differ in their beliefs that children should be apologetic for the behaviour for boys as compared to girls. However, the low controlling teachers believed that boys should be more apologetic for being shy than girls. For social disinterest, all the teacher groups differed in their beliefs that the behaviour should be made amends for boys as compared to girls. Interestingly, there was no variation in the medium controlling teachers' responses toward socially disinterested behaviour in girls (i.e., all the teachers indicated "1" as a response) and in the low controlling teachers' responses toward socially disinterested behaviour in boys (i.e., again, all of the teachers indicated "1" as a response). Further, both low and high controlling teachers believed that girls who are disinterested should be more apologetic than boys who are disinterested, whereas medium controlling teachers believed that boys who are disinterested should be more apologetic than girls who are disinterested (relevant means are displayed in Table 9).

Monitoring. For monitoring, the main effect of Teacher Group, $F(2, 185) = 1.57, p = .21, MS_e = 2.29$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$, the Behaviour x Teacher Group interaction, $F(4.60, 425.12) = 1.24, p = .29, MS_e = 1.26$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$, the Gender of Child x Teacher Group interaction, $F(2, 185) = .93, p = .40, MS_e = .55$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$, and the Behaviour

Table 9

Means (and Standard Deviations) for Gender of Child x Teacher Group Interactions for Amends

Teacher Group: Gender of Child:	Vignette			
	<u>Interventionist (High Controlling)</u>	<u>Interactionalist (Medium Controlling)</u>	<u>Non-Interventionist (Low Controlling)</u>	
	Boy	Boy	Boy	Girl
<i>Teacher Response - Amends</i>				
Shyness	1.16 _a (.60)	1.11 _a (.36)	1.23 _a (.55)	1.05 _b (.21)
Social Disinterest	1.02 _a (.12)	1.08 _a (.51)	1.00 _a (.00)	1.08 _b (.32)

- all responses measured on a 5-point scale

x Gender of Child x Teacher Group interaction, $F(5.64, 521.94) = 1.07, p = .38, MS_e = .45$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$, were all found to be nonsignificant.

Discussion

The goal of the present study was to explore kindergarten teachers' beliefs and attitudes toward some behaviours that are frequently seen in early childhood classrooms. A lot of literature already exists on teachers' negative perceptions of aggression and favourable attitudes toward prosocial behaviours. Thus, the current study was focused on how teachers vary in their tolerances, attributions of, beliefs of costs to the child, and responses to shyness and social disinterest behaviours in their classrooms. Although shyness and social disinterest do have similarities, the causes and consequences of the behaviours are viewed as quite different (Coplan, 2000; Coplan et al., 2004). As such, understanding teachers' beliefs and attitudes toward each behaviour is potentially important, particularly with regards to assistance and intervention.

Results from the current study indicated that kindergarten teachers do have different beliefs toward shy and socially disinterested children. Moreover, a consistent pattern of results was found across all four behaviour types. Not surprisingly, teachers were most tolerant toward, had more internal attributions of, perceived less costs to the child, and believed they would have less negative responses toward the prosocial behaviours. In sharp contrast, opposite results were found for aggressive behaviours, with teachers viewing these behaviours as by far the most negative. Further, it was found that the teachers in general were more tolerant of and had less harsh beliefs toward the socially disinterested behaviours as opposed to the shy behaviours. Interestingly, child gender also moderated some of these results.

Also of interest in the present study was whether or not teachers' classroom management attitudes would affect their perceptions of the four types of behaviours in

the study. Classroom management was narrowly defined in the current study, so that it only included teachers' beliefs about how they interacted with their students and how they believed they would handle certain classroom behaviours (Martin et al., 2003). Results indicated that teachers' differed as a function of their classroom management beliefs with regards to their tolerances of children's aggressive behaviours, and their responses to shy and disinterested behaviours. In addition, teachers' classroom management beliefs varied for different behaviours and as a function of gender for behaviour attributions and for believing the child should make amends for his or her behaviours.

In the following sections, these results are discussed in turn. The first section describes and discusses the results concerning teachers' general attitudes towards and beliefs about aggression, prosocial behaviour, shyness and social disinterest. Following this, a section related to teachers' classroom management beliefs is presented.

Teachers' Beliefs/Attitudes toward Child Behaviours

Prosocial behaviour. Prosocial behaviour was included in the present study as a comparison group for shyness and socially disinterested behaviours. The findings concerning prosocial behaviours did not demonstrate any surprises. In general, prosocial behaviour was believed to be the most desirable behaviour with the best outcomes in this study. In particular, it was found that teachers tolerated prosocial behaviours the most, attributed this behaviour to the most internal causes, and believed this behaviour would have the least negative costs to the child. In addition, teachers believed that prosocial behaviours were the least in need of intervention, being reported and being monitored. These findings seem consistent with past research on prosocial behaviours (e.g.,

Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998) that suggests that prosocial behaviours are positive and beneficial. Indeed, prosocial children are not disruptive and actually improve the classroom atmosphere by demonstrating ultimate classroom and societal behaviour.

Kindergarten teachers' belief that prosocial behaviour is mostly internally caused is consistent with past research results with parents indicating that mothers tend to "give children credit" for good behaviours (Coplan et al., 2002). Overall, teachers attributed all "non-prosocial" behaviours to less internal causes. This is evidence that teachers' attributional beliefs are quite similar to parents' attributional beliefs. It has been previously found that parents are essentially "developmental optimists", meaning that they attribute negative behaviours to external sources while they attribute positive behaviours to internal sources (Coplan et al., 2002). In essence, both parents and teachers want to see children as generally good individuals, who make mistakes based on environmental circumstances. Thus, both parents and teachers may be optimistic about the success of using interventions to help children recover from "negative" behaviours. In addition, the belief that children who exhibited prosocial behaviour would have the fewest social and academic problems may be due to the positive influence this behaviour has on other children in the classroom, which may reduce the probability of peer rejection for the child as well as the academic difficulties that may occur when a child cannot work well with other children (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998).

Since prosocial behaviour is positive it makes sense for teachers not to want to punish the behaviour. Past research has shown that teachers spend less time with prosocial children (Coplan & Prakash, 2003) but they do enjoy prosocial deeds in the

classroom (Chang, 2003) and often do praise the behaviour or do nothing in response to the behaviour (Warden et al., 1996).

Aggression. Consistent with previous research on aggressive behaviour in the classroom (Coie & Dodge, 1998; Goldstein et al., 2001; Naas & Howse, 2003; Patterson, 1986), teachers in the current sample rated aggression as the most negative behaviour. Since there is a fair amount of research concerning aggressive types of behaviour in the classroom, in the present study, aggression was used as a comparison group for shyness and social disinterest (which have been less researched and are often confounded). Aggression was clearly distinguished from other types of behaviours in terms of being least tolerated, seen as having the most external attributions (unexpectedly), seen as most harmful to children, and most likely to receive responses from teachers.

Not surprisingly, aggression was tolerated the least by the kindergarten teachers in the current study. This is consistent with previous research findings that social defiant behaviours (e.g., aggression) were tolerated less than social immature behaviours (e.g., withdrawal; Cunningham & Sugawara, 1988; Safran & Safran, 1985). This finding makes sense because aggressive behaviour is noticeable and often believed to be contagious (Goldstein et al., 2001; Safran & Safran, 1985). Aggressive behaviour in the classroom can disrupt teachers' instruction and therefore can slow down teachers' plans for the day's lessons. Plus, teachers must deal with it immediately to ensure the well-being of the other students (Birch & Ladd, 1998; Coie & Koeppl, 1990; Safran & Safran, 1985).

Contrary to expectations, it was also found that teachers attributed aggression in boys to more external causes than aggression in girls. It appears that teachers were more "optimistic" of the aggressive behaviour in males than females. Males have been found to

be more overtly aggressive than females (Coie & Dodge, 1988, 1998; Crick et al., 1997; Hudley, 1993; Ladd & Profilet, 1996). Thus, perhaps aggression in boys was believed by the teachers to be more due to external sources than aggression in girls because it is generally more acceptable for boys to be overtly aggressive than girls (e.g., Coie & Dodge, 1998). Therefore it is possible that teachers were more optimistic of the overt aggression in boys because it is believed to occur more frequently in boys (Coie & Dodge, 1998). These teachers may have the attitude of "boys will be boys" and believe as boys age their rough and aggressive play will diminish. Further, teachers may believe that a girl who is aggressive must have more internal causes for the behaviour because it is not a gender stereotypical behaviour for girls to engage. Teachers may feel that since overt aggression is less likely to be seen in girls that girls who display this type of behaviour probably have serious behavioural problems that may be resistant to change. Indeed, it has been previously found that behaviours that are not gender stereotypical are less acceptable by society (Crick, 2000; Crick & Dodge, 1994). Previous studies have found that boys display overt aggression more than girls whereas girls display relational aggression more than boys (Crick, 1996). Halloran, Dumas, John, and Margolin (1999) also found that teachers reported an internal locus of control for aggressive behaviours in girls.

Consistent with previous research on aggressive behaviours, kindergarten teachers in the present study believed that aggression would have the most negative effects on children's social and academic development. Indeed, results from previous research have shown that aggression does have negative effects on children's peer relationships as well as on their performance in school. Children who are often aggressive have been shown to

be rejected by their peers (Coie & Dodge, 1998; Ladd & Price, 1987) and to have high rates of dropping out of school (Coie & Dodge, 1998; Parker & Asher, 1987). Thus, it appears that the kindergarten teachers in this study are aware of the problems that aggression can have on children who frequently resort to this behaviour. Cunningham and Sugawara (1988) found that preservice teachers believed that social immature behaviours would have more costs to the student than social defiant behaviours. However, in the current study, no difference was found between aggression and shyness in terms of teachers' perceptions of negative costs to the child.

Since aggression was tolerated the least in the study, it was not surprising for teachers to report that as compared to the other behaviours, they would be more likely to respond directly to aggression with intervention, by telling other authorities, by promoting social skills, by having children make amends, and by monitoring the behaviour. As mentioned previously, aggression is a very observable behaviour that affects other students' learning and well-being, and may also lead to other students modeling the behaviour. Plus, this behaviour is disruptive and may interfere with teaching. Thus, teachers probably would use any means to stop the behaviour immediately and prevent it from occurring in the future. Also, aggression has been shown to be stable (Coie & Dodge, 1983; Crick, 1996) and to have negative effects on children as they get older. For instance it has been found that aggressive children frequently commit crimes and delinquent acts (Walker et al., 1998) in adolescence and adulthood. Kindergarten teachers may be worried about these future effects on the children in their classrooms who frequently display aggressive behaviour. Therefore, teachers may be eager to stop the behaviour.

Shyness and social disinterest. The present study adds to the relatively new finding that teachers can make a distinction between shyness and socially disinterested behaviours (Coplan et al., 2004). As mentioned in the introduction, the lack of research on these behaviours is mainly due to previous studies' inability to differentiate between the two types of behaviours. The findings in the present study show that teachers do see these behaviours as distinct. Overall, differences between these two behaviours were observed for teacher tolerance, believed negative costs to the child, and for using monitoring and promoting of social skills as responses to the behaviours.

First, as hypothesized, kindergarten teachers were more tolerant of socially disinterested behaviours than of shy behaviours. This finding should be interpreted within the context of a kindergarten classroom. During the early years, children do spend much of their time playing by themselves, sometimes beside other children often referred to as parallel play (Ladd & Burgess, 1999). Teachers probably do not mind unsociable behaviours because children are not distressed, are quiet, and they do not disrupt the classroom (Rubin, 1982). In kindergarten there is probably no need to be concerned if a child prefers to play alone instead of with other children. Indeed, it has been suggested that these unsociable children may be object-oriented (Jennings, 1975) and children who engage in constructive activity have been found to be popular with their peers and believed to be socially competent by their teachers (Rubin, 1982). However, if this behaviour continues into middle and late childhood, concern should arise because at this time children are expected to form peer groups and those who do not are noticed by their peers and therefore these children could face peer rejection (Fordham & Stevenson-Hinde, 1999; Snyder et al., 1997). However, it is not uncommon for children in

kindergarten to display socially disinterested behaviours.

Shyness, although similarly characterized by alone play, is quite different because it is also accompanied by a feeling of anxiety and a yearning to play with others. Shy children wish to join in games and activities their peers are engaged in but are too afraid (Coplan et al., 2004). The absence of fear and anxiety may be why the kindergarten teachers in this study were more accepting of the socially disinterested behaviours than they were of the shy behaviours. Shy children may also have a tendency to display reticent behaviours, which has been found to be related to negative academic achievement and negatively related to teacher rated social competence (Coplan et al., 2001). Shy children have also been found to be more dependent on their teachers (Coplan & Prakash, 2003; Ladd & Burgess, 1999). Teachers may also be responding to overt displays of anxiety (e.g., crying; Coplan & Prakash, 2003) that shy children demonstrate in the classroom. Perhaps, teachers believe that shyness has more negative effects on children than socially disinterested behaviours and thus tolerate social disinterest behaviours more than shy behaviours.

There were two types of potential costs to the child that were included in the present study: academic and social costs. Although these costs were combined to produce one subscale (because they were significantly correlated), both types of costs will be discussed. As predicted, it was found that shyness was believed to incur more costs to the child than social disinterest. Indeed, past research has discussed a relation between shyness and academic problems. For instance, Coplan et al. (2001) found a relation between reticent behaviour (a behaviour that is frequently associated with shyness) and negative academic achievement in kindergarten. They suggested that the anxiety that

these children may be feeling could be interfering with their acquisition of skills and with their abilities to demonstrate them. Shy children are often perceived as less competent than their peers even though there is no evidence of real differences in competence (Evans, 2001). Teachers may believe that the anxiety that shy children feel will interfere with their learning, whereas children who display social disinterest are not anxious. In addition, disinterested children may frequently engage in educationally relevant behaviours (they are believed to engage in solitary-passive play in which they perform activities while playing alone), whereas shy children are believed to frequently engage in less “educationally relevant” behaviours such as reticent behaviour, or hovering around other children.

