12-1-2009

The effect of classroom management training and active or information-based follow -up on inexperienced teachers' perceived classroom behavior management effectiveness

Diana L. Casey
University of Nebraska at Omaha

The Effect of Classroom Management Training and Active or Information-Based Follow-Up on Inexperienced Teachers' Perceived Classroom Behavior Management Effectiveness

By

Diana L. Casey

A Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the

Graduate College at the University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements

For the Degree of Doctor of Education

Omaha, Nebraska

2009

Major: Educational Administration and Supervision

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Peter J. Smith

Dr. John W. Hill

Dr. Neal F. Grandgenett

Dr. Larry L. Dlugosh

Dr. Karen L. Hayes

ABSTRACT

The Effect of Classroom Management Training and Active or Information-Based Follow-Up on Inexperienced Teachers' Perceived Classroom Behavior Management Effectiveness

Diana L. Casey

University of Nebraska at Omaha

Advisor: Dr. Peter J. Smith

Inexperienced teachers' perceived classroom effectiveness of their planning and preparation, classroom environment, instruction, and professional responsibilities domains were analyzed to determine the effects of active follow-up compared to information-based follow-up of classroom management training (N = 50). Inexperienced teachers enrolled in I Can Do It Classroom Management Training were randomly assigned to active follow-up to the training (n = 24) or information-based follow-up to the training (n = 26). As reflected by the pretest and posttest evaluation form measuring their perceived effectiveness in the domains of planning and preparation, classroom environment, instruction, and professional responsibilities, teachers participating in active follow-up of the training demonstrated statistically significant growth in each of the domains. Teachers participating in the information-based follow-up

demonstrated little or no growth in each of the domains. Posttest-posttest analysis of perceptions of teachers engaged in active follow-up demonstrated significantly higher classroom effectiveness scores than teachers engaged in information-based follow-up. The study's results should encourage district officials to look at professional development and the type of follow-up included in staff development initiatives.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As I complete this journey, there are many people that deserved to be acknowledged. First, I want to dedicate this dissertation to some very important people in my life. Edna Ann (Sponeman) Casey, my mother, provided wonderful support and guidance throughout my life. She always encouraged me to keep learning and reach for the stars. When she died on February 25, 1997, I lost a great mother and a wonderful friend. Annlynn Mary Casey is my daughter and my inspiration. To Annlynn, always keep reaching for the stars. The joy in our lives comes from the journeys we take to reach our destination. The climb up the mountain is when we learn about who we are as human beings. The top of the mountain is merely the start of another journey. If we spend too long gazing out at the panorama, we miss the breathtaking view at the top of the next mountain. Never forget the people and places you meet on your exciting journey through life.

I could never have developed the I Can Do It curriculum without my two main co-trainers, Connie Scasny and Kathy Lorenz. Connie and I spent years revising and crafting an even more effective training session for new teachers. Connie, your caring and dedication to education is inspiring. When you retired, the students lost a

fierce advocate and an excellent teacher. I am proud to call you my friend. Kathy and I have collaborated in the creation of a whole new method of follow-up for the I Can Do It training, targeting key areas. Kathy, you are awesome!

Dr. Peter Smith, my committee chair, is truly remarkable. His depth of knowledge and amazing ability to lead, evaluate, and teach is immense. The Omaha Public Schools lost a great administrator when you retired, but the University of Nebraska at Omaha was fortunate to gain your skills. I am honored to have you as my committee chair.

A big thanks goes to the entire Department of Educational Administration & Supervision. You affect positive change in education and help to create effective, knowledgeable administrators. A special thanks goes to Dr. John Hill, Dr. Kay Keiser, and Dr. Karen Hayes for all of their hard work and dedication. The Educational Administration & Supervision is lucky to have Barbara Mraz run the office. Barb, Thank you so much for all of your help with my glitches over the years.

The Nebraska State Education Association is fortunate to have Jay Sears, the Director for Instructional Advocacy. Jay, you amaze me. I have seen

you take a controversial issue and present facts to a hostile group and somehow sway those on an opposing side to change their mind. Your depth of knowledge and strong advocacy for education is enormous. Thank you for your support of the I Can Do It program. Thank you for your support of the teachers, staff, and students in Nebraska.

Finally, I am proud to be a teacher in the Omaha Public Schools and a member of the Omaha Education Association, both of whom give new meaning to "the good fight." To the staff at Ashland Park-Robbins elementary school, you rock! We are fortunate to have Ray Perrigo as principal. His leadership is beyond extraordinary. Please keep holding off that retirement. We need you! To Debbie Churchich, thank you for putting up with me for 16 years and keeping me on track. I could not hope for a better paraprofessional. You always go above and beyond expectations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Classroom management is an essential component of a successful classroom. Problems with classroom management can have long-lasting, negative consequences on student learning. Even the smallest of disruptions in a classroom can hinder student learning. For new teachers, classroom management can be especially difficult (Giallo & Little, 2003; McCoy, 2003).

Professional development can assist inexperienced teachers in improving their classroom management skills (Wong, 2003). In addition, ongoing follow-up would give some classroom teachers added support and should be a guiding principle for districts (Danielson & McGreal, 2000). Unfortunately, because of budget and time constraints, professional development and follow-up is not priority for many districts (Darling-Hammond, 1996).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the effects of classroom management training and participation in active or information-based follow-up on inexperienced teachers' perceived classroom behavior

management effectiveness. This will be measured using teacher self-evaluations over time.

Theoretical Perspective

Teachers affect student learning (Wenglinsky, 2002; Wright, Horn, & Sanders, 1997). A teacher is the most important factor that influences student gains and student learning (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Wright, Horn, & Sanders, 1997). Classrooms that are well organized and have independent learning opportunities are important for student academic achievement (Eshel & Kohavi, 2003).

New teachers in a school face classroom management problems that experienced teachers do not face. Experienced teachers understand the culture and practices of a school. New teachers do not have the familiarity with a school, its policies, the student population, parents, staff, and administration that is necessary to effectively prepare for classroom management (Glasgow & Hicks, 2003).

New teachers report that classroom management is very difficult. Poor classroom skills can negatively affect student learning. For some classes, a small problem in classroom management can disrupt an entire class, causing a class to fall further behind (Giallo & Little, 2003; McCoy, 2003). Teachers who perceive a lack

of classroom management skills are less confident about their abilities (Giallo & Little, 2003). Teachers who are not confident in their classroom management skills are more likely to give up when faced with student misbehavior. Teachers who are less confident do less to solve classroom management problems (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000). At worst, a student can lose an entire year of learning. This loss could be compounded if a student is faced with ineffective teachers over several years (Wright, Horn, & Sanders, 1997).

Research shows that student academic achievement is highest when students view the classroom as having a high level of both teacher and student control. Students who view the classroom as being deficient in teacher and student control have the lowest level of academic achievement (Eshel & Kohavi, 2003).

Problems with classroom management can lead to problems for students in nonacademic ways. In a longitudinal study of adolescents in grades 7 – 12, students in schools with poor classroom management are less likely to develop a sense of school connectedness. When students do not feel a sense of school connectedness, students are more likely to use illegal

drugs or substances, commit violence, or become sexually active (McNeely, Nonnemaker, & Blum, 2002).

Problems with classroom management can lead to teacher burnout and job dissatisfaction. Studies indicate a link between classroom management problems and teacher burnout and teacher turnover. One research study showed that almost 29% of teacher turnover was related to job dissatisfaction (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003; National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 2003). Most of the 29% reported the specific reasons for dissatisfaction were student discipline problems, lack of administrative support, low student motivation, or lack of teacher-centered decision-making (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003).

Increased levels of student behavior problems reflect significantly increased levels of teacher turnover. A reduction in student discipline problems could reduce the rate of teacher turnover and, in turn, improve schools (Ingersoll, 2001). Teachers' confidence in their classroom management must be considered when trying to reduce teacher turnover (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000). Teachers who have a positive sense of success with student achievement are more likely to make a decision to stay in teaching (Johnson & Birkeland, 2002).

Teacher turnover rates have been increasing steadily. In 1991-1992, teacher turnover rate was 13.2%. By 1994-1995, the rate had increased to 14.3%. In 2000-2001, there was a 15.7% rate of teacher turnover. Research has shown that within the first few years of teaching, teacher turnover may increase to as much as 46% (National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 2003). A young teacher is 184% more likely to leave their job than a middle-age teacher (Ingersoll, 2001b).

Turnover can be divided into two groups, teachers who leave the profession (the "Leavers") and teachers who move to other schools or positions (the "Movers") (Ingersoll, 2001b; Johnson & Birkeland, 2002). Often, leavers experience failure and frustration. The job demands are overwhelming and there is not a sense of student success. Many times, leavers report a distinct lack of support by administration and their colleagues (Johnson & Birkeland, 2002). Although movers stay in the profession, their migration from a school has negative consequences or implications for the original school (Ingersoll, 2001b). Movers can be divided into involuntary and voluntary movers. Involuntary movers are teachers who are forced or asked to transfer or change grade levels (Johnson & Birkeland, 2002). Voluntary

movers choose to move. Voluntary mover perceptions are similar to leavers. Many do not feel effective as teachers and felt the school was not supportive or that the school was ineffective. One notable difference is the movers felt the problem was not systemic, rather a centralized problem within a particular location. Prior to hiring, many educators report little opportunity to assess a school or how they would "fit" in their first teaching assignment. They move to a new school as a second chance and take more time and effort to find a better assignment. These schools that teachers moved to were described as "schools that had well-established norms about respect, effective discipline systems, and deliberate approaches to parental involvement" (Johnson & Birkeland, 2002, p. 27). Teachers who choose to stay and are content in their career are "confident about being effective teachers and as they gained confidence and competence, they found frequent opportunities for growth and development" (Johnson & Birkeland, 2002, p. 34).

Teacher turnover can be costly. A Texas study concluded that teacher turnover cost the state over $329 million a year. When administrative/organizational costs are added, the estimated cost to Texas is as high as $2.1

billion (National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 2003).

Teacher turnover can undermine schools and the community they serve. School improvements are hindered when teachers leave before changes are established. The development of positive school communities may be hampered by turnover (Ingersoll, 2001; National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 2003). The commitment and unity of a school is negatively effected (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003). The most destructive cost of turnover is the negative effect on student achievement and teacher quality (National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 2003).

Professional development can have a significant positive impact on teachers' classroom performance (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Wenglinsky, 2002) and classroom management (McNeely, Nonnemaker, & Blum, 2002). Many times, the assistance and guidance that new teachers need are neither recognized nor met (Kardos, Johnson, Peske, Kauffman, & Liu, 2001). Some new teachers are virtually abandoned the moment they enter their building. There is little to no induction, support, or collegiality. Teachers need to feel they belong. An ongoing professional development program with a structured

induction program combined with a supportive school community can meet the needs of new teachers (Wong, 2003). New teachers who perceive an increase in support increase their self-efficacy. These teachers also view their teaching assignment as less difficult (Hoy, 2000).

Research Questions

To determine the effects of classroom management training and active or information-based follow-up on inexperienced teachers' classroom behavior management effectiveness, the following research questions will be addressed:

Research Question 1

Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-evaluation compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation following active follow-up to classroom behavior management training (AFCMT)?

Research Sub-Question 1a. Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-evaluation of the Planning and Preparation domain compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Planning and Preparation domain following active follow-up to classroom management training (AFCMT)?

Research Sub-Question 1b. Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-

evaluation of the Classroom Environment domain compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Classroom Environment domain following active follow-up to classroom behavior management training (AFCMT)?

Research Sub-Question 1c. Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-evaluation of the Instruction domain compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Instruction domain following active follow-up to classroom behavior management training (AFCMT)?

Research Sub-Question 1d. Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-evaluation of the Professional Responsibilities domain compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Professional Responsibilities domain following active follow-up to classroom behavior management training (AFCMT)?

Research Question 2

Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-evaluation compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation following information-based follow-up to classroom behavior management training (IBFCMT)?

Research Sub-Question 2a. Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-

evaluation of the Planning and Preparation domain compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Planning and Preparation domain following information-based follow-up to classroom behavior management training (IBFCMT)?

Research Sub-Question 2b. Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-evaluation of the Classroom Environment domain compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Classroom Environment domain following information-based follow-up to classroom behavior management training (IBFCMT)?

Research Sub-Question 2c. Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-evaluation of the Instruction domain compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Instruction domain following information-based follow-up to classroom behavior management training (IBFCMT)?

Research Sub-Question 2d. Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-evaluation of the Professional Responsibilities domain compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Professional Responsibilities domain following information-based follow-up to classroom behavior management training (IBFCMT)?

Research Question 3

Was there a significant difference between AFCMT teachers' posttest self-evaluation compared to the IBFCMT teacher's posttest self-evaluation following the classroom behavior management training and active or information-based follow-up?

Research Sub-Question 3a. Was there a significant difference between AFCMT teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Planning and Preparation domain compared to the IBFCMT teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Planning and Preparation domain following the classroom behavior management training and active or information-based follow-up?

Research Sub-Question 3b. Was there a significant difference between AFCMT teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Classroom Environment domain compared to the IBFCMT teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Classroom Environment domain following the classroom behavior management training and active or information-based follow-up?

Research Sub-Question 3c. Was there a significant difference between AFCMT teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Instruction domain compared to the IBFCMT teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the

Instruction domain following the classroom behavior management training and active or information-based follow-up?

Research Sub-Question 3d. Was there a significant difference between AFCMT teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Professional Responsibilities domain compared to the IBFCMT teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Professional Responsibilities domain following the classroom behavior management training and active or information-based follow-up?

Definition of Terms

Asynchronous. Participants do not participate at the same time (National Staff Development Council, 2001a).

Certificated employee (teacher). A person who holds a teaching certificate from a state's Department of Education or other State office mandated to provide teaching certificates (Danielson, 1996). For the purpose of this study, only certificated, classroom teachers will be surveyed.

Classroom behavior management. For the purposes of this study, this refers to the creation of interpersonal and physical conditions, the planning and preparation for instruction, and organization of student behavior conducive to an effective learning environment

(Danielson, 1996).

Classroom teacher. For the purposes of this study, classroom teacher is defined as a certificated employee who is directly responsible for the instruction of students in grades pre-kindergarten, kindergarten, one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven, and twelve.

Follow-up: Active. The follow-up consists of three structured emails and one structured phone call every two weeks for at least sixteen weeks. In addition, participants receive an information-only mailing that provides further information and discussion about classroom behavior management. This mailing is identical to the information-based follow-up. Participants could elect to contact the trainers for further information.

Follow-up: Information-based. The follow-up consists of an information-only mailing to participants that provides further information and discussion about classroom behavior management. This mailing is identical to the active follow-up mailing. Participants could elect to contact the trainers for further information.

I Can Do It Classroom Management Program. The Nebraska State Education Association (NSEA) provides classroom behavior management training for members based

on the I Can Do It classroom management program developed by the California Teachers Association. In 1996, the California Teachers Association and a group of San Bernardino County superintendents agreed to collaborate on the creation of a classroom behavior management training to assist new k-12 teachers in their first five years of teaching. Teachers collaborate throughout the workshop, building on personal and professional experiences and the experiences of other participants (California Teachers Association, 2003).

