5-2017

Teacher Self-Efficacy in Classroom Management Amongst Novice Middle School Teachers

Kentyl C. Byrne
Concordia University - Portland

Follow this and additional works at: http://commons.cu-portland.edu/edudissertations

Part of the Education Commons

Concordia University–Portland

College of Education

Doctorate of Education Program

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED MEMBERS OF THE DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

CERTIFY THAT WE HAVE READ AND APPROVE THE DISSERTATION OF

Kentyl Cae Byrne

CANDIDATE FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Mark Jimenez Ed.D., Faculty Chair Dissertation Committee

Corey McKenna, Ph.D., Content Specialist

Margaret Boice, Ed.D., Content Reader

ACCEPTED BY

Joe Mannion, Ed.D.

Provost, Concordia University–Portland

Sheryl Reinisch, Ed.D.

Dean, College of Education, Concordia University–Portland

Jerry McGuire, Ph.D.

Director of Doctoral Studies, Concordia University–Portland

TEACHER SELF-EFFICACY IN CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT AMONGST NOVICE

MIDDLE SCHOOL TEACHERS

Kentyl Byrne

Concordia University – Portland

College of Education

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the College of Education

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education in

Teacher Leadership

Mark Jimenez, Ed.D., Faculty Chair Dissertation Committee

Corey McKenna, Ph.D., Content Specialist

Margaret Boice, Ed.D., Content Reader

Portland, Oregon

2017

Abstract

There is a lack of research pertaining to classroom management solely related to self-efficacy.

This dissertation seeks to contribute to the field of literature and understand what support, if any

is being offered to pre-service teachers and novice teachers in the area of classroom

management. Rooted in Bandura's (1997) Social Cognitive Theory, this dissertation examines

how novice middle school teachers demonstrate teacher self-efficacy in classroom management,

and how the teachers achieved their level of teacher self-efficacy in classroom management.

Using a blind survey and face-to-face interview, participants demonstrated self-efficacy in

classroom management by focusing on routine and procedures within their classroom.

Participants also reported peers as a main source of information for classroom management

strategies. The results also showed how classroom discipline concerns decreased as the teaching

experience of the participants increased. Based on participant responses, there are minimal

opportunities for pre-service teachers to learn classroom management and put the strategies into

effect. Once the individual becomes an in-service teacher, there seem to be more opportunities

presented, but the information is acquired mostly from peers or through trial and error

experiences.

     Keywords: classroom management, novice teachers, self-efficacy

Dedication

This is dedicated to my husband Troy, who gave up a legacy so that I may "dare greatly." Thank

you for your unwavering support and encouragement along the way. I love you dearly.

Acknowledgements

Thank you to my husband Troy, for your encouragement and the countless hours you spent with our son Max so that I could focus on this product. I could not have accomplished this without your support. I appreciate the many times you listened to me brainstorm and were my sounding board for ideas, topics, questions, and when I just needed to think aloud.

Thank you to my son Max for all of the little giggles and smiles you gave me through this process. They reminded me of what life is really about. You gave me countless hugs and cuddles when I needed a break from reality. I love you.

Thank you Dr. Margaret Boice, Dr. Mark Jimenez, and Dr. Corey McKenna for agreeing to be my committee and advising me through this process. I appreciate the encouragement along the way and all the questions you asked to help me make this a stronger study.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction

Introduction to the Problem

Scholarly research exists on teacher self-efficacy in relation to classroom management, content areas, teacher attrition or retention, and any combination (Anthony, Gimbert, Fultz & Parker, 2011; Hong, 2012; Hughes, 2012; Menon & Sadler, 2016). However, there is a need for research on teacher self-efficacy solely in classroom management. This explanatory qualitative research study will seek to identify teachers' self-efficacy in classroom management, and will hopefully lead to initiatives in teacher preparation and staff development that will empower teachers in the area of classroom management.

Background, Context, History, and Conceptual Framework for the Problem

The problem of teacher self-efficacy in classroom management is rooted within Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory. The social cognitive theory provides the framework for understanding the influences shaping teacher efficacy (Bandura, 1997). According to Bandura (1994), the self-efficacy of a person is determined by how one feels, thinks, motivates oneself, and behaves. Self-efficacy can also be viewed as how, or the extent to which a person may have reached a goal or completed a task. Bandura (1977, 1986) reported that teacher self-efficacy is rooted within the social cognitive theory and is defined as "beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the course of action required to produce given attainments" (p. 3).

Not only does self-efficacy influence motivation, goal setting, and strategies, but it also stems from Weiner's (2000) Attribution Theory, where one believes their success in effecting an outcome is controllable by internal causes (Benhar, 2009). In other words, the attribution theory explains why people do what they do. In terms of efficacy, it explains how a person is able to accomplish tasks or goals, use strategies, or maintain the necessary motivation required to

accomplish the set tasks or goals. For teachers, possessing and maintaining the skills or perseverance necessary to accomplish tasks or goals within the classroom falls within their teaching efficacy.

Teacher self-efficacy in relation to classroom management has been prevalent in literature over the past 40 years since being linked to student achievement by the Rand Corporation (Armor, 1976). The extent to which a teacher is competent in maintaining classroom order, organizing a classroom, and gaining and maintaining the attention and participation of all the students is known as Classroom Management Self-Efficacy (CMSE). CMSE is defined by Aloe, Amo, and Shanahan (2014) as "efficacy for controlling disruptive behavior, calming and responding to defiant students, and establishing routine and order to keep learning activities running smoothly" (p. 105). When a teacher lacks efficacy in these areas, they struggle to maintain a productive and healthy classroom environment (Aloe et al., 2014; Marzano, Marzano, & Pickering, 2003). When the classroom environment is disrupted, all individuals within the classroom are negatively affected (Pace, Boykins, & Davis, 2014).

Statement of the Problem

To answer the first research question, participants take part in an online survey adapted from Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy's (2001) Teacher Self-Efficacy Survey (TSES). The survey asks 24 questions pertaining to classroom management, instructional strategies, and student engagement. For the purposes of this study, the focus is on the participants' responses to the question items about classroom management.

Upon completion of the online survey, all participants will be asked eight questions (Appendix A) pertaining to pre-service and in-service classroom management training. The interview questions also ask the participants how his or her classroom management has changed

over time. The questions will be asked in a face-to-face interview and the responses will be recorded. Upon completion of the interview, the responses will be transcribed and given back to the participant within 7 days for verification of the interview responses. The participant verifies the interview as accurate and correct when returning it. The responses given by participants will provide data to answer the second research question.

As a third data source, the number of total discipline referrals over the past three years will be obtained from each participant as a question in the blind survey. This allows longitudinal data pertaining to the increase or decrease of classroom management for each participant, while ensuring confidentiality for all participants, since only non-identifying information will be obtained. As classroom management increases, discipline referrals typically decrease. This is important, because it provides the convergence of evidence by data triangulation to strengthen the validity of this qualitative research study (Yin, 2014).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to find self-efficacy in classroom management amongst novice teachers of grades 6-8; and then find how teachers are learning classroom management. For this study, I used an explanatory qualitative case study analyzing teacher self-efficacy in classroom management. With permission of use from the authors, the Teacher Self-Efficacy Survey (Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy, 2001) was transcribed into Qualtrics, an online survey tool, to distribute to participants and analyze the survey. By doing so, this allows me to receive survey results electronically.

Research Questions

1. How do novice middle school teachers demonstrate teacher self-efficacy in classroom management?

2. How do novice middle school teachers achieve their level of teacher self-efficacy in classroom management?

Rationale, Relevance, and Significance of the Study

Teacher self-efficacy in classroom management is an ongoing struggle both for novice or beginning teachers, those with zero to five years of experience, and veteran teachers, those with more than five years of experience (Carr, 2013; Dunn, 2009; Hicks, 2012; Ritter & Hancock, 2004; Stronge, Tucker, & Hindman, 2003). Considering the constant struggle for teachers in classroom management, this research study considers the training received by pre-service and in-service teachers. This research study also aims to understand what support is being offered to novice teachers in the areas of classroom management, and how novice teachers perceive it to be effective, if at all.

A great deal of scholarly research is currently available on teacher self-efficacy in correlation to classroom management, content areas, teacher attrition or retention, and any combination (Anthony et al., 2011; Hong, 2012; Hughes, 2012; Menon & Sadler, 2016). However, there is a need for research on teacher self-efficacy, solely with reference to classroom management. The researcher sought to identify teacher self-efficacy in classroom management, and to potentially lead to initiatives in teacher preparation and staff development that will empower teachers in the area of classroom management.

Definition of Terms

Teacher self-efficacy. The belief in one's capabilities to execute specific demands or reach goals (Bandura, 1994).

Classroom management. Controlling disruptive behavior, calming and responding to defiant students, and establishing a routine and order to keep learning activities running smoothly (Aloe et al., 2014, p. 105).

Classroom management self-efficacy (CMSE). Efficacy in controlling disruptive behavior, calming and responding to defiant students, and establishing a routine and order to keep learning activities running smoothly (Aloe et al., 2014, p. 105).

Novice Teacher. Teachers who have five years or less of classroom teaching experience.

Pre-service teacher. Typically a college student participating in a period of guided, supervised teaching (vwc.edu, 2016).

In-service teachers. Those actively engaged in the teaching profession (adapted from Oxford Dictionary, 2016).

Delimitations, and Limitations

A limitation of this research design is the TSES, because participants are self-reporting. This enables participants to report on their own self-efficacy and may potentially be biased according to their strengths or weaknesses. I choose to use the TSES, because the reliability of the survey is established and it is regularly being used in other research.

An additional limitation of this research design is population. Most (approximately 90%) of the participants attended the same university. Therefore, the pre-service education received in classroom management is very similar amongst participants. However, the in-service classroom management training that participants may have received differs between each individual campus. All participants are within the same school district, therefore any classroom management training offered by the district is made available to all participants.

The delimitation of this in-depth qualitative case study of novice teachers in grades sixth through eighth is due to the lack of research pertaining to novice middle school teachers in the area of self-efficacy in classroom management. The results amongst participants are not generalizable due to the sample size, but I expect to find some commonalities in the responses.

Summary

This explanatory qualitative research study is conducted in order to gain a better understanding of a teacher's sense of self-efficacy in classroom management and also mitigate the lack of existing literature pertaining to middle school teacher self-efficacy in classroom management. Three data sources—online survey, interview, and campus totals of discipline referrals over the past three years—are utilized throughout this study in order to create a convergence of evidence and data triangulation. With the convergence of these three data sources, the two research questions listed at the beginning of Chapter 1 are answered. This research study leads to initiatives in teacher preparation and staff development through gaining a broader perspective of classroom management support for middle school novice teachers.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

This literature review is based on the framework of Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory. Bandura's (1994) research reported that self-efficacy is the belief in one's capabilities to execute specific demands or reach goals. "People with high assurance in their capabilities approach difficult tasks as challenges to be mastered rather than as threats to be avoided" (Bandura, 1994, p. 2). Teacher self-efficacy is rooted within self-efficacy of the social cognitive theory. Bandura's (1994) social cognitive theory "prescribes mastery experiences as the principal means of personality change" (p. 6). Based on this theory, teachers change their classroom management approach over time due to their experiences. Other determinates, such as self-motivation and choice, within the social cognitive theory worked cooperatively with self-efficacy. Together, Bandura (1997) argued, the two determined the thoughts, actions, and motives of human beings.

The literature review continues by exploring classroom management and three sub-areas of classroom management consisting of engagement, discipline, and procedures and routines. These three sub-areas work together to provide a foundation of classroom management for teachers. If a teacher shows efficacy in the areas of classroom management, they are likely to be successful (Marzano et al., 2003).

Study topic. Teacher self-efficacy in classroom management was the focus of the study. Teacher efficacy within classroom management is an ongoing struggle both for novice or beginning teachers, those with zero to five years of experience, and for veteran teachers, those with more than five years of experience (Carr, 2013; Dunn, 2009; Hicks, 2012; Ritter & Hancock, 2007; Stronge et al., 2004). This study focused on only novice teachers and how they

reached their current level of self-efficacy in classroom management. This study also focused on how participants demonstrated teacher self-efficacy in classroom management.

Context. This study focused on sixth through eighth grade novice teachers in an urban school district located in West Texas. The pool of participants was taken from three middle school campuses within the same district. Two of the three middle schools were considered to be comparable campuses by the state of Texas based on demographic information (TEA, 2015). All participants volunteered and were not given any incentive.

The participants were given the long form of the Teacher Self-Efficacy Survey (TSES) created by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001). The survey instrument was emailed to participants as a blind survey. The survey also identified three sub-areas within teacher self-efficacy, where participating teachers rate their self-perceived efficacy in the areas of instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management. The focus of this study was based around classroom management, therefore the results for only the eight questions pertaining to classroom management in the TSES were reported on. In addition to the TSES, participants self-reported the number of classroom discipline referrals they had written over the past three years during the blind survey and participated in a face-to-face interview with the researcher. The interview questions are available as Appendix A, and the TSES is available as Appendix D.

Significance. A great deal of scholarly research has been completed on the relationship between teacher self-efficacy and classroom management, content areas, teacher attrition or retention, and any combination (Anthony, Gimbert, Fultz & Parker, 2011; Hong, 2012; Hughes, 2012; Menon & Sadler, 2016). There is a need for research on teacher self-efficacy solely in classroom management. This study sought to identify teacher self-efficacy in classroom

8

management and to lead to initiatives in teacher preparation and staff development that will empower teachers in the area of classroom management.

This case study provides a resource to the institutions who prepare teachers in the area of classroom management. The comments made by participants during the interview allows an insight as to where one may find common methods of improving classroom management. This case study is important in that it allows teachers, administrators and districts an opportunity to receive honest feedback about teacher efficacy in classroom management from novice teachers. With this feedback districts may modify trainings available to better provide classroom management tools for novice teacher.

Problem statement. This research is designed to study teacher self-efficacy in classroom management. To do so, it was useful to identify teacher self-efficacy in the areas of student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management by asking the following questions:

1. How do novice middle school teachers demonstrate teacher self-efficacy in classroom management?

2. How do novice middle school teachers achieve their level of teacher self-efficacy in classroom management?

Organization. This literature review sought to identify studies in peer-reviewed journals, educational periodicals, psychology periodicals, reports, dissertations, and print books written by experts in the fields of classroom management and efficacy. The parameters of the literature search included searching texts with keywords such as social cognitive theory, teacher self-efficacy, self-efficacy, classroom management, classroom behavior management, classroom discipline, student engagement, and teachers. This search returned a great deal of literature

pertaining to classroom management and teacher self-efficacy, and therefore the focus of the search shifted to articles within the last 10 years as well as articles that were frequently cited by recognized experts in the field. The literature review is divided into the following sections: Introduction, Conceptual Framework, Review of Research Literature and Methodological Literature, Review of Methodological Issues, Synthesis of Research Findings, Critique of Previous Research, and Summary.

Conceptual Framework

  Piaget's theory of cognitive development. Piaget's theory of cognitive development was broken down into four different stages that take place throughout an individual's lifetime. The first was sensorimotor, which occurs from birth until the age of two. During the first stage an individual learns about their environment through the use of their senses (Simatwa, 2010). The second stage was the preoperational stage which occurs from age's two to seven. At this stage, an individual engaged in fantasy, unique illogical meaning, and intuitive thought prevails characterized by free association (Simatwa, 2010). Concrete operational was the third stage occurring throughout in individuals' life through the ages of 7–11. At this stage, an individual was only concerned with facts and may become confused in situations involving sarcasm or relative human knowledge (Simatwa, 2010). The final stage, formal operations, began at age 11 and continues through adulthood. The final stage of development occurred when an individual shifted to formal operations. This stage allowed an individual to begin patterns of thought that include logical, rational, and abstract thinking (Simatwa, 2010). An individual took the opinions of others into consideration and communicates with others. Piaget's theory of cognitive development was helpful in understanding how development takes place over a lifetime but does not necessarily explain how self-efficacy may increase overtime due to mastery experiences.