As for the social costs of the behaviours, teachers may have believed that disinterested behaviour would result in fewer social costs for the children because the children who engage in this behaviour are capable of interacting with the other children when they choose to. Results from studies have suggested that when unsociable children interact with other children, they have the social abilities to do so (Asendorpf & Meier, 1993; Harrist et al., 1997). Further, socially disinterested behaviour is believed to be a matter of preference, not of capability. Therefore, teachers may believe that socially disinterested behaviours have fewer social costs to children than shyness and aggression because shy and aggressive children do have problems interacting with other children. Coplan et al. (2001) also found that reticent behaviour in kindergarten was negatively related with teacher ratings of social competence.

As hypothesized, teachers did not ascribe different child costs to aggression and shyness. In a previous study however, preservice teachers believed that social immature

behaviours were more costly to the child than social defiant behaviours (Cunningham & Sugawara, 1988). It should be mentioned that Cunningham and Sugawara (1988) also included an item on physical costs, which was omitted from the analyses in the present study. Perhaps preservice teachers and experienced teachers have different beliefs about child behaviours. Since teachers who have been working in schools have probably had more experience dealing with different types of behaviours they may have developed the belief that shyness and aggression both have negative consequences for children's future outcomes. Moreover, this finding could also reflect teachers increasing awareness of shyness as problematic. Although teachers tolerated aggression less, and were more likely to respond directly to aggression than to the other behaviours in the present study, they believed aggression was equally likely as shyness to cause a problem for children.

Overall, teachers did not differentially attribute shy versus unsociable behaviours to external causes. However, as predicted, shyness in boys was attributed to more external causes than was shyness in girls. As was previously discussed, an identical finding was demonstrated for aggressive behaviours in which teachers attributed aggressive behaviours in boys to more external causes than aggressive behaviours in girls. Gender differences were not found for disinterested and prosocial behaviours regarding behavioural attributions. The present study also found that teachers were the least tolerant of aggression and shyness. Perhaps when girls display unacceptable behaviours, teachers attribute their behaviours to more internal causes than when boys display these behaviours. Teachers may be more "optimistic" of intolerable behaviours in boys than in girls because boys more frequently display problematic classroom behaviours as opposed

to girls (Kumpulainen, Raesaenen, & Henttonen, 1998). Therefore, teachers may be more hopeful that deviant behaviours in boys will change.

In regards to monitoring, it was found that the teachers believed that shy children needed to be monitored more than disinterested children. Again this finding makes conceptual sense if shy children appear to be more anxious than socially disinterested children. Teachers probably want to encourage shy children to interact with other children because shy children want to interact with their peers. The disinterested children, on the other hand, are independent and actually have the social skills to interact with other children if they wanted to, perhaps this is why socially disinterested children are believed to need less monitoring than shy children. However, recently Coplan et al. (2004) reported in their study on preschool children that socially disinterested behaviours may not be as benign as once was believed. They found that children rated by parents as more socially disinterested were rated by teachers as lower in prosocial behaviours, and more likely to face peer rejection. This finding suggests that teachers would be wise to monitor disinterested behaviours even in kindergarten.

Interestingly, there were no significant differences found between shyness and social disinterest for intervention and amends making. Since neither shyness nor social disinterest is very disruptive nor would either require immediate attention, it makes sense for teachers to believe that they are equally in need of intervention, both less than aggression and more than prosocial behaviours. Aggression is a more disruptive, noticeable, and possibly contingent behaviour (Goldstein et al., 2001), thus intervening and stopping the behaviour would be of greater concern in regards to this behaviour than for the other behaviours in this study. Prosocial behaviour, on the other hand, is a very

positive behaviour and probably would not require any intervention at all. Thus, teachers believe shyness and socially disinterested behaviours are problematic, and therefore in need of intervention, more than prosocial behaviours.

Again for amends making, there was no significant difference found between shyness and social disinterest. In addition, neither of these behaviours differed significantly from prosocial behaviour. However, aggression differed significantly from shyness, social disinterest, and prosocial behaviours. These findings are not surprising. Shy, socially disinterested, and prosocial behaviours are not behaviours that hurt other individuals. In fact, the prosocial children in the current study were helping and sharing with other children in their class. Thus, it is conceptually reasonable for teachers to not differ in their beliefs with regards to making children who display shy, social disinterest, and prosocial behaviours apologize for their behaviours because realistically teachers probably would not make any of them apologize.

Overall, teachers were found to believe that shyness should be given social skills aid more than social disinterested behaviours. This finding may be due to the belief that children who frequently engage in socially disinterested behaviours have adequate social skills to interact with other children (Asendorpf & Meier, 1993; Harrist et al., 1997). However, shy children want to interact with their peers but are too afraid (Asendorpf, 1990). Thus, teachers may feel that shy children would benefit from assistance interacting with the other children more than children who are already capable.

For reporting, there was no significant difference found between shyness and social disinterest. However, both behaviours were found to be believed to be in need of being reported more than prosocial behaviours but less than aggressive behaviours. If

teachers were going to report either shy or socially disinterested behaviours they would probably report the behaviours to the child's parents. Perhaps teachers would discuss these behaviours with the child's parents to develop strategies to help the child interact with their peers. Aggression, on the other hand, if it occurred frequently, would probably require teachers to consult with the child's parents and perhaps also the school principal, guidance counselors, and/or school psychologists. As has been mentioned previously, aggression is a more disruptive behaviour and because teachers have been found to be the least tolerant of aggressive behaviours they would probably be more likely to consult with other people who would help them to understand and to stop the child's aggressive behaviours so the class would be less disruptive. On the contrary, teachers would probably only discuss children who engage in prosocial behaviours with other individuals as an example of exceptional child behaviours. Teachers probably would not want prosocial behaviours to change.

An interaction with gender was also found for social skills training and reporting. In particular it was found that socially disinterested behaviours in boys were believed to be more in need of social skills training and of being reported than socially disinterested behaviours in girls. This finding is an additional sign that, like parents (Mills & Rubin, 1992), teachers also view social withdrawal as more problematic for boys than girls. These results are similar to those of Coplan et al. (2001) who reported more negative adjustment outcomes for boys who engaged in solitary-passive play than for girls. Children who display socially disinterested behaviours are believed to frequently engage in solitary-passive play (Coplan, 2000). In particular, Coplan et al. (2001) found that boys who engaged in solitary-passive play were less socially competent (as rated by their

teachers), and had more academic and internalizing problems than girls. In addition, Coplan et al. (2004) found that solitary-passive play was related to shyness but only for boys. Interestingly, Coplan et al. (2001) suggested that some shy boys may actually engage in constructive activities as a behavioural “compromise”, instead of engaging in reticent or hovering behaviours. Perhaps the teachers in the present study were concerned about problems that boys who engaged in socially disinterested behaviours may encounter, and thus believed they needed more social skills training and outside assistance than girls who engaged in similar behaviours. As mentioned previously, boys are expected to be more outgoing and sociable than girls. Thus, teachers may have felt that disinterested behaviours in boys should be corrected early to avoid future problems that may occur if these boys continue to be socially withdrawn. Disinterested girls, on the contrary, are performing societally acceptable behaviours. As opposed to boys, girls are supposed to be quiet and reserved (Caspi et al., 1988).

Previous results have suggested that shyness is more problematic for boys than girls. For instance studies have found that shy boys have more acting out behaviours (Stevenson-Hinde & Glover, 1996), have more internalizing problems (Rubin et al., 1993) and as adults, they marry later, have a delay in parenthood, and experience more career instability (Caspi et al., 1988). However, the present study demonstrated some of the first results to suggest that teachers also perceive socially disinterested behaviours to be less acceptable for boys too. Surprisingly, teachers believed that socially disinterested behaviours in boys should be reported more than socially disinterested behaviours in girls. This result was not demonstrated for shyness. These findings further illustrate the importance of separating social disinterest from shyness. Perhaps teachers believe that

socially disinterested behaviours in boys are problematic as well and that these boys need to be aided socially in school. Results showed that teachers also reported believing that they would obtain outside assistance, most likely from the boy's parents.

Thus, teachers are capable of differentiating shy and socially disinterested behaviours. They reported tolerating socially disinterested behaviours more than shy behaviours and reported believing that shy behaviours would have more negative effects on the child than socially disinterested behaviours. In addition, they also believed that shy children should be assisted in approaching other children and be monitored more than socially disinterested children. However, they attributed shyness and socially disinterested behaviours to similar causes, and they believed they would intervene, report, and make the children apologize for the behaviours similarly for both behaviours. Therefore, even though the behaviours are quite similar in appearance, teachers believed they would use some approaches more for shy behaviours than they would for socially disinterested behaviours. It is possible that because they feel that shy behaviours will have more negative outcomes for children than socially disinterested behaviours, that monitoring and helping shy children improve their social skills may be more beneficial to shy children.

There were also three Behaviour x Gender of Child interactions in the current study. Shyness was more externally attributed for boys than it was for girls. This finding is consistent with past research that has found that shyness is more problematic for boys than it is for girls. However, interestingly for teacher responses there were only gender differences found for social disinterested behaviours. Teachers believed that boys who displayed socially disinterested behaviours should be reported and be aided with their

social interaction more than girls who displayed socially disinterested behaviours. Therefore, even though teachers believed that shyness in boys was more “changeable” than shyness in girls, they were more likely to help boys who engaged in socially disinterested behaviours than girls who engaged in socially disinterested behaviours. Thus, the gender difference for the teachers’ attributions did not reflect their responses for the behaviours. It would be expected that since teachers believed that shyness in boys was more changeable than shyness in girls that they would respond more to shyness in boys than to shyness in girls. However, this finding was only found for socially disinterested behaviours. This is evidence that teachers also believe that socially disinterested behaviours in boys are problematic and should be responded to. Future research is needed to explore this finding.

Classroom Management Styles

The three teacher classroom management styles explored in the current study were interventionists (high controlling teachers), interactionalists (medium controlling teachers), and non-interventionists (low controlling teachers). The findings that pertain to each type of teacher will be discussed below. Interestingly, there were no significant main effects of teacher group found in the present study. However, a number of complex interaction effects emerged with child behaviours and gender. Thus, it is important to look at teachers’ classroom management beliefs in the context of different child behaviours, and in some instances also taking into account child gender.

Most of the discussion of the results involving teacher approaches effects are speculative, because there is little research on these different types of teacher beliefs. However, the results will be compared to some results on Baumrind’s (1971) different

types of parenting styles, so the findings have some conceptual base. It should be noted that parents and teachers do play different roles in children's lives and have different responsibilities toward children, but there are also similarities. For instance, both are authority figures to children and both have the ability to guide and control children's behaviours. These similarities are essentially what classroom management referred to in this study and what Baumrind's parenting styles refer to. Therefore, it seems logical to compare the results of this study and studies concerning parenting styles.

Teachers who are high on the interventionist approach (high controlling teachers) believe children should be controlled by the environment and hence by the people in their environment (Wolfgang & Glickman, 1986). Compared to the other types of teachers in this study, the interventionists were the most directive and controlling. As was discussed in the introduction, these teachers are probably most similar to authoritarian parents. At the opposite extreme, the non-interventionists are teachers who believe the child should be mostly in control of their own behaviour. These teachers believe that the child has their own mind and should do most of his or her own planning and decision-making. The non-interventionists (low controlling teachers) are the least commanding and controlling of the teacher types. As was mentioned in the introduction, the non-interventionists teachers can be loosely compared to permissive parents. In between the interventionist and the non-interventionist teachers lie the interactionalist teachers. These teachers can be characterized as those who believe that the child and the environment work together to mold the child. The interactionalists believe in compromising with their students, that is they try to find solutions that are adequate for both themselves and their students. These teachers can be described as most similar to authoritative parents.

Teacher tolerance. In the current study, as predicted, it was found that the interventionist teachers were less tolerant of aggressive behaviours than the non-interventionist teachers. Moreover, aggressive behaviours would probably require more control in the classroom than other behaviours. Since interventionist teachers do believe in the environment helping to control the child's behaviour, then aggressive behaviours would most likely require a lot of assistance on their part. Since interventionist teachers are thought to enjoy rules, organization, and not to like uncertainty (Martin et al., 1998), perhaps aggressive children are more stressful for the teacher because they need more support in the classroom when it comes to following classroom procedures. On the other hand, non-interventionist teachers believe that the child should be in control of his or her own behaviour, hence these teachers may not be as active and determined as the interventionist teachers to encourage the behaviour to stop.

Interestingly, the teacher approaches did not differ in their tolerances of the other three behaviours. Thus, the interventionist teachers were only less tolerant of the most serious behavioural offenses. This finding is similar to results demonstrated with parenting styles in which authoritarian and authoritative parents have been found to be the most distinct under the most difficult childrearing situations (Coplan et al., 2002).

Attributions. Somewhat surprisingly, the teacher groups did not differ overall in terms of their attributions of children's behaviours. However, a three-way interaction was detected. Three-way interactions are quite challenging to interpret. Nevertheless, the interaction can be speculated. For attributions, teacher groups appeared to differ with child behaviour and gender. In particular, it was found that for girls, non-interventionist teachers believed that shyness was more externally caused than the interventionist and the

interactionalist teachers. However, for socially disinterested behaviours in girls, non-interventionists and interventionists believed the behaviour was more externally caused than interactionalists.

Therefore, for both shy and socially disinterested behaviours in girls, the non-interventionists viewed these behaviours as externally caused and interactionalists viewed these behaviours as more internally caused. By definition, non-interventionists believe children should be in control of their behaviours, accordingly it was predicted that these teachers would attribute all behaviours more to the child. However, this prediction was not confirmed for the socially withdrawn behaviours in girls. Perhaps non-interventionist teachers are the most "developmentally optimistic" teachers for socially withdrawn behaviours for girls. Since these behaviours are not seen as extremely deviant for girls as opposed to boys, perhaps non-interventionists are optimistic that girls will "grow out" of their shyness. However, interactionalists may have reported more internal causes for these behaviours because they believe both the child and the environment are responsible for controlling the child. Thus, perhaps they believe the child does share some responsibility for her behaviour. In this regard, maybe interactionalists do believe that the child's behaviour is to some degree stable, controllable, and part of her personality.

