

Influence of Types of School, Discipline and Teaching Experience on Pupil Control Ideology of Secondary School Teachers

Indu Rathee

Associate Professor, Tika Ram College of Education, Sonipat, Haryana, India

Abstract

This study examined the effects of types of school, discipline and teaching experiences on pupil control ideology of teachers. The population for this study comprises of 30 government and 30 non-government school teachers from Sonipat and Panipat Dist. (Haryana). The Pupil Control Ideology Scale, designed by Khatoon and Munir (2009), was used for data collection. The obtained data was analyzed using means, S.D's and t-test. The results of the analysis showed that among the three independent variables, type of schools had the greatest influence on PCI. It is revealed that teachers in non-government schools are more custodial than teachers in government schools. The study also finds that teachers do not differ significantly in their PCI regarding their discipline and teaching experience.

KEYWORDS: Pupil Control Ideology, Secondary Schools, Discipline and Teaching Experience

Introduction

Teachers have to cope with a wide range of problems in school as the work of teachers today is multifaceted. In order to discharge this onerous responsibility the teacher focus not merely on cognitive growth of children but also attempt to bring about their emotional, social and physical development. They undertake not only teaching but also matters associated with curriculum, students, parents, the school community and departmental initiatives (Pillay, Goddard & Wilss, 2005). Turan and Altug (2008) regards teachers' pupil control ideology as one of the key parts of school culture and put high emphasis on examining the concept to analyze the relationships among school members including students, teachers, and school principals. However, the number of studies on the relationships between teacher professionalism and teachers' pupil control ideologies is scarce (Lunenburg 2000). Hoy (2007) states that teacher professionalism is closely related to teachers' pupil control ideologies and that teachers' professional behavior may serve as antidote to custodial pupil control orientation. A teacher can influence the climate within the class to stimulate the students' learning by exercising varying levels of control (Oppenlander, 1970). The form and nature of control exercised by the teacher is determined, by and large, by his own ideological orientations and positional and personality factors. Pupil control ideologies were developed to determine teachers' perceptions on pupil control (Helsel and Willower 1973). The construct of pupil control ideology was originally conceptualized in a study conducted by Gilbert and Levinson (1957, cited in Hoy 1968) to examine personnel ideology in mental hospitals and then adapted into schools by Willower et al. (1967) to study teachers' pupil control ideologies. Willower, Eidel & Hoy (1973) sought to define teachers' perceptions about student control (discipline) in the classroom and they and other, later researchers conceptualized student control along a continuum from custodial to humanistic

(Lunenburg, 1990; Hoy, 2001; 1992; Rideout& Morton, 2010).

The institutions that adopt custodial control ideologies exert high levels of control to maintain their rules. Teachers tend not to understand their students' behaviours and attitudes. Instead, they maintain a rigid student-teacher status hierarchy. Students must accept the decisions of these teachers without question. Students are perceived as irresponsible and undisciplined persons who must be controlled through punitive sanctions. Impersonality, pessimism and watchful mistrust characterise the atmosphere of the custodial school (Cadavid & Lunenburg, 1991; Lunenburg & Cadavid, 1992). On the other hand, according to the humanistic control ideology, self-discipline is substituted for strict teacher control. Students' learning and behaviours are considered psychologically and sociologically rather than morally (Hoy, 1969; Cadavid & Lunenburg, 1991; Lunenburg, 1991; Lunenburg & Cadavid, 1992). The humanistic model conceives of the institution as an educational community in which students learn through cooperative interaction and experience (Cadavid & Lunenburg, 1991). Scholars have recently investigated the relationships between teachers' pupil control ideologies and demographic variables (Altug 2007; Turan and Altug 2008), classroom management styles (Yilmaz 2009), school climate (Bayram and Aypay 2012), teacher self-efficacy (Beatty 2002), student achievement (Finkelstein 1999) and student dropout rates (Mackey 2003). The custodial and humanistic orientations on pupil control are only the ideological extremes. They are analytic abstractions, that is, pure types that may or may not be found in such form in experience. Outcomes, (grades, office referrals, and accountability scores) are more positive in humanistic classrooms than in custodial classrooms (Brame, 2007).

Objectives of Study:

- 1- To compare the attitude of Government and Non-Government school teachers regarding Pupil Control Ideology.
- 2- To compare the attitude of Science and Language- Social Science teachers regarding pupil control ideology.
- 3- To compare the attitude of more experienced and less experienced teachers regarding pupil control ideology.

Hypotheses of the Study

1. There is no significant difference between secondary school teachers in relation to type of schools (government and non-government schools) regarding Pupil Control Ideology.
2. There is no significant difference between secondary school teachers in relation to their discipline (Science teacher and Language- Social Science teacher) regarding Pupil Control Ideology.
3. There is no significant difference between secondary school teachers in relation to experience (more experienced and less experienced) regarding Pupil Control Ideology.

