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ABSTRACT

Preservice Teachers’ Beliefs About
Classroom Management Before
And After Student Teaching
by
Bonnie Gayle Ballard

Dr. Jane McCarthy, Examination Committee Chair
Professor
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Preservice Teachers’ Beliefs About Classroom Management Before and After Student Teaching describes a qualitative research study that explored student teachers’ beliefs about effective classroom management before they began their student teaching and then again at the end of their internship. This study examines the differences in these student teachers’ beliefs about effective management techniques after they have had actual classroom experiences with their cooperating classroom teachers.

Four student teachers and their nine cooperating teachers identified their management styles through the use of two surveys. The Inventory of Classroom Management Styles (ICMS) determined responses based on a continuum of control from teacher-controlled beliefs to student-controlled ideology. The Classroom Questionnaire provided evidence of the participants’ levels of
knowledge, importance, and use of twenty-one strategies based on Weber's classroom management approaches. Additionally, student teachers completed a concept map, or graphic organizer, in which they identified their beliefs about establishing and maintaining effective classroom management. Individual in-depth interviews and classroom observations were conducted to obtain further interpretations of these beliefs. This data collection was completed twice for the student teachers, initially prior to their student teaching and again at the end.

Data revealed that prior to student teaching, the preservice teachers held similar views regarding effective discipline in the classroom. However, there seemed to be no common scoring patterns when examining various strategies chosen on the surveys. The student teachers' scores fell along the continuum of teacher and student control of management.

In describing management beliefs following the student-teaching experience, some similar patterns emerged. When comparing the two concept maps each student teacher completed, the substance and structure remained similar but the beliefs were expanded or explained in more depth on the second map, especially in the discipline dimension. Additionally, strategies from the person dimension of management had been added to the graphic organizer. On the survey results, most of the changes in the students' scores moved in the direction of their cooperating teachers' thinking on the control continuum, except in the area of discipline. In this dimension, the student teachers' beliefs stayed the same or moved toward a more teacher-controlled focus, regardless of their cooperating teachers' beliefs.
The findings from this study add to the growing body of research that has identified the need to develop preservice teachers' beliefs about effective classroom management more fully. Care should be taken in placing student teachers in classrooms that can build on their beliefs and expand their knowledge of effective classroom management strategies and techniques.
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FOREWORD

As an administrator in an elementary school, I have consistently had to help new teachers develop an effective classroom management system to assist them in their focus on instruction. These novice teachers come into the school system with some experiences but are not always fully prepared for the management task ahead of them. When asked, they generally all agree that classroom management, and more specifically, discipline, is the most difficult aspect of their profession.

At least once a year, I have had to make a decision to non-renew a novice teacher after we have spent most of the year trying to help him or her develop the effective skills to implement appropriate classroom management. Most of the time, I never get to supervise the instructional aspect of teaching because we never get past the management issues. It is difficult to work so hard with a novice teacher, only to have to let him or her go because of their ineffectiveness.

As a part-time professor at a university, I teach a course in classroom management to undergraduate students who are aspiring to become teachers. The course focuses on classroom management theories, specific management techniques and strategies, and role-playing practice. This is generally the only class they take that relates specifically to classroom management. I find it very difficult to address all of the important objectives in one class, and I know that the students get just a tiny portion of the total management picture.
This study began as a quest to determine what other alternatives, approaches, and ideas I could offer as a teacher educator and site administrator to accommodate the needs of intending and novice teachers so that they can experience a successful teaching career.
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Teaching preservice teachers to teach is a dynamic, complex process that involves ongoing research on various theories of beliefs, child development, learning, instructional strategies, classroom management, and socialization. Learning to teach involves many factors and responsibilities that include facilitating student learning and academic development, planning, preparing and implementing learning activities, assessing learner outcomes, and organizing and managing the classroom effectively so learning can occur (Bolton, 1997).

Jones (1996) listed three major areas of expertise needed by beginning teachers: the knowledge of how to manage a classroom, the knowledge of subject matter, and an understanding of students' sociological backgrounds. Weber (1984) divides the teaching process into two basic dimensions: instruction and management. The focus of this dissertation will be on the management aspect of teaching and preservice teachers' beliefs about effective classroom management.

Classroom Management

Management can be described as those teacher behaviors that establish
and maintain favorable classroom conditions so that effective student learning can take place. Because a good management system must be in place for student learning to occur, it is a prerequisite for effective instruction and is therefore the most fundamental and difficult task for teachers to perform (Jones, 1996; Weber, 1994; Evertson, Emmer, & Worsham, 2000). Classroom management is used throughout the literature as a broad umbrella term to describe a teacher's behaviors to control the activities in the classroom, including student behaviors, social interactions, and learning (Martin & Baldwin, 1996). Classroom management supports instruction by establishing an effective learning environment and helping students develop self-control (Good & Brophy, 2000). In addition to providing effective instruction, Jones (1996), describes classroom management as, "a vehicle for providing students with a sense of community and with increased skills in interpersonal communication, conflict management, and self-control" (p. 503).

Classroom management can be further divided into three main dimensions: instructional management, people management, and behavior management (Martin, Yin, & Baldwin, 1998). Instructional management refers to the planning and delivery of instruction, monitoring of independent work, routines and procedures for daily interactions, and materials control. People management involves the student-teacher relationships. Behavior management focuses on both an established system of rules and procedures designed to elicit appropriate behaviors and a defined list of consequences for inappropriate
behaviors. These inappropriate behaviors are considered discipline issues and are not synonymous with classroom management, but fall under the umbrella of management (Martin & Baldwin, 1996). Wolfgang (1999) describes discipline as "the required action by a teacher toward a student or group of students, after the student's behavior disrupts the ongoing educational activity or breaks a pre-established rule or law" (p. xi).

Preservice Teachers and Classroom Management

Managing classrooms is a demanding and complex task. The literature indicates that teachers, both novice and experienced, cite management concerns as the main problem in effectively teaching (Feitler & Tokar, 1992; Rogers & Freiberg, 1994; Martin & Baldwin, 1996; Abebe & Shaughnessy, 1997; Soodak & Podell, 1997; Jones, 1996; Wang, Haertel & Walberg, 1993; Edwards, 2000; Cangelosi, 2000). Other studies have concluded that management issues actually led teachers to leave the profession (Veenman, 1984; Kelly, Stetson, & Stetson, 1997). Veenman (1984) stated that, "Classroom discipline was the most seriously perceived problem area of beginning teachers" (p.153). He noted that the major cause of new teachers leaving the teaching profession is due to the discipline problems in the classroom. Additionally, Veenman stated that administrators also considered lack of control as the major cause of unsuccessful teaching.
First year teachers really have two jobs to do in that they have to teach and they have to learn to teach (Wildman, Niles, Magliaro & McLaughlin, 1989). According to Lortie (1975), "No way has been found to record and crystallize teaching for the benefit of beginners" (p. 58). Because of this, the best way to learn to teach is by one's own experience, learning while doing.

Because most beginning teachers' exposure to classroom management has been limited to supervised experiences under the direction of a cooperating teacher and university supervisor, they are not totally prepared for the complex realities or "real" side of teaching, and are often ill-suited to make good judgments in areas of discipline (Crowson, 1999). These beginning teachers are less likely to attend to spontaneous student concerns, but are very sensitive to the student disruptions. (Veenman, 1984). Beginning teachers tend to be more controlling and may even view students as the "enemy" (Martin & Baldwin, 1996). They are overly concerned with class control and strive to discourage disruption of the class instead of enhancing learning (Kagan, 1992).

After teacher education, student teachers find themselves suddenly in the classroom and must shift from a primarily theoretical focus under the umbrella of supervision, to the management of a classroom (Smith, 1997). As new teachers, they must now deal with constant problems, responsibilities and unexpected "crises" that occur in a classroom environment. In addition to learning a new curriculum, district and site procedures, and school societal issues, these novices must develop a student-teacher relationship with their students, plan
effective lessons, and develop a successful management system. This “reality shock” is a term that Veenman (1984) assigned to the “collapse of the missionary ideals formed during teacher training by the harsh and rude reality of everyday classroom life” (p. 143). This view is usually experienced in the first year of teaching, and stems from a lack of opportunities and experiences (Neale & Johnson, 1994). Since no one can learn in one year, this first stage in teaching, called “survival and discovery”, is tied to experience and will potentially evolve into the mastery teaching stage by the time of tenure (Feiman-Nemser & Remillard, 1995; Berlinger, 1986).

Teacher Education Preparation For Effective Classroom Management

Walter Doyle (1990) defined teacher education as “a loosely coordinated set of experiences designed to establish and maintain a talented teaching force for our nation’s elementary and secondary schools” (p. 2). He addressed different sections of teacher education as preservice, induction, and inservice. In the preservice area, students are introduced to a liberal arts and science curriculum, specialized content-area instruction, pedagogy, and practical experiences in school settings.

Corrigan and Haberman (1990) discussed the critical elements of a profession, identifying these as “knowledge base, quality controls, resources, and conditions of practice” (p.195). In teacher education, the knowledge base has been narrowed to include certain basic skills including the three Rs
(Corrigan & Haberman, 1990). These authors identified needed resources for teacher education as the time available for specific pedagogical coursework, and the appropriate school sites for clinical experiences.

Doyle (1990) defined five models that exist in teacher education. These included: (a) the good employee model, that prepares new teachers to behave like good teachers, and where students are prepared for real world problems and taught to maintain the status quo; (b) the junior-professor model, that focuses on subject-matter knowledge; (c) the fully-functioning person model that prepares students through a study of personal development, values, personal styles of teaching, and positive learning environments; (d) the innovator model that provides a focus on innovative, proactive teaching in a laboratory setting; (e) and the reflective-practitioner model that focuses on observation, analysis, interpretation, and decision making.

Teacher-education programs consist of a combination of these models. At the least, they all include coursework in theory and associated teaching strategies. Additionally, these programs include some opportunities, called field experiences, to practice, train, and apply student knowledge and strategies under the supervision of university personnel and master teachers (Schwartz, 1996).

Doyle (1990) suggested that practical knowledge must be event structured so that teachers can understand classroom events, including management, and apply this knowledge in the natural course of the classroom setting. Creating
effective classroom management is often addressed through coursework in teacher-education programs. Student teachers enter their internship with pedagogical theories about effective classroom-management techniques that have been introduced in these classes.

Field Experience and Student Teaching

Another experience that preservice teachers have with classroom management is during participation in their field experiences, or practice in the learning setting itself. These field experiences typically consist of a certain number of hours during which the preservice teacher observes various classrooms and teachers. These observations are completed during the semesters when the students are also taking teacher-education coursework. These initial field experiences have proved invaluable in positively influencing the attitudes and teaching performance of future teachers (Freiberg & Waxman, 1990).

When the students complete their required coursework, they are then assigned to a school for a period of time, usually ten to sixteen weeks, where they actually participate in a teaching experience, called student teaching. Their activities include observing, tutoring, designing instructional materials, instructing small groups, and finally working with the entire classroom (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990).
Corrigan & Haberman (1990) refer to the student teaching experiences in their fourth element of a profession. They state that the training practices in the classroom are necessary so that, "preservice professionals are inducted into teaching under the guidance of able practitioners demonstrating effective instructional techniques in successful schools" (p.196).

This teaching experience is also referred to as "cognitive apprenticeship" (Brown, Collins & Duguid, 1989), "situated learning" (Feiman-Nemser & Remillard, 1995) and "assisted performance" (Vygotsky, 1978). Cognitive apprenticeship combines two words, apprenticeship and cognitive to define a model of student teaching. Using this model, a student teacher would be exposed to learning (cognitive) situations in the classroom. The cooperating teacher, a more experienced practitioner, would model appropriate methods of handling these situations so that the student teacher would be coached in the appropriate responses (Feiman-Nemser & Remillard, 1995).

The principle behind situated learning states that the preservice teacher will be able to experience authentic classroom activities, develop a social context with students and other teachers, and collaboratively learn instructional and managerial strategies from a coach (cooperating teacher). This experienced peer coach is required to nurture the preservice teacher by modeling and explaining episodic events using his/her expertise. It is assumed that the preservice teacher will learn to teach (think and act like a teacher) by observing
and participating in teaching activities next to a more experienced professional (Feiman-Nemser & Remillard, 1995).

Vygotsky (1978) described this practical learning as assisted performance in the zone of proximal development (ZPD). By practicing these situated activities, student teachers should develop alternative ideas and solutions to use in the classroom to successfully handle classroom activities including instruction and management.

We must keep in mind, however, that these experiences are not entirely authentic (Feiman-Nemser & Remillard, 1995). Student teachers actually enter a teaching situation where management of the classroom is already in place. By the time they begin their student teaching, the general classroom teacher, or cooperating teacher, has already established a management system that effectively demonstrates his/her beliefs and needs. The student teacher assumes the teaching role, but the management is in place. The management system in place may even contradict what the student teacher feels comfortable with or believes to be effective. Often, student teachers do not get the chance to develop and implement their own classroom procedures.

These two experiences, classroom instruction and situated learning, are intended to produce qualified teachers. Featherstone (1993) refers to this process as “the journey in, the journey out” (p.93). Through their experiences with instructional subject matter and classroom experiences, these student
teachers should develop the expertise to teach. But why then do new teachers struggle so much their first year?

Purpose of the Study

Goals

The purpose of this study was to identify, describe, and examine student teachers' beliefs about effective classroom management before their student teaching and again at the conclusion of their student teaching. The goals were to report what student teachers believe about classroom management before they have had extensive experience in the classroom, and to observe and determine what the differences were in their beliefs as a result of their student teaching experience.

Questions

The following questions provided a basis for inquiry and guided the data collection for this study:

1. What are the student teachers' beliefs about effective classroom management prior to and following their student teaching experience?

2. What changes occur in student teachers' beliefs about classroom management as a result of their experience?

3. What factors influence student teachers' beliefs about classroom management?
4. How do the cooperating teachers impact the student teachers’ beliefs about effective classroom management?

Theoretical Framework

Symbolic interactionism and ethnomethodology is a theoretical framework that focuses on the integration of social meaning and society (Lecompte & Presissle, 1993). This theoretical perspective assumes that individuals construct meaning and develop perceptions and interpretations through their social interaction with others. The constructed meanings and interpretations may change as different perceptions are viewed by the individuals. Additionally, these meanings are based on interactions and not on a given reality.

When using this theoretical perspective, analysis was based on observations of individuals as they interacted with others. These interactions included concepts of role expectations, discourse, scripts, and communication. This perspective did not seek to generalize to a larger population. Instead, it remained at the individual level and sought analysis of individuals on the basis of meanings that they perceived.

Analyzing student teachers’ classroom-management beliefs required the interpretation of individual’s beliefs and their social interaction with the students and cooperating teachers. The student teachers’ concepts about effective classroom management helped to identify their perceptions of appropriate student and teacher behaviors. Communication, discourse, and role
expectations between student and teacher demonstrated the social setting and classroom management that the student teacher was striving to create.

Methodology

For the purpose of the study, a collective case-study design (Stake, 1995) was used. Yin (1994) defined case study as, "an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident" (p.13). Stake (1995) defined case study as, "the study of the particularity and complexity of a single case, coming to understand its activity within important circumstances" (p. xi). Case study in education is commonly used to identify and explain specific issues and problems of practice and draws upon theory from sociology (Merriam, 1998).

Case-study methodology was appropriate in this study because it involved the researcher spending substantial time on site, personally in contact with the activities and operations of the case and interpreting the meaning of individuals' lives (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998). Additionally, the researcher recorded objectively what happened and examined its meaning, without disturbing the activity (Stake, 1995). According to Yin (1994), case studies are useful where the researcher has little control over the real-life situations and can preserve the integrity of the subjects' experiences. In addition, Yin explained that when questions of "why" or "how" are being asked, case studies are the preferred methodology.
In this study, several sources of data were used. The Inventory of Classroom Management Style, ICMS, (Martin & Baldwin, 1993) and the Classroom Management Questionnaire (Stripling, 1985) were given to elicit student teachers' and their cooperating teachers' beliefs about classroom management. In addition, a concept-map task (graphic organizer) was administered to the student teachers with an open-ended interview used to clarify and explain the map. Information from these sources was triangulated (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998; Stake, 1995) in an effort to assure credibility and validity in understanding and describing the differences in beliefs and conceptions about classroom management. A fully developed explanation of the methodology appears in Chapter 3.

Limitations of the Study

Interpretation is a major part of research. However, with the qualitative case study, the purpose is not to generalize but to emphasize the particular or uniqueness of the studies (Stake, 1995). The purpose of this study was not to determine if differences in beliefs and concepts of the participants occurred, but to describe the subjects' beliefs, and any changes that were found following their student teaching. Implications from these changes were also examined and discussed. Information gained from this study adds to the research available on preservice teachers' beliefs about effective classroom management. In addition, results from this study suggest additional research on appropriate practices and
techniques that can aid novice teachers in implementing successful and effective classroom management.

Three limitations existed in this case-study research. By its nature, qualitative inquiry is subjective (Stake, 1995). Because the researcher was the primary collector and interpreter of data, the subjectiveness of the study was a limitation. The researcher needed to be aware of personal biases that could be drawn from the data analysis.

Another limitation to this study was the small sample size. Although eight student teachers were originally assigned to the site and were to be used for the study, only four student teachers reported to the site. They had two, and in one case, three, cooperating teachers so the total sample size for this study was only 13. However, case study research is not sampling research (Stake, 1995).

The time needed to gather and interpret data was another limitation. The study involved four student teachers and their cooperating teachers. The intent of the study was to describe participants' beliefs about effective classroom management and examine the changes in their beliefs that occurred during their student teaching, not generalize findings to a larger population. The study took one semester, sixteen weeks, to complete before the student teachers graduated from the program, and an analysis of the data was summarized, described, and reported. Additional time to research these new teachers' induction into their own classroom may have given the researcher additional information about their classroom management beliefs.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The literature review is divided into three sections based on the dimensions that influence preservice teachers' beliefs about effective classroom management. The literature offers an abundance of research on teacher beliefs and the environmental sources that affect these beliefs. However, little research is available on management beliefs, specifically since the early 1990's. This review provides a theoretical framework for the goals of the study and the research questions.

The purposes of the first section, Preservice Teacher Beliefs, are to describe the development of beliefs and provide research to support the influence of schooling on these beliefs. The focus of the second section is on influences of the socialization process on preservice teachers' beliefs. The third section of the literature review focuses on current classroom-management theories, which provide the reader with a broad overview of general techniques available to preservice teachers. A summary is found at the end of each section.
Section One: Preservice Teachers Beliefs and Conceptions

Belief systems can be defined as "loosely-bound systems with highly variable and uncertain linkages to events, situations, and knowledge systems" (Nespor, 1987, p. 321). These beliefs are linked by personal and emotional experiences and may not be capable of being defended by cognitive arguments. Certain characteristics of teachers' beliefs are seen in the literature.

One common characteristic states that beliefs are organized and structured concepts found in the teacher's memory (Nespor, 1987). Beliefs can influence and internalize additional beliefs and can be clustered to prevent conflicting perceptions. Secondly, beliefs are disputable. It is often impossible to judge a belief as correct or incorrect. Additionally, beliefs are highly personal and grounded in experiences. These experiences may be single episodes and are stored in episodic memory (Nespor, 1987). Because of this personal dimension, beliefs can change based on new experiences or be resistant to change due to the lack of experiential knowledge.

Beliefs can also be defined as "powerful cognitive filters through which meaning is developed" (Smith, 1997, p. 239). Richardson (1996) describes beliefs as a "subset of a group of constructs that name, define, and describe the structure and content of mental states that are thought to drive a person's actions" (p. 102). Because beliefs drive action, teacher beliefs are important when looking at classrooms practices and learning to teach. So how are preservice teachers' beliefs acquired, maintained, and altered?
The years that the preservice teacher spent going to school as a student present experiences that result in the internalization of beliefs and attitudes about teaching models (Lortie, 1975; Borko & Mayfield, 1995; Tato, 1998; Wilson & Cameron, 1996). Lortie estimates that the average preservice teacher has spent close to 13,000 hours logging classroom experiences before entering college. Preservice teachers have developed beliefs based on hundreds of classroom experiences in their episodic storage (Breault, 1995). Lortie refers to this informal teacher training as "the apprenticeship of observation" (p. 61).

Preservice teachers' biographies therefore act as "intuitive screens" or flexible, adaptable filters (Goodman, 1988) when new experiences in schooling occur. These beliefs strongly influence what these novice teachers learn. New experiences may not affect beliefs if the ideas and experiences challenge already held unconscious assumptions. Preservice teachers' beliefs exert a powerful influence on their own teaching and learning (Kagan, 1992; Goodman, 1988; Bullough, 1994; Calderhead, 1991; Clark & Peterson, 1986; Pajares, 1992, Richardson, 1996). Pajara's writes that:

recent findings also suggest that educational beliefs of preservice teachers play a pivotal role in their acquisition and interpretation of knowledge and subsequent teaching behavior and that unexplored entering beliefs may be responsible for the perpetuation of antiquated and ineffectual teaching practices (p.328).

Preservice teachers' preconceptions may be formed based on limited experiences and unreal perceptions of classroom activity. As a result, these beliefs may be inadequate, only partially true, and not connected with authentic
classroom practices (Cole & Knowles, 1993). Joram & Gabriele (1997) discussed two disadvantages with preservice teachers' beliefs. First, prior beliefs are frequently falsely reinforced through daily experiences with student internships. As an example, Joram & Gabriele (1997) describe a situation where student teachers may see a cooperative learning situation as out of control, with no learning occurring, because the students are talking and the teacher is not imparting knowledge. If the student teacher believes that students must be quiet, and listen to the teacher to learn, then this situation could reinforce that belief. The preservice teacher may not realize that students are learning.

The second disadvantage with preconceived beliefs that Joram & Gabriele (1997) addressed is the lack of convincing, corrective feedback in the student teaching process that could alter prior beliefs. The authors state that sufficient effective exercises, analogies, and experiences are not available that could affect changes in preheld beliefs.

Preservice teachers initially interpret events based on existing knowledge and prior beliefs. Although prior beliefs can serve as barriers to reform, they also provide a baseline for examining alternative experiences that challenge their validity (Feiman-Nemser & Remillard, 1995). For teaching to change, preservice teachers must see something problematic currently occurring and be exposed to effective alternative experiences that challenge current beliefs. Feiman-Nemser & Remillard (1995) suggested that three conditions were necessary to create change in prior beliefs. First, teachers need time to consider why new practices
were better than the current approaches. Second, they need to view realistic examples of the new strategies. Third, they need to experience the approach as a learner. Providing these three conditions could lead to an evolution of teacher beliefs.

A review of the literature presented interesting results from studies that looked at changes in preheld beliefs once students entered the formal teacher-education program. The literature offered four distinct areas of research in teacher beliefs. These areas included educational coursework, awareness of beliefs, teacher efficacy, and beliefs about classroom management.