Further, the interventionists were found to have different attributional beliefs regarding the two types of socially withdrawn behaviours in girls. The interventionists reported believing more internal causes for shyness in girls whereas they reported believing more external causes for disinterested behaviours in girls. Since shyness is more often associated with anxiety than social disinterest, perhaps these high controlling teachers believe there is a more "internal component" with regards to shyness. Coplan et

al. (2002) found that authoritarian parents were “developmentally pessimistic”, that is they had a tendency to attribute negative behaviours to internal causes and positive behaviours to external causes. As was discussed previously, interventionist teachers can be compared to authoritarian parents. As was consistently found in the present study, shyness was more negatively perceived than social disinterest by teachers. Thus, the findings regarding authoritarian parents in Coplan et al.’s (2002) study mirror the findings regarding interventionist teachers in the current study. Perhaps, interventionist teachers are the most “developmentally pessimistic” teachers.

However, the above findings were only found for girls and only for shyness and socially disinterested behaviours. For boys, there was no effect of teacher group for any of the behaviours. Regardless of classroom management style, teachers believed that shyness in boys was more externally caused than disinterested and prosocial behaviours. Teachers also believed that aggressive and disinterested behaviours in boys were more externally caused than prosocial behaviours. Interestingly, these findings were different from the findings on the attributional beliefs of teachers in general. In general, teachers viewed aggression, shyness, and social disinterest as equally more externally caused than prosocial behaviours. Thus, teachers reported more extreme causal beliefs for shyness and aggressive behaviours for boys than they did for children in general. Since no difference was found for teachers’ attributional beliefs between aggression and shyness, it is possible that teachers view shyness as just as much a product of situational factors as they do aggression. Perhaps both behaviours are perceived as the most externally caused behaviours because for males overt aggression is more frequent (Coie & Dodge, 1988, 1998) and shyness is not a gender stereotypical behaviour (Mills & Rubin, 1993), thus

teachers may believe these behaviours are the most deviant for boys. Thus, this finding further illustrates that teachers are generally “developmental optimists,” they want to give children credit for their good behaviours and the environment credit for their bad behaviours.

Negative costs to the child. No significant main effects or interactions were found for negative child costs regarding the three teacher approaches. Thus, as was previously discussed, all of the teacher groups viewed aggression and shyness equally as the most costly to the child, followed by disinterested and prosocial behaviours. Perhaps regardless of teacher approach, teachers believe shy children, even though they are not as disruptive as aggressive children, can still be maladjusted.

However, even though the teachers’ approaches did not differ in regards to their beliefs about child costs, they did differ in regards to their levels of tolerance and attributional beliefs of the behaviours. To summarize the findings for teacher groups to this point, it was found in the present study that for tolerance levels teacher groups only differed for the aggressive behaviours. The non-interventionist teachers were more accepting of the aggressive behaviours than were the interventionist teachers. Thus, it was explained, as has been previously suggested for parenting styles, that perhaps classroom management styles are the most salient during the most difficult child behaviours. For teachers’ attributional beliefs, a relation between teacher groups and child behaviours was only found for girls. For girls, the non-interventionists were more likely to attribute more external causes to shy behaviours than were both the interventionists and the interactionalists. For disinterested behaviours in girls, it was found that both the non-interventionists and the interventionists attribute the behaviours

to more external causes than the interactionalists. It was suggested that the interventionists were the teachers that had the most different attributional beliefs regarding shyness and social disinterest. For shyness, the interventionists had more internal beliefs regarding the behaviours and for disinterested behaviours the interventionists had more external beliefs regarding the behaviours. Thus, for both teacher tolerance levels and teachers' attributional beliefs the interventionist teachers held the harshest beliefs.

Teacher responses. For reactions to the behaviours, it was predicted that the interventionist teachers would use all of the more direct strategies to stop the child behaviours more than the other two teacher approaches. However, the findings for the teacher groups' responses to the behaviours did not confirm this prediction. Surprisingly, interventionists in fact reported that they would promote social skills to the disinterested children less than the other two teacher approaches. In addition, the interventionists reported that they would actually be less likely than the non-interventionists to *intervene* in response to shy behaviours. These findings seem contradictory to interventionists' beliefs regarding classroom control. In general, these teachers believe the environment should shape and control children's behaviours. There are a number of explanations that can be suggested for these findings. First, perhaps the ABCC is not an adequate measure of interventionist teachers. It is also possible that the interventionist teachers in this study reported socially desirable responses to these classroom strategies. However, perhaps since interventionists are high controlling and enjoy classroom order they generate more of their time and energy to the most deviant behaviours. Indeed, it was found in the current study that compared to the other two teacher groups, interventionists were the

least tolerant of aggressive behaviours. Perhaps interventionists are only more likely to use social skills training and to intervene during the most demanding classroom behaviours. It is also possible that since interventionists were found to believe that shy behaviours were internally caused, perhaps they also view helping children who engage in these behaviours as a “waste of their time” because they believe that these behaviours are stable, controllable, and internal to the child.

It was also found that the non-interventionist teachers believed they would intervene with the shy children more than the interactionalist teachers. Since the non-interventionists believed that shyness is externally caused more than the interactionalists (although this was only found for girls in the present study) then it is also plausible that the non-interventionists also believed that intervention would aid the behaviour more than the interactionalists. If the behaviour is externally caused then outside aids may be more likely to help stop the behaviour from continuing.

Surprisingly, the results indicated a significant three-way interaction for “having children make amends” for their behaviours. It was suspected that the only significant finding would be that all of the teachers, regardless of classroom management style, would believe that the aggressive children should be more apologetic for their behaviours than the other children. Again, three-way interactions are difficult to interpret. However, it appeared that for shyness, the non-interventionists believed boys should be more apologetic than girls. Further, contrary to the finding for shy behaviours, the non-interventionists believed that socially disinterested girls should make amends more than socially disinterested boys. Similarly, the interventionists reported believing that socially disinterested behaviours in girls should be amends more than socially disinterested

behaviours in boys. However, the interactionalists reported believing that socially disinterested behaviours in boys should be amends more than socially disinterested behaviours in girls. For shyness, perhaps the non-interventionists are aware that for boys this behaviour is more problematic and less gender stereotypical than it is for girls (Mills & Rubin, 1993). Thus, the non-interventionists may believe that boys should explain this behaviour more than girls, so that help can be provided. Indeed, it was found in the current study that non-interventionists were the teachers most likely to intervene during shy behaviours.

On the other hand, for disinterested behaviours, the non-interventionists believed that girls should make amends more than boys. Perhaps, non-interventionists view unsociable behaviours as more of a problem for girls and are therefore more concerned about these behaviours in girls. Indeed, as was previously discussed, the non-interventionist teachers were also more likely than the interventionist teachers to promote social skills to disinterested children. Perhaps, non-interventionists would first have disinterested girls discuss why they are playing alone and then would coach them on how to interact with other children. An identical finding was demonstrated for the interventionist teachers. It is possible that they also reported believing that socially disinterested behaviours in girls should be amends more than socially disinterested behaviours in boys because they too are more concerned about unsociable behaviours in girls as compared to boys. It should be mentioned that this post-hoc pairwise difference barely reached significance.

Cahill and Adams (1997) found that early childhood teachers in their study reported non-traditional beliefs regarding adult gender roles. Perhaps interventionists and

non-interventionists share these beliefs regarding disinterested behaviours. It is possible that interventionists and the non-interventionists hold the most non-traditional gender beliefs. Accordingly, these teachers may want to encourage girls to be more outgoing because it is usually more acceptable for males to be assertive than it is for females (e.g., Caspi et al., 1988). Since all of the teachers in the current study were female, perhaps they held the most non-traditional gender role beliefs toward their own gender.

On the contrary, the interactionalists were found to report believing that boys who engage in socially disinterested behaviours should make amends more than girls who engage in socially disinterested behaviours. Perhaps, interactionalists hold the most traditional gender role beliefs. Since males are supposed to be more outgoing than females (e.g., Caspi et al., 1988) then perhaps the interactionalists believe they should be more social. Since this finding was not found in regards to shyness, perhaps these teachers believe that because shy children are more anxious shy boys have a reason for their withdrawn behaviours and thus do not need to explain their behaviours. However, since unsociable boys prefer to play alone and withdrawn behaviours are not as acceptable for boys as they are for girls (Rubin et al., 2002), then perhaps the interactionalists would like to encourage boys to play with others so these boys can conform to society's expectations for their gender. Since the interactionalists were also found to report promoting social skills to socially disinterested children more than interventionists, it is possible that interactionalists would first discuss with boys the reasons for their unsociable behaviours and then help them interact with the other children.

For having children make amends as a teacher response, no significant results were found for interventionist and interactionalist teachers as a function of gender of the child for shy behaviours. Thus, these teachers reported similar beliefs regarding the use of amends for shyness regardless of gender of the child.

There were no main effects or interactions involving teacher groups found for reporting and monitoring. Moreover, these strategies are not as immediate and commanding as the other three strategies in this study. Perhaps similar to a previous suggestion that classroom management styles are the most evident during the most difficult child behaviours, perhaps classroom management styles are also the most evident for the most controlling strategies, which in the current study were intervening, promoting social skills, and having the child make amends. Thus, teachers in general were more likely to believe that they would report and monitor aggression, followed by shyness and social disinterest, and were least likely to report and monitor prosocial behaviours.

Summary of Teacher Group Effects

Surprisingly, there were no significant main effects of teacher group found in this study. It was hypothesized that the interventionists would be the least tolerant, have the most pessimistic attributional beliefs, believe the most that children will be harmed by the behaviours, and report using the harshest strategies regardless of child behaviour and gender. The nonsignificant findings for teacher group suggest that teachers' classroom management styles are not the most important variables when examining teachers' beliefs. Worth mentioning again is the possibility that the ABCC does not effectively group the three types of teachers. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study that

has been conducted on the effects of teachers' beliefs about classroom management on their reported tolerances, attributions, believed child costs, and responses to classroom behaviours. Future research should further explore the ABCC's ability to categorize the three classroom management styles and the effects these styles have on teachers' beliefs about child behaviours. However, the present study did demonstrate that teachers' beliefs varied with classroom management style, child behaviours and, in two instances, child gender. The following subsections will describe the different types of classroom management styles based on the above findings.

Interventionists. As was mentioned above, it was found that the interventionists were less tolerant of the aggressive behaviours (the most deviant behaviour) than the non-interventionists. Further, for girls, the interventionists attributed external causes to the disinterested behaviours, but internal causes to the shy behaviours. In addition, contrary to expectations, the interventionists did not report using the response strategies for the behaviours more than the other classroom management styles. In fact, it was found that for shyness, the interventionists were not more likely than the other teachers to intervene during these behaviours. It was also found that interventionists were less likely than both the interactionalists and the non-interventionists to promote social skills to children who displayed social disinterest. For amends, the interventionists reported believing that girls who engaged in social disinterest should be more apologetic for their behaviours than boys who engaged in social disinterest. Taken together, these findings suggest that the interventionists in this study were the harshest and the least sympathetic types of teachers. They may be the most concerned with aggressive behaviours because these behaviours have a direct effect on how their classroom runs. The other behaviours in the

current study were not as disruptive and thus could be overlooked. As was suggested previously, perhaps these teachers are the most “developmentally pessimistic” teachers. Perhaps these teachers believe that good behaviours are a result of the environment whereas bad behaviours are the result of internal causes. This may be why the interventionists were less likely to use some strategies than the other teachers. Perhaps the interventionists believe that only behaviours that are disruptive should be helped because the other problematic child behaviours are more internally caused, meaning they are stable and controllable, and thus less likely to be changed.

Based on these findings it can be suggested that interventionist teachers are comparable to authoritarian parents. This results from this study demonstrated that interventionist teachers can be viewed as “developmental pessimists” whereas previous research has demonstrated that authoritarian parents can also be viewed as “developmental pessimists” (Coplan et al., 2002). In addition, compared to the other teacher groups, the interventionist teachers in the present study reported that they would be the least accepting of aggressive behaviours, whereas authoritarian parents have previously been found to report high control and anger toward aggressive behaviours (Hastings & Rubin, 1999).

Non-interventionists. The present study found that non-interventionists were more accepting of aggressive behaviours than interventionists. The non-interventionists also believed that both shyness and unsociable behaviours (in girls) were the result of external causes. Compared to the other teachers, the non-interventionists endorsed intervention for shy behaviours the most. Similarly, for disinterested behaviours, the non-interventionists believed significantly more than the interventionists that these behaviours were in need of

social skills training. In addition, the non-interventionists believed that shy boys should make amends more than shy girls, but also believed that disinterested girls should make amends more than disinterested boys. Thus, these findings suggest that non-interventionists are the least harsh teachers toward the most demanding behaviours. Also, these teachers are willing to help all children to overcome behaviours that are problematic, even those who are not disruptive in the classroom. In effect, non-interventionist teachers appear to be the most concerned about shy and disinterested behaviours, even though these behaviours probably do not interfere with their lesson plans or the safety of other children.

This study demonstrated that the non-interventionist classroom management style does not map well onto the permissive parenting style. The non-interventionist teachers in the present study appeared to believe that they would help children who engaged in shy and disinterested behaviours, whereas permissive parents are believed to not typically take active roles in controlling or monitoring their children's behaviours (Baumrind, 1971).

Interactionalists. The interactionalists in the current study were found to believe that both of the withdrawn behaviours in the current study, shyness and social disinterest, are internally caused. In addition, the interactionalists also reported that they would intervene when children engaged in shy behaviours less than the non-interventionists. Further, the interactionalists reported that they would promote social skills to the disinterested children more than the interventionists. Moreover, the interactionalists claimed they would expect boys who engaged in socially disinterested behaviours to make amends more than girls who engaged in socially disinterested behaviours. These

findings add to previous research on interactionalist teachers. From the current study, we can suggest that interactionalists use *interacting* methods to aid their students, especially for socially disinterested behaviours. For instance, although these teachers viewed withdrawn behaviours as a problem from within the child, they still reported wanting to help disinterested children improve their social skills. It appears that interactionalists may be more concerned about disinterested behaviours in boys, may be because withdrawn behaviours are not gender stereotypical for males. Perhaps the interactionalists believed that shy children would not benefit from teachers who intervened and forced them to interact with other children. Indeed it has been suggested that shy children do not like having attention placed on them in the classroom (Evans, 2001).