Methodology

The study presented here is based on a quantitative approach which carries a descriptive study in itself, to explore if teachers' pupil control ideologies differed significantly to a group of variables such as type of schools, their discipline and

teaching experience. The sample comprised of 60 secondary school teachers selected from Sonipat and Panipat districts of Haryana State working in government (30) and non-government schools (30). The sample was selected using random sampling technique.

Tools Used

Pupil Control Ideology Scale(PCI) designed by Khatoon and Munir (2009), was used to identify teachers control Ideology in schools. This scale consists of 20 items of Likert type about schools, teachers and pupils, designed to measure the pupil control ideology of educators. Each statement of the tool is scored on a 5-point, Likert type scale where 5 means strongly agree and 1 denotes strongly disagree for all the statements that were positive to custodial viewpoint. Item responses were coded so that high scores (maximum of 100) signal a custodial orientation and low scores (minimum of 20) a humanistic orientation, with a mean of 60. Thus, a score in the range of 71-100 signifies a custodial pupil control ideology, 51-70 signifies a moderate ideology, and a score range of 20-50 denotes a humanistic pupil control ideology. The reliability of the scale is 0.88 as reported by its authors and calculated by split-half method and corrected by Spearman Brown Profecy Formula. The inner consistency coefficient determined by the general Kuder-Richardson Formula is 0.91.

Result and Discussion:

The response received was analyzed through statistical applications using t-test for comparison of the team effectiveness of female school teachers in the light of objectives.

Table 1: Comparison of mean pupil control ideology scores of government and non-government school teachers.

Variable	Teachers of Government schools N= 30		Teachers of non-Government schools N= 30		t- value	Remark (.05 level of significance)
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
Pupil Control Ideology	46.40	9.31	57.26	8.93	4.62	Sig.

From table 1, t-test is performed to determine whether there is any difference in teacher' pupil control ideology according to their school types. Results show that teachers of Non-Government schools have significantly higher mean PCI scores ($M= 57.26$, $SD= 8.93$) than teachers of Government schools ($M= 46.4$, $SD= 9.31$). It is observed from table 1 that t-value is 4.62 which is significant at 0.05 level. Thus null hypothesis "there is no significant difference between secondary school teachers in relation to type of schools (government and non-government schools) regarding Pupil Control Ideology" is rejected.

Table 2: Comparison of mean pupil control ideology scores of Science and Language- Social Sciences school teachers.

Variable	Science Teachers N= 24	Language- Social Sciences Teachers N= 36	t- value	Remark

	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		(.05 level of significance)
Pupil Control Ideology	50.63	9.81	52.11	11.53	0.53	Not Sig.

The results obtained indicated from table 2, that Science school teachers ($M=50.63$, $S.D=9.81$) and Language- Social Sciences school teachers($M=52.11$, $S.D=11.53$) 't' value=0.53) do not differ significantly in regards to their pupil control ideology. The result indicates that, though Language- Social Sciences school teachers are having high PCI scores on pupil control ideology than their counter parts, but, this difference is very low and insignificant. So the hypothesis, "There is no significant difference between secondary school teachers in relation to their discipline (Science teacher and Language- Social Science teacher) regarding Pupil Control Ideology" is accepted.

Table 3: Comparison of mean pupil control ideology scores on the basis of Gender of more and less experienced school teachers.

Variable	Teachers having More Experience N= 26		Teachers having Less Experience N= 34		t- value	Remark (.05 level of significance)
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
Pupil Control Ideology	50.54	8.16	52.23	11.76	1.05	Not Sig.

It is inferred from the above table 3 that there is no significant difference between more experienced and less experienced teachers on pupil control ideology. However less experienced teachers have more PCI scores regarding pupil control ideology ($M=52.23$, S. D.=11.76) than more experienced teachers ($M=50.54$, S. D.=8.16) but close look of results clearly reveals that the difference is not significant. Thus the third hypothesis, "There is no significant difference between secondary school teachers in relation to experience (more experienced and less experienced) regarding Pupil Control Ideology" is retained.

