DOES A COURSE IN CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT AFFECT TEACHERS' SELF-PERCEIVED EFFICACY IN CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT?

by

MICHAEL DAVID BENHAR

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Educational Psychology in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,
The City University of New York

2009

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Educational Psychology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Dr. Georgiana S. Tryon

_____

_____ _____

Date Chair of Examining Committee

Dr. Mary Kopala

_____

_____ _____

Date Executive Officer

Dr. Marian C. Fish

Dr. David Rindskopf

Dr. Helen Johnson

Dr. Mary Kopala

Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Abstract

DOES A COURSE IN CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT AFFECT TEACHERS' SELF-PERCEIVED EFFICACY IN CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT?

By

Michael David Benhar

Adviser: Professor Georgiana S. Tryon

The literature on teacher burnout clearly indicates that classroom management problems are primary causes contributing to teachers leaving the field. Efficacy beliefs influence the individual's cognition and affect to mobilize the necessary psychological resources to accomplish a specific task. Lower perceived self-efficacy in classroom management directly impacts personal accomplishment. While much research has examined teacher efficacy in general, little research has looked at classroom management in particular. This study sought to contribute to the teacher efficacy in classroom management literature by investigating if a course in classroom management increased teacher efficacy in classroom management as contrasted with a comparative graduate course in the exceptional child. The investigator administered at pre and posttest the Teacher Efficacy in Classroom Management and Discipline Scale (SEBM) and used the71 graduate students' course grades along with behavior vignettes as a means to externally validate their self-perceived teacher efficacy beliefs. The current study also investigated the effect of mediating variables, such as gender, age, ethnicity, the number of years teaching, child or childless, socio-economic status, undergraduate and graduate grade-point averages on teacher efficacy in classroom management. The results indicated that students in the

classroom management course were significantly better at identifying target behaviors and interventions for the behavior vignettes than were students in the exceptional child course. In addition, teaching experience for classroom management students related positively to classroom management self-efficacy scores at posttest, but not at pretest, and none of the other mediating variables related to self-efficacy scores. Participants in the classroom management course did not statistically differ in gains on classroom management self-efficacy scores as compared with participants in the exceptional child course. Moreover, there was no significant relationship between course grades and posttest self-efficacy scores for both classes. Results are discussed in terms of implications for school psychologists, study limitations, and suggestions for future research.

dedicated to my mom,

Alice W. Benhar

(1927-2003)

you are sincerely missed

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank my parents, Alice (ז"ל) and Isaac Benhar for providing me with a strong foundation that enabled me to become the perpetual student that I am. They have embedded in me an insatiable thirst for knowledge that has no limits.

I would also like to thank my friends and family who demonstrated sincere happiness for me when discovering that the dissertation was coming to fruition. In particular I would like to thank Dr. Mikki-Malow Iroff. Dr. James LaFemina, Dr. Alison Sullivan, Jimmy Jung, Dr. Andy Dowling, Dr. Marian C. Fish, Dr. David Rindskopf, Dr. Helen Johnson, and Dr. Mary Kopala.

Finally, I would like to sincerely thank Dr. Georgiana Tryon who not only provided me with essential knowledge from her incredibly fruitful and enjoyable coursework, but who painstakingly provided innumerable assistance in making this dissertation a much better piece of work than I could have ever done on my own. I am extremely grateful for the time that she put into methodically reviewing my dissertation and providing important assistance and invaluable feedback.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Merrow (1999) contended that the main problem in the teaching profession is not a teacher shortage or recruitment problem, but retention of teachers. According to the author, within five years, 30% will leave teaching and in city settings the rate will reach an astounding 50%. Merrow concluded that poor training of teachers, including academic preparation for teaching the curriculum, misassignment, incompetent administration (i.e., bureaucracy), and a lack of necessary skills to deal with behavior problems in classroom life are to blame for teacher burnout that eventually leads to leaving the profession.

Maslach (1993) defines burnout as:

> a psychological syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among individuals who work with other people in some capacity. Emotional exhaustion refers to feelings of being emotionally overextended and depleted of one's emotional resources. Depersonalization refers to a negative, callous, or excessively detached response to other people, who are usually the recipients of one's services or care. (pp. 20-21)

The research clearly implicates classroom behavior problems (Martin, Linfoot, & Stephenson, 1999) as contributors to the burnout process involved in teaching. Merrett and Wheldall (1984) define classroom misbehavior as any behavior that has a detrimental impact on children's learning and/or adversely affects the teacher's ability to function effectively. Teachers who deal with disruptive behaviors spend an inordinate amount of time on discipline that adversely affects academic instruction and activities (Cains &

Brown, 1996). Simply speaking, teachers who spend much time addressing disruptive behaviors cannot concentrate on teaching the curriculum content. In addition, classroom misbehavior undermines the teacher's authority.

In a study by Evers, Brouwers, and Tomic (2002), the researchers investigated if a positive correlation exists between teachers' negative attitudes towards a new instructional practice and their level of burnout. In addition, they also investigated if a negative correlation exists between the teachers' self-perceived efficacy beliefs in regard to the implementation of the instructional practices and their level of burnout. The new instructional practice consisted of a study-home system that is a student-centered approach promoting student independent thinking and working on assignments in order to increase personal responsibility for their academic success or failure. From 33 randomly selected schools in the Netherlands, 490 teachers, 114 females, and 376 males, participated in the study. The average age of the teachers was 47 years of age with 22 years of teaching experience and all the teachers taught general secondary education. The investigators used a Dutch version of the Maslach Burnout Inventory for teachers (Schaufeli & Van Horn, 1995) to assess teachers' level of burnout. This instrument includes 20 items forming three subscales (Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization, and Personal Accomplishment) with items that teachers rate on a 7-point Likert scale. The researchers created their own self-efficacy instrument that consisted of 13 items related to activities teachers' conduct in secondary education such as involving students in tasks, implementing creative educational practices, and guiding student groups. The investigators also created a 5-item instrument to assess teachers' attitude with regard to the effectiveness and usefulness of the study-home system. The study's results indicated

that the teachers' self-perceived efficacy beliefs were positively correlated with the personal accomplishment dimension, and negatively correlated with the emotional exhaustion and depersonalization dimensions on the Maslach Burnout Inventory for teachers (Schaufeli & Van Horn, 1995). Moreover, the higher the teachers' negative attitude towards the study-home system, the higher they scored on the depersonalization and emotional exhaustion dimensions, and the lower they scored on the personal accomplishment dimension on the Maslach Burnout Inventory for teachers (Schaufeli & Van Horn, 1995). In summary, teachers' self-perceived efficacy beliefs are significantly correlated with their level of burnout. In other words, teachers with high self-efficacy beliefs are more willing to entertain and implement new teaching methodologies.

Classroom behavior problems represent a principle source of emotional exhaustion and perceived negative self-evaluation in job performance for teachers (Griffith, Steptoe, & Cropley, 1999). Moreover, teachers consistently report that deficient academic preparation and experience leaves them poorly equipped to deal with behavior problems and increases their stress. In a study conducted by Martin et al. (1999), the investigators concluded that teachers who had the greatest concern about behavioral problems in their classrooms were also the least confident in managing their students' behavior. Moreover, teachers were more likely to use non-physical punishment to manage misbehavior, instead of implementing reinforcement and/or response cost behavioral procedures appropriately. This is not a surprise since much of the educational establishment has ignored the literature that deals with behavioral techniques for managing disruptive behaviors (Kehle, Clark, & Jensen, 1996). Even though the research indicates that punishment can often negatively affect the problematic behavior in the classroom by

perpetuating it (Walker, Steiber, Ramsey, & O'Neill, 1991), the teachers used punishment much more than positive reinforcement when dealing with this type of behavior. Research has shown positive reinforcement to be an effective method in dealing with a wide variety of behavioral problems (Webber & Scheuermann, 1991), and yet, teachers in the Martin et al. study relied on punishment to address these behaviors. The authors concluded that teachers maintained intuitively appealing classroom management techniques that were without scientific foundations.

The teachers in the Martin et al. (1999) study were also more likely to refer the problematic students to other school personnel than to handle the disruptive behavior themselves. The investigators concluded that teachers overwhelmingly relied on within-school personnel to handle behavioral concerns rather than bringing in outside assistance, such as psychologists and medical personnel. This may indicate teachers' beliefs that the problematic behaviors can and should be resolved within the school system. In addition, there is evidence that assistance from a behavior management consultant, especially when conducted as a one-on-one consultation with the teacher, decreases disruptive behaviors in the classroom (Schottle & Peltier, 1996), and thus, it would make prudent sense to target increasing teachers' classroom management abilities prior to entering the classroom and/or increasing the assistance from within-school personnel, because the teachers are not likely to seek outside assistance.

This dissertation will attempt to fill this research need by examining the effects of such a course on self-reported teacher efficacy. Master's degree students who participated in a required course in classroom management completed the Teacher Self-Efficacy in Behavior Management and Discipline Scale (SEBM; Emmer & Hickman, 1991) before

and after taking the course. The objective of the study was to determine if course modules targeting specific classroom management factors (i.e., general classroom management, discipline, reducing external factors, efficacy in personal teaching) resulted in increases in self-reported teacher efficacy relative to these factors from pre- to post- course and relative to pre- and post- course self-reported teacher efficacy of a control group of students who took a course dealing with the exceptional child. The study also used students' course grades and their responses to vignettes that presented several classroom difficulties to assess their acquisition of classroom management techniques. I expected that students with higher post-course efficacy scores would also have higher course grades and more correct responses to the vignettes than students enrolled in the exceptional child course.

CHAPTER II

Literature Review

Classroom Management

This chapter presents an overview of the research literature pertaining to classroom management, teacher-efficacy, and the direct effect teacher-efficacy has on classroom management. The purpose of the literature overview is to illustrate the dearth of research with regard to the effects of teacher-efficacy on classroom management and the need for researchers to examine the potential benefits of having a course in classroom management as a requisite in a teacher education curriculum.

Perusing the classroom management literature for a universally accepted definition among researchers of classroom management is elusive. However, while researchers may not agree unequivocally on a definition, a characterization by Brophy (1988) appears to contain many, if not all, of the varied definitions: Good teacher classroom management entails eliciting student cooperation in decreasing disruptive behavior along with effectively handling misbehavior when it occurs. Moreover, good classroom management ensures that academic learning that promotes optimal student participation is continuously occurring.

In addition, researchers, such as Jones and Jones (2004), have delineated five areas in which teachers need to be proficient to implement effective classroom management: First, research and theory should guide teachers in understanding the etiology of behavioral and academic problems that exist in the classroom and how the teachers' behaviors relate to the failure of meeting students' needs. Although the authors promote the importance of research and theory, some of the theories, such as Erickson's

(1963) psychosocial theory and Maslow's (1968) hierarchy of needs cited in their writing have limited, if any, empirical support. Therefore, I will discuss only empirically validated theories in this section. Second, establishing a classroom that fosters positive teacher-parent, teacher-student, and peer relationships will enable a supportive academic environment. Third, once the teacher creates a warm, caring, and supportive atmosphere in the classroom, she/he implements instructional methods to assist the academic needs of the entire classroom and individual students. Fourth, due to large student classroom sizes that demand greater attention and multi-tasking skills from teachers, there is a need for organizational and group management methods to facilitate positive academic and behavioral outcomes. Even in a classroom that has a supportive climate, effective instructional methods, and good organization to reduce many maladaptive student behaviors, research and experience show that, at times, students may exhibit disruptive behaviors that are detrimental to the educational process (Mendler, 1992). Moreover, partly due to the increase of students with special needs in the general education classroom, teachers need to become proficient in acquiring and implementing good problem-solving and behavior management techniques. The fifth, and final, factor in establishing effective classroom management is possessing substantial behavior management skills to provide corrective feedback in order to change students' maladaptive behaviors.

A theoretical basis should guide the teacher to facilitate effective classroom management. By placing the student's poor academic learning and/or problematic behaviors within a theoretical framework, the teacher may be better able to solve the

disruptive problem more effectively. A discussion of theoretical and research support for the five areas for effective classroom management follows.

Theoretical Foundation (Area 1)

Two theories, self- regulation and attribution, provide a framework and help explain reasons for classroom maladaptive behaviors. When trying to uncover the causes of students' misbehavior, teachers may look to external influences. Such factors as lack of adequate parental involvement as well as children having poor attitudes and/or difficulties in learning due to inherent intellectual deficits may absolve the teacher from personally claiming responsibility for failure in improving the situation (Jones & Jones, 2004). Mendler (1992) concluded that teachers need to discover the function of the maladaptive behavior exhibited in the classroom before they employ a technique or method to change it. He contended that the maladaptive behavior stems from the student's needs not being met. The function of the teacher then is to create a supportive climate and not just react to dysfunctional behavior in order to fulfill the student's psychological needs. Self-regulation and attribution theory provide teachers with insight into students' needs, strategies, regulatory skills, and attributions as they impact classroom behavior. Guided by these theories, teachers can determine the reasons for and address students' maladaptive behavior. [The theoretical foundation corresponds to Factors 1 and 2 – classroom management and external influences, respectively, of the dependent measure that were used in this dissertation (Teacher Self-Efficacy in Behavior Management and Discipline Scale; SEBM; Emmer & Hickman, 1991; see Appendix D).]

Self-regulation theory. Much research has supported the use of self-regulatory processes in order to increase student achievement in many diverse areas, such as writing

(Graham & Harris, 1996; Zimmerman & Risemberg, 1997), mathematics (Schunk, 1996; Zimmerman & Schunk, 2001), classroom behavior (Maag, Rutherford, & DiGangi, 1992), and problem-solving ability (Delclos & Harrington, 1991). Zimmerman (1986) defines self-regulated learners as active participants who employ metacognitive, motivational, and behavioral techniques in their learning process. Self-regulatory processes include students' self-generating thoughts, feelings, and actions in order to achieve their specific learning goals. Although there are several theoretical perspectives within the self-regulation theory literature (Zimmerman & Schunk, 2001) such as constructivist, Vygotskian, Social-cognitive, and information processing, almost all of the prospective perspectives entail the awareness and directed use of specific strategies or processes by students to improve their academic achievement.

Another important feature shared by most perspectives and definitions of self-regulation includes a feedback loop that is cyclical in nature (Zimmerman & Schunk, 2001). The students monitor their learning in order to adjust the effectiveness of strategies. This active processing and monitoring requires that the students respond to this feedback loop by making changes in the strategies employed in order to attain the learning goal.

In an important study (Lan, 1998) that investigated self-monitoring as an intervention for a graduate level introductory statistics course, a total of 69 students participated. Students in the self-monitoring condition received a protocol consisting of 75 basic statistical concepts that was derived from the textbook used in the course. Next to each concept, students self-recorded their frequency of reading the textbook, amount of time, completion of assignments, participation with other students enrolled in the course

outside the classroom, and whether or not they received tutoring. In addition, students rated their self-efficacy in solving problems related to the statistical concepts. The self-monitoring group scored statistically significant better results when compared with an instructor-monitoring condition on the course examinations.

In another study that investigated the effects of self-monitoring on student on-task behavior and productivity with regard to arithmetic problems attempted and their accuracy, five of six students showed gains in on-task behavior and accuracy (Maag et al., 1992). A subsequent study indicated that self-monitoring needs to be coupled with sufficient strategies to improve skills (Reid & Harris, 1993).

Another study also indicated that self-monitoring has positive effects on academic productivity and on-task behavior. Two students, aged 10 and11, with learning disabilities attempted and completed more math problems due to the self-monitoring effects (DiGangi, Maag, & Rutherford, 1991). Self-graphing also increased productivity as part of the self-monitoring process.

In conclusion, self-regulation theory provides an empirically validated theoretical basis for teachers to use to facilitate effective classroom management. Since many maladaptive behaviors may emerge from students having academic and/or behavioral difficulties, incorporating self-regulatory techniques in the classroom that increase on-task behavior is an important element of classroom management.

Attribution theory. Much research has supported attribution theory as a way to increase academic motivation in students (Ahles & Contento, 2006; Cameron, Pierce, Banko, & Gear, 2005; Graham, 1996; Reyna & Weiner, 2001; Zimmerman & Schunk, 2001). Weiner (1979, 1990), who applied attribution theory to education, proposed that

students attribute their success or failure based on three dimensions: locus of control – internal or external to the student; stability – whether the cause is permanent or varies; and controllability – whether the student can control the cause. Academically successful students who fail perceive their failure to be due to controllable and internal events (Ames, 1992). They perceive their failure as due to a lack of necessary studying, not getting help from the teacher, or misunderstanding the directions that could result in a change of strategies that ultimately leads back to success. One can combine the three attributional dimensions to form different variations of perceived causes of success or failure that affect motivation (Weiner, 1992). For example, students who do not do well on a particular test may perceive the cause due to an external – stable – controllable combination. Students who explain their poor grade in this specific scenario may blame their friends for not helping them.

The teachers' responses to students convey information about the causes of their success or failure (Weiner, 1986, 2000). If a teacher perceives that the students' failure is due to uncontrollable circumstances, they may express sympathy instead of providing corrective feedback or punishment. If the teacher conveys to the students that the failure was controllable and due to a lack of effort by the students, the teacher provides corrective or punitive feedback. The students explain their success or failure at least partially as a function of the teacher's feedback and thus, teacher feedback has important implications for motivating behavior. The students could perceive a teacher's praise for effort when there was none or little, a teacher's pity, or a teacher's unsolicited help potentially as meaning that their failure was due to uncontrollable reasons. The students

may therefore conclude that they are lacking in ability (Graham, 1991; 1996). These self-perceived notions will limit the students' motivation for change.

In a study illustrating attribution theory to explain helping behavior in a cooperative learning classroom setting in a community college, a total number of 115 students participated (Ahles & Contento, 2006). Six separate classes of approximately 17-20 students enrolled in a communication class taught by the same faculty member employing a cooperative-learning model. The instructor presented students with a survey that described five scenarios that depicted two causal conditions (controllable versus uncontrollable) in which a member of the group was not participating in the cooperative learning process. The instructor then asked the participants to identify their emotions toward that group member who did not participate along with questions that addressed participants' willingness to help that student. The survey also asked students for demographic information along with questions that addressed participants' previous experience with group projects in a classroom setting. The results indicated that participants' past experience in cooperative-learning tasks influenced their responses. Participants with three or more previous classes that involved a group project were less likely to help a group member when the cause of the nonparticipation was attributed to controllable means. Therefore, attribution theory correctly predicted and explained student responses with regard to helping behavior in a cooperative learning classroom setting.

In conclusion, empirically validated theories that facilitate classroom management are an important part in effectively handling academic and behavior difficulties. Teachers

use of techniques based on self-regulation and attribution theories are good examples of ways to elicit student cooperation to promote a positive classroom environment.

Interpersonal Relationships (Area 2)

The second area expounded upon in the classroom management literature (Jones & Jones, 2004) is based on the assumption that good classroom management skills must include proactive techniques and must not just react to behavioral problems that emerge in the classroom. Students have personal and psychological needs that must be addressed by educators that, in turn, help to create a safe and productive educational environment (Pianta, Steinberg, & Rollins, 1995). In other words, in addition to supervising academic functioning, teachers need to address building their own personal-social skills that not only have a direct effect on the academic environment, but also promote skills that carry over after schooling is completed. [Interpersonal relationships corresponds to Factors 1, 2, and 3 – classroom management, external influences, and personal teaching efficacy, respectively, of the dependent measure (SEBM; Emmer & Hickman, 1991; see Appendix D).]

Establishing positive teacher-student relationships. Researchers at Stanford University analyzed students' perceptions of factors in high school environments that promote positive student attitudes and learning (Phelan, Davidson, & Cao, 1992). A consistent theme that emerged from this study indicated that students want teachers who are caring. The study also concluded that teachers and students want to be respected and have a safe environment that promotes openness, consideration, humor, and an active involvement of the students.

Pianta et al. (1995) emphasize the need for a child to have security in a relationship with an adult along with the ability to explore the environment in a competent manner. They conducted a study that examined teacher-child relationships with regard to school adjustment in 436 children from kindergarten to second grade. The researchers used the Student-Teacher Relationship Scale, which is a 30-item teacher-reported measure of closeness, dependency, and conflict, and found that students who had a warm, close, and open communication with their kindergarten teachers were rated as being better adjusted with regard to academics and behavior in second grade than those students who were rated as being angry and having a dependent child teacher relationship in kindergarten. They were also less likely to be retained or referred for special education services.

In another study by Birch and Ladd (1998) that followed longitudinally 199 kindergartners and 17 teachers from kindergarten until first grade, conflict in kindergarten children-teacher relationships predicted a decline in prosocial behavior in children over time. The authors of the study used the Student-Teacher Relationship Scale that consists of 30 items on three subscales measuring closeness, dependency, and conflict. Teachers used the Child Behavior Scale to measure the children's behavior. The authors contended that student-teacher conflicts may inhibit prosocial behavior and increase aggression. Children who exhibited asocial behaviors with other children and adults in kindergarten also displayed overly dependent behaviors in first grade. It appears that these very students need more guidance from their teachers to overcome their social ineptness. Conflicts with teachers appear to have independent, long-lasting negative effects on school adjustment across several years of school and across teachers (Birch & Ladd; Pianta et al., 1995). Therefore, a warm and caring relationship with a teacher

appears to have a moderating effect in decreasing maladaptive behaviors of problem children.

Other studies obtained similar findings. For example, Corbett and Wilson (2002) interviewed 400-inner city Philadelphian middle- and high-school students over a 3-year period and found that students defined good teachers as those who made sure that students completed their work, were able to control the classroom, explained the classroom content clearly, and were willing to invest time in knowing the students' needs and helping them. Clearly, promoting positive teacher-student relationships means much more than just creating a warm atmosphere; it entails effective classroom management techniques.

Creating positive peer relationships. One of the most important problems affecting students in schools worldwide is bullying (Limber & Nation, 1998). Much research supports the need for proactive prevention strategies that encourage a school atmosphere of tolerance and positive social interactions (Larson, Smith, & Furlong, 2002).

A study conducted in an urban high school by Bohanon et al. (2006) provides an illustration of the potential benefits of implementing proactive prevention strategies in the school system. They measured the effectiveness of prevention program implementation using the School-wide Evaluation Tool (SET), Effective Behavior Support Survey, Student Climate Survey, office disciplinary referrals, qualitative interviews, and observations. The researchers determined that the overall level of implementation of prevention strategies reached 80% as measured by the SET. Over a 3-year period of teaching staff about the prevention approach and implementing and evaluating its

effectiveness, there was a 20% reduction in referrals for disciplinary infractions (i.e., ranging from violations of school code to serious disobedience to authority).

Although a primary prevention approach would entail a systems-wide approach that includes the entire school and community, the individual classroom must be included in the process (Freiberg, Connell, & Lorentz, 2001). One way that teachers can address the potential violent and unsafe atmosphere that develops in the classroom is by promoting positive peer relationships (Schmuck & Schmuck, 2001).

According to Schmuck and Schmuck (2001), creating positive peer relationships influences students' success in assorted ways. First, peer attitudes toward academic success affect their goals and school behavior. Second, as mentioned previously, teacher's support and care, along with quality peer relationships, contributes to students' needs being met in the classroom. Third, cooperative group work is greatly affected by peer interactions. Finally, at-risk students who have poor peer relationships tend to feel alienated and do not participate as readily in school activities. Moreover, peer interactions provide feedback that communicates students' feelings toward each other. This communication from peers influences how students view themselves and is used as a basis for self-judgment of their abilities, likeability, and general worth. Effective schools help to reduce school violence by creating a positive classroom climate through conveying the sense that students are part of a caring and nurturing group (Freiberg et al., 2001).