Results from the present study demonstrate that interactionalist teachers can be compared to authoritative parents. Authoritative parents have been described as controlling but also as having warm interactions with their children (Baumrind, 1971). Similarly, the interactionalist teachers in the current study reported that they would use social skills training to help children who engaged in disinterested behaviours. The interactionalist teachers probably viewed unsociable behaviours as problematic and therefore reported that they would help unsociable children become more sociable.

Limitations and Future Research

Results from this study provided much insight concerning teachers' beliefs about children's behaviours in the classroom. However, there were a few limitations that should be mentioned. First, gender of the teacher could not be examined in the current study due to the small number of male kindergarten teachers who completed the questionnaire. The fact is that teachers of kindergarten are mostly female. Moreover, a study on male

kindergarten teachers' beliefs of different types of behaviours in the classroom would be an interesting issue for future research to explore. Perhaps since males are typically more overtly aggressive than females (e.g., Coie & Dodge, 1998), then maybe male kindergarten teachers are more accepting of this behaviour than some of the other types of behaviours. In addition, a study on the classroom management styles of male versus female kindergarten teachers' and their attitudes toward various child behaviours would be worth conducting. It has been previously found that male teachers are more controlling on both the Instructional Management and Student Management subscales of the ABCC (Martin et al., 2003). It is possible that each gender's classroom control groupings (teacher groupings) could differ differently when examining the various reactions to the behaviours (responses, tolerances, attributions, and negative child costs). Thus, teacher gender, in kindergarten and in other grades, is an important topic for future research.

Surprisingly, years of teaching experience was not related to any of the variables of interest in the present study. One would expect that teachers who have taught for one or more decades would view children and their behaviours differently than teachers who have taught for five or fewer years. Previous research results have indicated differences in teachers' levels of classroom control and their years in the educational field (Martin et al., 2003; Martin & Shoho, 2000). It should be mentioned, however, that Martin et al. (2003) only found a relation between teacher experience and classroom management for the Instructional Management subscale, which was not included in the present study. Similar to the present study, they found no difference between experienced traditionally trained certified teachers and traditionally trained inexperienced student teachers on the Student Management subscale. In addition, Howes, Phillips, and Whitebook (1992) found

that preschool teachers' experience in the childcare field had little effect on their competence as a teacher. Instead, good teaching behaviour was related to education. Those teachers who held any type of bachelor's degree or had specialized training were more effective teachers. Moore and Cooper (1984) found that teachers with lower education levels and experience were more likely to report having difficulties with problem behaviours. Future research should further examine teacher experience to determine the extent that number of years teaching plays on teachers' classroom behaviours and their responses made to children. It is possible that observational studies performed in the classroom would find different results concerning teacher experience than the present study.

The ABCC is a relatively new measure of classroom management attitudes. In addition, this was the first study that used the scale to categorize the three teacher approaches. Further research should be conducted on the ABCC to determine whether this scale should be used to differentiate the three teacher approaches. Plus, studies have not yet been conducted on whether teachers' classroom management beliefs match their classroom behaviours. Future research should explore whether the beliefs teachers report on the ABCC are consistent with their behaviours in the classroom.

A drawback of the current study is that it lacked observational data. Due to the extent and the time limit of the present study, observational data was not feasible. Although teacher beliefs were the focus of this study, observations of their behaviours would have also been ideal because participants' actual behaviours may not precisely reflect their answers on the questionnaire. Indeed, observational studies on teachers' classroom behaviours, especially toward children who display shyness and social

disinterest (in comparison with aggressive and prosocial types of behaviours) would be beneficial to the literature. As a side note, even if some teachers' behaviours are not exactly the same as their answers on the questionnaire, perhaps by completing the questionnaire teachers have become more aware of their behaviours in the classroom, especially towards children who may have typically gone unnoticed.

Another possible shortcoming of the present study was the structure of the response questions. Two kindergarten teachers mentioned that they would have liked to have written open-ended answers to the question, "What would you be likely to do in response to (Child's name)'s behaviour?" The open-ended answers would have given us a better indication of the actual responses teachers would have made in these situations. The Likert-scales did limit the amount of information we were able to extract about their classroom behaviours. However, the open-ended questions would have required coding and therefore would have been more time-consuming. Also, even though some kindergarten teachers would have preferred to give open-ended answers to questions, others may have been deterred from answering them and perhaps would not have participated in the study. The questionnaire was already quite long and time-consuming, thus the multiple-choice questions were probably the most appropriate for this study. Future studies that are not on such a strict time limit and that are not so intensive for teachers to complete would benefit from asking teachers to give open-ended answers about the responses they would make toward specific child behaviours.

Conclusion & Implications

The results in the present study indicated a complex interaction between teacher approaches and child gender in understanding teachers' attitudes, beliefs, and responses

to different types of child behaviours. It was shown that teachers' beliefs varied for different types of child behaviours. Teachers' beliefs (especially teachers' tolerances of behaviours) are important to study because teachers are the individuals who decide what should be done about behaviours in their classrooms. This study was important because it focused on the behaviours of an important age group of children in regards to the beliefs and attitudes of a main adult influence. If teachers are accepting of the behaviour perhaps they will be less harsh towards it and may be more interested in understanding and helping the behaviour as opposed to merely punishing the behaviour. The steps that are taken at an early age to control behaviours may indeed help or hinder the child's future outcomes, including their academic and social development.

Indeed, teachers were more likely to report using some strategies on certain behaviours than on others. This result was especially interesting in regards to shyness and social disinterest behaviours because these behaviours are very similar in appearance but have been shown to have different underpinnings (Coplan, 2000). The findings concerning shyness and social disinterest are important because past research has typically confounded the two types of behaviours. This study showed that teachers do perceive them as two distinct behaviours and believe they would treat them differently in their classrooms.

Previous research has suggested that shyness in males is more problematic than shyness in females. The present results also indicated that kindergarten teachers view unsociable behaviours in boys as more problematic than unsociable behaviours in girls. Thus, it can be suggested that teachers perceive socially withdrawn behaviours, in general, as more problematic for boys. Future research is needed to further explore this

pattern of results.

Interestingly, it was found that teachers' classroom management beliefs do have an influence on their perceptions of children's behaviours and what they would do if the behaviours occurred in their classrooms. For instance, interventionist teachers were the least tolerant teachers of aggressive behaviours. Perhaps aggressive children would benefit most from having non-interventionist teachers, because these teachers were the most tolerant of aggression. Future research should continue to study teacher's classroom management beliefs and the relation these beliefs have to teachers' beliefs and behaviours toward child classroom behaviours.

Summary

In general, the kindergarten teachers in this study were less tolerant and would work the most at trying to stop aggressive behaviours as opposed to the other types of child behaviours. On the other hand, the teachers had the most favourable attitudes toward prosocial behaviours. These results should not be considered surprising given past research in this area. However, much less is known about teacher perceptions of shy and unsociable children. Shy and unsociable behaviours may appear somewhat similar but are motivated by different reasons. Shy children usually appear anxious in social settings because they would like to interact with their peers but are too afraid to approach the other children. Unsociable children, on the contrary, have not been shown to experience anxiety in social situations or to have negative outcomes as a result of their behaviours. Indeed, teachers in the current study were able to make distinctions between these different types of behaviours. For instance, they were less tolerant, believed they would react more strongly to and predicted more negative problems for children who were shy

as opposed to those who like to play by themselves. These results show that teachers, even in kindergarten, believe that children who are shy are in need of assistance with their social interaction and if they are not helped then they may be at risk for future developmental outcomes. Perhaps teachers would enjoy and benefit from workshops that give them advice on how to help shy children in their classrooms become less anxious and feel more confident interacting with the other children.

In addition, kindergarten teachers reported having more concern for boys than for girls who play by themselves. Past research has suggested that shy boys may have more problems than shy girls, but perhaps socially withdrawn behaviours in general are seen as more problematic for boys versus girls. Maybe teachers value more outgoing and assertive behaviours in boys because our society also values such behaviour in boys. Perhaps they believe that if boys are aided in becoming more social in early childhood they will be prevented from some of the problems (e.g. loneliness), that they may encounter in the future as a result of their gender atypical behaviour.

Although no research currently exists on what type of teacher is the “best” teacher, results from the current study suggest that some teachers may be better suited to handle certain types of children. Teachers who believed that classroom control should be solely the teachers’ responsibility, and not the children’s, had less acceptance of aggressive children than teachers who believed that children should be in control of their own behaviours. Also, kindergarten teachers who believed that teachers should have most of the control in the classroom were less in favour of using some strategies on non-disruptive children (e.g., shy and unsociable) than other teachers.

Teachers who are less tolerant of aggressive behaviours may “feed” children who are aggressive. That is, they may give attention to their negative behaviours which may reinforce their aggressive behaviours and cause it to reoccur. Indeed previous research has found that some aggressive children do enjoy the attention that is given as a result of their behaviour by teachers and peers. Perhaps teachers who spend a lot of time trying to help and correct disruptive behaviours should think about the possibility that maybe their time spent with the child may be a reason for the occurrence of the behaviour. These teachers may also want to observe those children who are not disruptive but may also be at risk for negative outcomes. Teachers should not only help children who cause the most disruption in the classroom but also those that are less noticeable perhaps because they are too anxious to may themselves noticed. Teachers would be wise to “look out” for these children and to help guide them and make them more comfortable in the classroom as well as those who may cause difficulties for instruction and for other children’s learning.

References

- Abelson, A. G. (1970). Development of psychosexual concepts in relation to expressive language performance. *Psychiatry: Journal for the Study of Interpersonal Processes*, 42(3), 274-279.
- Alexander, K. L. (1988). Achievement in the first 2 years of school: Patterns and processes. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 53(2), 157.
- Algozzine, B. (1977). The emotionally disturbed child: Disturbed or disturbing? *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 5(2), 205-211.
- Algozzine, B., & Ysseldyke, J. E. (1986). The future of the LD field: Screening and diagnosis. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 19(7), 394-398.
- Algozzine, B., Ysseldyke, J., & Christenson, S. (1983). The influences of teachers' tolerances for specific kinds of behaviors of their ratings of a third grade student. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 29(2), 89-97.
- Algozzine, B., Ysseldyke, J. E., Christenson, S., & Thurlow, M. L. (1983). A factor analysis of teachers' intervention choices for dealing with students' behavior and learning problems. *The Elementary School Journal*, 84(2), 189-197.
- Armstrong, J., & Sugawara, A. I. (1989). Children's perceptions of their day care experiences. *Early Child Development and Care*, 49, 1-15.
- Ascione, F. R., & Sanok, R. L. (1982). The role of peer and adult models in facilitating and inhibiting children's prosocial behavior. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 106, 239-259.

- Asendorpf, J. (1989). Shyness as a final common pathway for two different kinds of inhibition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 481-492.
- Asendorpf, J. B. (1990). Development of inhibition during childhood: Evidence for situational specificity and a two-factor model. *Developmental Psychology*, 26(5), 721-730.
- Asendorpf, J. B. (1991). Development of inhibited children's coping with unfamiliarity. *Child Development*, 62, 1460-1474.
- Asendorpf, J. (1993). Abnormal shyness in Children. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 34, 1069-1081.
- Asendorpf, J. (1994). The malleability of behavior inhibition: A study of individual developmental functions. *Developmental Psychology*, 30(6), 912-919.
- Asendorpf, J. B., & Meier, G. H. (1993). Personality effects on children's speech in everyday life: Sociability-mediated exposure and shyness-mediated reactivity to social situations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64(6), 1072-1083.
- Atlas, R. S., & Pepler, D. J. (1998). Observations of bullying in the classroom. *Journal of Educational Research*, 92(2), 86-99.
- Bagwell, C. L., Newcomb, A. F., & Bukowski, W. M. (1998). Preadolescent friendship and peer rejection as predictors of adult adjustment. *Child Development*, 69(1), 140-153.
- Bar-Tal, D., Raviv, A., & Goldberg, M. (1982). Helping behavior among preschool children: An observational study. *Child Development*, 53, 396-402.

- Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology*, 4(1 pt 2), 1-103.
- Bengtsson, H., & Johnson, L. (1992). Perspective taking, empathy, and prosocial behavior in late childhood. *Child Study Journal*, 22(1), 11-22.
- Berndt, T. J. (1981). Age changes and changes over time in prosocial intentions and behavior between friends. *Developmental Psychology*, 17(4), 408-416.
- Berndt, T. J., Hawkins, J. A., & Hoyle, S. G. (1986). Changes in friendship during a school year: Effects on children's and adolescents' impressions of friendship and sharing with friends. *Child Development*, 57, 1284-1297.
- Birch, S. H., & Ladd, G. W. (1996). Interpersonal relationships in the school environment and children's early school adjustment: The role of teachers and peers. In J. Juvonen & K. R. Wentzel (Eds.), *Social Motivation: Understanding Children's School Adjustment* (pp. 199-225). New York, U.S.A.: Cambridge University Press.
- Birch, S. H., & Ladd, G. W. (1998). Children's interpersonal behaviors and the teacher-child relationship. *Developmental Psychology*, 34(5), 934-946.
- Boivin, M., Hymel, S. & Bukowski, W. M. (1995). The roles of social withdrawal, peer rejection, and victimization by peers in predicting loneliness and depressed mood in childhood. *Development and Psychopathology*, 7(4), 765-785.
- Bowen, F., Vitaro, F., Kerr, M., & Pelletier, D. (1995). Childhood internalizing problems: Prediction from kindergarten, effect of maternal overprotectiveness, and sex differences. *Development and Psychopathology*, 7(3), 481-498.
- Brophy, J. (1988). Educating teachers about managing classrooms and students. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 4(1), 1-18.