Vygotsky's concept development. Vygotsky's experiments and research of concept development indicated there are four stages of development in forming a concept (Gredler, 2009). The four stages are premastery, control of external auxiliary stimuli, internal reconstruction, and ultimate outcomes. During the premastery stage, an individual saw images and began to make connections amongst the images. Within the second stage, control of external auxiliary stimuli, identifying an example of a concept became possible. The third stage, internal reconstruction of auxiliary stimuli, individuals began to think in terms of the concept. During the fourth and final stage of Vygotsky's concept development, an individual accomplished self-organized attention, logical memory, conceptual thinking, and categorical perception (Gredler, 2009). Vygotsky's concept development supports the research in this case study indicating that a teacher's self-efficacy in classroom management improves overtime as an individual is exposed to more experiences provided by the everyday classroom situations.

Bandura's social cognitive theory. Bandura (1994) reports there are four sources of influences on one's self-efficacy. The first source is resiliency which is built by overcoming obstacles and then persevering through the obstacles presented. The second is built through vicarious experiences, or by learning from the successes and failures of others. Social persuasion is the third source of influence on one's self-efficacy which is built through an individual being verbally persuaded that they possess the capabilities to master activities. The final way to build self-efficacy is through mastery experiences which build one's sense of self-efficacy through every day experiences. For this reason, mastery experiences was the source of self-efficacy focused on throughout this research case study.

According to Bandura (1994), the self-efficacy of a person is determined by how that person feels, thinks, motivates oneself, and behaves. Self-efficacy can also be viewed as how, or

to what extent a person may have reached a goal or completed a task. According to Bandura (1986) self-efficacy is rooted within the social cognitive theory and is defined as "beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the course of action required to produce given attainments" (p. 3). The social cognitive theory provides the framework for understanding the influences shaping teacher efficacy (Bandura, 1997).

Not only does self-efficacy influence motivation, goal setting, and strategies, but it also stems from Weiner's (2000) attribution theory, where one believes their success in effecting an outcome is controllable by internal causes (Benhar, 2009). In other words, the attribution theory explains why people do what they do. In terms of efficacy, it explains how a person is able to accomplish tasks or goals, use strategies, or maintain the necessary motivation required to accomplish the set tasks or goals. For teachers, possessing and maintaining the skills or perseverance necessary to accomplish tasks or goals within the classroom falls within their teaching efficacy.

Teacher self-efficacy in relation to classroom management has been prevalent in literature over the past 40 years, since being linked to student achievement by the Rand Corporation (Armor, 1976). The extent to which a teacher has the competency in maintaining classroom order, organizing a classroom, and gaining and maintaining the attention and participation of all the students is known as Classroom Management Self-Efficacy (CMSE). CMSE can be defined as the ability to establish a routine and order which keeps classroom learning activities running smoothly while simultaneously controlling disruptive behavior, and calming and responding to defiant students (Aloe et al., 2014). When teachers lack efficacy in these areas, they struggle to maintain a productive and healthy classroom environment (Aloe et

al., 2014; Marzano et al., 2003). When the classroom environment is disrupted, all individuals within the classroom are negatively affected (Pace et al., 2014).

Review of Research Literature and Methodological Literature

      Classroom management. Stensmo (1995) defined classroom management as "the organization and learning environment; management of student discipline, order, and care; the grouping of students for different tasks and patterns of interaction; and the individualization of student learning" (p. 1). If effective classroom management is not present, it is often a strong indicator the teacher is unsuccessful in the classroom (Keidel, 2014). The strategies used by the teacher to maintain students' behavior can influence student motivation, respect and discipline either positively or negatively (DeJarnette & Sudeck, 2015). The components within classroom management vary between experts. The most common pillars discussed by experts are engagement, discipline, procedures and routines (Burden, 1983; Greenberg, Putman, & Walsh, 2014; Saphier, Haley-Speca, & Gower, 2008; Wong & Wong, 2009).

      Classroom management has been rated as the most challenging aspect of teaching for novice teachers (Carr, 2013; Dunn, 2009; Hicks, 2012; Ritter & Hancock, 2004; Stronge et al., 2003). This growing concern is a major cause of teacher attrition within the first five years (Hicks, 2012). Teachers continue to seek out professional development in the areas of classroom management in order to strengthen their abilities within the confines of the classroom. Interestingly enough, middle school teachers report lower self-efficacy for classroom management compared to elementary school teachers (Ryan, Kuusinen, & Bedoya-Skoog, 2015). Collaborating and discussing behavioral encounters with peers is another source novice teachers and experienced teachers alike seek in order to improve self-efficacy of classroom management (Ficarra & Quinn, 2014). However, experienced teachers tend to utilize only the strategies they

13

consider themselves to be confident with, or have a high sense of efficacy utilizing, rather than

employing new strategies (Reupert & Woodcock, 2010).

  Engagement. Classroom engagement describes how students are engaged with the

instruction in the classroom. Engagement is defined by the teacher's ability to foster and

maintain student engagement by teaching interesting lessons that include opportunities for active

student participation (Greenberg et al., 2014). The teacher may have students working in pairs,

small groups, hands-on activities, or utilizing interactive technology. A variety of methods such

as games, creating a competition, gestures, suspense, or relating the activity to real-world

experiences, may be used to enlist student interaction with the lesson and keep them engaged. If

students are not actively engaged and participating in the lesson, they are probably also not

learning the academic content (Saphier et al., 2008).

  When students are engaged in the learning activity, they are less likely to become

distracted and engage in off-task or distractive behavior (Eisenman, Edwards, & Cushman, 2015;

Marshall, 2016). Students reportedly experienced better classroom management and more

individual learning support when it was associated with cognitive activation, which is the degree

of cognitive challenge and activation offered to students in instruction (Holzberger, Philipp, &

Kunter, 2013). This is also a challenge for some teachers, since a teacher must capture students'

attention, and sustain the focus of the student throughout the lesson (Saphier et al., 2008). If a

teacher fails to gain or sustain the attention of students, then management and respect quickly

unravel (Marshall, 2016). Understanding the theory behind how students learn allows the

teacher to teach more effectively (Bembenutty, 2008). Thus, by teaching more effectively the

teacher is likely to be able to maintain student engagement for an extended period of time. When

preparing a lesson, a teacher needs to keep these challenges in mind in order to appeal to the

senses of the students and relate the lesson directly to the student. In an interview, Bembenutty (2008) reported McKeachie stating that "Students will not work very hard if they believe there is no use in doing so" (p. 365). The academic tasks of the lesson need to be relevant to the students in a way that enables them to relate to the instructional focus of the lesson and encourages student production of the tasks.

Within a class session, academic learning time is often decreased by transition time, either due to switching classes, or switching between tasks within a class. Codding and Smyth (2008) found that as transition time increased in three high school biology classes, instructional time spent on academic tasks was negatively affected. After feedback was given, the transition time decreased by up to 50% in two classrooms, and student engagement increased 30% over the baseline (Codding & Smyth, 2008). This information supports the premise that students are more engaged in the classroom academic tasks with proper management. Van Houten and Thompson (1976) reported that setting time limits for students and following through by timing them causes students to increase their academic task completion rates. A study completed by Rhymer, Skinner, Henington, D'Reaux, and Sims (1998) reported that overtly timing students increased problem completion rates when students were given a one-minute warning before time expired.

Creating games to use for transitions is also a strategy educators can use to decrease time spent on transitions. An investigative study completed by Campbell and Skinner (2004) made use of the Timely Transition Game (TTG). As students made transitions throughout the day, the teacher used a stopwatch to time the students during off-task behavior. The cumulative time was posted as feedback for the class to view. A quicker transition time was set for the next day as a goal for students. After TTG was implemented, "weekly transition times were reduced by approximately two hours" (Yarbrough, Skinner, & Lee, 2004, p. 88).

Many teachers began class by using a 3–10-minute warm-up, reviewing a question from the previous day or a question that mimics a standardized test question. Marshall (2016) argued the point of the warm-up activity was to get the students thinking, exploring, and talking from the beginning of the class. The question could simply have sparked curiosity or could be asked by the students. It was suggested to engage learners in something that was substantive and important to them or provide highlights of the coming days or weeks in order to reengage the students after a weekend or break (Marshall, 2016).

Discipline. Logan (2003) defined classroom discipline as "the adjustment of unacceptable behaviors to acceptable behavior according to our individual standards and measures" (p. 3). Instructional time lost to behavior management within the classroom can lead to lower academic engagement and achievement (DeJarnette & Sudeck, 2015). It is important to understand that all misbehavior in the classroom has an antecedent or cause. The student may have had a difficult morning before arriving at school or may be provoked by a peer. The misbehavior may stem from the teachers' poor general management, inappropriate work, boring instruction, unclear expectations, internal or external physical causes (Lennon, 2009; Saphier et al., 2008). Many teachers have not been properly trained to recognize the early signs of a student's misbehavior beginning to escalate until crisis strikes (Pace et al., 2014). It is important that the expectations of classroom behavior are taught consistently and reinforced by the teacher using verbal and nonverbal cues (Stronge et al., 2004).

An analysis conducted by Mitchell and Bradshaw (2013) consisting of approximately 1900 elementary students compared the use of exclusionary discipline strategies to classroom-based positive support. The researchers found that exclusionary discipline strategies were connected to lower order and discipline scores. In comparison, a greater use of classroom-based

positive behavior was connected to higher order and discipline scores, fairness, and student-teacher relationship. This information suggested that promoting positive behavior support strategies during pre-service teacher training and professional development training could reduce the use of exclusionary discipline strategies in order to improve the conditions for learning.

Boynton and Boynton (2005) believe there are four components that are crucial for establishing an effective classroom discipline system. The four components are positive teacher-student relations, clearly defined parameters of acceptable student behaviors, monitoring skills, and consequences. With each of the four components in place, teachers should have successful classroom discipline. Positive student and teacher behaviors and educational improvements are associated with high teacher self-efficacy (Chan, 2008).

Procedures and routines. Procedures and routines in the classroom are vital elements of classroom management. When firmly in place, they offer security to students and guidance on the how-tos in class (Wong & Wong, 2009). A classroom procedure may eventually become a classroom routine. Saphier et al. (2008) defined routine as any recurring event or situation for which there could conceivably be a regular procedure. Routines apply to a variety of procedures in the classroom, such as how the students are expected to enter and exit the classroom, submit assignments, ask questions, or work in groups. Procedures and routines are closely related. Wong and Wong (2009) defined a procedure as "what the teacher wants done" and a routine as "what the students do automatically" (p. 170). Powell (2009) reported that in terms of procedures, specificity is crucial, because "if you don't know what you want and teach for it, you'll never get it" (p. 95). It is important the routines be explained to the students beginning the first day of school and are practiced (Marshall, 2016; Wong & Wong, 2009). Modeling the expectations and giving performance feedback about student practice on the routine and procedures allows the

students to have a clear understanding of what is expected by the teacher (Powell, 2009). By doing so, students are made aware of the procedures and routines from the beginning of the school year and can be corrected in the first few weeks in case of infractions.

Established and purposeful routines decrease the likelihood of interruptions and misbehaviors, because the students are able to anticipate the process (Greenberg et al., 2014; Keidel, 2014). When the teacher has communicated the expectations of the routine clearly, students are enabled to move efficiently when transitioning between activities (Watson & Dicarlo, 2016). It is important for the procedures and routines to be communicated clearly and serve a purpose in order to decrease confusion or problems in the classroom (Powell, 2009; Saphier et al., 2008; Wong & Wong, 2009). Aloe et al. (2014) reported that effective teachers have a well-monitored system of rules and procedures to deter inappropriate or off-task behavior. Vincent (1999) reported that teachers who continuously monitor and redirect incidents appropriately in a timely manner are effective teachers. When redirecting off-task behavior, the teacher does not need to call attention to the behavior so that it causes a break in instruction, just simply using proximity is often enough to redirect the student (Cain & Laird, 2011).

Not only do procedures and routines improve classroom management and decrease off-task behavior, but students also perform better when they have procedures and routines to guide them (Marshall, 2016). In a meta-analysis study involving 636 students completed by Marzano et al. (2003) spanning roughly from 1965-2000, it was reported that the implementation of routines decreased disruptions by about 28%. With the decrease in disruptions and distractions throughout a lesson, more time can be spent on academic instruction and keeping students engaged.

Self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is defined by de Jong et al. (2014) as predicting what effort will be put into an activity. Bandura (1997) reported self-efficacy as the "beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute a course of action required to produce a given attainment" (p. 3). It is up to the talents and self-efficacy of teachers to create a learning environment conducive to the development of cognitive skills (Bandura, 1994). The success of the students depended heavily on the self-efficacy of their teacher. Teachers who worked collectively promoting academic success created a positive atmosphere of self-efficacy for the teachers and students. The positive atmosphere promoted academic attainments regardless of the student demographic being advantaged or disadvantaged. (Bandura, 1994).

Bandura (1994) reported four main sources of self-efficacy influence, which are through experience, social model experiences, social persuasion, and reducing stress reactions. The most effective way to create a strong sense of self-efficacy is through experiences. When teachers experienced integrating technology into a lesson with data collection, self-efficacy increased as well because the experience gave them confidence in their ability as teachers (Gado, Ferguson, & van't Hooft, 2006). As individuals successfully accomplish goals or tasks, they build a belief in their own personal efficacy. Successful experiences reinforce self-efficacy, but unsuccessful experiences will damage individuals' belief in their efficacy (Bandura, 1997). When an individual fails to successfully complete a task or accomplish a goal, the sense of personal efficacy is undermined (Bandura, 1994). "Teachers' performance affects their self-efficacy and self-efficacy influences teachers' performance" (Nejati, Hassani, & Sahrapour, 2014, p. 1220). DeJarnette and Sudeck (2015) found that educators who had positive experiences in their teacher preparation courses had positive efficacy for instruction, and those who had positive informal experiences with students also had positive efficacy regarding student interaction and

engagement. Research has shown that teachers who have positive classroom management experiences and student interaction tend to have greater self-efficacy in their teaching (Klassen & Chiu, 2010).

One may come to expect quick results and become easily discouraged by failure if only easy successes are experienced. For one's sense of efficacy to become more resilient, overcoming obstacles through perseverance must be experienced. When self-efficacy is firmly established, one is able to quickly rebound from setbacks and persevere through adversity (Goddard, Hoy, & Hoy, 2000). Lewis (2014) reported that meeting students' social-emotional needs and building the self-efficacy of the student begins with the positive classroom management strategies applied by teachers. However, a challenge for school leaders has been to develop or determine strategies they can use successfully in order to cultivate self-efficacy of their teachers, because doing so will powerfully impact student learning (Hardin, 2010).

Another way to strengthen self-efficacy is by providing social model experiences (Bandura, 1994). When people are uncertain of their own capabilities or have limited experience, they become more aware of their shortcomings by observing others (Matoti, Junqueira, & Odora, 2013). The key is for the observer to perceive similarities of oneself to the model. Greater successes and failures of self-efficacy are linked to the perceived similarity a person has to the model they experienced. If a person views the model as different from themselves, then their behavior and results are not much influenced (Bandura, 1994).

Bandura (1994) also mentioned social persuasion as an alternate way of strengthening one's beliefs that they have what it takes to be successful. Through this method, one is essentially verbally persuaded that one possesses the necessary abilities to master given activities. Effective persuaders must cultivate people's beliefs in their capabilities while at the

same time ensuring that the perceived success is attainable (Matoti et al., 2013). When faced with adversity, the verbal persuasions boost self-efficacy, leading one to try hard enough to succeed. Any self-doubt one may harbor is overcome by the verbal persuasion.