A study by Wentzel (1998) using students' prosocial goal pursuit illustrates the positive effect of peer relationships. In the study, student self-reports of efforts to behave in socially appropriate and responsible ways provided the basis of prosocial goal pursuit.

One hundred sixty seven sixth-grade students participated in this study in a predominantly middle-class community located in a suburban setting. Wentzel measured perceived support from peers by the Peer Social Support and Academic Support subscales of the Classroom Life Measure that consists of nine items. The study results clearly indicated that perceived support from peers, in contrast with support from parents and teachers, was the only independent, positive predictor of prosocial goal pursuit. This indicates the potential positive effect that peer relationships have on the behavior in the classroom.

Working with parents. It is unquestionable that in order to get students to achieve academically and socially, parents must be involved (Christenson & Sheridan, 2001). A survey of students and teachers indicated that 87% of students who primarily received A's and B's had parents who were involved and who aided them with homework (Binns, Steinberg, & Amoriosi, 1997). Students who received grades lower than C indicated that only 24% of their parents assisted them with homework. Correspondingly, the vast majority of students with the higher grades indicated their parents' encouragement as an important factor in pursuing their aspirations, more so than the students who earned lower grades. Moreover, a study by the National Center for Education Statistics indicated that parents had a considerable effect on whether or not students completed homework or if the students would drop out of school (Kaufman, Bradby, & Owings, 1992). Uninvolved parents were a prime factor in school dropout. Because it appears that parents can have an unequivocal positive influence on their children's academic and social performance, when the parents do not engage and promote discussion about the detrimental

consequences of dropping out, children are more likely to drop out (Kaufman et al., 1992).

Motivation and Instruction (Area 3)

Controlling behavior problems in the classroom is directly related to effectively planned instructional strategies (Woolfolk, 2004). It is not hard to imagine the relationship between poor instructional teaching methods and student misbehavior. Effective teaching requires teachers to adapt instructional strategies to the specific needs of the student. [Motivation and instruction corresponds to Factor 3 – personal teaching efficacy, of the dependent measure (SEBM; Emmer & Hickman, 1991; see Appendix D).]

A key component in good instructional strategies includes motivational techniques. Woolfolk (2004) defines motivation as "an internal state that arouses, directs, and maintains behavior" (p. 350). One can elucidate motivation further by considering extrinsic or intrinsic explanations for motivation. Intrinsic motivation satisfies internal needs or personal interests and does not require external incentives (Reeve, 1996). In contrast, extrinsic motivation requires external incentives, such as getting praise from others, receiving a high grade for an assignment, receiving money, or other primary and secondary reinforcers that have little to do with the task itself (Reeve, 1996). The causes or reasons for the act/behavior differentiate between extrinsic and intrinsic motivation.

It is most likely not correct to view extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on a continuum, but rather, as two independent possibilities that each contribute, albeit unequally, to a person's motivation in completing a task (Covington & Mueller, 2001). Nevertheless, both intrinsic and extrinsic motivations are important in stimulating

students in a classroom environment. Although intrinsic motivation is what every teacher aspires to instill in his or her students, it is unreasonable and impractical to expect students to be intrinsically motivated in all activities required by the classroom curriculum.

A study by Cordova and Lepper (1996) illustrates the positive effects of increasing students' intrinsic motivation. These authors randomly assigned 70 fourth and fifth-grade students from two private elementary schools to experimental and control groups to evaluate the effects on the learning process of three strategies – contextualization (presentation of learning activities in a meaningful context, rather than in an abstract manner divorced from the children's experiences and interests), personalization (associating the activity with interests of the student), and provision of choice (instructionally irrelevant choices so not to impact on their learning process but increase self – determination). The experimenters employed computer programs teaching the rules of mathematical order of operations to investigate the effects on learning. There was one control group and four experimental conditions. The examiners presented the academic material to the control group in an abstract manner in which the software would provide instructional feedback along with the correct answer. In the four experimental conditions, the experimenters presented the identical academic material to the participants in either generic or individually personalized form (the authors obtained personal information through a personalization questionnaire that inquired about specific pieces of information, such as their birthdates, favorite foods, nicknames, names of closest friends, hobbies, television shows, and books they like to read). In addition to the personalized software, another variation had to do with the extent the children had control over

superficial aspects of the software, such as the specific icons representing the user or the names of the characters in the software program. Therefore, there were four different experimental conditions of the software consisting of (a) generic – no choice, (b) generic – choice, (c) personalized – no choice, and (d) personalized – choice. In all of the experimental and control conditions, students had control over the level of difficulty of the arithmetic software. The results of the experiment indicated that students who were part of the experimental conditions did statistically better than the students in the control conditions. The students in the experimental conditions attempted more complex operations, chose a harder level and scored statistically higher on the arithmetic software program. Moreover, children in the choice conditions scored significantly higher than the children in the no – choice conditions and control group on the math test.

Students' academic needs. Garcia (1999) proposed a number of teacher characteristics and instructional strategies associated with a highly conducive educational environment for students from varied cultural backgrounds. Some important teacher behaviors included: (a) fostering instruction based on intrinsic motivating factors when possible; (b) implementing constructivist instructional strategies that incorporate active and cooperative learning activities; (c) communicating a warm relationship and high academic expectations; and (d) implementing specific instructional strategies for students with limited English proficiency along with respecting and incorporating diverse cultural backgrounds into instructional activities. Increasing and sustaining motivation for long periods of time is a difficult and arduous task for most teachers. It is necessary to employ instructional techniques that emphasize intrinsic motivation (see pages 19, 20) and active processing (see pages 9, 10). Moreover, when students' behavior is motivated based on

self-determination and intrinsic factors, even when extrinsic reinforcers are not available in the environment, learning is more likely to take place.

In conclusion, motivation is an important factor in keeping student learning high and reducing student misbehavior. Intrinsic motivational factors are important in facilitating appropriate behavior in the classroom in getting a student to self-direct his/her behavior to attain specific goals.

Organization and Management (Area 4)

Prevention of disruptive behaviors and proactive classroom management entails teachers' developing specific rules or behavior norms and procedures to facilitate an optimal learning environment. Procedures differ from rules in that procedures apply to a specific task by instructing students to accomplish an activity, rather than forbidding one. Some general practices educators should be aware of include introducing rules and procedures at the very beginning of the school year to establish expected classroom behavior. Educators need to discuss with students the importance of developing standards, behavior norms, and procedures so that students are more likely to adhere to them. Successful teachers also monitor the effectiveness of the rules and procedures and provide corrective feedback to students (Emmer, Evertson, Sanford, Clements, & Worsham, 1981). At times, this may entail demonstration and instruction of students so that they are better able to implement appropriate behavior in the classroom. In addition, teachers should post or hand out rules to students as dittos (Charles & Senter, 2005). [Organization and management corresponds to Factor 1 – classroom management of the dependent measure (SEBM; Emmer & Hickman, 1991; see Appendix D).]

Development of standards, rules, or procedures. When possible, it is appropriate for teachers to include students in developing the behavior norms of the class. Students who participate in the process tend to own the rules that make them more likely to adhere to them. Freiberg et al. (2001) studied the efficacious effects of implementing a specific program that promotes good classroom management techniques called Consistency Management and Cooperative Discipline. The program emphasizes the need for students to be included as citizens instead of tourists in the classroom. The focus of the program that is research-based, builds on shared responsibility between teachers and students with regard to learning and classroom organization. In the beginning of the school year, students and teachers together establish rules for the classroom. Rules and routines are clearly posted in the classroom and students fill out job applications applying for tasks that may consist of passing out papers or assisting the substitute teacher. The teacher then reviews the applications, conducts interviews, and then chooses students based on their stated interests. The program includes five areas: Prevention, Caring, Cooperation, Organization, and Community. It incorporates not only behavioral principles, but it is also based on a constructivist approach that emphasizes active student learning and participation.

The Freiberg et al. (2001) study consisted of examining the effects of consistency management on student mathematics achievement in seven Chapter 1 elementary schools. Specifically, the study looked at the mathematics achievement by students of teachers who were trained in the Consistency Management program as compared with achievement by students of teachers who had only the mathematics intervention to evaluate learner gains. The dependent measure was the mathematics subtest of a

mandated state test called the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills. The performance of students of teachers who were trained in the Consistency Management program showed an effect size of +.33 when compared with that of the comparison group. The Consistency Management program apparently also increased teacher and student attendance, increased classroom organization, reduced interruptions, and allowed for better teaching planning that had a positive impact on increasing teaching and learning time.

Second, teachers need to operationally define behavior norms in clear terms. All too often, educators may believe that they are instructing students unambiguously, but they need to present clear definitions that define specifically the parameters of appropriate behavior. Third, an overabundance of rules could jeopardize the comprehension, implementation, and enforcement. Therefore, it makes good sense to limit the classroom list of rules to a minimum. Fourth, teachers should monitor, evaluate, and be given corrective feedback concerning students' behavior to make sure that behavior conforms to the accepted norms of the classroom. Nelson, Martella, and Galand's (1998) study illustrates the need for clear, concise, systematically designed, taught, and reinforced rules. The study identified specific rules based on task analysis of the routines that were germane for common areas in the school for 594 first, third, fifth, and sixth graders. Afterwards, school personnel taught the rules and routines and supervised students along with providing corrective feedback, praise, and periodic rewards for the correct implementation of the rules. Formal office disciplinary referrals decreased by over 55 % during the course of four years compared to the baseline data.

Another study that illustrates the importance of rules examined third-grade classrooms (Emmer, Evertson, & Anderson, 1980). Emmer et al. observed teachers at the beginning of the school year as compared with other times throughout the entire school year. The researchers then examined what differentiated good classroom management from poor classroom management. The major difference had to do with how teachers handled rules and routines. In fact, the most important element was that effective classroom managers introduced clear rules (e.g., be prepared for a lesson to begin by having the correct book out and notebook open) and procedures (e.g., going to the bathroom) in the first few days of school. Other studies verified the importance of proactive planning and organization that includes teaching rules at the beginning of the year in secondary school settings (Evertson, 1985; Evertson & Emmer, 1982).

Positive behavior support. The research clearly indicates that teachers who were instructed in creating effective rules and procedures, along with monitoring their implementation, were more effective than teachers who were not instructed in this training (Sugai & Horner, 2002). Programs using applied behavior analysis as their basis create structure in the classroom that studies have shown to be effective for disruptive students with emotional and behavioral difficulties, along with general education students (Sugai & Horner, 2002). Numerous educators have recommended putting into place a program called “Positive Behavior Support” that implements empirically validated behavioral principles (Elliot, Hamburg, & Williams, 1998). This program emphasizes proactive and preventive measures for addressing problematic behaviors instead of reactive measures that school systems commonly employ (Sugai & Horner, 2002).

The main features of Positive Behavior Support (PBS) consist of: (a) “a prevention-focused continuum of support, (b) proactive instructional approaches to teaching and improving social behaviors, (c) conceptually sound and empirically-validated practices, (d) systems change to support effective practices, and (e) data-based decision making” (Sugai & Horner, 2002, p. 131).

A serious and thoughtful reflection of pedagogic practices is part of the proactive process to facilitate a positive educational environment. The goals are to maximize academic outcomes and implement appropriate rules and procedures. Moreover, because there is an emphasis on creating proactive processes to integrate with reactive practices, empirically-validated functional behavior assessment and behavior intervention plans are necessary components of PBS (Alberto & Troutman, 2001). The reader can find a research study illustrating a functional behavior assessment under intervention strategies (see page 31).

As Sugai and Horner (2002) describe, PBS is implemented at four main levels: the school (students and staff), the classroom (instructional and behavior management), a specific setting on school grounds (e.g., parking lots, library, hallways), and the individual student. These levels are predicated on the concept that implementation of effective rules and procedures on a school-wide basis will facilitate avoidance of many problematic behaviors. For the smaller number of students who do not adhere to or benefit from this school-wide discipline, school staff provide additional academic and behavioral supports. Finally, high at-risk students who do not respond to the latter intervention may receive highly intensive and individualized interventions that may

include Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) and specialized behavior intervention plans (Sugai & Horner, 2002).

According to Sugai and Horner (2002), another important component of PBS includes a systems perspective that views an individual as part of a complex network with many interacting components. A basic assumption of a systems perspective includes the notion that if a person changes one component of the system, the entire system is affected. The four main levels that the previous paragraph mentions require a balanced integrative approach in order to facilitate an optimal environment. The systems that implement the recommended practices must be in place for support, monitoring, and evaluation so that they are likely to succeed.

To summarize the PBS approach (Sugai & Horner, 2002), the first step is defining what behavior and/or academic problem will be the focus for amelioration. Second, some form of standardized data collection must be in place to assess the defined problem and evaluate the intervention. Third, empirically-based interventions need to be adopted and implemented to capitalize on targeted student outcomes. Finally, a systems approach must be implemented that constantly monitors and supports changes of the systems that implement the recommended practices. Bohanon et al.'s (2006) urban high school study provides an example that illustrates the potential benefits of implementing a PBS approach in the school system (see pages 15 - 16).

Intervention Strategies (Area 5)

It is incumbent upon teachers to learn effective strategies that respond to maladaptive student behavior. The proactive measures discussed above do not always guarantee success. It is imperative that teachers develop effective responses to disruptive

student behavior for several reasons: (a) Student learning is more efficient when limited disruptions occur in the classroom environment to allow more time spent on teaching and learning (Freiberg & Connell, 2001); (b) A child's ability to respond positively to adult requests is a necessary skill in the classroom environment (Henricsson & Rydell, 2004); (c) Children who demonstrate poor self-control and who fail to comply with adult requests are more likely to continue to have serious behavior difficulties (Henricsson & Rydell, 2006). Consequently, teachers who can model adaptive behaviors, provide corrective feedback, and teach appropriate skills that decrease disruptions in the classroom provide students with the means to react to the environment in a more productive manner. Therefore, teachers should adopt a perspective that includes an academic and/or behavioral skills-deficit approach with regard to student behavior rather than seeking to control the students as the primary intervention objective (Cardelle-Elawar, 1992).

Cardelle-Elawar (1992) employed metacognitive skills as a means to help students solve math problems more effectively. Teachers guided 30 daily lessons for low-achieving students involving math story problems. The teachers taught the students metacognitive strategies to help them to learn to recognize their lack of knowledge with regard to word meaning, their lack of adequate information necessary to solve a problem, their lack of knowing how to use task analysis to divide a problem into specific steps, or their lack of knowing how to execute a computation. Upon completion of the 30 daily training lessons, the students' attitudes and achievement scores had increased considerably. Other studies on self-monitoring cited earlier in the section on self-regulation (see pages 9, 10) also illustrate the need to teach students appropriate skills.

[Intervention strategies corresponds to Factor 1 – classroom management of the dependent measure (SEBM; Emmer & Hickman, 1991; see Appendix D).]

Practical strategies for decreasing maladaptive behaviors. Although punishment may be a common and natural response to maladaptive behaviors in the classroom, it tends to be ineffective (Nelson & Roberts, 2000). One important reason for the ineffectiveness of punitive responses by a teacher is that punishment teaches students what not to do, but it does not teach them appropriate behavior. Some effective strategies for dealing with disruptive behaviors in the classroom include proactive and reactive responses.

Many disruptive behaviors are easily resolved in the classroom and do not need special recording procedures for assessment purposes or intervention strategies that require advanced understanding of behavioral techniques (Shukla-Mehta & Albin, 2003). Research by Shukla-Mehta and Albin indicated that the best solution for problematic behaviors involves preventing behavioral escalation rather than waiting for a crisis situation to spiral out of control. They identified the following practical strategies for preventing behavioral escalation as empirically valid:

1. Reinforce appropriate behaviors (Shukla-Mehta & Albin, 2003). Positive reinforcement should be commonly found in a classroom. Teachers should employ reinforcement on a consistent basis for socially appropriate behaviors that involves the student engaging in on-task activities. Problematic behavior is more likely to occur in the classroom when students receive attention for disruptive behaviors and are ignored for appropriate behavior (Kennedy, 2000). Unfortunately, “bad students” may get more

attention than “good students.” Attention increases the likelihood that students will engage in disruptive behaviors in the future.

2. Be aware of triggers. Anything that evokes a response from others is a trigger (Shukla-Mehta & Albin, 2003). Often students when confronted with academic or behavioral tasks that are difficult for them to complete will exhibit maladaptive behaviors. One clear way to prevent maladaptive behavior from occurring is to recognize the triggers that elicit disruptive behaviors and to provide the student with several options, such as additional assistance or adjusting the length of the assignment when feasible. Consequently, when teachers are aware of the antecedents that elicit a disruptive behavior, they can act proactively and prevent the disruption from occurring.

A study by DuPaul, Ervin, Hook, and McGoey (1998) illustrates the importance of identification of an antecedent or trigger for preventing maladaptive behaviors. The researchers examined the effects of ClassWide Peer Tutoring (CWPT) on academic performance and behavioral control of 19 first through fifth-grade students with ADHD. Their teachers chose each student’s weakest academic area, either math, spelling, or reading, for implementation of CWPT. The study concluded that an active engagement of students increased from an average of 21.6% during baseline data collecting to an average of 82.3% after the implementation of CWPT. Moreover, academic performance increased from an average of 55.2% during baseline data collecting to an average of 73% after CWPT conditions. Thus, teachers need to employ proactive techniques as a means of preventing maladaptive behaviors from being exhibited.

3. Be aware of changes in normal behavior (Shukla-Mehta & Albin, 2003). Freiberg et al. (2001) emphasize the importance of teachers feeling and showing care for their

students as part of the Consistency Management and Cooperative Discipline program that was mentioned above (see page 22). Caring requires that teachers listen active and then give serious consideration to choosing an appropriate intervention. The child may have not slept enough the previous night or may have come to school hungry, which would have a detrimental effect on behavior. A teacher can assess the needs of the child in order to devise a plan to remedy the situation.

4. Limit the escalation (Shukla-Mehta & Albin, 2003). Teachers need to remain calm and not escalate the situation along with the student. Fay and Funk (1995) emphasize that students may have difficulty in self-monitoring and deescalating their own behavior if the teacher is caught up in the escalation and is exhibiting anger. Little thought will be devoted to the child's own anger and the child can get caught up in the anger of the teacher and not self-reflect on the mistake that caused this problematic situation.

5. Present students with opportunities to exhibit socially acceptable behavior (Shukla-Mehta & Albin, 2003). Often, students choose to emit a behavior that has specific negative consequences. They need to learn to take responsibility for their behaviors and choose behaviors that are socially acceptable. One solution for enabling the continuation of on-task behavior when a student is agitated would be to provide a verbal prompt facilitating the correct choice along with a clarification of the consequences for choosing the right or wrong choice. (Shukla-Mehta & Albin). There is always an alternative to disruptive behavior, and students need to learn to generate and choose appropriate behaviors that will keep them out of trouble.

6. Intervene early in the sequence to prevent escalation (Shukla-Mehta & Albin, 2003). Many students have a variety of disruptive behaviors that may occur

simultaneously to obtain a specific outcome, such as out-of-seat behavior and failing to open a book in order to avoid completing classwork. When less severe behaviors have not achieved the desired outcome for the student, he or she may engage in more disruptive behaviors (Shukla-Mehta & Albin, 2003). If a teacher is aware of a pattern of behaviors that eventually escalates into a severely disruptive situation, by discontinuing the sequence and interrupting early on, the teacher can avert very problematic behaviors.

7. Perform a Functional Behavior Assessment (Nelson, Martella, & Marchand-Martella, 2002). A functional behavior assessment basically consists of three components: antecedent (potential trigger that always occurs prior to the targeted behavior), target behavior, and consequence of the behavior (reinforcement or punishment). Knowing the antecedent and consequence of a behavior allows the teacher to gain knowledge of the function of a behavior. Disruptive behavior, like all types of behavior, serves a specific function; it may be to gain attention, escape a task, or to exert control. Nevertheless, by knowing the function of the behavior, teachers can select an appropriate intervention to decrease the disruptive behaviors and teach more appropriate ones.

A study by Burke, Hagan-Burke, and Sugai (2003) illustrates the efficacy of performing a Functional Behavior Analysis (FBA) using a single-subject male student with learning disabilities who exhibited disruptive behaviors during reading instruction. Burke et al. (2003) conducted the study in a third-grade general education class that was part of an elementary school with approximately 500 students. The student exhibited mild maladaptive behaviors that consisted of off-task behaviors, such as fidgeting with his glasses, talking to himself, and quietly not complying with completing his classwork,

along with more severe disruptions, such as arguing with teachers and singing loudly. A functional analysis indicated that his academic difficulties during reading instruction were highly correlated with his maladaptive behaviors. Based on the FBA, an intervention that involved teaching him vocabulary terms prior to reading class resulted in an increase to 99% on-task behavior during reading comprehension tasks as compared with a control condition in which he did not receive prior vocabulary instruction that consisted of 38% on-task behavior.

8. Employ extinction procedures properly (Shukla-Mehta & Albin, 2003). Extinction occurs when reinforcement is withdrawn after a particular response that decreases the probability of the response re-occurring (Kazdin, 2001). This directly relates to the function of the behavior. Teachers need to think about the function of the disruptive behavior, observe, and analyze what happens when the educator responds with a consequence. Just because the educator deems a consequence as punishment that does not automatically make it punishing. The real question is what happens to the behavior? If the behavior increases then reinforcement, not punishment, is occurring and there is no extinction of the maladaptive behavior. A good solution to make sure that a disruptive behavior decreases is to utilize extinction in combination with differential reinforcement. So, while teachers are decreasing the maladaptive behavior via extinction, they are also reinforcing a more socially-appropriate behavior (Shukla & Albin, 1996).

An empirical study by Durand and Carr (1992) illustrates the appropriate use of extinction and differential reinforcement. They defined challenging behaviors as consisting of four categories: aggression, opposition, tantrums, and destruction of property. Twelve children (ten boys and 2 girls) aged five years old to six years and two

months were randomly selected from nineteen children who engaged in any of these challenging attention-seeking behaviors. The investigators taught them alternative attention-seeking responses, such as verbal requests. Durand and Carr (1992) ignored the challenging behaviors so that extinction took place. The children would not receive a reward consisting of a trainer's attention while engaging in challenging behaviors. The study results indicated that following the introduction of teaching alternative attention-getting responses that employed extinction procedures, the challenging behaviors dropped approximately 44% as compared to the baseline data.

9. Teach students alternate appropriate behaviors (Shukla-Mehta & Albin, 2003). Students may be unaware of a more socially-appropriate behavior to employ, and therefore, rely on what has worked in the past. There is no substitute for teaching alternative solutions to replace disruptive behaviors as indicated by the results of the previous Durand and Carr (1992) study. If a student has difficulties in completing a classroom assignment, the teacher should teach the student to request assistance and provide assistance when it is requested.

10. Teach effective academic skills (Shukla-Mehta & Albin, 2003). Behavioral problems are clearly correlated with academic difficulties (Todd, Horner, Sugai, & Colvin, 1999). Students who are taught academic survival skills and are also provided high-quality instructional strategies are less likely to engage in disruptive behaviors (see pages 9, 10). Included in effective instructional strategies are proactive instructional methods that anticipate common academic or behavioral errors that students may make when given a specific assignment (Colvin, Sugai, & Patching, 1993). Teachers provide

cues and prompts as a means to focus attention and needed feedback on the task to aid in success.