I Can Do It areas of focus.

1. Getting to know your students.
2. Rules and routines.
3. Reinforcements.
4. Polishing your techniques.
5. Smoothly flowing classrooms.
6. Communication styles.
7. Home and school communication.
8. Dealing with difficult behaviors.

Inexperienced teacher. A classroom teacher with less than five years experience teaching.

Synchronous. Participants are participating at the same time, allowing one-to-one communication (National Staff Development Council, 2001a).

Teacher Self-Evaluation form (Summative evaluation form). A self-evaluation form based on Danielson's research-based teacher evaluation model. This includes four distinct domains of professional practice: Planning and Preparation, the Classroom Environment, Instruction, and Professional Responsibilities (Danielson & McGreal, 2000).

Teacher Self-Evaluation Levels of Performance.

Unsatisfactory. A teacher does not understand the basic principles of a concept.

Basic. A teacher understands the basic concept, but has difficulty implementing the concepts.

Proficient. A teacher understands and effectively implements the concepts.

Distinguished. A master teacher who contributes to the field of education, specifically dealing with a concept (Danielson, 1996).

Years of Experience. The total number of years the teacher has worked in the education profession as a certified teacher with a contract prior to the current school year. Teachers in their first year of teaching would have zero years of experience.

Assumptions

This study has several strong features. First,

the I Can Do It Classroom Management Program is a proven strategy for new teacher training. It has been shown to be an effective professional development model. Second, inexperienced teachers in the study elected to participate and are motivated to participate in the activities that enhance their classroom effectiveness. It is also reasonable to assume that voluntary participants see the importance or need for continued development of classroom behavior management skills. Their motivation may affect results.

Finally, all participants will have access to email and a telephone and be computer literate. The flexible use of synchronous and asynchronous communication will account for quality responses.

Delimitations

Most districts provide some sort of training or support in classroom management for new teachers. The responses of the teachers participating in the study may reflect additional support provided by their districts.

The timeframe of the follow-up is limited to sixteen weeks. Adjusting the length of follow-up could affect change.

All teacher participants chose to be part of the I Can Do It training without being identified by their schools as needing improvement. These teachers acknowledged that classroom behavior management is important and that they wanted to have additional training.

All participants will be from schools in Nebraska. These schools were rural, small town, or urban.

Limitations

There are four limitations in this proposal. First, this is a sample of naturally formed groups. Secondly, teacher responses may reflect the expectation that there should be improvement, rather than actual improvement. Third, the results are limited to schools in Nebraska. Finally, results are limited to participants in this study.

Significance of the Study

Contributions to Research

There is a gap in current research connecting classroom behavior management training and follow-up to teacher's self-evaluations. This research is intended to determine the effectiveness of active follow-up and information-based follow-up to classroom behavior management training.

Contributions to Practice

If teachers fail to develop effective classroom behavior management skills, achievement and learning is disrupted (Giallo & Little, 2003). The negative effects of ineffective teachers are compounded when students are faced with multiple ineffective teachers over a period of years. Students of effective teachers "make excellent academic gains, but not enough to offset previous evidence of less than expected gains" as a result of less effective teachers (Wright, Horn, & Sanders, 1997, p. 64).

Contributions to Policy

Many teachers struggle with classroom behavior management. The solution is often left up to the struggling teacher. A teacher may choose to attend or is sent to a "one-day" workshop about classroom behavior management. As a matter of policy, a school district, administrator, or professional organization/union may identify a teacher struggling with classroom behavior management. Single session workshops without follow-up are referred to as one-shot workshops, which are often ineffective. To develop quality schools, teachers need access to quality, ongoing professional development (Darling-Hammond, 1996). This study can provide insight

into the importance of follow-up to professional development and may inform schools professional development policies.

Organization of the Study

The literature reviewed relevant to this study is presented in chapter 2. Chapter 3 describes the research design methodology and procedures that will be used to gather and analyze the data of this research study. Chapter 4 will present the results. Chapter 5 will discuss the research findings.

CHAPTER TWO

Review of Selected Literature and Research

The literature review will discuss research relating the I Can Do It classroom management training and follow-up, the components of effective classroom behavior management and professional development, and how those components are reflected in the I Can Do It classroom management training and the perceived classroom effectiveness. There is a gap in the current research between the effects of classroom behavior management training and follow-up on teachers' perceived classroom effectiveness.

New Teachers and Successful Classroom Behavior Management

Many new teachers deal with classroom behavior management problems that most experienced teachers no longer face. Many new teachers do not have a working understanding of the policies, practices, and the culture of a school. They do not have the experience to apply that information to prepare and develop effective classroom management practices (Glasgow & Hicks, 2003).

New teachers report that classroom management is complicated and challenging. Minor problems can interrupt a whole class. Disruptions may cause the entire class to fall further and further behind their peers (Giallo &

Little, 2003; McCoy, 2003). This loss in learning may be compounded over the years if students are faced with similar problems (Wright, Horn, & Sanders, 1997).

Teachers who perceive problems with their classroom behavior management skills are less confident about their abilities in classroom behavior management (Giallo & Little, 2003). These teachers are more likely to give up on student misbehavior and less likely to work at solving classroom behavior management problems (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000).

On the other hand, teachers who are more confident in their classroom behavior management skills do more to solve problems in classroom behavior management (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000). In turn, teachers who perceive student success and achievement are more likely to stay in teaching (Johnson & Birkeland, 2002).

Effective Classroom Behavior Management

Research shows that teachers with a high level of self-efficacy are less threatened by problems in the classroom, including negative student behavior. Rather, they build relationships with their students and, in turn, classroom behavior management becomes easier (Ashton & Webb, 1986).

Students may come to school without basic social skills. Without these skills, students cannot exhibit responsible behavior. Rather, students fail to control their anger and impulses, they argue and fight, and they cannot identify nor describe their feelings. Misbehavior due to lack of social skills or self-control is often triggered by insecurity, unstructured places, excitability, guilt, new experiences, or frustration (Henley, 2003).

When students do not respond to most classroom behavior management plans, developing an understanding of the function and reasons for the behavior is important. Teachers must assess all aspects of a behavior. Assessment of the problem should include identifying specific behaviors, antecedents, and consequences of the behavior. Once an understanding of the behavior is established, a plan must be clearly organized to address the behavior (Skiba & Peterson, 2003). Students need to learn that their behavior has resulting effects (Henley, 1997).

Problems with classroom behavior management can lead to serious negative consequences. Academically, students who perceive a deficiency in teacher and student control have the lowest achievement levels (Eshel & Kohavi,

2003). Students in a classroom with poor classroom behavior management can lose an entire year of learning. Students who have consecutive years of ineffective teachers may have a compound loss of learning (Wright, Horn, & Sanders, 1997). Students are more successful in classrooms that have a high level of both teacher and student control (Eshel & Kohavi, 2003).

Non-academically, students who are in schools with poor classroom behavior management may fail to develop a sense of school connectedness. When this happens, students are more likely to use illegal substances, become sexually active, and commit violence (McNeely, Nonnemaker, & Blum, 2002).

For teachers, classroom behavior management problems can generate job dissatisfaction and teacher burnout. A teacher with more problems in classroom behavior management is significantly more likely to leave the profession (Ingersoll, 2001; Ingersoll & Smith, 2003)

Getting to Know Students

Teachers need to create a solid foundation for their students. Students with high quality teacher relationships are less likely to exhibit discipline problems (Marzano & Marzano, 2003). Kohn (1996) advocates that teachers should create a sense of community where

students feel respected and valued. A happy class climate has a positive effect on student achievement (Mills, 1987).

Developing a positive class climate must ensure basic students' needs, beginning with safety. Teachers need to be aware and understand the student's actual beliefs and not make assumptions about students' feelings or beliefs (Marzano & Marzano, 2003). Effective teachers create a climate of acceptance. This is accomplished by creating a sense of comfort and order (California Teachers Association, 2003). In addition, effective teachers are aware of students with a high level of need and have developed techniques to meet their needs (Marzano & Marzano, 2003).

Educators struggle to deal with issues that students face outside of the classroom. When students feel as if they know their teacher and fellow students, are recognized, cared for, and emotionally safe, students like the classroom and will respond more on an academic and personal level (Phelan, Davidson, & Cao, 1992).

Rules, Routines, and Organization

It is essential for students to have a clear understanding of the rules and routines in a classroom. Students must know the expectations of a classroom.

Teachers who set clear procedures and routines allow for maximum use of time and create an environment where students can work independently (Kierstead, 1985; Kierstead, 1984).

"Routines establish a sense of order and stability" (Nelsen, Lott, & Glenn, 2000, p. 164). Bosch and Kersey (1994) set clear guidelines for establishing what is important during the first weeks of school. The most important goal for teachers is to teach and re-teach their classroom behavior management plan.

Classroom organization is an important part of student achievement (Eshel & Kohavi, 2003). Brooks and Hawke (1985) found a pattern in successful teachers. Successful teachers develop a consistent routine. They are organized and prepared, therefore they do not waste time, and they communicate a sense of effectiveness and confidence to their students. Setting predictable routines allow teachers to prevent student interruptions and avoid confusion. In turn, this allows for more focused time on the lesson and less time on clerical work (California Teachers Association, 2003; Danielson, 1996). Beginning teachers must establish classroom routines before meaningful learning can take place (Danielson, 1996).

Teachers need to share control and responsibility with students. When this happens, students will begin to use higher order thinking skills and develop a sense of purpose and confidence. The sharing of control and responsibility with students increases their intrinsic motivation (Deci, 1985; Kierstead, 1984; Kierstead, 1985; Malouff, Rooke, Schutte, et al., 2008). When students actively participate in developing expectations and consequences, they create a sense of ownership, confidence, and value (Nelsen, Lott, & Glenn, 2000).

Educators should develop a process where teachers and students work together to make decisions about student classroom behavior and the reasons why it is important. Students develop an understanding and commitment to what they have developed. Students learn to become ethical people. Students become intrinsically motivated to exhibit positive behavior in the classroom. Giving students a voice increases the students self determination to demonstrate positive behavior (Kohn, 1996).

Reinforcements

Students who are intrinsically motivated demonstrate higher attainment of conceptual learning (Deci, 1985). Teachers must learn about intrinsic and extrinsic

rewards, their relationship to behavior, selecting appropriate awards, goals and guidelines for behavior intervention and feedback, and hands-on activities to accentuate application of reinforcement skills (California Teachers Association, 2003). There are hundreds of methods that teachers can use to reinforce student behavior. This includes relevantly connecting content to students, student directed goals, encouragement of self-learning, positive relationships, responding effectively, creative teaching methods, and motivating students. Teachers must select methods that suit their style of teaching (Malouff, Rooke, Schutte, et. Al, 2008). Immanuel Kant wrote:

> If you punish a child for being naughty, and reward him for being good, he will do right merely for the sake of the reward; and when he goes into the world and finds that goodness is not always rewarded, nor wickedness always punished, he will grow into a man who thinks about how he may get on in the world, and does right or wrong according as he finds of advantage to himself. (California Teachers Association, 2003, p. 24)

"With-it-ness" is very effective in reducing unwanted student behaviors. "With-it-ness" refers to a

teacher's awareness about what is happening in all parts of their classroom at all times. The students must be convinced that teachers are aware of their actions at all times. "With-it-ness" and reinforcement should not only be used with negative behaviors (California Teachers Association, 2003). Teachers with a high level of self-efficacy tend to display "with-it-ness" (Ashton & Webb, 1986).

Communication and Learning Styles

Problems with communication can lead to disruptive behavior (California Teachers Association, 2003). Some discipline problems stem from students who are not engaged in the curriculum (Kohn, 1996). Students are more likely to be engaged and interested when a variety of learning styles are met (Phelan, Davidson, & Cao, 1992). Students who work within their own learning style will make the most academic gain. Teachers must meet the needs of those learning styles (Armstrong, 1987).

Providing students with activity choices and options increases student understanding, develops a sense of cooperation between the teacher and students, allows students to focus on their interests, and demonstrates that the teacher is interested in the students (Marzano & Marzano, 2003). Students achieve more after teachers have

learned differentiated instruction (Wenglinsky, 2002). Effective teachers meet the differentiated needs of students by changing their teaching when needed (Darling-Hammond, 2000).

Home and School Communication

Teachers need to prepare and plan for home-school communications. A proactive approach can prevent future problems and create a working partnership to maximize student achievement (Glasgow & Hicks, 2003). Documentation is a necessary skill for new teachers to develop. New teachers need to learn how and when to document student behavior (Glasgow & Hicks, 2003) and home-school contacts (California Teachers Association, 2003).

Dealing with Difficult Behaviors

When teachers view discipline in terms of punishment and control, students learn about fear, disapproval, rejection, and embarrassment. Discipline should be an opportunity for students to develop a deeper understanding and ownership of responsibility, social skills, communication, critical thinking skills, problem-solving techniques, cooperation, and democracy. Learning becomes meaningful once they have obtained these skills. Teachers need to create a classroom environment where

they identify and understand the motivation of student behaviors and collaborate with other teachers, students, and parents in developing and encouraging positive solutions to those behaviors. This includes actively involving students in the creation of rules and expectations and creating a sense of ownership to the educational process (Nelsen, Lott, & Glenn, 2000).

Students may take on defensive behaviors when they feel that they do not belong or are not important. This behavior is often a way to give up, get attention, power, or revenge. Once teachers understand the motivation, they can begin to develop long-term solutions. Teachers must deal with the behavior and the motivation for the behavior (Nelsen, Lott, & Glenn, 2000).

Effective Professional Development

The needs of teachers differ during different stages of teaching (Danielson & McGreal, 2000). Effective professional development programs view all participants as important contributors and provide them with a sense of ownership (Wong, 2003). Collaboration builds a sense of collegiality, belonging, learning culture, and self-respect (Wong, 2004).

Components of the I Can Do It Classroom Management Training

The Nebraska State Education Association (NSEA) provides classroom behavior management training for members based on the I Can Do It classroom management program developed by the California Teachers Association. In 1996, the California Teachers Association and a group of San Bernardino County superintendents agreed to collaborate on the creation of a classroom behavior management training to assist new teachers (California Teachers Association, 2003).

This interactive training program was created for new k-12 teachers in their first five years of teaching. Teachers collaborate throughout the workshop, building on personal and professional experiences and the experiences of other participants (California Teachers Association, 2003).

Since inception, the program has been revised and expanded. Teachers from across the United States are trained as I Can Do It trainers (California Teachers Association, 2003).

The I Can Do It training contains eight areas of focus:

1. Getting to know your students.

2. Rules and routines.

3. Reinforcements.

4. Polishing your techniques.

5. Smoothly flowing classrooms.

6. Communication styles.

7. Home and school communication.

8. Dealing with difficult behaviors.

As part of the participant manual, detailed information for each section is provided along with additional sections for appendix materials and resources (California Teachers Association, 2003). The NSEA provides additional resources.