Effects of Teacher-Education Coursework on Beliefs

Several studies examined how preconceived images of teaching influenced the teacher-education student’s ability to conceive and implement effective practices in the classroom. These studies examined the influence of students’ preconceptions about teaching on their ability to effectively develop the skills to implement good practices in their teaching.

Dooley (1998) examined the learner’s current understandings of teaching as they were affected by past experiences and beliefs. She used field notes, subject’s journal entries, and transcripts from four audiotaped, unstructured interviews to record, analyze, and interpret observations of a preservice teacher’s teaching experiences. This student teacher was having difficulty replacing the teacher-centered approach that he had encountered as a student with a more student-centered approach being encouraged by the cooperating
teacher. Through the use of metaphors and image analysis offered by the teacher-educator, the subject was able to understand the conflict in his beliefs and evoke the necessary changes in practice. Dooley’s (1998) study showed the importance of teacher educators’ awareness of preservice teachers’ assumptions. Once aware, the education program can offer authentic experiences for student teachers so they can construct new psychological perspectives useful to teaching.

In another study, Tatto (1998) wanted to determine if a constructivist-oriented, teacher-education program would have more influence on student teacher views than the traditionally oriented teacher-education program. She collected data from nine teacher-education programs by using questionnaires from faculty and teacher-education entry and exit students to elicit views about the purposes, roles, and teaching practice of education. The results showed two challenges for teacher education.

First, Tatto (1998) found a lack of professional norms within the nine programs. This made it difficult for teachers and teacher educators to implement shared understandings and collaboration of good practices when they held opposing ideas about these practices. Second, programs with across-program and internal-program coherence were successful in influencing teacher-education students’ views. Thus, the constructivist-oriented programs produced teachers who held similar beliefs while the conventional programs seemed to graduate teachers who used conventional teaching beliefs.
A third study by Joram & Gabriele (1997) focused on two studies that explored a set of beliefs expressed by preservice teachers. The first study focused on the impact of instruction on perceived changes in beliefs. An educational-psychology instructor changed the format of the class to demonstrate the need for completing coursework at the university level. Although students originally felt that field experiences were the most beneficial training for becoming teachers, the professor was able to change their beliefs by comparing the coursework to driver-education training. After explaining that students can learn about situations that they may not encounter in their clinical field experiences, such as working with students of poverty, the students realized that university coursework could be beneficial.

The second study used an open-ended questionnaire to ask the above students how they thought their views of learning and teaching had changed as a result of the course. The results indicated that targeting preservice teachers’ beliefs in teacher-education instruction does impact actual changes in these beliefs.

A longitudinal study by Roger Day (1996) focused on three preservice teachers as they began their teacher education. Using interviews, he questioned them about their prior beliefs in math instruction. Over the next six months he collected data through field notes, journal entries, and field-experience observations. The subjects were then interviewed again after six months. These
case studies showed that there was an evolution of teaching perspectives. The subjects' beliefs were in transition as to the task of teaching math.

These studies suggest that understanding preservice teachers' beliefs can lead teacher educators to design specific program components that would influence the evolution of prior beliefs. An effective teacher-education program must provide specific components, including clinical experiences and coursework, that help students transition their preconceived beliefs about teaching and learning.

**Awareness of Beliefs**

Several other studies focused on student teacher awareness of their own beliefs and the problems with cognitive restructuring. Moira von Wright (1997) described a research project where teacher-education students were asked to express their expectations on their coming role as teachers and their beliefs about the socialization process. The results showed that student teachers enter their education programs with strong beliefs about what is pedagogically correct with teacher roles. Because beliefs affect meaning, the author stated that formal education must restructure these initial concepts by providing appropriate scientifically based theories and practical experiences. She stated that preconceived beliefs must be seriously challenged before students will shift their thinking about teaching and learning. Moira von Wright (1997) suggested that students must be made aware of their beliefs to eventually change them.
Another study by Wiggins & Clift (1995) used reflective inquiry to examine the learning experiences of two student teacher candidates at the secondary level. During this study, the existence of oppositional pairs was identified as a factor that affected the professional growth of these student teachers. Each student was found to hold opposing beliefs about effective teaching and management techniques but had no awareness of the contradictions in their beliefs. These inconsistencies included teacher as motivator versus motivated student, individualism versus favoritism, friend versus evaluator, and novice learner versus experienced instructor. This oppositional thinking, or cognitive dissonance, did not prove to adversely affect the preservice teachers' ability to develop personal beliefs about teaching. However, a lack of conflict in thinking may prevent changes in beliefs. Student teachers, supervisors, and cooperating teachers should be cognizant of cognitive discomfort and support the student teachers as they evolve through their beliefs in creating their own teaching philosophy.

Swafford, Peters & Lee (1998) used autobiographical analysis to understand preservice teachers' beliefs. They examined an autobiography assignment for preservice teachers enrolled in both undergraduate and graduate classes. Preservice teachers were to examine and reflect on their personal content-area literacy development as they completed literacy courses. This assignment helped the preservice teachers understand how educational experiences affect their beliefs. They came to understand that conflict might exist when instruction
Based on beliefs differed from one's prior experiences. Results supported
the need for teacher educators to identify preservice teacher beliefs, build on
those beliefs and then extend their pedagogical knowledge where lacking.
These researchers suggested that instruction and experiences during teacher-
preparation coursework and practice be relevant and meaningful.

Teacher Efficacy

Current data suggests that efficacy beliefs change as preservice teachers
enter the teaching profession. Teacher efficacy is the belief that one can affect
student learning in positive ways. Two research studies that were particularly
relevant to the area of classroom management help support the research that
finds preservice teachers have overly inflated beliefs about their effectiveness in
teaching and classroom management. (Veenman, 1984; Weinstein, 1989;
Goldstein & Lake, 1999; Crowson, 1999).

Herbert, Lee & Williamson (1998) examined how teacher efficacy varied as a
function of experience, looking at both preservice teachers and experienced
teachers. Interestingly, preservice teachers had a low perception of outside
elements' impact on student’s behavior. Such elements included the home and
family, school context, student characteristics, and community. Preservice
teachers cited personal qualities, such as caring for their students, as the basis
for their efficacy while experienced teachers supported pedagogical knowledge
from experience. This study indicated that teacher efficacy beliefs change due to
experience over the course of the teaching career.
A study by Soodak & Podell (1997) examined one hundred and sixty-nine preservice teachers enrolled in methods courses and/or student teaching. The researchers used a two-page questionnaire including a teacher efficacy scale. Findings indicated that the personal efficacy of preservice teachers was quite high during their fieldwork and student teaching but fell substantially during their first year of teaching. The authors associated this drop with the trauma noted during the beginning years of teaching. Although teachers gradually recovered their confidence, the efficacy rating never reached the preservice levels.

Additionally the results indicated that the first few years of teaching produce experiences that significantly damage teachers' beliefs about their own abilities. This study claimed that teachers do rebound from the devastating effects of entering the profession but only through years of experience. The research suggested that teacher-education programs should place student teachers in optimal environments and expose them to more representative conditions. The students should be placed with cooperating teachers whose beliefs differ to produce cognitive discomfort. This would help students recognize, confront, and perhaps adjust their beliefs to teaching. Additionally, new teachers need direct support from mentors and support groups as they evolve from students to teachers (Sodak & Podell, 1997).

**Beliefs about Classroom Management**

All of the previous research studies address preservice teacher beliefs across...
the curriculum. The last group of studies addresses classroom management research specifically. Goldstein & Lake (1999) examined preservice teachers’ understanding of the role of caring in the educational context. They studied journal entries and discovered common aspects of the preservice teachers understandings. The most distressing aspect was the belief that being a teacher is natural. This was a common belief held by all seventeen students. They felt that teaching and caring were rooted in instinct. According to Goldstein & Lake (1999), this preexisting belief could lead to cognitive confusion as new teachers begin interacting with students in classrooms and realize the conflict in a relationship of caring and teaching.

Wilson & Cameron (1996) examined student teachers’ perceptions of effective teaching. Their study showed a complex development by their participants as they moved from a teacher-centered to a pupil-centered view of instruction, from a personal to a professional view of student relationships and most importantly, from a control to a holistic view of classroom management. This longitudinal study focused on students as they moved through their education program for three years. The study found that first-year students were concerned with “control” of the classroom. By the third year, they were less concerned with control and teacher assertiveness and saw management in terms of effective planning and teacher flexibility. In student relationships, the student teachers moved from a relaxed, friendly, and empathetic tone to a more authoritative approach to finally a need for humor and respect for student
relationships. By the end of the third year, student teachers appeared to have replaced the first year's view of students as people to a view of them as learners. In effect, they move from a caring perspective to a managerial concept. This study supported Kagan's (1992) explanation that student teachers are overly concerned with class control.

A study by Neale & Johnson (1994) examined the development of elementary teachers' thinking about classroom management and control. Eighty-five student teachers were surveyed about their conceptions of control during their student teaching experience. Two years later, twelve of these student teachers took part in a second questionnaire and interview, after their first year of teaching. Results indicated that the two teachers whose data was reported in this study had fairly similar concepts during both surveys. Their statements still emphasized effective management conceptions that had been addressed during their training. There appeared to be a "filling out" of ideas, rather than radical changes to beliefs. The findings from this study indicated that student teachers already hold prior beliefs about management that are enhanced through experience.

The purpose of a study by Virginia Johnson (1994) was to examine the elementary student teachers' conceptions of classroom control. Student teachers were surveyed about their conceptions of control during their first month of field placement and again during their third and fourth month of student teaching. Results showed that the conceptions of management and control that
were previously held by these student teachers were consistent with the concepts taught during their training.

**Summary of Preservice Teachers' Beliefs**

Preservice teachers begin their teaching experience with preconceived beliefs and conceptions about teaching. Their prior life history, including their own personal experiences, and their schooling, greatly influence these beliefs. Pedagogical education additionally affects these beliefs, although the literature is inconsistent as to the intensity of affect. The student teaching experience adds to the cognitive confusion that most preservice teachers experience as their preconceived beliefs are questioned. What should they believe?

**Section Two: Socialization**

"Learning to become a teacher is a complex process of socialization that involves an individual's thoughts, perceptions, values, and actions" (Goodman, 1988, p. 31). When examining preservice teacher beliefs about classroom management, the influence of socialization is a consideration. Ashton & Webb (1986) detailed a framework that influenced teacher efficacy using four systems. These systems could also be used to define the influence of socialization on preservice teachers. The first system is called a microsystem and includes the immediate classroom environment. Student-teacher interactions and management would fall in this category. The next system, mesosystem, would include the environment within the school, staff members, administrators and
parents. Exosystem is the third category and would include the social structures influencing the teacher/setting. Examples of these influences include the community and school district as a whole. The last system, macrosystem, includes the cultural institutions and norms that effect teaching and learning conceptions. When focusing on these systems as influencing beliefs, it is possible to understand better how prior beliefs are formed, challenged, and eventually changed.

**Socialization Through the Schooling Process**

Wright (1997) defined the socialization as a scientific term that describes the process in which a person, with his/her disposition becomes a socially competent individual within the social confines of the environment. She further explained that as individuals, we are always choosing among values and habits that fit within the current social environment. Three social environments affect preservice teachers and their beliefs. The first socialization experience for preservice teachers has already been discussed as individuals travel through their own schooling as pupils. The school rules, procedures, and discipline patterns become unconsciously embedded in their belief systems, based on personalities, past teacher role models, and life experiences. Bolton (1997) explained that we teach as we were taught, and to change the way we teach, we must change our beliefs about effective teaching.
Teacher Education as a Socializing Process

The next social environment that students move into is teacher education, where prior assumptions about teaching are initially challenged. The teacher education environment can be broken into two segments, instructional coursework and field experience. Although research approaches each of these areas separately, both introduce new learning theories and instructional models that may produce cognitive dissonance, or a conflict between best practices and preconceived beliefs and experiences.

Uhlenberg, Fuller & Slotnik (1990) refer to the college experiences as differential socialization because professors tend to provide liberal beliefs about teaching. These beliefs are idealistic and include what ought to be done as teachers. These authors concluded that college students actually adapt their cognitive schema to meet the demands of their professors and field experiences. Students then shift back to their previously learned concepts and ideas once they begin student teaching (Lortie, 1975). During student teaching experiences, preservice teachers move to a more realistic focus on what can be done.

Professional Socialization

The preservice teacher's professional socialization, the third social context, begins with student teaching and continues throughout their professional life. This is the period of transition from pedagogical education to teaching (Richardson, 1996). This experience is a connection to the real world of teaching and provides opportunities for practicing learned strategies, pedagogical
knowledge, and problem solving dilemmas in a cooperative learning situation. Preservice teachers use their prior knowledge and newly learned concepts from teacher-education coursework to accommodate and assimilate successful teaching skills. Kenneth Smith (1997) stated that the student teaching experience is one of the most crucial times to examine teacher beliefs. The student shifts from a mostly theoretical framework to a practical setting. In a short period of time, this student must mix prior beliefs, current pedagogical theory, and the modeling of a cooperating teacher to construct his/her own understanding of effective teaching in the social/cultural surroundings.

The influence of the cooperating teacher on student beliefs cannot be understated. This mentor often represents one of the most potent socialization agents for the student teacher (Smith, 1997) and may be a more significant change agent than education courses. Smith suggests that student teacher attitudes and beliefs may mirror those of the cooperating teacher.

The following five studies address the effects of one or more of the social constructs on preservice teacher beliefs. In one study, Crowson (1999) examined the relationship between preservice teachers' epistemological beliefs and their perceptions of their college preparatory work. It demonstrated that preservice teachers' prior knowledge may have a significant impact on their motivation to engage in coursework assigned to them in college classes.

Two studies examined the effects of the cooperating teacher on preservice beliefs (Key, 1998; Smith, 1997). Key's study examined how student teacher
perceptions evolve during their field experience. This phenomenological case study showed negative growth and difficulty in the preservice teaching experiences because the cooperating teachers didn’t help the student teachers with problematic areas. This study suggested that training needed to be provided to cooperating teachers to enhance their effectiveness with student teachers.

Smith’s (1997) study examined cooperating teachers effects as a socialization agent for student teachers. Sixty student teachers participated in a survey consisting of three instruments. Results concluded that the beliefs of student teachers did not converge with the perceived beliefs of their cooperating teachers. This study contradicted earlier research that argued that the influence of the cooperating teacher is greater than college training coursework.

One study (Uhienberg, Fuller & Slotnik, 1990) used Wolfgang and Glickman’s Beliefs on Discipline Continuum to determine which environment affected preservice teacher beliefs about discipline. Their results indicated that socialization was an interaction of all environments: prior conceptions, education coursework, and field experience.

**Summary of the Socialization Process**

The socialization process affects teacher-belief systems. As teacher candidates move through their formal education coursework, their beliefs are put to question as they are exposed to pedagogical knowledge that may differ greatly from their preconceived ideas about effective classroom activities.
Student teaching begins the road to cognitive change as these preservice teachers become acclimated to the teaching and schooling environment. These studies have helped readers understand the importance of the socialization process on prior beliefs and their influence on preservice teachers’ ability to process new information and change current thinking. A focus on the specific classroom-management theories will help us understand which techniques preservice teachers tend to internalize and why changes may be hard to make.

Section Three: Classroom Management

What makes a teacher effective in the classroom? Is it his or her presentation of materials and ideas? Is it the instructional style and content used? Is it the classroom management system? Research shows that an effective teacher uses a culmination of all of the above mentioned strategies. Walter Doyle (1990) stated that in order to understand an effective classroom, “one needed to examine management, instruction, and curriculum simultaneously.” Other research suggests that where there is strong academic focus and learning, there is always a strong management system (Carter & Doyle, 1984; Doyle, Sanford, French, Emmer, & Clements, 1985). McCarthy (1992) stated that “the most effective classroom manager is one who has a broad repertoire of managerial strategies...which are appropriate for different instructional activities and contexts” (p.16).
Classroom management has been defined previously as an umbrella term to encompass those teacher behaviors that oversee classroom activities. Bruce Smith (1991) defined classroom management as “teacher behaviors, cognitions, and emotions which promote good behaviors, prevent misbehavior from happening, or effectively deal with misbehavior once it has happened” (p.2).

In looking at classroom management, we find that there are many systems, procedures, programs, and theories available for use by classroom teachers. No one approach to classroom management is considered the best, or worst. Most approaches seem to work best in a combination with each other, depending on the student make-up of the class, the teacher's pedagogical theories on behavior, and the current instructional content in the classroom (Doyle, 1990; McCarthy & Weber, 1979,1980,1981; McCarthy, 1992).

Beliefs regarding these classroom-management dimensions can vary, and play a role in a preservice teacher’s approach to effectively managing a classroom. Weber’s (1994) eight approaches to classroom management and the Three Faces of Discipline (Wolfgang, 1999) are examined to explain the basic, most widely used approaches and techniques for effective classroom management. These theories are used in this dissertation to identify and define the participants’ classroom management belief systems.
Weber's Eight Approaches to Effective Classroom Management

Currently, there are eight basic strategies used by teachers for classroom management (Weber, 1994). Some are more effective than others, but used in combinations depending on teacher beliefs and preferences and student behaviors, these strategies provide valuable guidelines and procedures for providing effective classroom management.

Intimidation Approach

One method of classroom management that was used extensively years ago but now seems to exhibit questionable effectiveness is the intimidation approach. This approach held that the teacher was the dictator in the classroom and students were forced to behave according to the teacher's rules. The dominant emphasis for using intimidation was the teacher's perception that students misbehave and must be disciplined (Doyle, 1990). Teachers using this form of management see control as a function of the teacher and are reactive rather than proactive in their use of classroom management.

Corporal punishment was previously the main form of intimidation. If a student misbehaved, he or she was spanked, either by the teacher or the principal. During the early 70's, this was the predominant form of classroom and parental "control". It was effective to some extent in keeping most students "in line" but the habitual, chronically misbehaving student seemed unaffected by the "treatment". This approach also offered little chance for students to develop intrinsic motivation for their own self-controlled behavior patterns. In addition,
individual choices, mutual respect, and optimism were lacking in the classroom environment that used this method.

This form of management is still used today. Other forms of intimidation include sarcasm, ridicule, coercion, threats, (calling parent, sending to office, loss of privileges), force, and disapproval. Although these intimidation techniques may be effective in controlling some student behavior, they are not considered the best form of management. These techniques may deal with the problem but usually result in only a temporary solution. Additionally, the affected student can develop hostility, which will ruin the student-teacher relationship permanently (Weber, 1994).

Authoritarian Approach

Another form of classroom management that uses the teacher as the obedience monitor is the authoritarian approach. This approach still adheres to the assumption that the teacher is responsible for controlling the conduct of the students in the classroom. These controlling strategies include the establishment and enforcement of classroom rules, the use of mild desists, and the use of commands and directives. Riner & McCarthy (1998) explained that the authoritarian approach uses direct, external control of the students' behavior through the use of rules and coercive enforcement. Teachers using this approach are organized and all business. Weber (1994) listed five strategies when using the authoritarian approach: (1) establish and enforce rules (2) issue
commands and orders (3) use mild desists (4) use proximate control (5) isolate and exclude as necessary.

This approach is effective but lacks the supportive, warm, caring approach offered in other management styles (McCarthy, 1992). As with the intimidation approach, the major weakness with this type of management is the lack of encouragement for students to "self-manage" behavior. Students simply follow the rules established in the classroom or receive the stated consequence. All student behavior is treated with the same rewards and consequences with no exceptions allowed for individual differences. It should be noted that this approach is different from the intimidation approach in the degree of negative interaction towards the student (Weber, 1994).

This technique also encourages student confrontation with the teacher over the rules, rewards, and consequences. With at-risk students exhibiting antisocial behaviors, power struggles could surface with this form of management. The student control depends on the teacher behaviors and the rewards and consequences used. This obedience perspective of classroom management is flawed, because it implies that classroom management should be designed to establish authority or obedience. Students have no input into the rules, therefore fail to establish a "buy-in" to the program. In addition, teacher flexibility is decreased as all students must be treated the same. This approach still presumes that student self-control is the result of obedience to adult control (Weber, 1994).
The authoritarian approach can be useful when combined with other approaches. Research clearly shows that students need an established set of boundaries, rules, and procedures to follow in order to maintain a classroom conducive for learning (Cangeiosi, 2000; Evertson et al., 2000; Wong & Wong, 1998). In addition, some rules and procedures that involve the safety of students and staff must be enforced. However, using only an authoritarian approach to classroom management produces an obedience orientation instead of a learning environment that emphasizes the self-cooperative role of the student.

**Cookbook Approach**

A third classroom management approach is called the cookbook or “bag of tricks” approach (Weber, 1994). This particular approach emphasizes a combination of strategies taken from other management systems. It generally encompasses a list of do’s and don’ts. Student behavior is managed by applying specific “tried and true” ideas borrowed from other approaches. This is very much a reactionary method in which the teacher waits for a misbehavior then reacts by following a simplistic remedy (Weber, 1994). The cookbook approach uses absolutes in its management, therefore, not allowing for individual student behaviors. Such absolutes as “never smile until Christmas”, “never play favorites when rewarding students”, “always be consistent with enforcing your rules”, and “start out tough and then you can always lighten up later” are examples of the cookbook approach to classroom management (Weber, 1994).
Obviously, some of the techniques used may be effective. However, most of the strategies invite problems. First, this approach lacks consistency. Teachers using the cookbook approach react to a situation with short-range solutions (Weber, 1994). Additionally, if a strategy doesn't work, the teacher may not have alternatives because this approach uses absolutes. If only absolutes are used, individual needs cannot be met. Additionally, students have no real procedures to follow. They may be unsure exactly what consequence may be applied.

**Behavior Modification Approach**

Behavior Modification is a classroom management strategy that has been used for several decades (Skinner, 1971). The underlying premise behind behavior modification is that a few basic processes account for all learning. The role of the teacher is to promote student behavior by rewarding appropriate actions and eliminating inappropriate student behavior by not rewarding it.

The use of positive and negative reinforcement, punishment, and extinction, or the removal of a reward, are the four main processes involved in behavior modification (Piper, 1974). Reinforcement is identified as primary reinforcers (food) or conditioned reinforcers (praise, tokens, activities). The reinforcer must meet the student's needs and desires or it is not meaningful or successful at rewarding the student. The most difficult aspect of this program is finding the right reinforcer for which the student will engage in appropriate classroom behaviors. McCarthy (1992) included modeling, shaping, contingency
contracting, self-monitoring, cues, prompts, and signals as processes used in behavior management. Additionally, when negative reinforcers are necessary for extinction of inappropriate behaviors, such punishments as over-correction, fines (response costs), and fading can be utilized (Weber, 1994).