11. Use a problem-solving approach (Shukla-Mehta & Albin, 2003). Students need self-regulatory skills to facilitate learning and self-control of behavior, therefore, a skills-deficit approach entails teaching students' problem solving skills (see page 27). There is a current trend for schools to restructure school curricula by incorporating problem solving skills and critical thinking into their teaching (Peterson, 1996). Problem solving entails an information processing strategy in which the individual processes available information in order to identify and generate solutions to the problem (Wehmeyer, Agran, & Hughes, 2002). Student competence requires the ability to encode, process, retrieve, and finally, propose a productive solution to a concrete problem (Agran & Wehmeyer, 1999). In other words, there is an integral relationship between self-regulatory processes, self-determination, and problem-solving skills. Students who are effective problem solvers clarify, set, and map out how to attain their specific goals, while self-regulating their behavior and learning in order to achieve their specific goal (Wehmeyer, Palmer, Agran, Mithuag, & Martin, 2000).

In conclusion, proactive measures are an important part of classroom management, but it is necessary for teachers to become fully versatile and adept in applying intervention strategies when disruptive behaviors arise in the classroom (Shukla-Mehta & Albin, 2003). First, teachers need to teach metacognitive strategies, such as self - monitoring to students due to the intimate connection between academic and behavioral difficulties. In addition, practical strategies, such as employing a Functional Behavior Analysis, reinforcement, punishment and extinction appropriately, being cognitively

aware of triggers in the environment along with preventing escalations, are all necessary elements for correctly handling maladaptive behaviors.

Teacher Efficacy: Definition and Theoretical Basis

If teachers learn and practice the classroom management strategies just reviewed, they should be able to affect students' performances in a positive way. Whether or not teachers practice good classroom management may depend on their beliefs concerning their ability to do so. Three decades ago, the Rand Corporation's "Change Agent Study" gave birth to a new construct known as teacher efficacy (Berman, McLauglin, Bass, Pauly, & Zelman, 1977). The Rand researchers defined teacher efficacy as "the extent to which the teacher believes he or she has the capacity to affect student performance" (McLaughlin & Marsh, 1978, p. 84). Other researchers of the construct, such as Guskey and Passaro (1994), defined teacher efficacy as "teachers' belief or conviction that they can influence how well students learn even those who may be difficult or unmotivated" (p. 4).

Gibson and Dembo (1988) have proposed efficacy expectations consisting of two components: General Teaching Efficacy and Personal Teaching Efficacy. General Teaching Efficacy is similar to Bandura's (1997) concept of outcome expectancy (discussed below) and pertains to a teacher's personal beliefs about the relationship between teaching and learning. Personal Teaching Efficacy is similar to Bandura's (1997) concept of efficacy expectancy and relates to a general sense of a teacher's own effectiveness. It is quite possible that teachers may have high confidence in their own ability to teach (Personal Teaching Efficacy), but believe that their students have a low ability to learn (General Teaching Efficacy).

Theories of Teacher Efficacy

Although many early studies (Holden & Rotter, 1962; Rotter, Liverant, & Crowne, 1961; Rotter & Mulry, 1965) provided evidence that teachers' self-beliefs about their capabilities have a lasting and important impact on the educational system, often the measures employed were less than adequate (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998). As teacher efficacy research increased, better measures emerged based on different theoretical frameworks. A discussion of two theories that have affected the definition and assessment of teacher efficacy follows.

Rotter's locus of control. Rotter's (1966) concept is grounded in social learning theory and is based on generalized expectancies for control of reinforcement that he coined "locus of control." This term refers to individuals' perceived belief about what determines whether or not they get reinforced. If individuals have a strong internal locus of control, they perceive that reinforcement is primarily dependent upon their efforts (Ames, 1992). People with a strong external locus of control perceive the amount of reinforcement given to them based on forces out of their control, such as chance or the behavior of other people (Rotter, 1966). Therefore, they are less likely to exert effort as a means to change their environment or circumstance. People fall along a continuum from very internal to very external. Moreover, prediction of behavior is more accurate when specific behaviors associated with past events are known. Therefore, individuals may have a strong feeling of little control over their life, and yet, may have a strong sense of control over specific situations. The main implication here is that people's interpretations of a situation are paramount and that behavior is influenced by an interaction between the person and the environmental situation (Weiner, 1979).

The Rand researchers (Berman et al., 1977) created their survey questions that tapped into teacher efficacy based on Rotter's (1966) theory. The two questions that the Rand researchers devised were added to an already existing questionnaire that scrutinized the efficacy of various reading programs and interventions that were meant to ascertain whether control of reinforcement was internal or external (Berman et al.). In other words, Rand researchers sought to determine whether teachers perceived themselves as controlling student motivation and performance (internal locus of control) or whether they believed that student motivation was due to environmental factors other than the teachers' actions (external locus of control). Based on the data they collected, Berman and colleagues concluded that teacher efficacy is a strong predictor of program implementation success.

Bandura's social cognitive theory. Research on Bandura's self-efficacy construct (1977) and his social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986) also contributed to the definition and assessment of teacher efficacy. Bandura defined self-efficacy as "beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments" (Bandura, 1997, p. 3). Self-efficacy is a future-oriented belief about the level of proficiency a person expects to demonstrate (task capability) in a given circumstance, and is therefore, situation specific, unlike self-esteem, which is an affective self-evaluation, such as feelings of self-worth (Gist & Mitchell, 1992). In other words, if individuals have low self-efficacious beliefs for a particular activity, such as swimming, but do not deem that activity important, they would not suffer from esteem issues. Conversely, high achievers with significant skills may have a negative evaluation about themselves due to their incredibly high standards that have not been met (Bandura, 1997).

Efficacy beliefs influence the individual's cognition and affect to mobilize the necessary psychological resources to accomplish a specific task. More specifically, self-efficacy beliefs influence goal setting and the strategies for attaining these goals by influencing motivation in the face of obstacles (Bandura, 1997; Zimmerman, 1995). Bandura conceived that individuals form self-efficacy beliefs due to four different sources of information: (a) Enactive direct mastery experiences provide the most important source of efficacy information (Bandura, 1997). People's attributions are an essential element also. Similar to Weiner's (2000) attribution theory, if a person believes that his/her success in effecting a particular task was due to controllable internal causes, then self-efficacy is enhanced. However, if the individual attributed success to external influences or uncontrollable events, then self-efficacy is not enhanced (Bandura, 1993). (b) Vicarious experiences in which observation of someone else succeeding or failing on a task influence efficacy beliefs. The more the observer identifies with the model, the larger the effect on efficacy (Bandura, 1977). (c) Verbal persuasion in which others give a "pep talk" to guide individuals to make additional effort or attempt new strategies also influences efficacy beliefs. As in the case of vicarious experiences, the persuader influences the efficacy impact. If the persuader is a person of expertise with much credibility, the impact is that much greater (Bandura, 1982). (d) Physiological arousal provides the individual with feedback about one's performance. If individuals are filled with anxiety while performing a specific task, this information relates to the individuals that they may not be highly competent and reduces efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1997).

Outcome expectancy, which differs from efficacy expectancy, is an essential component of Bandura's (1986) social cognitive theory. Efficacy expectancy pertains to

an individual's confidence in organizing the necessary actions to perform a specific task, while outcome expectancy relates to the individual's estimate of the likely outcome if he or she performs the task at that level of competence (Bandura, 1986). According to Bandura, people first develop efficacy expectations prior to developing outcome expectations. Nevertheless, outcome expectations, such as rewards or punishments, influence the individual by providing incentives or disincentives for a specific behavior.

Bandura (1997) indicates that there is a clear distinction between self-perceived subjective conceptions of efficacy and the objective level of competence. People may perceive themselves as capable of performing a specific act and yet not be able to execute the action as thought (Bandura, 1997). There is a direct consequence on the amount of effort exerted in addition to the choice of action when people perceive a task as beyond their capabilities. Low self-confidence or self-doubt can overcome even very adept skills (Bandura, 1986).

A study by Bouffard-Bouchard (2000) provides an example of people performing at a lower level due to their underestimation of their capabilities. The author investigated the effects of self-efficacy judgments through verbal feedback on a verbal concept-formation task in a sample of 64 Canadian college students. The participants showed no differences in prerequisite skills prior to the study. Bouffard-Bouchard's results indicated that differences in perceptions related to several variables: number of completed problems, effectiveness of problem-solving strategies, and the accuracy of self-evaluation of responses. Students who received positive feedback perceived themselves to be more efficacious than those students who received negative feedback. The feedback given to students supported Bandura's (1982) contention that verbal persuasion significantly

contributes to a sense of self-efficacy. Evidently, students when confronted with a novel task along with no clear external criterion for judgment of performance, look to others for evaluation. Teachers, potentially, become an important source of self-perceived efficacy for students in evaluating their performance and capabilities.

Bandura (1997) claims and provides evidence that his concept of self-efficacy and Rotter's (1966) internal-external locus of control are distinctly different. Perceived self-efficacy that is a personal belief about whether one can generate specific actions is different from locus of control that contains personal beliefs about whether actions affect outcomes. Locus of control is actually a weaker predictor of behavior in contrast to perceived self-efficacy, because the former deals with "casual beliefs about the relationship between actions and outcomes, but not with personal efficacy" (Tschannen-Mora et al., p. 207). People may believe that a specific outcome is internal and controllable, but still have little self-confidence that they can carry out the necessary actions to complete the task.

Within-Teacher Predictors of Teacher Efficacy

One study indicated a gender difference between male and female teacher efficacy in a secondary school setting (Ross, Cousins, & Gadalla, 1996), although Ghaith & Shaaban's (1999) study of elementary and secondary teachers and Karaka's (2008) study of primary and high school teachers did not result in this conclusion. Moreover, there have been few studies conducted. Female teachers tend to have higher teacher efficacy than male teachers (Ross et al., 1996). In addition, the research literature indicates an inverse relationship between General and Personal Teacher Efficacy with regard to years of experience. Teachers report an increase in Personal Teacher Efficacy, but a decrease in

General Teacher Efficacy as experience in the profession increases (Ghaith & Shaaban, 1999; Ross et al., 1996).

Teacher Self-Perceived Efficacy in Classroom Management

Gibson and Dembo (1984) developed an instrument, the Teacher Efficacy Scale that greatly enhanced the scientific study of teacher efficacy. To make the scale items, they expanded the two Rand items that dealt with teacher efficacy and included items based on their research using teacher interviews and analyses of studies by other researchers on teacher efficacy. Emmer and Hickman (1991) extended the Gibson and Dembo instrument based on current conceptualizations in the research that examined important skills and capabilities and applied teacher efficacy specifically to the domain of classroom management. They called their instrument the Teacher Efficacy in Classroom Management and Discipline Scale (TECMDS). Since Emmer and Hickman created the TECMDS, there have been only a handful of studies researching perceived self-efficacy in classroom management.

One such study observed the direction of relationships between perceived self-efficacy in classroom management and teacher burnout (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000). Participants in the study were 1156 secondary teachers in the Netherlands. The authors measured perceived self-efficacy in classroom management by 14 items rated on a 6-point Likert scale based on a Dutch version of the Classroom Management/Discipline Efficacy factor of the TECMDS by Emmer and Hickman (1991). Brouwers and Tomic (2000) used the Dutch version of the Maslach Burnout Inventory (Schaufeli & Van Horn, 1995; Maslach & Jackson, 1981) for teachers to measure teacher burnout. It includes 20 items forming three subscales (Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization, and Personal

Accomplishment) with items that teachers rate on a 7-point Likert scale. They sent instruments, along with a letter explaining the purpose of the study, to the principals of 15 randomly selected schools.

Teachers who scored high on the Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalization along with a low score on the Personal Accomplishment scales also scored high on the burnout scale. The results of the study indicated that emotional exhaustion has a direct impact on perceived self-efficacy in classroom management, while self-efficacy has a direct impact on Personal Accomplishment and Depersonalization. Brouwers and Tomic (2000) concluded that emotional exhaustion most likely decreases the number of enactive mastery experiences of teachers and, therefore, lowers their performance and hence, their perceived self-efficacy. Moreover, emotional exhaustion involves long-term stress that may indicate low capability that, in turn, negatively impacts perceived self-efficacy. Therefore, lower perceived self-efficacy in classroom management directly impacts on depersonalization. The authors contended that teachers who are doubtful of their ability to provide adequate discipline in the classroom eventually blame students and distance themselves from their work.

Lower perceived self-efficacy in classroom management directly impacts personal accomplishment. Bandura (1997) differentiated between perceived self-efficacy and personal accomplishment, although they are commonly mistaken as the same phenomenon (Bouwers & Tomic, 2000). He defined the former construct as a judgment of a person's ability to execute a specific action, while personal accomplishment pertains to a judgment of the outcome of such actions. Therefore, teachers who doubt their capabilities to handle disruptive students tend to become impotent in solving the problem.

Bouwers and Tomic (2000) indicated that a practical implication of their study for the classroom is that, when trying to prevent or treat teacher burnout, school personnel should consider teachers' perceived self-efficacy in classroom management. Maddux and Lewis (1995) proposed the following strategies for increasing self-efficacy. Education programs need to train teachers to deal effectively with disruptive student behavior. Maddux and Lewis (1995) believed that this can be accomplished by providing demonstrations using experienced teachers showing how they handle real experiences with difficult students (vicarious experience). Also, having students role-play along with teacher feedback (verbal persuasion) enhances self-efficacy for beginning teachers. The purpose of the training is to eventually enable teachers to have many experiences of success (enactive mastery). Second, Maddux and Lewis (1995) indicated that it is not enough to just target teachers' self-efficacy. One also needs to address and diminish teacher burnout by increasing social support and having school-wide intervention policies for disruptive students.

In another study, Martin et al. (1999) examined teachers' perceived efficacy in dealing with behavior problems and whether or not it mediated the relationship between their concerns about students' maladaptive behaviors and their use of strategies and support needs. The examiners randomly recruited 130 female (95.3%) and male (4.7%) teachers of kindergarten through second grade from 21 primary schools in Australia. They used a questionnaire to gather data about the teachers' perceptions of behavior problems in their classroom, strategies employed to manage the behaviors, and teachers' support needs. Likert scales that ranged from 3 to 5 points depending on the section of the questionnaire provided teacher ratings. Martin et al. defined and classified

misbehavior using four categories: (a) distractibility, (b) disobedience, (c) delinquency, and (d) aggression.

In addition, the researchers (Martin et al., 1999) also examined how much concern the teachers had over the problematic target behaviors for their classroom that were listed as items in reference to the four categories. They defined and classified teachers' support needs with two scales that examined school-based support and non-school professional support. The former consisted of support from school counselors, class teachers, principal, and itinerant support teacher. The latter consisted of outside support groups, university courses, and staff, along with professional associations. They classified strategies for dealing with student maladaptive behavior into four groups: referral of the child to other personnel in the school, referral to non-school professionals, positively-focused strategies (reinforcement), and non-physical punishment. Teachers also rated how confident they were in dealing with behavioral problems in their classroom.

Martin et al. (1999) found a strong negative correlation between teachers' concern about behavior problems and their confidence in managing the behaviors. In order to manage behaviors in the classroom, teachers tended to employ non-physical punishment and refer students with behavior problems to school-based support. Moreover, teachers with lower teacher efficacy were more likely to refer the child to other school personnel instead of employing positively focused strategies or referring the students to non-school professionals.

In another study, Giallo and Little (2003) examined the relationship between classroom experiences, preparedness, and teacher efficacy. The experimenters recruited 54 elementary school teachers (12 males and 42 females) with less than three years

teaching experience from 58 randomly selected schools in Melbourne, Australia. They also recruited 25 student teachers (2 males and 23 females) from four Victorian universities. Gaillo and Little employed the Teacher Self-efficacy in Behavior Management and Discipline Scale [SEBM] by Emmer and Hickman (1991) to assess teachers' confidence in classroom management. They used the PrepCom questionnaire (Cains & Brown, 1996) to evaluate teachers' perceived preparedness for teaching. The PrepCom assesses eight categories: behavior management, general teaching, special needs, teaching theory, administration, personal development, and race and gender. Teachers indicated their teaching readiness by answering 41 items that are scaled on a 7-point Likert scale. Finally, Gaillo and Little used the Rating Scale for Measuring Teachers' Perception of Problem Behaviors (Safran & Safran, 1985) to ascertain information about experiences with behavior problems. The scale assesses four dimensions (severity, tolerance, manageability, ripple effect on the class) of student problematic behaviors based on a 5-point scale.

Not surprisingly, Gaillo and Little (2003) found that teachers who had higher perceived preparedness to deal with student problem behaviors had higher self-efficacy. In other words, teachers' perceived preparedness greatly influenced their confidence. Interestingly, the majority of the teachers and student teachers rated their teacher training as inadequate in preparing them for behavior management. One student teacher responded quite acrimoniously by saying, "I feel like we have done virtually nothing on this [behaviour management] at all during our four year course" (Giallo & Little, 2003, p. 30). Another student commented, "It is not explicitly taught at all at uni-only if you happen to get good modeling from a supervising teacher on rounds. Therefore, classroom

management in general needs to be taught more comprehensively in the curriculum" (Giallo & Little, p. 30). This study (Cains & Brown, 1998) indicates that there must be better and more comprehensive training in classroom management in pre-service teaching courses.

Summary and Rationale for Current Study

The literature on teacher burnout clearly indicates that classroom management problems are primary causes contributing to teachers leaving the field (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000; Giallo & Lttle, 2003; Griffith et al., 1999; Merrow, 1999). Research and theory should guide teachers in understanding the causes of academic and behavioral problems and how their behavior impacts on their students' needs. Teachers also need to establish a classroom that promotes a nurturing academic environment along with strong organizational group behavior management and instructional methods that facilitate academic learning for the entire classroom. Lack of academic preparation, misassignment, incompetent administration (i.e., bureaucracy), and a lack of necessary skills to deal with classroom life are to blame for teacher burnout (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000; Friedman, 1996; Giallo & Little, 2003; Griffith et al., 1999; Martin et al., 1999).

Good teacher classroom management requires student cooperation in decreasing disruptive behavior along with effectively handling misbehavior when it occurs. Classroom misbehavior can be defined as any behavior that has a detrimental impact on children's learning and/or adversely affects the teacher's ability to function effectively (Merrett & Wheldall, 1984). Teachers who deal with disruptive behaviors spend an inordinate amount of time on discipline that adversely affects the time spent on academic instruction and activities (Cains & Brown, 1996). Moreover, teachers were more likely to

use non-physical punishment to manage misbehavior, instead of implementing reinforcement and/or response cost behavioral procedures appropriately. It seems that much of the educational establishment has ignored the literature that deals with behavioral techniques for managing disruptive behaviors (Kehle, & Clark, 1996). Kehle and Clark (1996) concluded that teachers maintained intuitively appealing classroom management techniques that were scientifically unfounded. In addition, because assistance from a behavior management consultant, especially when conducted as a one-on-one consultation with the teacher, has been shown to decrease disruptive behaviors in the classroom (Schottle & Peltier, 1996), it would make prudent sense to target increasing teachers' classroom management abilities prior to entering the classroom.

Bandura (1997) defined self-efficacy as people's beliefs about their capacity to ascertain a desired goal. Self-efficacy is a future-oriented belief about the level of proficiency a person expects to demonstrate (task capability) in a given circumstance, and is therefore, situation specific. Efficacy beliefs influence the individual's cognition and affect to mobilize the necessary psychological resources to accomplish a specific task (Bandura, 1997). More specifically, self-efficacy beliefs influence goal setting and the strategies for attaining these goals by influencing motivation when obstacles are presented (Bandura, 1997; Zimmerman, 1995). Lower perceived self-efficacy in classroom management directly impacts personal accomplishment (Giallo & Little, 2003; Brouwers & Tomic, 2000). Teachers who doubt their capabilities to handle students tend to become impotent in solving problems in the classroom environment.

While much research has examined teacher efficacy in general (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998; Bandura, 1997; Zimmerman, 1995; Allinder, 1994) little research has looked

at classroom management in particular. When a study evaluated the ratings of teacher training, it indicated that the teachers were inadequately prepared for behavior management (Giallo & Little, 2003). Self-efficacy is considered to be context specific to a particular task, yet so much of the research has focused on teacher efficacy in general and little research has been conducted on classroom management in particular. In fact, less than a dozen articles have been published in this particular area (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000; Emmer & Hickman, 1991; Gencer & Gakiroglu, 2007; Giallo & Little, 2003; Maddux & Lewis, 1995, Martin et al., 1999).

This study sought to contribute to the teacher efficacy in classroom management literature by investigating if a course in classroom management increased teacher efficacy in classroom management as contrasted with a comparative graduate course in the exceptional child. Since there is a clear link between teacher burnout and perceived teacher efficacy in classroom management, one would expect abundant research in this area, and yet, no published research has investigated this particular research question. Emmer and Hickman (1991) created an instrument that is specific to the domain of teacher efficacy and classroom management and called their instrument the Teacher Efficacy in Classroom Management and Discipline Scale (SEBM). The current study employed SEBM. The SEBM contains three factors consisting of: (a) classroom management/discipline factor; (b) external influences factor; and (c) personal teaching efficacy factor. In addition to the SEBM, the researcher used the graduate students' course grades along with behavior vignettes as a means to externally validate their self-perceived teacher efficacy beliefs. The current study also investigated the effect of mediating variables, such as gender, age, ethnicity, the number of years teaching, child or

childless, socio-economic status, undergraduate and graduate grade-point averages on teacher efficacy in classroom management.

Hypotheses

Thus, using the SEBM instrument and demographic questions to evaluate teacher efficacy in classroom management, the investigator advanced the following hypotheses based on the literature reviewed:

With regard to research supporting hypotheses 1 through 6, Maddux and Lewis (1995) proposed the following strategies for increasing self-efficacy. Education programs need to train teachers to deal effectively with disruptive student behavior. Having students role-play along with teacher feedback (verbal persuasion) enhances self-efficacy for beginning teachers. The purpose of the training is to eventually enable teachers to have many experiences of success (enactive mastery).

HO1: Graduate Master's students who take the course in classroom management will have significantly greater increases in SEBM total scores than graduate Master's students who take the exceptional child course.

HO2: Graduate Master's students who take the course in classroom management will have significantly greater increases in SEBM classroom management/discipline factor scores than graduate Master's students who take the exceptional child course.

HO3: Graduate Master's students who take the course in classroom management will have significantly greater reductions in SEBM external factor (beyond the teacher's control, such as student's classroom behavior is more influenced by

peers than the teacher) scores than graduate Master's students who take the exceptional child course.

HO4: Graduate Master's students who take the course in classroom management will have significantly greater increases in SEBM personal teaching factor scores than graduate Master's students who take the exceptional child course.

HO5: Graduate Master's students with higher course grades who take the course in classroom management will have significantly higher SEBM total scores at posttest.

HO6: Graduate Master's students who take the course in classroom management will have significantly higher behavior vignette scores than graduate Master's students who take the exceptional child course.

Research indicates that female teachers tend to have higher teacher efficacy than male teachers (Ross et al., 1996).

HO7: Graduate Master's female students who take the course in classroom management will have significantly higher pre and posttest SEBM total scores than male students.

HO8: Graduate Master's students with children who take the course in classroom management will have significantly higher pre and posttest SEBM total scores than childless students.

The research literature indicates an increase in Personal Teacher Efficacy as experience in the profession increases (Ghaith & Shaaban, 1999; Ross et al., 1996).

HO9: Graduate Master's students who take the course in classroom management who have more teaching experience will have significantly higher pre and posttest SEBM total scores.

HO10: Graduate Master's students who take the course in classroom management with the highest undergraduate G. P. A. will have significantly higher pre and posttest SEBM total scores.