The training session provides teachers with the tools to effectively understand the role of classroom behavior management, to develop an effective environment for students to achieve, and to collaborate with other professionals to enhance personal learning. These are key components of the National Staff Development Council's Standards for Staff Development (2001b).

The follow-up focuses the new teachers on using data to target specific areas to improve their classroom and increase student learning. In turn, this provides the facilitators with a focal point for providing needed support and information as part of the follow-up. These

are key components of the National Staff Development Council's Standards for Staff Development (2001).

Getting to Know Your Students

Goals for this module include hands-on practice using interactive tools to create a classroom community, provide information about creating a community, and have participants begin working collaboratively in small, grade-level specific groups. Effective teachers create a climate of acceptance. This is accomplished by creating a sense of comfort and order (California Teachers Association, 2003).

Rules and Routines

It is essential for students to have a clear understanding of the rules and routines in a classroom. Goals for this module include learning the value and guidelines for establishing rules and routines and the concept of momentum and its relationship to routines. This allows teachers to focus on the lessons instead of clerical work (California Teachers Association, 2003).

Reinforcements

The goals of this module are to learn about intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, their relationship to behavior, selecting appropriate awards, goals and guidelines for behavior intervention and feedback, and

hands-on activities to accentuate application of reinforcement skills. This includes a discussion of "with-it-ness" (California Teachers Association, 2003).

Polishing your Techniques

This brief module serves to create a basic awareness of the resources in the manual and discuss how they relate to participants' classrooms. Included is a review of a seven-step lesson plan model, instructional procedures, effective questioning skills, and strategies for English language learners. The San Francisco Unified School District provides several resources about effective lesson planning (California Teachers Association, 2003).

Smoothly Flowing Classrooms

This interactive module provides information about the value of using signals, successful directions, elements of student independent activities, smooth and effective transitions, and sponge activities. Teachers have the opportunity to build on what they know and collaborate with other professionals (California Teachers Association, 2003).

Communication Styles

This module introduces communication styles and how they relate to lesson planning (California Teachers

Association, 2003). The NSEA trainers allocate additional time to expand this unit to briefly review learning styles, connect communication and learning styles to differentiated learning, and use hands-on activities to apply differentiation to actively engage all students.

Home and School Communication

In this brief module, participants learn helpful information about communicating with parents, planning for parent conferences, and coping with hostile parents. Several key factors in communicating with parents about a child's misbehavior are provided. At the forefront is the careful selection of words with a goal of developing parental cooperation and preventing/reducing hostility and a discussion about the importance and role in documenting student behavior and parent contacts and communication (California Teachers Association, 2003).

Dealing with Difficult Behaviors

This interactive module allows teachers to build on their current knowledge and work with their colleagues to build confidence and capacity in solving difficult classroom behaviors (California Teachers Association, 2003).

While there are many options to assess behavior, identifying negative and positive behaviors, selecting

specific behaviors to address, and developing a plan that clearly sets specific goals, modifications and assessments are important issues to address. The desired outcome is not to control the behavior, rather teach new, appropriate behaviors (Skiba & Peterson, 2003).

Research shows that when students chronically misbehave, strategies aimed at specific individual student behaviors are more effective than general strategies aimed at the general student population (Safran & Oswald, 2003).

As part of the follow-up to I Can Do It, teachers may use the Student Self-Control Inventory. The Student Self-Control Inventory provides a guide to develop specific goals for students. It is designed to identify a student's strengths and weaknesses. It can be used to guide teachers in developing goals and priorities for teaching self-control. Reliability and validity of the instrument was determined over three years. Cronbach's Alpha was used for internal validity. The coefficient was 0.62 for males and females, but is more reliable for males. There are five domains of the Self-Control Inventory: impulses, school routines, group pressure, stress, and problem solving (Henley, 2003).

The following details the Student Self-Control Inventory (Henley, 2003)

Controlling Impulses

1. Manages situational lure.
2. Demonstrates patience.
3. Verbalizes feelings.
4. Resists tempting objects.

Following School Routines

5. Follows rules.
6. Organizes school materials.
7. Accepts evaluative comments.
8. Makes classroom transitions.

Managing Group Situations

9. Maintains composure.
10. Appraises peer pressure.
11. Participates in group activity.
12. Understands how behavior affects others.

Managing Stress

13. Adapts to new situations.
14. Copes with competition.
15. Tolerates frustration.
16. Selects tension-reducing activities.

Solving Social Problems

17. Focuses on the present.

18. Learns from past experience.
19. Anticipates consequences.
20. Resolves conflicts.

The inventory reflects topics covered in the I Can Do It curriculum and follow-up. The inventory can guide teachers in identifying positive replacement behaviors that may need to be taught. Results may also assist the trainers in developing strategies for follow-up.

Perceived Classroom Effectiveness Evaluation

The evaluation of teachers serves primarily to assure quality teachers and provide for professional growth and development (Danielson & McGreal, 2000). As part of the NSEA's I Can Do It Classroom Management program, teachers must perform a self-evaluation based on Danielson's research. Danielson developed a modern teacher evaluation model based on current educational research and cooperative discussion among administration about effective teaching. School districts cooperatively develop an evaluation system based on the needs of the school districts and its' teachers. No two districts have the exact same evaluation procedures and expectations, even if all four domains are precisely incorporated into an evaluation system (Danielson & McGreal, 2000).

"Teachers are professionals; they are practitioners of a complex craft" (Danielson, 1996, p. 25). Teachers are inclined to be aware of their own strengths and weaknesses. Evaluation instruments should lead to teacher self-reflection. With a reflective evaluation system, teachers can direct their growth as a professional. This evaluation model allows for professional inquiry by teachers. The evaluation process should not add an overabundance of additional work. Rather, the process should flow from what teachers are already doing in their classroom (Danielson, 1996; Danielson & McGreal, 2000).

Milanowski, Kimball, and White (2004) conducted a study examining the relationship between teacher evaluation scores and student achievement. Of the three school districts, two developed teacher evaluation programs based on Danielson's *Framework for Teaching*. The two districts were the Cincinnati Public School District and the Washoe County School District. The researchers studied the relationship one teacher evaluation rating level change had on student test scores. In the Cincinnati Public School District, the standard deviation of reading scores was .14. The standard deviation of math scores was .18. In the Washoe County School District, the standard deviation of reading scores was .14. The

standard deviation of math scores was .19. The difference could be a considerable benefit for students with multiple years of higher rated teachers. They concluded that the teacher evaluations they examined go beyond measuring teacher experience. Teacher evaluation scores are a better predictor of student achievement than experience (Milanowski, Kimball, & White, 2004).

Danielson identified four distinct domains of professional practice: planning and preparation, the classroom environment, instruction, and professional responsibilities (Danielson & McGreal, 2000). These domains have been identified by Danielson's research as components for increasing student learning. The framework correlates to the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) standards that guide teacher education programs to develop effective teachers (1996).

Planning and preparation involves an overall, all-inclusive knowledge and understanding of curricular content, the background of students, and designing and assessing instruction (Danielson & McGreal, 2000). Content changes over time. Teachers must continue their growth in content knowledge. Distinguished teachers develop a deep understanding of content, concepts, and

principles and design instruction to incorporate that understanding to meet the needs of all students. This includes organization of instruction and effective assessment. If a teacher does not understand a concept, they cannot expect to effectively teach it (Danielson, 1996).

A key component is selecting instructional goals. Teachers must develop goals and subsequent methods and assessments that meet the varying needs of students and content (Danielson, 1996).

The primary components of Domain 1: Planning and Preparation, are (Danielson, 1996):

- Demonstrating Knowledge of Subject Matter, Pedagogy, and Best Practices.
- Understanding and Using District Content Standards.
- Designing Coherent Instruction.
- Assessing Student Learning.
- Demonstrating Knowledge of Students.
- Demonstrating Knowledge of and Utilizing Instructional Resources.

The classroom environment includes the skill of teachers to create interpersonal and physical conditions

conducive to an effective learning environment (Danielson & McGreal, 2000). While this does not reflect direct instruction, these interactions and activities are essential for effective teaching. The safe, respectful, and comfortable climate that is created allows students to cooperate and take risks. Clear routines are established. Beginning teachers need to master this domain first to set the stage for meaningful learning (Danielson, 1996). New teachers need to emphasize planning the classroom environment before focus on content (Glasgow & Hicks, 2003).

The primary components of Domain 2: The Classroom Environment, are (Danielson, 1996):

- Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport.
- Managing Classroom Procedures and Practices Consistent with Building and District Policies.
- Managing Student Behavior.
- Establishing a Culture for Learning through Support of the Mission and Aims of the District.
- Organizing Physical Space.

Instruction focuses on the skill of a teacher to engage learners in the content utilizing a variety of instructional strategies (Danielson & McGreal, 2000).

This is central to effective teaching, "the actual engagement of students in content" (p. 31). This domain is comprised of specific components of instruction. Teachers engage students in meaningful activities (Danielson, 1996).

The primary components of Domain 3: Instruction, are (Danielson, 1996):

- Communicating Clearly and Accurately.
- Engaging Students in Learning.
- Providing Feedback to Students.
- Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques.
- Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness.

Professional and leadership responsibilities include the professional responsibilities of a teacher, such as home-school communication, professional development activities, self-assessment, and contributions to the situation of the school and district (Danielson & McGreal, 2000). These professional "activities are critical to preserving and enhancing the profession" (p. 32). This domain is more fully developed after a few years of teaching experience (Danielson, 1996).

The primary components of Domain 4: Professional and Leadership Responsibilities, are (Danielson, 1996):

- Maintaining Accurate Records and Reports.
- Communicating and Developing Positive Relationships with Students, Families, Colleagues, and Community Partners.
- Growing and Developing Professionally.
- Demonstrating Professionalism.
- Contributing Positively to the School Environment.

Next Danielson & McGreal (2000) identified four levels of performance: unsatisfactory, basic, proficient, and distinguished. An unsatisfactory rating on a component indicates that a teacher doesn't "appear to understand the concepts underlying the component" (Danielson, 1996, p. 36). A basic rating indicates that a teacher understands the concepts, but has difficulty implementing them (Danielson, 1996). A proficient rating indicates a teacher understands and implements the concepts effectively (Danielson, 1996). A distinguished rating indicates a teacher is a master teacher who contributes "to the field [of education], both in and outside of school" (Danielson, 1996, p. 37).

When used as a district evaluation, it is essential that administration and teachers have cooperatively developed a common understanding of the definition of the four levels of performance (Danielson, 1996). For the purposes of the study, the researcher will provide the definition of the levels of performance.

Teachers who believe that they are better prepared to teach are significantly, positively correlated with a belief in their behavior management skills. Teachers who believe that they are confronted with difficult and uncontrollable student behaviors have a lower level of confidence in classroom behavior management (Giallo & Little, 2003).

Teachers with a low level of self-efficacy have a different perspective on classroom behavior management and its relation to students. Research showed that regardless of student behavior, teachers with a low level of self-efficacy used the words conflict and disruption to describe classroom behavior management. Control is obtained through punishments, discouragement, embarrassment, and even humiliation. Teachers with a high level of self-efficacy are less negative about students and their behavior (Ashton & Webb, 1986).

Student Achievement

The strongest predictor of student success is the quality of the teacher (Wong, 2004). Teachers have the greatest impact on student achievement. "The most important factor affecting student learning is the teacher" (Wright, Horn, and Sanders (1997, p. 63). Wright, Horn, and Sanders (1997) found that when students with multiple years of ineffective teachers are compared to students with multiple years of the most effective teachers, their mean range of achievement scores were a difference of 52 to 54 points. The effects of teachers are cumulative. Students who have been assigned an effective teacher show negative residual effects from ineffective teachers. The effective and ineffective teacher residual effects can be measured, even after two years of effective teachers.

"Improving student achievement boils down to the teaching. What the teacher knows and can do in the classroom is the most important factor resulting in student achievement" (Wong, 2004, p. 41). There is a positive correlation between teachers who seek out and utilize peers and district resources for assistance and student achievement (Ross, 1992).

Teachers who practice self-reflection improve their teaching and, in turn, student performance. These

teachers set high expectations, work harder with low-achieving students, emphasize learning and instruction, and try new instructional strategies (Chase, Germundsen, Brownstein, & Distad, 2001). Teachers' self-efficacy has a marked effect on student achievement. Student achievement is related to the level of a teacher's self-efficacy. Teachers with low levels of self-efficacy lack confidence in their students' potential behavior. This lack of confidence causes changes to be made to the teachers' instruction. They spend less time, effort, and instructional attention reaching the neediest students and may view instruction as a means of control as opposed to learning. These teachers are more likely to pay "little or no attention to their lowest achieving students as long as the students [are] well behaved" while giving preferential treatment to other students (Ashton & Webb, 1986, p. 83).

Teachers with high levels of self-efficacy set high expectations for all students, keeping the class on task, encouraged and enthused about learning, and helping all students achieve (Ashton & Webb, 1986). Students achieve more with teachers who have higher levels of self-efficacy (Ross, 1992).

Research shows that student achievement increases when teachers and students have high levels of control (Eshel & Kohavi, 2003). When students have control and responsibility, they develop a sense of purpose and confidence (Deci, 1985; Kierstead, 1985). Students who view the classroom as having low teacher and student control have the lowest level of academic achievement (Eshel & Kohavi, 2003).

Follow-up to Classroom Behavior Management Training

A new teacher usually does not become an effective teacher overnight. Most effective teachers develop over the first five to seven years of teaching. Induction programs are not enough to assist teachers in becoming effective. Professional development must provide teachers with effective, ongoing opportunities to develop their skills. Teachers learn more with extensive, high-quality, ongoing programs. Short-term programs are not as effective (Wong, 2003). A program must give teachers the skills to deal with classroom behavior management (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000). Beginning teachers who participated in either an induction program or a mentoring program are less likely to leave the profession in their first year (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003).

Professional development without follow-up has frequently become the norm in education. Professional development needs to be long-term, continuous, and ongoing (Richardson, 2003). Follow-up activities for teachers should be a guiding principle for districts. Districts should provide follow-up activities beyond the training session (Danielson & McGreal, 2000). Unfortunately, investing in ongoing professional development has not become a priority for many school districts. Many times, professional development becomes the first program to be cut during budget limitations (Darling-Hammond, 1996). A variety of methods can be used to deliver high-quality professional learning. Strategies that allow teachers to identify areas of need and access the information and support at any time are highly effective (National Staff Development Council, 2001a). A professional development program can be sustainable (American Educational Research Association, 2005).

Online professional development may serve as a partial solution. Using the computer to communicate can overcome time and distance problems and may increase teacher motivation (Kabilan, 2004; Merseth, 1990). Much of the research about online asynchronous communication and professional development in education is focused on

the asynchronous components of tele-mentoring, online classes, and student use as part of a class. Asynchronous communication can be email, participation in online discussion groups, message boards, viewing and posting class materials, and list groups.