According to McCarthy (1992), behavior modification approaches are more successful for small numbers of students. It has also proven to be effective on individual students who are having problems controlling their behavior. Behavior modification can be successful. However, students may believe that every time they do something appropriate they should be rewarded. Students must learn to behave appropriately for intrinsic values rather than exclusively for extrinsic motivation.

*Group Process Approach*

Another strategy utilized for classroom management is the group process or sociopsychological approach (Weber, 1994). The teacher develops a group sense of identity, fosters group cohesiveness, and teaches students leadership skills. Students are also taught conflict resolution skills. The premise behind this strategy is that students in these classrooms tend to comply with behavioral expectations because they want to be part of the group. Inappropriate behavior is generally addressed by utilizing group norms and group processes. A common example of this might be a teacher conducting a classroom meeting to discuss an issue. Students committing minor offenses may be reminded of the agreed-upon norms.
Some strategies noted in this approach include group behavior expectations clarification, shared leadership, fostered positive interpersonal relationships among all students, helping the group establish group norms, or shared expectations, and encouraging open, positive communication (Schmuck & Schmuck, 1979). Additionally, the teacher must facilitate the group in problem-solving discussions, handling conflict, and maintaining/restoring morale. These strategies are usually addressed during classroom meetings, which are held at specified times during the day, week or month (Weber, 1994).

Another way to look at this strategy is to define "discipline" as "cooperative planning and problem solving." Students need to have an active voice in the way the classroom is run. If students generate and participate in creating the established norms, then they understand when the group feels that the norms have been violated (McCarthy, 1992).

Permissive Approach

The Permissive Theory utilizes the premise that the teacher is responsible for maximizing student freedom by interfering as little as possible (Weber, 1994). The role of the teacher is to promote the freedom of students, thereby fostering their natural development. The major managerial strategy is to encourage students to express themselves freely so that they might reach their fullest potential. Teachers may have difficulty stepping back and attempting to allow the classroom to function on its own. This method could also create problems for the student needing boundaries, primarily the habitual discipline offender.
Instructional Approach

The Instructional Approach to classroom management implies that management will not be a problem if the students are actively engaged in meaningful academic activities (Weber, 1994). According to Doyle (1986), the tasks of promoting learning and order are closely intertwined. He suggested that orderliness is necessary for instruction to occur and lessons must be sufficiently well constructed to capture and sustain student attention. He also indicated that teachers face competing pressures to maximize learning and sustain order. In this strategy, activities are introduced in short blocks of classroom time. These short blocks range from ten to twenty minutes. Labels such as seatwork, recitation, presentations, and small groups are prevalent in this organizational structure (Doyle, 1986).

Kounin’s (1970) research findings are particularly relevant to this management form. He suggested that lessons that were well prepared and presented would prevent boredom, inattention, and inappropriate behaviors. On-task behaviors waste little instructional time and keep students busy. Additionally, smooth, rapid transitions create little time for misbehaviors.

Kounin (1970) found that unsuccessful teachers displayed many behaviors that increased the likelihood of student misbehavior. Thrusts, dangles, truncations, and flip-flops create jerky work patterns. Thrusts include sudden, quick movements into a new activity without sufficient introduction. A teacher dangles or flip-flops a lesson when she or he leaves the lesson for a minute,
starts something else and then returns to the previous activity. Truncations are abandoned lessons before they are finished, in order to move on to a new lesson. These patterns of instruction create fragmented time-on-task activities and confuse students. Resulting student behaviors may include frustration, confusion or attention loss.

Successful strategies found in this approach include providing interesting and motivating activities and work for the students. The transitions between lessons must be smooth and rapid to hold student attention. Advanced lesson planning is essential to being prepared and effective. Establishing classroom procedures and routines at the beginning of the year is helpful in understanding typical daily activities. Additionally, it is important that the teacher prepare students for any changes in their routines or environment to keep disruptions to a minimum.

This managerial system could be helpful to students with social needs (Evertson, Emmer & Worsham, 2000). The attention span of at-risk students is decreased compared to their peers. It becomes difficult to grasp and maintain focus on academic material when more basic needs like safety and security are involved. Teachers must keep this in mind as they plan their method and delivery of instruction. If prior planning does not occur, inappropriate behaviors will increase because students are not engaged. Teachers can cooperatively plan with students to determine the topics for an upcoming curriculum unit. By doing so, students' personal concerns and interests are addressed. Students then buy into the activities, thus reducing off task behavior.
Socioemotional-Climate Approach

The last approach in classroom management to be discussed, the socioemotional-climate approach, is one of the best forms of management for the current needs of all students (Riner & McCarthy, 1998). This approach emphasizes the student's ability to empower his or her own responsible behavior as a result of social awareness and training. The socioemotional-climate results from the clinical and counseling psychology field and involves positive teacher-student and student-student relationships (Weber, 1994). The development of these positive relationships is the primary responsibility of the teacher.

The socioemotional approach embraces today's current teaching pedagogy that encourages constructivist teaching. Just as students are required to construct their own knowledge through the facilitation of the teacher, they should also be encouraged in construction of appropriate social skills knowledge. The role of the teacher is to "empower students to play roles that contribute to development of the community of learners" (Neale, Johnson, & Smith, 1994). Students are no longer managed in this approach, but rather empowered to self-control their behaviors to meet the acceptable standards set by the school and community.

This approach calls for a more indirect control by the teacher than in the previously mentioned approaches. This indirect teacher control is used to establish or influence student behaviors by creating positive school experiences and using a multitude of systematic and effective strategies to help the student
fulfill his/her needs (Riner & McCarthy, 1998). The positive school experience is produced through student training which includes "respect for others, basic goodness and caring, self-reliance, group cooperation, and social learning in addition to the safety and protections of all children..." (Riner & McCarthy, 1998, p. 5). This approach teaches the student a cooperative and intrinsic moral responsibility for behaving in an appropriate manner instead of assuming the role of the obedient, compliant student controlled by teacher dominance.

Bruce Smith (1991) described this socioemotional approach through his explanation of classroom management. He stated that management consists of "teacher behaviors, cognitions, and emotions that involve organizing the physical environment of the classroom, structuring and organizing social activity for classroom groups, and supervising individual students' behavior, task engagement, and socializations in the classroom." (p.2) Through this definition, the reader is made aware that this management technique emphasizes the importance of establishing rules, procedures, and routines in combination with the development of a strong instructional program that keeps the students focused and involved.

McCarthy (1992) suggested that classroom management is most effective when teachers know "who's coming to school." These teachers are aware of individual student needs, in addition to their educational needs, and plan the curriculum to provide successful experiences for everyone. Management and
instruction are related activities in the classroom. There can be no effective instruction without effective classroom management. In the socioemotional approach, the teacher designs the physical layout of the classroom, rules and procedures, and classroom instructional activities to encourage student participation. Before management problems arise, the effective teacher teaches the students procedures for managing their own behavior.

This approach is considered a proactive rather than a reactive approach to classroom management (McCarthy 1992). The teacher using this approach can anticipate the behavioral needs of his or her students, based on "who's coming to school", and design reasonable expectations for appropriate conduct in the classroom. These expectations are then communicated to the students at the beginning of the school year and are practiced and reviewed often until the students can participate with minimum disruption. Logical consequences and established, consistent, practiced rules, policies and procedures, and planned instructional strategies that motivate students help minimize discipline problems. This management style will best meet the needs of all students, including those with special discipline needs. Jones (1996) stated that, "as teachers face increasing numbers of students who desperately need models of caring adults who can simultaneously provide a sense of order and safety in their lives, it becomes increasingly necessary to blend caring and controlling in the classroom." (p.505) This blend can be offered through the socioemotional-climate.
Jones (1996) identified four key skills that teachers need to implement for effective classroom management. The first skill is socialization. Teachers need to create positive teacher-student and student-student peer relationships. Teachers can accomplish this by accepting personal accountability from all students, being persistent with student success, and expressing a constant sense of optimism in the classroom.

The second skill consists of the need for constant provision of effective and appropriate instruction for all students. This skill keeps students engaged, interested, and motivated to stay on task. Organizing the classroom and maintaining classroom management while responding with appropriate disciplinary consequences complete the third and fourth skills. These skills again address the socioemotional climate of the classroom.

Proactive teachers will likely use the group, authoritarian, and socioemotional approaches with rules, procedures, and set boundaries established at the beginning of the school year. Several authors stress the need for established rules and procedures to help students identify boundaries and understand the social context of school (Evertson, Emmer, & Worsham, 2000; Wong & Wong, 1998; Doyle, 1986).

Summary

These eight identified approaches to classroom management are useful to teachers in developing an effective classroom-management system. They were briefly discussed here but the reader can get a better, more thorough
explanation of them by reading Chapter Eight in *Classroom Teaching Skills* by James Cooper, General Editor. Weber (1994) encourages the use of all of these techniques depending on the student specific situation that is occurring. He equates the effective use of these approaches to a computer-retrieval system. As a situation arises, the teacher checks the computer system to retrieve the strategies that have been stored. The teacher then analyzes the situation and chooses the strategy that would best solve the problem. This eclectic approach uses all of the managerial approaches to create a sound theoretical repertoire of effective solutions to classroom issues. It is obviously important then that preservice teachers be exposed to these techniques so they can develop such a retrieval system.

To determine which management approach should be used, Weber (1994) has developed a four-step process. The teacher first determines what classroom conditions are desired. Next, the teacher analyzes the current conditions or problem, if there is a specific situation. Third, the teacher uses the retrieval system defined above to determine which approach would offer the most effective solution. Finally, the strategies are applied and then assessed to determine the effectiveness. This process is referred to as the Analytic-Pluralistic Classroom Management Process (Weber, 1994). It may be applied during any single-episodic activity or at the beginning of the school year as the teacher determines the social and academic make-up of the classroom.
The Three Faces of Discipline

Glickman & Tamashiro (1980) and Wolfgang (1999) developed a different matrix for identifying and categorizing classroom management approaches. Originally, three approaches to classroom interactions were identified on the continuum of control exercised by the teacher. These approaches were non-interventionist, interventionist, and interactionalist (Glickman & Tamashiro, 1980).

The non-interventionist approach assumes that students have an inner drive that helps them behave appropriately. This dimension provides the least direction and control by the teacher for appropriate student behavior. At the other end of the continuum, the interventionist approach holds that the outer environment shapes student behaviors. In the middle, the interactionalist approach examines what the environment does to shape the student and what the student does to modify his or her environment. Several classroom management programs are available that fit in each category and they will be discussed shortly.

Wolfgang (1999) renamed these categories as he discussed the discipline responses to student behaviors. The Teacher Behavior Continuum (TBC) consists of four categories. The Relationship-Listening category identifies strategies that use a therapeutic response to student needs. Confronting-Contracting is an educational and counseling response while the Rules and Consequences category defines teacher-controlling strategies. Additionally,
Wolfgang (1999) identified a fourth response called Coercive-Legalistic or restraining, exclusionary, and legal response.

These responses make up the Three Faces of Discipline. Like Glickman and Tamashiro's (1980) model, the above categories are placed on the continuum of control or power used by the teacher. This matrix provides an orderly arrangement or sequence of teacher control techniques. Currently, the continuum serves as the knowledge base for practical and theoretical techniques and strategies needed to develop and maintain an effective classroom environment, and to handle the discipline problems that occur in the school setting.

Wolfgang (1999) identified seven elements that these management approaches could address for teacher strategies. These elements include: (1) looking on (2) nondirective statements (3) questions (4) directive statements (5) modeling (6) reinforcement (7) physical intervention/isolation. They correlate with the faces across the TBC from minimum to maximum teacher control.

Several management packages or theories are available for teachers to utilize that fall on the continuum of these processes and will be discussed briefly. The approaches will be discussed as they fall along the continuum, starting with those models using minimum teacher power.

The Relationship-Listening Face

This face involves the use of minimum teacher power. The student can change the inappropriate behavior, which has been caused because of inner
personal turmoil, flooded behavior, or feelings of inadequacy (Wolfgang, 1999). The teacher strategies in the models found in this face would usually address the elements of looking on (modality cuing) and nondirective statements. Two current models are described.

Teacher Effectiveness Training.

Gordon’s (1974) discipline book on Teacher Effectiveness Training (T.E.T) is based on the emotionally supportive theory held by Carl R. Rogers, referred to as Rogerian Theory (Wolfgang, 1999). The assumption behind this behavioral theory is that human beings are self-regulating and can learn and manage their own behavior (Edwards, 2000). Thus, the teacher’s role is to facilitate and support the children as they solve their own problems. This facilitation includes teacher active listening, supporting questions, modifying the environment, and appropriately constructed l-messages. Typical rewards and praise are discouraged.

Peer Mediation model.

Peer Mediation (Schrumpf, Crawford & Bodine, 1997) is a proactive program that addresses student conflict by using one’s peers to help solve the problems. A cadre of students is trained to mediate during disputes between other students. The role of the mediator is to follow defined steps with the angry students in an effort to teach them how to solve their problems in a non-violent manner.
The first step, agree to mediate, involves the introduction of all parties and an agreement that those involved will commit themselves to obey the rules and mediate. In step two, gather points of view, each disputant gives his or her side of the story. Summarizing and clarifying the issues take place during this phase. Next, a common interest is sought by the mediator by asking, "What do you want?" or "How do you think that made you feel?" In step four, the mediator asks for any solutions that the disputants may have to solve the problem. Next, step five evaluates the solutions. In step six, an agreement is reached and a plan is devised to meet this agreement. These steps are followed without an adult present. This process enables students to help other students in developing options for social problems and learning more appropriate social skills when conflicts arise.

The Confronting-Contracting Face

The discipline models discussed in this section focus on adult control to change inappropriate behaviors. The adult will confront the misbehavior and encourage and contract the student to change as necessary. This position primarily uses the elements of questioning and directive statements.

Logical consequences.

This theory first originated from Alfred Adler, who believed that the central motive for all behavior came from a need to belong and be accepted (Wolfgang, 1999). In this theory, inappropriate behavior is motivated by the need for attention, to display power, get revenge, or display inadequacy (Edwards, 2000).
and all behavior, including misbehavior is orderly, purposeful, and wanton of social recognition (Wolfgang, 1999).

Dreikurs and Cassel (1990) asserted that if a student did not get attention or feel socially accepted, a pattern of misbehavior would begin in an effort to gain acceptance. Once it could be determined which of the four goals was motivating the inappropriate behaviors, then a series of corrective steps could be taken to address the real goal. Dreikurs and Cassel (1990) did not promote punishment, rewards or praise. Rather, they emphasized that students should suffer the logical or natural consequences for their actions. This theory uses choices as a solution to give the student alternative behavior patterns to select. Teachers can use the choice and logical consequence strategies in their classrooms to maintain and control student behaviors.

This theory is placed in the middle continuum of approaches for several reasons. First, the child is given credit for the ability to choose the behavior. However, direct adult intervention is used to intervene and redirect. And these interventions require specific actions to replace the inappropriate behaviors and foster a sense of belonging in the classroom. Thus this theory falls between the two extreme poles of child behavior theorists. The newer version of this theory is Albert's (1989) work called "Cooperative Discipline".

Reality therapy/Choice theory.

This theory is placed in the middle continuum because its founder, William Glasser believed that human beings must live with other humans and therefore,
must satisfy needs in a way that do not infringe on others (Wolfgang, 1999).

Students are self-regulating and must manage their own behavior.

Consequences for inappropriate behaviors are accepted without exploring motives and making excuses (Edwards, 2000). This theory differs from the Relationship-Listening focus in that empathy and supportive acceptance of the child's behavior is not accepted.

Glasser (1992) asserted that student disruptions are caused because students are bored. These students don't feel success and are not involved in what they learn. In his book, *The Quality School* in 1992, Glasser presented many short theory-to-practice suggestions for applying the choice theory of discipline in classroom and schools. Important steps for teachers to use include:

1. observe the student and situation
2. assess the teacher's actions and student success
3. start over with new activities.

If the inappropriate behavior continues, then the student is confronted and told to stop, questioned about the behavior, pressured for a plan and commitment to change, and finally, faced with logical consequences.

*The Judicious Discipline model.*

Most discipline models give teachers specific strategies to use during a discipline situation. This model, authored by Gathercoal (1993) is a reflective approach that requires the teacher to pass classroom rules and procedures through a filter of democratic rights (Wolfgang, 1999). The assumption is that students will learn to act responsibly in using their personal freedoms as
guaranteed in the Constitution. This model uses legal rights to understand necessary rules. In this regard, students create the classroom rules and accept consequences instead of punishment (Edwards, 2000). This is not a stand alone model of discipline but must be used in conjunction with others in the first two continuums.

Rules and Consequences Face

The strategies that use the maximum teacher control are found in this face. Students are not capable of simply behaving appropriately, but must be taught to respond correctly through external stimuli. Here, the teacher determines the appropriate behavior and assertively demands and trains the students to comply. The discipline models that fall in this category primarily use elements of directive statements and physical intervention. Four popular management techniques are found in this teacher attitude.

Behavior Modification.

This model of discipline, often called behavior mod, comes from the behaviorist work of B.F. Skinner (1971). The basic assumptions driving this theory state that human beings have no will and must be managed. They respond to external, environmental stimuli in order to behave correctly. Rewarding appropriate behaviors will encourage correct responses while ignoring misbehavior will cause it to cease. Teachers must plan a shaping program to help misbehaving students learn self-control (Wolfgang, 1999).
When using this model, the teacher identifies the behavioral objective, collects data, and plans a system of rewards and consequences to reinforce or decrease the behavior. This discipline system is easy to use and produces immediate results. However, constant external rewarding may reduce the chance that students will become intrinsically motivated to behave properly (Edwards, 2000).

**Assertive Discipline.**

This discipline model, authored by Canter and Canter (1992), has certain similarities to the Behavior Modification approach previously discussed, but differs in some ways. Whereas the Behavior Modification approach rewards good behavior and ignores misbehavior, Assertive Discipline punishes inappropriate behaviors and reinforces acceptable behaviors. This approach insists that teachers have rights that include the right to establish the classroom rules and procedures, insist on acceptable behaviors from all students, and receive help from parents and school administrators. Based on the premise that humans react to conflict in one of three ways, nonassertively, hostilely, or assertively, this process suggests how to react and teach assertiveness techniques.

The assertiveness model of discipline relies on a systematic combination of verbal assertiveness from the teacher and rewards and punishments used daily. The teacher designs the discipline plan that contains a list of classroom compliance rules, positive reinforcers and recognition, consequences, and a
severity clause. This plan is shared with students, parents, and the school administration so that everyone knows that the teacher has the right to teach and expect acceptable behavior from students. This form of discipline is very popular, as evidenced by the “card pull” system and posted classroom rules, rewards, and consequences seen in many classrooms.

*The Positive Discipline or Jones model.*

This model, authored by Frederic Jones (1987), encourages teachers’ physical presence and proximity to control student behaviors and keep them on-task. Positive discipline promotes positive management procedures, setting limits, and encouraging cooperation. The procedures must be practical and simple. Positive management is accomplished by knowing how to properly structure the classroom, maintaining control through instructional strategies and limits, building cooperation, and having a backup system (Edwards, 2000). Some specific strategies include the avoidance of universal helping interactions, utilizing praise, prompt, leave sequence, limit setting, terminating instruction, and close proximity. Rewards are based on a preferred activity time (PAT) and can be negotiated by the students based on their interests. PATs should be fun activities that students find highly interesting and at the same time share an academic focus.

*Skillstreaming.*

This discipline model is considered a skill-deficit model for teaching social skills to students. The authors, McGinnis & Goldstein (1997), developed a list of
sixty prosocial skills that students should automatically learn incidentally, but are not learning in today’s social realm (Wolfgang, 1999). These prosocial skills are divided into the areas of classroom survival, making friends, dealing with feelings, alternatives to aggression, and dealing with stress. This model is a preventative or proactive process, similar to Peer Mediation. The skills are introduced, then students model, role-play, get and give feedback, and practice (transfer training).

The program involves nine steps: (1) define the skill (2) model the skill (3) establish student skill need (4) select the role-players (5) set up the role-play (6) conduct the role-play (7) provide performance feedback (8) assign skill homework (9) select next role-player.

*Summary of Classroom Management Theories*

A brief outline of current classroom management approaches and teacher/student interaction models has been described. No research has been provided to document that one model is superior to another. Rather, each model has strengths and weaknesses that must be considered when deciding which strategy would best meet student and teacher needs.

Wolfgang (1999) states that the student teacher is an intuitive-survival teacher. This preservice teacher has a limited repertoire of techniques to use, fluctuates between being permissive and harsh and will probably select one “face” and learn it well. Only after teaching for three or more years will this teacher then be ready to use the continuum of discipline models based on
student/teacher needs. It is important for preservice teachers to realize which “face” or philosophy fits their personality and beliefs type so that they have a meaningful starting point to naturally begin their management approach.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the methodology that was used to investigate changes in student teachers' beliefs about classroom management after they have completed their field experience. Included are the procedures for site and participant selection, tools and techniques for data collection, and the role of the researcher in the study. The protocol for this study was reviewed and approved by the university's Office of Sponsored Programs for a period of one year (see Appendix A).

Problem Statement and Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to examine and record student teachers' beliefs and knowledge about classroom management before they began their student teaching practice and again at the end of this experience. The goals were to report what teachers believe about classroom management before they had extensive experience in the classroom, and to observe and determine what the differences were in their beliefs as a result of their student teaching experience. The following questions provided a basis for inquiry and guided the data collection for this study:
1. What are the student teachers' beliefs about effective classroom management prior to and following their student teaching experience?

2. What changes occur in student teachers' beliefs about classroom management as a result of their experience?

3. What influences student teachers' beliefs about classroom management?

4. How do the cooperating teachers impact the student teachers' beliefs about effective classroom management?

Site Selection

The site for this study was based on availability and convenience. The researcher was an assistant principal at an elementary school and this school was selected for the study. Although it is not wise to conduct a qualitative study in the setting in which one is already employed (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998), the role of investigator would not be compromised because the student teachers were not employees of the site and therefore not under the researcher's immediate direction. Additionally, since the site was frequently used for purposes of student teaching, the researcher felt the findings could be maximized.

The demographics of the school site revealed that it was in an at-risk area based on socio-economic status. Approximately fifty-five percent of the population fell in the lower-income bracket. In addition, the ethnic ratio was
almost fifty percent Hispanic. Almost thirty-three percent of the students were identified as using Spanish as their primary and only language.

The school calendar followed a year-round schedule and, therefore, the school was open all year long. The students attended for one hundred eighty days on a rotating basis. The population was over nine hundred students, but one-fifth of students were on track break at any given time.

Criteria for Teacher Selection

Selection of cooperating teachers for the study was established prior to the beginning of the student teaching assignment. The elementary school was located near a teacher-education university, so student teachers were consistently assigned to the site. Therefore, student teachers were readily available for participant selection. Additionally, the school has at least five teachers at each grade level so the availability of a qualified pool of cooperating teachers was substantial. The cooperating teachers' effective level of management was already recognized through district teacher evaluations and observations. Successful management techniques were displayed in their classroom, noted by appropriate student behavior, rules, and consequences.