- Brophy, J. E., & Rohrkemper, M. M. (1981). The influence of problem ownership on teachers' perceptions of and strategies for coping with problem students. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 73(3), 295-311.
- Brophy, J., & Evertson, C. (1981). *Student characteristics and teaching*. New York: Longman.
- Burns, G. L., & Owen, S. M. (1990). Disruptive behaviors in the classroom: Initial standardization data on a new teacher rating scale. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 18(5), 515-525.
- Cahill, B., & Adams, E. (1997). An exploratory study of early childhood teachers' attitudes toward gender roles. *Sex Roles*, 36(7-8), 517-529.
- Caspi, A., Elder, G. H., & Bem, D. J. (1988). Moving away from the world: Life-course patterns of shy children. *Developmental Psychology*, 24(6), 824-831.
- Chang, L. (2003). Variable effects of children's aggression, social withdrawal, and prosocial leadership as functions of teacher beliefs and behaviors. *Child Development*, 74, 535-548.
- Charlesworth, R., Hart, C. H., Burts, D. C. & Hernandez, S. (1991). Kindergarten teachers beliefs and practices. *Early Child Development and Care*, 70, 17-35.
- Check, J.M., & Krasnoperova, E.N. (1999). Varieties of shyness in adolescence and adulthood. In L.A. Schmidt, & J. Schulkin, J. (Eds), *Extreme fear, shyness, and social phobia: Origins, biological mechanisms, and clinical outcomes* (pp. 224-250). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Coie, J. D., & Dodge, K. A. (1983). Continuities and changes in children's social status: A five-year longitudinal study. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 29(3), 261-282.

- Coie, J. D., & Dodge, K. A. (1988). Multiple sources of data on social behavior and social status in the school: A cross-age comparison. *Child Development*, 59, 815-829.
- Coie, J. D., & Dodge, K. A. (1998). Aggression and antisocial behavior. In W. Damon (Ed. in Chief) & N. Eisenberg (Volume Ed.), *Handbook of Child Psychology: , Vol. 3. Social, emotional, and personality development* (5th ed., pp. 779-862). New York: Wiley.
- Coie, J. D., & Koeppel, G. K. (1990). Adapting intervention to the problems of aggressive and disruptive rejected children. In S. R. Asher & J. D. Coie (Eds.), *Peer rejection in childhood*. Cambridge studies in social and emotional development (pp. 309-337). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Coie, J. D., & Kupersmidt, J. B. (1983). A behavioral analysis of emerging social status in boys' groups. *Child Development*, 54, 1400-1416.
- Comadena, M. E., & Prusank, D. T. (1988). Communication apprehension and academic achievement among elementary and middle school students. *Communication Education*, 37(4), 270-277.
- Copeland-Mitchell, J., Denham, S. A., & DeMulder, E. K. (1997). Q-sort assessment of child-teacher attachment relationships and social competence in the preschool. *Early Education and Development*, 8(1), 27-39.
- Coplan, R. J. (2000). Assessing nonsocial play in early childhood: Conceptual and methodological approaches. In K. Gitlin-Weiner & A. Sandgrund (Eds.), *Play diagnosis and assessment* (2nd ed.)(pp. 563-598). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Coplan, R. J., Gavinski-Molina, M. H., Lagace-Seguin, D. G., & Wichmann, C. (2001).

When girls versus boys play alone: Nonsocial play and adjustment in kindergarten.

Developmental Psychology, 37(4), 464-474.

Coplan, R. J., & Hastings, P. D., Lagace-Seguin, D. G., & Moulton, C. E. (2002).

Authoritative and authoritarian mothers' parenting goals, attributions, and emotions

across different childrearing contexts. *Parenting: Science and Practice*, 2(1), 1-26.

Coplan, R. J., & Prakash, K. (2003). Spending time with teacher: Characteristics of

Preschoolers who frequently elicit versus initiate interactions with teachers. *Early*

Childhood Research Quarterly, 18(1), 143-158.

Coplan, R. J., Prakash, K., O'Neil, K., & Armer, M. (2004). Do you 'want' to play?

Distinguishing between conflicted shyness and social disinterest in early childhood.

Developmental Psychology, 40(2), 244-258.

Coplan, R. J., Rubin, K. H., Fox, N. A., Calkins, S. D., & Stewart, S. L. (1994). Being

alone, playing alone, and acting alone: Distinguishing among reticence and passive

and active solitude in young children. *Child Development*, 65, 129-137.

Costin, S. E., & Carlson Jones, D. (1992). Friendship as a facilitator of emotional

responsiveness and prosocial interventions among young children. *Developmental*

Psychology, 28(5), 941-947.

Crick, N. R. (1996). The role of overt aggression, relational aggression, and prosocial

behavior in the prediction of children's future social adjustment. *Child*

Development, 67, 2317- 2327.

Crick, N. R., Casas, J. F., & Mosher, M. (1997). Relational and overt aggression in

preschool. *Developmental Psychology*, 33(4), 579-588.

- Crick, N. R., & Grotpeter, J. K. (1995). Relational aggression, gender, and social-psychological adjustment. *Child Development*, 66, 710-722.
- Crozier, W. R. (1999). Individual differences in childhood shyness: Distinguishing fearful and self-conscious shyness. In L. A. Schmidt & Schulkin, J. (Eds.), *Extreme fear, shyness, and social phobia: Origins, biological mechanisms, and clinical outcomes. Series in affective science* (pp. 14-29). London: Oxford University Press.
- Crozier, W.R. (2000). Shyness and social relationships: Continuity and change. In W.R. Crozier (Ed.), *Shyness: Development, consolidation, and change* (pp. 1-21). London: Routledge.
- Crozier, W.R. (2001). Shyness, self-perception, and reticence. In R. J. Riding & S. G. Rayner (Eds.), *Self-perception: International perspectives on individual differences, vol. 2* (pp.53-76). Westport, CT, US: Abler Publishing.
- Crozier, W. R., & Perkins, P. (2002). Shyness as a factor when assessing children. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 18(3), 239-244.
- Cunningham, B., & Sugawara, A. (1988). Preservice teachers' perceptions of children's problem behaviors. *Journal of Educational Research*, 82(1), 34-39.
- Cunningham, B., & Sugawara, A. (1989). Factors contributing to preservice teachers' management of children's problem behaviors. *Psychology in the Schools*, 26(4), 370-379.
- Dix, T., Ruble, D. N., Grusec, J. E., & Nixon, S. (1986). Social cognition in parents: Inferential and affective reactions to children of three age levels. *Child Development*, 57(4), 879-894.

- Dodge, K. A. (1983). Behavioral antecedents of peer social status. *Child Development*, 54, 1386-1399.
- Dornbusch, S. M., Ritter, P. L., Leiderman, P. H., Roberts, D. F., & Fraleigh, M. J. (1987). The relation of parenting style to adolescent school performance. *Child Development*, 58, 1244-1257.
- Eisenberg, N., Cameron, E., Tryon, K., & Dodez, R. (1981). Socialization of prosocial behavior in the preschool classroom. *Developmental Psychology*, 17(6), 773-782.
- Eisenberg, N., Carlo, G., Murphy, B., & Van Court, P. (1995). Prosocial development in late adolescence: A longitudinal study. *Child Development*, 66, 1179-1197.
- Eisenberg, N., & Fabes, R.A. (1998). Prosocial development. In W. Damon (Ed. In Chief) & N. Eisenberg (Volume Ed.), *Handbook of Child Psychology: Vol. 3. Social, emotional, and personality development* (5th ed., pp. 701-778). New York: Wiley.
- Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., Miller, P. A., Shell, R., Shea, C., & May-Plumlee, T. (1990). Preschoolers' vicarious emotional responding and their situational and dispositional prosocial behavior. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 36(4), 507-529.
- Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R.A., & Murphy, B.C (1995). Relations of shyness and low sociability to regulation and emotionality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 505-517.
- Eisenberg, N., Lundy, T., Shell, R., & Roth, K. (1985). Children's justification for their adult and peer-directed compliant (prosocial and non prosocial) behaviors. *Developmental Psychology*, 21(2), 325-331.

- Eisenberg, N., & Miller, P. A. (1987). The relation of empathy to prosocial and related behaviors. *Psychological Bulletin*, 101(1), 91-119.
- Eisenberg, N., Miller, P. A., Shell, R., McNalley, S., & Shea, C. (1991). Prosocial development in adolescence: A longitudinal study. *Developmental Psychology*, 27(5), 849-857.
- Eisenberg, N., Shell, R., Pasternack, J., Lennon, R., Beller, R., & Mathy, R. M. (1987). Prosocial development in middle childhood: A longitudinal study. *Developmental Psychology*, 23(5), 712-718.
- Evans, M. A. (1993). Communicative competence as a dimension of shyness. In K. H. Rubin & J. B. Asendorpf (Eds.), *Social withdrawal, inhibition, and shyness in childhood* (pp. 189-212). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Evans, M. A. (2001). Shyness in the classroom and home. In R. W. Crozier & L. E. Aldon (Eds.), *International handbook of social anxiety: Concepts, research and Interventions relating to the self and shyness* (pp. 159-183). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Fabes, R. A., Fultz, J., Eisenberg, N., May-Plumlee, T., & Christopher, F. S. (1989). *Developmental Psychology*, 25(4), 509-515.
- Fang, Z. (1996). A review of research on teacher beliefs and practices. *Educational Research*, 38(1), 47-65.
- Farver, J. A., & Husby Branstetter, W. (1994). Preschoolers' prosocial responses to their peers' distress. *Developmental Psychology*, 30(3), 334-341.

- Fordham, K., & Stevenson-Hinde, J. (1999). Shyness, friendship quality, and adjustment during middle childhood. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines*, 40, 757-768.
- Glickman, C. D., & Tamashiro, R. T. (1980). Clarifying teachers' beliefs about discipline. *Educational Leadership*, 37, 459-464.
- Glickman, C. D., & Wolfgang, C. H. (1978). Conflict in the classroom: An eclectic model of teacher-child interaction. *Elementary School Guidance and Counseling*, 13(2), 82-87.
- Goldstein, S. E., Tisak, M. S., & Boxer, P. (2002). Preschoolers' normative and prescriptive judgments about relational and overt aggression. *Early Education and Development*, 13(1), 23-39.
- Goldstein, N. E., Arnold, D. H., Rosenberg, J. L., Stowe, R. M., & Ortiz, C. (2001). Contagion of aggression in day care classrooms as a function of peer and teacher responses. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 93(4), 708-719.
- Green, S. B., Salkind, N. J., & Akey, T. M. (2000). *Using SPSS for windows: Analyzing and understanding data (2nd ed.)*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Grusec, J. E. (1991). Socializing concern for others in the home. *Developmental Psychology*, 27(2), 338-342.
- Haapasalo, J., Tremblay, R. E., Boulerice, B., & Vitaro, F. (2000). Relative advantages of person- and variable-based approaches for predicting problem behaviors from kindergarten assessments. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 16(2), 145-168.

- Halloran, E. C., Dumas, D. M., John, R. S., & Margolin, G. (1999). The relationship between aggression in children and locus of control beliefs. *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 160*(1), 5-21.
- Halperin, M. S. (1976). First-grade teachers' goals and children's developing perceptions of school. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 68*(5), 636-648.
- Hamre, B. K., & Pianta, R. C. (2001). Early teacher-child relationships and the trajectory of children's school outcomes through eighth grade. *Child Development, 72*, 625-638.
- Harrist, A.W., Zaia, A.F., Bates, J.E., Dodge, K.A., & Pettit, G.S. (1997). Subtypes of social withdrawal in early childhood: Sociometric status and social-cognitive differences across four years. *Child Development, 68*, 278-294.
- Hastings, P. D., & Grusec, J. E. (1998). Parenting goals as organizers of responses to parent-child disagreement. *Developmental Psychology, 34*(3), 465-479.
- Hastings, P. D., & Rubin, K. H. (1999). Predicting mothers' beliefs about preschool-aged children's social behavior: Evidence for maternal attitudes moderating child effects. *Child Development, 70*, 722-741.
- Hegvik, R.L., McDevitt, S.C., & Carey, W.B. (1982). The Middle Childhood Temperament Questionnaire. *Journal of Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics, 3*, 197-200.
- Henington, C., Hughes, J. N., Cavell, T. A., & Thompson, B. (1998). The role of relational aggression in identifying aggressive boys and girls. *Journal of School Psychology, 36*(4), 457-477.

- Henson, R. K., & Roberts, J. K. (2001). *A confirmatory factor analysis of preservice teachers' responses to the attitudes and beliefs on classroom control inventory*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Heyman, G. D., & Legare, C. H. (2004). Children's beliefs about gender differences in the academic and social domains. *Sex Roles, 50*(3-4), 227-236.
- Howes, C., & Hamilton, C. E. (1992). Children's relationships with child care teachers: Stability and concordance with parental attachments. *Child Development, 63*, 867-878.
- Howes, C., Hamilton, C. E., & Matheson, C. C. (1994). Children's relationships with peers: Differential associations with aspects of the teacher-child relationship. *Child Development, 65*, 253-263.
- Howes, C., Phillips, D. A., & Whitebook, M. (1992). Thresholds of quality: Implications for the social development of children in center-based child care. *Child Development, 63*, 449-460.
- Hudley, C. A. (1993). Comparing teacher and peer perceptions of aggression: An ecological approach. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 85*(2), 377-384.
- Hughes, J. N., Cavell, T. A., & Jackson, T. (1999). Influence of the teacher-student relationship on childhood conduct problems: A prospective study. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 28*(2), 173-184.
- Huston, T. L., & Burgess, R. L. (1979). Social exchange in developing relationships: An overview. In T. L. Huston & R. L. Burgess (Eds.), *Social exchange in developing relationships*. New York: Academic Press.