Email interactions allow teachers to take time to arrange and constructively reflect on their thoughts and questions. Teachers can share those thoughts and questions with anyone at any time. Other teachers can respond in the same manner. Email allows teachers to manage their conversations and self-direct future conversations (Goodwin, Graham, & Scarborough, 2001; Kabilan, 2004). Research shows that email discussions gave beginning teachers insight into their own experiences and teaching as a whole (Merseth, 1990) and strengthens learning (Goodwin, Graham, & Scarborough, 2001). Reflection is a central component of self-assessment, leading teachers to self-direct their own professional learning and development (Danielson & McGreal, 2000).

Email interactions can provide privacy. Research supports that beginning teachers feel that using a computer network to communicate about certain issues allows them to discuss these issues with more candor and

honesty without being evaluated. Electronic communication allows beginning teachers to ask questions that they may be fearful of asking at their school or are too embarrassed to ask. Asking for help at their school may be too uncomfortable (Heider, 2005; Merseth, 1990; Schuck, 2003).

One major benefit of using technology is that teachers can learn what they need, when they need it. The use of technology allows teachers the flexibility to focus their learning. It actually increases a teacher's access to follow-up. This is directly tied to the NSDC's Standards for Staff Development (National Staff Development Council, 2001a).

Teachers have a different relationship with their administrator(s) who serve as evaluators. A mentor or a coach may be in a better position to engage teachers in professional discussions. Teachers are unlikely to be candid in their professional discussions if they fear that the information could be used against them (Danielson & McGreal, 2000). New teachers may be intimidated and reluctant to discuss problems with administration or colleagues (Glasgow & Hicks, 2003). Some teachers are afraid the requests for help will be viewed in a negative context and result in an

unsatisfactory evaluation (Johnson & Birkeland, 2002). New teachers may not know what questions to ask in a building (Kardos, Johnson, Peske, Kauffman, & Liu, E., 2001).

Using synchronous (i.e., phone calls, chat rooms, etc.) and asynchronous communication (i.e., email, discussion boards, etc.) in combination can provide great benefits for professional development (Schuck, 2003). Teachers can communicate when it is convenient for their schedules (Heider, 2005).

There are drawbacks to using an electronic network. For example, there may be details a beginning teacher needs to know about the school that can only be learned at the school, most likely by someone familiar with the school. Also, questions asked by beginning teachers may not be the correct questions. The questions may be missing important information or the situation may be misrepresented. Additionally, participants may choose not to respond, this may cause the resolution to be unclear. Finally, one-on-one, face-to-face contact cannot be easily replicated on an electronic network (Heider, 2005; Merseth, 1990).

Teachers may choose not to participate or respond electronically. In one project, beginning teachers

reported several reasons why they did not respond in a network-based project developed for beginning teachers. Beginning teachers responded that they lacked time, lacked reliable access to the electronic network, lacked trust or doubted the confidentiality of the other participants, felt overwhelmed by their job, were focused on other priorities, or did not need additional assistance (Schuck, 2003).

Participants may have difficulty accessing the Internet, either at home or at work. Often, if access is only available at school, teachers do not have the time, access, privacy, or permission to use the Internet or email at a convenient time (Schuck, 2003).

Research provides some guidelines for keeping asynchronous communications on topic and encouraging learning and learning retention. First, questions need to be thoughtfully, clearly, and carefully designed to evoke on-target discussions about topics. Second, participants need to have instructions and guidelines for responding on-topic, possibly including data organizers. Third, trainers should restate/reword questions to elicit appropriate discussion. Finally, participants should have a summary of discussion topics provided periodically (Beaudin, 1999).

Standards for Staff Development

It is important that any professional development activity be held to a high set of standards. In 2001 the National Staff Development Council (NSDC) (2001b) developed a revised set of standards for staff development. The National Staff Development Council's Standards for Staff Development are focused on three key areas that "improves the learning of all students" (p. 1), Context Standards, Process Standards, and Content Standards. The I Can Do It Classroom Management Training reflects the high standards set forth by the NSDC.

National Staff Development Council's Standards for Staff Development (2001b, p. 1) are:

Context Standards. Staff development that improves the learning of all students:

- Organizes adults into learning communities whose goals are aligned with those of the school and district. (Learning Communities)
- Requires skillful school and district leaders who guide continuous instructional improvement. (Leadership)
- Requires resources to support adult learning and collaboration. (Resources)

Process Standards. Staff development that improves the learning of all students:

- Uses disaggregated student data to determine adult learning priorities, monitor progress, and help sustain continuous improvement. (Data-Driven)
- Uses multiple sources of information to guide improvement and demonstrate its impact. (Evaluation)
- Prepares educators to apply research to decision making. (Research-Based)
- Uses learning strategies appropriate to the intended goal. (Design)
- Applies knowledge about human learning and change. (Learning)
- Provides educators with the knowledge and skills to collaborate. (Collaboration)

Content Standards. Staff development that improves the learning of all students:

- Prepares educators to understand and appreciate all students, create safe, orderly and supportive learning environments, and hold high expectations for their academic achievement. (Equity)

- Deepens educators' content knowledge, provides them with research-based instructional strategies to assist students in meeting rigorous academic standards, and prepares them to use various types of classroom assessments appropriately. (Quality Teaching)
- Provides educators with knowledge and skills to involve families and other stakeholders appropriately. (Family Involvement)

Summary

The literature review demonstrates that the I Can Do It Classroom Management Training curriculum has a strong research base and that follow-up is an essential component of effective professional development. Danielson's (1996) work provides a powerful foundation for the Omaha Public School Summative Evaluation form (2001) that will be used to assess the perceived classroom effectiveness of participants. Henley's *Self-Control Inventory* (2003) provides a tool for trainers and participants to examine student behavior as part of the follow-up. This research will compare and assess the effectiveness of the classroom behavior management training and follow-up components.

CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine the effects of classroom behavior management training and participation in active or information-based follow-up on inexperienced teachers' perceived classroom effectiveness over time. This was a quasi-experimental, pretest-posttest study.

Independent Variable

The independent variable was the I Can Do It Classroom Management Training (California Teachers Association, 2003). The first arm was the active follow-up to classroom management training (AFCMT). The second arm was the information-based follow-up to classroom management training (IBFCMT).

Dependent Variable

The dependent variables were the teachers' perceived classroom effectiveness evaluation based on the Omaha Public Schools' Summative Teacher Evaluation Form.

Participants

Number of Participants

The Nebraska State Education Association (NSEA) provides classroom teachers with less than 5 years of

experience an opportunity to participate in one of several identical classroom behavior management training programs with ongoing follow-up. There were 50 teachers who completed initial surveys at the beginning of the training were randomly selected to complete a self-evaluation survey at the end of the follow-up to provide the trainers with information about their classroom behavior management (N = 50). Of the 50, 26 received information-based follow-up (n = 26) and 24 received active follow-up (n = 24). This was a convenience sample.

Gender of Participants

There were no gender limitations for this study. Of the total number of potential participants (N = 50), the gender ratio of the responses is congruent with the number of males and females who completed follow-up. Therefore, for this study, 42 females and 8 males participated in the study. Total study accrual was 50 participants.

Age Range of Participants

The age range for the adult subjects was 21 years to 70 years. All participants were adults who had completed a teacher certification program at an accredited college or university, were certified to teach in the state of Nebraska, were currently teaching under a full-time

contract, and had volunteered to participate in the I Can Do It Classroom Management Training. Total study accrual was 50 participants.

Racial and Ethnic Origin of Participants

There were no racial or ethnic limitations for this study. Based on the number of participants, identifying the racial or ethnic background of the participants would serve to identify several of the participants. This would have been in violation of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the Protection of Human Subjects guidelines. Total study accrual was 50 participants.

Method of Participant Identification

Jay Sears, the Nebraska State Education Association (NSEA) Director of Advocacy, assisted trainers with the identification of I Can Do It training participants. The I Can Do It trainers and the NSEA make initial contact with all training participants. Invitations clearly stated the expectations for participation in the ongoing training program.

Study participants were fully certified teachers with less than 5 years experience in teaching. While NSEA is sponsoring the training opportunity, participants did not need be members of the Nebraska State Education Association (NSEA).

All participants were self-selected into this opportunity to learn more about classroom behavior management. It is logical to assume that teachers who self-selected a professional development activity during their free time must have felt that the topic was of importance. Teachers are more devoted to a professional development project if they have identified their own need and chosen to pursue improvement (Danielson & McGreal, 2000). Therefore, the teachers that signed up for the classroom behavior management training either saw a need to improve their classroom behavior management skills or saw the importance of continued growth of their classroom behavior management skills.

Following the I Can Do It Classroom Management Training, participants were randomly selected into two groups, an active follow-up group and an information-based follow-up group.

Research Design

This pretest-posttest study is displayed in the following notation:

Group 1	O_1	X_1	X_2	O_2
Group 2	O_1	X_1	X_3	O_2

Group 1: Group 1 was be randomly selected I Can Do It Classroom Management Training (CMT) participants receiving active follow-up (n = 25).

Group 2: Group 2 was be randomly selected I Can Do It Classroom Management Training (CMT) participants receiving information-based follow-up (n = 25).

X_1: Classroom behavior management training provided to teachers with less than 5 years experience. The training was provided by the Nebraska State Education Association (NSEA) and is based on the I Can Do It Classroom Management Program developed by the California Teachers Association.

X_2: Teachers with less than 5 years experience who received active follow-up after the I Can Do It training.

X_3: Teachers with less than 5 years experience who received information-based follow-up after the I Can Do It training.

O_1: Self-evaluation form pretest based on the

Summative Teacher Evaluation Form created by the Omaha Public Schools (OPS)

O_2: Self-evaluation form posttest based on the Summative Teacher Evaluation Form created by the Omaha Public Schools (OPS).

Description of Procedures

The Nebraska State Education Association (NSEA) provides classroom behavior management training for any new teacher and all members regardless of experience. The training is based on the I Can Do It Classroom Management Program developed by the California Teachers Association. In 1996, the California Teachers Association and a group of San Bernardino County superintendents agreed to collaborate on the creation of a classroom behavior management training to assist new teachers. This interactive training program was created for new k-12 teachers in their first five years of teaching. Since then, the program has been revised and expanded. Teachers from across the United States are trained as I Can Do It trainers (California Teachers Association, 2003).

The California Teachers Association trains up to 50 participants during each training session. The NSEA

has chosen to limit the number of participants, allowing trainers to expand certain sections.

NSEA has been offering this training for eight years. I am a practicing teacher who has been trained as a trainer for the I Can Do It Classroom Management Training module. I have trained teachers with the I Can Do It curriculum for eight years. My fellow trainer is a retired teacher who has been training teachers for five years. Both trainers presented at all training sessions.

The NSEA invited teachers with less than five years experience to participate in identical classroom behavior management training sessions. Fifty of the teachers were randomly selected to participate in follow-up and complete the final self-evaluation at the end of the follow-up. While the training is open to all teachers with less than five years experience, only teachers who meet the selection criteria were included in the research. All participants received the opportunity for follow-up. Not all participants elected to participate in follow-up.

When participants registered at the training session, they completed an information form that has contact and basic demographic information. The

information form was used to randomly assign follow-up.

The teachers were randomly assigned to two groups, an active follow-up group and an information-based follow-up group. The active follow-up to classroom behavior management training (AFCMT) group and information-based follow-up to classroom behavior management training (IBFCMT) group served as the two independent variables of this study.

Active-Based Follow-up

There were 24 teachers who received active follow-up after the I Can Do It Classroom Management Training (CMT) were in the first arm. These teachers received a minimum of three emails and one structured phone call every two weeks for a minimum of sixteen weeks to discuss components of the training and the implications for their classroom. Emails encouraged discussion, collaboration, and sharing of ideas. One of the three emails contained an electronic packet providing written information that discussed components of the training and the implications for their classroom. Participants received a minimum of eight electronic packets. The packets reflected the I Can Do It training modules:

1. Getting to know your students.

2. Rules and routines.

3. Reinforcements.

4. Polishing your techniques.

5. Smoothly flowing classrooms.

6. Communication styles.

7. Home and school communication.

8. Dealing with difficult behaviors.

Information-Based Follow-up

There were 26 teachers who received information-based follow-up after the I Can Do It Classroom Management Training (CMT) were in the second arm. These teachers received an electronic packet providing written information that discussed components of the training and the implications for their classroom. Participants received a minimum of eight electronic packets. This mailing was identical to the mailing received by the active follow-up group. Teachers in this research arm may have initiated contact with the principal trainers for online support.

Immediately prior to the classroom behavior management training, all participants evaluated themselves using a self-evaluation form based on the Summative Teacher Evaluation Form created by the Omaha Public Schools (OPS) (appendix B). OPS developed the

evaluation form based on the work of Danielson (1996). The pretest instruments for teachers' perceived classroom effectiveness was distributed at the I Can Do It Classroom Management Training session prior to instruction at locations throughout Nebraska. Self-assessment allows teachers to determine where they need to focus their attention for improvement (Danielson, 1996). Effective teachers use reflection to modify their classrooms (Glasgow and Hicks, 2003). Self-assessment builds a teacher's confidence (Moir & Baron, 2002).

After the training, teachers received follow-up to assist them in further developing their classroom behavior management. As part of the follow-up training materials, teachers were provided with various materials that allowed teachers to develop and organize classroom behavior management plans. The contents of the folder was not shared with the researchers for the study. This folder was intended to allow the teachers to organize a plan to address any problems with classroom behavior management. Subsequently, the folder may have contained confidential information and documents.

Active follow-up consisted of a minimum of three structured emails and one structured phone call every two weeks for at least sixteen weeks. One of the emails was

an informational mailing at least once every two weeks for a minimum of sixteen weeks. There were at least eight electronic mailings. This provided written information that discussed components of the training and the implications for their classroom. An email was sent prior to each phone call to allow participants to contemplate specific topics about students and other classroom behavior management topics to be discussed by phone. After the phone call, there was an email sent to summarize the phone call and provide a direction for the next few weeks. If there was difficulty communicating by either method, the number of emails or phone calls was adjusted to ensure consistent communication.

Participants could initiate additional contacts. This allowed for synchronous and asynchronous communication while preventing problems associated with limiting interaction to one communication style.

The information-based follow-up group received an informational mailing at least once every two weeks for a minimum of sixteen weeks. There were at least eight electronic mailings. This provided written information that discussed components of the training and the implications for their classroom. This mailing was identical to the active follow-up group mailing. The

participants could initiate email contact with the trainers and the trainers could respond.

Following the final week of follow-up, teachers were asked to complete an identical, self-evaluation form (appendix B) to determine any changes in self-perception.

The posttest self-evaluations were mailed to participants at the end of the follow-up. Participants were given the opportunity to complete the forms online. Forms filled out by hand were collected at the end of the follow-up. Participants were contacted if necessary.

All data were analyzed in the home office of the primary researcher. Data from these dependent measures were used to directly answer the proposed research questions. Data were stored for statistical analysis. No individual identifiers were attached to the data.

Confidentiality

Non-coded numbers were used to display individual de-identified demographic data. Aggregated group data, descriptive statistics, and parametric statistical analyses were utilized and reported.