Participant Selection

The method used for participant selection was a nonprobability, convenience sampling (Merriam, 1998). A non-random sampling was appropriate for this
study as no generalizations were sought. Rather, the purpose of this study was to research in depth the beliefs about classroom management for this group of student teachers and their cooperating teachers.

For this particular fall semester, eight student teachers were originally assigned to the school site as part of the Project Thread program. This project was funded by a federal grant that the university had acquired. The basis for the grant involved placement of preservice teachers who showed an interest in technology into classrooms at specific school sites that had been identified as part of the grant. According to the grant, these student teachers were to be assigned to cooperating teachers who incorporated a significant amount of technology into classroom instruction. Cooperating teachers were chosen to mentor these student teachers based on their years of experience (they must have at least three years of classroom teaching experience), their technological expertise, and their overall ability to effectively teach and mentor student teachers. These student teachers would also be used as participants for this study.

Only four student teachers reported to the assigned school on the first day of the new school year. The other four either dropped from the student teaching seminar or were placed at other locations at the last minute. A meeting was held to explain the purpose and elements of this study to the student teachers, ask for their participation, and answer any questions. These student teachers were asked to consider the time commitment for the study, requirements to complete
the pencil and paper tasks, and the classroom observations. They all agreed to participate.

The cooperating teachers assigned to mentor these student teachers were then asked to participate in the study by completing two surveys that would identify their management preferences and beliefs. Their responses were used to determine the classroom management beliefs that were practiced in their classrooms to which their student teachers would be exposed. The cooperating teachers were asked to consider the time commitment for the study and the requirements to complete the surveys. All agreed to participate.

Anonymity

Participants of the study were offered complete anonymity. The student teachers and cooperating teachers were asked to sign a consent form for use of the data analysis in reporting findings. Additionally, in compliance with the University and the Teacher Induction Office with the School District, each subject signed a consent form that stated the purpose of the research, the extent that the data analysis would be used, the confidentiality of the participants, and the right to withdraw from the study (see Appendixes B and C).

Data Sources

In order to identify beliefs and examine changes, Richardson (1996) suggested using an open-ended qualitative approach. Methods used to gather
data follow the qualitative use of observation, interviewing, researcher
designed instruments, and content analysis of human artifacts (Lecompte &
Pressile, 1993). According to Patton, (1990), qualitative data consist of "direct
quotations from people about their experiences, opinions, feelings, and
knowledge; detailed descriptions of people's activities, behaviors, actions; and
excerpts, quotations, or entire passages" taken from documents (p.10). In
addition to these sources, a concept map, constructed by the participants, was
used to analyze student teacher beliefs about effective classroom management
(Neale & Johnson, 1994). Using these methods of data collection, the
researcher worked toward an understanding of the participants' beliefs about
classroom management, their personal interactions using their beliefs, and
captured and explained the changes in their beliefs and practices. The data
collection is summarized in Table 1.

**Researcher Designed Instruments**

This was a mixed design study that incorporated two questionnaires, a
concept map, interviews, field notes, and observations. Both qualitative and
quantitative measures were used; however, major findings were based primarily
on qualitative data. Two questionnaires were used to gain information about
classroom management beliefs and concepts. The first instrument (see
Appendix D), the Inventory of Classroom Management Styles, ICMS, (Martin &
Baldwin, 1993), identified participants' theoretical framework as it applied to the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Kind of Data to be Collected</th>
<th>Process of Analysis</th>
<th>Time of Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are the student teachers' beliefs about classroom management before and after student teaching?</td>
<td>Student teachers</td>
<td>Questionnaires, concept maps, interviews, observations</td>
<td>Transcription of oral text. Analysis of data collected from written artifacts. Observation and interaction during observations</td>
<td>First week of school, observations during the semester, last week of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes occur as a result of their student teaching experience?</td>
<td>Student teachers</td>
<td>Questionnaires, concept maps, interviews, observations</td>
<td>Domain analysis</td>
<td>Beginning of semester, during the semester, at the end of student teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What influences student teachers' beliefs about classroom management?</td>
<td>Student teachers</td>
<td>Questionnaires, concept maps, interviews, observations</td>
<td>Domain analysis, taxonomy of management</td>
<td>Ongoing throughout the semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do the cooperating teachers impact student teachers' beliefs about management?</td>
<td>Cooperating teachers</td>
<td>Questionnaires, interviews</td>
<td>Analysis of data collected from written artifacts and interviews</td>
<td>Ongoing throughout the semester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
continuum of control discussed earlier in the Three Faces of Discipline (Wolfgang, 1999) section in the literature review. The ICMS consisted of 24 statements that described a variety of management options. Each statement offered two choices and the participants were to circle one choice from each statement that best described what they would do in their own classroom. Each pair of choices for each statement consisted of one option that could be classified as more controlling than the other. Two points were given for the more controlling choice and one point for each less controlling choice. Total scores ranged from 24 (most non-interventionist or student controlled) to 48 (most interventionist, or teacher controlled). The scores in the mid-point of 36 indicated the interactionalist belief that both teacher and student control the classroom environment. This continuum is shown in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Behavior Continuum for ICMS Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-interventionist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Student control)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ICMS also included three sub-scales that identified dimensions of classroom management: person, instruction, and discipline. Statements were arranged so that responses for each of these areas could also be placed on the continuum for control. Responses for the person dimension ranged from 6 to 12 with 9 being the midpoint. For example, on the continuum, a score of 6 would indicate non-interventionist beliefs, 9 would define interactionist philosophy, and 12 would identify interventionist ideology. All three dimensions and their possible scores are illustrated on Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Behavior Continuum for Sub-scale Scores for ICMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-interventionist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person Dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction Dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline Dimension</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ICMS was administered to the student teachers prior to the beginning of their teaching experience and again at the end of the sixteen-week program. Cooperating teachers were also given the ICMS to determine their beliefs about control. Their answers were analyzed on the full scale and sub-scale parts.
Because the study sought to determine how the student teachers may have changed their beliefs, data from this instrument were examined by each answer and for movement along the continuum; therefore no quantitative data were used.

The other instrument used to gather data was the Classroom Management Questionnaire (Stripling, 1985). The questionnaire consisted of 21 statements that defined strategies that appear in six of Weber's classroom management approaches (Weber, 1994). This instrument used a likert scale to identify participants' ratings of how knowledgeable they were about each approach, how important they thought each approach was, and how often they used each approach (see Appendix E). The participants were asked to read each statement and then rate their answers. This instrument was given to the preservice teachers prior to and following the student teaching experience so that changes in beliefs' statements could be examined. Additionally, the master teachers were also administered this instrument so that their beliefs about the approaches could be analyzed. As with the ICMS, the data gathered from this questionnaire were analyzed by the answers to each statement. Additionally, the student teachers' ratings were compared with their cooperating teachers to determine how similar their beliefs had become. Again, no quantitative data were solicited.

**Participant-construct Surveys**

Before students reported to class, participants were asked to prepare a concept map. This concept map, a form of participant-construct survey
(LeCompte & Preissle, 1993), aided the researcher in understanding the participants’ beginning beliefs and concepts about effective classroom management prior to extensive classroom interaction. In individual interviews, each participant was asked to design a concept map, or graphic organizer, using the question, “How do teachers establish and maintain effective classroom management?” They were instructed to arrange their ideas around the subject, grouping them as needed. During the interview, the subjects were asked to explain their map as the interviewer probed for clarification. The participants were asked to complete this concept map again at the end of their student teaching assignment to examine changes that may have occurred in their beliefs about management after the practical classroom experience.

**Interviews**

Interviews are the most common form of data gathering in qualitative studies (Merriam, 1998). During the data collection, unstructured/informal (Merriam) or open-ended interviews (Patton, 1990) were conducted. These interviews were informal, with the focus on clarification of questionnaires and concept map answers, and after observing the participant in the classroom setting. Interviews were used to obtain the descriptions and interpretations of the participants’ multiple views about effective classroom management (Stake, 1995). Interview guides were designed to focus on specific questions and more open-ended questions that could be used to probe as needed (see Appendixes F and G). The interviews were tape recorded to ensure that everything said was preserved.
for later analysis. Notes were taken during the informal interviews following observations. Transcripts from all interviews were written and proved useful information in collecting descriptive data from the participants.

The interviews were held throughout the sixteen-week study. The initial interview was conducted during the first week that the student teachers were on campus. Using a general interview guide approach, the student teachers were probed about their background information to determine beliefs based on prior schooling and life experiences. Additionally, interpretations of important pedagogical knowledge gained through university coursework were sought during this initial interview. This initial interview also probed the participants’ classroom management beliefs based on their limited classroom experiences in practicum classes. The participants also had an opportunity to explain their concept maps.

Interviews were conducted after each teaching observation to analyze the teaching that had been observed and to offer suggestions. The researcher used an informal conversational approach. Student teachers were given the opportunity to explain and analyze the lesson that had been observed. Additional questions were used to probe their beliefs about how they felt their teaching and management skills were developing.

A final interview was conducted during the last week of student teaching. The student teachers had the opportunity to explain their second concept map, which was introduced in the same format as the first time. Additionally, the researcher
again used a general interview guide approach to discuss how the student teachers felt their beliefs about teaching and management had changed with sixteen weeks of experience in the classroom. Additionally, they were asked to critique their experiences.

The information gained through interviews with student teachers was valuable in explaining their beliefs. It provided rich examples of their beliefs about management. Additionally, their written concepts were more thoroughly explained, which helped triangulate (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998) the results from the questionnaires and concept maps.

Classroom Observations and Fieldnotes

One of the roles as an administrator is to move in and out of the classrooms. Student teachers were observed in these unscheduled classroom appearances, for either a brief period or for an entire lesson, and field notes were recorded. Observations focused on student teachers’ effective teaching methods and the classroom management techniques observed. During these observations, extensive fieldnotes were recorded for further analysis and reporting, keeping attentive to the environmental conditions that may have influenced the interactions occurring.

Document Review

Additional data were gathered by reviewing any classroom discipline citations and reports that were completed, as well as scheduled home notes to parents. These documents clarified the current management styles that were used during
student teaching. They were analyzed for frequency, and served as substitutes for records of events that the observer did not see directly (Stake, 1995).

Data Analysis

The task of data analysis includes comparing, contrasting, aggregating, and ordering the raw data (Lecompte & Preissle, 1993) in an effort to make sense from these data. In a qualitative study, data analysis involves looking for patterns, putting together what people say or think at different times and putting together similar things identified by different people. These authors suggested that the data analysis begin with a review of the research question, then proceed by scanning the raw data. A system of classification would then emerge for sorting or categorizing the data.

In qualitative research, the researcher focuses on each instant or activity, trying to analyze and synthesize for interpretation and patterns (Stake, 1995). In this regard, the constant comparison strategy (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Lecompte & Preissle, 1993) was used to collect and analyze the data simultaneously and continuously. Each incident from interviews, observations, field notes or questionnaires was compared with other incidents to search for patterns or theories.

This simultaneous data collection and analysis helped in the review of the research questions and determined if they were still relevant or if new ones
needed to be formulated. Additionally, patterns were identified as categorizing of findings began.

In this initial stage of analysis, data were tidied up, (Lecompte & Preissle, 1993), the coding and retrieval process was determined, and broad categories and relationships emerged. Analysis consisted of reading and rereading field notes, transcribing audiotapes and rereading these transcriptions, and looking for patterns related to, but not exclusive of the domains from the literature.

Initially, the three control domains from the ICMS, non-interventionist, interactionalist, and interventionist were used to determine how controlling each student teacher appeared. Also, the Classroom Management Questionnaire established which strategies were determined to be important and used by the student teachers. The concept map provided examples of strategies that these student teachers believed were important in effective management. These instruments provided valuable information but the data needed to be tied together.

To do this, Semantic Relationships from Spradley's Domain Analysis (1980) were used to aggregate the data into domains that shared properties and attributes. Spradley recommended constructing domains that contain cover terms or labels to define the domains. Cover terms were used in semantic relationship to define and organize the data. (See Table 4). These cover terms
### Table 4

**Examples of Spradley's Domains**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Included Terms: Elements of the Domain</th>
<th>Cover Terms: Title of the domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What a teacher believes about students as persons</td>
<td>is a kind of Person dimension of classroom management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher's beliefs about the capabilities/ expectations of students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher's beliefs about opportunity for student success</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher's beliefs about group spirit, focus and purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher's beliefs about classroom climate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher's beliefs about the physical environment of the classroom</td>
<td>is a kind of Instruction dimension of classroom management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher's beliefs about allocated time for instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher's beliefs about classroom procedures and routines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher's beliefs about monitoring the learning environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher's beliefs about who sets the classroom rules and which rules should be used</td>
<td>is a kind of Discipline dimension of classroom management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher's beliefs about positive and negative consequences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Management Approach</td>
<td>is a way to Non-interventionist-student controlled environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Emotional Management Approach</td>
<td>is a way to Interactionalist - student influenced environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructional Management Approach
Behavior Modification Management Approach  
Authoritarian Management Approach  
Intimidation Management Approach

is a way to Interventionist -teacher controlled environment

included the person, instruction and discipline dimensions of classroom management and non-interventionist, interactionalist and interventionist controlled environments. The first relationship used was strict inclusion, (X is a kind of Y). The other relationship used was means-end (X is a way to Y). Data analysis worksheets were prepared using the above mentioned cover terms to help organize the data.

In addition to the degree of control identified on the ICMS, the responses were analyzed according to three dimensions of management, the person dimension, instruction dimension, and discipline dimension, to determine what student teachers believed about control in each specific area. These dimensions were then applied to the responses on the concept maps as shown in Table 5. These responses were provided as an illustration of how data were codified and will be discussed in Chapters 4 and 5. The findings triangulated the data analysis of participant beliefs about teacher and student control of classroom management.

Next, the strategies on the Classroom Management Questionnaire were identified and grouped together into Weber's classroom approaches. Only six of the approaches had strategies listed in this instrument. These grouped
Table 5

*Concept Map Responses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teacher responses</th>
<th>Joe A</th>
<th>Joe B</th>
<th>John A</th>
<th>John B</th>
<th>Jane A</th>
<th>Jane B</th>
<th>Joy A</th>
<th>Joy B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Person</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. High expectations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Know the student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Safe, warm climate</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Encouragement</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Respect</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Team points, group focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instruction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Engaging lessons</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Classroom arrangement</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Routines, structure</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discipline</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Consistency</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Positive/Negative Rewards</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Consequences</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Student Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Procedures, Rules</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Praise</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: A = First concept map response  
B = Second concept map response

strategies were then placed in order of more student-centered or controlled approaches to the more teacher-controlled approaches. Then, participant responses could be identified along the same control continuum as the ICMS.
(See Table 6). Finally, key linkages in the data were identified that connected similar phenomenon.

Table 6

Overlay of Weber's Approaches on the Teacher Behavior Continuum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-interventionist</th>
<th>Interactionalist</th>
<th>Interventionist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Student control)</td>
<td>(Teacher and student controlled)</td>
<td>(Teacher control)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group Socioemotional Instructional Behavior Mod. Authoritarian Intimidation

While the domains were being developed, the observations and interviews became more focused. Steps in the Developmental Research Sequence (DRS) that Spradley (1980) described were followed to complete a thorough analysis of the data collected. These steps began with a wide focus on the social selection, in this case, gathering information about the classroom management beliefs of the student teachers. As the study continued and the domains were analyzed, more focused observations and data analysis were initiated.

A componential analysis, or the systematic search for attributes associated with categories (Spradley, 1980), was made to sort and group the contrasts found on the concept maps. Finally, theory was applied to the data and interpretations of the analysis addressed the questions from the study.
Coding the Data

The data were coded for easy retrieval. According to Reid (1992), data management can be divided into three categories: data preparation, data identification, and data manipulation. These categories required the use of a computer for easy retrieval and categorization. Microsoft Word and Inspirations were utilized to manage the data.

Some of the themes used for sorting and analyzing data were based on the literature review and were pre-established. Others were determined as a result of patterns that emerged during data collection and analysis. These themes are based on the research questions and are delineated in the following sections.

Theme One: Classroom Management Can Be Divided Into Three Broad Dimensions. As the literature review addressed, three management dimensions can be used to categorize teacher and student behaviors. These dimensions are called: person, instruction, and discipline. Different strategies and techniques for implementing effective classroom management fall into these three categories.

Theme Two: Teachers' Beliefs About Classroom Management Fall Along A Continuum Between Student-Controlled Behaviors and Teacher-Controlling Behaviors. The literature review also provided categories for strategies and techniques that teachers use to identify their beliefs about the amount of control needed for effective classroom management. These broad categories are non-interventionist at the student-controlled behavior end of the continuum to interventionist at the teacher-controlling end. In the middle is the interactionalist.
Theme Three: Weber's Classroom Approaches Can Be Implemented Along the Control Continuum. Strategies from six of Weber's approaches were used for statements in the Classroom Management Questionnaire and these were placed on the continuum of control to aid in analysis of teacher beliefs. The six approaches found in these statements include: Group Approach, Socio-emotional Approach, Instructional Approach, Behavior Modification Approach, Authoritarian Approach, and Intimidation Approach.

The Role of the Researcher

Using Gold's classic typology (as cited in Merriam, 1998), the researcher's role was that of an observer-as-participant. This allowed the researcher to be a participant in the classroom as the student teachers were observed. However, the researcher tried not to become involved in the setting's central activities, thus affecting the group's management. The researcher observed the teacher and the student teacher as part of the responsibilities as an administrator. However, the researcher narrowed the focus to include the identification of specific classroom-management techniques being used. The researcher watched and listened for key words, phrases or actions that could explain management style. The mix of participation and observation changed from time to time, as expected with any social interaction with the teachers and students.
CHAPTER 4

INTRODUCTION

This chapter details four case studies of student teachers Joe, John, Jane and Joy. Each student teacher's beliefs about classroom management have been organized into themes and categories as described in Chapter 3. Each case study is presented using the same format.

First, key influences on management beliefs prior to student teaching are discussed. These include the student teacher's biological background, prior schooling experiences, university classes in education and practicum experiences prior to student teaching. Next, the student teacher's beliefs about effective classroom management prior to student teaching are defined using data from the first concept map, questionnaires and interview. The third section addresses the classroom environment during student teaching. This section describes the cooperating teacher's beliefs about effective management as well as their questionnaire results. Additionally, information gathered from the classroom observations is discussed. Finally, the last section focuses on the student teacher's beliefs about effective classroom management at the end of their student teaching experience. Data from the second concept map and
questionnaires are discussed. A summary is found at the end of each case study.

Case Study One: Joe

Key Influences on Management Beliefs Prior to Student Teaching

When looking at influences that affected Joe's beliefs about classroom management, the researcher looked at his background experiences with schooling, his educational foundations and his prior experiences in the classroom. As the review of literature revealed, his prior schooling experiences and the educational socialization process helped form his early beliefs about effective classroom management processes.

Joe is in the 30 to 39 years old category. He grew up in a small town and attended small schools. Joe remarked that he was never in trouble at school. He explained:

I honestly never had any trouble in school. My grades were average and I loved to play sports, which kept me out of trouble. I think having coaches in my life kept me from going the wrong way. I don't have many memories of school or what the classrooms looked like. I was very shy during my elementary years and I became most liked in high school. If the other students got in trouble, they were either suspended or swatted with a wooden paddle.

Joe was asked why he wanted to become a teacher. He admitted:

I had always wanted to be in the teaching profession. There is a desire to be in a profession that would allow myself to give back to the community and teaching was a great avenue to take. The only influence from family came from my wife. She encouraged me to finish my degree while working full-time. She agreed for me to take a reduction of income.
When looking at formal education in classroom management strategies, Joe felt that most of the undergraduate classes provided information about classroom management. Additionally, one course, Classroom Management for Elementary Teachers, directly targeted techniques. When asked what formal classroom management techniques or strategies he had received at the university, he stated:

I would say most of my education courses that lead into the classroom deal with classroom management just because it's talked about so much. The classes that are directed straight towards classroom management are, of course, the classroom management class that we have to take. There's a couple of classes early on that you would take that would deal with classroom management but encompasses a larger range of what you're going to be doing in the classroom. Plus your observations and your practicums, that deal with management as well.

When asked what the salient points were that Joe gleaned from the coursework, he admitted that most of the things he learned came straight from the textbook. In explaining the impact of the information he stated:

I haven't had my own classroom and I can't say what works for me but what we have learned is a lot of different strategies about different ideas that people can use. I think that some of the strategies might work for one person and might not work for others. Mostly what we got from those courses has given us a wealth of information of what we can try in the classroom and what works for us personally and what fits our style so we can use it. I think that's what it's brought to us.

The next area that impacted Joe's beliefs about classroom management involved the field experiences in the classroom. He had completed two practicum experiences that included thirty hours each of observation in classroom settings. His first observation was in a fifth grade classroom and he observed a third grade for his second practicum. When asked about the
management experiences he had in these classrooms, Joe expressed his concern that he didn’t have the control he thought he would have, because he was emulating the teacher’s system, not his own. He was asked to elaborate about these practicum experiences, and he concluded that:

They’re kind of artificial because you don’t have that much control over the students. The teacher did say that they had a point system, a positive reward system. I could use it if I felt there was a need to, if there’s a time. From the beginning the students understood that I’m a practicum student, that I’m going to be teaching the class and I need to have as much respect as the teacher in the class. At the same time, I really didn’t have any way of controlling the class or discipline or anything like that. The kids did pretty well. But they did act differently when I was there. They were rowdier and liked to talk and chatted a little more. I don’t think as a practicum student that I had the control I would have in my own classroom. It was difficult for me to even attempt to at times and other times I would need their attention.

Joe then mentioned some techniques like, "Give me five", which is a procedure for gaining student attention, but didn’t suggest that he had used it. This explanation indicated that Joe did not feel comfortable using another teacher’s established management system. This belief would actually interfere with his successful student teaching experience, which will be explained later.

Joe was asked to describe any strategies or techniques that the practicum experiences provided that he liked or disliked. He indicated that he liked the positive reward system that was used in the classrooms. He believed that the students were more engaged when they had something to look forward to.

When asked to explain the positive rewards that were used, he cited positive comments like, “Great job”, a point system to earn points towards something like a pizza party, team rewards, and individual rewards. He stated, “It’s good
feedback for the kids." He also voiced his approval of well thought out
lesson plans. He felt that if the lessons were good, and if the students were into
what they were doing along with a positive reward system, "most kids are going
to be on task, from what I've seen."

Joe expressed his concern about the lack of an effective management
system in the third grade practicum. He proclaimed that the students didn't really
have a set of procedures to follow during the first fifteen minutes of the morning.
In this particular classroom, the students had fifteen minutes before they went to
their specials, either art, music, physical education or library. He outlined the
problem as follows:

The first fifteen minutes was purely wasted time because there was not a
procedure to put their stuff away, like let's get to work or something.
Basically, the kids were talking, and I didn't like that at all. The kids were
used to going crazy for those fifteen minutes. The rest of the day seemed to
go pretty smooth, though.