Reducing stress reactions and altering their negative emotional tendencies and misinterpretations of their physical states is the final method of self-efficacy to be taken into consideration (Bandura, 1994). Intensity is not important for the reaction, but rather, how the reactions and emotional tendencies are perceived and interpreted. Students claim that teachers who employ content knowledge are viewed as interested, and considered to be able to teach their content effectively (Long & Moore, 2008). One who has a high sense of efficacy is likely to view their state of effective arousal as energizing, whereas one who is plagued by self-doubt finds the reaction debilitating. Physiological indicators of efficacy play a very influential role in health functioning (Bandura, 1994). The same can be said about an individual's attitude as well. A teacher with a positive attitude towards work tends to also have a higher self-efficacy rating (Evans, 2011). When teachers display condescension, sarcasm, and lack of support in the classroom, it is counterproductive in encouraging students to take risks in the classroom, and such teachers become less effective (Marshall, 2016).

Some researchers argue that self-efficacy is a learned skill. Bembenutty (2008) stated, "I believe that teachers . . . can be trained to enhance their self-efficacy. Training them to develop specific skills helps them feel more efficacious. Each teacher needs at least to have a sense that they have the potential to improve who they are as a teacher" (p. 366). As previously stated, training teachers to enhance their self-efficacy is a challenge for school leaders (Hardin, 2010). Enhancing teacher self-efficacy is important in order to improve the academic successes of students. Chesnut and Cullen (2014) reported that teachers had significant

issues regarding self-efficacy including their ability to manage the classroom environment, facilitate and engage student learning. By implementing strategies to improve teacher self-efficacy, their ability to manage the classroom environment, and facilitate and engage student learning should increase. Dicke et al., (2014) found that low self-efficacy in classroom management from classroom disturbances predicted emotional exhaustion, meaning feelings of being emotionally drained and fatigued, which is a contributing factor to teacher attrition.

   Teacher self-efficacy. The foundational definition of teacher self-efficacy is rooted within the social cognitive theory of Bandura (1997). Generally speaking, teachers who have a high self-efficacy are more confident in their ability to obtain required or expected results. Teachers who feel more efficacious see children as partners in the creation of knowledge and are less likely to consider children's difficulties in the classroom as a personal failure (Jamil, Downer, & Pianta, 2012). Some argue that with time and experience, self-efficacy increases within the individual (Benhar, 2009; Goddard et al., 2000). Teacher self-efficacy has also been linked to teachers' classroom behaviors that affect teachers' efforts, persistence, and resilience in the face of difficulties with students (Chan, 2008). A teacher's self-efficacy is also considered to be positively related to a variety of outcomes for both teachers and their students in relation to the motivational construct (Scherer, Jansen, Nilsen, Areepattamannil, & Marsh, 2016). The ability to be strong leaders in managing behavior, student concerns, and instruction is what makes an effective teacher (Aloe et al., 2014).

   Novice teachers are most likely to struggle with self-efficacy, because they have yet to experience a variety of situations in which growing self-efficacy is a possibility (Bullock, Coplan, & Bosacki, 2015). As a novice teacher evolves into an experienced teacher, belief about meeting challenges alters due to their experience. Teachers' confidence in promoting a learning

environment depends on past experiences, but also on the school culture. Meeting the challenges and expectations of teaching are shaped in part by the attitudes of other teachers about resources, constraints, ability to facilitate their work, and organization expectations and goals (Chong, Klassen, Huan, Wong, & Kates, 2010). Mentor teachers and school administrators are able to foster a sense of efficacy for individual teachers and the entire school (Protheroe, 2008). Collaboration amongst teachers and the ability to impact decision-making significantly correlate with high self-efficacy (Epstein & Willhite, 2015).

Teachers with a higher sense of efficacy tend to experiment with instructional methods more often (Allinder, 1994) and also have students who perform higher on achievement tests than students of teachers with a lower efficacy (Anderson, Greene, & Loewen, 1998; Moore & Esselman, 1992). Research has shown that students who perceive their classroom environments as more caring, mastery oriented, and challenging tend to have higher levels of self-efficacy which translates to higher performance (Fast et al., 2010). Lower efficacy teachers tend to criticize students who respond incorrectly to questions, whereas higher efficacy teachers tend to praise the effort of the students in attempting to answer the question at all (Bullock et al., 2015). Building teaching efficacy is possible. By building a teacher's belief that the necessary skills for teaching are learnable, over time teachers can learn to handle problems that will crop up in their classroom and have a higher sense of efficacy (Bembenutty, 2008).

Review of Methodological issues

Multivariate meta-analysis. Snedecor, Ceppelleri, Wan, and Stevens (2014) reported that a multivariate meta-analysis of information "estimates an average effect even when studies have conflicting results" (p. 4). Some of the advantages within this method of research are that it uses correlated information to produce outcomes, borrows information of missing outcomes from

other studies, and can make predictions based on the association of the endpoints of various studies (Snedecor et al., 2014).

A meta-analysis can be defined by a combination of studies' results which address a common research question (Aloe et al., 2014). Multivariate meta-analysis allows for the inclusion of the correlated relationships among the effect sizes. Standard multivariate meta-analysis adopts a two-stage analysis approach by using information within and between studies (Aloe et al., 2014).

A limitation to utilizing this type of method is that the multivariate meta-analysis is generally very specific within its analysis. This becomes dependent on sample size, the presence of zero values, and how close the probability of an event is to 0 or 1 (Snedecor et al., 2014). An additional limitation is that studies' resulting in statistically significant results have a greater chance at being published than studies' results that yield non-significant results (Aloe et al., 2014). If publication bias is present, results may depart from the targeted population (Aloe et al., 2014). The publication bias is one to be taken into consideration when utilizing the multivariate meta-analysis results. In order to counteract the publication bias, a researcher utilizing a meta-analysis approach may consider including both published and unpublished studies as done by Aloe et al. (2014).

Teacher self-efficacy scale. A survey was randomly emailed out to potential participants across Canada asking for participation (Bullock et al., 2015). The researchers utilized the TSES (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001) to assess efficacy of classroom management among early childhood educators in the area of classroom management self-efficacy. Utilizing TSES (Tschannen-Moran & Wooldfolk Hoy, 2001) enabled Bullock et al.

(2015) to determine that teachers with a greater number of years of teaching experience reported higher levels of classroom management efficacy.

There are several limitations to consider when using this methodology. First, it is simply a snapshot of a given time and not a longitudinal study. Bullock et al. (2015) reported how a longitudinal study would shed more light on the development of a teacher's self-efficacy at different points throughout their career. The longitudinal study of a research is related to the social cognitive theory in which Bandura (1994) reported that mastery experiences are the principal means of personality change. Therefore, longitudinal studies allow the researcher to view how the self-efficacy of a teacher evolves over time as they gain experience in a classroom setting.

The second limitation of this methodology is the narrowed focus of the survey. The TSES (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001) only surveys the efficacy of participants in the areas of student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management. If the researcher seeks to correlate any of the previously mentioned topics with another topic not included, it may cause strife for the researcher.

An additional limitation of this methodology is the lack of narratives given by participants. The survey only identifies the participants' current practice, it does not take into consideration the pre-service education or inservice teacher education that lead to adjustments in teachers' efficacy beliefs which support considerable adjustments in authentic teaching (Chan, 2008).

Online survey. Chesnut and Cullen, (2014) utilized this method allowing participants to remain anonymous. The researchers pulled from a controlled pool of students within a teacher education program at the same university. The researchers acknowledged the criticisms

regarding self-report measures causing unnecessary error variance due to social-desirability bias, undue influence of previous and subsequent items, or other factors which may cause unnecessary error variance (Chesnut & Cullen, 2014). Safeguards, such as anonymous responses, were implemented for data collection that reduced the real world impact of survey outcomes (Chesnut & Cullen, 2014).

By sending the survey electronically to participants, the results were not influenced by the presence of the researchers. Bullock et al. (2015) also found that data was missing for less than 5% of the variables. The researchers were able to easily remedy the situation using "listwise/casewise deletion" (Bullock et al., 2015, p. 178). This also enabled the researchers to reach a greater demographic to gather information from if they chose to do so.

A limitation to this method is the unknown participation. It is a random approach where the researcher essentially sends out e-mails to potential participants not knowing if anyone will respond. Some teachers may not have been made aware of the survey and therefore did not participate. The researchers had little control over who was made aware of the survey and who was not.

Multiple survey approach. Several researchers utilized a multiple survey approach to their research. This approach may be helpful when a researcher is considering multiple variables and needs to gather data on each individual aspect, as Chong et al. (2010) did. Surprisingly the most common survey utilized among many was the TSES (Tshannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). Chong et al. (2010) and Fabio & Palazzeschi (2008) used the 24-item survey, while de Jong et al. (2014) used the 12-item version. Both versions questioned teacher self-efficacy in the areas of student engagement, instructional strategies and classroom management. The 12-item

version asked four questions in each category, while the 24-item version asked eight questions in each category.

Chong et al. (2010) utilized a multiple survey approach for research. Chong et al. (2010) researched the relationships among school types, teacher self-efficacy beliefs, and academic climate to research each different aspect of the study and also identify the relationships among them. Chong et al., (2010) also utilized the Teacher Collective Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Moran & Barr, 2004), and the Academic Climate (Sweetland & Hoy, 2000). Combined, the three surveys consisted of 30 questions in which participants responded using a 9-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*Nothing)* to 9 (*A great deal*). By utilizing the three surveys, the researchers were able to make sure all the research topics were addressed.

Chan (2008) utilized this method with a TSES-18 (TSES-18) item questionnaire and a 36-item Successful Intelligence Questionnaire (SIQ). For the TSES-18, Chan (2008) demonstrated that the TSES-18 scale has a relatively high reliability based on Cronbach's alpha values ranging from .79 to .91. This method also uses a Likert scale (0 = none at all, 5 = moderately, 10 = highly certain). This not only allows participants to respond, but also notifies the researcher as to the degree to which the participant is able to accomplish the given task or scenario in the question. Chan (2008) demonstrated that the SIQ also has a high reliability based on "Cronbach's alpha values being .878, .87, and .86 for the analytic, creative, and practical abilities scale" (p. 738). The SIQ used a six-point scale (0= least descriptive to 5= most descriptive).

The Questionnaire on Teacher Interaction (QTI) was given to students to measure the student perceptions of the teacher-student relationship using 50 items and a 5-point Likert scale ranging from *never* to *always* (de Jong et al., 2014). An additional questionnaire was used to

research the nature of discipline strategies of pre-service teachers based on punishment, recognition and reward, hinting, or aggression. This questionnaire also contained a component analysis for principals, also using a 5-point Likert scale. Extraversion and friendliness were measured using a questionnaire on a 7-point Likert scale, where participants had to identify which personality traits were applicable to them. The advantages of this study were that it not only included the participant, but also the students they interacted with and the principals who oversaw their teaching. By doing so, the researchers were able to gauge more comprehensively how effective the participant was.

The limitations encountered by de Jong et al. (2014) included participants who had more classroom experience scoring higher in self-efficacy of classroom management than their counterparts who had less experience in the classroom. Also, specific classes were selected, meaning the results may have been biased (de Jong et al., 2014). By broadening the classes selected, the outcomes may have slightly changed the results.

One limitation addressed by utilizing the multiple survey approach is a concern with one of the instruments independently. When offering a self-report, the potential for disparity between the subjective and objective measures exists (Chong et al., 2010). Additionally, the self-report may not have captured the demographic information that influences teachers' self-beliefs and perceptions (Chong et al., 2010).

Another limitation to the multiple survey approach is the same as the TSES and online-survey approach; without a narrative with the participant or open-ended response opportunities, the researcher may not know if the teacher education preparation the participant received possibly shaped their current self-efficacy. Additionally, it does not allow the researcher to know if the teacher self-efficacy of the individual has changed over the course of their career.

Mixed methods. DeJarnette and Sudeck (2015) used qualitative analysis of observational research and information interviews combined with a survey to the participants who were in their final semester of a teacher preparation program. The survey used a Likert-type scale, a scale measuring the degree to which people agree or disagree with a statement, which measured the self-efficacy through the participant's ability to establish a learning community. The surveys were administered and collected at three points during the semester; however, the survey remained anonymous, causing the researchers to be unable to track specific pre-service teachers. The researchers used a Learning Community Survey based on a 5-point Likert scale, in which participants had to rate themselves on different aspects of the learning community. Also, based on a 5-point Likert scale the researchers used a Researcher Observation Evaluation developed by one of the researchers to evaluate the extent to which the participants were implementing the learning community philosophy throughout their clinical practice experience. The third instrument used by the researchers was an informal interview of the participants with the researchers, where questions were asked about the participants' classroom management strategies observed and comments were documented regarding their learning community development. The advantage of the researchers' approach was that it included a narrative with the participants and the researchers were able to monitor improvement or lack thereof throughout the course of the semester instead of a onetime snapshot.

A limitation of DeJarnette and Sudeck's (2015) research was that it only included seven pre-service teachers who were under the direct supervision of the researchers. With a limited pool, the results are very specific to only the participants and may not be a true representation of the general population.

Evans (2011) also utilized a mixed methods research approach based on qualitative and quantitative methods. Each participant was given a content knowledge test and two questionnaires at the beginning and end of the semester. The content test consisted of 25 free-response items and was taken at both the beginning and end of a semester by participants. The first questionnaire used a 5-point Likert scale consisting of 40 items measuring the participant's attitude toward the content including self-confidence, value, enjoyment, and motivation (Evans, 2011). The second questionnaire measured teacher self-efficacy within the content utilizing a 21-item 5-point Likert scale. Both Likert scale choices ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

A limitation presented by Evans (2011) was a potential participant bias, because the researcher was also a teacher of the participants and the participants were aware of the research being conducted. An additional limitation was the convenience sampling method used by the researcher. By using a convenience sample, the researcher restricted the generalizability of the study (Evans, 2011).

Synthesis of Research Findings

Population bias. Each individual study contained a population bias. Evans (2011) and Chesnut and Cullen (2014) only pulled from pre-service teachers at a given university. The results may have turned out differently had they included other universities or participants in the teaching field. Chan (2008) and de Jong et al. (2014) utilized student teachers in pre-service and in-service training. Chan (2008) admitted that the specific group used may have been highly motived and the results may not have been a true representation of the larger population of Hong Kong Chinese teachers. With a highly motivated group as suggested by Chan (2008), one may consider the possibility of people remaining for the full term of the study and having statistically

30

less attrition. Bullock et al. (2015) sent out emails to early childhood education centers that published their contact information online in Canada. By doing so, they only received results from the random population who read the e-mail, forwarded it to the education center teachers, and the teachers who were willing to participate in a survey. The centers without online publication of contact information was not included. Without incentives offered, it may have presented a challenge in recruiting participants to forward the survey or participate in the survey. There did not appear to be any type of follow up with participants in the study completed by Bullock et al. (2015). By following up with participants who received the email but did not participant, more data may have been made available to the researchers.

In each instance, the participant pool was limited or demonstrated some bias. The bias may be based on geographical location, as was the case with Evans (2011), Chesnut and Cullen (2014), and Chan (2008), because the researchers targeted specific populations they had access to at their respective universities. Bullock et al. (2015) only reached out to early childhood education centers that published their information online. Early childhood education centers that did not publish information online were not included in the research. De Jong et al. (2014) focused on three graduate schools in the Netherlands, which excluded other countries in Europe. In every instance, some degree of population bias was present, due to accessibility issues faced by the researchers.

Male representation. Many researchers expressed the concern that males were underrepresented in the study population (Bullock et al., 2015; Chesnut & Cullen, 2014). While this may be due to the field of study, it is a concern with research findings, because the results may not be a true representation of males in the area of classroom management. Research

conducted by Bullock et al. (2015) contained 2% male participants, while Chesnut & Cullen contained approximately 12%.

In contrast with Bullock et al. (2015) and Chesnut and Cullen (2014), Chong et al. (2010) and de Jong et al. (2014) were able to secure a surprisingly higher male participation rate. Evans (2011) and Chong et al. (2010) had a male participation rate of approximately 34.5%, whereas de Jong et al. (2014) had a male participation rate of 60%. Chong et al. (2010) conducted the survey across five middle schools in Singapore, all situated in lower-middle working class residential areas, while de Jong et al. (2014) utilized three graduate schools in the Netherlands. Regardless, the concern remains that less than 50% of the participants in the studies were male. As mentioned in the preceding paragraph, this may have been a result of the specified field of study.