Participants in the I Can Do It program were encouraged to use a private email account to ensure secure access and privacy of communication. To ensure confidentiality, the email address did not have any

identifiers as part of the address. Teachers were encouraged to not use their school email accounts because school districts have the right to read any email communications.

As part of the I Can Do It follow-up, it was essential to eliminate all identifiers during contact and to use substitute codes. If participants did not have access to secure email at home, any information that was potentially confidential was communicated by telephone or email with confidential information coded or removed.

All communications about students used pseudonyms. When discussing students, either by phone or email, the trainers and participants used the students' pseudonyms. Data were recorded in a manner whereby the students or participants could not be identified. Teachers did not access school or district records that were not already in their possession and did not share any confidential information with the trainers.

Informed Consent

All data collected were archival data that would routinely be collected as part of the I Can Do It training program.

Independent Variable

The classroom behavior management training program is based on the I Can Do It training program developed by the California Teacher's Association. The first arm was the active follow-up to classroom behavior management training (AFCMT). The second arm was the information-based follow-up to classroom behavior management training (IBFCMT).

Dependent Variables, Measures, and Instrumentation

The dependent variables were the summative teachers' perceived classroom effectiveness evaluation.

Teachers' Perceived Classroom Effectiveness Measures and Instrumentation

All participants evaluated themselves using a self-evaluation form based on the Summative Teacher Evaluation Form created by the Omaha Public Schools (OPS) (appendix A). OPS developed the evaluation form based on the work of Danielson (1996). The perceived levels of performance will be coded as: Unsatisfactory = 1, Basic = 2, Proficient = 3, and Distinguished = 4.

Teacher Demographics

Teachers were asked various demographic questions. These questions were:

1. What is your gender? Gender will be coded as: male = 1, female = 2.

2. How many years prior to this year have you been teaching? Participants will have less than five years experience in teaching. Years of experience will be coded as teachers in their: first year = 0, second year = 1, third year = 2, fourth year = 3, fifth year = 4.

4. What is your teaching position? Position will be coded into the following categories: Grade 1 = 1, Grade 2 = 2, Grade 3 = 3, Grade 4 = 4, Grade 5 = 5, Grade 6 = 6, Grade 7-8 = 7, Grade 9-12 = 8, Pre-kindergarten = 9, Kindergarten = 10, Grade K-6 (Special Education) = 11, Grade 7-8 (Special Education) = 12, and Grade 9-12 (Special Education) = 13.

Research Questions, Sub-Questions, and Data Analysis

This is a quasi-experimental, pretest-posttest study. The research questions were:

Research Question 1

Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-evaluation compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation following active follow-up to classroom behavior management training (AFCMT)?

Research Sub-Question 1a. Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest

self-evaluation of the Planning and Preparation domain compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Planning and Preparation domain following active follow-up to classroom behavior management training (AFCMT)?

Research Sub-Question 1b. Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-evaluation of the Classroom Environment domain compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Classroom Environment domain following active follow-up to classroom behavior management training (AFCMT)?

Research Sub-Question 1c. Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-evaluation of the Instruction domain compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Instruction domain following active follow-up to classroom behavior management training (AFCMT)?

Research Sub-Question 1d. Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-evaluation of the Professional Responsibilities domain compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Professional Responsibilities

domain following active follow-up to classroom behavior management training (AFCMT)?

Research sub-questions 1a, 1b, 1c, and 1d were tested using dependent *t*-tests to examine the significance of the difference between the pretest and posttest of AFCMT teachers' self-evaluation scores. An alpha level of .05 was utilized to control for Type I errors. Means and standard deviations are displayed on tables.

Research Question 2

Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-evaluation compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation following information-based follow-up to classroom behavior management training (IBFCMT)?

Research Sub-Question 2a. Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-evaluation of the Planning and Preparation domain compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Planning and Preparation domain following information-based follow-up to classroom behavior management training (IBFCMT)?

Research Sub-Question 2b. Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-evaluation of the Classroom Environment domain

compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Classroom Environment domain following information-based follow-up to classroom behavior management training (IBFCMT)?

Research Sub-Question 2c. Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-evaluation of the Instruction domain compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Instruction domain following information-based follow-up to classroom behavior management training (IBFCMT)?

Research Sub-Question 2d. Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-evaluation of the Professional Responsibilities domain compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Professional Responsibilities domain following information-based follow-up to classroom behavior management training (IBFCMT)?

Research sub-questions 2a, 2b, 2c, and 2d were tested using dependent *t*-tests to examine the significance of the difference between the pretest and posttest of IBFCMT teachers' self-evaluation scores. An alpha level of .05 was utilized to control for Type I

errors. Means and standard deviations are displayed on tables.

Research Question 3

Was there a significant difference between AFCMT teachers' posttest self-evaluation compared to the IBFCMT teacher's posttest self-evaluation following the classroom behavior management training and follow-up?

Research Sub-Question 3a. Was there a significant difference between AFCMT teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Planning and Preparation domain compared to the IBFCMT teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Planning and Preparation domain following the classroom behavior management training and follow-up?

Research Sub-Question 3b. Was there a significant difference between AFCMT teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Classroom Environment domain compared to the IBFCMT teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Classroom Environment domain following the classroom behavior management training and follow-up?

Research Sub-Question 3c. Was there a significant difference between AFCMT teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Instruction domain

compared to the IBFCMT teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Instruction domain following the classroom behavior management training and follow-up?

Research Sub-Question 3d. Was there a significant difference between AFCMT teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Professional Responsibilities domain compared to the IBFCMT teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Professional Responsibilities domain following the classroom behavior management training and follow-up?

Research sub-questions 3a, 3b, 3c, and 3d were tested using independent *t*-tests to examine the significance of the difference between the AFCMT and IBFCMT teachers' self-evaluation posttest scores. An alpha level of .05 was utilized to control for Type I errors. Means and standard deviations are displayed on tables.

Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the Protection of Human Subjects Approval Category

The exemption category for this study is category 4 45CFR46101(b)2 (Appendix A). While data were analyzed, the self-reflection and questions were considered routine

actions for teachers in their teaching and development of classroom behavior management skills. All participants must have completed an accredited teacher preparation program and attained, at minimum, a bachelor's degree in education. These methods of evaluation are a routine part of a teacher's responsibility.

The training is designed to assist inexperienced teachers with developing their classroom behavior management skills and providing follow-up assistance in implementing the concepts in their classroom. It may be concluded that the content of the data will not present a potential risk to the inexperienced teachers.

CHAPTER FOUR

Results

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the effects of classroom behavior management training and participation in active or information-based follow-up on inexperienced teachers' perceived classroom effectiveness over time. This was a quasi-experimental, pretest-posttest study.

Following identical classroom management trainings, participants were randomly assigned to one of two arms of follow-up, active-based and information-based follow-up. The independent variable for this study was the I Can Do It Classroom Management Training (California Teachers Association, 2003). The first arm was the active follow-up to classroom management training (AFCMT). Teachers who participated in active follow-up received both synchronous (phone-calls) and asynchronous (interactive email and information packets) follow-up. The second arm was the information-based follow-up to classroom management training (IBFCMT). Teachers in the information-based follow-up only received part of the asynchronous (information packets) follow-up.

The dependent variable for this study was the teachers' perceived classroom effectiveness evaluation based on the Omaha Public Schools' Summative Teacher Evaluation Form. The evaluation was divided into four domains of knowledge and skills: Planning and Preparation, Classroom Environment, Instruction, and Professional Responsibilities.

Teacher Self-Evaluation Levels of Performance

The performance levels were: Unsatisfactory. A teacher does not understand the basic principles of a concept; Basic. A teacher understands the basic concept, but has difficulty implementing the concepts; Proficient. A teacher understands and effectively implements the concepts; Distinguished. A master teacher who contributes to the field of education, specifically dealing with a concept (Danielson, 1996).

Participants

The NSEA invited teachers with less than five years experience to participate in identical classroom behavior management training sessions. Fifty teachers were randomly selected to participate in follow-up and complete the final self-evaluation at the end of the follow-up. While the training was open to all teachers, only teachers who met the selection criteria

were included in the research. All participants received the opportunity for follow-up. Not all participants elected to participate in follow-up.

Breaking down the results by gender, teaching assignment, or years of experience would serve to identify the participants. Therefore, demographic results were generalized.

A general breakdown of the gender of participants can be seen in Table 1. The gender of the 50 total participants was 7(14%) male and 43(86%) female. The subgroup numbers were consistent with the total participants. In the active group, 3(12.5%) were male and 21(87.5%) were female. In the information-based group, 4(15.4%) were male and 22(84.6%) were female.

A general breakdown of the teaching position of participants can be seen in Table 2. The teaching position of the 50 total participants was spread out over all grade levels. Of the total participants, 23(46%) taught in grades pre-kindergarten to grade 6, 12(24%) taught in grades 7-12, and 15(30%) taught in k-12 Special Education. The subgroup numbers were not consistent with the total participants. In the active group, 13(54.2%) taught in grades pre-kindergarten to grade 6, 3(12.5%) taught in grades 7-12, and 8(33.3%) taught in k-12

Special Education. In the information-based group, 10(38.5%) taught in grades pre-kindergarten to grade 6, 9(34.6%) taught in grades 7-12, and 7(26.9%) taught in k-12 Special Education.

A general breakdown of the years of experience of participants can be seen in Table 3. The years of experience of the 50 total participants are skewed towards zero years of experience. Of the total number of participants, 44(88%) had zero years experience, 2(4%) had one year experience, 3(6%) had two years experience, and 1(2%) had four years experience. The subgroup numbers were similarly skewed with the total participants, with the active follow-up group having more experience as a whole compared to the information-based group. In the active group, 20(83.3%) had zero years experience, 1(4.5%) had one year experience, 2(8.3%) had two years experience, and 1(4.5%) had four years experience. In the information-based group, 24(92.3%) had zero years experience, 1(3.9%) had one year experience and 1(3.9%) had two years experience.

Research Questions

To determine the effects of classroom management training and active or information-based follow-up on

inexperienced teachers' classroom behavior management effectiveness.

Research Question 1

Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-evaluation compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation following active follow-up to classroom behavior management training (AFCMT)?

Sub-question 1a. Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-evaluation scores of the Planning and Preparation domain compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation scores of the Planning and Preparation domain following active follow-up to classroom management training (AFCMT)? Inferential analysis was conducted utilizing a dependent *t*-test to examine the significance of the difference between the pretest-posttest Planning and Preparation domain AFCMT teachers' self-evaluation scores. An alpha level of .01 was utilized to control for Type I errors. Results for each participant are displayed in Table 4. Results for question 1a are displayed on Table 5. As seen in Table 5, the pretest self-evaluation scores (M = 2.69, SD = 0.24) compared to the posttest self-evaluation scores (M = 2.99, SD = 0.35) were statistically significantly different, $t(23) = 4.92$, $p < .001$(two-tailed), $d = 0.99$.

AFCMT teachers' self-evaluation posttest scores for the Planning and Preparation domain were statistically higher than pretest scores.

Sub-question 1b. Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-evaluation scores of the Classroom Environment domain compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation scores of the Classroom Environment domain following active follow-up to classroom behavior management training (AFCMT)? Inferential analysis was conducted utilizing a dependent *t*-test to examine the significance of the difference between the pretest-posttest Classroom Environment domain AFCMT teachers' self-evaluation scores. An alpha level of .01 was utilized to control for Type I errors. Results for each participant are displayed in Table 6. Results for question 1b are displayed on Table 7. As seen in Table 7, the pretest self-evaluation scores (M = 3.03, SD = 0.36) compared to the posttest self-evaluation score (M = 3.31, SD = 0.37) were statistically significantly different, $t(23) = 4.59$, $p < .001$(two-tailed), $d = 0.74$.

AFCMT teachers' self-evaluation posttest scores for the Classroom Environment domain were statistically higher than pretest scores.

Sub-question 1c. Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-evaluation scores of the Instruction domain compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation scores of the Instruction domain following active follow-up to classroom behavior management training (AFCMT)? Inferential analysis was conducted utilizing a dependent *t*-test to examine the significance of the difference between the pretest-posttest Instruction domain AFCMT teachers' self-evaluation scores. An alpha level of .05 was utilized to control for Type I errors. Results for each participant are displayed in Table 9. Results for question 1c are displayed on Table 9. As seen in Table 9, the pretest self-evaluation scores (M = 2.71, SD = 0.34) compared to the posttest self-evaluation scores (M = 3.03, SD = 0.32) were statistically significantly different, $t(23) = 6.17$, $p < .001$(two-tailed), $d = 0.97$.

AFCMT teachers' self-evaluation posttest scores for the Instruction domain were statistically higher than pretest scores.

Sub-question 1d. Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-evaluation scores of the Professional Responsibilities domain compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation scores of the

Professional Responsibilities domain following active follow-up to classroom behavior management training (AFCMT)? Inferential analysis was conducted utilizing a dependent *t*-test to examine the significance of the difference between the pretest-posttest Professional Responsibilities domain AFCMT teachers' self-evaluation scores. An alpha level of .05 was utilized to control for Type I errors. Results for each participant are displayed in Table 10. Results for question 1d are displayed on Table 11. As seen in Table 11, the pretest self-evaluation scores (M = 2.92, SD = 0.26) compared to the posttest self-evaluation scores (M = 3.05, SD = 0.29) were not statistically significantly different, $t(22)$ = 1.93, p = .67 (two-tailed), d = 0.47.

AFCMT teachers' self-evaluation posttest scores for the Instruction domain were not statistically significantly different than pretest scores.

Research Question 2

Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-evaluation scores compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation scores following information-based follow-up to classroom behavior management training (IBFCMT)?

Sub-question 2a. Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-evaluation scores of the Planning and Preparation domain compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation scores of the Planning and Preparation domain following information-based follow-up to classroom behavior management training (IBFCMT)? Inferential analysis was conducted utilizing a dependent *t*-test to examine the significance of the difference between the pretest-posttest Planning and Preparation domain IBFCMT teachers' self-evaluation scores. An alpha level of .05 was utilized to control for Type I errors. Results for each participant are displayed in Table 12. Results for question 2a are displayed on Table 13. As seen in Table 13, the pretest self-evaluation scores (M = 2.67, SD = 0.45) compared to the posttest self-evaluation scores (M = 2.73, SD = 0.25) were not statistically significantly different, $t(25) = 1.22$, $p = .234$ (two-tailed), $d = 0.17$.

IBFCMT teachers' self-evaluation posttest scores for the Instruction domain were not statistically significantly different than pretest scores.

Sub-question 2b. Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-evaluation scores of the Classroom Environment domain compared to teachers'

posttest self-evaluation scores of the Classroom Environment domain following information-based follow-up to classroom behavior management training (IBFCMT)? Inferential analysis was conducted utilizing a dependent *t*-test to examine the significance of the difference between the pretest-posttest Classroom Environment domain IBFCMT teachers' self-evaluation scores. An alpha level of .01 was utilized to control for Type I errors. Results for each participant are displayed in Table 14. Results for question 2b are displayed on Table 15. As seen in Table 15, the pretest self-evaluation scores (M = 2.85, SD = 0.45) compared to the posttest self-evaluation scores (M = 2.89, SD = 0.27) were not statistically significantly different, $t(25) = 0.99$, $p = .332$(one-tailed), $d = 0.13$.