HO11: Graduate Master's students who take the course in classroom management with the highest graduate G. P. A. will have significantly higher pre and posttest SEBM total scores.

CHAPTER II

Methodology

This chapter describes study participants and instruments. The chapter presents the procedure and details the content of the classroom management course. Finally, the chapter also presents the dependent variables and the methods of data analyses.

Participants

To solicit participants, the researcher introduced the study by reading a script that I prepared in advance and that the Graduate Center IRB committee approved (see Appendix A) to all 77 graduate Master's students in a special education department who were taking mandatory courses in classroom management (30 students enrolled, 29 participated) and the exceptional child (47 students enrolled, 42 participated) as per their requirements in a private college in the Westchester, New York area. The purpose of the standardized script was to inform students about the overall study purpose and procedure, along with clarifying their voluntary participation in my proposed study. I asked them to sign an informed consent if they wished to participate (see Appendix B).

The special education department is part of the education department in which students focus on getting a graduate education degree for an inclusive setting. No students may take the classroom management course in the first semester in the program (The majority take this course during the second semester), but students take the exceptional child course in their first semester. Therefore, all students who were in the classroom management course had already taken the exceptional child course, but those in the exceptional child course had not taken the classroom management course. It was important to find a comparison group that had not previously taken the classroom

management course or the study results would have been confounded by previous participation in the course and any differences in the groups could not be attributed to the current classroom management course content.

Student participants. Seventy-one students (92% of those solicited) from both classes participated in the study. The researcher wanted to obtain at least 64 participants in each group based on the rationale that this number would provide the needed power to illustrate a medium effect for mean differences at the $p < .05$ level of confidence (Cohen, 1992). However, the final sample fell short of this and corresponds more to what is needed to detect a large effect at the $p < .05$ level (i.e., 26 participants per group).

Tables 1, 2, and below present sample demographic frequency information for both classrooms concerning participants' gender, ethnicity, type of teaching experience, salary, year in graduate program, current grade teaching, subjects taught, and teaching county. Readers will note that the majority of participants were female. The exceptional child class had proportionately more women than the classroom management class, χ^2 (1, N = 71) = 28.52, $p = .01$. About 12% of students in the exceptional child class were members of minority groups compared to only a 7% minority representation in the classroom management course, χ^2 (2, N = 71) = 103.13, $p = .01$. Readers will note that the majority of participants taught in an elementary school setting, with over half of the students in the classroom management class teaching in elementary school while about a third of the students in the exceptional child course were teaching in either elementary or middle schools, χ^2 (4, N = 57) = 55.54, $p = .01$. About half of students taught in Westchester County in the classroom management class while about a third of the students in the exceptional child course taught in Westchester, χ^2 (13, N = 49) = 204.43, *p*

= .01. A χ^2 analysis determined a significant difference in the students' salaries, χ^2 (5, N = 67) = 17.99, p = .01, with about a quarter of students in the classroom management course earning a salary between 15,000 - 25,000 dollars, while a little over a third of the exceptional child students earning above 55, 000 dollars.

Table 1

Frequencies for the Experimental (Classroom Management) and Control Groups' (Exceptional Child) Gender, Ethnicity, Type of Teaching Experience, Income, Year in the Graduate Program, Current Grade Teaching, Subjects Taught, and Teaching County

Experimental Participants				*Control Participants*	
	N	*Percentage*	*Descriptor*	*N*	*Percentage*
			Gender		
Male	4	(13.79 %)		9	(21.43 %)
Female	25	(86.21%)		33	(78.57%)
			Ethnicity		
White	27	(93.10%)		37	(88.10%)
Black	1	(3.45%)		2	(4.76%)
Hispanic	1	(3.45%)		3	(7.14%)
Asian	0	(0%)		0	(0%)
Other	0	(0%)		0	(0%)

Table 1 *(continued)*

	Experimental Participants			*Control Participants*	
	N	*Percentage*	*Descriptor*	*N*	*Percentage*
			Type of Teaching Experience		
Teacher	8	(27.59%)		6	(14.29%)
Substitute	7	(24.14%)		11	(26.19%)
Para	9	(31.03%)		14	(33.33%)
Student	4	(13.79%)		6	(14.29%)
Other	1	(3.45%)		5	(11.90%)
Income					
< 15, 000	5	(17.24%)		4	(9.52%)
15-25,000	7	(24.14%)		12	(28.57%)
25-35,000	6	(20.69%)		3	(7.14%)
35-45,000	3	(10.34%)		4	(9.52%)
45-55,000	4	(13.79%)		0	(0.0%)
> 55,000	4	(13.79%)		15	(35.71%)
			Year in Graduate Program		
1 (2^{nd} sem.)	21	(72.41%)		42	(100.00%)
2	6	(20.69%)			
3	2	(6.90%)			

Note. sem. = semester.

Table 1 *(continued)*

Experimental Participants			*Control Participants*		
Descriptor	*N*	*Percentage*	*Descriptor*	*N*	*Percentage*
			Current Grade Teaching		
Preschool	1	(3.45%)		4	(9.52%)
Kindergarten	2	(6.90%)		0	(0.00%)
Elementary	16	(55.17%)		15	(35.71%)
Middle	5	(17.24%)		12	(28.57%)
High	1	(3.45%)		1	(2.38%)
			Subjects Taught		
All subjects	18	(62.07%)		19	(45.24%)
Art	1	(3.45%)		1	(2.38%)
Athletics	0	(0.00%)		1	(2.38%)
Science	0	(0.00%)		2	(4.76%)
English	1	(3.45%)		3	(7.14%)
Spanish	0	(0.00%)		3	(7.14%)
Music	1	(3.45%)		0	(0.00%)
History	2	(6.90%)		0	(0.00%)

Table 1 *(continued)*

Experimental Participants			*Control Participants*		
Descriptor	*N*	*Percentage*	*Descriptor*	*N*	*Percentage*
			Teaching County		
Bronx	1	(3.45%)		0	(0.00%)
Dutchess	0	(0.00%)		1	(2.38%)
Fairfield	2	(6.90%)		3	(7.14%)
Greenwich	1	(3.45%)		1	(2.38%)
Hawthorne	0	(0.00%)		1	(2.38%)
Livingston	1	(3.45%)		0	(0.00%)
New Canaan	0	(0.00%)		1	(2.38%)
Pearl River	0	(0.00%)		1	(2.38%)
Putnam	0	(0.00%)		1	(2.38%)
Queens	0	(0.00%)		2	(4.76%)
Rockland	0	(0.00%)		1	(2.38%)
Rye	1	(3.45%)		0	(0.00%)
Westchester	15	(51.72%)		14	(33.33%)
Yonkers	1	(3.45%)		1	(2.38%)

Table 2 presents means and standard deviations for participants in both classrooms according to age, years of teaching experience, graduate and undergraduate GPAs, and number of children.

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations for Participants' Age, Years of Teaching Experience, Graduate and Undergraduate GPAs, and Number of Children

Descriptor	Classroom Management			Exceptional Child		
	N	*M*	*SD*	*N*	*M*	*SD*
Age	29	30.07	11.13	29	30.22	8.61
Years of Teaching	28	3.17	5.33	42	2.08	2.21
Undergraduate GPA	29	3.34	.46	42	3.37	.37
Graduate GPA	25	3.83	.25	22	3.81	.28
Number of Children	7	.38	.78	12	.62	1.10

Participants in the classroom management class (CM) and participants in the exceptional child class (EC) did not differ in age, t (68) = -.07, p = .47; years of teaching experience, t (64) = 1.13, p = .09; undergraduate GPA, t (69) = -.33, p = .07); graduate school GPA, t (43) = .15, p = .39; or number of children, t (69) = -.41, p = .69.

Course instructors. The professors were full-time faculty members of the special education department. The classroom management professor had a doctorate in education

and had taught the course for four years. The professor of the exceptional child course had a doctorate in educational psychology, was a certified school psychologist, and had taught this course for six years.

Instruments

Demographic questionnaire. The researcher obtained student demographic information pertaining to gender, age, ethnicity, if they were teaching, the number of years teaching, what subjects they were teaching, which year they were in the graduate program, child or childless, socio-economic status, and undergraduate and graduate grade-point averages using a questionnaire (see Appendix C).

The rationale for obtaining information needed on gender for this study is research that indicates that female teachers have higher teacher efficacy than male teachers (Ross et al., 1996). The research also shows a positive correlation between age (Cambell, 1996) and years of teaching experience (Cambell, 1996; Ross et al., 1996). There are no published studies investigating teacher demographic variables of ethnicity, child or childless, socio-economic status, and undergraduate and graduate grade-point averages. I collected this additional demographic information to provide readers with a complete description of the sample.

Teacher Self-Efficacy Behavior Management and Discipline Scale. This dissertation used a self-report measure – Teacher Self-Efficacy in Behavior Management and Discipline Scale (SEBM; Emmer & Hickman, 1991; see Appendix D) – to assess teachers' perceived self-efficacy in classroom management.

Three decades ago, the Rand Corporation's "Change Agent Study" gave birth to a new construct known as teacher efficacy (Berman et al., 1977). The Rand researchers

defined teacher efficacy as “the extent to which the teacher believes he or she has the capacity to affect student performance” (McLaughlin & Marsh, 1978, p. 84). The two items that appeared in the survey that examined the success of reading programs and interventions grounded in Rotter’s social learning theory were: “When it comes right down to it, a teacher really can’t do much because most of a student’s motivation and performance depends on his or her home environment;” and “If I really try hard, I can get through to even the most difficult or unmotivated students.” (Armor, Conroy-Oseguera, Cox, King, McDonnell et al., 1976).

In the 1980s, Gibson and Dembo (1984) developed a 30-item measure of teacher efficacy based on the Rand items, teacher interviews, and analyses of previous studies of teachers who reported high efficacy. Bandura’s (1977) outcome expectancy and efficacy expectancy concepts provided the theoretical underpinnings for Gibson and Dembo’s measure. Using more current conceptualizations in the research examining important skills and capabilities, Emmer and Hickman (1991) extended the Gibson and Dembo instrument and applied teacher efficacy specifically to the domain of classroom management. They called their instrument the Teacher Efficacy in Classroom Management and Discipline Scale (SEBM).

This self-report measure conceives of teacher efficacy in classroom management as consisting of three factor subscale scores: Classroom Management/Discipline (Factor 1) relates to the teacher’s self-perceived competence in the area of discipline and management. Some items from this subscale are: “I know what routines are needed to keep activities running efficiently,” “I can keep a few problem students from ruining an entire class,” and “I know what kinds of rewards to use to keep students involved.”

External Influences (Factor 2) consists of items that reflect the view that influences that are beyond the teacher's control to determine student outcomes. Some items from this subscale are: "Student behavior in classrooms is influenced more by peers than the teacher," "The amount that a student can learn is primarily related to family background," and "If a student doesn't feel like behaving, there's not a lot teachers can do." The Personal Teaching Efficacy (Factor 3) consists of items reflecting teachers' beliefs that they possess knowledge of appropriate teaching techniques in order to facilitate student learning. Some items from this subscale are: "When a student gets a better grade than usual, it is probably because I found better ways of teaching that student," "If a student masters a new concept quickly this might be because I found more effective teaching approaches," and "When a student does better than usual, many times it is because I exerted a little extra effort." I chose the SEBM for use in this study because it is the only scale in the field that specifically evaluates teacher efficacy with regard to classroom management. Moreover, since it has good psychometric properties including reliability and validity evidence, it seemed to be a good choice to enhance the field of teacher efficacy in classroom management.

The SEBM consists of 35 items that indicate the degree to which teachers agree or disagree with the statements. Teachers rate the items using a 6-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 = "disagree strongly" to 6 = "agree strongly". Total SEBM scores may range from 35 – 210. Factor 1 contains 18 items with a range of possible scores from 18 – 108. Factor 2 contains 15 items with a range of possible scores from 15 – 90. Factor 3 contains 10 items with a range of possible scores from 10 – 60. The subscales have moderate internal consistency (Factor 1 = .81, Factor 2 = .79, Factor 3 = .69) and three-week test-

retest (Factor 1 = .79, Factor 2 = .83, Factor 3 = .82) reliabilities (Emmer & Hickman, 1991).

The Gibson and Dembo (1984) instrument consisted of only two factors: External Influences and Personal Teaching Efficacy. Emmer and Hickman (1991) found support for construct validity of the two subscales along with a third subscale, namely the Classroom Management/Discipline subscale, through factor analysis of intercorrelation of items. However, Emmer and Hickman did not find support for the efficacy scales in predicting 30 student teachers' performance in the area of special education based on supervisor assessments. The researchers believed that student teachers with unrealistically high self-efficacy perceptions may be in denial that permits them to avoid negative feelings. Another possible interpretation is that these student teachers never had corrective feedback to promote a more realistic estimate of teacher efficacy in classroom management. Moreover, there probably was not enough power to discern an effect due to just 30 student teacher participants in their study. A larger group of participants would be needed to better evaluate the predictive validity of the SEBM along with additional validity studies.

Course grades. I used the students' final grades for the classroom management course as a means to externally validate their self-perceived efficacy in classroom management.

Behavior vignettes (see Appendix E). I chose behavior vignettes as a measure for validating students' self-perceived teacher efficacy in classroom management because there is no standardized behavior rating scale for measuring classroom management, and I employed the behavior vignettes as a means to measure how a person would react *in-*

vivo. Researchers studying other topics often use behavior vignettes because there is no standardized measure for validation of their construct, such as in sexual harassment training to decrease sexual harassment in the workplace (Glomb & Espelage, 2005; Fuegen & Biernat, 2000).

All students responded to two behavior vignettes at the end of the semester to externally validate their self-perceived efficacy in classroom management. Appendix F presents the scoring rubic for each behavior vignette along with information that indicates each target behavior's correspondence to the three self-efficacy factors of classroom management found on the SEBM. I adapted the behavior vignettes from a textbook called *Classroom Management* (Emmer, Evertson, & Worsham, 2006) that is different from the text used in the classroom management course in this study. The authors of this text provided behavior vignettes to evaluate students' comprehension and application of classroom management techniques, and the researcher adapted them to assess the three factors of self-efficacy of classroom management found in the SEBM survey.

The goal of the behavior vignettes was for students to first identify target behaviors that were disruptive in a classroom setting. Then, participants identified potential interventions that could be implemented in the classroom to improve learning by decreasing the maladaptive behaviors. The five target behaviors for the first behavior vignette question are: late to class, forgetting materials, calling out answers, out-of-seat, and off-task behaviors. Therefore, a possible range of scores for a student in correctly identifying the target behaviors for behavior vignette question number one is 0 to 5, reflecting the number of targets the student identified correctly. Some potential interventions for these target behaviors are: enacting rules, routines, effective

consequences, modeling, contracting, and self-monitoring. A possible range of scores for a student in correctly identifying interventions for each of the 5 target behaviors in behavior vignette question number one is 0 to 27, reflecting the number of interventions the student identified correctly. Therefore, by combining the score for correctly identifying the target behaviors and appropriate interventions for the first behavior vignette, a student can have a possible range of scores from 0 to 32, reflecting the number of targets and interventions the student identified correctly.

The three target behaviors for the second behavior vignette question are: off-task behaviors, transition, and oppositional/arguing. Therefore, a possible range of scores for a student in correctly identifying the target behaviors for behavior vignette question number two is 0 to 3, reflecting the number of targets the student identified correctly. Some potential interventions for these target behaviors in the second behavior vignette are: prompting, enacting rules, routines, effective consequences, modeling, role-playing, peer mediation, and conflict resolution. A possible range of scores for a student in correctly identifying interventions for each of the 3 target behaviors in behavior vignette question number two is 0 to 15, reflecting the number of interventions the student identified correctly. Therefore, by combining the score for correctly identifying the target behaviors and appropriate interventions for the second behavior vignette, a student can have a possible range of scores from 0 to 18. The score for both behavior vignettes combined that includes the target behaviors and potential interventions can range from 0 to 50, reflecting the number of interventions each student identified correctly.

Inter-Rater Reliability Coefficients for Behavior Vignettes. The investigator and another rater (a licensed psychologist who taught a different classroom management

course in another school for three years) scored the behavioral vignettes according to the scoring rubric in Appendix E. Table 3 presents the Pearson product-moment coefficients assessing the inter-rater reliability of the behavior vignettes. For the target behaviors in question one, the scoring range was from 0 to 5 (M = 1.56, SD = 1.37) for the investigator and 0 to 5 (M = 1.24, SD = 1.24) for the other rater. For the target behaviors in question two, the range was from 0 to 3 (M = 1.23, SD = .90) for the investigator and 0 to 3 (M = .86, SD = .98) for the other rater. For the solutions in question one, the range was from 1 to 8 (M = 3.03 SD = 1.34) for the investigator and 1 to 8 (M = 2.79, SD = 1.37) for the other rater out of a potential range of scores of 0 to 27. For the solutions in question two, the range was from 1 to 6 (M = 2.21, SD = 1.31) for the investigator and 0 to 6 (M = 2.03, SD = 1.26) for the other rater out of a potential range of scores of 0 to 15. Since there was high inter-rater reliability between the investigator and the other rater, the investigator used his scores for the grading of the behavior vignettes in the results section.

Table 3

Inter-Rater Reliability Coefficients for Targets and Solutions to Behavior Vignettes

Targets and Solutions of Behavior Vignettes	*Inter-Rater Reliability Coefficient*
Target Behaviors (Q1)	.85 **
Target Behaviors (Q2)	.85 **
Solutions (Q1)	.95 **
Solutions (Q2)	.96 **
Composite (Q1 & Q2)	.93**

Note. Q1 = Behavior Vignette Question # 1, Q2 = Behavior Vignette Question # 2

** = $p < .01$.

Procedure

Upon approval of the IRB committee, I contacted the professors who taught the classroom management course and the exceptional child course at the college in the special education department and asked if they would allow me to conduct the study with their students. I received their permission (see Appendix G) to conduct the study. The purpose of the inclusion of the exceptional child course in the study was to provide a comparison group to the classroom management course. The exceptional child course, however, occurs chronologically earlier in the teacher education curriculum than the classroom management course. Students are required to take the coursework according to

a set curriculum, which is why a comparison class composed of students at the same stage in the curriculum who have not taken the classroom management course was not possible.

The investigator informed all the participants that the purpose of the study was to investigate their beliefs about classroom management and asked them to sign an informed consent if they wished to participate (see Appendix B). He also informed them that participation was voluntary and that they could withdraw from the study at any time without any penalty. He told them that all data would be kept at his home and that he alone would have access to them. Individual students' responses would not be shared with the professors of the courses they were taking.

Upon arrangement with the professors and following consent of the students, the students completed the SEBM along with answering demographic questions in their classrooms during the second week of the semester and completed the SEBM again along with the behavioral vignettes during the second to last week of the course in their classroom (14^{th} week). I distributed and collected the survey, demographic questions, and behavior vignettes.

The data coding system consisted of assigning each student a number based on the last four digits of his/her social security number. The purpose of the data coding system was to see if the scores of the specific students changed from the beginning of the semester to the end of the semester. This is why it was necessary to keep track of each specific student's responses, and therefore, it required coded identifiers. Upon completion of the semester, the professors of the classroom management and exceptional child courses shared the grades they assigned to each student based on the last four digits of the

student's identification code. A licensed psychologist who taught a classroom management course for three years, but was not one of the course instructors for this study, and the investigator graded the behavioral vignettes independently. Table 3 above presents the interrater reliability for the vignettes. The purpose of obtaining the professors' assigned grades and the evaluation of student performance on the behavioral vignettes was to ascertain some external evidence that would validate students' self-perceived efficacy beliefs in classroom management. Upon completion of the study, the investigator destroyed the student identifiers.

Classroom Management Course Content

This course examined theories, practices, and strategies for enriching the classroom environment in order to enhance students' motivation and learning. The goal of this course was to help students develop their own ideas about classroom management that are congruent with their educational goals, style of teaching, and their students' needs. The course focused on a theoretical and practical approach to classroom management, organization, and discipline. The professor used direct instruction, class discussions, role-playing, small cooperative group activities, reflection papers, a research paper, and group and individual presentations to conduct this course.

The professor assigned 13 chapters of the course textbook, Classroom Management: Models, Applications, and Cases (Manning & Bucher, 2007) to students consisting of one chapter per weekly class. The class covered all of the assigned course material. The professor employed direct instruction along with the Socratic Method to facilitate learning and discussion. The first two sessions involved mostly direct instruction from the professor expounding on the requirements of the course and course material along

with some group activity. Beginning with class session number 3, students made presentations on different theories and/or topics in classroom management followed by the professor's lecture on the same topic. There was then a group activity (scenarios that include role-playing), followed by a review for the entire class of what was covered.

The course requirements included (See Appendix H for course syllabus):

1) Class participation and attendance;

2) Reflection papers that included a short summary of the theory, approval or disapproval of the theory, practical application to the classroom, and an evaluation of the students' presentation;

3) An individual research paper that investigated an approved particular theory pertaining to classroom management followed by an oral presentation of the salient facts. Some topics explored included different theories of classroom management proposed by Kounin, Coloroso, Jones, Gardner, along with assertive discipline, democratic teaching, congruent communication, discipline with dignity, etc. (A. Dowling, personal communication, October 26, 2006); and

4) Twelve hours of field experience that included logging 12 hours of experiential activities, such as observation classroom management in a real classroom or working with a group of students in a school.

Textbook Content for Classroom Management Course

The textbook, Classroom Management: Models, Applications, and Cases (Manning & Bucher, 2007), provides information regarding effective classroom management. It served as a basis for class discussion, role-play, presentations, and group activities. The textbook authors do not consider any chapter by itself to be completely effective in

creating good classroom management and they emphasize the need to combine several classroom management theories expounded upon throughout the book.

Chapter 1 – Introducing the concept of classroom management. Content material taught and discussed included defining good classroom management, student diversity, developing a personal classroom management model, and the problem of aggression and violence. This chapter corresponds to Factor 1 – classroom management of the SEBM.

Chapter 2 – Building the foundation: Skinner, Redl, and Wattenberg; Glasser; and Gordon. This chapter gives an overview that consists of biographical information and an overview of the foundational theorists who helped to develop modern day classroom management techniques. This chapter corresponds to Factor 1 – classroom management, Factor 2 – external influences and Factor 3 - personal teaching efficacy, respectively of the SEBM.

Chapter 3 – Exploring the theories of assertive discipline: Lee Canter and Marlene Canter. This chapter expounds on applying assertive discipline that includes how to implement reward and punishment, and creating a discipline hierarchy. This chapter corresponds to Factors 1 – classroom management of the SEBM.

Chapter 4 –Exploring the theories of democratic teaching: Rudolf Dreikurs. The chapter gives an overview of democratic teaching and management, teachers' roles and responsibilities, identifying and addressing mistaken goals, and using logical consequences. Much of this material focuses on employing Adlerian principles so that teachers can nurture and help students to feel that they belong in their classroom social environment. This chapter corresponds to Factor 1 – classroom management of the SEBM.

Chapter 5 – Exploring the theories of congruent communication: Haim Ginnot. This chapter explains how teachers can develop positive communication, behaviors, and relationships in the classroom that can lead to a safe environment in the classroom and in the school. This chapter corresponds to Factor 1 – classroom management of the SEBM.