Questionnaires/surveys. Questionnaires and surveys seem to be the most recurring method of research. Several researchers (Bullock et al., 2015; Chan, 2008; Chesnut & Cullen, 2014; de Jong et al., 2014; Evans, 2011; Fabio & Palazzeschi, 2008) utilized a TSES survey. By only using the survey or a combination of surveys, the researchers did not have a narrative with participants to consider the teacher preparation education the participant received or any other factors that may have influenced the teaching efficacy of the participants. Without a narrative with the participants, the researchers may not have had a comprehensive understanding of the factors influencing the results. The researchers were only given information based on the questionnaires and surveys. They were unable to ask the participants for more clarification, or why they rated themselves a certain way. Bandura's (1997) social cognitive theory suggested teacher self-efficacy improves through experiences. Bullock et al.(2015), Chan (2008), Chestnut and Cullen (2014), de Jong et al. (2014), Evans (2011), and Fabio and Palazzeschi (2008) were

unable to ask participants what experiences, if any molded their teacher self-efficacy because a dialogue between researchers and participants did not exist.

Critique of Previous Research

  Teacher self-efficacy and burnout. Aloe et al. (2014) conducted a meta-analysis study of sixteen studies based on classroom management self-efficacy in areas pertaining to teacher burnout. Aloe et al. (2014) studied the relationship of classroom management self-efficacy and its contribution to teacher burnout and therefore teacher attrition. The evidence suggested that a higher level of classroom management self-efficacy meant teachers were less likely to experiences feelings of burnout (Aloe et al., 2014).

  While classroom management may be seen as one aspect of teacher burnout, Betoret (2009) reported evidence that the structural organization of a campus may also contribute. The effects of things outside the control of a teacher such as school support resources coupled with classroom management and instructional self-efficacy contribute to job stressors. In turn, the job stressors contribute to emotional exhaustion playing a role in teacher burnout as well (Betoret, 2009).

  Beginning teachers often enter the teaching profession with an intrinsic interest; however, in a study conducted by Hong (2012), it was found that they often leave due to weaker self-efficacy beliefs. The teachers who chose to leave had similar challenges to those who chose to stay in the areas of classroom management and lesson delivery (Hong, 2012). It was discovered that the beginning teachers who chose to leave were often the victims of self-imposed heavy burdens, "which may have created emotional stress and burnout" (Hong, 2012). Emotional exhaustion from classroom disturbances contributed to low-self efficacy in classroom management (Dicke et al., 2014).

While the previously mentioned studies discuss teacher self-efficacy and/or classroom management in some capacity, they fail to analyze specifically teacher self-efficacy in classroom management for teachers in grades 6–8. Some look at teacher self-efficacy and burnout to find that weaker self-efficacy in instruction or classroom management and job stressors contribute to teacher burnout (Aloe et al., 2014; Betoret, 2009; Hong, 2012). Chesnut and Cullen (2014) with Fabio and Palazzeschi (2008) found that high emotional intelligence contributes to the ability of one to effectively manage a classroom. Dicke et al. (2014) found that self-efficacy in classroom management predicted emotional exhaustion from classroom disturbances when self-efficacy in classroom management was low, which is a contributing factor to teacher attrition. Bullock et al. (2015) researched the self-efficacy of novice teachers in early childhood education.

While a substantial amount of research has been done on self-efficacy of novice teachers (Aloe, 2014; Bullock et al., 2015; Chan, 2008; Hong, 2012), the gap in literature remains for novice teachers in grade 6–8 pertaining specifically to self-efficacy in classroom management. This researcher aims to provide more information pertaining to the literature on this topic for future researchers. With more information available, districts, campuses and teacher education training programs may be able to provide a more focused support system for novice teachers.

Teacher self-efficacy and emotional intelligence. Research suggests that emotional intelligence may also play a role in teacher self-efficacy. Chesnut and Cullen (2014) found pre-service teachers with greater emotional intelligence and motivational thinking demonstrated high levels of commitment and satisfaction upon entering the profession of teaching. The high levels of commitment were found to be positively correlated with high levels of teacher self-efficacy (Chesnut & Cullen, 2014). Similar to Chesnut and Cullen, (2014) Fabio and Palazzeschi (2008) found a positive relationship between emotional intelligence and teacher self-efficacy. More

advanced teacher self-efficacy in the ability to manage a classroom was linked to more advanced emotional intelligence (Fabio & Palazzeschi, 2008).

Teacher self-efficacy in student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management. Many researchers who studied teacher self-efficacy used Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy's (2001) Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale, also referred to as the Ohio State Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale. This researcher believes it was used in part because its reliability and validity had already been established. There are also long and short versions available, giving researchers the flexibility to use the version best suited to their needs. The evidence found in studies supports its use as a valuable tool to study teacher self-efficacy (Bullock et al., 2015; Chan, 2008; Chesnut & Cullen, 2014; Chong, 2010; de Jong et al., 2014, Fabio & Palazzeschi, 2008; Hicks, 2012; Hui, Snider, & Couture 2016).

A study conducted by Shoulders and Krei (2015) found that teachers with more than 15 years of teaching experience combined with a Master's degree were more efficacious in classroom management and instructional practices. When it came to student engagement, Shoulders and Krei (2015) could not find a statistically significant difference between education levels and years of experience.

Using the same instrument as Shoulders and Krei (2015), Shaukat and Iqbal (2012) examined teacher self-efficacy as a function of student engagement, using instructional strategies and classroom management (p. 85). Shaukat and Iqbal (2012) found that male teachers and those with a Master's degree tended to show more efficacy in classroom management than female teachers or those with only a Bachelor's degree. However, the researchers found no statistically significant difference between education levels or gender in the areas of student engagement and instructional strategies. While no differences were revealed across all age groups in the area of

instructional strategies, it was reported that older teachers were less likely to engage students and manage classrooms when compared to younger teachers (Shaukat & Iqbal, 2012).

Chapter 2 Summary

This literature review is based on Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory, which defines teacher self-efficacy as the belief in one's capability to execute specific demands or reach goals (Bandura, 1994). Classroom management can be defined as the ability to keep classroom learning activities running smoothly with an established routine while calming and responding defiant students, and controlling disruptive behavior (Aloe et al., 2014). This study will seek to identify teachers' belief in their possessing the capability to execute effective classroom management. The strategies utilized by a teacher to maintain the flow of the classroom can influence student motivation, respect, and discipline either positively or negatively (DeJarnette & Sudeck, 2015). Classroom management has been rated as the most challenging aspect of teaching for novice teachers, and many do not receive adequate classroom management training during their pre-service teacher education training (Freeman, Simonsen, Briere, & MacSuga-Gage, 2014).The inadequacy of training causes novice teachers to lack self-efficacy in classroom management abilities (Lewis, 2014). Three aspects of classroom management – student engagement, discipline, and procedures and routines – will be taken into consideration when looking at teacher self-efficacy in classroom management.

Based on the framework of Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory, Bandura's (1994) research reported that teacher self-efficacy is the belief in one's capability to execute specific demands or reach goals. Based on this theory, teachers change their classroom management approach over time due to their experiences. The performance of teachers affects their self-efficacy and vice versa (Nejati, et al., 2014). Experiences influence self-efficacy, because a

36

positive experience in classroom management or instruction promotes a positive efficacy in that area, increasing one's confidence through that experience (Bandura, 1994; DeJarnette & Sudeck, 2015).

Teachers who feel more effective in their teaching tend to see students as partners in learning and are less likely to take behavior disturbances personally (Jamil et al., 2012). However, collaboration amongst teachers is correlated with higher self-efficacy (Epstein & Willhite, 2015). Working together, the three sub-areas of classroom management consisting of engagement, discipline, and procedures and routines provide a foundation of classroom management for teachers. Teachers who show efficacy in the areas of classroom management are likely to be successful (Marzano et al., 2003).

Chapter 3: Research Methodology

Introduction

This explanatory qualitative research case study sought to identify the extent to which teachers possess self-efficacy in classroom management. The case study also researched how teachers demonstrated efficacy in classroom management. As stated in Chapter 2, this study was based on the framework of Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory. Bandura's (1994) research reported that teacher self-efficacy is the belief in one's capability to accomplish goals and execute specific demands.

To asses a teacher's self-efficacy in classroom management, participants completed the survey from Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy's (2001) Teacher Self-Efficacy Survey (TSES). In addition to the survey, the number of years of experience in teaching was requested in order to verify that each participant was in fact a novice teacher. The survey was given as a blind survey, because there was no identifying information attached to the survey. Upon volunteering to participate in this research study, each participant gave me a preferred email address where I emailed them the Qualtrics link to complete the survey. The participants received emails as reminders to complete the survey throughout the process. For this study, I focused on eight questions within TSES specifically pertaining to classroom management. The goal of the survey was to find if the teachers believed themselves to be effective in the area of classroom management. A follow-up interview was conducted, where participants were asked eight questions pertaining to their classroom management preparation, experience, and achievement level. This guided me in discovering any commonalities or differences in the experience of novice teachers.

Research Questions

Through this research study, I asked the following research questions:

1. How do novice middle school teachers demonstrate teacher self-efficacy in classroom management?

2. How do novice middle school teachers achieve their level of teacher self-efficacy in classroom management?

Purpose and Design of the Study

The purpose of this study was to find teacher self-efficacy in classroom management amongst novice teachers, those with less than five years of teaching experience. The study focused on teachers of grades sixth through eighth, finding how teachers learned classroom management strategies. This study was an explanatory qualitative case study analyzing teacher self-efficacy in classroom management. I, with permission of use from the authors, transcribed the Teacher Self-Efficacy Survey created by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001), and used Qualtrics, an online survey tool, to distribute and analyze the survey. Doing so allowed me to receive survey results electronically.

Principals of all three participating campuses allowed me to meet with their faculty at each of the three middle school campuses, for a total of 146 teachers (53 teachers on Campus A, 50 teachers on Campus B, and 43 teachers on Campus C), to explain the process of the case study during a faculty meeting. Campus A and C allowed me to present to faculty upon the conclusion of a faculty meeting. Campus B offered time with teachers through their Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings. At the conclusion of my presentation, the volunteering participants gave me their preferred contact information, signed the consent form (see Appendix B), and scheduled face-to-face interviews. Once contact information was received, the consent

form signed, and an interview scheduled, I emailed a link to the participants for completion of the survey. An additional email followed, with a confirmation of the scheduled interview date and time. I expected approximately five volunteers from each of the three campuses for a total of approximately 15 participants. However, I received 13 volunteers. Campus A had seven participants volunteer, Campus B had five volunteer, and Campus C had one participant volunteer. There were no incentives offered for participation in this research study.

Chesnut and Cullen (2014) utilized an online survey approach, but never met directly with participants. By meeting with participants and explaining the process, I hoped to avoid unknown participation and reliance on others to send information to participants. I also provided background information to the participants, explaining that self-efficacy is the belief in one's capability to execute specific demands or reach goals. "People with high assurance in their capabilities approach difficult tasks as challenges to be mastered rather than as threats to be avoided" (Bandura, 1994, p. 2). I explained that classroom management consists of management of student care, discipline, order, and the overall organization of the learning environment (Stensmo, 1995).

After collecting the results of the online survey, Using techniques recommended by Hatch (2002), I analyzed data for commonalities amongst participant responses to TSES questions related specifically to classroom management, as well as commonalities amongst interview responses. The purpose of this was to analyze potential answers to the first research question asking how the novice middle school teachers demonstrate teacher self-efficacy in classroom management. During the interview phase, I asked participants the questions written in Appendix A. The responses to these questions allowed me to gain information pertaining to the second research question, how novice middle school teachers achieve their level of teacher self-

efficacy in classroom management. It also allowed me to gather information about both the pre-service and the in-service training that participants received pertaining to classroom management.

By completing the interview, I was able to delve into what influenced a teacher's self-efficacy beliefs and perceptions (Chong et al., 2010). With the permission of the participant, I recorded the interviews. By doing so, the flow of the interview was maintained and I did not miss any information given by the participant. Upon completion of the interview I transcribed the interview into a word document. A copy of the completed transcription was delivered to the participant within three days of the interview in a sealed envelope which allowed the individual to verify that the transcribed information was correct and accurate, while maintaining confidentiality. After the individuals had verified the information to be correct and accurate, they returned the transcription to me in a sealed envelope with their signature across the closure to ensure confidentiality of the document. Upon receipt of the verified transcription, the interview responses for each participant were added to their Qualtrics survey. If a participant did not complete the survey but completed the interview, a survey was created for the individual and survey responses were left blank.

Research Population, Sampling Method and Related Procedures

The target population for this study were 13 novice teachers in grades sixth through eighth, from three middle school campuses in the western region of Texas. As previously mentioned, novice teachers are those who have five years or less of classroom teaching experience. Each of the three campuses achieved a 2015 accountability rating as "Met Standard" as identified by the state of Texas, meaning each campus made the required percentage of improvement on the state's standardized test. Of the campus teacher populations, approximately

41

24% of the teachers were identified as novice teachers according to the Texas Education Agency (TEA, 2015). Each campus was chosen based on the professional relationship I have with the participating campus. I was no longer employed by the campuses or district at the time of the research study, but had built professional relationships with the administrators in the past. The participants from each campus were selected on a volunteer basis. If at any time participants wished to dissociate themselves from the study they were able to freely do so. Each campus participant was informed of the study and sent an email with a link to a survey. A follow-up interview was conducted with the willing participants.

Instrumentation

The long form of the TSES was administered to the participants (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). It consisted of 24 questions. The instrument measured teacher self-efficacy in student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management with eight questions pertaining to each sub topic. This survey was used with permission from the author Anita Woolfolk Hoy and was made available to the public from the author's website (Appendix C and Appendix D).

Additionally, participants who volunteered to participate in the survey met face-to-face with me for a follow-up interview. The same interview questions were asked of each participant and the responses were transcribed (Appendix A). Interviews have a strength as a source of evidence, because the questions may be targeted, focusing directly on the case study and also allow the participant to provide explanation as well as personal views (Yin, 2014).

In addition to the survey and interview, the third data point in my research study consisted of obtaining the number of discipline referrals written by each participant over the past

3 years. Yin (2014) reported that, "By developing convergent evidence, data triangulation helps to strengthen the construct validity" of a single research study (p. 121).

Data Collection

The 24-question survey was transcribed into a survey form utilizing Qualtrics, an online data collection tool. Once the form had been completed, participants were emailed a hyperlink to complete the survey. At the end of the survey, the participant simply clicked "submit", which allowed me to view submissions. When submissions were completed, the data was exported to a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet in order to create tables from the submitted information. In addition to the 24-question survey, participants were asked how many years of experience they had teaching and how many discipline referrals they had written over the past three school years.

While collecting survey submissions, participants took part in an audio recorded interview which was then transcribed. It was important to meet with the participant face-to-face because studies have reported the lack of meeting face-to-face with participants was a limitation (Bullock et al., 2015; Chan, 2008; Chesnut & Cullen, 2014). By using different sources of data collection, I was able to provide different sources of evidence for data triangulation (Yin, 2014).

Numerous studies have been conducted utilizing the TSES (Bullock et al., 2015; Chan, 2008; Chesnut & Cullen, 2014; Chong et al., 2010; de Jong et al., 2014; Fabio & Palezzeschi, 2008; Hui et al., 2016; Shoulders & Krei, 2015). In several instances the survey was handed directly to the participants (Chong et al., 2010; de Jong et al., 2014; Fabio & Palezzeschi, 2008). I have opted to distribute the survey online in order to remove human error from calculating results, expedite the collection process, and reduce paper waste through the use of technology. However, I initially met with participants during a faculty meeting or PLC in order to explain the

research questions, explain the process and respond to any questions or concerns participants might have before completing the survey through the Qualtrics survey system.