IBFCMT teachers' self-evaluation posttest scores for the Classroom Environment domain were not statistically significantly different than pretest scores.

Sub-question 2c. Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-evaluation scores of the Instruction domain compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation scores of the Instruction domain following information-based follow-up to classroom behavior management training (IBFCMT)? Inferential analysis was

conducted utilizing a dependent *t*-test to examine the significance of the difference between the pretest-posttest Instruction domain IBFCMT teachers' self-evaluation scores. An alpha level of .01 was utilized to control for Type I errors. Results for each participant are displayed in Table 16. Results for question 2c are displayed on Table 17. As seen in Table 17, the pretest self-evaluation scores (M = 2.63, SD = 0.52) compared to the posttest self-evaluation scores (M = 2.63, SD = 0.36) were not statistically significantly different, $t(25)$ = 0.00, p = 1.00(two-tailed), d = 0.00.

IBFCMT teachers' self-evaluation posttest scores for the Instruction domain were not statistically significantly different than pretest scores.

Sub-question 2d. Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-evaluation scores of the Professional Responsibilities domain compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation scores of the Professional Responsibilities domain following information-based follow-up to classroom behavior management training (IBFCMT)? Inferential analysis was conducted utilizing a dependent *t*-test to examine the significance of the difference between the pretest-posttest Professional Responsibilities domain IBFCMT

teachers' self-evaluation scores. An alpha level of .01 was utilized to control for Type I errors. Results for each participant are displayed in Table 18. Results for question 2d are displayed on Table 19. As seen in Table 19, The pretest self-evaluation scores (M = 2.79, SD = 0.55) compared to the posttest self-evaluation scores (M = 2.78, SD = 0.29) were not statistically significantly different, $t(25) = 0.15$, $p = .885$ (one-tailed), $d = 0.03$.

IBFCMT teachers' self-evaluation posttest scores for the Professional Responsibilities domain were not statistically significantly different than pretest scores.

Research Question 3

Was there a significant difference between AFCMT teachers' posttest self-evaluation scores compared to the IBFCMT teacher's posttest self-evaluation scores following the classroom behavior management training and active or information-based follow-up?

Sub-question 3a. Was there a significant difference between AFCMT teachers' posttest self-evaluation scores of the Planning and Preparation domain compared to the IBFCMT teachers' posttest self-evaluation scores of the Planning and Preparation domain following the classroom behavior management training and active or information-

based follow-up? Inferential analysis was conducted utilizing an independent *t*-test to examine the significance of the difference between the posttest-posttest Professional Responsibilities domain of the AFCMT teachers' self-evaluation scores compared to the IBFCMT teachers' self-evaluation scores. An alpha level of .01 was utilized to control for Type I errors. Results for each participant are displayed in Table 20. Results for question 3a are displayed on Table 21. As seen in Table 21, the posttest self-evaluation scores from AFCMT (M = 2.99, SD = 0.35) compared to the posttest self-evaluation scores for IBFCMT (M = 2.73, SD = 0.25) were statistically significantly different, $t(48) = 3.05$, p = .004 (two-tailed), d = 0.90.

AFCMT teachers' self-evaluation posttest scores for the Professional Responsibilities domain were statistically significantly higher than IBFCMT teachers' self-evaluation posttest scores for the Professional Responsibilities domain.

Sub-question 3b. Was there a significant difference between AFCMT teachers' posttest self-evaluation scores of the Classroom Environment domain compared to the IBFCMT teachers' posttest self-evaluation scores of the Classroom Environment domain following the classroom

behavior management training and active or information-based follow-up? Inferential analysis was conducted utilizing an independent *t*-test to examine the significance of the difference between the posttest-posttest Classroom Environment domain of the AFCMT teachers' self-evaluation scores compared to the IBFCMT teachers' self-evaluation scores. An alpha level of .01 was utilized to control for Type I errors. Results for each participant are displayed in Table 22. Results for question 3b are displayed on Table 23. As seen in Table 23, the posttest self-evaluation scores from AFCMT (M = 3.31, SD = 0.37) compared to the posttest self-evaluation scores for IBFCMT (M = 2.89, SD = 0.27) were statistically significantly different, $t(48) = 4.61$, $p < .001$ (two-tailed), d = 0.31.

AFCMT teachers' self-evaluation posttest scores for the Classroom Environment domain were statistically significantly higher than IBFCMT teachers' self-evaluation posttest scores for the Classroom Environment domain.

Sub-question 3c. Was there a significant difference between AFCMT teachers' posttest self-evaluation scores of the Instruction domain compared to the IBFCMT teachers' posttest self-evaluation scores of

the Instruction domain following the classroom behavior management training and active or information-based follow-up? Inferential analysis was conducted utilizing an independent *t*-test to examine the significance of the difference between the posttest-posttest Instruction domain of the AFCMT teachers' self-evaluation scores compared to the IBFCMT teachers' self-evaluation scores. An alpha level of .01 was utilized to control for Type I errors. Results for each participant are displayed in Table 24. Results for question 3c are displayed on Table 25. As seen in Table 25, the posttest self-evaluation scores from AFCMT (M = 3.03, SD = 0.32) compared to the posttest self-evaluation scores for IBFCMT (M = 2.63, SD = 0.36) were statistically significantly different, $t(48) = 4.12$, $p < .001$ (two-tailed), $d = 1.17$.

AFCMT teachers' self-evaluation posttest scores for the Instruction domain were statistically significantly higher than IBFCMT teachers' self-evaluation posttest scores for the Instruction domain.

Sub-question 3d. Was there a significant difference between AFCMT teachers' posttest self-evaluation scores of the Professional Responsibilities domain compared to the IBFCMT teachers' posttest self-evaluation scores of the Professional Responsibilities

domain following the classroom behavior management training and active or information-based follow-up? Inferential analysis was conducted utilizing an independent *t*-test to examine the significance of the difference between the posttest-posttest Instruction domain of the AFCMT teachers' self-evaluation scores compared to the IBFCMT teachers' self-evaluation scores. An alpha level of .01 was utilized to control for Type I errors. Results for each participant are displayed in Table 26. Results for question 3d are displayed on Table 27. As seen in Table 27, the posttest self-evaluation scores from AFCMT (M = 3.04, SD = 0.29) compared to the posttest self-evaluation scores for IBFCMT (M = 2.78, SD = 0.29) were statistically significantly different, $t(48) = 3.25$, p = .002 (two-tailed), d = 0.92.

AFCMT teachers' self-evaluation posttest scores for the Professional Responsibilities domain were statistically significantly higher than IBFCMT teachers' self-evaluation posttest scores for the Professional Responsibilities domain.

Table 1

Demographic Gender Profile of Active and Information-Based Participants

	Active-Based Participants	Information-Based Participants	Total Study Participants
Male	3(12.5%)	4(15.4%)	7(14)
Female	21(87.5%))	22(84.6%)	43(86)

Table 2

Demographic Teaching Position Profile of Active and Information-Based Participants

	Active-Based Participants	Information-Based Participants	Total Study Participants
Pre-Kindergarten	3	1	4
Kindergarten		2	2
Grade 1	1	1	2
Grade 2	1	1	2
Grade 3	3	1	4
Grade 4	3	3	6
Grade 5	1		1
Grade 6	1	1	2
Grades 7-8	2	5	7
Grades 9-12	1	4	5
Grades K-6 Special Education	5	4	9
Grades 7-8 Special Education	3	1	4
Grade 9-12 Special Education		2	2

Table 3

Demographic Years of Experience Profile of Active and Information-Based Participants

	Active-Based Participants	Information-Based Participants	Total Study Participants
0 Years Experience	20(83.3%)	24(92.3%)	44(88%)
1 Years Experience	1(4.5%)	1(3.9%)	2(4%)
2 Years Experience	2(8.3)	1(3.9%)	3(6%)
3 Years Experience			
4 Years Experience	1(4.5%)		1(2%)

Table 4

Pretest and Posttest AFCMT Self-Evaluation Scores on the Planning and Preparation Domain

Participant	Pretest	Posttest
1	2.76	3.17
2	2.76	3.11
3	2.88	3.28
4	2.65	3.17
5	2.65	2.89
6	3.12	3.06
7	3.00	2.83
8	3.00	2.94
9	2.31	2.72
10	2.82	3.06
11	2.88	3.72
12	2.53	2.72
13	2.76	2.83
14	3.00	3.11
15	2.88	3.44
16	2.41	3.11
17	2.47	2.61
18	2.24	1.89
19	2.65	3.44
20	2.35	2.61
21	2.82	3.00
22	2.59	2.89
23	2.59	3.06
24	2.53	3.06

Table 5

Difference on the Planning and Preparation Domain Self-Evaluation Scores Between the Pretest and Posttest of Teachers Receiving Active Follow-up to Classroom Management Training

	Active-Based Follow-up Pretest		Active-Based Follow-up Posttest				
Sources of Data	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*d*	*t*	*p**
Planning and Preparation	2.69	0.24	2.99	0.35	0.99	4.92	<.001

*Significant

Table 6

Pretest and Posttest AFCMT Self-Evaluation Scores on the Classroom Environment Domain

Participant	Pretest	Posttest
1	3.08	3.55
2	3.00	3.08
3	3.42	3.75
4	3.08	3.08
5	2.67	3.00
6	3.83	3.67
7	3.00	3.58
8	3.00	3.67
9	2.83	3.00
10	3.17	3.08
11	3.83	3.67
12	3.00	3.00
13	2.75	2.92
14	3.00	3.83
15	3.00	3.50
16	2.92	3.42
17	2.83	3.42
18	2.25	2.33
19	3.50	3.92
20	2.67	3.17
21	3.00	3.25
22	3.42	3.17
23	2.67	3.00
24	2.92	3.30

Table 7

Difference on the Classroom Environment Domain Self-Evaluation Scores Between the Pretest and Posttest of Teachers Receiving Active Follow-up to Classroom Management Training

	Active-Based Follow-up Pretest		Active-Based Follow-up Posttest				
Sources of Data	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*d*	*t*	*p**
Classroom Environment	3.03	0.36	3.31	0.37	0.74	4.59	<.001

*Significant

Table 8

Pretest and Posttest AFCMT Self-Evaluation Scores on the Instruction Domain

Participant	Pretest	Posttest
1	3.21	3.21
2	2.64	3.29
3	2.71	2.93
4	2.79	3.07
5	2.50	2.93
6	2.86	2.71
7	2.93	3.07
8	3.07	2.93
9	2.57	2.86
10	2.93	3.14
11	3.50	3.79
12	2.50	2.71
13	2.79	2.86
14	3.00	3.14
15	3.00	3.64
16	2.29	3.21
17	2.36	2.86
18	1.86	2.14
19	2.79	3.36
20	2.43	2.86
21	2.57	3.07
22	2.86	3.07
23	2.36	2.86
24	2.57	3.07

Table 9

Difference on the Instruction Domain Self-Evaluation Scores Between the Pretest and Posttest of Teachers Receiving Active Follow-up to Classroom Management Training

	Active-Based Follow-up Pretest		Active-Based Follow-up Posttest				
Sources of Data	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*d*	*t*	*p**
Instruction	2.71	0.34	3.03	0.32	0.97	6.17	<.001

*Significant

Table 10

Pretest and Posttest AFCMT Self-Evaluation Scores on the Professional Responsibilities Domain

Participant	Pretest	Posttest
1	3.15	3.00
2	2.92	3.00
3	3.08	3.31
4	2.69	3.00
5	2.77	3.00
6	3.54	3.08
7	3.33	2.92
8	3.08	3.31
9	2.92	2.77
10	3.00	3.00
11	3.23	3.69
12	3.00	2.92
13	2.69	3.00
14	3.00	2.85
15	2.85	3.46
16	2.62	3.15
17	2.92	3.31
18	2.62	2.31
19	3.00	3.54
20	2.69	2.85
21	2.46	2.92
22	3.00	2.77
23	2.62	3.00
24	2.88	2.92

Table 11

Difference on the Professional Responsibilities Domain Self-Evaluation Scores Between the Pretest and Posttest of Teachers Receiving Active Follow-up to Classroom Management Training

	Active-Based Follow-up Pretest		Active-Based Follow-up Posttest				
Sources of Data	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*d*	*t*	*p**
Professional Responsibilities	2.92	0.26	3.05	0.29	0.47	1.93	.067

*Not significant

Table 12

Pretest and Posttest IBFCMT Self-Evaluation Scores on the Planning and Preparation Domain

Participant	Pretest	Posttest
1	3.18	2.94
2	3.47	3.11
3	3.06	3.00
4	2.82	2.83
5	2.50	2.67
6	2.75	2.76
7	3.06	3.00
8	2.67	2.72
9	2.59	2.71
10	2.82	2.83
11	2.94	2.94
12	2.41	2.50
13	2.50	2.71
14	2.82	2.94
15	2.41	2.67
16	2.35	2.44
17	3.06	2.94
18	2.47	2.50
19	2.18	2.17
20	2.94	2.94
21	2.82	2.78
22	3.00	2.83
23	1.53	2.29
24	1.59	2.28
25	3.06	2.83
26	2.41	2.56

Table 13

Difference on the Planning and Preparation Domain Self-Evaluation Scores Between the Pretest and Post-test of Teachers Receiving Information-Based Follow-up to Classroom Management Training

	Information-Based Follow-up Pretest		Information-Based Follow-up Posttest				
Sources of Data	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*d*	*t*	*p**
Planning and Preparation	2.67	0.45	2.73	0.25	0.17	1.22	.234

*Not significant

Table 14

Pretest and Posttest IBFCMT Self-Evaluation Scores on the Classroom Environment Domain

Participant	Pretest	Posttest
1	3.17	3.00
2	3.58	3.00
3	3.17	3.08
4	2.67	2.75
5	3.08	3.08
6	3.00	3.17
7	3.25	3.25
8	2.67	2.75
9	3.00	3.00
10	2.92	2.92
11	2.92	3.00
12	2.75	2.92
13	2.83	2.83
14	2.83	2.92
15	2.92	3.00
16	3.00	3.00
17	2.92	3.00
18	2.00	2.25
19	2.67	2.67
20	3.42	3.25
21	3.00	3.08
22	3.00	2.83
23	1.82	2.40
24	1.58	2.25
25	3.17	3.08
26	2.67	2.67

Table 15

Difference on the Classroom Environment Domain Self-Evaluation Scores Between the Pretest and Post-test of Teachers Receiving Information-Based Follow-up to Classroom Management Training

	Information-Based Follow-up Pretest		Information-Based Follow-up Posttest				
Sources of Data	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*d*	*t*	*p**
Classroom Environment	2.85	0.45	2.89	0.27	0.13	0.99	.332