Chapter 6 –Exploring the theories of instructional management: Jacob Kounin. This chapter provides a discussion on how teachers can create an appropriate instructional momentum, methods to alert groups, and to provide group accountability. Strategies and routines that support cooperative learning that include how to arrange the room, signaling to get a group's attention, promoting interdependence, and individual accountability are carefully laid out in simple terms. Social skills that also facilitate students' abilities to explain material and how to effectively manage group work are explained. This chapter corresponds to Factors 1 and 3 – classroom management and personal teaching efficacy respectively, of the SEBM.

Chapter 7 –Exploring the theories of discipline with dignity: Richard Curwin and Allen Mendler. The purpose of this chapter is to teach the teacher to convey dignity, restore hope, and show the natural consequences when students engage in hostile and aggressive behaviors. The chapter emphasizes the need to combine these theories with other chapters to restore hope and dignity to students who have engaged in maladaptive behaviors. This chapter corresponds to Factors 1 and 2 – classroom management and external influences respectively, of the SEBM.

Chapter 8 – Exploring the theories of positive classroom management: Fredric Jones. The teacher needs to get students to increase cooperation among each other. The chapter emphasizes eye contact, physical proximity, body language, classroom rules and routines

to help proactively prevent misbehaviors and to react successfully when they do occur. This chapter corresponds to Factors 1 and 2 – classroom management and external influences respectively, of the SEBM.

Chapter 9 – Exploring the theories of inner discipline: Barbara Coloroso. Although Coloroso wrote mainly to educate parents in order to improve their parenting skills, her theory apply to teaching teachers to provide more effective teaching and learning in the classroom. Coloroso emphasizes natural consequences rather than punishment, modeling appropriate behaviors, conflict resolution, assertive confrontation, and advocating discipline. This chapter corresponds to Factors 1 and 2 – classroom management and external influences respectively, of the SEBM.

Chapter 10 – Exploring the theories of consistency management: Jerome Freiberg. This chapter focuses on consistency management – continuity within the classroom as well as within the entire school. The chapter emphaszes teaching students self-discipline, accepting leadership positions, preventing behavior problems, and increasing classroom organization to facilitate learning. This chapter corresponds to Factors 1, 2 and 3 – classroom management, reducing external influences and personal teaching efficacy of the SEBM.

Chapter 11 – Exploring the theories of judicious discipline: Gorrest Gathercoal. This chapter emphasizes the teacher's responsibility to create accountability in the classroom that also respects the rights of students. Teachers need to create an equitable learning environment that should also be modeled by the teacher. Moreover, teachers need to adapt their teaching styles and management expectations to students. Judicious discipline encourages a fair and democratic environment that empowers students to behave. This

chapter corresponds to Factors 1, 2, and 3 – classroom management, reducing external influences and personal teaching efficacy of the SEBM.

Chapter 12 – Introducing additional theorists: Albert: Evertson and Harris; Johnson and Johnson; Nelson, Lott, and Glenn; and Kohn. This chapter expounds on the contributions of contemporary classroom management theorists. The chapter discusses classroom management and instructional management that includes the need for students to take responsibility for their decisions and actions, along with instructing teachers to be proactive and plan their lesson plans carefully; sequence, pace, monitor and provide instructional feedback to students. This chapter corresponds to Factors 1 and 3 – classroom management, and personal teaching efficacy of the SEBM.

Chapter 13 – Creating safe classrooms and safe schools. This chapter expounds upon peer mediation, conflict resolution, and creating a safe classroom in this chapter. Teachers need to create a safe environment otherwise learning will be impacted. Teachers are encouraged to work with parents, the school and the community to create a productive climate in the classroom. This chapter corresponds to Factors 1, 2, and 3 – classroom management, reducing external influences and personal teaching efficacy of the SEBM.

The Exceptional Child Course Content

This course provided an overview of the exceptional child that included some of the major topics and perspectives pertaining to the exceptional child in and outside the school system. Students learned about the theories, diagnostic procedures, and teaching interventions to apply in the classroom for exceptional children. The course covered the history of special education including the laws and legislation along with the assessment

process involved in classifying students. In addition, the course expounded upon hearing impairment, vision impairment, communication disorders, autism, mental retardation, and classroom management interventions.

The professor assigned nine chapters of the course textbook, *Introduction to Special Education: Teaching in an Age of Challenge* (Smith, 2004), to students along with supplemental articles and information presented in lecture form. All of the course material that was assigned was covered in the course. The professor employed direct instruction along with an inquiry–exploration style guided by student interests or needs, cooperative groups, and role playing to facilitate learning and discussion (M. Malow-Iroff, personal communication, October 18, 2006).

The course requirements included (See Appendix I for course syllabus):

1) Class participation and attendance;

2) a self-disposition paper that included students' strengths and weaknesses in potentially working with exceptional children;

3) a group project presentation of a disorder that exceptional child may have that included general characteristics, etiology, developmental course, classroom intervention strategies and instructional adaptations that are pertinent to the category of exceptionality chosen;

4) twelve hours of field experience that included logging twelve hours of experiential activities, such as visiting and describing a self-contained special education class, ethnically diverse class, special education school, and working and interviewing a special needs student;

5) a midterm exam that consisted of short answer/essay format. The teacher provides

a short list of objectives in advance to help prepare students for the content of the exam; and

6) an IEP group project in which each student assumed a role of the IEP team in the development of an IEP based on a case study that was given to each group. A social history and IEP paperwork were filled out by each group.

Textbook Content for Exceptional Child Course

The textbook, Introduction to Special Education: Teaching in an Age of Challenge (Smith, 2004), provides information on the history of special education including the laws and legislation, the disorders of exceptional children, and assessment and intervention procedures.

Chapter 1 - The context of special education: A time of opportunity. This chapter includes the 13 categories of classification based on the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), expounds on the history of special education, and differentiates between the American Disabilities Act and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Chapter 2 - Individualized special educational programs: Planning and delivering services. This chapter describes the roles and responsibilities of special education and related service professionals who provide services to students with disabilities and their families along with the six fundamental principles integral to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. The chapter explains the least restrictive environment and the key components of the IEP.

Chapter 4 – Learning disabilities. The chapter discusses reading, writing, and mathematics disorders along with perceptual problems that students may experience. The

chapter also discusses etiology, course, assessment, and interventions along with assistive technology.

Chapter 5 - Speech or language impairments. This chapter defines the difference between speech and language along with giving specific examples of each. The chapter also discusses etiology, course, assessment, and interventions along with assistive technology.

Chapter 9 – Physical impairments and special health care needs. The chapter discusses seizure related disorders along with other physical impairments. Chapter 9 also discusses the etiology, course, assessment, and interventions along with assistive technology.

Chapter 10 – Deafness and hard of hearing. Chapter 10 discusses the major causes of hearing impairment along with the developmental outcome throughout the school years and into adulthood. The chapter also discusses assessment and interventions along with assistive technology.

Chapter 11 – Low vision and blindness. This chapter discusses the major causes of visual disabilities and measures that can be taken to prevent children from the disability along with technological advances that can help increase the students' academics. The chapter also presents information about employment opportunities and transitioning into adulthood.

Chapter 12 – Autism spectrum disorders. Chapter 12 presents the major symptoms and causes of autism along with asperger's disorder. The chapter elucidates assessment and intervention techniques along with specific curriculum possibilities teachers may employ.

Dependent Variables

This study used six dependent variables. Four of these variables are part of the SEBM (Emmer & Hickman, 1991). The first dependent variable, Classroom Management/Discipline (Factor 1), related to the teachers' self-perceived competence in the area of discipline and management. The second dependent variable, External Influences (Factor 2), consisted of items that reflect the view that influences that are beyond the teacher's control determine student outcomes. The third dependent variable, Personal Teaching Efficacy (Factor 3), consisted of items reflecting teachers' beliefs that they possess knowledge of appropriate teaching techniques in order to facilitate student learning. The fourth dependent variable, teacher efficacy in classroom management in general, was the total of the Factor scores. The fifth dependent variable was the course grade for each student. Finally, the sixth dependent variable was the behavior vignette scores.

Data Analysis

This study used a pretest-posttest control group design. For Hypotheses 1 – 4, repeated measures ANOVAs tested the pre-post difference scores for the dependent measures. For Hypothesis 5, I used a Spearman ranked correlation to correlate classroom management course grades with efficacy scores at posttest. For Hypothesis 6, an independent samples *t* test tested for differences in behavior vignette scores between students in the classroom management and exceptional child course. For Hypotheses 7 and 8, an independent *t* test analyzed pre-post difference scores for female and male students and child or childless in the classroom management course. For Hypotheses, 9 -

11, Pearson product moment correlations analyzed pre-post difference scores for experience in teaching and undergraduate and graduate G.P.A .

CHAPTER III

Results

This chapter presents the results of the data analyses. The chapter presents descriptive statistics for dependent variables and statistics examining pre-post changes in the experimental and control group. The chapter also presents results of the inferential analyses testing the hypotheses. This is followed by statistics relating participant descriptors to dependent variables to identify covariates.

Descriptive Statistics

Tables 4 through 12 present pretest and posttest means and standard deviations for the dependent measures for the classroom management and exceptional child classes. Hypothesis testing follows each table.

Hypothesis 1. Table 4 presents SEBM total pre-post means and standard deviations for each group. There are no norms for the SEBM; so it is not possible to interpret specific scores. Total scores can range from 35 - 210, with a midpoint score of 105. Table 4 shows that participants in both classes had pre and post average scores above the midpoint of possible scores. For the classroom management course, individual participants' scores ranged from 96 to 159 for pre scores and 124 to 161 for post scores. For the exceptional child course, individual participants' scores ranged from 105 to 163 for pre scores and 108 to 162 for post scores. As shown in Table 4, students in both the classroom management and exceptional child courses began their respective courses with similar overall average total scores on the SEBM, t (69) = .58, p = .89. The classroom management and exceptional child students also ended their respective courses with similar overall average SEBM scores, t (69) = .12, p = .11.

Table 4

Pre and Post Total Means and Standard Deviations of Overall SEBM Self-Efficacy for Participants in Classroom Management and Exceptional Child Classes

	Classroom Management			Exceptional Child		
Descriptor	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*N*	*M*	*SD*
Pretest	29	131.90	11.71	42	130.24	11.95
Posttest	29	135.03	9.26	42	134.71	10.04

To test hypothesis 1, I conducted a 2 x 2 repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) with course as the grouping variable and overall classroom management perceived self-efficacy scores over time as the repeated measure to investigate gain scores in teachers' perceived self-efficacy in classroom management. Although there was a significant effect in gains over time in overall classroom management efficacy scores for all participants, F (1, 69) = 8.48, $p < .01$ (gain for classroom management course = 3.14, and gain for exceptional child course = 4.48), with an effect size of .11, which is considered small (Cohen, 1992), there was no significant interaction of gains on overall classroom management scores depending on class, F (1, 69) = .262, $p > .05$, with an effect size of .01. Therefore, hypothesis 1 was not supported. Participants in the classroom management course did not statistically differ in gains on overall classroom management self-efficacy scores as compared with participants in the exceptional child course.

Hypothesis 2. As shown in Table 5, the classroom management and exceptional child students began and ended their respective courses with similar discipline factor scores, t (69) = .54, p = .22, for beginning score; t (69) = 2.36, p = .97, for ending score. Possible discipline self-efficacy scores can range from 18 to 108, with a midpoint of 54. Students began and ended their respective courses with scores falling above the midpoint on the discipline factor. For the classroom management course, individual participants' scores ranged from 40 to 90 at pre test and from 66 to 93 at posttest. For the exceptional child course, individual participants' scores ranged from 58 to 92 at pretest and from 64 to 88 at posttest.

Table 5

Pre and Post Mean Scores of Classroom Management/Discipline Factor Self-Efficacy for Participants in the Classroom Management and Exceptional Child Courses

	Classroom Management			Exceptional Child		
Descriptor	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*N*	*M*	*SD*
Pretest	29	72.66	10.08	42	71.52	7.65
Posttest	29	77.97	6.48	42	74.29	6.43

For hypothesis 2, I conducted another repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) with course as the grouping variable and classroom management/discipline factor over time as repeated measure to investigate gain scores in teachers' perceived self-efficacy in classroom management and discipline. Although there was a significant

effect in gains over time in the classroom management/discipline factor scores for participants in both classes, F (1, 69) = 22.44, $p < .001$ (gain for classroom management course = 5.31, and gain for exceptional child course = 2.77) with an effect size of .25, which is considered medium (Cohen, 1992), there was no significant interaction of gains on the classroom management/discipline factor depending on class, F (1, 69) = 2.24, $p >$ .05, with a very small effect size of .03. Therefore, hypothesis 2 was not supported. Participants in the classroom management course did not statistically differ in gains on discipline factor self-efficacy scores as compared with participants in the exceptional child course.

Hypothesis 3. As shown in Table 6, the classroom management and exceptional child students began and ended their courses with similar reducing external factor scores, t (69) = .36, p = .59, at the beginning; t (69) = -1.28, p = .44, at course end. Possible reducing external factor perceived self-efficacy scores can range from 15 to 90, with a midpoint of 45. Students in both classes had pre and post scores averaging near the midpoint. For the classroom management course, individual participants' scores ranged from 29 to 65 at pretest and from 33 to 63 at posttest. For the exceptional child course, individual participants' scores ranged from 33 to 68 at pretest and from 29 to 73 at posttest.

Table 6

Pre and Post Mean Scores of Reducing External Factor Self-Efficacy

	Classroom Management			Exceptional Child		
Descriptor	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*N*	*M*	*SD*
Pretest	29	48.31	8.16	42	45.57	7.49
Posttest	29	47.79	8.57	42	48.38	8.92

For hypothesis 3, I conducted a repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) with course as the grouping variable and external influences factor scores over time as repeated measure to investigate scores in teachers' perceived self-efficacy in reducing external influences. There was no significant effect in gains over time in reducing the external influences factor scores for all participants, F (1, 69) = .91, $p > .05$ (reduction for classroom management course = .52, and gain for exceptional child course = 2.81), with an effect size of .01, which is considered very small (Cohen, 1992). There was also no significant interaction of reduction on external influences factor scores depending on class, F (1, 69) = 3.44, $p < .07$, with an effect size of .05, which is considered very small (Cohen, 1992); however, there was a trend toward a decrease in the external influences factor for the classroom management course participants as compared to participants in the exceptional child course, whose scores on this factor actually increased at posttest. Nevertheless, even though a trend was apparent with a very small effect size, hypothesis 3 was not supported. Participants in the classroom management course did not

statistically differ in gains on reducing external influences factor self-efficacy scores as compared to participants in the exceptional child course.

Hypothesis 4. As shown in Table 7, the classroom management and exceptional child students began and ended their courses with similar personal teaching factor scores, t (69) = -.21, p = .08, at the beginning; t (69) = -1.74, p = .47, at course end. Possible personal teaching factor perceived self-efficacy scores can range from 10 to 60, with a midpoint of 30. For the classroom management course, individual participants' scores ranged from 34 to 48 at pretest and from 33 to 48 at posttest. For the exceptional child course, individual participants' scores ranged from 31 to 48 at pretest and from 29 to 50 at posttest.

Table 7

Pre and Post Mean Scores of Personal Teaching Factor Self-Efficacy for Participants in the Classroom Management and Exceptional Child Courses

	Classroom Management			Exceptional Child		
Descriptor	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*N*	*M*	*SD*
Pretest	29	39.59	3.19	42	39.79	4.31
Posttest	29	39.28	4.04	42	41.19	4.88

For hypothesis 4, I conducted another repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) with course as the grouping variable and personal teaching factor scores over time as repeated measure to investigate gain scores in teachers' perceived self-efficacy in

personal teaching. There was no significant effect in gains over time in personal teaching factor scores for participants in both courses, F (1, 69) = 1.14, $p > .05$ (reduction for classroom management course = .31, and gain for exceptional child course = 1.40), with an effect size of .02, which is considered very small (Cohen, 1992). There was no significant interaction of gains on personal teaching factor scores depending on class, F (1, 69) = 2.79, $p < .10$, with an effect size of .04, which is considered very small (Cohen, 1992); however, there was a trend toward an increase for the personal teaching factor for participants in the exceptional child course as compared to participants in the classroom management course. Nevertheless, even though a trend in the opposite direction of what was predicted was apparent with a very small effect size, hypothesis 4 was not supported. Participants in the classroom management course did not statistically differ in gains on personal teaching factor self-efficacy scores as compared to participants in the exceptional child course.

Hypothesis 5. Table 8 presents the course grades (4.00 = A; 3.66 = A-, and 3.33 = B+) for students in both classes and the percentages of students each class who received the grades. The majority of students in both classes received a grade of 4.0 (A).

Table 8

Course Grades for Both Classes

Classroom Management			Exceptional Child		
Grade	*n*	Percentage	Grade	*n*	Percentage
3.33	1	(3.45 %)	3.00	1	(2.38%)
3.66	7	(24.14%)	3.66	15	(35.71%)
4.00	21	(72.41%)	4.0	26	(61.90%)

The reported classroom management course grades ranged from 3.33 to 4.00 (M = 3.89, SD = .18). The reported exceptional child class course grades ranged from 3.00 to 4.00 (M = 3.85, SD = .21). The classrooms did not differ in reported course grades, t (69) = .83, p = .28.

For hypothesis 5, I calculated Pearson Product Moment correlations to evaluate the relationship between classroom management students' course grades and total efficacy scores at posttest. The results did not support hypotheses 5. There was virtually no relationship between students' grades in the classroom management course and posttest total SEBM efficacy scores, r (27) = .004, p = .49. In addition, there was also no significant relationship between course grades and posttest total efficacy scores for graduate Master's students enrolled in the graduate exceptional child course, r (40) = -.06, p = .40. Both correlations represent very small effects (Cohen, 1992)

Hypothesis 6. Table 9 presents the means and standard deviations for the two behavioral vignettes (Vs) that participants completed at the end of their respective courses. The scores represent the average of participants' scores from each class (CM and EC) for identifying the combined mean scores target and intervention scores for both vignettes (CBV). Vignette scores from participants in both courses fell in the low range of possible scores (range of possible scores is 0 to 50). For the target behaviors in vignette one, the scoring range was from 0 to 5 (M = 1.56, SD = 1.37; range of possible scores is 0 to 5). For the target behaviors in vignette two, the range was from 0 to 3 (M = 1.23, SD = .90; range of possible scores is 0 to 3). For the interventions in vignette one, the range was from 1 to 8 (M = 3.03, SD = 1.34; range of possible scores is 0 to 27). For the interventions in vignette two, the range was from 1 to 6 (M = 2.21, SD = 1.31; range of possible scores is 0 to 15). Thus, students in both courses combined were not very able to identify the target behaviors and arrive at appropriate interventions.

Table 9

Combined Behavior Vignettes Mean Scores for Participants in the Classroom Management and Exceptional Child Courses

	Classroom Management			Exceptional Child		
Descriptor	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*N*	*M*	*SD*
CBV	29	10.03	3.90	42	6.64	2.65

Note: CBV = Combined Behavior Vignettes

For hypothesis 6, I conducted an independent samples *t* test on the combined vignette scores for the two classroom groups. Classroom management students scored significantly higher than exceptional child students, $t\ (69) = 4.32$, $p < .01$; with an effect size of 1.04, which is considered large (Cohen, 1992). The results indicated support for the hypothesis that participants in the classroom management course would be better than participants in the exceptional child course at identifying the target behaviors and correct interventions on the behavior vignettes. Readers should note, however, that scores on the vignettes for both groups tended to be relatively low.

There was no significant relationship between total behavior vignette scores (see Table 9) and total efficacy scores at pretest (see Table 4) for participants in the classroom management course, but there was a significant relationship at posttest. The correlation was non-significant, $r\ (27) = .29$, $p = .13$, a large effect = .99 (Cohen, 1992), for beginning score, but was significant, $r\ (27) = .43$, $p = .02$, a large effect = .99, for ending score.

Hypothesis 7. Table 10 presents mean pre and post SEBM efficacy scores for male and female participants in both classes. Readers should note the small number of men in both classes.

Table 10

Pretest and Posttest Total SEBM Efficacy Scores for Participants in the Classroom Management and Exceptional Child Courses According to Gender

	Classroom Management			Exceptional Child		
Descriptor	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*N*	*M*	*SD*
Male						
Pretest	4	133.25	10.05	9	136.22	14.20
Posttest	4	137.50	11.56	9	139.56	17.16
Female						
Pretest	25	131.68	13.13	33	128.61	10.95
Posttest	25	134.64	9.06	33	133.39	10.19

To test hypothesis 7, I conducted a repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) with gender as the grouping variable and overall classroom management perceived self-efficacy scores over time as the repeated measure to investigate gain scores in teachers' perceived self-efficacy in classroom management in the classroom management course. There was no significant interaction of gains on overall classroom management scores depending on gender, F (1, 27) = .06, p > .81, with an effect size less than .01. Therefore, hypothesis 7 was not supported. Female participants did not statistically differ on pre and posttest total self-efficacy scores as compared with male participants in the classroom management course.

Hypothesis 8. Table 11 provides SEBM self-efficacy scores for participants in each class with and without children. Participants with children statistically differed on pretest total self-efficacy scores as compared with participants without children in the classroom management course, t (27) = -2.11, p = .04 with an effect size of -.81, which is considered large (Cohen, 1992). Also, participants with children statistically differed on pretest total self-efficacy scores as compared with participants without children in the exceptional child course, t (40) = -1.67, p = .10 with an effect size of -.53, which is considered medium (Cohen). Thus, participants with children entered their respected courses with better classroom management self-efficacy than did participants without children.

Table 11

Pretest and Posttest Total SEBM Efficacy Scores for Participants With and Without Children in Classroom Management and Exceptional Child Courses

	Classroom Management			Exceptional Child		
Descriptor	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*N*	*M*	*SD*
Child						
Pretest	7	139.57	12.19	12	135.00	13.52
Posttest	7	143.71	13.71	12	140.33	10.50
Childless						
Pretest	22	129.45	10.71	30	128.33	10.94
Posttest	22	132.27	5.24	30	132.47	12.04

To test hypothesis 8, I conducted a repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) with parenthood as the grouping variable and overall classroom management perceived self-efficacy scores over time as the repeated measure to investigate gain scores in teachers' perceived self-efficacy in the classroom management course. There was no significant interaction of gains on overall classroom management scores depending on parenthood, F (1, 27) = .76, p > .05, with an effect size of less than .01. Therefore, hypothesis 8 was not supported. Participants with and without children in the classroom management course did not statistically differ according to pre-post gains in overall classroom management self-perceived efficacy scores.

Hypothesis 9. For hypothesis 9, I used Pearson product moment correlations to investigate the relationship between teaching experience (see Table 1) and teacher efficacious beliefs (see Table 4) for graduate Master's students enrolled in the graduate classroom management course. The correlation was non-significant, r (27) = .34, p = .07, a medium effect (Cohen, 1992), for beginning score, but was significant, r (27) = .47, p = .01, almost a large effect, for ending score. Therefore, hypothesis 9 was partially supported. Teaching experience was positively and significantly related to posttest total, but not pretest total, classroom management self--efficacy for students in the classroom management course. There were no significant teaching experience-total self-efficacy relationships for students in the exceptional child class at either pre, r (40) = -.041, p = .81, or posttest, r (40) = -.192, p = .25.

Hypothesis 10. For hypothesis 10, I conducted Pearson product moment correlations to investigate the relationship between both pretest and posttest SEBM scores (see Table 4) and undergraduate grade-point-averages (GPA's) of students in the graduate classroom

management course (see Table 2). There was no significant relationship between total efficacy scores and undergraduate GPA, r (27) = .26, p = .17, almost a medium effect size, for beginning score (pretest); r (27) = .09, p = .65, a small effect size, for ending (posttest) score. Thus, hypothesis 10 was not supported. There were no significant correlations between undergraduate GPA (see Table 2) and SEBM scores (see Table 4) of graduate Master's students enrolled in the graduate exceptional child course, r (40) = -.02, p = .91 for beginning (pretest) score, a very small effect size; r (40) = .22, p = .17, between a medium and a small effect size, for end score (posttest).