Beliefs About Effective Classroom Management Prior to Student Teaching

These early experiences with schooling and formal educational training
supplied Joe with a belief foundation that he would use when he began his
student teaching. A look at his pre-student teaching beliefs will outline his
pedagogical philosophy about effective classroom management.

Concept Map

A close examination of the first concept map that Joe was asked to complete
showed a rather simple, one-tiered management plan (see Figure 1).
Figure 1. Initial concept map for Joe, before student teaching
Around the topic of, "How do teachers establish and maintain effective classroom management", he revealed seven belief statements. Three statements dealt with well-written lesson plans, high expectations, and classroom arrangement. Additionally he had three broad categories that he loosely grouped as follows: choice, consistency and positivism; positive and negative reward system, structure and routine, and procedures, rules and consequences; and students must feel loved, respected, and safe, warm social climate. The last statement, although not ordered, states a belief that, "the teacher must maintain professional growth, health, and keep mentally refreshed."

When Joe was asked to describe his concept map that he had completed, he cited the most important aspect would be the positive reward system. Additionally, he cited well written lesson plans that are meaningful to the students as important. He stated, "You can do what’s engaging and interesting to the kids. School can be boring and that can hurt your management for you."

Joe was asked if he would rank the concepts in order of importance and he concluded:

I could rank them but I do believe there’s some that go into a well developed effective classroom management plan and if you leave certain aspects out of it, it’s going to hurt you. If you tie them all together, and make it work for you, that would be the most effective management system for you.

Joe continued with his explanation of the concept map, describing the importance for teachers to retain their positiveness and their health. He expressed his belief that a teacher needs to be exercising, and come into the
classroom with the belief that that was going to be the best day, because it reflects on the students. He exclaimed, "Some people probably don't think of this but if you come to school feeling lousy, chances are you won't want to teach."

Student expectations were also seen as very important. Joe explained that the students needed to know what the teacher has planned to do. Additionally, he felt the teacher should let the students know that they were expected to achieve. He concluded his explanation by saying, "I can take these and what works for me and work them into my classroom management."

Surveys

ICMS.

In addition to the concept map, Joe completed the two surveys to determine his theoretical perception or style of classroom management. As explained in Chapter III, the ICMS identifies participants' beliefs about classroom management along a continuum between non-interventionist, interactionalist, and interventionist ideology (Martin & Baldwin, 1993). Looking at Joe's first ICMS survey results, as shown in Table 7, his total score of 40, on a continuum of 24 to 48, is halfway between the interactionalist (36) and the interventionist (48) concepts. This would indicate that he would support teacher behaviors that emphasize a certain amount of teacher power on student behavior and classroom management.

Using the Framework for the ICMS Dimensions (Martin & Baldwin, 1993) the ICMS subscale scores can be examined for specific management behaviors
Table 7

*Initial ICMS scores for Joe*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Joe’s Score (X)</th>
<th>Non-interventionist</th>
<th>Interactionalist</th>
<th>Interventionist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person Dimension</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Minimum score 6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Maximum score 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction Dimension</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline Dimension</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(see Appendix H). On the person dimension, Joe scored 9 on a scale of 6-12. This scale measures the teacher’s perception of student abilities and the overall psychosocial climate, again on a continuum of teacher influence and power. Joe’s score suggests that he would support a classroom environment that would provide joint solutions, using student independence, creativity and self-expression, and teacher controls.

Joe scored 22 on the ICMS subscale score for the instructional dimension. Since the range of scores is between 12 to 24 on the continuum of power, his score suggested a strong teacher control over such factors as physical arrangement, seating, and materials. Additionally, on-task behaviors, including
daily routines and transitions, would be closely monitored and controlled by close proximity, assessment, and teacher selection of instructional activities.

On the third ICMS dimension, discipline, Joe scored 9, once again halfway between the ranges of 6 to 12. This score suggested that Joe would use a variety of strategies for setting rules and acknowledging appropriate and inappropriate behaviors. Students would have some degree of control over their environment; however, Joe would also provide some control.

In summary of this survey, Joe scored within the interactionalist range on the personal and discipline dimensions and very strongly in the interventionist range on the instructional dimension. These findings support his comments during interviews and on the concept map, when he credited well thought out lesson plans and a reward system as being very important in an effective classroom management system. He did add that the plans would need to be engaging, focusing on student interest and support.

*Classroom Management Questionnaire.*

On the other questionnaire that Joe completed, the Classroom Management Questionnaire, the focus turned to specific techniques used for classroom management. Joe was asked to read twenty-one specific classroom management strategies. Using a likert scale ranging from 1 to 5, with 1 meaning not at all or never to 5 meaning very knowledgeable about the strategy, very important strategy, or very frequently used, he was asked to mark his thoughts about these strategies. The questionnaire listed strategies aligned with Weber's
classroom approaches (1994), discussed in Chapter II, to determine the classroom management style of the person. The six approaches that the strategies described, can be placed along a control continuum similar to the ICMS. Arranged from least teacher influence or control to the most is as follows: group; socioemotional; instructional; behavior modification; authoritarian; and intimidation.

When looking at Joe's answers to these strategies, as shown in Table 8, in the area of importance, he identified four of the five group strategies as most important (23/25), two of the three socioemotional strategies as most important (14/15), both of the instructional strategies as most important (10/10), two of the four behavior modification strategies most important (17/20), and two of the three authoritarian strategies as most important (13/15). Only on the intimidation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Socio-Emotional</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Behavior Modification</th>
<th>Authoritarian</th>
<th>Intimidation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Possible score</td>
<td>5-25</td>
<td>3-15</td>
<td>2-10</td>
<td>4-20</td>
<td>3-15</td>
<td>4-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
strategies did he show little or no importance (9/20). These results would indicate that Joe felt most of the strategies were most important to use when managing a classroom. While he felt the strategies were important, Joe did not rate his use of them very high in this pre-student teaching questionnaire. Overall, only three of the twelve strategies that were given the highest rating were marked with a 5 in the area of use. Additionally, only two of these were given a 5 rating in the knowledgeable category.

The Classroom Environment During Student Teaching

Joe was given his choice of assignments for his teaching internship and was placed in a fifth grade classroom. The classroom was located in a portable building at the back of the campus because the school was going through renovation. All of the fourth and fifth grade classes were located in the portables and were grouped together to provide close proximity for departmentalization of academic subjects and grade level sharing. Because the school followed a year-round calendar, this class would recess for track break during the middle of the semester. Joe was notified that during the three-week track break, he would continue his internship in a first grade classroom with a pair of team teachers.

Joe entered the student teaching environment with preconceived beliefs about classroom management as described in the previous section. His internship began the same day as the teachers reported to school so he was able to witness the beginning of the school year. When asked about this timing,
he expressed his gratitude that he was able to see how a classroom management system was implemented from the beginning of the school year.

Joe was also amazed at the amount of work that goes into starting a school year and shared with me:

I like that I'm starting from day one. I get in on what's going on. I think there's more than I expected. I didn't realize what happens before the kids get here. You always step into the classroom and wonder, why is this, where does this go. This way you get to see it from the get go.

Joe was asked to explain what he had seen so far about the classroom management system being implemented in his classroom. He stated that he was just observing while the cooperating teacher set up her policies and procedures.

He spoke of the teacher setting up the classroom and admitted:

So far I'm pretty much sitting back and letting her set up her policies, her management system, her procedures, her rules and school wide rules. She does have a positive reward system and I like that. So far, I've just let her get the kids set up in their routine. The kids already know the system and what's expected. She wants her classroom set up of course. That's the way she's going to be doing it.

The Cooperating Teachers

Joe's cooperating teacher, referred to as T1, was an experienced teacher, having taught intermediate grades for over five years. She had just completed her Master's Degree program in Administration and was looking forward to beginning the district's administrative leadership training. She was a strict teacher, but fair and consistent. Her students traditionally performed well on standardized tests and she had a strong understanding of the district's academic curriculum. T1 was also the chairman of the school site's discipline committee.
and was responsible for implementing the school-wide discipline program that had been in effect for the past year. Joe was her first student teacher.

T1 completed the ICMS and the Classroom Questionnaire so that her management style could be assessed. Her overall score on the ICMS was 31. When compared to the range between 24 and 48, it is apparent that she fell between the non-interventionist and the interactionalist range on the classroom management continuum. It should be noted that T1 scored at the opposite end of the management continuum from her student teacher, Joe. Using these data, this teacher would most likely allow student choice in many management decisions.

On the ICMS subtests, T1 scored 7 on a scale from 6 to 12 in the person dimension, 19 on a scale from 12 to 24 in the instruction dimension and 11 on a scale from 6 to 12 on the discipline dimension. Using the ICMS framework for teacher behaviors, the data suggested that T1 believed that students could be independent and individual. She would create a warm, respectful classroom environment that provides group cohesiveness and high expectations. T1 would tend to control the physical environment of the classroom, hold students accountable for work completion, and keep academic learning time at a premium. With discipline, she would probably determine the classroom rules and effectively enforce stated rewards and consequences.

On the Classroom Questionnaire, T1 identified the group and socioemotional approaches as most important. On the group subtest, she chose two of the five
strategies as very important (19/25) and in the socioemotional approach, she gave two of the three strategies a 5 rating (14/15). The intimidation approach received the lowest rating (7/20) and the behavior modification score fell next (14/20). These results supported the findings from the ICMS that suggest that T1 would provide a classroom that enables students to become independent and work together while providing logical consequences, praise, and encouragement.

When asked to describe her classroom management system, T1 outlined this system admitting that she does several different things:

I have the rules and consequences listed on a chart and I follow them very consistently. If a student gets a warning for breaking one of the three school rules, their name goes in the behavior log. It then continues with checks next to the name. I don't like to put kids names on the board because I think that can be embarrassing to look at all day. I keep the behavior log on my desk. I usually put the names in the book myself, or sometimes I tell a student to do it. If a student gets a warning, they may not play the game at the end of the day and they do not get a star on the behavior chart. Anyone who does not get a warning, receives a star for the day. Students may cash their stars in for prizes every three weeks or they can build them up. The prizes that they choose are things that we have discussed that they would like to earn: computer passes, homework passes, trinkets, candy, lunch with the teacher. I try to do a lot of passes that don't cost me money.

T1 continued explaining her individual plan, outlining the recurring offenses. If the students continued to misbehave, the additional steps included: 10 minute lunch detention with the teacher, a citation and two days lunch detention, and then a discipline referral. In addition to the individual plan, T1 acknowledged that she also provided a team plan. She began her explanation:

I have team points. We switch seats every three weeks and teams need to work cooperatively to earn points. They can earn points for being ready,
being quiet, having all of their homework, all kinds of reasons. I usually let the students pick their own seats because I can use that as leverage to help maintain good behavior. It is also a good way to teach them how to make good choices for themselves. The team that earns the most points in the three-week period has lunch with me. Sometimes we have pizza, sometimes we cook, sometimes I cook, it is always a surprise. They never know what they’re going to get.

Lastly, T1 addressed the particular behavior needs of individual students. She concluded that she used a daily home note. It is a chart with targeted behaviors on it that are unique for each child. T1 explained that this note helps keep the parents informed and is a good way to give daily feedback to the students. As she completed her explanation, she stated, “Most importantly, every day is a new day and kids deserve a fresh start. Secondly, I think it is necessary to be truthful with kids and let them know the rules. Then implement them fairly and consistently.”

Joe spent thirteen of his sixteen weeks of internship with T1. However, when she went on track break, he was moved to a first grade classroom for three weeks. During this time, he observed the team teachers but did not teach any lessons. These teachers were also asked to complete the ICMS and the Classroom Questionnaire so their management styles could be assessed. Although Joe did not spend a significant amount of time in their classroom, the researcher felt that these teachers’ styles may impact his classroom management beliefs. Because these teachers taught together, their scores will be shared together.
T2 and T3 both have three years of teaching experience, all in first grade. They worked well together and provided an excellent example of effective team teaching. They both currently have Bachelor’s Degrees but are working towards completion of a Master’s Degree.

On the ICMS, T2 had a total score of 35, while T3 scored 34, which places both of them in the interactionalist range. On the subtests, their scores were as follows: person dimension, T2 = 6, T3 = 7; instruction dimension, T2 = 20, T3 = 19; discipline dimension, T2 = 9, T3 = 8. For the person dimension, both teachers fell in the non-interventionist range. Using the framework for teacher behavior on the ICMS dimensions, these results would indicate that both teachers felt strongly that students can be independent, individual, and capable. Additionally they would most likely provide a warm, safe environment that encourages a group spirit, respect, friendliness, and opportunities for student success.

Both teachers scored in the interactionalist range in the instruction component. This would imply that they would use joint solutions between teacher and student control for issues involving the physical arrangement, time, classroom routines, and student learning behaviors. On the discipline dimension, both teachers again scored in the interactionalist range. These teachers would provide some control while allowing student input on rule setting, rewards, consequences, and praise.
The Classroom Questionnaire was then provided to determine the classroom management approaches that these teachers believed were important. Again, both teachers scored within a point of each other so their scores will be presented together.

T2 and T3 both expressed importance in the group, socioemotional and instructional strategies found in the questionnaire. T2 scored 23/25 and T3 scored 24/25, with both acknowledging four of the five strategies in the group approach as very important. Of the socioemotional strategies, T2 marked all three strategies as most important, scoring 15/15, while T3 scored 14/15, showing two of the three strategies as very important. Both teachers believed that the two instructional strategies were most important, giving both a score of 5.

The strategies found in the authoritarian and behavior modification segments showed some importance to these teachers, although not as high as those already mentioned. T2 scored a 10/15 while T3 scored 13/15 on the authoritarian strategies. However, they both felt that establishing and enforcing rules were very important. Their scores on the behavior modification strategies, 15/20 and 16/20, respectively, illustrate that they feel some of these strategies are important. They both indicated that positive reinforcement was very important while the other strategies were given ratings of 3 or 4.
The intimidation classroom management strategies were not selected to be as important to either T2 or T3. The intimidation segment scores, 7/20 and 8/20, would suggest that these strategies are not consistently used in their classroom.

When asked to describe their classroom environment in terms of classroom management these teachers revealed their management plan:

All of our classroom management is positively enforced. We use both individual and group incentives. The students sit in teams and they earn team points. These are totaled at the end of each day and the winning team gets to see what's in a mystery envelop as a prize. Usually included are pencils, or the school-wide tokens, sticker, candy. Individually, the kids get their name put on the board if they're caught being good. They get stars put next to their name for each time they're good. Each star earns a ticket and at the end of the week, five tickets are drawn and those students earn a prize. It’s like a lottery.

T2 went on to conclude that for behavior problems, they do daily contracts after conferencing with the parents. She did admit that they rarely had to use the contracts.

*The Student Teaching Experience*

During the sixteen weeks that Joe completed his student teaching internship, he was observed twice to monitor lessons that he was teaching. Field notes were taken using the classroom observation checklist to check for satisfactory progress in the district’s Elements for Quality Schools. In the area of learning environment, Joe was found to be satisfactory in all areas.

On the first evaluation, twelve weeks into his internship, Joe seemed somewhat uncomfortable but the researcher assumed it was because he was
being evaluated. He had developed quick transitions, “Let’s switch gears into Math”, and provided positive verbal feedback to the student responses. Additionally, Joe used team points for positive rewards, proclaiming, “I need you to…” and “I’m looking for a team that’s ready to go”. A class game was evident on the white board. Some letters and dashes, signifying missing letters, were written. The missing letters were added as the students behaved appropriately. Joe moved about the room, monitoring independent student work and reminded students of time limits. He allowed one student, known for his over-active movements, to wiggle and move about the room as needed. The lesson was satisfactory, but neither exciting nor mundane. The academic objectives were met but student engagement was more solicited, rather than volunteered.

Joe was offered several suggestions for improving his management. First, it was suggested that he be consistent with his commands. For instance, when he stated, “1,2,3, eyes on me”, he did not wait until everyone was looking at him before he began the explanation. This happened several times, so the need for consistency and follow through with those types of attention seeking commands was explained. Additionally, it was suggested that he make sure that all students participated in the activity by monitoring each group closely and repeating the activity until all participated.

At the supervisory conference, Joe agreed with these suggestions. He remarked that following the present management system was a little difficult as he would do things differently but he did not elaborate, even after he was asked
to clarify this statement. He accepted the constructive criticism and asked that he be reevaluated again at a later date.

Before the second observation occurred, Joe's cooperating teacher expressed alarm in his failure to meet the expectancies of the internship. She outlined problems with lesson planning, initiative, and classroom management. Joe's teaching experience seemed to have turned sour after the three-week track break. His explanation revealed:

I was just getting my momentum and my confidence going when the track break occurred. I was then sent to the first grade classroom, which I really enjoyed, but I was thrown off track with the teaching experience. I only observed in that classroom, so I didn't start officially teaching full day until late in my internship. I think that really hurt my confidence and initiative.

Additionally, Joe felt that communication between him and the cooperating teacher was not effective. He felt uncomfortable developing lesson plans without her input, while she thought he should plan whatever he thought would be appropriate, using the district curriculum guides. He also expressed the continued concern that the class belonged to her and so did the procedures, rules, and consequences. After much discussion, it was decided that Joe should continue for two extra weeks with his student teaching experience, in the hopes of developing the confidence to teach independently of the master teacher's influence. These two weeks would decide if he successfully completed his internship and could pursue a teaching career.

The second observation occurred the last week of extended student teaching. Joe had implemented the suggestions that had been given to him and
he seemed much more at ease. He had developed and implemented
effective lesson plans for the entire week. Additionally, he demonstrated more
ease with monitoring students and verbally correcting inappropriate behaviors.

When asked about the rapport that he had established with the students, he
remarked, "I feel I have a great rapport with my students."

**Joe’s Beliefs About Effective Classroom Management**

*Following Student Teaching*

Joe was able to successfully complete his student teaching internship. Prior
to his leaving, he was again asked to complete the ICMS, the Classroom
Management Questionnaire and design another concept map with the same
subject, "How do teachers establish and maintain effective classroom
management?" He was then interviewed about his responses for clarification.

When Joe was asked to explain how he felt about his student teaching
experience, he admitted:

Unfortunately, I had the feeling that I was unable to utilize my full
management skills because I felt I was working under the framework of my
master teacher. I felt a sense of loss there and I had a little different view.
With my own class, I would definitely be more of a disciplinarian. I would
definitely need to follow through with what I have. The kids understand that
you mean it and this is how it’s going to work. That just commands respect
on both ends.

Joe was asked to elaborate about the techniques that he used in the
classrooms or the techniques he liked that were used. He expressed a definite
approval for the point system, where students worked in teams. He concluded, "I
think that's really effective. If they want to work together and do the best they can, students will help each other working on their rules."

Joe went on to describe how the points could be used for a positive reward system. The fifth grade class had used the points to earn a pizza party. He explained that the team with the most points after a three week period earned a party. Another option that he enjoyed seeing was when the team winners got to have lunch with the teacher. When the researcher expressed surprise that fifth graders would enjoy lunch with their teacher, he exclaimed, "They were excited. If it works, then go with it."

Joe seemed to think that there were endless effective strategies that could be used in classroom management dealing with a positive reward system. He told of the first graders getting excited by earning stars for their homework or good behavior. These were traded in for treasure chest items. He also spoke of inexpensive items that could be used as incentives, like sitting in the teacher's chair, educational games or homework passes.

When asked if there were any strategies that he had observed that he felt were not effective his reply was:

I don't think so. I think just definitely following through on your consequences might not have happened all of the time. I think that if you don’t follow through one time then the kids will be right on top of that.

Joe was asked if he thought the student teaching experience had changed any of his beliefs about effective classroom management. He acknowledged that he didn’t think anything had changed drastically by concluding:
I think you go in with a perception of this is how it’s going to work and then you get into the classroom and it’s the real world. Probably every classroom is going to be unique. I think every strategy you use may change, maybe just molded to fit that classroom. We’ve been taught strategies in our management classes and with what you’ve seen in your practicums and student teaching, what system works just depends on what works best for you. If you don’t think it’s effective or the kids don’t like it, you can change it up and make it better.

From this statement, the researcher understood that Joe felt any strategy could work if he and the students liked it. This presented the researcher with a question about the management system Joe intended to implement when he began teaching. When asked to tell about this system he proclaimed:

I think it’s important on the first day to let the kids know what the rules are, what the procedures are, what the consequences are. But I really think they need to be rehearsed, talked about, and discussed so everyone has a clear idea what’s going to be happening that year. The classroom must be run a certain way and we must all work together. I think the kids respect that first and foremost. My classroom has to be set properly so I can effectively work in it.

Although Joe seemed positive about the strategies, there was concern that he didn’t have a more specific plan outlined.

Concept Map

Our attention turned to the second concept map Joe had designed (see Figure 2). This map was still a simple organizer with 14 topics circled and arranged around the concept. These included team point system, praise and encouragement, respect, positive rewards, resources and materials, engaging lessons, room arrangement, withitness, procedures, rules, routines, logical consequences, create a warm climate where the student feel safe, and follow
How do teachers establish and maintain effective classroom management?

- Room arrangement
- Withitness
- Procedures
- Engaging lessons
- Resources, materials
- Rules
- Routines
- Logical consequences
- Positive reward
- Create a warm climate where the student feels safe
- Follow through with consequences
- Praise, encouragement
- Team point system
- Respect

Figure 2. Joe's second concept map after student teaching
through with the consequences. It was interesting to note that these were all management strategies, but were not apparently interrelated according to Joe.

Comparing both concept maps, it's interesting to note that the first map had seven topics arranged around the concept. The second map actually contained most of the same strategies as the first; however, they were listed individually instead of grouped as in the first. Gone from the second map was the mention of teacher growth, either physical or mental. Also missing were the terms choice, positivism, and high expectations. Additional terms added to the second map included resources and materials, respect, praise and encouragement, withitness, logical consequences, and team point system. With the exception of the first entry, the other topics all addressed specific positive rewards or consequences and are strategies used in the socioemotional approach to classroom management.

Surveys

The ICMS was again administered to view Joe's beliefs after his student teaching experience. As shown in Table 9, although his first total score was 40 (in a range from 24-48), his second score dropped to 37, which placed him in the interactionalist range. It's interesting to note that the three teachers he worked with had total scores of 31, 35, and 34. It appeared that he moved closer to their range of beliefs.
Table 9

*A scattergram of the relationship between Joe’s scores and those of his cooperating teachers’ scores on the ICMS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Joe’s initial score (X)</th>
<th>Joe’s 2nd score (Y)</th>
<th>T1 score (*)</th>
<th>T2/3 score (+)</th>
<th>Non-interventionist</th>
<th>Interventionist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6/7</td>
<td>Minimum Score</td>
<td>Maximum score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20/19</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y+</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35/34</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. T1 = cooperating teacher; T2 and T3 = track out cooperating teachers

The scores for each of the three dimensions showed the same tendency. For instance, in the person dimension, Joe initially scored a 9 but later scored a 7, on a scale of 6-12. His teachers’ scores were 7, 6, and 7. These scores are all in the noninterventionist range which implies that one would expect to see an environment that supports student independence, high expectations, opportunities for success, and a warm, social climate with group cohesiveness.