*Not significant

Table 16

Pretest and Posttest IBFCMT Self-Evaluation Scores on the Instruction Domain

Participant	Pretest	Posttest
1	2.93	3.00
2	2.64	2.36
3	3.29	3.00
4	3.00	3.00
5	2.93	2.93
6	2.64	2.43
7	2.79	2.79
8	2.64	2.71
9	3.00	3.00
10	2.93	3.00
11	3.07	3.07
12	2.36	2.36
13	2.79	2.79
14	2.79	2.79
15	1.43	2.21
16	2.86	2.86
17	2.79	2.79
18	2.00	2.14
19	2.14	2.21
20	3.36	2.93
21	2.64	2.64
22	3.00	2.36
23	2.00	2.07
24	1.21	1.79
25	2.93	2.93
26	2.29	2.29

Table 17

Difference on the Instruction Domain Self-Evaluation Scores Between the Pretest and Posttest of Teachers Receiving Information-Based Follow-up to Classroom Management Training

	Information-Based Follow-up Pretest		Information-Based Follow-up Posttest				
Sources of Data	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*d*	*t*	*p**
Instruction	2.63	0.52	2.63	0.36	0.00	0.00	1.00

*Not significant

Table 18

Pretest and Posttest IBFCMT Self-Evaluation Scores on the Professional Responsibilities Domain

Participant	Pretest	Posttest
1	3.00	2.85
2	3.62	3.00
3	3.00	3.08
4	2.85	2.85
5	2.50	2.69
6	3.38	2.92
7	3.15	3.08
8	2.62	2.77
9	3.08	3.08
10	2.92	2.92
11	3.00	3.08
12	2.54	2.69
13	2.85	2.77
14	3.23	3.00
15	1.85	2.23
16	2.77	2.77
17	3.00	3.00
18	2.00	2.15
19	2.38	2.54
20	3.23	3.23
21	2.92	2.92
22	3.00	2.46
23	2.54	2.77
24	1.31	2.15
25	3.77	2.77
26	2.00	2.46

Table 19

Difference on the Professional Responsibilities Domain Self-Evaluation Scores Between the Pretest and Posttest of Teachers Receiving Information-Based Follow-up to Classroom Management Training

	Information-Based Follow-up Pretest		Information-Based Follow-up Posttest				
Sources of Data	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*d*	*t*	*p**
Professional Responsibilities	2.79	0.55	2.78	0.29	0.03	0.15	.885

*Not significant

Table 20

Posttest-Posttest Results Comparing the AFCMT and IBFCMT Teachers' Self-Evaluation Scores on the Planning and Preparation Domain

AFCMT Posttest (N = 24)	IBFCMT Posttest (N = 26)
3.17	2.94
3.11	3.11
3.28	3.00
3.17	2.83
2.89	2.67
3.06	2.76
2.83	3.00
2.94	2.72
2.72	2.71
3.06	2.83
3.72	2.94
2.72	2.50
2.83	2.71
3.11	2.94
3.44	2.67
3.11	2.44
2.61	2.94
1.89	2.50
3.44	2.17
2.61	2.94
3.00	2.78
2.89	2.83
3.06	2.29
3.06	2.28
	2.83
	2.56

Table 21

Difference on the Planning and Preparation Domain Self-Evaluation Scores Comparing the Post-test of Teachers Receiving Active Follow-up to Classroom Management Training to the Post-test of Teachers Receiving Information-Based Follow-up to Classroom Management Training

	Active-Based Follow-up Posttest		Information-Based Follow-up Posttest				
Sources of Data	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*d*	*t*	*p**
Planning and Preparation	2.99	0.35	2.73	0.25	0.90	3.05	.004

*Significant

Table 22

Posttest-Posttest Results Comparing the AFCMT and IBFCMT Teachers' Self-Evaluation Scores on the Classroom Environment Domain

AFCMT Posttest (N = 24)	IBFCMT Posttest (N = 26)
3.55	3.00
3.08	3.00
3.75	3.08
3.08	2.75
3.00	3.08
3.67	3.17
3.58	3.25
3.67	2.75
3.00	3.00
3.08	2.92
3.67	3.00
3.00	2.92
2.92	2.83
3.83	2.92
3.50	3.00
3.42	3.00
3.42	3.00
2.33	2.25
3.92	2.67
3.17	3.25
3.25	3.08
3.17	2.83
3.00	2.40
3.30	2.25
	3.08
	2.67

Table 23

Difference on the Classroom Environment Domain Self-Evaluation Scores Comparing the Posttest of Teachers Receiving Active Follow-up to Classroom Management Training to The Posttest of Teachers Receiving Information-Based Follow-up to classroom Management Training

	Active-Based Follow-up Posttest		Information-Based Follow-up Posttest				
Sources of Data	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*d*	*t*	*p**
Classroom Environment	3.31	0.37	2.89	0.27	0.31	4.61	<.001

*Significant

Table 24

Posttest-Posttest Results Comparing the AFCMT and IBFCMT Teachers' Self-Evaluation Scores on the Instruction Domain

AFCMT Posttest (N = 24)	IBFCMT Posttest (N = 26)
3.21	3.00
3.29	2.36
2.93	3.00
3.07	3.00
2.93	2.93
2.71	2.43
3.07	2.79
2.93	2.71
2.86	3.00
3.14	3.00
3.79	3.07
2.71	2.36
2.86	2.79
3.14	2.79
3.64	2.21
3.21	2.86
2.86	2.79
2.14	2.14
3.36	2.21
2.86	2.93
3.07	2.64
3.07	2.36
2.86	2.07
3.07	1.79
	2.93
	2.29

Table 25

Difference on the Instruction Domain Self-Evaluation Scores Comparing the Posttest of Teachers Receiving Active Follow-up to Classroom Management Training to the Posttest of Teachers Receiving Information-Based Follow-up to Classroom Management Training

	Active-Based Follow-up Posttest		Information-Based Follow-up Posttest				
Sources of Data	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*d*	*t*	*p**
Instruction	3.03	0.32	2.63	0.36	1.17	4.12	<.001

*Significant

Table 26

Posttest-Posttest Results Comparing the AFCMT and IBFCMT Teachers' Self-Evaluation Scores on the Professional Responsibilities Domain

AFCMT Posttest (N = 24)	IBFCMT Posttest (N = 26)
3.00	2.85
3.00	3.00
3.31	3.08
3.00	2.85
3.00	2.69
3.08	2.92
2.92	3.08
3.31	2.77
2.77	3.08
3.00	2.92
3.69	3.08
2.92	2.69
3.00	2.77
2.85	3.00
3.46	2.23
3.15	2.77
3.31	3.00
2.31	2.15
3.54	2.54
2.85	3.23
2.92	2.92
2.77	2.46
3.00	2.77
2.92	2.15
	2.77
	2.46

Table 27

Difference on the Professional Responsibilities Domain Self-Evaluation Scores Comparing the Posttest of Teachers Receiving Active Follow-up to Classroom Management Training to the Posttest of Teachers Receiving Information-Based Follow-up to Classroom Management Training

	Active-Based Follow-up Posttest		Information-Based Follow-up Posttest				
Sources of Data	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*d*	*t*	*p**
Professional Responsibilities	3.04	0.29	2.78	0.29	0.92	3.25	.002

*Significant

CHAPTER 5

Conclusions and Discussion

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the effects of classroom behavior management training and participation in active or information-based follow-up on inexperienced teachers' perceived classroom effectiveness over time. This was a quasi-experimental, pretest-posttest study.

This chapter presents the conclusion and discussion of the findings from this study, significance of findings, and recommendations for future research.

Conclusions

Research Question 1

Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-evaluation compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation following active follow-up to classroom behavior management training (AFCMT)? Overall, the pretest-posttest results for the AFCMT teachers' self-evaluation scores across three of the four domains were statistically significantly different. Teachers who participated in active follow-up after classroom management training showed significant growth comparing the pre-test to post-test self-evaluation scores.

Question 1 was analyzed employing a dependent *t*-test to examine the significance of the difference between the pretest and posttest of AFCMT teachers' self-evaluation scores across all four domains.

Sub-question 1a. Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-evaluation of the Planning and Preparation domain compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Planning and Preparation domain following active follow-up to classroom behavior management training (AFCMT)? The pretest-posttest results for the AFCMT teachers' self-evaluation Planning and Preparation domain scores were statistically significantly different. Teachers who participated in active follow-up after classroom management training showed significant growth in the Planning and Preparation domain.

The Planning and Preparation domain involves the all-inclusive understanding of curriculum, the background of students, and designing and assessing instruction (Danielson & McGreal, 2000). As a whole, teachers who participated in active follow-up feel that they improved significantly in this area, suggesting that they are more prepared to plan and prepare for teaching than they were before the classroom management training. As teachers

become more effective, they begin to develop a deep understanding of content and basic principles that meet the needs of all students (Danielson, 1996).

Sub-question 1b. Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-evaluation of the Classroom Environment domain compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Classroom Environment domain following active follow-up to classroom behavior management training (AFCMT)? The pretest-posttest results for the AFCMT teachers' self-evaluation Classroom Environment domain scores were statistically significant. Teachers who participated in active follow-up after classroom management training showed significant growth in the Classroom Environment domain.

The Classroom Environment domain involves the ability to create interpersonal and physical conditions that lead to an effective learning environment (Danielson & McGreal, 2000). These activities are essential for effective teaching, especially new teachers (Danielson, 1996; Glasgow & Hicks, 2003). As a whole, teachers who participated in active follow-up feel that they improved significantly in this area, suggesting that they are more prepared to create an effective classroom environment than they were before the classroom management training.

Sub-question 1c. Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-evaluation of the Instruction domain compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Instruction domain following active follow-up to classroom behavior management training (AFCMT)? The pretest-posttest results for the AFCMT teachers' self-evaluation Instruction domain scores were statistically significant. Teachers who participated in active follow-up after classroom management training showed significant growth in the Instruction domain.

The Instruction domain involves the skill of a teacher to engage learners in the content utilizing a variety of instructional strategies (Danielson & McGreal, 2000). This is a core component of effective teaching (Danielson, 1996). As a whole, teachers who participated in active follow-up feel that they improved significantly in this area, suggesting that they are more prepared to meet the instructional needs of learners than they were before the classroom management training.

Sub-question 1d. Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-evaluation of the Professional Responsibilities domain compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Professional Responsibilities domain following active follow-up to

classroom behavior management training (AFCMT)? The pretest-posttest results for the AFCMT teachers' self-evaluation Professional Responsibilities domain scores were not statistically significant. While teachers who participated in active follow-up after classroom management training showed growth in the Professional Responsibilities domain comparing the pre-test to post-test self-evaluation scores, the growth was not significant.

The Professional Responsibilities domain involves home-school communication, professional development activities, self-assessment, and contributions to the school and district (Danielson & McGreal, 2000). This is something that develops with teaching experience (Danielson, 1996). As a whole, teachers who participated in active follow-up feel that they improved in this area, but the improvement was not significant, suggesting that they do not feel more prepared to meet their responsibilities as a professional than they were before the classroom management training. This may indicate that teachers have become more aware of their professional responsibilities and that they are not meeting those requirements as well as they could. Or it could mean that they felt they were already well prepared in the

Professional Responsibilities domain prior to the training.

Research Question 2

Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-evaluation compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation following information-based follow-up to classroom behavior management training (IBFCMT)? Overall, the pretest-posttest results for the IBFCMT teachers' self-evaluation scores across all four domains were not statistically significant.

Question 2 was analyzed employing a dependent *t*-test to examine the significance of the difference between the pretest and posttest of IBFCMT teachers' self-evaluation scores across all four domains.

Sub-question 2a. Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-evaluation of the Planning and Preparation domain compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Planning and Preparation domain following information-based follow-up to classroom behavior management training (IBFCMT)? The pretest-posttest results for the IBFCMT teachers' self-evaluation Planning and Preparation domain scores were not statistically significant. Teachers who participated in information-based follow-up after classroom management

training showed no significant growth in the Planning and Preparation domain comparing the pre-test to post-test self-evaluation scores. While there was a slight gain, teachers, as a whole, do not feel that they are any better at planning and preparation after the classroom management training.

Sub-question 2b. Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-evaluation of the Classroom Environment domain compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Classroom Environment domain following information-based follow-up to classroom behavior management training (IBFCMT)? The pretest-posttest results for the IBFCMT teachers' self-evaluation Classroom Environment domain scores were not statistically significantly different. Teachers who participated in information-based follow-up after classroom management training showed no significant growth in Classroom Environment domain. While there was a slight gain, following information-based follow-up to classroom behavior management training teachers do not feel that they are any better prepared in planning and preparation after the classroom management training.

Sub-question 2c. Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-evaluation of the

Instruction domain compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Instruction domain following information-based follow-up to classroom behavior management training (IBFCMT)? The pretest-posttest results for the IBFCMT teachers' self-evaluation Instruction domain scores were not statistically significantly different. Teachers who participated in information-based follow-up after classroom management training showed no significant growth in Instruction domain. There are indications that individual results vary, some teachers rated themselves as higher, some ranked lower. While there was a deviation, the mean was the same for the pre-test and posttest. As a whole, teachers do not feel that they are any better at planning and preparation after the classroom management training.

Sub-question 2d. Was there a significant difference between teachers' pretest self-evaluation of the Professional Responsibilities domain compared to teachers' posttest self-evaluation of the Professional Responsibilities domain following information-based follow-up to classroom behavior management training (IBFCMT)? The pretest-posttest results for the IBFCMT teachers' self-evaluation Professional Responsibilities domain scores were not statistically significantly

different. Teachers who participated in information-based follow-up after classroom management training showed no significant growth in Professional Responsibilities comparing the pre-test to post-test self-evaluation scores. There was a slight drop in self-evaluation scores. This drop may reflect a better understanding of professional responsibility that comes with experience and the knowledge that they are not doing what needs to be or could be done. Teachers, as a whole, do not feel that they are any better prepared in planning and preparation after the classroom management training.

Research Question 3

Was there a significant difference between the posttest-posttest results comparing the active (AFCMT) and information-based (IBFCMT) teachers' self-evaluation scores? Overall, the posttest-posttest results for comparing the AFCMT and IBFCMT teachers' self-evaluation scores across all four domains were statistically significantly different.

Question 3 was analyzed employing an independent *t*-test to examine the significance of the difference between the posttest of IBFCMT teachers' self-evaluation scores and posttest AFCMT teachers' self-evaluation scores across all four domains.

Sub-question 3a. Was there a significant difference between the posttest-posttest results comparing the AFCMT and IBFCMT teachers' self-evaluation scores on the Planning and Preparation domain? Overall, the posttest-posttest results for comparing the AFCMT and IBFCMT teachers' self-evaluation scores for the Planning and Preparation domain were statistically significantly different. The posttest scores for active follow-up were statistically significantly different compared to the information-based group, suggesting that the active follow-up was more effective over time in affecting the Planning and Preparation domain.

Sub-question 3b. Was there a significant difference between the posttest-posttest results for comparing the AFCMT and IBFCMT teachers' self-evaluation scores on the Classroom Environment domain? Overall, the posttest-posttest results for comparing the AFCMT and IBFCMT teachers' self-evaluation scores for the Classroom Environment domain were statistically significantly different.

The posttest scores for active follow-up were statistically significantly different compared to the information-based group, suggesting that the active

follow-up was more effective over time in affecting the Classroom Environment domain.