Hypothesis 11. For hypothesis 11, I conducted Pearson product moment correlations to investigate if the graduate G.P.A.s of graduate Master's students enrolled in the graduate classroom management course (see Table 2) would be positively correlated with teacher efficacious beliefs as measured by both pre and posttest SEBM scores (see Table 4). There was no significant relationship between graduate G. P. A., r = -.28, p = .17, almost a medium effect size, for beginning (pretest) score; r = -.22, p = .30, between a small and a medium effect size, for ending (posttest) score. Therefore, hypothesis 11 was not supported. There was also no significant relationship between graduate grade-point-averages (see Table 2) and total SEBM efficacy scores (see Table 4) for participants in the exceptional child course, r = -.01, p = .98, a very small effect size, for beginning (pretest) score; r = .26, p = .26, close to a medium effect, for ending (posttest) score.

Summary. Thus, of the 11 hypotheses, only 1 (hypothesis number 6) received support. At the conclusion of their coursework, students in the classroom management course were significantly better at identifying target behaviors and interventions for the behavioral vignettes than were students in the exceptional child course. Another

hypothesis (hypothesis 9) received partial support as teaching experience for classroom management students related positively to classroom management self-efficacy scores at post but not at pretest. The remaining 9 of the 11 hypotheses received no support.

CHAPTER IV

Discussion

This chapter discusses the results of the study. It also presents the implications for programs of education for teachers, along with staff development ideas for school psychologists in the school system. This chapter also discusses the limitations of the present study and makes suggestions for future research.

Discussion of Results

Teacher self-efficacy. There were no statistically significant differences between the participants in the classroom management course in gains on overall classroom management self-efficacy and discipline/classroom management factor scores as compared with participants in the exceptional child course, although there was a small effect in gains over time on overall classroom management self-efficacy and a medium effect in the discipline/classroom management factor for both classes. Therefore, although results of this study did not support hypotheses 1 and 2, both classes showed statistically significant increases in efficacy scores. No published studies have examined the effects of college courses on teacher efficacy, but in this study, both courses may have increased participants' overall classroom management self-efficacy and specifically increased their self-perceived discipline beliefs due to the course content.

The reason why I think there was no difference in SEBM scores between students in the separate courses is because although the content of the exceptional child course did not directly deal with managing the classroom, such as in the classroom management course, the exceptional child participants learned about children with specific disabilities (i.e., such as ADHD, learning disabilities, oppositional defiant disorder, and conduct

disorder) whom they encounter or will encounter in the classroom. The exceptional child curriculum instructs students in identifying, assessing, and providing appropriate interventions for students with disabilities in the classroom. Therefore, it is possible that this instruction may have increased students' comprehension and intervention strategies for dealing with children who have assorted disabilities that can potentially disrupt the classroom. Thus, students in the exceptional child course obtained increased self-efficacy scores similar to efficacy scores of students in the classroom management course.

Self-perceived efficacy scores in reducing external influences, such as those in the home environment and personal teaching ability did not increase for students in either course. Apparently, students perceive their capabilities increased primarily in dealing with discipline problems and not with their ability to reach students who are having trouble academically or are very influenced by their home environment.

I believe that based on the content of both courses, the graduate students may feel more qualified and capable of dealing with disruptive behaviors, but are still lacking knowledge on how to improve academic skills or reduce external influences from the home that neither course discussed in depth. The classroom management coursework (see Appendix H) and textbook (Manning et al., 2007) do not directly address academic problems or reducing external home influences except by addressing the physical and emotional environment in the classroom by providing structure, rules, procedures, and routines along with implementing reinforcement and punishment in an effective manner to create an environment that would facilitate learning. In other words, much of the classroom management coursework directly deals with preventing or dealing with disruptive behaviors so that a teacher would enable productive learning to take place, but

not specifically addressing academic difficulties or how to decrease home environmental influences.

After perusing the exceptional child textbook (Smith, 2004) along with looking at the course content (see Appendix I), one can see that even a chapter on learning disabilities barely addresses concrete and specific steps on how to improve academic functioning. Much of the content material is basically an overview of learning disabilities and does not discuss in depth on how to create a curriculum or provide specific interventions to address poor phonological awareness, or visual-perceptual problems that accompany specific learning disabilities. Therefore, students' self-perceived efficacy in handling specific and serious academic difficulties was not improved by either course. Although the exceptional child textbook (Smith, 2004) does discuss the effects of a child having a disability on the home environment, once again, it provided general ideas such as understanding cultural norms, assumptions, standards and interpretations instead of very specific strategies to overcome home environmental influences that negatively affect the classroom.

Demographic variables and teacher self-efficacy. There was virtually no relationship between students' course grades in both the classroom management and the exceptional child courses and their total efficacy scores. This was due to such a restricted range of grades. The majority of students in both classes received a grade of 4.0 (A). In order to see if course grades can act as an externally valid indicator of students' self-perceived efficacy in classroom management, there has to be a less restricted range of course grades provided by the professors. In other words, based on the course professors'

grades, the majority of the students mastered the material and therefore, grades gave no indication of differences among students.

A previous study indicated that female teachers have higher teacher efficacy than male teachers (Ross et al., 1996). This study's results did not agree with their results; there was no statistical significant difference between genders with regard to teacher efficacy. It is important to point out that this study only had a small sample of male teachers and possibly if there had been a larger sample of males participating in the study, there could have been a gender difference.

Previous research also shows a positive correlation between teacher age and teacher self-efficacy (Cambell, 1996) that this dissertation did not find. Previous research also shows a positive correlation between years of teaching experience and self-efficacy (Cambell, 1996; Ross et al., 1996). This study's results partially support such a relationship. However, only participants in the classroom management course who had greater teaching experience at posttest had a significant relationship between total self-efficacy scores and teaching experience. Perhaps there is a connection between teaching experience and classroom management course content. This would mean that students who have prior experience teaching in a classroom would benefit most from a course in classroom management by increasing their self-perceived teacher efficacy. Possibly, this could be due to better awareness of the pitfalls of teaching due to previous experience in the classroom. Therefore, when graduate students who have teaching experience are currently taking a course in classroom management, they may be contemplating specific cases in which they had teaching difficulties in the past and actively learning to provide future interventions that work.

Behavior vignettes. As predicted, the participants in the classroom management course did significantly better on identifying the target behaviors and correct interventions on the behavior vignettes than the participants in the exceptional child course. However, students in the classroom management course had scores for correctly identifying target behaviors that were only in the low-middle range of possible scores. Thus, while students in the classroom management course were better at identifying target behaviors than the exceptional child students, they still had some difficulties in doing so. Therefore, it seems that the course content of the classroom management course did not result in students' learning how to correctly identifying target behaviors that are in need of change.

In addition, even though the classroom management course students did statistically significantly better than the exceptional child students in identifying appropriate interventions on both behavior vignettes, the classroom management students scores fell in the low range of possible scores. Thus, they apparently were not able to identify multiple interventions to deal with problematic behaviors or, much of the time, even identify interventions for the specific target behaviors. This, of course, could be due to a lack of motivation by the students in answering the behavior vignettes; however, since they had difficulties in identifying the target behaviors, it is more likely that they only had a limited amount of knowledge in identifying and applying appropriate interventions for maladaptive behaviors that indicates a very limited repertoire of knowledge and application. These results indicate that the classroom management class in this study may be in need of revision to provide students with better skills to identify and address target behaviors.

Based on a perusal of the course content (see Appendix H) and the textbook (Manning et al., 2007), the course did not seem to cover enough behavioral terminology and principles covered to adequately train teachers to become more adept at assessing and providing appropriate interventions to target behaviors. The textbook and course content exposed students to assorted techniques and methodologies to implement classroom management, which may have left an inadequate amount of time to educate students on applying such important concepts as a functional behavioral assessment through a behavior modification plan assignment, behavioral vignettes, or role playing. This lack of time for practice would not have given students adequate experience in applying the behavioral concepts, such as in assessing target behaviors.

There was also a significant positive relationship for participants in the classroom management course who scored higher on identifying the target behaviors and correct interventions on the behavior vignettes and total self-efficacy scores at posttest. This indicates that students in the classroom management course who had higher self-efficacy scores in classroom management at the end of the course performed better on answering behavior vignettes than students with lower self-efficacy scores in classroom management that is in congruence with self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1997). Efficacy beliefs influence the individual's cognition and affect to mobilize the necessary psychological resources to accomplish a specific task. More specifically, self-efficacy beliefs influence goal setting and the strategies for attaining these goals by influencing motivation in the face of obstacles (Bandura, 1997; Zimmerman, 1995). Therefore, because there was only a significant correlation between total self-efficacy scores in classroom management at the end of the course, but not at the beginning, perhaps the

classroom management course content affected the classroom management students with higher self-perceived efficacy scores in classroom management to perform better in answering behavior vignettes than students with lower self-perceived efficacy scores in classroom management.

Study Implications for School Psychologists

Although most of the hypotheses were not supported, the results of the study have important implications for the practice of school psychology and graduate educational programs for teachers. The results of the behavior vignettes indicate that, while they demonstrated better proficiency than students in the exceptional child course, the students in this classroom management course needed better skills in correctly identifying the triggers, targeting behaviors, and implementing appropriate interventions for disruptive behaviors in the classroom setting.

A study by Burke et al. (2003) illustrates the importance of correctly applying a functional behavior assessment that is involved in identifying and reducing disruptive behaviors. The study demonstrated through a single-subject design using a male student with learning disabilities that reading instruction correlated highly with his maladaptive behaviors (singing out loud, arguing with teachers, and not completing classwork). Based on the FBA that helped the teacher to target specific behaviors, an intervention that involved teaching him vocabulary terms prior to reading class resulted in an increase to 99% on-task behavior as compared with a control condition in which he received no prior vocabulary instruction and demonstrated only 38% on-task behavior.

Moreover, even when classroom management students identified an appropriate intervention correctly, they generated a limited repertoire of intervention responses,

indicating a restricted range of knowledge of appropriate interventions. In a classroom setting, teachers need an arsenal of appropriate interventions to implement especially when a chosen intervention did not produce the desired results (Shukla-Mehta et al., 2003). Limited knowledge of possible interventions could increase the risk that teachers will dogmatically apply a few behavioral interventions that may not decrease maladaptive behaviors in the classroom, and leave teachers with increased frustration. In addition, this increased frustration may also potentially increase the likelihood that teachers will fall back on punishing techniques because of their limited ability to generate alternative interventions (Nelson & Roberts, 2000). Research reminds us that although punishment may be the most widely used response to maladaptive behaviors in the classroom, it tends to be ineffective (Nelson & Roberts, 2000).

Positive behavior support is a program that emphasizes proactive rather than reactive measures for addressing disruptive behaviors in the school system (Sugai et al., 2002). The assumption of this program is that many teachers can avoid maladaptive student behaviors if they implement effective rules and procedures on a school-wide basis. Nelson's et al. (1998) study demonstrates the importance of systematically designed, taught, and reinforced rules for effective disciplinary policies and procedures. The study, using a comprehensive school-wide classroom management intervention program through the implementation of a positive behavior support system, identified specific rules that were relevant for common areas in the school for 594 first, third, fifth, and sixth graders. Upon school personnel teaching the rules and routines along with supervising students and providing corrective feedback, praise, and periodic rewards for the correct implementation, formal office disciplinary referrals decreased by over 55% during the

course of four years compared to the baseline data. Suspensions also decreased dramatically by over 50%. This clearly indicates that schools do not necessarily need to only address problematic behaviors on the individual level, but can employ school-wide programs to effectively reduce maladaptive behaviors.

For this to work, teachers need to have the required skills to effectively implement rules and procedures in order to reduce disruptive behaviors. School psychologists can be an important part of this process through consultation with teachers when dealing with problematic behaviors, but more importantly, through staff training. School psychologists can provide educational knowledge and application on the use of empirically-validated practices in the classroom and change the systems in the school at large.

Reinke, Lewis-Palmer, and Merrell (2008) conducted a study that illustrates the effectiveness of a school psychologist employing a classwide consultation model to increase student adaptive behaviors and reduce maladaptive behaviors in the classroom. Four White female general education elementary teachers participated in the study and they had varied teaching experience ranging from 4 to 25 years. The researchers created the Classroom Check-Up (CCU, one of the two independent variables) as a classwide consultation model that includes multiple steps: 1) the consultant assesses classroom via classroom observations, and teacher interview; 2) the consultant provides feedback including strengths and weaknesses of the teacher's handling of problematic behaviors; 3) the teacher and consultant collaboratively brainstorm to create an appropriate intervention; 4) the teacher chooses and implements one of the many interventions discussed, while the consultant provides ongoing consultation during the implementation

of the intervention; and 5) the teacher self-monitors treatment integrity via an intervention procedural checklist.

Visual performance feedback (the second independent variable) greatly increased teacher implementation of an intervention in the classroom, such as behavior-specific praise, even though the visual performance feedback was given to the teacher when applying overall praise to students and not behavior-specific praise. Reinke et al. (2008) used a single-subject, multiple baseline design across classrooms to assess the effectiveness of the CCU and visual performance feedback. The researchers contend that consultation prior to the visual performance feedback in the classroom must have contributed to this success. First, the consultant would explain the empirical evidence via research on the effectiveness of behavior-specific praise in decreasing problematic behaviors in the classroom, and then, the consultant would give performance feedback to the teacher during implementation of the intervention in the classroom. In all four classrooms, a dramatic increase in behavior-specific praise occurred (effect sizes ranged from + 1.53 to +3.83, which are large effect sizes) along with a reduction in disruptive behaviors (e.g., talking out, hitting, or noisy distractions; effect sizes ranged from -.30 to -2.40, which are small to large effect sizes).

Also, using effective assessment instruments that increase proactive, rather than just reactive processes, along with data-based decision making will have a positive impact on the school environment (Alberto & Troutman, 2001). Bohanon et al.'s (2006) urban high school study provides a good example illustrating a PBS approach for schoolwide adherence to rules, procedures, and routines that has positive ramifications for the diverse systems in the school. They measured the effectiveness of implementation of the PBS

using the School-wide Evaluation Tool (SET), Effective Behavior Support Survey, Student Climate Survey, office disciplinary referrals, qualitative interviews, and observations. Over a three-year period that included training staff in the implementation and effectiveness of the PBS approach, the researchers found a 20% reduction in referrals for behavioral problems that violated the rules and regulations of the school.

Study Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

The current study has its limitations and readers should interpret the data with an awareness of these limitations. First, this study consisted of a sample of convenience and since it was quasi-experimental in nature, there was no random assignment of participants to the classroom management or exceptional child courses. Therefore, there is always the possibility that there were differences between the experimental and control group that were not accounted for in the study. Moreover, the exceptional child students were at an earlier stage in the education program than the classroom management students, thus casting a confounding effect on differences between the two groups that did not have to do with the experimental condition of the classroom management course content. In addition, due to the exceptional child course being offered in the first semester of the program, there was no ability to get current graduate point averages to be used as a moderator variable of self-perceived efficacy scores.

A second limitation of this study had to do with the small number of male participants and participants in general. It is possible that having a larger group of male students participating in the study would have uncovered gender differences that were not evident in the current sample. A larger number of participants, particularly in the classroom management course, could have resulted in more significant results between

classes. Larger samples that include several classes taught by several different instructors would also aid the generalizability of results.

A third limitation of this study had to do with a dearth of information on the psychometric properties of the SEBM survey. Although this is the only published survey on self-perceived efficacy beliefs specifically for classroom management, and not just teacher efficacy in general, there needs to be more published material focusing on its validity. In other words, more studies need to evaluate the survey's purported construct of teacher efficacy in classroom management. Also, researchers need to obtain norms for the SEBM so that one may interpret the scores relative to a large, representative, national sample of teachers.

A fourth limitation of this study has to do with the restricted range of grades assigned by the professors of the classroom management and exceptional child courses. The grades assigned to the graduate students were so similar that they did not act as an external validity measure of the reported students' self-perceived efficacy scores. Since graduate school grades are usually A's and B's, future researchers should use other indicators to validate classroom management efficacy measures. One possible solution would be to observe some of the graduate students in their teaching setting throughout the semester while taking their graduate coursework in order to externally validate their self-perceived efficacy scores in classroom management.

A fifth limitation of this study had to do with another external validity measure of the students' self-perceived efficacy scores in classroom management, namely, the behavior vignettes that I created. The behavior vignettes presented as a way of externally validating the students' self-reported efficacy scores by measuring their knowledge and

application ability in solving analog classroom management problems that would likely occur in a classroom setting. One could argue that since they are not *in vivo* demonstrations of real classroom management problems, it is possible that the graduate students would act differently in a real classroom setting. It certainly is not inconceivable that with the multi-tasking requirements of teaching in a live classroom, teachers may fail to properly assess the needs of the educational setting and apply the appropriate interventions. Thus, future researchers should obtain classroom behavioral observations of teacher identification of target behaviors and use of appropriate interventions.

I also caution readers that this study used only two classes and the results may not be generalizable to other classes with the same course titles. Instructors include and emphasize in their courses information that they believe students should know. This information may vary across instructors of the same course. So, this study's results may not be typical of those that I might have found had I used different classroom management and exceptional child courses. Thus, I again encourage larger samples of several courses.

The current findings suggest future research. In addition to the above suggestions, another important study would be for a researcher to create a standardized, empirically-validated measure of behavior of teachers that could be used as a means to evaluate their classroom management effectiveness. Currently, there is no standardized instrument in the field that could be used to externally validate the self-reported efficacy scores of teachers in classroom management. Moreover, this would also evaluate the predictive validity of the SEBM as an accurate measure of teacher performance in the classroom.

Behavior vignettes' test construction. Specific steps are needed in test construction that is based on providing evidence for construct validity (Anastasia & Urbina, 1997). Construct, refers to "broad categories, derived from the common features shared by directly observable behavioral variables" (Anastasia & Urbina, 1997, p. 114). Since construct validity identifies what the test measures, it is considered an all-inclusive validity concept and is vital when constructing an instrument (Anastasia & Urbina, 1997). Evidence is gathered to support the validity of the construct. For example, the construct of classroom management includes shared observable behaviors that are based on a theoretical framework. Emmer and Hickman (1991) created the Teacher Self-efficacy in Behavior Management and Discipline Scale [SEBM] by analyzing current conceptualizations in the research that examined important skills and capabilities and applied teacher efficacy specifically to the domain of classroom management. Emmer and Hickman (1991) found support for construct validity of the three subscales: Classroom Management/Discipline, External Influences and Personal Teaching Efficacy subscales, through factor analysis of intercorrelation of items. Behavior vignettes should be created based on these same classroom management theoretical underpinnings as the SEBM. Content, predictive, and concurrent validation procedures contribute in defining and validating the construct (Anastasia & Urbina, 1997).

Once a researcher has a theoretical framework for test construction, the next step would be to create test items that would reflect content derived from the theory (Okamoto, 2001). Specifically with regard to behavior vignettes, the assorted scenarios would include items that would be assessing students' abilities to promote classroom discipline, reduce external influences and increase learning in the classroom. However,

writing test items can be quite difficult and DeVellis (1991) provided guidelines for test constructors: (a) construct specific items that are supported by the theoretical framework that clearly defines what you want to measure, (b) generate a large item pool, but be careful in creating redundant items, (c) avoid items that are wordy and sentences that are long, (d) systematically think about and adapt the reading difficulty level to the designated participants, (e) avoid items that contain two or more ideas in the same statement, such as "I vote Democratic because I support social welfare programs," and, (f) the test constructor should mix positively and negatively worded items to make sure that the reader is not just acquiescing to the response set. Another important point in test construction is the need to be sensitive to gender, ethnic and cultural differences in the wording of the test items (Kaplan & Saccuzzo, 2005). For example, test constructors should refrain from using test items that could favor one gender over another, such as using sports analogies.

The next step in test construction is item refinement (Anastasia & Urbina, 1997). Test constructors who choose appropriate items are demonstrating strong content validity. Content validity means generating items that measure the particular construct (Gliner & Morgan, 2000). A test that has high content validity would be a test that covers a good representative sample of the behaviors that are measured (Anastasia & Urbina, 1997). This can be an arduous task because high content validity includes the systematic analysis of the content material to make sure that the test items include all areas of content and in the correct proportion. With regard to good test construction of behavior vignettes, the test constructor needs to thoroughly and systematically examine the classroom management course syllabus, textbook, and other materials. In addition,

consultation with experts is needed in the classroom management field in helping to identify content areas that were not adequately covered in the creation of test items (Anastasia & Urbina, 1997).

The test constructor should have participants assess the test item target behaviors and interventions for clarity through a pilot study that will help in item refinement and the final selection process of test items (Okamoto, 2001). With regard to the behavior vignettes, participants should be asked to comment on the clarity of instructions and test items, including grammar, sentence structure, vocabulary difficulty, relevance to the coursework, and applicability to the three classroom management subdomains. The test constructor should request the participants to sort items from the behavior vignettes into the three classroom management subdomains. Potential interventions posited by the test constructor that are missing from the behavior vignettes or items that are repeatedly sorted incorrectly or problematic in clarity should be revised or eliminated.

Appendix A

Oral Script

I wish to thank the professor of the course for allowing me to investigate my dissertation topic during class time. My name is Michael Benhar and I am a doctoral student in the Educational Psychology department at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York. I am asking you to participate in this study that will aid my dissertation research by assessing your beliefs about your abilities in classroom management, such as, how good you are at general classroom management, discipline, reducing external factors, such as home environment, and confidence in personal teaching. This dissertation research study will also hopefully benefit the education research literature by clarifying the importance of having a graduate course in classroom management in helping to prepare teachers. I am asking you to fill out a form that means you agree to participate in this study, along with some demographic questions and a survey after class. At the end of the semester, I will return and ask you to fill out the survey again along with answering some behavioral vignettes that assesses your knowledge of applying classroom management techniques to hypothetical situations after class. The demographic questionnaire should take approximately 5 minutes to fill out. The survey should take approximately 10 minutes to fill out and the behavior vignettes, approximately 20-30 minutes. This study is completely voluntary and if you choose to participate, you may stop participating in this research project at any time. Students will not have their grades in the classroom management course or performance affected by their decision to participate or not. I thank you for your time and consideration and I hope that you will take the time to participate in my research study. Are there any questions?

Appendix B

Ph.D. Program in Educational Psychology

The Graduate School and University Center
The City University of New York
365 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10016-4309
TEL 212.817.8285 FAX 212.817.1516

INFORMED CONSENT

My name is Michael Benhar and I am a student in the Educational Psychology Ph.D. Program at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York (CUNY), and Principal Investigator of this project, entitled "Teacher efficacy in classroom management." I am asking you to participate in a study that will aid my dissertation research by assessing your beliefs about your abilities in classroom management.

Explanation of Procedures:

At the beginning and end of the semester I am asking you to answer a survey, consisting of questions relevant to your self-perceived abilities in classroom management (i.e., general classroom management, discipline, reducing external factors, such as home environment, confidence in personal teaching). The survey should take approximately 10 minutes. In addition, I am asking you to answer some demographic questions that should take approximately 5 minutes. At the end of the semester I am asking you to answer the same survey again and some behavior vignettes that would assess your knowledge and application of classroom management. The behavior vignettes should take approximately 20-30 minutes. There will be approximately 65 participants taking part in this study.