- Hutton, J. B. (1984). Teacher ratings of problem behaviors: Which student behaviors "concern" and "disturb" teachers? *Psychology in the Schools*, 21, 482-484.
- Hutton, J. B., & Roberts, T. (1983). Factor structure of problem behavior for mildly handicapped and non-handicapped students. *Psychological Reports*, 52, 703-707.
- Hymel, S., Rubin, K. H., Rowden, L., & LeMare, L. (1990). Children's peer relationships: Longitudinal predictions of internalizing and externalizing problems from middle to late childhood. *Child Development*, 61, 2004-2021.
- Jennings, K.D. (1975). People versus object orientation, social behavior, and intellectual abilities in children. *Developmental Psychology*, 11, 511-519.
- Johns, F., MacNaughton, R., & Karabinus, N. (1989). *School discipline guidebook: Theory into practice*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Jones, V. F., & Jones, L. S. (1981). *Responsible classroom discipline*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Kagan, D. M., & Smith, K. E. (1988). Beliefs and behaviours of kindergarten teachers. *Educational Research*, 30(1), 26-35.
- Kauffman, J. M., Lloyd, J. W., & McGee, K. A. (1989). Adaptive and maladaptive behavior: Teachers' attitudes and their technical assistance needs. *Journal of Special Education*, 23(2), 185-200.
- Kauffman, J. M., Pullen, P. L., & Akers, E. (1986). Classroom management: Teacher-child-peer relationships. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 19(1), 1-10.
- Kedar-Voivodas, G., & Tannenbaum, A. J. (1979). Teachers' attitudes toward young deviant children. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 71(6), 800-808.

- Kelley, H. H. (1979). *Personal relationships: Their structures and processes*. New York: Halsted Press.
- Kemple, K. M., David, G. M., & Hysmith, C. (1998). Teachers' interventions in preschool and kindergarten children's peer interactions. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 12(1), 34-47.
- Kerr, M. (2000). Childhood and adolescent shyness in long-term perspective: Does it matter? In W. R. Crozier (Ed.), *Shyness: Development, consolidation and change* (pp. 64-87). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kienbaum, J., Volland, C., & Ulich, D. (2001). Sympathy in the context of mother-child and teacher-child relationships. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 24(4), 302-309.
- Kumpulainen, K., Raesaenen, E., & Henttonen, I. (1998). The persistence of teacher-reported behavioral problems among children aged 8 to 12. *European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 7(4), 225-234.
- Ladd, G. W. (1981). Effectiveness of a social learning method for enhancing children's social interaction and peer acceptance. *Child Development*, 52, 171-178.
-
- Ladd, G. W., & Burgess, K. B. (1999). Charting the relationship trajectories of aggressive, withdrawn, and aggressive/withdrawn children during early grade school. *Child Development*, 70, 910-929.
- Ladd, G. W., & Burgess, K. B. (2001). Do relational risks and protective factors moderate the linkages between childhood aggression and early psychological and school adjustment? *Child Development*, 72, 1579-1601.

- Ladd, G. W., & Price, J. M. (1987). Predicting children's social and school adjustment following the transition from preschool to kindergarten. *Child Development*, 58, 1168-1189.
- Ladd, G. W., & Profilet, S. M. (1996). The Child Behavior Scale: A teacher-report measure of young children's aggressive, withdrawn, and prosocial behaviors. *Developmental Psychology*, 32(6), 1008-1024.
- LaFreniere, P. J., & Sroufe, L. A. (1985). Profiles of peer competence in the preschool: Interrelations between measures, influence of social ecology, and relation to attachment history. *Developmental Psychology*, 21(1), 56-69.
- Leary, M.R., Herbst, K.C., & McCrary, F. (2003). Finding pleasure in solitary-activities: Desire for aloneness or disinterest in social contact? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 35, 59-68.
- Lemerise, E. A. (1997). Patterns of peer acceptance, social status, and social reputation in mixed-age preschool and primary classrooms. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 43(2), 199-218.
- Lipps Birch, L., & Billman, J. (1986). Preschool children's food sharing with friends and acquaintances. *Child Development*, 57, 387-395.
- Mamlin, N., & Harris, K. R. (1998). Elementary teachers' referral to special education in light of inclusion and prereferral: "Every child is here to learn . . .but some of these children are in real trouble." *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 90(3), 385-396.
- Martin, A. J., Linfoot, K., & Stephenson, J. (1999). How teachers respond to concerns about misbehavior in their classroom. *Psychology in the Schools*, 36(4), 347-358.

Martin, N. K., & Baldwin, B. (1994). *Beliefs regarding classroom management style: Differences between novice and experienced teachers*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Southwest Educational Research Association, San Antonio, TX.

Martin, N. K., & Shoho, A. R. (2000). *Teacher experience, training, & age: The influence of teacher characteristics on classroom management style*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, Dallas, TX.

Martin, N.K., Shoho, A. & Yin, Z. (2003). Attitudes & beliefs regarding classroom management styles: The impact of teacher preparation vs. experience. *Research in the Schools*, 10(2), 29-34.

Martin, N. K., & Yin, Z. (1997). *Attitudes and beliefs regarding classroom management style: Differences between male and female teachers*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, Austin, TX.

Martin, N. K., Yin, Z., & Baldwin, B. (1998). Construct validation of the attitudes & beliefs on classroom control inventory. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 33(2), 6-15.

McEvoy, M. A., Estrem, T. L., Rodriguez, M. C., & Olsen, M. L. (2003). Assessing relational and physical aggression among preschool children: Intermethod agreement. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 23(2), 53-63.

Meehan, B. T., Hughes, J. N., & Cavell, T. A. (2003). Teacher-student relationships as compensatory resources for aggressive children. *Child Development*, 74, 1145-1157.

- Mills, R. S., & Rubin, K. H. (1990). Parental beliefs about problematic social behaviors in early childhood. *Child Development*, 61, 138-151.
- Mills, R. S., & Rubin, K. H. (1992). A longitudinal study of maternal beliefs about children's social behaviors. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 38(4), 494-512.
- Mills, R. S., & Rubin, K. H. (1993). Socialization factors in the development of social withdrawal. In K. H. Rubin, & J. B. Asendorpf (Eds.). *Social withdrawal, inhibition and shyness in childhood*, (pp. 117-148). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.
- Mischler, E. G. (1975). Studies in dialogue and discourse III: Types of discourse initiated by and sustained through questioning. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 4, 99-121.
- Moore, W. L., & Cooper, H. (1984). Correlations between teacher and student background and teacher perceptions of discipline problems and disciplinary techniques. *Psychology in the Schools*, 21(3), 386-392.
- Moore, N. V., Evertson, C. M., & Brophy, J. E. (1974). Solitary play: Some functional reconsiderations. *Developmental Psychology*, 10(6), 830-834.
- Naas, R. M., & Howse, R. B. (April, 2003). *Preschool problem behaviors as predictors of kindergarten peer and teacher relationships*. Poster presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Tampa, FL.
- Nelson, J. R., & Roberts, M. L. (2000). Ongoing reciprocal teacher-student interactions involving disruptive behaviors in general education classrooms. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 8(1), 27-37.

- Nishikawa, M., & Takagi, O. (1989). Effects of the attribution of need for help and the relationship between the potential helper and the person in need on helping behavior. *Japanese Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 28(2), 105-113.
- Olweus, D. (1979). Stability of aggressive reaction patterns in males: A review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86, 852-875.
- Olweus, D. (1993). Victimization by peers: Antecedents and long-term outcomes. In K. H. Rubin & J. B. Asendorpf (Eds.), *Social withdrawal, inhibition, and shyness in childhood* (pp. 315-341). Hillsdale, NJ, England: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Paget, K. D., Nagle, R. J., & Martin, R. P. (1984). Interrelationships between temperament characteristics and first-grade teacher-student interactions. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 12(4), 547-559.
- Parker, J. G., & Asher, S. R. (1987). Peer relations and later personal adjustment: Are low-accepted children at risk? *Psychological Bulletin*, 102(3), 357-389.
- Patterson, G. R. (1986). Performance models for antisocial boys. *American Psychologist*, 41(4), 432-444.
- Pedlow, R., Sanson, A., Prior, M., & Oberklaid, F. (1993). Stability of maternally reported temperament from infancy to 8 years. *Developmental Psychology*, 29, 998-1007.
- Pepler, D. J., & Craig, W. M. (1995). A peek behind the fence: Naturalistic observations of aggressive children with remote audiovisual recording. *Developmental Psychology*, 31(4), 548-553.

- Phillipsen, L. C., Bridges, S. K., McLemore, T. G., & Saponaro, L. A. (1999). Perceptions of social behavior and peer acceptance in kindergarten. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 14*(1), 68-77.
- Phillipsen, L. C., DePuda, D. P., & Cohen, R. (1999). Relating characteristics of children and their friends to relational and overt aggression. *Child Study Journal, 29*(4), 269-289.
- Pianta, R. C., & Steinberg, M. (1992). Teacher-child relationships and the process of adjusting to school. *New Directions for Child Development, 57*, 61-80.
- Pianta, R. C., Steinberg, M. S., & Rollins, K. B. (1995). The first two years of school: Teacher-child relationships and deflections in children's classroom adjustment. *Development and Psychopathology, 7*(2), 295-312.
- Prior, M Smart, D., Sanson, A, & Oberklaid, F. (2000). Does shy-inhibited temperament in childhood lead to anxiety problems in adolescence? *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry 39*, 461-468.
- Puleo, J. S. (1978). Acquisition of imitative aggression in children as a function of the amount of reinforcement given the model. *Social Behavior and Personality, 6*(1), 67-71.
- Radke Yarrow, M., Scott, P. M., & Zahn-Waxler, C. (1973). Learning concern for others. *Developmental Psychology, 8*(2), 240-260.
- Radke Yarrow, M., Zahn-Waxler, C., Barrett, D., Darby, J., King, R., Pickett, M., & Smith, J. (1976). Dimensions and correlates of prosocial behavior in young children. *Child Development, 47*, 118-125.

- Rhodes, W. C. (1970). A community participation analysis of emotional disturbance. *Exceptional Children*, 36(5), 309-314.
- Rosenhan, D., & White, G. M. (1967). Observation and rehearsal as determinants of prosocial behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 5(4), 424-431.
- Rubin, K.H. (1982). Non-social play in preschoolers: Necessary evil? *Child Development*, 53, 651-657.
- Rubin, K. H., & Asendorpf, J. B. (1993). Social withdrawal, inhibition, and shyness in childhood: Conceptual and definitional issues. In K. H. Rubin & J. B. Asendorpf (Eds.), *Social withdrawal, inhibition, and shyness in childhood* (pp. 3-17). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Rubin, R. A., & Balow, B. (1978). Prevalence of teacher identified behavior problems: A longitudinal study. *Exceptional Children*, 45(2), 102-111.
- Rubin, K. H., & Burgess, K. B., & Coplan, R. J. (2002). Social withdrawal and shyness. In P. K. Smith & C. H. Hart (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of childhood social development. Blackwell handbooks of developmental psychology* (pp. 330-352). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Rubin, K. H., Chen, X., & Hymel, S. (1993). The socio-emotional characteristics of extremely aggressive and extremely withdrawn children. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 39, 518-534.
- Rubin, K. H., Coplan, R. J., Fox, N. A., & Calkins, S. D. (1995). Emotionality, emotion regulation, and preschoolers' social adaptation. *Development and Psychopathology*, 7, 49-62.

- Rubin, K. H., & Daniels-Beirness, T. (1983). Concurrent and predictive correlates of sociometric status in kindergarten and grade 1 children. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 29(3), 337-351.
- Rubin, K. H., Daniels-Beirness, T., & Bream, L. (1984). Social isolation and social problem solving: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 52(1), 17-25.
- Rubin, K. H., & Mills, R. S. (1988). The many faces of social isolation in childhood. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 56(6), 916-924.
- Safran, S. (1982). Resource consultant communication and teacher expectations of behaviorally disordered children. *Behavioral Disorders*, 8, 25-31.
- Safran, J. S., & Safran, S. P. (1987). Teachers' judgements of problem behaviors. *Exceptional Children*, 54(3), 240-244.
- Safran, S. P., & Safran, J. S. (1984). Elementary teachers' tolerance of problem behaviors. *The Elementary School Journal*, 85(2), 237-243.
- Safran, S. P., & Safran, J. S. (1985). Classroom context and teachers' perceptions of problem behaviors. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 77(1), 20-28.
- Salkind, N., Adams, D., Dermer, C., Heinerikson, J., Jones, B., & Nash, E. (2000). Guns and chewing gum: The perceptions and reality of problem behaviours in public schools. *School Psychology International*, 21(1), 106-112.
- Schlosser, L., & Algozzine, B. (1979). The disturbing child: He or she? *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 25(1), 30-36.
- Schwartz, N. H., Wolfe, J. N., & Cassar, R. (1997). Predicting teacher referrals of emotionally disturbed children. *Psychology in the Schools*, 34(1), 51-61.

- Serbin, L. A., O'Leary, K. D., Kent, R. N., & Tonick, I. J. (1973). A comparison of teacher response to the preacademic and problem behavior of boys and girls. *Child Development, 44*, 796-804.
- Snyder, J., Horsch, E., & Childs, J. (1997). Peer relationships of young children: Affiliative choices and the shaping of aggressive behavior. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 26*(2), 145-156.
- Sokal, L., Smith, D. G., & Mowat, H. (2002). *Pre-service teachers' attitudes toward classroom management in an alternative certification program*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Stanhope, L., Bell, R. Q., & Parker-Cohen, N. Y. (1987). Temperament and helping behavior in preschool children. *Developmental Psychology, 23*(3), 347-353.
- Stevens, J. (2002). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences (4th ed.)*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Stevenson, J., Linfoot, K., & Martin, A. (2000). Behaviours of concern to teachers in the early years of school. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education, 47*(3), 225-235.
- Stevenson-Hinde, J., & Glover, A. (1996). Shy girls and boys: A new look. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines, 37*(2), 181-187.
- Suda, W., & Fouts, G. (1980). Effects of peer presence on helping in introverted and extroverted children. *Child Development, 51*(4), 1272-1275.