Identification of Attributes

The TSES asked the participants eight questions pertaining to self-efficacy in classroom management. One question asked "How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?" As defined in Chapter 2, self-efficacy is the belief in one's capability to execute specific demands or reach goals. The participants responded to the self-efficacy questions on a Likert scale of 1 through 9 with odd numbers being described as the following, "not at all, very little, some degree, quite a bit, or a great deal." Based on the responses of the participants, I was able to determine the self-efficacy, or belief the participants had in themselves in the area of classroom management.

Through the face-to-face interview questions, I was able to probe how participants acquired classroom management skills and how their skills have changed through the course of their experience as a classroom teacher. The questions were designed to also gain knowledge about the support that was given to teachers in the area of classroom management both as pre-service and in-service teachers. Through the interview, I was able to answer the second research question, how do novice middle school teachers achieve their level of self-efficacy in classroom management?

Data Analysis Procedures

Based on the directions for scoring the TSES (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001) items numbered 3, 5, 8, 13, 15, 16, 19, and 21 determine teacher self-efficacy in the area of classroom management. Using percentages, I summarized the Likert data received from the participants. I used Qualtrics to analyze the qualitative data received from participants during the

face-to-face interview. Additionally, this assisted me in answering the research questions, how do teachers demonstrate self-efficacy in classroom management and how do teachers achieve their level of self-efficacy in classroom management. Using Qualtrics also allowed me to analyze responses of self-efficacy in classroom management based on years of teaching experience. For example, is there an upward trend of self-efficacy in classroom management as the years of teaching experience increase?

When analyzing the face-to-face interviews I implemented techniques described by Hatch (2002) for use with typological data. Hatch (2002) reported a typological analysis divides the overall data set into categories based on predetermined typologies. Each interview question was analyzed as its own category and relationships amongst participant responses were identified based on commonalities amongst responses. Participants may have cited multiple reasons in response to each question, therefore each reason was tallied individually and reflected in the results as common themes amongst the responses.

Limitations and Delimitations of the Research Design

A limitation of this research design was the online survey, because participants self-reported. Self-reporting enabled participants to report on their own self-efficacy, which had the potential of their being biased toward their strengths or weaknesses. I chose to use the TSES, because the reliability of the survey is proven and it has been repeatedly used in other research.

An additional limitation of this research design is population. Most (approximately 90%) participants attended the same university. Therefore, the pre-service education received in classroom management is very similar amongst participants. However, the difference was the in-service classroom management participants received on their individual campuses. All

45

participants are within the same school district, and therefore any classroom management training offered by the district was made available to all participants.

I chose to focus this in-depth qualitative case study on novice teachers in Grade 6 through Grade 8 due to the lack of research pertaining to novice middle school teachers in the area of self-efficacy in classroom management. As expected, commonalities were found amongst the responses.

Validation

Credibility. In order to ensure credibility of data, steps were taken to maintain confidentiality of the research. Any information from the survey received through Qualtrics was downloaded, saved as a 'zip.file' and password protected on my computer, which remained locked in my safe at home when not in use. To access Qualtrics information a password was also required, which was known only to me, the researcher. The interview transcripts were also password protected on a 'zip.file' on my computer. The paper copies were hand delivered to the participants in a sealed envelope with my signature across the seal. When the participants had read and agreed that the transcription was accurate and correct, the transcripts were returned to me in a sealed envelope with their signature or marking across the seal, which ensured confidentiality. After checking transcript verifications, the paper copies of the interview transcriptions were shredded.

Utilizing Qualtrics eliminated possible human error in data collection, and also excluded the possibility of myself or a participant misplacing a completed survey in an unsecured area, where others might have access to it. All information submitted and transcribed into Qualtrics was password protected. Additionally, as a certified Texas educator, I am bound to the Texas Administrative Code, Educator Code of Ethics. According to the Texas Educator Code of Ethics

(2010) standard 2A.2.1, the information each participant submitted to me is considered to be

personal information and cannot be disclosed to the campus or district unless it serves a lawful

professional purpose or is required by law.

Dependability. The TSES had been tested and was considered to be a reliable test of

teacher self-efficacy. It was a survey repeatedly used in other studies to research teacher self-

efficacy in student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management. By

collecting a number of discipline referrals written by participants, I was able to have an

additional data source about each participant's self-efficacy in classroom management. This also

allowed me to look for trends in the participants' self-efficacy in classroom management over

time, based on the increase or decrease of discipline referrals each year.

Expected Findings

Through this research, I expected to discover that teacher self-efficacy in classroom

management is low with novice teachers, but increases over time as the teachers gain experience.

I expected to see results indicating a teacher with five years of experience is likely to have higher

self-efficacy in classroom management than a teacher with one year or less of classroom

experience. These expected results would be indicated by the number of discipline referrals

written over time when comparing the participants. The TSES also asked questions pertaining to

classroom management. When analyzing participant scores, I expected to see teachers with three

or four years of experience rate themselves at a higher level of self-efficacy than those with zero

years of in-service teaching experience. This was not always the case.

I expected to discover that no isolated training has been received by participants in the

areas of classroom management within pre-service education or in-service staff development.

During the follow-up interview with participants, I expected to find that novice teachers learned

classroom management from either a colleague or by trial and error through experience. I also expect there will be a participant that sought out classroom management trainings or information through alternative sources such as books, articles, or internet searches. I expect classroom management trainings were offered to participants but may not have the words "classroom management" in the title so it is possible a novice teacher would overlook the training as classroom management resource.

If my expectations were fulfilled, the results would inform the literature by drawing attention to the need for isolated pre-service classroom management training for novice teachers. This research would also highlight the need for in-service classroom management training for novice teachers.

Ethical Issues

Conflict of interest assessment. I did not face any conflict of interest with the participants in this study. I had no previous knowledge of the participants and was not an employee of the district or campuses at the time of the research study. Additionally, no family member was an employee of the district at the time the research study was conducted.

Researcher's position. My intentions were to add to existing literature pertaining to teacher self-efficacy in classroom management in relation to novice teachers in grades six through eight. The ethics code for conducting research as outlined by the American Psychological Association's (APA) Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct (2010) was conformed to during this research study.

Ethical issues in the study. The potential for ethical issues to arise was present in this case study, due to the use of human beings as participants. However, this risk was eliminated by adhering to APA's Code of Conduct and not discriminating against participants based on "age,

gender, gender identity, race, ethnicity, culture, national origin, religion, sexual orientation, disability, socioeconomic status or any basis proscribed by law" (APA, 2010, p. 5).

Chapter 3 Summary

This was an explanatory qualitative research study which sought to identify the extent to which teachers possess self-efficacy in classroom management. As stated in Chapter 2, this study was based on the framework of Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory. Bandura's (1994) research reported that teacher self-efficacy is the belief in one's capability to accomplish goals and execute specific demands.

Participants were novice teachers in grades six through eight from three middle school campuses. To find a teacher's self-efficacy in classroom management, participants completed the TSES. For this study, I focused on eight questions within TSES specifically pertaining to classroom management. The goal of the survey was to find if teachers believe themselves to be effective in the area of classroom management. A follow-up interview was conducted, where participants were asked eight questions pertaining to their classroom management preparation and experience. This guided me to discover any commonalities or differences in the classroom management experience of novice teachers. As a third data source, I obtained the total number of referrals written over the past three years by each participant. This allowed an upward or downward trend to be seen for classroom management.

Chapter 4: Data Analysis and Results

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the sample population, methodology, findings, and present the results of this research case study. This research case study aimed to identify the extent to which novice middle school teachers possess self-efficacy in classroom management. The research questions are as follows:

1. How do novice middle school teachers demonstrate teacher self-efficacy in classroom management?

2. How do novice middle school teachers achieve their level of self-efficacy in classroom management?

As stated in Chapter 2, this study is based on the framework of Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory. Bandura's (1994) social cognitive theory "prescribes mastery experiences as the principal means of personality change" (p. 6). Based on this theory, teachers change their classroom management approach over time due to their experiences. When experiences are combined with self-motivation and choice, Bandura (1997) argued, the combination determines the thoughts, actions, and motives of human beings. Bandura's (1994) research reported that teacher self-efficacy is the belief in one's capability to accomplish goals and execute specific demands.

After gaining site permissions, my role as the researcher was to recruit eligible participants, distribute the online blind survey, and conduct face-to-face interviews. Upon completion of the interviews, I transcribed each of the 12 interviews and handed over their interview transcripts to each of the 12 participants in sealed envelopes, allowing them to verify that the information was correct and accurate. Once verified, each participant returned the

transcript to me in a sealed envelope. I personally distributed and collected each envelope in order to ensure confidentiality.

Description of the Sample

The participants were recruited across three middle schools within the same urban West Texas school district. As stated in Chapter 2 in the context of the case study section, two of the three middle schools are considered to be comparable campuses by the state of Texas based on demographic information (TEA, 2016).   The three campuses are predominantly comprised of Hispanic teachers who, according to the Oxford dictionary, are those who ethnically identify themselves as Spanish-speaking persons living in the US, especially as people of Latin American descent. Of the campus teacher populations, approximately 24% of the teachers are identified as novice teachers, individuals with zero through five years of teaching experience, according to the Texas Education Agency (TEA, 2015). Two of the campuses allowed me to meet the school faculty during a staff meeting to explain my research and recruit potential participants. At the first campus one volunteered to participate in the research study, while at the second campus seven participants volunteered. The third campus allowed me to recruit teachers through Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). After speaking to each of the four PLCs, five participants volunteered to participate.

In the voluntary response sample population of approximately 45 middle school teachers, 13 novice teachers, those with zero through five years of teaching experience, eight females and five males, volunteered to participate. Of the 13 participants, 11 participants, seven females and four males, completed both the blind survey and the interview of the research case study. Of the remaining two participants, one completed only the face-to-face interview, while the other participant completed only the online survey. Two follow-up emails were sent to these two

participants in an effort to secure completion, but no response was received. Data is given based on the information obtained from all 13 participants. Data in Table 1 is a description of the completed years of classroom teaching experience for the participants.

Table 1

Participant years of experience

Completed years of classroom teaching experience	Number of participants
0	3
1	3
2	4
3	3

Research Methodology and Analysis

Case Study. The methodological approach used was an explanatory case study. The objective of a single case study is to capture the circumstances and conditions of an everyday situation (Yin, 2014). A case study methodological approach was chosen due to self-efficacy in classroom management and the circumstances surrounding an individual's classroom management method being an everyday situation for the participants. It is not something that happens only once. According to Baxter and Jack (2008), an explanatory case study is conducted when the researcher seeks to answer a question that intends to explain the presumed causal links in real-life interventions, which are too complex for the survey or experimental strategies.

In the context of this specific case study, the TSES and self-reported number of written discipline referrals assisted in answering the first research question, "How do novice middle school teachers demonstrate teacher self-efficacy in classroom management?" Interviews were conducted to identify the causal links of one's self-efficacy in classroom management, and how their specific level was achieved. The interview data collection provided the answer to the

second research question, "How do novice middle school teachers achieve their level of teacher self-efficacy in classroom management?"

When participants volunteered, they immediately signed the consent form and scheduled a mutually convenient time for the interview to take place. Each interview took place on the campus of the participant either in their classroom or in a conference room during the conference time of the participant or after school hours. A conference time is a class period within the school day where a teacher does not serve students. It is designated to meet with or make contact with parents, faculty, or administrators. Within three business days of the interview, the interview transcripts were handed over to each participant for them to verify the transcripts. Within three business days of the transcripts being given to the participants for verification, the transcripts were collected from participants. Each transcript exchange was made using a sealed envelope. During the time the transcripts were in my possession, they were kept in a locked safe at my residence. This process ensured confidentiality. The TSES (Tschannen Moran & Woolfolk-Hoy, 2001) were transcribed into the Qualtrics online survey system and distributed to participants as a blind survey. A blind survey does not ask for identifying information, which allowed my participants to be honest without any apprehension of being identified. To send the surveys, the preferred email addresses of participants were put into the Qualtrics website, then Qualtrics emailed the survey to participants at the scheduled time. Email reminders were sent through Qualtrics, containing a link to the survey and a link for them to opt out of the study. The recruiting, interview, and transcript verification took place over the course of four weeks.

As mentioned in Chapters 2 and 3, questionnaires and surveys are the most frequently occurring method of research used in the area of classroom management and self-efficacy. Several researchers utilized a TSES survey, which is why it was chosen for this research case

study (Bullock et al., 2015; Chan, 2008, Chesnut et al., 2014; de Jong et al., 2014; Evans, 2011; Fabio & Palazzeschi, 2008). By only using the survey or a combination of surveys, the researchers did not have a narrative with participants to consider the teacher preparation education the participant received or any other factors that may have influenced the teaching efficacy of the participants. The surveys were distributed online as a blind survey in order to remove human error from calculating results, in an attempt to help the participants feel at ease when self-reporting information, and to expedite the collection process. Without a narrative with the participants, the researchers may not have had a comprehensive understanding of the factors influencing the results. To gain a more comprehensive understanding, the TSES was combined with a face-to-face interview for this research case study.

In the survey, participants were also asked to report the number of completed years of teaching experience they possessed, and the number of discipline referrals they had written over the course of three school years. The survey did not ask for any identifying information. While collecting online survey submissions, I also met with participants to interview them face-to-face with an audio recording, then transcribed the interview, and handed over the transcript to the participant for verification. It was important for me to meet with the participants face-to-face, because studies have reported that the lack of meeting face-to-face with participants was a limitation (Bullock et al., 2015; Chan, 2008; Chesnut & Cullen, 2014). By using different sources of data collection, I was able to provide different sources of evidence for data triangulation (Yin, 2014).

Of the 24 questions on the TSES, eight questions were asked pertaining to self-efficacy in classroom management, which were analyzed for this research case study. The participants responded to the self-efficacy questions on a Likert scale ranging from "1-not at all" to "9-a great

deal." Based on the responses, the self-efficacy the participant has in the area of classroom

management was determined. Percentages were used to report the data of the TSES survey

questions. To calculate the percentages, the number of participants answering a specific Likert

indicator was divided by the total number of participants, then multiplied by 100. When

participants were asked "How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?"

two of the 12 participants responded with "some degree (5)." Two divided by 12 is equal to

0.166, which was multiplied by 100 to arrive at 16.6%. The percentages were then rounded off to

the nearest whole percent, making this specific example 17%. The results of the blind survey

analysis are reported in Table 2.

Table 2

Participants' survey responses to self-efficacy in classroom management

Question Number	Likert scale								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	Not at all		Very Little		Some Degree		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal
3. How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?	0%	0%	0%	0%	17%	0%	58%	25%	0%
5. To what extent can you make your expectations clear about student behavior?	0%	0%	0 %	0%	0%	8%	33%	33%	25%
8. How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?	0%	0%	0%	0%	17%	25%	50%	0%	8%
13. How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?	0%	0%	0%	33%	0%	17%	42%	25%	8%
15. How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?	0%	0%	0%	8%	17%	0%	33%	25%	17%
16. How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?	0%	0%	0%	0%	8%	25%	50%	8%	8%
19. How well can you keep a few problem students from ruining an entire lesson?	0%	0%	8%	0%	25%	17%	42%	17%	0%
21. How well can you respond to defiant students?	0%	0%	0%	0%	8%	33%	42%	17%	0%

Hatch (2002) reported that a typological analysis divides the overall data set into categories based on predetermined typologies. Each interview question was analyzed as its own category and relationships amongst participant responses were identified. Hatch's (2002) steps

for analyzing typological data were followed. The response tally for each question may not add up to the participant numbers due to the open ended response allowing participants to answer with multiple strategies or methods. The interview questions and common themes for each question are reported in Table 3. The numbers in parentheses refer to the number of participants reporting the specific response.