Potential Discomfort and Risks:

I do not foresee any potential harm to the students except for the slight possibility of feelings of embarrassment or worry about your classroom management capabilities.

Potential Benefits:

A benefit that may arise from this study is greater awareness, knowledge and motivation to improve classroom management abilities.

Confidentiality:

All data will be kept at my home and only my dissertation advisor and I will have access to it. Individual students' responses will **not** be shared with the professor of the course you are taking. The data coding system will consist of you generating a 6-8 digit number (not the date or social security number). You will place the number at the top of the survey and will be asked to keep the number to be used again at the end of the

semester. I will also keep the self-generated student number in case you forget it and will give you your self-generated number on a separate piece of paper at the end of the semester. The purpose of the data coding system is to see if the scores of the specific students change from the beginning of the semester to the end of the semester. This is why it will be necessary for me to keep track of each student's responses, and therefore, requires identifiers.

Upon completion of the study, the collected forms will be destroyed and any links to identifying the students will be eliminated. I may publish results of the study, but names of people, or any identifying characteristics, will not be used in any of the publications. If you would like a copy of the study, please provide me with your address and I will send you a copy in the future.

Withdrawal from the Project:

Your participation in this research project is completely voluntary. You may decide to stop participating in this project at any time. You are free to leave at any time.

Who to Call if you have any Questions:

If you have any questions about this research, you can contact me at (631) 000-4496 or profbenhar@optonline.net, or my advisor Dr. Georgiana Tryon at (212) 817-8293 or Gtryon@gc.cuny.edu. If you have questions about your rights as a participant in this study, you can contact Kay Powell, IRB Administrator, The Graduate Center/City University of New York, (212) 817-7525, kpowell@gc.cuny.edu.

What Signing this Form Means:

By signing this consent form, you agree to participate in this research project. The purpose, procedures to be used, as well as, the potential risks and benefits of your participation have been explained to you in detail. You can refuse to participate or withdraw from this research project at anytime. Students will not have their grades or performance in the classroom management affected by their decision to participate or not. Thank you for your participation in the study. I will give you a copy of this form to take with you.

_____
Printed Name of Participant

_____ _____
Participant Signature Today's Date

_____

Printed Name of Research/Study Investigator

_____ _____

Signature of Research/Study Investigator Today's Date

Appendix C

Last four numbers of social security number: _____

Gender: Male Female

Age: _____

Ethnicity: White African-American/Black Hispanic/Latino(a) Asian
Other: _____

Number of years teaching: _____
(If you are a substitute teacher or paraprofessional, please indicate)

If you answered yes to the previous question, in which county or city do you work at?
_____

If you teach, what subjects do you teach? _____

What grade do you teach or work as a paraprofessional or substitute teacher? _____

Have you ever had a classroom management course before (undergraduate or graduate; please indicate)? _____

What year are you in the special education program? _____

Do you have children, and if so, how many? _____

Socioeconomic Status: under 15,000 15,000-25,000 25,000-35,000 35,000-45,000
45,000-55,000 above 55,000

Graduate GPA: _____

Undergraduate GPA: _____

Appendix D

1 2 3 4 5 6

strongly disagree disagree mildly disagree mildly agree agree strongly agree

_____1. When a student does better than usual, many times it is because I exerted a little extra effort.
_____2. If a student in my class becomes disruptive and noisy, I feel assured that I know some techniques to redirect him quickly.
_____3. The hours in my class have little influence on students compared to the influence of their home environment.
_____4. I find it easy to make my expectations clear to students.
_____5. I know what routines are needed to keep activities running efficiently.
_____6. There are some students who won't behave no matter what I do.
_____7. I can communicate to students that I am serious about getting appropriate behavior.
_____8. If one of my students couldn't do an assignment I would be able to accurately assess whether it was at the correct level of difficulty.
_____9. I know what kinds of rewards to use to keep students involved.
_____10. If students aren't disciplined at home, then they aren't likely to accept it at school.
_____11. There are very few students that I don't know how to handle.
_____12. If a student doesn't feel like behaving, there's not a lot teachers can do.
_____13. When a student is having trouble with an assignment, I am usually able to adjust it to his/her level.
_____14. Student behavior in classrooms is influenced more by peers than the teacher.
_____15. When a student gets a better grade than usual, it is probably because I found better ways of teaching that student.
_____16. I don't always know how to keep track of several activities at once.
_____17. When I really try, I can get through to most difficult students.
_____18. I am unsure how to respond to defiant students.
_____19. A teacher is very limited in what can be achieved because a student's home environment is a large influence on achievement.
_____20. I find some students to be impossible to discipline effectively.
_____21. When the grades of my students improve, it is usually because I found more effective teaching approaches.
_____22. Sometimes I am not sure what rules are appropriate for my students.
_____23. If a student masters a new concept quickly this might be because I knew the necessary steps in teaching the concept.
_____24. The amount that a student can learn is primarily related to family background.
_____25. I can keep a few problem students from ruining an entire class.

_____26. If parents would do more with their children at home. I could do more with them in the classroom.
_____27. If students stop working in class, I can usually find a way to get them back on track.
_____28. If a student did not remember information I gave in a previous lesson, I would know how to increase his/her retention in the next lesson.
_____29. Home and peer influences are mainly responsible for student behavior.
_____30. Teachers have little effect on stopping misbehavior when parents don't cooperate.
_____31. The influence of a student's home experiences can be overcome by good teaching.
_____32. Even a teacher with good teaching abilities may not reach many students.
_____33. Compared to other influences on student behavior, teacher's effects are very small.
_____34. I am confident of my ability to begin the year so that students will learn to behave well.
_____35. I have very effective classroom management skills.

Appendix E

1) Mr. Oliver is concerned about several students arriving always late to class, while other students frequently forget their books, paper, pencils, or assignments. During content presentations, students call out answers, leave their seats to sharpen their pencils, and often talk or write notes. What interventions could you implement to reduce these disruptive behaviors?

2) Mr. Miller feels that too much time is wasted in his ninth-grade class while students get settled after class changes, get supplies ready, or move from one activity to another. While the teacher deals with students' problems, make-up work, or questions at the beginning of class, students talk and begin to play around. It then takes some time to get their attention and get class started. Also, when activities change during the class period, students sometimes delay activities while they sharpen pencils or borrow and argue over supplies that sometimes lead to yelling at each other. What can Mr. Miller do to cut down on wasted time and curb classroom arguing?

Appendix F

Behavior Vignettes Rubric

Question # 1

Behaviors	Potential Solutions	Chapters in text	Classroom Management Factor
late to class	rules, routines, prompting, consequences, contracting	2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15	1, 2
forgetting materials	making lists, rules, routines, prompting, consequences, self-monitoring	2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15	1, 2
calling out answers	prompting, consequences, differential reinforcement, extinction, teacher and student modeling, contracting	2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15	1
leaving seat	prompting, consequences, differential reinforcement, extinction, teacher and student modeling, contracting	2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15	1
off-task behaviors	prompting, consequences, self-monitoring	2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15	1, 3

Question # 2

Behaviors	Potential Solutions	Chapters in text	Classroom Management Factor
off-task behaviors	prompting, consequences, self-monitoring	2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15	1, 3
transition	rules, routines, prompting, self-monitoring, consequences	2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15	1
oppositional	Prompting, consequences, self-monitoring, modeling, role-playing, peer mediation, conflict resolution	2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15	1, 3

The scoring procedure for the behavior vignettes are based on the following criteria:

1) Composite score for identifying target behaviors – students received 1 point for each target behavior that is identified.
2) Composite score for identifying and explaining solutions – students received 1 point for each solution that is identified and explained that potentially solves the target behavior.
3) Full-scale composite score that combines composite scores 1 and 2.

Appendix G

December 3, 2006

To the IRB committee:

I hereby give permission for Michael Benhar to conduct research in the Special Education Department for my classroom management course and for Dr. Mikki-Malow Iroff's exceptional child course at Manhattanville college for 2007.

Sincerely,

Dr. Andy Dowling

Appendix H

EDU 5130
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION

Dr. Andrew Dowling dowlinga@mville.edu Wed 4 : 20 - 6 : 50
914-323-5460 Office hours: T & W 1-4
Reid 406

COURSE DESCRIPTION

The focus of this course is a theoretical and practical approach to classroom management, organization, and discipline. It includes an analysis of the way these issues relate to the nature of learning and classroom interactions. Methods and techniques of effective teaching will be addressed, including organizing the classroom environment to include different learning styles, multilevel instruction, managing cooperative learning groups, preventive, supportive and corrective discipline, behavior modification, self-management techniques, and assessment.

REQUIRED TEXT

Manning & Bucher. CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT: Models, Application, and Cases, 2003, Upper Saddle River: Merrill Prentice Hall.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

When you have completed this course you will have a better understanding of:

1. The need for classroom management (CEC Standard 7)
2. Classroom management theories. (CEC Standard 5)
3. The foundation for classroom management. (CEC Standard 7)
4. The theories of assertive discipline. (CEC Standard 5)
5. The theories of democratic teaching. (CEC Standard 6)
6. The theories of congruent communication. (CEC Standard 7)
7. The theories of instructional management. (CEC Standard 7)
8. The theories of discipline with dignity. (CEC Standard 7)
9. The theories of positive classroom management. (CEC Standard 5)
10. The theories of inner discipline. (CEC Standard 4)
11. The theories of consistency management. (CEC Standard &)
12. The theories of judicious discipline. (CEC Standard 7)
13. Building a personal classroom management plan. (CEC Standard 7)
14. How to develop your personal classroom management philosophy. (CEC Std 7)
15. How to establish cooperative learning and group activities. (CEC Standard 7)
16. A range of strategies for improving classroom management. (CEC Stds 4 &5)
17. How to create a safe environment in which diversities are valued. (CEC Std 5)
18. Ethical considerations inherent in behavior management. (CEC Standard 7)
19. Develop effective social skills. (CEC Standard 5)
20. A variety of techniques to control targeted behavior and maintain attention of

individuals with disabilities. (CEC Standard 4)
21. The demands of learning environments. (CEC Standard 5)
22. Teacher attitudes and behaviors that influence behavior. (CEC Standard 5)
23. Strategies for crisis prevention and intervention. (CEC Standard 5)
24. How to prepare students to exhibit self-enhancing behavior in response to societal attitudes and actions. (CEC Standard 5)
25. Early Childhood strategies. (CEC Standard 7)

COURSE REQUIREMENTS
Class participation and attendance 10%.
Write a statement of your personal philosophy regarding classroom management 10% (Std 5) Classroom management Project and Presentation 40% (Standard 5) Journals of Field Experience 20% (Standards 2, 3, 6) Reaction Papers 20%.

COURSE SCHEDULE:

Session	Topics / Activities	Assignments
SESSION 1	Overview of Syllabus	Draft of Philosophy Statement
	Discussion of Requirements Introductions: Paired activity/sharing Overview of Classroom Management Theories	Chap 1
SESSION 2	Foundation Theorists – Ecology of the Classroom	Chap 2, Reaction paper
	Creating Positive Environments Project Save	
SESSION 3	Designing Learning Spaces Organizing Your Classroom	Chap 3
SESSION 4	Strategies to encourage Motivation & Thoughtful Learning; Presentation on	Chap 4, Reaction paper
	Assertive Discipline	
SESSION 5	Handling severe Discipline Problems Presentation on Democratic Teaching	Chap 5, Reaction paper
SESSION 6	Howard Gardner – Theory of Multiple	Chap 6,

	Intelligences Mel Levine – Neuro-Linguistic Theory Presentation on Congruent Communication	Reaction paper
SESSION 7	With-it-ness, Name Card Method, Presentation on Instructional Mgmt	Chap 7, Reaction paper
SESSION 8	Confrontation, Assertiveness & Discipline Presentation on Discipline w/Dignity	Chap 8, Reaction paper
SESSION 9	Student Conflicts Societal Problems, Violence Presentation on Positive Classroom Mgmt	Chap 9, Reaction Paper
SESSION 10	Physical arrangement; Getting Started; Presentation on Inner Discipline	Chap 10, Reaction paper
SESSION 11	Classroom Organization & Mgmt Program - Evertson Inquiry-based Approach Presentation on Consistency Mgmt	Chap 11, Reaction paper
SESSION 12	Using Curricular Approaches; Transitions & Interruptions Presentation on Judicious Disc.	Chap 12, Reaction paper
SESSION 13	Meta-analysis of studies of Classroom mgmt Presentation on Responsive Classroom	Chap 13
SESSION 14	Classroom Tips to Take on the Road	

GROUP PRESENTATION SCHEDULE

Groups will be assigned topics for the Final Group Report and Presentation. Students are required to keep a reflection log based on reactions to each class presentation.

WEEK 1:	Chapter 3	Assertive Discipline
WEEK 2:	Chapter 4	Democratic Teaching
WEEK 3	Chapter 5	Congruent Communication
WEEK 4	Chapter 6	Instructional Management
WEEK 5	Chapter 7	Discipline with Dignity
WEEK 6:	Chapter 8	Positive Classroom Management
WEEK 7	Chapter 9	Inner Discipline
WEEK 8:	Chapter 10	Consistency Management
WEEK 9	Chapter 11	Judicious Discipline
WEEK 10	Chapter 14	Responsive Classroom

REFLECTION LOG FOCUS QUESTIONS

1. Include a short summary of the theory
2. Do you agree or disagree with these principles?
3. Is there a practical application here for your class? Explain.
4. Was the presentation effective? Why/ Why not?

STUDENT ACCOMMODATIONS

Students needing accommodations for a documented disability should notify the instructor at the beginning of the semester.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

www. disciplinehelp.com
www.k12.bi.us/-dmotooka/
www.geom.umn.edu/-dwiggins/plan/html#1e
Bluestein, J. Create a Caring Classroom, Scholastic Instructor, 35-37, September 2000.

Emig,Veroica, 2003) A Multiple Intellegences Inventory, Educational Leadership,43-46 Glasser,W., Control Theory in the Classroom,New York: Harper &Rowe, 1986 Good, T.L., & Brophy, J.E., Looking into Classrooms (4th ed.). New York: Harper and Row, 1987 Jenkins,J., Antil, L., Wayne,K., and Vadsay,P., Exceptional Children, 69(3), 279-92 Instruction for All Students, Teaching Exceptional Children, 33(5)2001, 68-73 Matlock, L., Fielder, K., Walsh,D., Building the Foundation for Standards Based Instruction for All Students, Teaching Exceptional Children, 33(5)2001,68-73 Perez, S.A. Responding differently to diversity, Childhood Education, 70, 151-53, 1994 Peterson, R.L. & Skiba, R. (2001) Creating climates that prevent school violence, The Clearing House, 74(3), 155-163 Richardson,B.& Shape, M.,The Importance of Teacher Self-Awareness in Working with Students with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, Teaching Exceptional Children,36(2), 2003,8-13 Tomlinson, C., Leadership for Differentiated Classrooms, The School Administrator, October 1999, 6-11.

ACADEMIC CONDUCT

The School of Education strongly supports the college's mission to "educate students to become ethically and socially responsible leaders for the global community." We promote and rely on mutual respect, civility, concern for others and academic integrity. All forms of academic dishonesty and plagiarism will have consequences, from failure of the assignment or failure of the course, up to expulsion from the School of Education.

STUDENT ACCOMMODATIONS

Students needing accommodations for a documented disability should notify the instructor at the beginning of the semester.

Appendix I

Instructor: Dr. Micheline Malow
Telephone: 914 323-5348
E-mail: malowm@mville.edu
Office: Founders 25
Office Hours: Tuesday 4:30 – 6:30, Wednesday 2:00 – 4:00, Thursday 4:30 – 6:30

Fall 2006
Wednesday 4:20-6:50 P.M.; BR 14
EDU 5071
Department Chair: Dr. Andy Dowling

EDU 5071 Introduction to the Exceptional Student + 12 hours field experience

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course is designed to provide an overview of the field of special education. The objectives are to make the student more aware of the theories, diagnostic procedures and teaching strategies that are important in the areas of learning disabilities, mental retardation, emotional disturbance, physical handicaps and multiple handicaps. This course will examine the evaluation procedures and educational alternatives within the context of I.D.E.A. and the practical realities within schools.

REQUIRED TEXT

Smith, D.D. (2004). Introduction to special education: Teaching in an age of challenge, 5TH ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

SUMMARY OF COURSE INSTRUCTIONAL FOCUS & ASSESSMENT
(Refer to "Attachments" for specific details of assignments and performance assessments.)

COURSE OBJECTIVES CEC STANDARDS By the end of the course you will have a better understanding of:	LEARNING ACTIVITIES/ ASSIGNMENTS	PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT
The nature of students within the full range of disabilities.(2)	Lecture, discussion, student presentations.	Oral presentation rubric. Observation. Exam.
Special health related issues. (1 & 3)	Video Anticipation Guide.	Class discussion

Learning processes of the exceptional student. (2)	Research report. Lesson plan	Research report rubric. Lesson Plan rubric.
Motivational and Communication technique.(1)	Journals of field experiences	Field Experience rubric.
Classroom management. (5)	Lesson plan.	Lesson plan rubric.
The means to update knowledge and skills in the subjects taught. (1)	Research project.	Research rubric
Pedagogical history, Philosophy and the role of education (1)	Class discussion. Lecture.	Exam.
The rights and reponsibilities of parents. (1)	Role play. Identify components of an IEP	Observation
Technology (5,6 & 7)	Electronic Journals. Powerpoint presentations. Lesson plans.	Field experience rubric. Lesson plan rubric. Oral Presentation rubric.
Ethical and policy issues. (1,8, & 9)	Self-disposition.	Disposition rubric.
Current trends and issues. (1)	Class discussion. Group investigation.	Group investigation rubric.
Special Education Legislation. (1)	Class discussion. Oral presentation.	Exam.
Theories of child development. (2)	Research project.	Research rubric.
Child development. (2)	Lesson plan.	Lesson Plan Rubric
Characteristics and etiology of specific disabilities. (2)	Class discussion.	Exam
Cultural and linguistic diversity. (1,2,3,5,6, & 10)	Lesson Plan.	Lesson Plan Rubric
Families as active Participants in the Assessment process. (1,2,3 & 10)	Case Study	Case study rubric
The individual education program and individual family service plan. (3)	Class Lecture	Exam
Intervention curricula and methods for children with disabilities. (4)	Lesson Plan	Lesson Plan Rubric
Appropriate assessment procedures. (1)	Lesson Plan	Lesson Plan Rubric
Medical care for children.	Collaborative Group Work	Class Discussion
How to adapt the learning environment to meet the	Lesson Plan	Lesson Plan Rubric

Needs of exceptional children (2)		
The continm of educational services. (1)	Lecture	Exam
Collaboration partnerships. (1 & 10)	Collaborative Group Work	Class Discussion
Teacher models. (8 & 9)	Lesson Plan	Lesson Plan Rubric
Identification of Exceptional individuals (1)	Class discussion, Lecture, participation Guides, Videos, research projects	Research Rubrics, Exam
Your personal philosophy as it relates to special and general education (2)	Personal Philosophy essay	Personal Philosophy Rubric. position rubric
Life Skills Instruction. (1 &	Class discussion. Video	Exam.
How to prepare lesson plans. (7)	Lesson Plan	Lesson Plan rubric
Instructional strategies for exceptional children. (3)	Classroom strategies, activities, lesson plan	Teacher Observation. Lesson Plan Rubric
Theories and research that Form the basis of Curriculum dev. (7)	Research Report	Research Rubric and Oral presentation rubric
The scope and sequence of general and special curricula. (7 & 8)	Lesson Plan	Lesson Plan Rubric
National, state, and local curricula standards. (7)	Lesson Plan	Lesson Plan Rubric
The portfolio process. (8)	Portfolio	Portfolio Rubric

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

Class Participation and Attendance 10 %
Self-Disposition Rubric 10 %
Mid-Term Exam 20 %
IEP Group Project 20%
Journal of field experience 20 %
Group Research Investigation and Oral Presentation 20 %

Grading Plan:

A+: 97-100	B+: 87-89	C+: 77-79	F: 69 and below
A: 93-96	B: 83-86	C: 73-76	
A-: 90-92	B-: 82-80	C-: 72-70	

TENTATIVE CLASS SCHEDULE FALL 2006 , WEDNESDAYS 4:20-6:50 P.M.

MONTH AND DAY	*TOPIC/ACTIVITIES*	*ASSIGNMENT DUE*
SESSION 1 August 30	Introductions Course requirements Topics for presentation Current issues in Spec. Ed. Family-Teacher Partnerships Self-Disposition Personal Special Ed. Philo.	In Class - Personal Philosophy Statement In Class - Choose Topics and Groups
SESSION 2 September 6	Library orientation Meet at 4:20 at library Circulation desk	Due - 2 copies of Self- Disposition
SESSION 3 September 13	Chapter 1 The context of Special Ed. History of Special Education Key laws P.L. 94-142 I.D.E.A.	In Class – Work on IEP Project
SESSION 4 September 20	Chapter 2 Classification of Disabilities Special Education Services Multidisciplinary team Continuum of Services Individualized Special Ed. Programs Mainstreaming and Inclusion	In Class – Work on IEP Project
SESSION 5 September 27	Adapting Environments Adapting Instruction	In Class – Work on IEP Project
SESSION 6 October 4	Classroom Management	Present IEP Projects In Class – Work on Group Research
SESSION 7 October 11	Mid-Term Exam Classroom Management	In Class – Work on Group Research

SESSION 8 October 18	Learning Disabilities Video-FAT CITY Workshop	Research Presentations
SESSION 9 October 25	Behavior Disorders Video-Last One Picked	Research Presentations
SESSION 10 November 1	Physical Impairments Video	Research Presentations
SESSION 11 November 8	Deafness and Hard of Hearing Video	Research Presentations
SESSION 12 November 15	Speech and Language Impairments	Research Presentations
SESSION 13 November 22	Low Vision and Blindness Definition and Visual Impairments Visual and Tactile Aids	Research Presentations Due – Field Work Journals
SESSION 14 November 29	Autism Asperger's Syndrome	
SESSION 15 December 6	Other Areas of Disability Section 504	

ATTACHMENTS

GUIDELINES FOR JOURNAL OF FIELD EXPERIENCE (12 HOURS)

Date of observation and record of hours (Signed by school official)

Assignments:

Visit one self-contained special education class and one inclusion class

- Describe the setting
- Describe the students, teacher and classroom climate
- How is the curriculum modified to meet the students' needs?
- What specific types of strategies did you observe in each class?
- How did these strategies help the students?
- How did this visit relate to the topics we discussed in class?
- Compare and Contrast these two settings using a Venn diagram.

4 hours

Visit an ethnically diverse class

- Describe the setting
- Describe the students, teacher and classroom climate
- Did you oberve any students who had behavioral or language learning issuses?
- If so how did the teacher accomadate these students?
- How did this visit relate to the topics we discussed in class?

2 hours

Visit a special education school

- Describe the setting
- Describe the students, teacher and classroom climate
- How is the curriculum modified to meet the students' needs?
- What specific types of strategies did you observe in each class?
- How did these strategies help the students?
- How did this visit relate to the topics we discussed in class?

2 hours

Spend time working with a special needs student.

- Interview the student's teacher or parent to identify the types of learning and or behavioral problems.
- Discuss the types of activities you did with this student and your reactions

4 hours

Guidelines for IEP Group Project: Each student will assume a role in the development of an IEP based on a case study handed out in class. The group will work together to discuss the various responsibilities of each person's role, complete and compile all the necessary paperwork, make decisions and create IEP goals.