On the instruction dimension, Joe’s first score was 22 on a scale of 12-24, followed by a score of 19 on the second try. The teachers’ score were 17, 20, and 19. Again, Joe seemed to move closer to the master teachers’ beliefs. This
score moved him into the interactionalist range, which would imply that Joe would likely give students more choice in their physical environment, their daily routines and assignments, and their study behaviors.

Joe’s score on the last dimension, discipline, moved up from a score of 9 to 11, in a range of 6-12. The cooperating teachers’ scores were 7, 9, and 8. Again this difference supports Kagan’s (1992) research that suggests that novice teachers become more authoritarian after their initial teaching experiences. Joe moved from an interactionalist range with this score to an interventionist range, indicating that he would most likely control the rule setting and rewards/consequences area of classroom management. The responses for Joe and his cooperating teachers on the ICMS can be found in Appendix I.

The Classroom Management Questionnaire provides further changes in Joe’s beliefs as shown in Table 10. Again his second scores seemed to align more with the scores of his cooperating teachers, especially with T1, the teacher he spent 13 of the 16 weeks with. Looking at total scores, Joe first scored 63 on how knowledgeable he felt about each strategy and then scored 86 at the end of his internship. His teachers’ scores were 86, 73, and 92. In the area of importance, Joe initially scored 86 but lowered that score to 75. The teachers’ scores were 73, 80, and 85. On how much he used these strategies, the first score of 41 was raised to 74, indicating that he was able to use several of these strategies. The cooperating teachers scored 75, 70, and 77 respectively.
Table 10

*Responses on the Classroom Management Questionnaire for Joe and his Cooperating Teachers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Joe's initial score</th>
<th>Joe's second score</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K I U</td>
<td>K I U</td>
<td>K I U</td>
<td>K I U</td>
<td>K I U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Meetings</td>
<td>2 5 1</td>
<td>5 3 3</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
<td>3 3 2</td>
<td>4 4 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Interpersonal Relationships</td>
<td>4 5 3</td>
<td>3 3 4</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>4 5 4</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withitness and Overlapping</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td>4 5 4</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting Productive Group Norms</td>
<td>2 3 1</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>4 5 4</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering Group Cohesiveness</td>
<td>3 5 1</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>4 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GROUP</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total 5-25</strong></td>
<td><strong>16 23 11</strong></td>
<td><strong>19 17 18</strong></td>
<td><strong>19 19 19</strong></td>
<td><strong>19 23 19</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical Consequences</td>
<td>3 4 1</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>4 5 4</td>
<td>5 5 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reality Therapy</td>
<td>3 5 1</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>4 5 4</td>
<td>4 4 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise/Encouragement</td>
<td>4 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>4 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIOEMOTIONAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total 3-15</strong></td>
<td><strong>10 14 7</strong></td>
<td><strong>14 14 14</strong></td>
<td><strong>14 14 14</strong></td>
<td><strong>12 15 13</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Expectations and Routines</td>
<td>4 5 2</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting, Relevant, Appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td>4 5 4</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSTRUCTIONAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total 2-10</strong></td>
<td><strong>9 10 7</strong></td>
<td><strong>10 10 10</strong></td>
<td><strong>8 8 8</strong></td>
<td><strong>9 10 9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Reinforcement</td>
<td>4 5 3</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 4 5</td>
<td>4 5 4</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extinction/Time Out</td>
<td>3 3 2</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 3 3</td>
<td>4 4 3</td>
<td>4 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Token Economy Systems</td>
<td>3 5 1</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>5 3 5</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency Contracting</td>
<td>2 4 1</td>
<td>3 3 2</td>
<td>5 4 3</td>
<td>3 3 2</td>
<td>4 4 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BEHAVIOR MOD.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total 4-20</strong></td>
<td><strong>12 17 7</strong></td>
<td><strong>17 17 16</strong></td>
<td><strong>20 14 16</strong></td>
<td><strong>14 15 13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Strategies | Joe’s initial score | Joe’s second score | T1 | T2 | T3 |
| | K | I | U | K | I | U | K | I | U | K | I | U |
| Mild Desists | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 |
| Establish/Enforce Rules | 4 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Isolation/Exclusion | 3 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 2 |

| AUTHORITARIAN | Total | 3-15 | 9 | 13 | 5 | 12 | 11 | 10 | 14 | 11 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 13 | 13 | 10 |
| Harsh Reprimands | 3 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| Corporal Punishment | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Threats | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Punishment | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 |

| INTIMIDATION | Total | 4-20 | 7 | 9 | 4 | 14 | 6 | 6 | 11 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 15 | 8 | 7 |
| TOTALS | Knowledge | 63 | 86 | 86 | 73 | 92 |
| | Importance | 86 | 75 | 73 | 80 | 85 |
| | Used | 41 | 74 | 75 | 70 | 77 |

*Note. K = knowledge score; I = importance score; U = understanding score. T1 = cooperating teacher; T2 and T3 = track-out cooperating teachers.*

Looking at each of the six approaches, the data indicated that Joe had changed some of his original beliefs. The importance score on the group strategies dropped from 23/25 to 17/25, indicating Joe did not believe these strategies were as important as previously thought. His master teachers scored 19, 23, and 24. Although the team teachers’ (T2 and T3) scores were much higher, we need to remember that Joe was only in their classroom for three
weeks. This group score would support Joe's score on the discipline dimension on the ICMS where he moved to a more teacher controlled range.

The socioemotional importance score on Joe's questionnaires stayed the same, with a score of 14/15. The knowledge and frequent use areas increased from 10/15 to 14/15 and from 7/15 to 14/15, probably because all three teachers indicated that they felt these strategies were important and used them often. Their scores were: 14,14,14; 12,15,13; and 14,14,12, on the knowledge, importance and used areas respectively. The socioemotional scores again supported Joe's scores on the ICMS person dimension, where he scored in the noninterventionist range.

Joe's instructional and behavior modification scores stayed the same in the importance areas, 10/10 and 17/20, with increases evident in the knowledge, 9/10 to 10/10 in instructional and 12/20 to 17/20 in behavior modification. Additionally, scores increased in the used areas for these strategies from 7/10 to 10/10 in instruction and 7/20 to 16/20 in behavior modification. Interestingly, his major cooperating teacher, T1, scored less in the importance area on both of these; whereas all three cooperating teachers scored near the same on the use area. This would indicate that because these strategies were used, Joe continued to believe they were important.

Joe's authoritarian and intimidation importance scores fell from 13/15 and 9/20 to 11/15 and 6/20, again reflecting his cooperating teachers' scores on importance and use. It is interesting to note that T1 scored six strategies with a 5
in all three categories. On Joe's second questionnaire, he increased his initial scores to all 5's on five of the six strategies.

*Summary of Case Study One: Joe*

Joe entered his student teaching experience bringing with him certain preconceived beliefs about effective classroom management. His schooling and professional socialization provided him with ideas and strategies for management that he expected to use during his internship.

Joe wanted to and was able to use positive reward systems in his classroom experiences and felt this strategy was an effective management tool. In both classrooms, first the fifth grade, then the first, this strategy provided students with the motivation to behave appropriately according to the classroom rules that had been established.

There were concerns expressed during early interviews and throughout his student teaching that emphasized Joe's reluctance to participate freely in the strategies that he thought would be beneficial, other than the positive rewards. Although Joe never mentioned what he would do differently, he admitted that he felt that he was just doing what the master teacher would do. This reluctance to try new strategies was revealed throughout Joe's student teaching experience, as noted during the researcher's observations, in interviews, and supervisory conferences. Even when asked how he planned to set up his classroom, he could only broadly describe the implementation of rules, procedures, and the follow through needed.
The information obtained from the concept maps and questionnaires revealed changes in Joe's classroom beliefs during his teaching. He began the internship believing that reward systems, procedures, rules and consequences, and a safe, warm climate in the classroom were important strategies to implement and should be designed by both the teacher and the students. Well-written, engaging lessons were also noted as important for effective classroom management but Joe thought that these should be teacher controlled. By the end of his teaching experience, his beliefs became more teacher controlled in the discipline areas and more student centered in the person and instruction areas. His beliefs about specific strategies showed a decrease in the importance of class meetings and interpersonal relationships, even though these items had been rated important by his cooperating teachers.

Joe's beliefs seemed to gravitate toward the cooperating teachers' beliefs, especially the major teacher, T1, whom he worked with for the majority of his teaching. This would imply that the master teachers' beliefs could influence previously held beliefs of the preservice teacher. Since T1 held different beliefs and used strategies that supported these beliefs, Joe did experience some cognitive discomfort as evidenced by his comments. This discomfort was displayed through his seemingly indifference in his teaching, planning and management. This did change, however, after he was able to discuss his concerns with his cooperating teacher.
Case Study Two: John

Key influences on management beliefs prior to student teaching

John is in the 20 to 29 year old range and is currently completing his first Bachelor’s Degree. He grew up in a small town and stated, “I have always worked with children and wanted to make a difference in their lives. No one had to encourage me to become a teacher. I always wanted to.”

John considered himself an average student growing up. He remembered getting into minor trouble a few times and had detention as a punishment. However, he was never in serious trouble at school. He revealed having to write the states and capitols over and over.

John was asked to recall his favorite teacher or grade and explain why. He answered without hesitation that his fourth grade teacher was his favorite. He explained, “He seemed to care about teaching and helping everyone succeed.

John was asked to elaborate about his professional schooling in classroom management coursework at the university. He first mentioned a psychology class he took that talked about how students progress and what you should look for if they were having problems. He added that this class did not give any specific management techniques but more child development information.

The other class he mentioned was the classroom management course required for graduation credit. When asked what management tools he was exposed to in this class, he commented:

The rewards system mostly. It seems like all the classes were blended together, really. It seemed like they all said the same thing – reward systems,
rules, procedures, consequences. There was one idea that I remember that I wanted to try. It was sort of like a game. It was the students versus the teacher.

John explained that the game was demonstrated during the course. He said that if the students were on task and doing what they were supposed to be doing they got a point. However, if they were off task, the teacher got the point. At the end of the lesson, the students would win something if they received the most points. He admitted:

As I went along, I realized that I didn’t like the game that much because I believe, right now, that I don’t think rewards is a very good discipline technique. I feel like the students are working for a candy or pizza party instead of just intrinsically behaving. I actually used the game and it worked but then the kids wanted to play games all of the time.

John further explained that he would like to get away from rewards and just use positive "phrasing" to the students. He supported positive, verbal statements but did not like the idea of token rewards.

When first asked about his practicum experiences, John revealed that the second practicum was not the best example of a good classroom management system. He began his explanation:

I interviewed the teacher and she said she doesn’t follow any kind of discipline plan or anything like that, and it showed, too. The students weren’t that bad but there was a waste of time when they came in. It took them ten minutes to get ready and sometimes five more. The amount of time it took them, they wasted like two whole school days just to come in and waste all of that time.

From his discussion, it was obvious that he was quite appalled that the students were off task so much. Additionally, he valued some type of procedures and rules to address student on task behaviors.
John really enjoyed his first practicum, however. It was in a first grade classroom and he spoke highly of the teacher and her procedures. The students were well behaved which he credited to such procedures as the card system, weekly progress reports, and marbles in a jar for whole class points. He also discussed a strategy that the teacher used with a particularly difficult student:

Her parents were involved in this plan. The teacher gave connecting blocks to this student. She was pretty bad every day. She gave her 15 of them and if she had any left on Friday or at the end of the week, her parents had agreed to take her somewhere. If she didn't have any left then they wouldn't go. My teacher would take one from her whenever she misbehaved.

John was asked if the teacher ever gave any blocks back for good behavior and he replied, "No, she didn't. She just took them away." He emphasized that this seemed to work with this student as well as two others, but the procedure was not used with the whole class.

Beliefs About Effective Classroom Management

Prior to Student Teaching

Concept Map

The discussion turned to the graphic organizer that John had completed using the question, "How do teachers establish and maintain effective classroom management?" (see Figure 3). He designed his map illustrating six strategies. Three of the strategies were then expanded to provide more detail. His single topics included: praise students who behave properly; curriculum in which students are interested; and demonstrate procedures practice/rehearse procedures, review procedures. The strategies that were multi-tiered included:
Discuss with class the importance of school

Have students assist in creating rules

ownership

Set up routines and procedures

Logical consequences

First days of school

Demonstrate procedures, practice/rehearse procedures, review procedures

How do teachers establish and maintain effective classroom management?

Model proper behavior

Follow rules as a teacher

Consistency with consequences

Praise students who behave properly

Curriculum in which students are interested

Fair

Figure 3. John's initial concept map before student teaching
consistency with consequences, and branching from that was the word, fair; model proper behavior with a second tier stating, "follow rules as a teacher"; and first days of school with several additional topics stemming from it. These included: set up routines and procedures; rules; logical consequences; discuss with class the importance of school; and have students assist in creating rules and ownership.

John was asked to elaborate on his concept map and he began his explanation by proclaiming:

The most important one is the curriculum. I think if the students are interested in what you're teaching them, then they won't want to misbehave and they'll be interested. They want to do the work instead of talking with their neighbors. The students who are more advanced, you give them more difficult work, not so much more work, just more difficult. I figure the smart ones will misbehave because they think, "This is so easy." So they won't want to do it because it's below them. You need to find stuff for them to do that's more challenging.

John also expressed his beliefs about teacher modeling when he stated:

You may want to point out to some other students who are working appropriately and say, "I like the way you're sitting there." Most of the times, myself modeling the proper behavior, like going down the halls, is important for the students to see. I don't think it's fair that a teacher walks down the hall talking to other teachers.

Continuing to explain his concept map, John described the necessary strategies for the first day of school. He told me that implementing certain procedures were as important as the curriculum. These procedures needed to be demonstrated, then practiced so that the students would get into a routine. John emphasized that the procedures needed to be practiced, not just explained, to make sure the students understood their importance.
Surveys

John was asked to complete the ICMS to determine his perceptions in classroom management (see Table 11). He scored a total score of 31, in a range from 24 to 48. This score falls between the non-interventionist and interactionalist segments, which means his overall management style would be less teacher controlled and more student controlled.

Looking at the sub-scale scores, John scored 7 on a range of 6 to 12 on the person dimension, placing him in the non-interventionist segment. This score reflected John's perceptions that students need to be treated as capable

Table 11
Initial ICMS scores for John

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>John's score (X)</th>
<th>Non-interventionist Minimum score</th>
<th>Interactionalist Maximum score</th>
<th>Interventionist Maximum score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person Dimension</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6 X</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction Dimension</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12 X</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline Dimension</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6 X</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24 X</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
individuals. Additionally, he would provide a warm, friendly classroom and encourage a community spirit among the students.

On both the instructional and discipline sub-scales, John scored midway between the non-interventionist and the interactionalist categories. His score of 16 on a scale of 12-24 indicated that John would mix teacher and student input when making choices about the physical environment of the classroom and the daily activities and routines. He would also use input from the students when determining classroom rules and appropriate rewards and consequences, according to his discipline dimension score of 8, on a scale of 6-12. These scores reflected John's earlier statements about his concept map choices and the positive experiences with his first practicum teacher.

John also completed the Classroom Management Questionnaire to determine his knowledge, level of importance, and use of specific classroom management strategies (see Table 12). For the first analysis, the level of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Socio-Emotional</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Behavior Modification</th>
<th>Authoritarian</th>
<th>Intimidation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Possible score</td>
<td>5-25</td>
<td>3-15</td>
<td>2-10</td>
<td>4-20</td>
<td>3-15</td>
<td>4-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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importance that he placed on the strategies to determine his current beliefs was examined. Moving from the more student-centered subgroups, John scored a 24/25 on the importance rating of the group approach. This indicated that he would value class meetings, positive interpersonal relationships, and fostering group interactions within the classroom. For the strategies found in the socioemotional management approach, John scored 13/15. This high score showed his preference for logical consequences, praise, and encouragement as effective forms of management. Both of these scores supported his earlier beliefs illustrated on the concept map and initial interview. John also rated both instructional strategies very high, which validated his earlier comments about the curriculum being the most important topic on his concept map.

The final two approaches suggested a more teacher-controlled classroom. John did mark all three strategies in the authoritarian approach with a 4 or 5 for a score of 13/15, marking the strategy for establishing and enforcing rules as very important. He scored only 4/20 on the intimidation strategies, clearly indicating that he did not favor negative forms of punishment.

These two scales, along with John's comments and concept map would indicate that John is entering his student teaching experience with a student-centered focus for classroom management. He scored high on the knowledge section of the Classroom Management Questionnaire, 80/105, indicating that he understood the strategies and had determined which of them were the most effective techniques to use.
The Classroom Environment During Student Teaching

John was assigned to a fifth grade classroom under the supervision of T4. This particular class followed a Track 2 schedule, which meant the students reported for the first three weeks of school then went on track break for three weeks. During the class's absence, John would be assigned to the science classroom.

The student teachers reported to the school on the first day that teachers returned so John was able to see the management system develop from the beginning of the school year. During the initial interview, John discussed the management system that the cooperating teacher had developed in the classroom and he candidly replied:

She's going to start using a behavior chart but the specifics, I forget. I'm letting the teacher do it (set up the rules). I'm doing it sometimes but I don't want to step on anybody's toes. Before, I thought about having the students create their rules but (laughing) not my teacher. She was cracking up. She doesn't give them the choice. She gives the rule out. She doesn't want to go there because the kids go off on a tangent.

He went on to explain his belief about rule setting:

I think she has a good point sometimes. If students go off the handle, I can't let them eat candy and stuff like that. Still, I think students should have some kind of input just so they have ownership of the class. Also, you should discuss with the class why the class need rules at home and at school.

John talked of the logical consequences that should go along with the rules. He used the example of students running down the hallway and suggested that they go back and walk the right way. The inappropriate consequence would be for them to have to write 10 times that they don't run in the halls. John also
ended his explanation by stating the importance for consistency and follow through with the consequences. He elaborated by giving examples of students losing points for incomplete homework or running. He explained:

You can't say if you don't turn in your homework you're going to lose five points and then someone gets full credit for turning it in late on Monday. Also, if you see one student running and you don't tell them to go back, the others might think it's okay to do.

The Cooperating Teachers

T4 was John's major cooperating teacher, as he spent the majority of his internship under her direction. T4 is in the 30-39 year old range and has been teaching for eight years. She currently holds a Bachelor's Degree but is pursuing a Master's Degree in Education Administration. Her classroom was just moved to a portable classroom located at the back of the school site due to renovation of the school. As previously mentioned, all of the fourth and fifth grades were located in portables so they could departmentalize for reading and for grade level sharing.

T4 completed the ICMS and the Classroom Management Questionnaire so her perceptions about classroom management could be viewed. On the ICMS, her total score was 39, falling in the high range of 24-48. This score fell between the interactionalist and interventionist segments of the control continuum scale and was indicative of her overall belief that classroom management is a function of both teacher control and student input.

The three individual sub-scales were examined to gain more insight into the three distinct areas of management. On the person dimension, T4 scored a 9 on
a range from 6-12. This score, falling in the interactionalist range, was indicative of her belief that students could be viewed as individuals and could help in the implementation of a warm classroom climate with her supervision and guidance. The classroom would be a combination of a teacher and student-centered environment.

The instruction sub-scale score revealed the perceptions of what the teacher would be willing to do to help students learn. T4 scored 19 on a range from 12-24, again indicating interactionalist ideology. Her classroom would show a combination of teacher and student input for planning the physical environment, instructional activities, and performance analysis.

T4 showed strong non-interventionist beliefs on the discipline dimension, scoring 11 on a scale of 6-12. Using this ideology, the teacher would determine the class rules and the appropriate rewards and consequences without student input. The teacher would believe that the rules are necessary to guide students’ successful behaviors and it is her responsibility to enforce them consistently.

On the Classroom Management Questionnaire, T4 gave high ratings of importance to every strategy in the group approach, 24/24, the socioemotional approach, 15/15, the instructional approach, 10/10, and the behavior modification approach, 18/20. She gave a total of 13 strategies the highest score of 5, indicating that she feels all of these strategies are very important. The only approach that she did not rate high overall was the intimidation approach.
On this questionnaire, T4 also indicated that she frequently used these strategies, with the exception of the behavior modification techniques. Although she marked the strategies as important, she indicated that the token system and contract contingency were seldom used. Time out was the one strategy from this approach that she chose as frequently used.

When asked to describe her classroom management system, T4 explained:

I have students pull cards for my discipline plan. If they break a rule, they get the following progressive steps: warning, change card to yellow, change card to red, change card to blue and receive a citation and a note home, citation #2 and call home, and citation 3 and go to principal.

After the first three weeks of school, T4 and her class went on track break for three weeks and John was assigned to the science classroom. This particular classroom was a pilot project that had been implemented at the beginning of the school year. The third, fourth and fifth grade students, accompanied by their general education teacher, attended the science lab weekly where they received science instruction from a full-time science teacher, T5. Although John was only in this setting for three weeks, it was important to review T5's classroom management beliefs.

T5 is in the 20-29 years old range and has been teaching for a total of 4 years. He was a general education teacher, having taught fourth grade, prior to becoming the science teacher. T5 currently holds a Bachelor's Degree and is working on a Master's Degree in Educational Technology.

The overall score on the ICMS for T5 was 33, placing him in the interactionalist range on the control continuum. With this score, one would
expect this teacher to focus on the student's ability to modify their environment as well as what the teacher can do to shape the student. His overall management system would include both student and teacher input.

The sub-scale scores indicated that T5 is a noninterventionist in the person dimension scoring 7 on the 6-12 range. This teacher would probably provide a creative, warm classroom environment with much student input and group cohesiveness. In fact, in his classroom, he preferred tables to individual student desks so students could work as teams. T5's scores in the instruction and discipline dimensions, 18 (range 12-24) and 8 (range 6-12) both fell in the interactionalist range, showing a tendency for a combination of student and teacher input in the physical environment, classroom routines, and rule setting.

Scores on the Classroom Management Questionnaire supported T5's scores on the ICMS, although his overall score on the importance of the strategies was low, 72. He marked both instructional strategies very important (5) and three of the socioemotional strategies, positive interpersonal relationships, withitness and overlapping, and promoting group norms as very important. Because the classroom teachers attended the lab with their students, T5 did not have an extensive management system in place. He expected the classroom teacher to manage the class. So his scores indicated frequent use of promoting group norms, praise/encouragement, classroom routines, and mild desists. The general education teacher would provide follow through with the established classroom rules and procedures.
When asked to describe his classroom management system for the science classes, T5 explained:

My classroom management program is aligned to the school-wide discipline program. I follow through first with warnings. After one warning, I give a citation. I use a count down for attention. I start at one and count up to five. When I reach five, the students are expected to have hands free of materials, mouths closed, and eyes on me.