Table 3

Interview questions and participant responses

Questions	Response (number of participants with that response)
1. How did you learn about classroom management?	Mentors (3) Books/Articles (2) Trial & Error (3) Peers (5) Job Experience (4) Professional Development (1) Pre-service Education (1)
2a. What pre-service preparation did you have in classroom management?	Previous Experience (2) Through conversation in College Classes (3) None (3) Internship (1) Learning Modules (1) College Course (1)
2b. What support is offered now as an in-service teacher?	Mentor (3) Administrator (4) Instructional Coach (2) Professional Development (3) Peers (4) None (1) Experience (1)
3. Teacher self-efficacy is the belief in one's capability to execute specific demands or reach goals. How did your teacher preparation education shape your current self-efficacy in classroom management?	Increased Self-Esteem (1) It did not (6) Learning Modules (1) Expectations (2) Earn respect from students by developing a relationship (1)

Question	Response (number of participants with that response)
4. What in-service professional development have you participated in regarding classroom management?	Direct Classroom Management Training (3) None (2) Strategic Training with Classroom Management as a Byproduct (15) -English as a Second Language strategies (1) -Special Education strategies (1) -Expectations, Rituals and Routines (1) -Learning Modules (1) -New Teacher Partnership (2) -Fundamental 5 book (2) -Harry Wong's First Days of School (1) -Classroom Management (2) -Differentiating Instruction (1) -No More Molasses Classes book (1) -Kagen Strategies (1) -Boys Town (1)
5. On a scale of 1-10, 1 being "not at all" and 10 being "extremely effective", how effective do you believe your classroom management to be? Why?	5 (3) – Some days we're on point, other days we are not. - I'm not assertive enough and struggle with consistency and following through from beginning to end. - Still learning but implementing strategies that worked from my first year. 5.5 (1) More to learn 6 (1) I should be more strict, sometimes we get out of hand. 7 (1) I still need to figure a few things out but don't have major issues. 7.5 (1) There is always room for improvement but my expectations are communicated clearly. 8 (3) - Always room for improvement but I keep the students engaged and participating - Routines, procedures, positive rapport, and reward system are all in place and utilized. - Structured lessons, timed lessons, organization is in place, routines and procedures are in place. 9 (1) No difficulties

Question	Response (number of participants with that response)

6. Using the previously mentioned scale of one through 10, how has your efficacy in classroom management changed throughout your teaching experience?	1.5 (1) I was teaching but not worrying about what the students were doing.
	2 (2) - Students were safe but very little learning was taking place.
	  - Students were testing me because I started teaching after the school year started.
	  - No routines, no procedures, the students were not involved.
	2.5 (1) I started after the school year began and students were used to substitutes coming and going.
	3 (2) - I did not have the experience I do now
	  - I did not know how to get the students attention. I did not realize that what works for one may not work for another.
	4 (1) Lack of rituals and routines and changing rules constantly.
	6 (2) - Large class size, no experience, lack of confidence, not efficient.
	  - I could have done things differently to be better but the class was very structured at the time.
	9 (1) Previous job experience helped me learn my own style of classroom management.

7. How did you achieve your current level of teacher self-efficacy in classroom management?	Trial and Error (5) Peers (4) Mentor (1) Clear Expectations (1) Books/Internet (2) Student Conferences (1) Immediate Feedback (1)
8. How do you demonstrate teacher self-efficacy in classroom management?	Routines and Procedures (8) Clear Expectations (3)

Through the face-to-face interview questions, the participants were asked questions about how they acquired classroom management skills and how their skills have changed through the years of experience as a classroom teacher. The interview questions were designed in a way to also gain knowledge about the support that has been given to teachers in the area of classroom management both as pre-service and in-service teachers. The questions asked in the interview

gleaned information which answered the second research question, "How do novice middle school teachers achieve their level of self-efficacy in classroom management?" When calculating the open-ended interview data, a different approach from the blind survey data was taken. All the responses were downloaded from Qualtrics and placed into a word document sorted by question number. Within each question response, common themes were highlighted and counted. The recurring themes were, trial and error, peers, mentors, books/internet, experience, and administrators. For experience, some identified it as classroom experience while others identified it as pervious job experience. One participant attributed achievement of level of self-efficacy in classroom management to learning modules. These were the themes that arose during the interview that participants attributed their achievement of level of self-efficacy in classroom management to. The goal of the interview was to answer the second research question, the focus was on the responses answering that question.

Utilizing the blind survey method allowed participants to self-report on their self-efficacy in classroom management and the number of discipline referrals they had written over three school years, without disclosing any identifying information. The blind survey method also assisted in keeping information confidential, because the information given was only seen by the individual participant and myself. These two data points allowed me to answer the first research question asking "how do novice middle school teachers demonstrate teacher self-efficacy in classroom management?" The face-to-face interview allowed me to identify similar patterns among participants pertaining to where their own classroom management knowledge came from. Having this information allowed me to answer the second research question, because the information gained allowed me to determine how each participant achieved their level of self-efficacy in classroom management.

Summary of the Findings

   Demonstrate self-efficacy in classroom management. In Chapter 2, it was reported that as individuals achieve success in accomplishing goals or tasks, they build a belief in their own personal efficacy. Successful experiences reinforce self-efficacy, but unsuccessful experiences will damage individuals' belief in their efficacy (Bandura, 1997). Also as reported in Chapter 2, research has shown that teachers who have positive classroom management experiences and student interaction tend to have greater self-efficacy in their teaching (Klassen & Chiu, 2010). Therefore, as classroom teaching experience increases, self-efficacy increases as well. As a result of increased teacher self-efficacy that comes with experience, five of 12 teacher participants self-reported a decline in discipline referrals from the 2014–2015 school year to the 2015–2016 school year, while seven of the 12 participants self-reported a decline in discipline referrals from the 2015–2016 school year to the current school year. Two participants self-reported an increase in discipline referrals from the 2014–2015 school year to the 2015–2016 school year, but then self-reported a decline of discipline referrals from the 2015–2016 school year to the current school year. The cause for the upswing in written discipline referrals from 2014–2015 to 2015–2016 is unknown. The data described in this paragraph is reported in Table 4.

Table 4

Self-reported discipline referrals written over a three-year period

	2016-2017 School Year	2015-2016 School Year	2014-2015 School Year
Participant 1	1	N/A*	N/A
Participant 2	2	N/A	N/A
Participant 3	6	N/A	N/A
Participant 4	0	2	4
Participant 5	0	4	N/A
Participant 6	0	N/A	N/A
Participant 7	0	9	3
Participant 8	0	3	5
Participant 9	3	1	0
Participant 10	2	2	3
Participant 11	1	3	6
Participant 12	0	3	6

Retrieved from Qualtrics (December 5, 2016).
Note. *N/A is the value used when no data was available for that school year.

This information correlates with a set of interview questions asking the participants to rank themselves on a scale of 1-10, one being "not at all" and 10 being "excellent", in the area of classroom management during their first year and during the current year. The participants self-reported as having better classroom management currently than during their first year or week of teaching experience. During one participant's first year of teaching the participant self-reported a score of 2. Participant 1 stated:

> The first nine weeks of my teaching was probably a 2. Students were not hurting each
> other but I'm pretty sure they did not learn much. I improved through my first year as I
> started being presented with situations to find answers to. Now I would rate myself a 5 or
> 6 because I know there is more out there for me to learn.

Participant 6 stated:

> At the beginning I was probably a 2 but I have improved since then because as soon as the students walk in I address any issue. I know I have a long way to go and I'm not where I want to be. Now I would rate myself a 5. I don't think I am assertive enough and I struggle with being firm and direct from beginning to end.

One question asked of all participants was, "How do you demonstrate self-efficacy in classroom management?" As an opened-ended question, participants were able to interpret the question differently. Participant 1 responded "I think I demonstrate efficacy in classroom management because I can take something that works in the classroom and put it to use when we are off campus and it still works." Participant 3 responded, "I follow the requirements." Several respondents had similar answers, responding they demonstrate self-efficacy because the students know what to expect in their classroom, because they are consistent and use routines and procedures. Information shown in Table 2 was taken from the online survey, which reported 50% of the participants felt they could do "quite a bit" to establish routines to keep activities in their classroom running smoothly. Sixty-six percent of participants also felt they do "quite a bit" or "a great deal" to establish a classroom management system with each group of students.

Achieving self-efficacy in classroom management. Throughout the interviews, participants were asked how they achieved their current level of classroom management. The interview questions were open ended, which allowed participants to report all sources they accredit their level of self-efficacy in classroom management to. Every participant made mention of either trial and error or peers. Five participants mentioned a mentor teacher as a source of information, while four participants also mentioned specific websites they use to gather information. All participants mentioned *First Days of School* (Wong & Wong, 2009), a book

title they referenced for classroom management assistance, but only two attributed their current level of self-efficacy in classroom management to strategies learned from the book. Some sought out the book individually and some were informed by an administrator. All participants referenced a book recommended by the district during the current school year as a focus, but did not report it as aiding them in classroom management. Two participants reported that their administrator was helpful in suggesting strategies when they were faced with a challenging situation. When asked how classroom management was learned, Participant 2 stated, "Mostly through mentors, trial and error, and hands on experience. My mentor helps me with specific circumstances as they arise." Participant 5 stated, "My administrator is always willing to help me with classroom management." Participant 7 reported that most classroom management training was done during a pre-service internship, where most of what was learned was from their mentor teacher. Participant 9 stated, "My administrator has given me ideas of things to try when I struggle with classroom management." Participant 10 stated, "My mentor teacher during my pre-service internship taught me a lot about classroom management."

Three participants received certification, or are in the process of receiving certification through an alternative certification program. Through the alternative certification program, Participant 2 reported classroom management modules were being used. The participants would read scenarios and then as a group discuss the best approach to handle the classroom management scenario. The majority of participants, however, attended the same local university, which contributes to similar pre-service preparation experiences. When participants were asked how their pre-service preparation assisted them in classroom management, a common response was that the focus of pre-service was content not classroom management. Participants five, six, seven, eight and nine reported not having any pre-service preparation on classroom management,

and that anything they have learned about classroom management has come from mentor teachers, peers, and their own experience. Participants may have cited more than one method or strategy of pre-service preparation within the individual response. Consequently, each of those responses was counted independently. For a few of the participants, teaching is a second career, therefore skills learned during their first career assisted them in classroom management approaches and techniques.

Presentation of the Data and Results

During the face-to-face interview, participants were asked eight questions (Appendix A). The goal of the interview questions was to provide support and answers to the two research questions.   The first research question, "How do novice middle school teachers demonstrate teacher self-efficacy in classroom management?" was answered in part when the survey data showed teachers reporting a self-efficacy score of "some degree" (5) or higher with each preceding question pertaining to classroom management. For example, stating clear expectations to students, establishing routines, or keeping problem students from ruining an entire lesson.

Additionally, this research question was posed to participants. Participants responded to this question a variety of ways. The main themes throughout the responses for demonstrating self-efficacy in classroom management were routines, procedures and consistency. The participants felt that by having consistency with their routines and procedures the students knew what was expected and that was the key to demonstrating self-efficacy in classroom management. These findings support the statement that "established and purposeful routines decrease the likelihood of interruptions and misbehaviors because the students are able to anticipate the process", made in Chapter 2 (Greenberg et al., 2014; Keidel, 2014).

65

Participants were also asked to rate their classroom management during their first year of teaching and current year of teaching on a scale of 1 through 10, 1 meaning no classroom management and 10 meaning excellent classroom management. The participants with less than one year of experience were asked to rate their first week of teaching compared to their current week of teaching. In 11 of the 12 responses, the participants rated themselves lower during their first week or year of classroom experience compared to their current year or week of classroom experience. One participant for each instance self-rated as a 9. The participant reported being strict with students and below average class sizes as a contributing factor to having such a strong handle on classroom management. These findings also support the findings of a decrease in written discipline referrals as the participants' classroom experience increases.

Five participants reported that mentor teachers during their pre-service internship was all of the classroom management preparation they had received before beginning their teaching career. Six participants reported they did not have any pre-service classroom management preparation before entering the classroom as a teacher. One participant reported going through an alternative certification program where learning modules were used in the areas of classroom management. Two participants referenced classroom management emerging organically through conversation during content methods courses, where the professor would make recommendations but there was no set structure in place for them to learn specifically about classroom management. The second research question, "How do novice middle school teachers achieve their level of teacher self-efficacy in classroom management?" can be supported by the preceding case study findings. Participants achieve self-efficacy in classroom management through different avenues, but mostly through peers and trial and error.

Chapter 4 Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to describe this research case study sample population, methodology, findings, and present the results of the study. This explanatory qualitative research case study sought to identify the extent to which novice middle school teachers possess self-efficacy in classroom management. The research questions are as follows:

1. How do novice middle school teachers demonstrate teacher self-efficacy in classroom management?

2. How do novice middle school teachers achieve their level of teacher self-efficacy in classroom management?

Overall, both research questions were answered through the findings as mentioned in the previous section. Data showed that, in general, as the classroom management experience increased the number of discipline referrals decreased. This finding was also reflected in the interview, when participants rated themselves as having a higher self-efficacy in classroom management in their current year of teaching as compared to their first year.

Achieving self-efficacy in classroom management can be considered a challenge for any novice teacher as mentioned in Chapter 2. However, participants reported that most of their classroom management was learned by trial and error, discussion with peers, or discussion with mentors. The general theme was that no formal pre-service preparation existed for the participants in the area of classroom experience. Occasionally, administrators were mentioned as a source of information for classroom management, but it was not an immediate source. The findings as a whole will be discussed at greater length in Chapter 5.

Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusion

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to give a final summary and discussion of data results. Within this chapter, the reader will find an evaluation of the results in relation to the literature, the limitations, and implications of the results for practice, policy, and theory, as well as recommendations for further research.

Summary of the Results

Demonstration of self-efficacy. When the first research question, "How do you demonstrate teacher self-efficacy in classroom management?" was asked during the interview, eight of the participants responded with "routines and procedures." This coincides with research mentioned in Chapter 2 that reported one of the most common pillars of classroom management as being procedures and routines (Burden, 1983; Greenberg et al., 2014; Saphier et al., 2008; Wong & Wong, 2009). This information was also addressed during the blind survey. In question eight, participants were asked "How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?" Fifty percent of the participants responded on the Likert scale of 1 through 9 with a 7, meaning quite a bit, while 8% responded with a 9, meaning a great deal. Question 16 of the blind survey asked participants "How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?" The results showed that 66% of the participants responded on the Likert scale with a 7, 8, or 9, meaning quite a bit or a great deal. Twenty-five percent responded with a Likert scale response of 6, which is more than "some degree" but less than "quite a bit." This information was surprising, because the results of these two survey questions almost mirrored one another. On both questions, 25% responded on the Likert Scale with a 6, 50% responded with a 7, meaning "quite a bit" and 8% responded with a 9, meaning "a great deal."

Amongst the remaining six survey questions pertaining to teacher self-efficacy in classroom management, no other results were as similar as these two questions. These survey results allowed me to infer that teachers actually have quite a bit of self-efficacy in classroom management and are able to demonstrate their self-efficacy through establishing routines. The interview question supports this inference as well, with eight of the participants responding they demonstrate teacher self-efficacy in classroom management through routines and procedures.

Achievement of self-efficacy. To answer the second research question, "How do novice middle school teachers achieve their level of teacher self-efficacy in classroom management?" I asked the participants the exact question during the interview. Five of the participants mainly attributed their achievement of self-efficacy in classroom management to trial and error of strategies within the classroom walls. Trying new strategies and then keeping them, changing them, or getting rid of them altogether was something participants continually reported doing. The sources individuals pulled strategies from varied based on the participant; some gathered information from staff development, peers, internet sources, or books. Four participants mentioned peers as also being a great source in shaping their teacher self-efficacy in classroom management.

Participant 1 reported attending professional development trainings for English as a Second Language (ESL) and Special Education (SPED) students. The reasoning offered by this participant was "If I can keep my ESL and SPED students engaged, then I know I can keep everyone engaged. The best information has come from the district SPED or ESL department." Participant 3 reported "Teachers talk. I do a lot of listening when those things [classroom management] comes up." Participant 4 reported learning from a mentor teacher but also it was "just seeing how teachers did it."