Guideline for Group Research Presentation: Each group of students will choose a specific federal category or a DSM IV classification of exceptional children to investigate. The project will follow a jigsaw format with each person responsible for some areas in the presentation. The group will present their research to the class utilizing transparencies or power point and will be referenced in APA style. The group presentation will inform the students of general characteristics, origin, developmental course, classroom intervention strategies and instructional adaptations that are pertinent to the category of exceptionality chosen.

Possible Categories for Research

Specific Learning Disabilities (i.e. Reading, Math, Spelling, etc.);
Speech or Language Impairment; Mental Retardation; Emotionally Disturbed; Hearing Impairment; Visual Impairment; Physical/Orthopedic Impairment; Cerebral Palsy; Traumatic Brain Injury; Gifted and Talented;
Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder; etc.

Midterm Exam: The exam will be short answer / essay format. A short list of objectives will be provided in class in order to prepare students for the content.

ADA STATEMENT:

Students with disabilities needing academic accommodation should provide documentation of disability to the professor at the beginning of the semester.

POLICY ON ACADEMIC INTEGRITY:

For acts of academic dishonesty, the school of Education may impose one or more of the following sanctions: Rewriting the assignment and/or failing the assignment, failing the course, taking a mandated LIS workshop, not being recommended for certification, and/or being expelled from the program. Academic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to, plagiarism – intended or otherwise.

PLEASE KEEP DUPLICATE COPIES OF ALL WORK TURNED IN.

Appendix J

Post hoc Hypothesis 12. I conducted a repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) with course and gender as the grouping variables and overall classroom management perceived self-efficacy scores over time as the repeated measure to investigate gain scores in teachers' perceived self-efficacy in classroom management. There was no significant interaction of gains on overall classroom management scores depending on class and gender, F (1, 67) = .71, p > .05, with an effect size of less than .01. Therefore, this hypothesis was not supported. Female participants did not statistically differ on pre and posttest total self-efficacy scores as compared with male participants between the classroom management and exceptional child course.

Post hoc Hypothesis 13. I conducted a repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) with gender as the grouping variable and overall classroom management perceived self-efficacy scores over time as the repeated measure to investigate gain scores in teachers' perceived self-efficacy in classroom management in the exceptional child course. There was no significant interaction of gains on overall classroom management scores depending on gender, F (1, 40) = .74, p > .05, with an effect size of less than .01. Therefore, this hypothesis was not supported. Female participants did not statistically differ on pre and posttest total self-efficacy scores as compared with male participants in the exceptional child course.

Post hoc Hypothesis 14. I conducted a repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) with course and parenthood as the grouping variables and overall classroom management perceived self-efficacy scores over time as the repeated measure to investigate gain scores in teachers' perceived self-efficacy in classroom management.

There was no significant interaction of gains on overall classroom management scores depending on class and parenthood, F (1, 62) = .26, p > .05, with an effect size of .06. Therefore, the hypothesis was not supported. Participants with children did not statistically differ according to gains in total self-efficacy scores as compared with participants without children between the classroom management and exceptional child course.

Post hoc Hypothesis 15. I conducted a repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) with parenthood as the grouping variable and overall classroom management perceived self-efficacy scores over time as the repeated measure to investigate gain scores in teachers' perceived self-efficacy in the exceptional child course. There was no significant interaction of gains on overall classroom management scores depending on class and parenthood, F (1, 40) = .77, p > .05, with an effect size of less than .01. Therefore, the hypothesis was not supported. Participants with and without children in the exceptional child course did not statistically differ according to gains in overall classroom management self-perceived efficacy scores.

Post hoc Hypothesis 16. Correlations between teaching experience (see Table 1) and SEBM scores (see Table 3) for the graduate Master's students enrolled in the graduate exceptional child course were not significant, r (40) = -.041, p = .81 for beginning score, a very small effect; r (40) = -.192, p = .25, for ending score, between a small and a medium effect. There were no significant teaching experience-total self-efficacy relationships for students in the exceptional child class.

Post hoc Hypothesis 17. There were no significant correlations between undergraduate GPA (see Table 1) and SEBM scores (see Table 3) of graduate Master's

students enrolled in the graduate exceptional child course, r (40) = -.02, p = .91 for beginning (pretest) score, a very small effect size; r (40) = .22, p = .17, between a medium and a small effect size, for end score (posttest).

Post hoc Hypothesis 18. There was also no significant relationship between graduate grade-point-averages (see Table 1) and total efficacy scores (see Table 3) for participants in the exceptional child course, r (40) = -.01, p = .98, a very small effect size, for beginning (pretest) score; r (40) = .26, p = .26, close to a medium effect, for ending (posttest) score.

References

Ahles, P. M., & Contento, J. M. (2006). Explaining helping behavior in cooperative learning classroom setting using attribution theory. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice, 8,* 609-626.

Alberto, P.A., & Troutman, A. C. (2001). *Applied behavior analysis for teachers.* Columbus: Merrill.

Allinder, R. (1994). The relationship between efficacy and the instructional practices of special education teachers and consultants. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 17,* 86-95.

Ames, C. (1992). Classrooms: Goals, structures, and student motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 84,* 261-271.

Anastasi, A. & Urbina, S. (1997). *Psychological testing.* NJ: Prentice Hall.

Argan, M., & Wehmeyer, M. L. (1999). *Teaching problem solving to students with mental retardation.* Washington D. C.: American Association of Mental Retardation.

Armor, D., Conroy-Oseguera, P., Cox, M., King, L., McDonnell, Pascal, A. et al. (1976). *Analysis of the school preferred reading program in selected Los Angeles minority schools.* Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory.* New York: General Learning Press.

Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist, 37,* 122-147.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist, 28,* 117-148.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control.* New York: Freeman Press.

Berman, P., McLaughlin, M. W., Bass, G., Pauly, E., & Zelman, G. (1977). *Federal programs supporting educational change: Factors affecting implementation and continuation.* Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation.

Binns, K., Steinberg, A., & Amorosi, S. (1997). *The Metropolitan Life Survey of the American Teacher 1998: Building family-school partnerships: Views of teachers and students.* New York: Louis Harris & Associates.

Birch, S. H., & Ladd, G. W. (1998). Children's interpersonal behaviors and the teacher child relationship. *Developmental Psychology, 34*, 934-946.

Bohanon, H., Fenning, P., Carney, K. L., Minnis-Kim, M. J., Anderson-Harriss, S., Moroz, K. B.et al. (2006). Schoolwide application of positive behavior support in an urban high school. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 8,* 131-145.

Bouffard-Bouchard, T. (2000). Influence of self-efficacy on performance in a cognitive task. *Journal of Social Psychology, 139,* 353-363.

Brophy, J. (1988). Educating teachers about managing classrooms and students. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 4,* 1-18.

Brouwers, A., & Tomic, W. (2000). A longitudinal study of teacher burnout and perceived self-efficacy in classroom management. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16, 239-253.

Burke, M. D., Hagan-Burke, S., & Sugai, G. (2003). The efficacy of function-based interventions for students with learning disabilities who exhibit escape-maintained problem behaviors: Preliminary results from a single-case experiment. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 26,* 15-25.

Cains, R. A., & Brown, C. R. (1996). Newly qualified primary teachers: A comparative analysis of the perceptions held by B.Ed. and PGCE trained teachers of their training routes. *Educational Psychology, 3,* 257-270.

Cains, R. A., & Brown, C. R. (1998). Newly qualified teachers: a comparative analysis of the perceptions held by B. Ed. and PGCE-trained primary teachers of the level and frequency of stress experienced during the first year of teaching. *Educational Psychology, 18,* 97-110.

Cambell, J. (1996). A comparison of teacher efficacy for pre and in-service teachers in Scotland and America. *Education, 117*, 2-11.

Cameron, J., Pierce, D. W., Banko, K. M., & Gear, A. (2005). Achievement-based rewards and intrinsic motivation: A test of cognitive mediators. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 4*, 641-655.

Cardelle-Elawar, M. (1992). Effects of teaching metacognitive skills to students with low mathematics ability. *Teaching and teacher Education, 8,* 109-121.

Charles, C. M. & Senter, G. W. (2005). *Elementary classroom management.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Christenseon, S., & Sheridan, S. (2001). *Schools and families: Creating essential connections for learning.* New York: Guilford Press.

Cohen J. (1992) A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin, 112,* 155-159.

Colvin, C. R. (1993). Childhood antecedents of juvenile-adult judgability. *Journal of Personality, 4,* 611-635.

Colvin, G., Sugai, G. & Patching, W. (1993). Precorrection: An instructional approach for managing predictable problem behaviors. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 28, 143-150.*

Corbett, D., & Wilson, B. (2002). What urban students say about good teaching. *Educational Leadership, 60,* 18-22.

Cordova, I., & Lepper, M. R. (1996). Intrinsic motivation and the process of learning: Beneficial effects of contextualization, personalization, and choice. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 88,* 715-730.

Covington, M. V., & Mueller, K. J. (2001). Intrinsic versus extrinsic motivation: An approach/avoidance reformulation. *Educational Psychology Review, 13,* 157-176.

Delclos, V. R., & Harington, C. S. (1978). An analysis of learned helplessness: Continuous changes in performance, strategy, and achievement cognitions following failure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36,* 451-462.

DeVellis, R. E. (1991). *Scale development: Theory and applications:* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

DiGangi, S. A., Maag, J. W., & Rutherford, R. B. (1991). Self-graphing of on-task behavior; Enhancing the reactive effects of self-monitoring on on-task behavior and academic performance. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 14,* 221-230.

DuPaul, G. J., Ervin, R. A., Hook, C. L., & McGoey, K. E. (1998). Peer tutoring for children with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder: Effects on classroom behavior and academic performance. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 31,* 579-592.

Durland, V. M., & Carr, E. G. (1992). An analysis of maintenance following functional communication training. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 25,* 777-794.

Elliot, D.S., Hamburg, B.A., & Williams, K. R. (1998). *Violence in American schools: A new perspective.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Emmer, E. S., Evertson, C. M., & Anderson, L. M. (1980). Effective classroom management at the beginning of the school year. *Elementary School Journal, 80,*

219-231.

Emmer, E., Everston, C., Sanford, J., Clements, B., & Worsham, M. (1981). *Organizing and managing the junior high school classroom.* Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Emmer, E., Evertson, C. M., & Worsham, M. E. (2003). *Classroom management for secondary teachers.* Boston: Pearson.

Emmer, E., & Hickman, J. (1991). Teacher efficacy in classroom management and discipline. *Educational and Psychological Measurement,* 51, 755-765.

Evers, W. J. G., Brouwers, A., & Tomic, W. (2002). Burnout and self-efficacy. A study on teachers' beliefs when implementing an innovative educational system in the Netherlands. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 72, 227-243.

Evertson, C. (1985). Training teachers in classroom management: An experimental study in secondary school classrooms. *Journal of Educational Research, 79,* 51-58.

Evertson, C., & Emmer, E. (1982). Effective management at the beginning of the school year in junior high school classes. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 74,* 485 498.

Erikson, E. (1963). *Childhood and society.* New York: Norton.

Evers, W., Fine, M., & Somerville, J. I. (1998). Burnout among teachers: Students' and teachers' perceptions compared. *International Journal of School Psychology, 25,* 131-148.

Fay, J., & Funk, D. (1995). *Teaching with love and logic.* Golden, CO: The Love and Logic Press.

Freiberg, H. J., Connell, M. L., & Lorentz, J. (2001). Effects of consistency management on student mathematics achievement in seven chapter 1 elementary schools. *Journal of Education for Students Placed At-Risk, 6,* 249-270.

Friedman, I. A. (1996). Multiple pathways to burnout: Cognitive and emotional scenarios in teacher burnout. *Anxiety, Stress, and Coping, 9,* 245-259.

Fuegen, K., & Biernat, M. (2000). Defining discrimination in the personal/group discrimination discrepancy. *Sex Roles, 5-6,* 285-310.

Gaith, G. & Shaaban, K. (1999). The relationship between perceptions of teaching concerns,teacher efficacy, and selected teacher characteristics. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 15,* 487-496.

Garcia, E. (1999). *Student cultural diversity: Understanding and meeting the challenge.*

Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Gencer, A. S., & Cakiroglu, J. Turkish preservice science teachers' efficacy beliefs regarding science teaching and their beliefs about classroom management. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 23*, 664-675.

Giallo, R., & Little, E. (2003). Classroom behavior problems: The relationship between preparedness, classroom experiences, and self-efficacy in graduate and student teachers. *Australian Journal of Educational & Developmental Psychology*, 3, 21-34.

Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76, 569-582.

Gist, M. E., & Mitchell, T. R. (1992). Self-efficacy: A theoretical analysis of its determinants and malleability. *Academy of Management Review*, 17, 183-211.

Gliner, J. A. & Morgan, G. A. (2000). *Research methods in applied settings.* NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Glomb, S. M., & Espelage, G. L. (2005). *The influence of restrictive emotionality in men's emotional appraisal of sexual harassment: A gender role interpretation. Psychology of Men & Masculinity,4,* 240-253.

Graham, S. (1991). A review of attribution theory in achievement contexts. *Educational Psychology Review, 3,* 5-39.

Graham, S. (1996). How casual beliefs influence the academic and social motivation of African-American children. In G. G. Brannigan (Ed.), *The enlightened educator: Research adventures in the schools* (pp. 111-126). New York: McGraw Hill.

Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (1996). Self-regulation and strategy instruction for students who find writing and learning challenging. In M. Levy & S. Ransdell (Eds.). *The science of writing: Theories, methods, individual differences, and applications* (pp. 347-360). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Griffith, J., Steptoe, A., & Cropley, M. (1999). An investigation of coping strategies associated with job stress in teachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 69,* 517-531.

Guskey, T. R., & Passaro, P. D. (1994). Teacher efficacy: A study of construct dimensions. *American Educational Research Journal, 31*, 627-643.

Henricsson, L., & Rydell, A. (2004). Elementary school children with behavior problems: Teacher-child relations and self-perception. A prospective study. *Merill-Palmer Quartely, 50,* 113-138.

Henricsson, L., & Rydell, A. (2006). Children with behaviour problems: The influence of social competence and social relations on problem stability, school achievement and peer acceptance across the first six years of school. *Infant and Child Development, 15*, 347-366.

Holden, K. B., & Rotter, J. B. (1962). A nonverbal measure of extinction in skill and chance situations. *Journal of Experimental Psychology, 63*, 519-520.

Jones, V., & Jones, L. (2004). *Comprehensive classroom management.* New York: Pearson Education.

Kaplan, R. M. & Saccuzzo, D. P. (2005). *Psychological testing.* Ca: Wadsworth.

Karaka, E. (2008). An investigation of primary and high school teachers' perception levels of efficacy of measurement and evaluation in education in Turkey. *Social Behavior and Personality, 36,* 1111-1122.

Kaufman, P., Bradby, D., & Owings, J. (1992). *National longitudinal study of 1988: Characteristics of at-risk students in NELS: 88.* Washington, D.C.: US Office of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Kazdin, A. (2001). *Behavior modification in applied settings.* Belmont: Wadsworth.

Kehle, T. J., & Clark, E. (1996). Interventions for children with traumatic brain injury. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 29,* 633-642.

Kennedy, C. H. (2000). When reinforcers for problem behaviors are not readily apparent. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 2,* 195-201.

Lan, W. Y. (1998). Teaching self-monitoring skills in statistics. In D. H. Schunk & B. J. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Self regulated learning: From teaching to self-reflective practice* (pp.86-105). New York: Guilford Press.

Larson, J., Smith, D. C., & Furlong, M. J. (2003). Best practices in school violence prevention. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology IV* (pp. 1081-1098). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Limber S. P., & Nation, M. A. (1998). Violence within the neighborhood and community. In P.K.Trickett & C. J. Schellenbach (Eds.), *Violence against children in the family and the community* (pp. 171-193). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Maag, J. W., Rutherford, R. B., & DiGangi, S. A. (1992). Effects of self-monitoring and contingent reinforcement on on-task behavior and academic productivity of

learning disabled students: A social validation study. *Psychology in the Schools, 29,* 157-172.

Maddux, J. E., & Lewis, J. (1995). Self-efficacy and adjustment: Basic principles and issues. In J. E. Maddux (Ed.), *Self-efficacy, adaptation, and adjustment: Theory, research, and application* (pp. 37-68). New York: Plenum Press.

Manning, M. L., & Bucher, K. T. (2007). Classroom management: Models, applications, and cases. New Jersey: Pearson.

Martin, A., Linfoot, K., & Stephenson, J. (1999). How teachers respond to concerns about misbehavior in their classroom. *Psychology in the Schools, 36,* 347-358.

Maslach, C. (1993). Burnout: A multidimensional perspective. In W.B. Schaufeli, C. Maslach, & T. Marek, *Professional burnout: Recent developments in theory and research* (pp. 19-32). Taylor and Francis: Washington, D.C.

Maslach, C. & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of Occupational Behavior, 2,* 99-113.

Maslow, A. (1968). *Toward a psychology of being.* New York: D. Van Nostrand.

McLaughlin, M.W., & Marsh, D.D. (1978). Staff development and school change. *Teachers College Record, 80,* 70-94.

Mendler, A. (1992). *What do I do when …? How to achieve discipline with dignity in the classroom.* Bloomington, IN: National Educational Services.

Merrett, F., & Wheldall, K. (1984). Classroom behaviour problems which Junior School teachers find most troublesome. *Educational Studies, 2,* 87-92.

Merrow, J. (1999). The teacher shortage: Wrong diagnosis, phony cures. *Education Week, 6,* 64-65.

Nelson, J. R., Martella, R., & Garland, B. (1998). The effects of teaching school expectations and establishing a consistent consequence on formal office disciplinary actions. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 6,* 153-161.

Nelson, J. R., Martella, R., & Marchand-Martella, N. (2002). Maximizing student learning: The effects of a comprehensive school-based program for preventing problem behaviors. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders 10,* 136-149.

Nelson, J., & Roberts, M. (2000). Ongoing reciprocal teacher-student interactions involving disruptive behaviors in general education classrooms. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 8,* 27-37, 48.

Okamoto, S. K. (2001). Instrument development: Practitioner fear of youthful clients: An instrument development and validation study. *Social Work Research, 25,* 173-184.

Peterson, M. (1996). A team-based approach to problem-based learning: An evaluation of structured team problem solving. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching, 7,* 129-153.

Phelan, P., Davidson, A., & Cao, H. (1992). Speaking up: Students' perspectives on school. *Phi Delta Kappan, 73,* 695-704.

Pianta, R. C., Steinberg, M. S., & Rollins, K. B. (1995). The first two years of school: Teacher child relationships and deflections in classroom's classroom adjustment. *Development and Psychopathology, 7,* 295-312.

Reeve, J. (1996). *Motivating others: Nurturing inner motivational resources:* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Reid, R., & Harris, K. R. (1993). Self-monitoring of attention versus self-monitoring of performance: Effects on attention and academic performance. *Exceptional Children, 60,* 29-40.

Reinke, W. M., Lewis-Palmer, T., & Merrell, K. (2008). The classroom check-up: A classwide teacher consultation model for increasing praise and decreasing disruptive behavior. *School Psychology Review, 37,* 315-332.

Reyna, C., & Weiner, B. (2001). *Justice and utility in the Classroom : An attributional analysis of the goals of teachers' punishment and intervention strategies. Journal of Educational Psychology, 2,* 309-319.

Ross, J. A., Cousins, J. B., & Gadalla, T. (1996). Within-teacher predictors of teacher efficacy. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 12,* 385-400.

Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs, 33,* 300-303.

Rotter, J. B., Liverant, S., & Crowne, D. P. (1961). The growth and extinction of expectancies in chance controlled and skilled tasks. *Journal of Psychology, 52,* 161-177.

Rotter, J. B., & Mulry, R. C. (1965). Internal versus external control of reinforcement and decision time. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 2,* 598-604.

Safran, S., & Safran, J. (1985). Classroom contet and teachers' perceptions of problem behaviours. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 77,* 20-28.

Schaufeli, W. B., & Van Horn, J. E. (1995). Maslach Burnout Inventory voor leraren (MBI-NL-Le). Voorlopige handleiding. [Maslach Burnout Inventory for Teachers. Preliminary guide]. University of Utrecht: PAGO.

Schmuck, R., & Schmuck, P. (2001). *Group processes in the classroom.* Boston: McGraw Hill.

Schottle, D. A., & Peltier, G. L. (1996). Should schools employ behaviour management consultants? *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 23,* 128-130.

Schunk, G. H. (1996). *Learning theories: An educational perspective.* New York: Merril/Mcmillan.

Shukla, S., & Albin, R. W. (1996). Effects of extinction alone and extinction plus functional communication training on covariation. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 4,* 565-568.

Shukla-Mehta, S., & Albin, R. W. (2003). Twelve practical strategies to prevent behavioral escalation in classroom settings. *Clearing House, 2,* 50-56.

Smith, D. D. (2004). Introduction to special education: Teaching in an age of challenge (5^{TH} ed.) Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Sugai. G., & Horner, R. H. (2002). Introduction to the special series on positive behavior support in schools. *Journal of Emotional and Behavior Disorders, 3,* 30-35.

Todd, A. W., Horner, R.H., Sugai, G., & Colvin, G. (1999). Individualizing school-wide discipline for students with chronic problem behaviors: A team approach. *Effective School Practices, 17,* 72-82.

Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk, Hoy, A., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research, 68,* 202-248.

Walker, H. M., Steiber, S., Ramsey, E., & O'Neill, R. E. (1991). Longitudinal prediction of the school achievement, adjustment, and delinquency of antisocial versus at risk boy. *Remedial and Special Education, 12,* 43-51.

Webber, J., & Scheuermann, B. (1991). Accenuate the positive …eliminate the negative! *Teaching Exceptional Children, 24,* 13-19.

Wehmeyer, M. L., Argan, M., & Hughs, C. (2002). A national survey of teachers' promotion of self-determination and self-directed learning. *Journal of Special Education, 34,* 58-68.

Wehmeyer, M. L., Palmer, S. B., Argan, M., Mithuag, D. E., & Martin, J. (2000). Teaching students to become causal agents in their lives: The self-determining

learning model of instruction. *Exceptional Children, 66,* 439-453.

Weiner, B. (1979). A theory of motivation for some classroom experiences. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 71,* 3-25.

Weiner, B. (1986). *An attributional theory of motivation and emotion.* New York: Springer.

Weiner, B. (1990). History of motivational research in education. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 82,* 616-622.

Weiner, B. (1992). *Human motivation: Metaphors, theories, and research.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Weiner, B. (2000). Interpersonal and intrapersonal theories of motivation from an attributional perspective. *Educational Psychology Review, 12,* 1-14.

Wentzel, K. R. (1998). Social relationships and motivation in middle school: The role of parents, teachers, and peers. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 90,* 202-209.

Woolfolk, A. (2004). *Educational psychology.* New York: Pearson Education.

Zimmerman, B. J. (1986). Development of self-regulated learning: Which are the key subprocesses? *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 16,* 307-313.

Zimmerman, B. J. (1995). Self-efficacy and educational development. In A. Bandura (Ed.), *Self efficacy in changing societies* (pp. 202-231). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Zimmerman, B. J., & Risemberg, R. (1997). Becoming a proficient writer: A self regulatory perspective. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 22,* 73-101.

Zimmerman, B. J., & Schunk, D. H. (2001). *Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: Theoretical perspectives.* New Jersey: Erlbaum.