*The Student Teaching Experience*

During formal observations in John's classroom, strategies that he had discussed previously were observed. He had only been teaching full time for two weeks when he was observed for the first time. John used verbal praise frequently to assure the students that they were doing well. He moved about the classroom, using close proximity and non-verbal cues, like "the look" to redirect off-task students. Procedures were in place, using, "1,2,3, eyes on me" to gain student attention, and "Thumbs up or down", to assess student understanding of the objective being introduced. In addition, students were reminded of several other activities they needed to complete when they were through with the current lesson.

Quick pads, which were individual word processors, were utilized during both lessons and it was apparent that the students were familiar with the procedure for checking them out, attaching them to the computer for printing, and in their use and care. John was consistent with consequences, waiting until all students were attending before beginning his instructions and awarding team points when students were working appropriately.
During the second observation two weeks later, it was noted that classroom rules were posted and a card system had been initiated for consequences. Although John had mentioned interesting curriculum as a strategy that effective classroom teachers would use, his direct instruction was rather slow-paced and mechanical. He didn’t effectively set the stage for the next lesson following the transition, but instead, passed out the worksheet and began explaining the directions. All students were working on the same activities, so modifications and adaptations to the lesson, used to accommodate the learning of all students, was not apparent. The students were on-task, though, throughout both lessons and seemed to enjoy John.

When asked how John thought the lessons went, he revealed that the first lesson could have gone better. He concluded, “Next time, I would ensure that I had enough time to completely finish the worksheets.” He did acknowledge that the students understood the objective. He felt much better with the second lesson observed, “I felt the lesson went well. The students were on task. The students look forward to playing the spelling game.” From this statement, the researcher felt John had grasped an understanding of the relevance of setting the stage and engaging the students in meaningful but fun, academic activities, instead of just pencil and paper tasks.

When asked what he would change the next time he taught a similar lesson, John spoke of using more of a variety of activities. Specifically, he suggested using pen pals to increase the letter writing skills. He also indicated that he
would write down examples to share with the students before beginning the
guided and independent practice, thus setting the stage for the activity.

*John’s Beliefs About Effective Classroom Management*

*Following Student Teaching*

John successfully completed his student teaching internship. When asked
how he felt the experience went he admitted, “I thought it was great. I had an
excellent experience.” He did, in fact, seem very pleased with the student
teaching, and he was asked to specifically discuss the classroom management
approaches he had experienced. He answered without hesitation:

I think I would have done it differently than T4 had it set up. She didn't go
over the rules on the first day of school. She didn't say what her expectations
were and I would've done that. The kids still behaved while they were with
her, but I would just as a caution on the first day, really go over why we have
rules.

John was asked to share anything that he didn’t like or thought was not effective.

He continued his discussion by outlining the difficulties he noticed in the science
room, when he taught his lesson there:

I liked it but I think at the beginning the students were kind of confused. Their
classroom has one set of rules, and then the science teacher has one set of
classroom management skills and strategies that they used and then myself,
I had a different one. For example, T5 did 5,4,3,2,1 (to get students’
attention) and I liked it, but I kind of modified it. I did 3,2,1. After a while they
caught on.

John was encouraged to discuss any strategies that he had seen that he
thought were effective and he would want to use himself. He cited the school
wide discipline procedures and the rewards that the students received as very
beneficial because they could earn these from anyone in the school.
Additionally, he expressed a likeness for some of the techniques that T4 had used in the classroom:

I liked when she made the students freeze whatever they were doing. A lot of times what would happen with that, they would keep moving or finish what they were doing and she would call out and say, “OK, I said freeze” and they’d stop. I like that because the students knew what she meant and they’d stop.

John continued by explaining that T4 was really liberal with what she let him do in the classroom. He stated, “She’d let me do my own thing. We talked because she does some stuff differently than I do. She was comfortable with that and kind of let me explore with my own thing.”

John was asked if he thought his experiences in student teaching had made a difference in his management beliefs. He responded:

Yes! Primarily with the team points. At the beginning of the semester, remember, I said, “No team points. No rewards.” But I really used them and it was effective. It was once a week, at the end. Whoever had the most points, I would give them candy. What I found was that half of it in using team points is that one student from each table kind of stood out to be the leader. I didn’t choose. They just kind of stepped up and started moving everyone in the right direction.

John went on to add that the team points really helped with the transitions between activities and lining up. He seemed surprised that this technique worked so well, and though he was insistent at the beginning of the school year that he didn’t want to use this kind of reinforcement, he admitted that it gave him more time to teach.

The interviewer asked John to explain what he planned to do for a management system when he started teaching. He indicated that he would
definitely use team points, rules, and consequences. When questioned for
details, he exclaimed, “I think we’re going to talk it over in class. I want the kids
to have input on the rules.” For consequences, he expressed using techniques
like time out, or moving the students. He explained that he talked with the
students frequently about their behaviors and he hoped that the students would
problem solve and determine their own consequences.

The discussion turned to the second concept map that John had completed,
using the same question as the first one, “How do teachers establish and
maintain effective classroom management?” As shown in Figure 4, his concept
map was much more detailed than the first map but showed similarities in
structure and substance. Whereas six concepts were illustrated on the initial
map, the second one had twelve concepts with four secondary levels and two
tertiary levels. Additionally, several of the original concepts were leveled with
different ideas on the second map.

The first day of school concept was still used with most of the same details as on
the first. John added four new strategies to the new concept map: parent
involvement; ask other teachers for strategies; finding what type of student
he/she is; and proactive. Team points had been added to the second concept
student teaching map, as well as monitoring students. Both of these concepts
had secondary levels of strategies added to them. John illustrated monitoring
students as a primary concept and added peer tutors to it. Praise had been
Parent involvement
Finding what type of student him/her is
Monitor the students
Peer tutors
rules
establish
model
First days of school
Have students responsible for their behavior
Curriculum
Schedule
Structure
Team points
Proactive
Positive reinforcement
self-monitoring
leader
posted
discuss
practice
review

HOW DO TEACHERS ESTABLISH AND MAINTAIN EFFECTIVE CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

Figure 4. John's second concept map after student teaching
changed to positive reinforcement, and consistency became an extension of logical consequences instead of a primary concept.

In the interview about the concept map, John emphasized the need for establishing and practicing the rules. He again concluded that team points were important as he explained, "It was kind of like they were doing my job for me. I just stood back and watched them do their thing." All but one of John's original concepts focused on the discipline aspect of management. His second map still focused on discipline strategies but did include several instructional components as well as one strategy from a person component. Several of the concepts he constructed in his design showed a growing belief that student control and input were needed to effectively influence their classroom environment.

John also talked about the parent involvement component on the concept map. He explained that he had contacted the parents of two students because of inappropriate behaviors. When asked if he thought it had helped, he replied, "It helped a little bit. If it was my own classroom, I would have called a little bit more often."

Surveys

John completed the ICMS and the Classroom Management Questionnaire again to determine his current beliefs about classroom management. His later scores were compared with the original scores and his cooperating teachers' scores. As shown on Table 13, on the ICMS, John's total score increased slightly, from 31 to 33 on a scale of 24-48. His major cooperating teacher, T4,
Table 13

A scattergram of the relationship between John's scores and those of his cooperating teachers' scores on the ICMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>John's initial score (X)</th>
<th>John's second score (Y)</th>
<th>T4 score (*)</th>
<th>T5 score (+)</th>
<th>Non-interventionist</th>
<th>Interventionist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6 XY +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12 X Y +</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6 X Y +</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24 X Y +</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. T4 = cooperating teacher; T-5 = track out cooperating teacher

scored 39 while the science teacher scored a 33. Interestingly, John's sub-scale scores did not change in the person and instruction dimension, which meant the discipline score increased two points. John scored a 7 in a range of 6-12 on both surveys in the person dimension. T4 scored 9 and T5, a 7. John's score implied that he values student individuality and creativity, and would encourage group participation and input in the classroom climate. He did change his response to two statements showing an increase in his belief of student independence, but at the same time demanding, instead of encouraging student respect.
On the instruction component, John changed answers to two questions, proclaiming that he would assign student seating, but would allow students to progress at their own rate on activities. So, even though John's score remained the same, 16 on a scale of 12-24, he showed some differences in his responses to student control of the instruction.

John chose the more controlling responses on most of the discipline concepts, with a score of 10 in a range of 6-12. He even selected the statement that indicated he would tell the students what the classroom rules were, instead of just discussing the rules with them. This was directly opposite of the statement he made during an interview when he said he would let the students decide on the class rules. A complete table of John's and his cooperating teachers' scores on the ICMS can be found in Appendix J.

On the Classroom Management Questionnaire (see Table 14), John again chose four of the five group strategies as most important, so his scored remained the same, 24/25. T4 also scored 24 and T5 scored 20. John chose an additional socioemotional strategy as most important, which increased his score on that approach from 13/15 to 14/15. T4 scored all three strategies as most important, 15/15.

There was a substantial increase in the behavior modification approach score. John initially scored 12/20 but increased the overall importance of the strategies to 17/20. T4 scored 18/20. John marked the use of positive reinforcement and token economy systems higher than the first time, which
Table 14

Responses on the Classroom Management Questionnaire for John and his Cooperating Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>John's initial score</th>
<th>John's second score</th>
<th>T4</th>
<th>T5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K I U</td>
<td>K I U</td>
<td>K I U</td>
<td>K I U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Meetings</td>
<td>3 4 1</td>
<td>4 5 4</td>
<td>4 5 2</td>
<td>4 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Interpersonal Relationships</td>
<td>4 5 2</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>4 5 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withitness and Overlapping</td>
<td>4 5 3</td>
<td>5 5 4</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting Productive Group Norms</td>
<td>4 5 3</td>
<td>5 4 4</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>4 5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering Group Cohesiveness</td>
<td>3 5 1</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>4 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP Total 5-25</td>
<td>18 24 12</td>
<td>24 24 22</td>
<td>23 24 21</td>
<td>21 20 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical Consequences</td>
<td>4 5 3</td>
<td>4 5 4</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>4 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reality Therapy</td>
<td>3 4 1</td>
<td>5 4 4</td>
<td>5 5 4</td>
<td>4 4 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise/Encouragement</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIOEMOTIONAL Total 3-15</td>
<td>11 13 11</td>
<td>14 14 13</td>
<td>15 15 14</td>
<td>13 11 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Expectations and Routines</td>
<td>4 5 1</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting, Relevant, Appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>4 5 3</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 4</td>
<td>5 5 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTRUCTIONAL Total 2-10</td>
<td>8 10 4</td>
<td>10 10 10</td>
<td>10 10 9</td>
<td>10 10 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Reinforcement</td>
<td>3 4 3</td>
<td>4 5 5</td>
<td>5 4 3</td>
<td>4 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extinction/Time Out</td>
<td>4 2 3</td>
<td>5 4 3</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>4 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Token Economy Systems</td>
<td>4 2 2</td>
<td>5 4 4</td>
<td>3 5 3</td>
<td>5 4 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency Contracting</td>
<td>4 4 1</td>
<td>5 4 1</td>
<td>3 4 2</td>
<td>5 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEHAVIOR MOD. Total 4-20</td>
<td>15 12 9</td>
<td>19 17 13</td>
<td>16 18 13</td>
<td>18 14 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>John's initial score</th>
<th>John's second score</th>
<th>T4</th>
<th>T5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K I U</td>
<td>K I U</td>
<td>K I U</td>
<td>K I U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mild Desists</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>4 3 3</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>5 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish/Enforce Rules</td>
<td>4 5 1</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>4 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation/Exclusion</td>
<td>4 4 1</td>
<td>4 2 1</td>
<td>5 5 4</td>
<td>5 4 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHORITARIAN – Total 3-15</th>
<th>12 13 6</th>
<th>13 10 9</th>
<th>14 14 13</th>
<th>14 11 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harsh Reprimands</td>
<td>4 1 1</td>
<td>4 2 2</td>
<td>5 2 2</td>
<td>3 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal Punishment</td>
<td>4 1 1</td>
<td>4 1 1</td>
<td>2 1 1</td>
<td>2 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats</td>
<td>4 1 3</td>
<td>4 1 1</td>
<td>5 3 2</td>
<td>4 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>4 1 2</td>
<td>5 2 2</td>
<td>4 3 2</td>
<td>5 2 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTIMIDATION – Total 4-20</th>
<th>16 4 7</th>
<th>17 6 6</th>
<th>16 6 6</th>
<th>14 6 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS Knowledge</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. K = knowledge score; I = importance score; U = understanding score. T4 = cooperating teacher; T5 = track-out cooperating teacher.

would indicate that their use in the classroom increased his belief in their value as an important strategy for classroom management. The intimidation strategies also increased slightly from 4/20 to 6/20, with T4 scoring 9/20.

When looking at the major teacher’s scores, T4 scored 13 strategies as most important. Looking at all three scores, knowledgeable, importance and use, T4 gave eight strategies all 5’s. Of these strategies, John rated all 5’s on six of the
same strategies. Comparing the total scores, John scored 80 then 97 in knowledge with T4 scoring 94, 76 then 81 in importance with T4 scoring 90, and from 46 to 73 in use, while T4 earned 77. On all but three strategies, John's score in the importance area moved closer to T4's scores. This would indicate that the teacher's use of these strategies increased John's belief in their importance.

**Summary of Case Study Two: John**

John entered his student teaching internship, bringing with him certain preconceived beliefs about effective classroom management. His concept maps indicated a primary focus on discipline as the major component of management. He constructed these concept maps using a three-tiered hierarchical structure that stayed much the same after his teaching experiences, with a few more added techniques.

John's interviews and supervisory observations revealed his belief in a supportive, student valued and controlled classroom environment. He was candid in admitting his change in belief about positive token reinforcements such as team points instead of simple intrinsic motivation. However, he held fast to the cooperative establishment of rules, procedures, and consequences, even though his major cooperating teacher displayed a more authoritarian approach.

The surveys indicated only slight changes in John's already established beliefs about student power. Only the discipline areas seemed to have changed slightly toward a more teacher-control approach. All of the data collected
indicated John’s belief that students should have much input and control over their classroom environment, and the teacher should encourage and foster this student growth.

T4 and John held fairly close beliefs in the three dimensions on the Classroom Management Questionnaire and the ICMS, although T4’s scores were somewhat higher. T5’s scores were not indicative of much influence on John’s beliefs and he explained that when he described the unique characteristics of the science classroom. John emphasized that he liked the track break and the opportunity to work with different teachers. However, he felt both teacher styles were comparable. He admitted that it might have been beneficial if he could have seen a different style of management, to see if he saw something he liked better.

**Case Study Three: Jane**

*Key Influences on Management Beliefs Prior To Student Teaching*

Jane grew up in a large metropolitan area where she still lives. She attended urban elementary, middle, and high schools and was a good student. Jane described her childhood classrooms as similar to the ones that she has seen in her practicum classes. She further stated that during her early years in school, the classroom management was about the same as it is now.
Jane explained that she was not a bad student and that she didn’t get into trouble. Her only problems centered around getting along with her girlfriends. The students who did get in trouble usually received lunch detention or time out in a corner.

The interviewer questioned her about her favorite teachers and without hesitation she answered that her favorite was a third grade teacher. She explained that this teacher was fun, creative, and always had a smile on her face. Jane’s favorite grades were third grade and her junior year in high school. She concluded that these classes were memorable because of the teachers and the success she had.

When asked why she had decided to become a teacher, Jane acknowledged that her mother had suggested this profession after her second year in college. Her mom had noticed that Jane loved kids and thought teaching would suit her. Jane further explained that not having to work 365 days a year also appealed to her.

After deciding to become a teacher, Jane began taking the required education courses at the university. When asked what courses she had taken that dealt with classroom management she concluded:

I just finished Classroom Management last semester. Actually it was a review of things that I already knew. I really learned a lot in my 201 class. That was my first education class where we do an observation in the school. You get to see a first case of the classroom. And I really learned a lot in my 450, Instructional Strategies.
Jane went on to explain that the strategies class was important because she had already been in a classroom and could relate the information she learned to the teaching experience. She laughed:

Giving me a few rules and procedures for everything was overwhelming in that class! I learned a lot because we had to teach lessons in the class and manage the class at the same time. The professor would grade us like our actual practicum supervisors would on how we managed the class and kept them in the activity. I think this was a really important class and fun too.

When asked if there was anything she would like to have learned that she didn’t, Jane mentioned that the students had practiced some of the discipline techniques in the classes but she would like to have had more practice with specific discipline problems.

The discussion turned to Jane’s field experiences in the two practicum classes she was required to take. She revealed that she had always been paired with good teachers and good management. She further described the classes she observed:

My first practicum was third grade at the university cohort school and my second was first grade. That was a different experience! You’re dealing with little, little people. With the third and fifth graders, you say something and you have them repeat it, but with the first graders, it was just constantly, constantly, repeat it. In first grade, it’s so hard to remember the teachers’ names.

Jane was asked to discuss any strategies that she had observed that she either liked or didn’t like. She admitted a problem with candy:

I probably would not offer candy so much as far as rewards. I’ve seen it a lot. I think it’s fine sometimes, I just don’t want it to always be candy. A lot of times, kids have reactions to it. I like other rewards, like pencils, sharpeners, things like that.
Jane completed her explanation by discussing how important she thought constant reinforcement and follow-through were for effective classroom management. She stated that the teachers she observed were usually good about using these strategies, so when she took over the lesson, she used the same procedures and her teaching went well.

During the discussion, Jane did mention that the third grade practicum teacher was a little lax with her management:

She was a third year teacher and although she had a management system, she had to constantly repeat herself. You need to repeat yourself, but it shouldn't be several times during the day. They took advantage of that because she was easygoing, but too easygoing I think.

Jane concluded that she would be more firm:

In fact, I was more firm! When I would teach my lesson, I had to stop a couple of times and say, "This wasn't acceptable," especially when my supervisor was there. With that experience, I personally would just be more firm and act upon what I said. The teacher did, but not all of the time. I would probably enforce a lot more.

Beliefs about Effective Classroom Management Prior to Student Teaching

Concept Map

When looking at the concept map that Jane constructed (see Figure 5), it was noted that she had drawn six bubbles for primary concepts and had completed four of them. These concepts included organization, professionalism, discipline, and consistency. Attached to these primary concepts was a secondary level of strategies to elaborate the initial concepts.

Attached to organization were two ideas, "Keys to success" and "If you do not have anything organized, then it makes it harder to teach." When I asked Jane
Teachers need to enforce rules and show consequences.

Consequences need to be explained with all rules and procedures.

 Discipline

How Do Teachers establish and maintain effective classroom management?

Consistency

Yes means yes and no means no.

Set/follow procedures

Professionalism

Receive and maintain student respect

Key to success

Organization

If you do not have anything organized then it makes it harder to teach.

Figure 5. Initial concept map for Jane
to elaborate on this concept she emphasized, “You have to be organized
before you can do anything. If you’re not organized, nothing will get done. If
they’re not organized, they can’t teach. That’s my first thing.”

Jane outlined the next two concepts jointly. She had added two phrases to
the primary concept, consistency, “Let your yes mean yes/no mean no”, and
“Set/follow procedures”. For discipline she had added, “Teachers need to
enforce rules and show consequences” and “Consequences need to be
explained with all rules and procedures.” She proclaimed:

You have to be consistent so that the students don’t take advantage,
because of the learning environment. It’s difficult. I think teachers need to
enforce rules and share consequences, practice the rules and procedures so
that students are really aware of them. Not necessarily if the kid is getting in
trouble, just send him to the corner, but discipline them in a way that they
know what they’re doing is wrong and have them change it, not just take
them out.

Jane then explained the last concept she had chosen, professionalism. On
the concept map, she had attached the comment, “Receive and maintain
students’ respect.” Jane described this concept by admitting that, “If you don’t
have that professionalism with your students, then they’re not going to respect
you.”

Discussion followed about the classroom management system that she had
observed so far in the three days in the classroom. She exclaimed, “The teacher
has it, it’s so overwhelming, there seems to be so much. She has it in order from
the very beginning.” Jane did seem overwhelmed at the intense rules and
procedures that the classroom teacher was developing for the classroom environment.

**Surveys**

Jane's ICMS and Classroom Management Questionnaire results were then analyzed to determine her current management beliefs. Her total score on the ICMS, 37, places her in the interactionalist range between the non-interventionist and the interventionist (see Table 15). This score would indicate that she prefers a classroom management system that involves student input as

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Initial ICMS scores for Jane**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Minimum score</th>
<th>Maximum score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person Dimension</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction Dimension</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline Dimension</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Score</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
well as teacher control. Interestingly, this philosophy was not apparent in the early interview with Jane.

On the sub-scale for person dimension, Jane scored 7, on a range of 6-12. This score suggested that Jane would create a warm, social classroom environment that supports a strong belief in student individualism and capabilities. Additionally, a strong group spirit would be fostered.

The instruction dimension showed a score of 21, on a range from 12-24. This score demonstrated a strong propensity for the teacher to control the physical environment, classroom routines, and the students’ learning behaviors. However, since the score is in between the interventionist and interactionalist ranges, the teacher would tend to value some input from the students on their academic management.

On the discipline sub-scale, Jane received a score of 9, on a range from 6-12. This score would indicate that she would use the interactionalist belief that joint teacher and student solutions should be used to determine the classroom standards for behavior, and the rewards and consequences used to enforce these standards.

The Classroom Management Questionnaire, Table 16, was examined next. When looking at scores that showed a very important belief, Jane selected strategies in the group, socioemotional, instructional, and authoritarian approaches. She reached a score of 22/25 on the group strategies, scoring all
Table 16

*Initial scores on the Classroom Management Questionnaire for Jane*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Socio-Emotional</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Behavior Modification</th>
<th>Authoritarian</th>
<th>Intimidation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Possible score</td>
<td>5-25</td>
<td>3-15</td>
<td>2-10</td>
<td>4-20</td>
<td>3-15</td>
<td>4-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

strategies either 4 or 5 on the likert scale. The instructional strategies both received ratings of 5 for 10/10 on importance and the authoritarian strategies were rated with 4 and 5 also, for a score of 13/15.

The behavior modification strategies were rated with either 2 or 3, which supported Jane's earlier statements emphasizing a dislike for candy and lots of rewards. Although the intimidation strategies were rated low, Jane did rate the punishment strategy as very important, giving it a 5. Altogether, Jane rated 8 of the 21 strategies as most important when looking at classroom management.