69

Participant 7 reported a different approach.

> I actually look up a lot of things online. I get a lot of ideas on how teachers taught certain
> topics and then I try them. How to arrange groups, how to say certain things. I also like to
> watch the teacher channel online. I get a lot of ideas about how to present something to
> the kids and learn different strategies and activities that will help the kids and I work
> together.

While the participants were able to achieve their current level of teacher self-efficacy in
classroom management through various avenues, they all had a system, which worked for them.

Discussion of the Results

The objective of this research was to identify a teacher's self-efficacy in classroom
management and how classroom management is being learned. The data discovered during this
case study, shown in Table 2 in Chapter 4, generally showed participants as having quite a bit of
teacher self-efficacy in classroom management. With every question asked pertaining to
classroom management during the blind survey, the majority of participants responded with a 7,
meaning quite a bit, on the provided 1 through 9 Likert scale. The first question of the interview
asked participants, "How did you learn about classroom management?" Five participants noted
peers as being the source for learning classroom management. Job experience was followed with
four responses, mentors and trial and error both had three responses. This information was
reported in Table 3 of Chapter 4.

In the blind survey, participants were asked "How well can you establish routines to keep
activities running smoothly?" As previously mentioned, 50% of participants responded on the
Likert scale with a 7, meaning quite a bit. I found this interesting, because as a former
instructional coach at the middle school level I expected the results to be scattered across the

scale. I was surprised to see 50% responding that they can comfortably establish routines to keep activities running smoothly.

Initially, I was hopeful classroom management would have been taught to some extent as a course during pre-service preparation. However, that was not the case for all participants. Three participants reported not having any pre-service classroom management preparation, while three others reported classroom management was only mentioned through conversation in college classes but was not explicitly taught. In hindsight, I should have asked participants if an isolated classroom management class would have been helpful during their pre-service education. Participant 1said something that stood out from the other responses when asked how pre-service preparation shaped their self-efficacy in classroom management. Participant 1 stated "There were several professors that would answer our [classroom management] questions when we approached them with situations. However, because we were pre-service teachers, we did not have the questions. We did not know what to ask." This was an interesting response, because all other participants were able to give an example of having classroom management taught to them or reported having no pre-service training. The idea that a pre-service teacher may not have the classroom management questions to ask due to lack of experience was a thought that never struck me.

A revised January 2014 review of 122 teacher preparation programs completed by Greenberg, Putman, and Walsh reported that most of the programs reviewed claimed to cover classroom management. However, the research found that programs that addressed classroom management in multiple courses were ineffective (Greenberg et al., 2014). This corresponds with the comments regarding classroom management made by Participant 1 as being mentioned but never a focus. Greenberg et al. (2014) examined 213 courses in 122 programs where classroom

management may be addressed and reported, "only 4% of programs dedicate the equivalent of a full course or more to classroom management alone" (p. 12). The study by Greenberg et al. (2014) focused on five classroom management strategies: rules, routines, praise, misbehavior, and engagement. Thirty-four percent of the teacher prep programs addressed four of the five classroom management strategies, while 21% addressed all five strategies. Greenberg et al. (2014) found that only a third of the programs studied required teacher candidates to practice classroom management skills as they learned them. This information stood out, because no participant in my research study mentioned being required to practice strategies. This information begged the question, is it merely the preparation program received by candidates that directly impacts teacher self-efficacy in classroom management? The majority of participants in my research study received preparation from the same institution where classroom management only came up in conversation for undergraduate teacher pre-service preparation.

Discussion of the Results in Relation to the Literature

Classroom management can be defined as the ability to establish a routine and order which keeps classroom learning activities running smoothly while controlling disruptive behavior, and calming and responding to disruptive students (Aloe et al., 2014). This is related to survey questions 3, 8, 15, 16, 19 and 21, which ask participants to respond to how much they believe they can do in situations to address these classroom management concerns. For every question, at least 50% of the participants responded on the Likert scale with a 7 or higher, meaning "quite a bit" or "a great deal." Overall, participants responded as having teacher self-efficacy in classroom management.

Bandura (1994) reported self-efficacy as the belief in one's capability to execute specific demands or reach goals. Based on Bandura's theory, teachers changes their classroom

72

management approach over time as they gain experience. Participants were asked, "How did you achieve your current level of teacher self-efficacy in classroom management?" which is related to the second research question. Five of them responded with trial and error. This supports Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory that teachers change their classroom management approach over time due to experience.

A strong consistency in routine and procedures, which participants cited as a way to demonstrate self-efficacy in classroom management, was attributed to *The First Days of School* (Wong & Wong, 2001). Eight participants cited routines and procedures as how they demonstrate teacher self-efficacy in classroom management.

Limitations

A limitation of this research study was the time frame in which it was completed. This study was completed over the course of six weeks. Information gathered pertaining to teacher self-efficacy in classroom management was merely a snapshot in time. The self-efficacy perceived by an individual changes over time and through experiences (Bandura, 1994).

An additional limitation of this research study was the pre-service education of the participants. All participants attended the same university for undergraduate education. The difference in participant education was only if they chose to go through the alternative certification program after receiving a degree. If a participant chose alternative certification it was done locally through the regional education service center or the local university.

Delimitations

A delimitation of this research study was the sample size. With a larger sample population to pull from, the results may have varied a little more. The majority of this sample size attended the same university for pre-service education training, therefore similar pre-service

experience existed. A sample size much larger that could span across several states would strengthen results.

Implication of the Results for Practice, Policy, and Theory

As reported in Chapter 2, the existing scholarly research supports research for teacher self-efficacy in classroom management, content areas, teacher attrition or retention and any combination. There is a need for research on teacher self-efficacy solely in classroom management. This case study research attempts to assist in filling the gap in existing research, by focusing on teacher self-efficacy solely in classroom research.

The data reported in Table 3 of Chapter 4 reports the pre-service preparation in classroom management received by the participants. Only one participant reported having a college course specifically for classroom management. This was a course actually offered through a Master's degree program the candidate participated in to become a certified teacher. It is not a course offered to undergraduate pre-service teachers. Nine participants mentioned a pre-service internship, but only one credited the internship for their learning any classroom management. The participants reported making copies or only observing as part of their internship. In general, they did not see it as of value because they did not get to put classroom management strategies into practice.

Recommendations for Further Research

A longitudinal study of teacher self-efficacy in classroom management for the novice teacher is recommended for further research. By doing so, the researcher may find more support for the data I was able to get a quick glimpse of. As this study considered sources that increased teacher self-efficacy in classroom management, it is possible that a longitudinal study would uncover specific strategies that helped novice teachers improve teacher self-efficacy in

classroom management. While this research study was merely a snapshot in time producing evidence of how teacher self-efficacy in classroom management increases, a longitudinal study may produce more reliable results. The participants within the study may produce further evidence that over the course of several years, classroom management does actually improve.

While this case study only looked at a sample population of novice middle school teachers, future research could study teacher self-efficacy in classroom management amongst veteran middle school teachers, or other grade levels of teachers as well. By doing so, one may find links between novice and veteran teachers' self-efficacy in the area of classroom management.

Conclusion

The research questions for this case study were as follows:

1. How do novice middle school teachers demonstrate self-efficacy in classroom management?

2. How do novice middle school teachers achieve their level of self-efficacy in classroom management?

There is a great deal of scholarly research supporting routines and procedures as an essential part of classroom management (Greenberg et al., 2014; Keidel, 2014; Marshall, 2016; Powell, 2009; Saphier et al., 2008; Wong & Wong, 2009). This is due in part to students being able to anticipate the process, which decreases the likelihood of interruptions and misbehaviors. When participants were asked the first research question, eight participants responded by saying routines and procedures. The remaining three participants responded with clear expectations.

Classroom management is noted as an ongoing struggle for novice and veteran teachers alike (Carr, 2013; Dunn, 2009: Hicks, 2012; Ritter & Hancock, 2004; Stronge et al., 2003). A

goal of this case study was to learn what support, if any was being offered to pre-service teachers and novice teachers in the area of classroom management. Based on the responses of participants, there are minimal opportunities for pre-service teachers to learn classroom management and put the strategies into effect. Once the individual becomes an in-service teacher, there seem to be more opportunities presented, but the information is taken mostly from peers or through trial and error experiences. When asked the second research question, participants credited trial and error of strategies and peers for their ability to achieve their level of teacher self-efficacy in classroom management.

References

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

Aloe, A. M., Amo, L. C., & Shanahan, M. E. (2014). Classroom management self-efficacy and burnout: A multivariate meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review, 26*(1), 101–126. doi:10.1007/s10648-013-9244-0

Anderson, R., Green, M., & Loewen, P. (1988). Relationships among teachers' and students' thinking skills, sense of efficacy, and student achievement. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 34(2),* 148–165.

Armor, D. (1976). *Analysis of the school preferred reading program in selected Los Angeles minority schools.* (No. R-2007-LAUSD). Retrieved from http://cupdx.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.proquest.com.cupdx.idm.oclc.org/docview/63907112?accountid=10248

American Psychological Association. (2010). *Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct.* Retrieved July 13, 2016, from http://apa.org/ethics/code/

Anthony, A. B., Gimbert, B. G., Fultz, D. M., & Parker, R. A. (2011). Examining the relationship between E-coaching and the self-efficacy of novice teachers seeking certification through alternative routes. *Journal of the National Association for Alternative Certification, 6*(1), 46–64. Retrieved from http://jnaac.com/

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

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

Bandura, A. (1989). Regulation of cognitive processes through perceived self-efficacy. *Developmental Psychology, 25*(5), 729–735.

Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachandran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior* (Vol. 4, pp. 71–81). New York, NY: Academic Press.

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

Baxter, P. & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report, 13*(4), 544–559.

Bembenutty, H. (2008). The teacher of teachers talks about learning to learn: An interview with Wilbert (Bill) J. McKeachie. *Teaching of Psychology, 35*(4), 363. doi:10.1080/00986280802390787

Benhar, M. D. (2009). Does a course in classroom management affect teachers' self-perceived efficacy in classroom management? (Order No. 3344959). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (304858228).

Betoret, F. D. (2009). Self-efficacy, school resources, job stressors and burnout among Spanish primary and secondary school teachers: A structural equation approach. *Educational Psychology, 29*(1), 45. doi:10.1080/01443410802459234.

Boynton, M. & Boynton, C. (2005). *The educator's guide to preventing and solving discipline problems.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Bullock, A., Coplan, R. J., & Bosacki, S. (2015). Exploring links between early childhood educators' psychological characteristics and classroom management self-efficacy beliefs. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 47*(2), 175–183. doi:10.1037/a0038547.

Burden, P. R. (1983). *Classroom management guidelines for teacher education.* Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED237507.

Cain S., & Laird, M. (2011). *The fundamental 5: The formula for quality instruction.* United States: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.

Campbell, S., & Skinner, C. H. (2004). Combining explicit timing with an interdependent group contingency program to decrease transition times: An investigation of the timely transition game. *Journal of Applied School Psychology, 20(2).* 11–27.

Carr, D. (2013). *The effects of teacher preparation programs on novice teachers regarding classroom management, academic preparation, time management and self-efficacy* (Order No. 3604827). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: Social Sciences. (1476209749).

Chan, D. W. (2008). Teacher self-efficacy and successful intelligence among Chinese secondary school teachers in Hong Kong. *Educational Psychology, 28*(7), 735. doi:10.1080/01443410802259246.

Chesnut, S. R., & Cullen, T. A. (2014). Effects of self-efficacy, emotional intelligence, and perceptions of future work environment on pre-service teacher commitment. *The Teacher Educator, 49*(2), 116. doi:10.1080/08878730.2014.887168.

Chong, W. H., Klassen, R. M., Huan, V. S., Wong, I., & Kates, A. D. (2010). The relationships among school types, teacher efficacy beliefs, and academic climate: Perspective from Asian middle schools. *The Journal of Educational Research, 103*(3), 183–190. doi:10.1080/00220670903382954.

Codding, R. S., & Smyth, C. A. (2008). Using performance feedback to decrease classroom transition time and examine collateral effects on academic engagement. *Journal of Educational & Psychological Consultation, 18*(4), 325–345.

DeJarnette, N. K., & Sudeck, M. (2015). Supporting clinical practice candidates in learning community development. *Teacher Development, 19*(3), 311. doi:10.1080/13664530.2015.1027000.

de Jong, R., Mainhard, T., van Tartwijk, J., Veldman, I., Verloop, N., & Wubbels, T. (2014). How pre-service teachers' personality traits, self-efficacy, and discipline strategies contribute to the teacher-student relationship. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 84*(2), 294. doi:10.1111/bjep.12025.

Dicke, T., Parker, P. D., Marsh, H. W., Kunter, M., Schmeck, A., & Leutner, D. (2014). Self-efficacy in classroom management, classroom disturbances, and emotional exhaustion: A moderated mediation analysis of teacher candidates. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 106*(2), 569. doi:10.1037/a0035504.

Dunn, S.H. (2009). *Pre-service teacher preparation for managing problem behaviors: An interpretive qualitative analysis of the classroom management course.* Retrieved from: https://repositories.lib.utexas.edu/handle/2152/17372

Eisenman, G., Edwards, S., & Cushman, C. A. (2015). Bringing reality to classroom management in teacher education. *Professional Educator*, 39(1), 12.

Epstein, A., & Willhite, G. L. (2015). Teacher efficacy in an early childhood professional development school. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education, 7*(2), 189–197. Retrieved from http://www.iejee.com/.

Evans, B. R. (2011). Content knowledge, attitudes, and self-efficacy in the mathematics New York City Teaching Fellows (NYCTF) program. *School Science and Mathematics, 111*(5), 225. doi:10.1111/j.1949-8594.2011.00081.x.

Fabio, A. D., & Palazzeschi, L. (2008). Emotional intelligence and self-efficacy in a sample of

    Italian high school teachers. *Social Behavior and Personality, 36*(3), 315–325.

    doi:10.2224/sbp.2008.36.3.315.

Fast, L. A., Lewis, J. L., Bryant, M. J., Bocian, K. A., Cardullo, R. A., Rettig, M., & Hammond,

    K. A. (2010). Does math self-efficacy mediate the effect of the perceived classroom

    environment on standardized math test performance? *Journal of Educational Psychology,

    102*(3), 729–740. doi:10.1037/a0018863.

Ficarra, L., & Quinn, K. (2014). Teachers' facility with evidence-based classroom management

    practices: An investigation of teachers' preparation programmes and in-service

    conditions. *Journal of Teacher Education for Sustainability, 16*(2), 71–87.

Freeman, J., Simonsen, B., Briere, D. E., & MacSuga-Gage, A. (2014). Pre-service teacher

    training in classroom management: A review of state accreditation policy and teacher

    preparation programs. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 37*(2), 106–120. Retrieved

    from http*://*journals.sagepub.com/home/tes*.*

Gado, I., Ferguson, R., & Mark van 't Hooft. (2006). Using handheld-computers and probeware

    in a science methods course: Pre-service teachers' attitudes and self-efficacy. *Journal of

    Technology and Teacher Education, 14*(3), 501–529. doi:10.1177/0888406413507002.

Gredler, M. E. (2009). Hiding in Plain Sight: The Stages of Mastery/Self-Reulation in

    Vygotsky's Cultural-Historical Theory. *Educational Psychologist*, *44*(1), 1–19.

    doi:10.1080/00461520802616259.

Goddard, R. D., Hoy, W. K., & Hoy, A. W. (2000). Collective teacher efficacy: Its meaning,

    measure, and impact on student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal,

    37*(2), 479–507. doi:10.3102/00028312037002479.

Greenberg, J., Putman, H., & Walsh, K. (2014). *Training our future teachers: Classroom management. revised* National Council on Teacher Quality. Washington, DC 20005.

Hardin, J. (2010). *A study of social cognitive theory: The relationship between professional learning communities and collective teacher efficacy in international school settings* Available from ERIC. (864943779; ED517953). Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED517953.