- Summers, M., Stroud, J. C., Stroud, J. E., & Heaston, A. (1991). Preschoolers' perceptions of teacher role and importance. *Early Child Development and Care*, 68, 125-131.
- Swap, S. M. (1974). Disturbing classroom behaviors: A developmental and ecological view. *Exceptional Children*, 41(3), 163-172.
- Szynal-Brown, C., & Morgan, R. R. (1983). The effects of reward on tutor's behaviors in a cross-age tutoring context. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 36, 196-208.
- Taylor, J.C., & Romanczyk, R. G. (1994). Generating hypotheses about the function of student problem behavior by observing teacher behavior. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 27(2), 251-265.
- Vartuli, S. (1999). How early childhood teacher beliefs vary across grade level. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 14(4), 489-514.
- Walker, H. M., Stiller, B., Severson, H. H., Feil, E. G., & Golly, A. (1998). First step to success: Intervening at the point of school entry to prevent antisocial behavior patterns. *Psychology in the Schools*, 35(3), 259-269.
- Warden, D., Christie, D., Kerr, C., & Low, J. (1996). Children's prosocial and antisocial behaviour, as perceived by children, parents and teachers. *Educational Psychology*, 16(4), 365-378.
- Weiner, B. (1979). A theory of motivation for some classroom experiences. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 71(1), 3-25.

- Weiner, B. (1980). May I borrow your class notes? An attributional analysis of judgments of help giving in an achievement-related context. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 72(5), 76-681.
- Wolfgang, C. H. (1995). *Solving discipline problems: Strategies for classroom teachers* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Wolfgang, C. H., & Glickman, C. D. (1980). *Solving discipline problems: Strategies for classroom teachers*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Wolfgang, C. H., & Glickman, C. D. (1986). *Solving discipline problems: Strategies for classroom teachers* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Wubbels, T., Levy, J., & Brekelmans, M. (1997). Paying attention to relationships. *Educational Leadership*, 54(7), 82-86.
- Younger, A. J., & Boyko, K. A. (1987). Aggression and withdrawal as social schemas underlying children's peer perceptions. *Child Development*, 58, 1094-1100.
- Younger, A. J., & Daniels, T. M. (1992). Children's reasons for nominating their peers as withdrawn: Passive withdrawal versus active isolation. *Developmental Psychology*, 28(5), 955-960.
- Younger, A. J., Schwartzman, A. E., & Ledingham, J. E. (1986). Age-related differences in children's perceptions of social deviance: Changes in behavior or in perspective? *Developmental Psychology*, 22(4), 531-542.
- Zahn-Waxler, C., Radke-Yarrow, M., Wagner, E., & Chapman M. (1992). Development of concern for others. *Developmental Psychology*, 28(1), 126-136.

Appendix A
(Example of Questionnaire Package)

Department of Psychology
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
B550 Loeb Building
1125 Colonel By Drive
Ottawa, ON K1S 5B6 Canada
Tel: (613) 520-2644
Fax: (613) 520-3667

January, 2004

Dear Principal/School Administrator,

We are Developmental Psychology researchers from Carleton University in Ottawa, Ontario. We are currently conducting a study related to kindergarten teachers' attitudes, beliefs, and responses towards child behaviours that may be seen in the classroom. This study has been approved by the New Brunswick Teachers' Association.

We are asking kindergarten teachers to anonymously complete a questionnaire booklet consisting of a general teacher attitudes and beliefs questionnaire as well as questions pertaining to specific child behaviours. These questionnaires should take approximately 20 minutes to complete. We are asking the principals of schools (or school administrators) to give a copy of the questionnaires to **two** kindergarten teachers at their school (currently teaching kindergarten or having taught kindergarten in the last 5 years). Each questionnaire booklet includes a stamped-addressed envelope. If you have any questions or comments or would like a copy of the findings (which will be available in the summer of 2004), please feel free to contact either Dr. Robert Coplan or Kim Arbeau (see below).

Thank you for your time and consideration! Your help is very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

Robert J. Coplan, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Psychology
Carleton University
email: robert_coplan@carleton.ca
phone: (613) 520-2600, ext. 8691

Kim Arbeau
M.A. Student
Department of Psychology
Carleton University
email: karbeau@connectmail.carleton.ca
phone: (613) 520-2600, ext. 1979

Department of Psychology
 Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
 B550 Loeb Building
 1125 Colonel By Drive
 Ottawa, ON K1S 5B6 Canada
 Tel: (613) 520-2644
 Fax: (613) 520-3667

January, 2004

Teacher Attitudes and Beliefs Study

Teachers play a critical role in children's development. Beyond academics, teachers play a large role in shaping children's social and emotional development, particularly in the early grades. We are in the process of conducting a study to explore the different 'philosophies' (i.e., attitudes, beliefs, responses) that teachers may have towards different types of child behaviours and 'misbehaviours' in the kindergarten classroom. We know you are busy! We would genuinely appreciate your participation in this study. We are hopeful that a better understanding of teacher beliefs and strategies in the classroom will be helpful both in terms of teacher-education, as well as in identifying and assisting young children who are not adjusting well to the early school environment.

If you agree to participate, please anonymously complete the attached questionnaire (which should take about 20 minutes). The first page is a consent form (which we would like you to initial and return), followed by some questions regarding demographic and background information. Other items will concern your tolerance (i.e., acceptance) toward certain behaviours seen in the classroom setting and your general approach to managing the classroom. Eight short scenarios are then presented, each followed by questions regarding your responses and attitudes concerning the behaviours. You are free to withdraw from the study at any time and you can omit any questions you feel uncomfortable answering. If you do choose to complete the study you can return your questionnaires in the provided self-addressed envelope.

This research project has been approved by the Carleton University Ethics Committee for Psychological Research and the New Brunswick Teachers' Association. The data collected in this study are strictly confidential and are made available only to researchers associated with this project. All questionnaires will be used only to extract data for study and data analysis. If you have any questions or concerns about this study please feel free to contact us directly (Kim Arbeau, karbeau@connectmail.carleton.ca, 613-520-2600 ext. 1979 or Dr. Robert Coplan, robert_coplan@carleton.ca, 613-520-2600 ext. 8691). You can also contact Dr. M. Gick (Chair, Carleton University Ethics Committee for Psychological Research, 613-520-2600, ext. 2664), or Dr. J. Logan (Chair, Dept. of Psychology, 613-520-2600, ext. 2648).

Once all the data has been collected and analyzed, a summary of the findings will be provided to the participating schools and school boards. We know how valuable your time is and therefore would be sincerely grateful to you if you do choose to participate. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Robert J. Coplan, Ph.D.
 Associate Professor
 Department of Psychology
 Carleton University

Kim Arbeau
 M.A. Student
 Department of Psychology
 Carleton University

CONSENT FORM – Teacher Attitudes and Beliefs Study

date: _____

Please check one:

_____ I give my permission to participate in the Teacher Attitudes and Beliefs Study.

_____ I do not give my permission to participate in the Teacher Attitudes and Beliefs Study.
(if you chose not to participate, please recycle the attached questionnaires)_____
(please initial here)**Please return the initialed consent along with the questionnaires in the attached self-addressed stamped envelope.**

If you would like to receive a summary of the findings from this study please indicate an e-mail address or a mailing address in which we can send the results:

Background Information

Age _____

Male _____ Female _____

Ethnicity (optional): Caucasian _____
Hispanic _____Asian _____
Aboriginal _____Black _____
Other _____Last degree obtained:
(check one)High School _____ ECE certificate _____
University: B.A. _____ B.Sc. _____ B.Ed. _____
Graduate: M.A. _____ M.Ed. _____ Ph.D. _____
Other (please specify) _____

Year Education Degree was obtained? _____

Name of the Institution degree was obtained _____

How many years have you been teaching? _____

Name of the school where you are currently employed _____

Location of school (e.g., town/city and province)? _____

What grade(s) are you currently teaching? _____

If you are not currently teaching kindergarten, when did you last teach kindergarten? _____

Teacher Attitudes and Beliefs Questionnaire

Read the following attitude and belief statements, then circle the number that best corresponds to how well the statement describes you. The following are the number correspondences: 1 – “describes me not at all,” 2 – “describes me somewhat,” 3 – “describes me usually,” and 4 – “describes me very well.”

	<i>describes me not at all</i>	<i>describes me somewhat</i>	<i>describes me usually</i>	<i>describes me very well</i>
1. When a student bothers other students, I will immediately tell the student to be quiet and stop it.	1	2	3	4
2. Students in my classroom are free to use any materials they wish during the learning process.	1	2	3	4
3. I believe students need the structure of a daily routine that is organized and implemented by the teacher.	1	2	3	4
4. I specify a set time for each learning activity and try to stay within my plans.	1	2	3	4
5. I believe friendliness, courtesy, and respect for fellow students is something that students have to learn first-hand through free interaction.	1	2	3	4
6. I believe students will be successful in school if they listen to adults who know what's best for them.	1	2	3	4
7. The teacher knows best how to allocate classroom materials and supplies to optimize learning.	1	2	3	4
8. I believe class rules are important because they shape the student's behaviour and development.	1	2	3	4
9. I believe students should create their own daily routines as this fosters the development of responsibility.	1	2	3	4
10. If students agree that a classroom rule is unfair, then I would replace it with one that students think is fair.	1	2	3	4
11. I believe that students need direction in how to work together.	1	2	3	4
12. I believe teachers should require student compliance and respect for law and order.	1	2	3	4
13. When moving from one learning activity to another, I will allow students to progress at their own rate.	1	2	3	4
14. I believe the teacher should decide what topics the students study and the tasks used to study them.	1	2	3	4

	<i>describes me not at all</i>	<i>describes me somewhat</i>	<i>describes me usually</i>	<i>describes me very well</i>
15. While teaching a lesson on farm animals, a student begins to talk about her pet I would remind the student that the class has to finish the lesson before the end of the class period.	1	2	3	4
16. I believe students should choose the learning topics and tasks.	1	2	3	4
17. I believe class rules stifle the student's ability to develop a personal moral code.	1	2	3	4
18. I believe students will be successful in school if allowed the freedom to pursue their own interests.	1	2	3	4
19. I believe students should judge the quality of their own work rather than rely on what the teacher tells them.	1	2	3	4
20. When students behave appropriately, I will provide a reward of some kind such as points toward a party or free time.	1	2	3	4
21. I believe it's important to continuously monitor students' learning behaviour during seatwork.	1	2	3	4
22. I believe the teacher should direct the students' transition from one learning activity to another.	1	2	3	4
23. During the first week of class, I allow the students to come up with a set of classroom rules.	1	2	3	4
24. I believe the primary purpose of homework is to provide drill and practice of skills learned in the classroom.	1	2	3	4
25. I allow students to select their own seats.	1	2	3	4
26. During the first week of class, I announce the classroom rules and inform students of the penalties for disregarding the rules.	1	2	3	4

*Child Behaviour Vignettes***Instructions:**

As you read each vignette below, please imagine that it is a child in your **kindergarten class** being described. Maybe something like this has happened before, and you can remember how you felt and what you did. If nothing like what is described in a scenario has happened before, please imagine what it is like to be in that situation and see the child behaving this way. After each story there are eight questions describing attitudes or beliefs you may have if you saw a child behaving that way. Please try to answer every question. If you are not sure about any of the items, just take your best guess. Also, we are interested in what *you* think, so please do not talk about the stories and questions with other people until after you have given us your answers.

Vignette #1: One of the other children has a toy that Heather wants, and you see Heather grab the toy and push the other child down. You have seen Heather do this a few times before.

1. What would you be likely to do in response to Heather's behaviour?

a) Nothing

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

b) Intervene to stop the behaviour (e.g., tell Heather to stop, remove Heather from the situation, etc.)

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

c) Report Heather's behaviour to other authorities so they can correct the behaviour (e.g., principal, parent)

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

d) Promote social skills (e.g., instruct Heather on appropriate social behaviour)

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

e) Have Heather make amends (e.g., make Heather apologize for this behaviour)

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

f) Monitor the situation (e.g., watch Heather for signs of future problems due to this behaviour)

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

g) Verbal encouragement (e.g., Praise Heather for this behaviour)

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

2. How tolerant (accepting) would you be of Heather's behaviour if it were displayed in your classroom?

not at all tolerant

1

2

3

4

very tolerant

5

3. Heather might have acted this way because it was in her nature or personality to act this way, or it might have been due to the situation.

<i>completely due to personality</i>	<i>mostly due to personality</i>	<i>equally due to both</i>	<i>mostly due to situation</i>	<i>completely due to situation</i>
1	2	3	4	5

4. Heather might have acted this way on purpose, or she might not have meant to act this way.

<i>definitely did this on purpose</i>	<i>probably did this on purpose</i>	<i>it could be either way</i>	<i>probably did not mean to do this</i>	<i>definitely did not mean to do this</i>
1	2	3	4	5

5. Heather might be going through a phase or stage that will end soon, or she might keep on acting this way.

<i>definitely a stage that will pass</i>	<i>probably a stage that will pass</i>	<i>it could be either way</i>	<i>probably will act this way in future</i>	<i>definitely will act this way in future</i>
1	2	3	4	5

6. Will this behaviour negatively interfere with her physical development?

<i>not at all likely</i>				<i>very likely</i>
1	2	3	4	5

7. Will this behaviour negatively interfere with her social development?

<i>not at all likely</i>				<i>very likely</i>
1	2	3	4	5

8. Will this behaviour negatively interfere with her academic development?

<i>not at all likely</i>				<i>very likely</i>
1	2	3	4	5

Vignette #2: Sarah is hovering near a group of children who are playing a game. She appears somewhat anxious. She inches closer to the other children but does not try to join in. You have seen Sarah behave like this in the past.

1. What would you be likely to do in response to Sarah's behaviour?

a) Nothing

<i>not at all likely</i>				<i>very likely</i>
1	2	3	4	5

b) Intervene to stop the behaviour (e.g., tell Sarah to stop, remove Sarah from the situation, etc.)

<i>not at all likely</i>				<i>very likely</i>
1	2	3	4	5

c) Report Sarah's behaviour to other authorities so they can correct the behaviour (e.g., principal, parent)

<i>not at all likely</i>				<i>very likely</i>
1	2	3	4	5

d) Promote social skills (e.g., instruct Sarah on appropriate social behaviour)

<i>not at all likely</i>				<i>very likely</i>
1	2	3	4	5

e) Have Sarah make amends (e.g., make Sarah apologize for this behaviour)

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

f) Monitor the situation (e.g., watch Sarah for signs of future problems due to this behaviour)

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

g) Verbal encouragement (e.g., Praise Sarah for this behaviour)

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

2. How tolerant (accepting) would you be of Sarah's behaviour if it were displayed in your classroom?

not at all tolerant

1

2

3

4

very tolerant

5

3. Sarah might have acted this way because it was in her nature or personality to act this way, or it might have been due to the situation.