Sub-question 3c. Was there a significant difference between the posttest-posttest results comparing the AFCMT and IBFCMT teachers' self-evaluation scores on the Instruction domain? Overall, the posttest-posttest results for comparing the AFCMT and IBFCMT teachers' self-evaluation scores for the Instruction domain were statistically significantly different. The posttest scores for active follow-up were statistically significantly different compared with the information-based group, suggesting that the active follow-up was more effective over time in affecting effective Instruction domain.

Sub-question 3d. Was there a significant difference between the posttest-posttest results comparing the AFCMT and IBFCMT teachers' self-evaluation scores on the Professional Responsibilities domain? Overall, the posttest-posttest results for comparing the AFCMT and IBFCMT teachers' self-evaluation scores for the Professional Responsibilities domain were statistically significantly different. The posttest scores for active follow-up were statistically higher than scores for the information-based group, suggesting that the active

follow-up was more effective over time in affecting the Professional Responsibilities domain.

Significance of the Study

Research indicates that professional development must provide teachers with effective, ongoing opportunities to develop their skills. And extensive, high-quality, ongoing programs with follow-up activities should be in place to ensure that teachers learn and use skills developed (Wong, 2003). Unfortunately, investing in ongoing professional development has not become a priority for many school districts. And frequently professional development becomes the first program to be cut during budget limitations (Darling-Hammond, 1996). This research supports the claim by the National Staff Development Council (2001a) that even though a variety of methods can be used to deliver high-quality professional learning, professional development with active and on-going follow-up is most effective.

Also important is to ensure that teachers take an active role in identifying professional development activities and to allow them to participate voluntarily. Professional development strategies which focus on needs actually identified by teachers are typically more successful (National Staff Development Council, 2001a).

Teachers are more devoted to a professional development project if they have identified it as a personal need and make it an individual choice to become involved (Danielson & McGreal, 2000).

As this research shows, the type of follow-up has a significant impact on key parts of teachers' belief in their own classroom management abilities. Providing teachers with on-going, one-on-one assistance does make a significant difference. This research should encourage districts to find a balance between the high cost of one-on-one assistance and training and the needs of struggling new teachers. There are many possible options for assistance to new teachers that districts can effectively implement. Even though the price tag of such programs can be a stumbling block, the alternative can be even more costly. Students in a classroom with poor classroom behavior management can lose up to an entire year of learning (Wright, Horn, & Sanders, 1997). However, when districts take a long-term view of quality teachers and teacher retention, it can be less costly to provide follow-up to teachers than it is to remove an ineffective teacher and search for a quality replacement.

Recommendations for Future Research

As a continuation of the study, each question could be examined on its own. A cursory glance at individual questions shows a dramatic difference in some questions for both groups. There were areas that the information-based group may have made improvements on that were not reflected in the results of question 2.

In this research study, the active follow-up was very time-intensive for the facilitators of the training session. Few school districts could afford to pay for such one-on-one attention. Since the study, the I Can Do It training has evolved to encompass an optional follow-up session composed of a class session with built-in work time and planning. Teachers collaborate with other teachers at their grade level or subject. In the future, it would be useful to compare different types of active follow-up. Since the study concluded, follow-up consists of a second voluntary class that participants can take, focusing on hands-on preparation of activities.

As part of the self-evaluation portion of the I Can Do It Classroom Management Training, occasionally there will be teachers who rank themselves extremely high on the pre-test and teachers who rank themselves extremely low on the pre-test. While sometimes the extreme

evaluation is accurate, sometimes it is a sign of something else. For example, a student teacher who was taking the course prior to student teaching ranked herself as distinguished or proficient in every category, even after it was explained that distinguished would refer to someone making substantive changes at a district or state level. She was positive that she was knowledgeable enough to effectively contribute at an advanced level. As the class progressed, it became clear that she wanted information about how to "fix" the students, the parents, and administration. She was not open to the possibility that many classroom management problems begin with the actions of the teacher. So the question is this, could the self-evaluation scores be an indicator that there is a problem, perhaps with denial? Would an administrator's evaluation reflect the participant's self-evaluation?

The lack of gain of some participants may reflect other factors. Teachers may be more aware of the requirements of effective classroom management. Subsequently, they may be more aware of areas that need improvement. Does that self-awareness translate into improved classroom performance or long-term self-improvement?

Quite often, teachers attend training sessions in groups with other teachers from their building or district. As a group, they made a choice to improve their classroom management skills. From a practical standpoint, it is reasonable to assume that collaborative effort would lead to more collaborative planning and support for any changes or improvements in classroom management training. Wong (2004) agrees, stating that collaboration builds a sense of collegiality, belonging, learning culture, and self-respect.

The nature of relationship of group collaboration to support classroom management improvement deserves further investigation. The implications of the effectiveness of using teams in an approach to self-improvement and building-wide improvement in classroom management could be significant.

Finally, at times, teachers are required to take the I Can Do It training, either because they are struggling and have been identified by the school district or teacher union or perhaps they have to take the session to make up a missed workshop provided by a school district. Making a personal commitment to change can be very difficult. And resistance to change, especially when it is imposed, is determined by one's understanding of it

and how it affects one's beliefs. This is directly related to the motivation to improve, and accepting the losses and discontinuities of change will not be accepted unless the change is personally meaningful (Evans, 1996). Research shows that motivation can play an important role in the success of change. How much of a factor does motivation play in improving classroom management skills?

References

American Educational Research Association (AERA) (2005). Teaching teachers: Professional development to improve student achievement. *American Educational Research Association Research Points*, *3*(1), 1-4.

Armstrong, C. (1987). On learning styles. *Learning Styles*, *61*, 157-161.

Ashton, P. T., & Webb, R. B. (1986). *Making a difference: Teachers' sense of efficacy and student achievement*. White Plains, NY: Longman, Inc.

Balkin, R. S., White, G. L., & Bodey, K. J. (2002). Do classroom behavior, access to materials, and teaching experience influence teachers leaving the profession? *Arkansas Educational Research & Policy Studies Journal, 2*(2), 65-79.

Beaudin, B. P. (1999). Keeping online asynchronous discussions on topic. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, *3*(2), 41-53.

Bosch, K. A., & Kersey, K. C. (1994). *The first-year teacher: Teaching with confidence*. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Brooks, D. M., & Hawke, G. (1985). *Effective and ineffective session opening: Teacher activity and task structures*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL, 1985.

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

Brunvand, S., Fishman, B., & Marx, R. (2003). *Moving professional development online: Meeting the needs and expectations of all teachers*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL, April 21-25, 2003.

California Teachers Association, (2003). *Classroom management: "I Can Do It" trainer manual.* Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Chase, B., Germundsen, R., Brownstein, J. C., & Distad, L. S. (2001). Making the connection between increased student learning and reflective practice. *Educational Horizons*, *79*, 143-147.

Danielson, C. (1996). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Danielson, C. & McGreal, T. L. (2000). *Teacher evaluation to enhance professional practice*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. *Education Policy Analysis Archives* [On-Line], *8*(1). Retrieved on November 11, 2006, from http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v8n1.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1996). What matters most: A competent teacher for every child. *Phi Delta Kappan* [On-line article]. Retrieved on November 11, 2006, from http://www.pdkintl.org/kappan/k9611dar.htm.

Deci, E. (1985). The well-tempered classroom. *Psychology Today*, March 1985, 52-53.

Eshel, Y., & Kohavi, R. (2003). Perceived classroom control, self-regulated learning strategies, and academic achievement. *Educational Psychology*, *23*(3), 249-260.

Evans, R. (1996). *The human side of change: Reform, resistance, and the real-life problems of innovation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Falch, T. & Ronning, M. (2005). *The influence of student achievement on teacher turnover*. CESifo Working Paper No. 1469.

French, K. D. (2004). *An examination of email-based novice teacher mentoring: Proposing a practitioner-oriented model of online reflection*. Dissertation, University of Texas at Austin. Retrieved on November 20, 2006, from http://dspace.lib.utexas.edu/bitstream/2152/1294/1/frenchk516882.pdf.

Giallo, R., & Little, E. (2003). Classroom behavior problems: The relationship between preparedness, classroom experiences, and self-efficacy in graduate and student teachers. *Australian Journal of Educational & Developmental Psychology*, *3*, 21-34. Retrieved on November 11, 2006, from http://www.newcastle.edu.au/journal/ajedp/archives/papers/v3-giallo-little.pdf.

Glasgow, N. A., & Hicks, C. D. (2003). *What successful teachers do: 91 research-based classroom strategies for new and veteran teachers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Goodwin, C., Graham, M., & Scarborough, H. (2001). Developing an Asynchronous Learning Network. *Educational Technology & Society* [On-Line], *4*(4), 39-47.

Heider, K. L. (2005). Teacher isolation: How mentoring programs can help. *Current Issues in Education* [On-Line], *8*(14). Retrieved on November 11, 2006, from http://cie.ed.asu.edu/volume8/number14.

Henley, M. (2003). *Teaching self-control: A curriculum for responsible behavior*. Bloomington, IN: National Educational Service.

Hoy, A. W. (2000). Changes in teacher efficacy during early years of teaching. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA, April 28, 2000.

Ingersoll, R. M. (2001a). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. *American Educational Research Journal*, *38*(3), 499-534.

Ingersoll, R. M. (2001b). *Teacher turnover, teacher shortages, and the organization of schools*. University of Washington, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.

Ingersoll, R. M., & Smith, T. M. (2003). The wrong solution to the teacher shortage. *Educational Leadership*, *60*(8), 30-33.

Johnson, S. M., & Birkeland, S. E. (2002). *Pursuing "a sense of success": New teachers explain their career decisions*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA, April 1-5, 2002.

Kabilan, M. K. (2004). Online professional development: A literature analysis of teacher competency. *ISTE (International Society for Technology in Education)*, *21*(2), 51-57.

Kardos, S. M., Johnson, S. M., Peske, H. G., Kauffman, D., & Liu, E. (2001). Counting on colleagues: New teachers encounter the professional cultures of their schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *37*(2), 250-290.

Kauffman, D., Johnson, S. M., Kardos, S. M., Liu, E., & Peske, H. G. (2002). "Lost at sea": New teachers' experiences with curriculum and assessment. *Teachers College Record*, *104*(2), 273-300.

Kierstead, J. (1985). Direct instruction and experiential approaches: Are they really mutually exclusive? *Educational Leadership*, *42*(8), 25-30.

Kierstead, J. (1984). Outstanding effective classrooms. In N. Douglas (ed.) *Claremont Reading Conference Form Eighth Yearbook*. Claremont, CA: The Claremont Reading Conference Center for Developmental Studies.

Kohn, A. (1996). *Beyond discipline: From compliance to community*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Lang, J. D., Frye, V. H., and Lang, E. W. (1985). *Making it till Friday: A guide to successful classroom management*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Book Company.

Malouff, J. M., Rooke, S. E., Schutte, N. S., Roster, R. M., and Bhullar, N. (2008). *Methods of Motivational Teaching*. Australia: University of New England. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED499496).

Marzano, R. J., & Marzano, J. S. (2003). *The key to classroom management*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

McCoy, L. P. (2003). It's a hard job: A study of novice teachers' perspectives on why teachers leave the profession. *Current Issues in Education* [On-Line], *6*(7). Retrieved on November 12, 2006, from http://cie.ed.asu.edu/volume6/number7.

McNeely, C. A., Nonnemaker, J. M., & Blum, R. W. (2002). Promoting school connectedness: Evidence from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health. *Journal of School Health*, *72*(4), 138-146.

Merseth, K. K. (1990). *Beginning teachers and computer networks: A new form of induction support*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA, April, 1990.

Milanowski, A. T., Kimball, S. M., & White, B. (2004). *The relationship between standards-based teacher evaluation scores and student achievement: Replication and extensions at three sites*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA, April, 2004.

Mills, R. C. (1987). *Relationship between school motivational climate, teacher attitudes, student mental health, school failure and health damaging behavior*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington DC, April, 1987.

Moir, E., & Baron, W. (2002). Looking closely, every step of the way. *Journal of Staff Development* [Online], *23*(4). Retrieved on November 11, 2006, from http://www.nsdc.org/library/publications/jsd/moir234.cfm.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, (2003). *No dream denied: A pledge to America's Children*. Washington, DC: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.

National Staff Development Council (2001a). E-learning for educators: Implementing the standards for staff development. *National Staff Development Council* [Online]. Retrieved on February 2, 2007, from http://www.nsdc.org/e-learning.pdf.

National Staff Development Council (2001b). NSDCs standards for staff development. *National Staff Development Council* [On-Line]. Retrieved on February 2, 2007, from http://www.nsdc.org/standards/index.cfm.

Nelsen, J., Lott, L., & Glenn, H. S. (2000). *Positive discipline in the classroom: Developing mutual respect, cooperation, and responsibility in your classroom* (*3rd ed.*). Roseville, CA: Prima Publishing.

Phelan, D.P., Davidson, A., & Cao, H. (1992). Speaking up: Students' perspectives on school. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *73*(9), 695-704.

Richardson, V. (2003). The dilemmas of professional development. *Phi Delta Kappan* [On-line]. Retrieved on November 10, 2006, from http://www.pdkintl.org/kappan/k0301ric.htm.

Ross, J. A. (1992). Teacher efficacy and the effects of coaching on student achievement. *Canadian Journal of Education, 17*(1), 51-65.

Safran, S. P., & Oswald, K. (2003). Positive behavior supports: Can schools reshape disciplinary practices? *Exceptional Children*, *69*(3), 361-373.

Sanders, W. L., & Rivers, J. C. (1996). *Cumulative and residual effects of teachers on future student*

academic achievement. Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Value-Added Research and Assessment Center.

Schuck, S. (2003). Getting help from the outside: Developing a support network for beginning teachers. *Journal of Educational Inquiry 4*(1), 49-67.

Skiba, R. J., & Peterson, R. L. (2003). Functional behavioral assessments & individual behavior plans. *Effective Responses*. Safe & Responsive Schools.

Smith, T., & Ingersoll, R. M. (2004). What are the effects of induction and mentoring on beginning teacher turnover? *American Educational Research Journal*, Unpublished document.

Wenglinsky, H. (2002). How schools matter: The link between teacher classroom practices and student academic performance. *Education Policy Analysis Archives* [On-Line], *10*(12). Retrieved on November 12, 2005, from http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v10n12.

White, B. W. (2004). *The relationship between teacher evaluation scores and student achievement: Evidence from Coventry, RI.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA, April 12-16, 2004.

Wright, S. P., Horn, S. P., & Sanders, W. L. (1997). Teacher and classroom context effects on student achievement: Implications for teacher evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, *11*, 57-67.

Wong, H. K. (2004). Induction programs that keep new teachers teaching and improving. *NASSP Bulletin*, *88*(638), 41-58.

Wong, H. K. (2003). Induction programs that keep working. In M. Scherer (Ed.), *Keeping good teachers* (p. 42-49). Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Appendix A

Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects Study Approval Letter

Letter is on file and is available upon request