Hatch, J. A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in education settings*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Hicks, S. D. (2012). *Self-efficacy and classroom management: A correlation study regarding the factors that influence classroom management* (Order No. 3516823). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: Social Sciences. (1030435909).

Hispanic. (2016). In *Oxford English dictionary online.* doi:10.1093/acref/9780191823541.001.0001.

Holzberger, D., Philipp, A., & Kunter, M. (2013). How teachers' self-efficacy is related to instructional quality: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 105*(3), 774. doi:doi.org/10.1037/a0032198.

Hong, J. Y. (2012). Why do some beginning teachers leave the school, and others stay? Understanding teacher resilience through psychological lenses. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 18*(4), 417. doi:10.1080/13540602.2012.696044.

Hughes, G. D. (2012). Teacher retention: Teacher characteristics, school characteristics, organizational characteristics, and teacher efficacy. *Journal of Educational Research, 105*(4), 245–255. doi:10.1080/00220671.2011.584922.

Hui, C., Snider, L., & Couture, M. (2016). Self-regulation workshop and occupational
performance coaching with teachers: A pilot study. *The Canadian Journal of
Occupational Therapy, 83*(2), 115–125. doi:10.1177/0008417415627665

In-service teacher. (2016). In *Oxford English dictionary online*.
doi:10.1093/acref/9780191823541.001.0001.

Jamil, F. M., Downer, J. T., & Pianta, R. C. (2012). Association of pre-service teachers'
performance, personality, and beliefs with teacher self-efficacy at program completion.
Teacher Education Quarterly, 39(4), 119–138. Retrieved from
http://www.teqjournal.org.

Keidel, S. A. (2014). Teacher demographics, professional preparation, and training needs
associated with classroom management based on teachers' self-reported survey (Order
No. 3703551). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: Social Sciences.
(1684781431).

Klassen, R. M., & Chiu, M. M. (2010). Effects on teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction:
Teacher gender, years of experience, and job stress. *Journal of Educational Psychology,
102*(3), 741. doi:10.1037/a0019237.

Lennon, S. (2009). *Maintaining discipline: Conceptualizations towards the understanding and
controlling of classroom behavior.* Valdosta, GA: Valdosta State University.

Lewis, S. (2014). *Elementary teachers' perspectives of traditional classroom management
training and social emotional learning* (Order No. 3629453). Available from ProQuest
Dissertations & Theses Global: Social Sciences. (1562268648). Retrieved from
http://gradworks.umi.com/.

Logan, J. G. (2003). *Classroom management: Techniques, policies, procedures, and programs to ensure that discipline "rules" in your classroom* Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED479639.

Long, J. F., & Moore, R. (2008). Motivating content: How interest and self-efficacy respond to subject matter in an alternative teacher education program. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice, 11*(4) Retrieved from https://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/cej/index.

Matoti, S. N., Junqueira, K. E., & Odora, R. J. (2013). Assessing the teaching efficacy beliefs of teacher trainees: A comparison of two institutions of higher learning in South Africa. *Africa Education Review, 10*(4), 634. doi:10.1080/18146627.2013.853558.

Marshall, J. C. (2016). *The highly effective teacher: 7 classroom-tested practices that foster student success.* United States: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.

Marzano, R. J., Marzano, J. S., & Pickering, D. J. (2003). *Classroom management that works: Research-based strategies for every teacher.* (5th ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Menon, D., & Sadler, T. D. (2016). Preservice elementary teachers' science self-efficacy beliefs and science content knowledge. *Journal of Science Teacher Education, 27*(6), 649–673. doi:10.1007/s10972-016-9479-y.

Mitchell, M. M., & Bradshaw, C. P. (2013). Examining classroom influences on student perceptions of school climate: the role of classroom management and exclusionary discipline strategies. *Journal of School Psychology, 51(*5), 599–610.

Moore, W., & Esselman, M. (1992, April). *Teacher efficacy, power school climate and achievement: A desegregating district's experience.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Nejati, R., Hassani, M. T., & Sahrapour, H. A. (2014). The relationship between gender and student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management of Iranian EFL teachers. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 4*(6), doi:10.4304/tpls4.6.1279-1226.

O'Neill, S. C., & Stephenson, J. (2011). The measurement of classroom management self-efficacy: A review of measurement instrument development and influences. *Educational Psychology, 31*(3), 261–299. doi:10.1080/01443410.2010.545344.

Pace, R. T., Boykins, A. D., & Davis, S. P. (2014). A proactive classroom management model to enhance self-efficacy levels in teachers of adolescents who display disruptive behaviors. *Journal of Psychosocial Nursing & Mental Health Services, 52*(2), 307. doi:10.3928/02793695-20130930-01

Protheroe, N. (2008). Teacher efficacy: What is it and does it matter? *Principal, 87*(5), 42–45.

Powell, A. (2009). *The cornerstone: Classroom management that makes teaching more effective, efficient and enjoyable.* Due-Season Press.

Ratcliff, N. (2001). Use the Environment to Prevent Discipline Problems and Support Learning. *Young Children*, *56*(5), 84–88.

Reupert, A., & Woodcock, S. (2010). Success and near misses: Pre-service teachers' use, confidence and success in various classroom management strategies. *Teaching and Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies, 26*(6), 1261–1268.

Rhymer, K. N., Skinner, C. H., Henington, C., D'Reaux, R.A., & Sims, S.P. (1998). Effects of explicit timing on mathematics problem completion rates in African-American third-grade elementary students. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 31(4),* 673–677.

Ritter, J. T., & Hancock, D. R. (2007). Exploring the relationship between certification sources, experience levels, and classroom management orientations of classroom teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies, 23*(7), 1206–1216.

Ryan, A.M., Kuusinen, C.M., & Bedoya-Skoog, A. (2015). Managing peer relations: A dimension of teacher self-efficacy that varies between elementary and middle school teachers and is associated with observed classroom quality. *Contemporary Education Psychology, 41,* 147-156. doi:10.1016/j.cedpsych.2015.01.002.

Saphier, J., Haley-Speca, M.A., & Gower, R. (2008). *The skillful teacher: Building your teaching skills* (6th ed.). United States: Research for Better Teaching Inc. (RBT).

Scherer, R., Jansen, M., Nilsen, T., Areepattamannil, S., & Marsh, H. W. (2016). The quest for comparability: Studying the invariance of the teachers' sense of self-efficacy (TSES) measure across countries. *PLoS One, 11*(3) doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0150829

Shaukat, S., & Iqbal, H. M. (2012). Teacher self-efficacy as a function of student engagement, instructional strategies and classroom management. *Pakistan Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 9*(3), 82–86. Retrieved from http://www.gcu.edu.pk/

Shoulders, T. L., & Krei, M. S. (2015). Rural high school teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management. *American Secondary Education, 44*(1), 50–61. Retrieved from https://www.ashland.edu/.

Simatwa, E. M. W. (2010). Piaget's theory of intellectual development and its implication for instructional management at pre- secondary school level. *Educational Research and Reviews, 5*(7), 366-371.

Snedecor, S. J., Cappelleri, J. C., Wan, Y., and Stevens, J. W. (2014, June). *Multivariate meta analysis: uses and applications.* Workshop conducted at the international meeting of the International Society of Pharmaeconomics and Outcomes Research, Montreal, QC, Canada. Retrieved from: http://www.ispor.org/meetings/montreal0614/presentations/W8-All-Speakers.pdf.

Stensmo, C. (1995). *Classroom management styles in context: Two case studies.* (). Sweden: Uppsala University.

Stronge, J. H., Tucker, P. D., & Hindman, J. L. (2004). *Handbook for qualities of effective teachers.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Sweetland, S. R., & Hoy, W. K. (2000). School characteristics and educational outcomes: Toward an organizational model of student achievement in middle schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *36*, 703–729.

Texas Administrative Code (2010). *Texas educator code of ethics.* Retrieved from: http://texreg.sos.state.tx.us/ on September 24, 2016.

Texas Education Administration (2016). *2015 Campus Comparison Report.* TEA division of performance reporting. Retrieved from: http://tea.texas.gov on June 7, 2016.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Barr, M. (2004). Fostering student learning: The relationship of collective teacher efficacy and student achievement. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *3*, 189–209.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive

    construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17,* 783–805.

Van Houten, R., & Thompson, C. (1976). The effects of explicit time on math performance.

    Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 9, 227–230.

Virginia Wesleyan College. (2016). Pre-service teaching. Retrieved from:

    http://www.vwc.edu/academics/majors/education/field-experiences/pre-service-

    teaching.php on September 24, 2016.

Vincent, S. (1999). *The multigrade classroom: A resource handbook for small, rural schools.*

    book 3: Classroom management and discipline These publications are also available

    online as PDFs at http://www, nwrelorg/ruraled/indexhtml#multigradepubs. Retrieved

    from http://*blockislandschool.net/.*

Watson, K. J., & Dicarlo, C. F. (2016). Increasing completion of classroom routines through the

    use of picture activity schedules. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 44*(2), 89–96.

Weiner, B. (2000). Interpersonal and intrapersonal theories of motivation from an attributional

    perspective. *Educational Psychology Review, 12,* 1–14.

Wong, H. K., & Wong, R. T. (2009). *The first days of school: How to be an effective teacher*

    (4th ed.). Mountain View, CA: Wong, Harry K. Publications.

Yarbrough, J. L., Skinner, C. H., Lee, Y. J., & Lemmons, C. (2004). Decreasing transition times

    in a second grade classroom. *Journal of Applied School Psychology. 20(2),* 85–107.

Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: design and methods* (5th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE

    Publications.

APPENDIX A

Please state the grade level you teach and your years of teaching experience.

1. How did you learn about classroom management?

2. What pre-service preparation did you have in classroom management?

3. Teacher self-efficacy is the belief in one's capability to execute specific demands or reach goals. How did your teacher preparation education shape your current self-efficacy in classroom management?

4. What in-service professional development have you participated in regarding classroom management?

5. On a scale of 1-10, 1 being "not at all" and 10 being "extremely effective", how effective do you believe your classroom management to be? Why?

6. How has your efficacy in classroom management changed throughout your teaching experience?

7. How did you achieve your current level of teacher self-efficacy in classroom management?

8. How do you demonstrate teacher self-efficacy in classroom management?

CONSENT FORM

Research Study Title: Teacher Self-Efficacy in Classroom Management
Principal Investigator: Kentyl Byrne
Research Institution: Concordia University-Portland
Faculty Advisor: Dr. Mark Jimenez

Purpose and what you will be doing:
The purpose of this survey is to find the extent to which classroom management correlates with teacher self-efficacy among novice teachers of grades sixth through eighth. I expect approximately 15 volunteers. No one will be paid to be in the study. I will begin enrollment on October 26, 2016 and end enrollment on November 11, 2016. To be in the study, you will respond to a 24-question online survey, allow the researcher to obtain the number of written discipline referrals over the past two years, and participate in a face-to-face interview with the researcher where you will answer eight questions pertaining to your classroom management training and experience. After the interview is completed, you will receive a transcript of your responses in a sealed envelope. You will verify that the transcription is correct and accurate, and you will return the transcript to the researcher in a sealed envelope with your signature across the seal to ensure its confidentiality. Upon verification you grant the researcher permission to use your responses in the research for the purposes of her dissertation work.
Doing these things should take less than 45 minutes of your time.
Step 1: Volunteer and give the researcher your email address for follow up and scheduling confirmation.
Step 2: Complete the 24 question online survey by using the link emailed to you by the researcher.
Step 3: Complete a face-to-face interview with the researcher answering eight questions pertaining to your classroom management training and experience.
Step 4: Within a week following the interview, you will receive a sealed copy of the interview transcript for you to verify as correct and accurate.
Step 5: Return the transcribed interview to the researcher in a sealed envelope with your signature across the seal to ensure confidentiality within five business days of receiving the transcription.

Risks:

There are no risks to participating in this study other than providing your information. However, we will protect your information.   Any personal information you provide will be coded so it cannot be linked to you. Any name or identifying information you give will be kept securely via electronic encryption or locked inside the computer program being password protected. When we or any of our investigators look at the data, none of the data will have your name or identifying information. We will only use a secret code to analyze the data. We will not identify you in any publication or report.   Your information will be kept private at all times and then all study documents will be destroyed 3 years after we conclude this study.

Benefits:

Information you provide will help identify areas of strengths and weaknesses in classroom management training. You could benefit this by participating in the research, which will add to the literature consisting of classroom management self-efficacy for middle school teachers, shedding light on where the education industry may lack in support for novice teachers.

Confidentiality:

This information will not be distributed to any other agency and will be kept private and confidential. The only exception to this is if you tell us of abuse or neglect that makes us seriously concerned for your immediate health and safety.

Right to Withdraw:

Your participation is greatly appreciated, but we acknowledge that the questions we are asking are personal in nature. You are free at any point to choose not to engage with or stop the study. You may skip any questions you do not wish to answer. This study is not required and there is no penalty for not participating. If at any time you experience a bad emotion from answering the questions, we will stop asking you questions.

Contact Information:

You will receive a copy of this consent form. If you have questions you can talk to or write the principal investigator, Kentyl Byrne, at email kentylbyrne@gmail.com. If you want to talk with a participant advocate other than the investigator, you can write or call the director of our institutional review board, Dr. OraLee Branch (email obranch@cu-portland.edu or call 503-493-6390).

Your Statement of Consent:

I have read the above information. I asked questions if I had them, and my questions were answered. I volunteer my consent for this study.

_____   _____

Participant Name   Date

_____   _____

Participant Signature   Date

_Kentyl Byrne_____   _____

Investigator Name   Date

_____   _____

Investigator Signature   Date

APPENDIX C

ANITA WOOLFOLK HOY, PH.D.   PROFESSOR
                                             PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDIES IN EDUCATION

Dear

You have my permission to use the *Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale* in your research. A copy the scoring instructions can be found at:

http://u.osu.edu/hoy.17/research/instruments/

Best wishes in your work,

Anita Woolfolk Hoy

Anita Woolfolk Hoy, Ph.D.
Professor Emeritus

Teacher Beliefs - TSES

This questionnaire is designed to help us gain a better understanding of the kinds of things that create challenges for teachers. Your answers are confidential.

Directions: Please indicate your opinion about each of the questions below by marking any one of the nine responses in the columns on the right side, ranging from (1) "None at all" to (9) "A Great Deal" as each represents a degree on the continuum.

Please respond to each of the questions by considering the combination of your *current* ability, resources, and opportunity to do each of the following in your present position.

Scale: None at all — Very Little — Some Degree — Quite A Bit — A Great Deal (1–9)

#	Question	Response (1–9)
1.	How much can you do to get through to the most difficult students?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
2.	How much can you do to help your students think critically?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
3.	How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
4.	How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in school work?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
5.	To what extent can you make your expectations clear about student behavior?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
6.	How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in school work?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
7.	How well can you respond to difficult questions from your students?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
8.	How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
9.	How much can you do to help your students value learning?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
10.	How much can you gauge student comprehension of what you have taught?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
11.	To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
12.	How much can you do to foster student creativity?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
13.	How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
14.	How much can you do to improve the understanding of a student who is failing?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
15.	How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
16.	How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
17.	How much can you do to adjust your lessons to the proper level for individual students?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
18.	How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
19.	How well can you keep a few problem students form ruining an entire lesson?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
20.	To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
21.	How well can you respond to defiant students?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
22.	How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
23.	How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨
24.	How well can you provide appropriate challenges for very capable students?	①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨

APPENDIX E

I attest that:

1. I have read, understood, and complied with all aspects of the Concordia University-
   Portland Academic Integrity Policy during the development and writing of this
   dissertation.

2. Where information and/or materials from outside sources has been used in the
   production of this dissertation, all information and/or materials from outside sources
   has been properly referenced and all permissions required for use of the information
   and/or materials have been obtained, in accordance with research standards outlined in
   the *Publication Manual of The American Psychological Association*

*Kentyl Byrne*_____
Digital Signature

Kentyl Byrne_____
Name (Typed)

June 6, 2017_____

Date