*completely
due to
personality*

1

*mostly
due to
personality*

2

*equally due
to both*

3

*mostly
due to
situation*

4

*completely
due to
situation*

5

4. Sarah might have acted this way on purpose, or she might not have meant to act this way.

*definitely
did this on
purpose*

1

*probably
did this on
purpose*

2

*it could be
either way*

3

*probably
did not mean
to do this*

4

*definitely
did not mean
to do this*

5

5. Sarah might be going through a phase or stage that will end soon, or she might keep on acting this way.

*definitely
a stage that
will pass*

1

*probably
a stage that
will pass*

2

*it could be
either way*

3

*probably
will act this
way in future*

4

*definitely
will act this
way in future*

5

6. Will this behaviour negatively interfere with her physical development?

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

7. Will this behaviour negatively interfere with her social development?

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

8. Will this behaviour negatively interfere with her academic development?

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

Vignette #3: Caitlin is playing quietly away from the other children. She does not appear anxious or upset. If left undisturbed Caitlin would happily continue playing on her own. You have seen Caitlin behave similarly on other occasions.

1. What would you be likely to do in response to Caitlin's behaviour?

a) Nothing

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

b) Intervene to stop the behaviour (e.g., tell Caitlin to stop, remove Caitlin from the situation, etc.)

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

c) Report Caitlin's behaviour to other authorities so they can correct the behaviour (e.g., principal, parent)

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

d) Promote social skills (e.g., instruct Caitlin on appropriate social behaviour)

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

e) Have Caitlin make amends (e.g., make Caitlin apologize for this behaviour)

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

f) Monitor the situation (e.g., watch Caitlin for signs of future problems due to this behaviour)

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

g) Verbal encouragement (e.g., Praise Caitlin for this behaviour)

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

2. How tolerant (accepting) would you be of Caitlin's behaviour if it were displayed in your classroom?

not at all tolerant

1

2

3

4

very tolerant

5

3. Caitlin might have acted this way because it was in her nature or personality to act this way, or it might have been due to the situation.

*completely
due to
personality*

1

*mostly
due to
personality*

2

*equally due
to both*

3

*mostly
due to
situation*

4

*completely
due to
situation*

5

4. Caitlin might have acted this way on purpose, or she might not have meant to act this way.

*definitely
did this on
purpose*

1

*probably
did this on
purpose*

2

*it could be
either way*

3

*probably
did not mean
to do this*

4

*definitely
did not mean
to do this*

5

5. Caitlin might be going through a phase or stage that will end soon, or she might keep on acting this way.

*definitely
a stage that
will pass*

1

*probably
a stage that
will pass*

2

*it could be
either way*

3

*probably
will act this
way in future*

4

*definitely
will act this
way in future*

5

6. Will this behaviour negatively interfere with her physical development?

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

7. Will this behaviour negatively interfere with her social development?

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

8. Will this behaviour negatively interfere with her academic development?

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

Vignette #4: Several children are playing a game and Laura seems to be one of the leaders. One of the other children trips over something, and starts crying. Laura goes to the crying child, helps her to sit up, and sits together with the other child until she stops crying. Laura has done this kind of thing before.

1. What would you be likely to do in response to Laura's behaviour?

a) Nothing

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

b) Intervene to stop the behaviour (e.g., tell Laura to stop, remove Laura from the situation, etc.)

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

c) Report Laura's behaviour to other authorities so they can correct the behaviour (e.g., principal, parent)

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

d) Promote social skills (e.g., instruct Laura on appropriate social behaviour)

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

e) Have Laura make amends (e.g., make Laura apologize for this behaviour)

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

f) Monitor the situation (e.g., watch Laura for signs of future problems due to this behaviour)

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

g) Verbal encouragement (e.g., Praise Laura for this behaviour)

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

2. How tolerant (accepting) would you be of Laura's behaviour if it were displayed in your classroom?

not at all tolerant

very tolerant

1

2

3

4

5

3. Laura might have acted this way because it was in her nature or personality to act this way, or it might have been due to the situation.

*completely
due to
personality*

*mostly
due to
personality*

*equally due
to both*

*mostly
due to
situation*

*completely
due to
situation*

1

2

3

4

5

4. Laura might have acted this way on purpose, or she might not have meant to act this way.

*definitely
did this on
purpose*

*probably
did this on
purpose*

*it could be
either way*

*probably
did not mean
to do this*

*definitely
did not mean
to do this*

1

2

3

4

5

5. Laura might be going through a phase or stage that will end soon, or she might keep on acting this way.

*definitely
a stage that
will pass*

*probably
a stage that
will pass*

*it could be
either way*

*probably
will act this
way in future*

*definitely
will act this
way in future*

1

2

3

4

5

6. Will this behaviour negatively interfere with her physical development?

not at all likely

very likely

1

2

3

4

5

7. Will this behaviour negatively interfere with her social development?

not at all likely

very likely

1

2

3

4

5

8. Will this behaviour negatively interfere with her academic development?

not at all likely

very likely

1

2

3

4

5

Vignette #5: Steven is drawing a picture with crayons. Another child reaches toward one of the crayons in front of Steven. Steven hits the child and grabs the crayon. Steven has displayed this type of behaviour before.

1. What would you be likely to do in response to Steven's behaviour?

a) Nothing

not at all likely

very likely

1

2

3

4

5

b) Intervene to stop the behaviour (e.g., tell Steven to stop, remove Steven from the situation, etc.)

not at all likely

very likely

1

2

3

4

5

c) Report Steven's behaviour to other authorities so they can correct the behaviour (e.g., principal, parent)

not at all likely

very likely

1

2

3

4

5

d) Promote social skills (e.g., instruct Steven on appropriate social behaviour)

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

e) Have Steven make amends (e.g., make Steven apologize for this behaviour)

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

f) Monitor the situation (e.g., watch Steven for signs of future problems due to this behaviour)

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

g) Verbal encouragement (e.g., Praise Steven for this behaviour)

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

2. How tolerant (accepting) would you be of Steven's behaviour if it were displayed in your classroom?

not at all tolerant

1

2

3

4

very tolerant

5

3. Steven might have acted this way because it was in his nature or personality to act this way, or it might have been due to the situation.

*completely
due to
personality*

1

*mostly
due to
personality*

2

*equally due
to both*

3

*mostly
due to
situation*

4

*completely
due to
situation*

5

4. Steven might have acted this way on purpose, or he might not have meant to act this way.

*definitely
did this on
purpose*

1

*probably
did this on
purpose*

2

*it could be
either way*

3

*probably
did not mean
to do this*

4

*definitely
did not mean
to do this*

5

5. Steven might be going through a phase or stage that will end soon, or he might keep on acting this way.

*definitely
a stage that
will pass*

1

*probably
a stage that
will pass*

2

*it could be
either way*

3

*probably
will act this
way in future*

4

*definitely
will act this
way in future*

5

6. Will this behaviour negatively interfere with his physical development?

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

7. Will this behaviour negatively interfere with his social development?

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

8. Will this behaviour negatively interfere with his academic development?

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

Vignette #6: George is standing against the wall, watching some of the other children playing but looking somewhat nervous. He seems interested, but stays against the wall, keeps his chin down, and does not try to talk to the other children. You have seen George act like this at other times.

1. What would you be likely to do in response to George's behaviour?

a) Nothing

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

b) Intervene to stop the behaviour (e.g., tell George to stop, remove George from the situation, etc.)

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

c) Report George's behaviour to other authorities so they can correct the behaviour (e.g., principal, parent)

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

d) Promote social skills (e.g., instruct George on appropriate social behaviour)

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

e) Have George make amends (e.g., make George apologize for this behaviour)

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

f) Monitor the situation (e.g., watch George for signs of future problems due to this behaviour)

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

g) Verbal encouragement (e.g., Praise George for this behaviour)

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

2. How tolerant (accepting) would you be of George's behaviour if it were displayed in your classroom?

not at all tolerant

1

2

3

4

very tolerant

5

3. George might have acted this way because it was in his nature or personality to act this way, or it might have been due to the situation.

*completely
due to
personality*

1

*mostly
due to
personality*

2

*equally due
to both*

3

*mostly
due to
situation*

4

*completely
due to
situation*

5

4. George might have acted this way on purpose, or he might not have meant to act this way.

*definitely
did this on
purpose*

1

*probably
did this on
purpose*

2

*it could be
either way*

3

*probably
did not mean
to do this*

4

*definitely
did not mean
to do this*

5

5. George might be going through a phase or stage that will end soon, or he might keep on acting this way.
<i>definitely
a stage that
will pass</i>	<i>probably
a stage that
will pass</i>	<i>it could be
either way</i>	<i>probably
will act this
way in future</i>	<i>definitely
will act this
way in future</i>
1	2	3	4	5
6. Will this behaviour negatively interfere with his physical development?
<i>not at all likely</i>				<i>very likely</i>
1	2	3	4	5
7. Will this behaviour negatively interfere with his social development?
<i>not at all likely</i>				<i>very likely</i>
1	2	3	4	5
8. Will this behaviour negatively interfere with his academic development?
<i>not at all likely</i>				<i>very likely</i>
1	2	3	4	5

Vignette #7: Henry is playing alone, painting a picture. He seems to be quite content in this activity, and does not often initiate play with the other children. You have seen Henry engage in this type of behaviour in the past.

1. What would you be likely to do in response to Henry's behaviour?
- a) Nothing
<i>not at all likely</i>				<i>very likely</i>
1	2	3	4	5
- b) Intervene to stop the behaviour (e.g., tell Henry to stop, remove Henry from the situation, etc.)
<i>not at all likely</i>				<i>very likely</i>
1	2	3	4	5
- c) Report Henry's behaviour to other authorities so they can correct the behaviour (e.g., principal, parent)
<i>not at all likely</i>				<i>very likely</i>
1	2	3	4	5
- d) Promote social skills (e.g., instruct Henry on appropriate social behaviour)
<i>not at all likely</i>				<i>very likely</i>
1	2	3	4	5
- e) Have Henry make amends (e.g., make Henry apologize for this behaviour)
<i>not at all likely</i>				<i>very likely</i>
1	2	3	4	5
- f) Monitor the situation (e.g., watch Henry for signs of future problems due to this behaviour)
<i>not at all likely</i>				<i>very likely</i>
1	2	3	4	5
- g) Verbal encouragement (e.g., Praise Henry for this behaviour)
<i>not at all likely</i>				<i>very likely</i>
1	2	3	4	5

2. How tolerant (accepting) would you be of Henry's behaviour if it were displayed in your classroom?

not at all tolerant

very tolerant

1

2

3

4

5

3. Henry might have acted this way because it was in his nature or personality to act this way, or it might have been due to the situation.

*completely
due to
personality*

*mostly
due to
personality*

*equally due
to both*

*mostly
due to
situation*

*completely
due to
situation*

1

2

3

4

5

4. Henry might have acted this way on purpose, or he might not have meant to act this way.

*definitely
did this on
purpose*

*probably
did this on
purpose*

*it could be
either way*

*probably
did not mean
to do this*

*definitely
did not mean
to do this*

1

2

3

4

5

5. Henry might be going through a phase or stage that will end soon, or he might keep on acting this way.

*definitely
a stage that
will pass*

*probably
a stage that
will pass*

*it could be
either way*

*probably
will act this
way in future*

*definitely
will act this
way in future*

1

2

3

4

5

6. Will this behaviour negatively interfere with his physical development?

not at all likely

very likely

1

2

3

4

5

7. Will this behaviour negatively interfere with his social development?

not at all likely

very likely

1

2

3

4

5

8. Will this behaviour negatively interfere with his academic development?

not at all likely

very likely

1

2

3

4

5

Vignette #8: Brad is playing with some of the children in the classroom with building blocks. You notice that Brad spontaneously offers another child some of his blocks. Brad has demonstrated this behaviour in the past.

1. What would you be likely to do in response to Brad's behaviour?

a) Nothing

not at all likely

very likely

1

2

3

4

5

b) Intervene to stop the behaviour (e.g., tell Brad to stop, remove Brad from the situation, etc.)

not at all likely

very likely

1

2

3

4

5

c) Report Brad's behaviour to other authorities so they can correct the behaviour (e.g., principal, parent)

not at all likely

very likely

1

2

3

4

5

d) Promote social skills (e.g., instruct Brad on appropriate social behaviour)

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

e) Have Brad make amends (e.g., make Brad apologize for this behaviour)

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

f) Monitor the situation (e.g., watch Brad for signs of future problems due to this behaviour)

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

g) Verbal encouragement (e.g., Praise Brad for this behaviour)

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

2. How tolerant (accepting) would you be of Brad's behaviour if it were displayed in your classroom?

not at all tolerant

1

2

3

4

very tolerant

5

3. Brad might have acted this way because it was in his nature or personality to act this way, or it might have been due to the situation.

*completely
due to
personality*

1

*mostly
due to
personality*

2

*equally due
to both*

3

*mostly
due to
situation*

4

*completely
due to
situation*

5

4. Brad might have acted this way on purpose, or he might not have meant to act this way.

*definitely
did this on
purpose*

1

*probably
did this on
purpose*

2

*it could be
either way*

3

*probably
did not mean
to do this*

4

*definitely
did not mean
to do this*

5

5. Brad might be going through a phase or stage that will end soon, or he might keep on acting this way.

*definitely
a stage that
will pass*

1

*probably
a stage that
will pass*

2

*it could be
either way*

3

*probably
will act this
way in future*

4

*definitely
will act this
way in future*

5

6. Will this behaviour negatively interfere with his physical development?

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

7. Will this behaviour negatively interfere with his social development?

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5

8. Will this behaviour negatively interfere with his academic development?

not at all likely

1

2

3

4

very likely

5