Conclusion

The variables studied by the investigators in the present study are school types discipline and teaching experience. Type of schools account to the greatest influence on teachers' PCI, while discipline and teaching experience account no significant influence on PCI. As an increase in the total score on the teachers' control ideology scale represents a more custodial student control ideology, it may be stated that high mean PCI scores of non-government teachers suggest, the role of these secondary school teachers can be characterized as custodial in nature and one that deal with discipline and coordination behavior. This disparity among different types of school can be attributed to the disparity of socio economic status, discipline and power in the hands of the management and administrative authorities, which indirectly compel the teachers' to adopt custodial ideologies in order to make their students' attentive and disciplined. According to Lunenburg & Cadavid (1992), if an educational system strives for excellence, teachers' mental health should be a priority, since they are the

active agents in achieving excellence among students. Thus, it is recommended that teachers should be provided with assistance to better apply humanistic classroom orientations. It is strongly recommended that there is a need to have teachers with more humanistic approach to pupil control in secondary schools. The teachers who have supervisory control ideology can be helped to develop a more positive approach by giving them proper guidance. Seminars and workshops should also be organized by the authorities for the teachers to modify their behavior skills because it has been found that teachers who perceive themselves as competent adopt more humanistic orientations in classroom management (Emmer & Hickman, 1991). .

References

- Altug SC 2007. Sinif Ogretmenlerinin Ogrenci Kontrol Ideolojilerinin Bazı Demografik Degiskenler Acisindan Incelenmesi [An Examination of the Primary School Teachers' Student Control Ideologies in Terms of Some Demographic Variables]. Ph. D. Thesis, Unpublished. Eskisehir, Turkey: Eskisehir Osmangazi University.
- Bayram F, Aypay A 2012. Ilkogretimokullarindamuduretkilikligi, okuliklimiveogrencikontrolideolojileriarasindakiiliski [The relationship between school principal effectiveness, school climate and pupil control ideologies in elementary schools]. Journal of Policy Analysis in Education, 1(1): 49-63.
- Beatty TH 2002. The Relationship Between Teacher Sense of Efficacy and Pupil Control Ideology in Urban Middle Schools. Ph. D. Thesis, Unpublished. Virginia, United States: The College of William and Mary.
- Brame, M. M. (2007). Examining the empirical impact of teacher pupil control ideology on student outcomes: The classroom perspective . A dissertation submitted to the faculty of the graduate school of the University of Louisville in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, Department of Leadership, Foundations and Human Resource Education, University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky.
- Cadavid, V. & Lunenburg, F. C. (1991). Locus of control, pupil control ideology, and dimensions of teacher burnout. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL, 3-7 April.
- Emmer, E. T. & Hickman, J. (1991). Teacher efficacy in classroom management and discipline. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 51, 755-765.
- Finkelstein R 1999. The Effects of Organizational Health and Pupil Control Ideology on the Achievement and Alienation of High School Students. Ph.D. Thesis, Unpublished. New York, United States: St. John's University.
- Helsel AR, Willower DJ 1973. Toward definition and measurement of pupil control behavior. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of The American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, February 28, 1973.
- Hoy, W. K. (1969). Pupil control ideology and organizational socialization: A further examination. *The School Review Quarterly*, 77(3-4), 257-265.

Hoy WK 2007. The pupil control studies: A historical, theoretical, and empirical analysis. In: WK Hoy, MDiPaola (Eds.): Essential Ideas for the Reform of American Schools. A Volume in Research and Practice in Educational Administration. USA: InformationAge, pp. 3-26

Hoy, W. K. (2001). Pupil control studies: A historical, theoretical, and empirical analysis. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 39(5), 424-441.

Lunenburg, F. C. (1991). Educators' pupil control ideology as a predictor of educators' reactions to student disruptive behavior. *The High School Journal*, 74, 81-87.

Lunenburg, F. C. & Cadavid, V. (1992). Locus of control, pupil control ideology, and dimensions of teacher burnout. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 19, 13-22.

Lunenburg FC 2000. School bureaucratization, pupil control ideology, and pupil control behavior. Paper presented at The Annual Meeting of American Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Mackey W 2003. The Impact of Pupil Control Ideology on Students' Dropout Rates as Perceived By Administrative Staff in Selected 4-A High Schools in Texas. Ph. D. Thesis, Unpublished. Texas, United States: Texas A & M University.

Oppenlander, L. (1970). Classroom interaction and pupil affect. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. Washington, DC. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/IPDFSIED038342.pdf>

Pillay, H., Goddard, R. & Wilss, L. (2005). Well-being, burnout and competence: Implications for teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 30(2), 22-33.

Rideout, G. W. & Morton, L. L. (2010). Pre-service teachers' beliefs and pupil control ideology: The custodilizing practicum. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 48, 64-88.

Turan S, Altug SC 2008. Öğretmenlerin öğrenci kontrol ideolojileri [Teachers' student control ideologies]. *Usak University Journal of Social Sciences*, 1(1): 95-113.

Willower, D. J., Eidel, T. L. & Hoy, W. K. (1973). The school and pupil control ideology. Revised ed. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Yilmaz K 2009. Primary school teachers' views about pupil control ideologies and classroom management styles. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*, 4: 157-167.