*The Classroom Environment During Student Teaching*

Jane was assigned to a fourth grade classroom that followed the track 5 schedule. This meant that the cooperating teacher and students would not go out on a break until three weeks prior to winter break. Jane would be able to stay in this classroom until her last week of student teaching. At this time she would
be assigned to a fifth grade classroom under the direction of T7. The classroom was located in a portable building at the back of the school campus, where the other fourth and fifth grade classes were assigned.

Jane reported to her cooperating teacher on the first day of the teacher's return to school for the new school year. Jane expressed her approval of this schedule because it gave her a chance to see the development of classroom management, instead of coming into a classroom after everything was already in place. Jane explained how the classroom was set up:

From the very beginning, I think her presence was known. The way she carried herself, they automatically respected her because she meant business. She would state, “Okay, this is what we're doing today.” She would go into everything from the very start. You tell them about yourself so they feel comfortable and then basically for the first two days, we worked on the rules and procedures. So after she went through her rules and procedures, we didn’t have to spend the next two days on them, they had them down. She hasn’t had to remind them of anything.

Jane continued her outline of the management system by detailing different strategies that the teacher had set in place. She told of the team point system, where each table of students would receive points for following the appropriate directions. The team with the most points would get some kind of a treat or pencil or something else, whatever the teacher chose to give them. Jane explained that the students were given so many tickets per week and these were to be used for bathroom privileges. The students who had the most tickets at the end of a two-week period or a month, would get a surprise or treat. Jane exclaimed, “She also had star of the week, she has so much.”
The Cooperating Teachers

Jane's major cooperating teacher, T6, is in the 20 to 29 years old range and has been a teacher for five years in fourth grade. She currently holds a Bachelor's Degree but is working towards a Master's Degree. T6 was chosen by the administration to mentor a student teacher because of her strong background in effective classroom management, her interest in computers, her effective instructional strategies, and her consistently high student achievement.

T6 completed the ICMS and the Classroom Management Questionnaire so her classroom management beliefs could be identified. On the ICMS, T6 received a total score of 34, on a scale of 24-48. This score would place her in the interactionalist range of the continuum. This would indicate that T6 believes students as well as the teacher should make joint decisions about student control and classroom management issues.

On the sub-scales, the person dimension showed a score of 8, in a range of 6-12, for T6. This score demonstrated the teacher's belief that the classroom should foster student success and personal growth. Additionally, the students should feel that their individuality is appreciated while encouraged to work effectively for a group purpose. This teacher's classroom should emphasize warmth, friendliness, and respect.

The instructional sub-scale score was 17, in a range of 12-24. Again, this score placed T6 between a non-interventionist and interactionalist philosophy of control. This teacher indicated that she would want to assign student seating but
would allow students to use any materials available. She would give students the opportunity to complete assignments at their own rate, thus allowing them the control over learning time. However, T6 would give explicit directions for all assignments and circulate to monitor student work. These statements indicate that T6 would allow some student control over their learning environment but would also insist on some power over the management of the instruction.

The sub-scale score on the discipline dimension, 9, on a scale of 6-12, again illustrates the degree of power this teacher is willing to give to students to control their classroom environment. She illustrated that rules are important and she would reinforce them, but she would give students the opportunity to develop and agree with the classroom rules. This interactionalist approach would incorporate joint decisions of the teacher and students.

When asked to describe her classroom management, T6 responded by outlining her procedures:

I use strategies for both individual and group behaviors. For group management, it was team points. The group could work together to get points for their team and then the team with the most points at the end of the day gets a treat from the jar. I also did individual management. Each student has a chart and if they behave well and do not get their name on the board, then they get a star on their chart at the end of the day. At the end of each row that they fill up, they get a school buck and when they fill up the whole chart, approximately 25 spaces, they get to have breakfast with the teacher.

When asked how she thought the strategies were working, T6 stated, “I think that I have had like four people put their name of the board all year. The system really works well.”
Jane interacted only one week with the other cooperating teacher, during the last week of her student teaching. However, Jane did refer to some of the classroom practices that she observed so T7's beliefs should be mentioned.

T7 is in the 50 to 59 years of age range and has been teaching for nearly twenty years. She currently holds a Master's Degree and has been a special education teacher as well as teaching in the general education classroom. This teacher is often assigned student teachers or practicum students by the administration because she incorporates very successful classroom management strategies in her instructional program and consistently works well with students.

The ICMS results were reviewed to identify T7's beliefs about the amount of student control she allowed in her classroom. The total score was 38, on a scale of 24-48. This places T7 near the interactionalist range, indicating that she would incorporate both student input and her own ideas when making decisions about classroom management.

Looking at the person sub-scale, T7 scored an 8, on a range of 6-12. This score would indicate that she sets guidelines and rules for the students to follow and directs students in learning to work together. However, she realizes that students have legitimate decision making processes and aids in that process. When dealing with the person dimension of management, this teacher would combine student and teacher power.
T7 scored between the interactionalist and interventionist range of power on the instructional sub-scale. This teacher indicated that she would most likely assign student seating but would allow students to use materials as they were needed instead of allocating them. The instructional activities would be designed with input from the students and instructional time would be determined by their needs. As evidenced by these statements, this teacher would allow some student input into their instructional management but would most likely feel strongly that structure and daily routine would be her decisions.

For the discipline sub-scale, T7's score of 10, in a range of 6-12, places her between an intervention and interactionist range of student control. This teacher selects the classroom rules, rewards, and consequences, and expects student compliance. Both rewards and consequences would be mild, using either verbal praise or non-verbal gestures instead of tangible rewards.

When asked to describe her current classroom management strategies, T7 explained that most of the system is based on Linda Albert's book on cooperative discipline. She explained the program, "Instead of rules, the class has a code of conduct. When a teacher has a code of conduct, it decreases the power struggles in the classroom." She gave an example of a code of conduct, "I am respectful. I am responsible. I am safe. I am prepared." She went on to add:

Each are written in terms of "I". "I am" or "I will" statements emphasize each person's commitment and responsibility to follow the code. Teaching the code involves the following steps: identify appropriate and inappropriate behaviors, clarify appropriate and inappropriate behaviors, and involve the parents.
To enforce the code of conduct, T7 explained that there were two procedures. First, the teacher walks over the code and points to the operating principle that is being violated, making sure that she has eye contact with the misbehaving student. Next, she writes the number of the code being broken, or a word from the code, on a self-stick note, and puts it on the student’s desk. Finally, the teacher reinforces the appropriate behavior by publicizing the code of conduct, modeling self-correction, and encouraging student evaluation.

T7 described several other strategies that she uses:

- Be proactive. Catch them being good and reinforce with verbal praise or a pat on the shoulder. For another strategy, I select missing letters in a word. The students get to guess letters, if their behavior is appropriate. If they guess the word, they get a class treat since it is a class effort. For severe infractions, the students stand on the wall during recess and watch the other students play.

Additionally, T7 explained ideas that she used for reinforcement. School play money, the school-wide behavior token, was given to appropriately behaved students to use in a class store or for the Big Event. This event was sponsored monthly and students who received a certain number of school bucks could purchase a ticket and attend a major event sponsored by the student activities committee, like movie and popcorn or a craft fair. Also, she used a positive note/phone call home, provided lunch with the teacher, or handed out candy bars. Interestingly, there was a candy bar using T7’s name and this is the one she specifically gave to the students.
The Student Teaching Experience

During the semester, Jane was visited for two formal observations. She seemed at ease and comfortable during both observations and displayed a good knowledge of the objective being taught. For the first lesson, the students were designing circle graphs using accurate table information. The students worked in groups and Jane did give team points for appropriate behaviors. Management procedures were in place as team captains were responsible for distribution and collection of student materials.

Jane was observed using verbal praise frequently and redirected off-task students with verbal and non-verbal cues. She reviewed rules for working collaboratively on a group assignment and made sure that students understood the procedures. Jane gained student attention during transitions by giving them time limits, instructing them to clear their desks, and using the attention cue, “Eyes on me.” Additionally, she waited until everyone was looking at her to begin the next explanation. Her follow through of directions and commands was thorough and consistent.

When asked for feedback on the observation, Jane agreed that the lesson went well. She self-critiqued the lesson and her ideas were correct. When asked about student rapport, she stated, “The students and I get along great. They listen, respect me, and learn from me.”

For the second scheduled observation, Jane had prepared a lesson from a pilot math program. Again, gaining student attention was completed quickly and
instruction was quick paced. Team points were given for appropriate behaviors. Jane monitored students' work and used close proximity to keep students on-task. Her classroom management was structured, thorough, consistent, and enforced. The researcher was impressed with Jane's comfort level with the students. She knew all by name and worked calmly and happily with them during the independent part of the lesson.

In post observation conferences or during unscheduled informal conferences, Jane did not ask many questions or seem to have concerns about her teaching or management. She took advantage of the extra time that she had to visit other classrooms, hoping to see additional instructional or management strategies. Jane was always positive and thoroughly enjoyed the student teaching experience. The researcher felt that this student teacher had a good command of the job requirements, instructional strategies, and effective management. Likewise, the students enjoyed her as a teacher and were visibly sad to see her leave at the end of the semester.

Jane's Beliefs About Effective Classroom Management

Following Student Teaching

At the end of her student teaching experience, Jane was asked how she had liked her internship. She stated that she had really enjoyed it and how much help she felt she had received from T6, her major cooperating teacher. She explained:

She gave me a lot of help but she let me make my own mistakes. She let me go on my own in the sense that she said, "Okay, I have these materials. And
this is the way the kids are used to it, but this is what you can use and create your own thing." She gave me some direction but I was able to do my own thing.

Jane added that she, "keyed in on other teachers who I thought had a good style and I watched them as well, asked them questions."

When asked what strategies she had seen that she liked she revealed:

I liked the management style that I was involved in with T6. She had rules and procedures and consequences and rewards for almost everything. It was hard for me to keep up with, but I learned it. One thing I liked and plan to use but didn't really know about was the group rewards. T6 focused on rewards and if you weren't up to her standards then you just didn't get anything. She also singled people out to the side, if they didn't follow the rules and procedures. She used individual, group, and whole class rewards and that's what I liked.

Another strategy that Jane admitted she didn't know much about but planned to use was class meetings. She told me that the students would write down any problem that they had in a journal book, and during the class meetings, they were allowed to discuss these problems, without naming any student. Jane mentioned that the students didn't have many problems at all, and when I ask her to explain why, she acknowledged:

Because she (T6), and I followed through a system in the classroom that you can talk and we are all friends here. "I'm going to help you, this is your home away from home." If there were problems, it was from the outside people. T6 really established this and I followed through making the kids come to me to talk.

When asked if she had seen any effective strategies in the one week that she observed in T7's classroom, Jane exclaimed:

Very much so. I really like her too. She has a couple of students in the class who are street kids, that's the best way I can explain them, and they respond to her well. I've watched her and I just really respect her. She treats them
with respect. She's hard but loving and unlike other teachers I've observed, if she has to get onto somebody, she lets the class know that she has to take care of something and to stay on-task. Then she discreetly takes the student with the problem to the side, respectfully, and gives them a choice. She's really big on respect.

Jane continued to explain another strategy that T7 used that she really liked.

She referred to the way that this teacher kept the students engaged at all times, even during bathroom breaks. Jane explained her procedure:

She has something she calls, “observation back”. While the students are waiting in line, they are observing what's around them. When she comes back to the line, she asks them what they observed. I just think that that is an awesome strategy. She's always engaging them. They treat her with respect.

Jane summed up the experiences she had with both cooperating teachers, “I would use some strategies from each. I'm really going to steal some ideas from both of them.”

Jane was questioned to see if she felt that student teaching had made a difference in her beliefs about classroom management. She proclaimed that she had certain ideas about the classroom before she started but she wasn’t sure they would work because she had never been able to try them. She did identify one idea that she had heard and now firmly believes is true. This strategy came from an old saying, “Be tough at the beginning of the year. Don’t smile until Christmas.” Jane explained:

I did notice that I could back off, because once you set limits, you could back off. So I realize now that you do have to be very firm and you have to do just like T6 did. I also agree that you have to practice, practice, your procedures. Also, the students have to make the rules their own. They have to look at the rules and explain what they mean to them. That’s what I plan to do. We are going to be spending some time the first week practicing what I expect.
Jane further explained the need to be hard at first when she described an incident during her teaching:

I realized that literally if you give them an inch, they’ll go a mile. When we did an assignment, they had to draw what they saw before they went to Lake Mead on a field trip. I said, “Okay, sit down, start drawing.” I didn’t give them any rules or guidelines before we left. Oh my goodness, I saw a couple of kids run down way over there. Immediately, I called them back and told them we’re going to stay within this square.

Jane was asked to describe the management system she planned to use when she began teaching. She spoke of the overall feeling of her management:

They are coming into my classroom to learn and be engaged and if they need help for any problems, they can talk to me. We can feel that that is a place of safety for them. As far as everything else, my rules and procedures will be posted. They will be enforced daily. I want to be proactive, so it’s really observation, knowing what kids can go with who, seeing what problems they have before they happen. Being really proactive and letting them know and be really aware of what my rules are.

Jane was questioned about the student teaching schedule. She admitted that she would have liked to spend more time with a different type of teacher. When asked what she meant by a different teacher, she said that she would like to have seen a completely different type of management and teaching style. She commented, “You can see just in walking past a classroom, what management does and doesn’t work.” She clarified by her statement by explaining that the students didn’t necessarily have to be quiet, but engaged. If you saw students at different centers and they’re were actually engaged than the teacher obviously had good management. From this remark I felt that Jane did view engaged students, which would indicate appropriate instruction, as a sign of good classroom management.
Prior to leaving, Jane was asked to again construct a concept map using the same concept as before, "How do teachers establish and maintain effective classroom management?" (see Figure 6). In comparing the second map with the original, she had introduced four primary concepts again, but the secondary level was much more intricate, showing a more elaborately structured map.

The four original concepts, organization, consistency, discipline, and professionalism had changed to consistency, rules, procedures, and respect. Although similar to the first, they were numbered differently in order of importance. Interestingly, both times, Jane identified concepts that mostly addressed discipline and routine. Nothing was mentioned about instructional management.

Jane revealed her change of thought from the first concept map where she listed organization as the most important concept, to the second, where consistency was discussed as the number one concept to consider:

Of course you have to have the rules and procedures so I put down but I really believe in consistency. I think that’s the most important. I mean, it’s great to establish rules and procedures, but if you don’t follow through with it, it’s pointless to have them. If you don’t follow through, students will not respect your authority.

She also talked about respect:

I believe that along with implementing your rules and procedures and follow-through, you need to treat your students with respect. If you don’t, they’ll see it right away and they won’t respond to you. I realized that right away. So, if there is just one person in the class who is really a problem, I’ve noticed that
Yelling or talking down to students in front of peers is not recommended.

**1. CONSISTENCY**

- Most important
- If you do not follow through, students won't respect authority

**2. RULES**

- Listen and follow directions
- A few so students remember them always

**3. PROCEDURES**

- Rewards: whole class, individual, or small group recognition
- Positive reinforcement

**4. RESPECT**

- Students respond to teachers who treat them with respect

**Consequences**

- Fire drill, line up, sharpening pencils

**How do teachers establish and maintain effective classroom management?**

Figure 6. Second concept map for Jane, after student teaching
teachers point out that problem in front of everyone else. It doesn't really rectify it. So we need to pull them to the side, telling them what you're having problems with, as far as their behavior. If that doesn't work, then take more action. If you treat them with respect, they give it back to you.

Looking at the secondary levels of the concept map, Jane listed two phrases

Of course you have to have the rules and procedures so I put that down but I really believe in consistency. I think that's the most important. I mean, it's to further clarified her choice of consistency, "Most important" and "If you do not follow through, students won't respect authority." For #2, rules, she added, "Listen and follow directions", "Use appropriate words/behavior", and "A few so students remember them always."

Jane used three levels to explain her beliefs about procedures. The secondary levels included consequences, rewards, whole class, individual or small group recognition, and rehearse procedures for everything. Additionally, she listed fire drill, line up, and sharpening pencils to describe rehearsing procedures, and positive reinforcement as an extension of rewards. To further elaborate on the concept of respect, Jane used the phrases, "Students respond to teachers who treat them with respect", and "Yelling or talking down to students in front of peers is not recommended." This concept replaced the concept, professionalism, on the first map. However, Jane stated the same meaning, only explained it in more detail. When asked why she used these particular phrases, she admitted that she had seen this in a classroom and felt sorry for the students. Additionally, she had liked the way both of her cooperating teachers showed respect when dealing with misbehaving students.
The concepts on both maps were similar in substance with the second map, only demonstrating more clarity. Discipline was renamed procedures, professionalism became respect, with rules being added as a primary concept. Organization was removed as a primary concept and the key to success. Consistency remained on both maps but became the most important on the second, and addressed follow through and authority. This comparison showed some change in beliefs about which concept is the most important but Jane's overall beliefs did not show a substantial change. There seemed to be more elaboration of the same beliefs held prior to the student teaching experience.

Surveys

Looking for changes in beliefs about specific management strategies, the researcher examined the second ICMS and the Classroom Management Questionnaire that Jane completed. On the ICMS, Jane's total score rose from 37 to 40 on a scale of 24-48 (see Table 17). This would suggest that her beliefs about management became more teacher-centered as she moved closer to the interventionist range. Since 36 is the middle score and supports interactionalist beliefs, Jane would still acknowledge some student control but not to the extent she did prior to student teaching.

On the person dimension sub-scale, Jane's score increased by two, from 7 to 9, on a range form 6-12. Again, one sees Jane moving to a more teacher-controlled environment that before. This score fell in the interventionist range and looking at Jane's answers, it appeared that she would want to set guidelines
**Table 17**

*A scattergram of the relationship between Jane's scores and those of her cooperating teachers' scores on the ICMS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Jane's initial score (X)</th>
<th>Non-interventionist Minimum score</th>
<th>Jane's second score (Y)</th>
<th>Interactionalist Maximum score</th>
<th>T6 score (*)</th>
<th>T7 score (+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>21  21  19  20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>9   10  9   10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>37  40  34  38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. T6 = cooperating teacher; T-7 = track out cooperating teacher*

for the students and help them learn how to work toward good decision-making skills. These answers focused on Jane's beliefs that the teacher and the students can share joint solutions about how students should develop socially in the classroom.

Jane's score remained the same on the instruction dimension sub-scale, 21 on a scale of 12-24. However, she did change four answers. She demonstrated the need to control the physical environment, routines, and the instructional climate of the classroom. Jane did show some student freedoms of choice in
climate of the classroom. Jane did show some student freedoms of choice in instructional activities. This score, which fell in the interventionist range, still indicated that Jane believed strongly that the teacher should assume control of the child's instruction.

On the discipline sub-scale score, Jane again moved slightly, from 9 to 10 on a scale of 6-12, toward a more teacher-controlled management. Her choices demonstrated belief that the teacher should set the rules but make sure the students understand them. This score still showed Jane's desire to incorporate student input in the classroom decisions. However, the teacher would probably manipulate the students' input to match her solutions.

When comparing Jane's scores with her cooperating teacher, her score (40), did not seem to be affected by the teachers' beliefs. T6's score of 34 and T7's score of 38 were both centered between joint teacher and student choices. On the sub-scales, Jane's scores were 7 to 9 but T6 was 8. On instruction, Jane scored 21 on both tries while T6 scored 17. On the discipline dimension, Jane scored 9 then 10 and T6 scored 9. However, when Jane changed an answer, 5 of the 9 changes matched T6's score, so the cooperating teacher's beliefs may have influenced these changes. Appendix K provides the individual answers for Jane and her cooperating teachers.

The changes on the Classroom Management Questionnaire (Table 18) showed a similar pattern to move away from the cooperating teachers' scores. Of the group management strategies Jane's importance score dropped from
Table 18

Responses on the Classroom Management Questionnaire for Jane and her Cooperating Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Jane's initial score</th>
<th>Jane's second score</th>
<th>T6</th>
<th>T7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K I U</td>
<td>K I U</td>
<td>K I U</td>
<td>K I U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Meetings</td>
<td>1 4 1</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Interpersonal Relationships</td>
<td>3 5 3</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withitness and Overlapping</td>
<td>4 5 2</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting Productive Group Norms</td>
<td>3 4 2</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>4 4 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering Group Cohesiveness</td>
<td>3 4 2</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP Total</td>
<td>5-25</td>
<td>14 22 10</td>
<td>18 18 18</td>
<td>25 25 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical Consequences</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reality Therapy</td>
<td>3 5 2</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>4 4 3</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise/Encouragement</td>
<td>4 5 1</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIOEMOTIONAL Total</td>
<td>3-15</td>
<td>10 13 6</td>
<td>12 12 12</td>
<td>14 14 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Expectations and Routines</td>
<td>4 5 3</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting, Relevant, Appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>3 5 1</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTRUCTIONAL Total</td>
<td>2-10</td>
<td>7 10 4</td>
<td>9 9 9</td>
<td>10 10 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Reinforcement</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extinction/Time Out</td>
<td>4 3 2</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td>5 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Token Economy Systems</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
<td>5 3 3</td>
<td>5 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency Contracting</td>
<td>1 2 1</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td>5 4 3</td>
<td>5 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEHAVIOR MOD. Total</td>
<td>4-20</td>
<td>11 10 7</td>
<td>13 13 13</td>
<td>18 15 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Jane's initial score</th>
<th>Jane's second score</th>
<th>T6</th>
<th>T7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mild Desists</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish/Enforce Rules</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation/Exclusion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AUTHORITARIAN</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harsh Reprimands</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal Punishment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTIMIDATION</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. K = knowledge score; I = importance score; U = understanding score. T6= cooperating teacher; T7= track-out cooperating teacher.

22/25 to 18/25. However, T6 and T7 scored these strategies very important, 25/25 and 23/25, respectively. Jane did show a slight increase in her knowledge and use of these strategies. Interestingly, T6 marked all five of these strategies with 5's in all three areas, knowledgeable, importance, and use.

A slight drop in importance was noted in both the socioemotional and instructional strategies. Jane's scores moved from 13/15 to 12/15 on the socioemotional approach but T6 and T7 scored 14/15, marking two of the three
strategies as most important. On the instructional approach, Jane dropped the importance of classroom expectations from 5 to 4, receiving a score of 9/10. Both T6 and T7 scored 10/10.

The authoritarian strategies also fell in importance, according to Jane. Her second score 8/15 dropped from 13/15 when she dropped the importance of mild desists and isolation/exclusion. T6 and T7 scored these strategies an 11/15 and 14/15.

The only approach that Jane showed an increase in the importance of strategies was the behavior modification approach. She moved from an original score of 10/20 to a 13/20, increasing her belief of the importance of positive reinforcement. T6 scored 15/20 on the importance of these strategies and T7 showed a score of 18/20.

Jane dropped the total number of strategies that she viewed as most important from 8 to 3. These three strategies were praise/encouragement, interesting/appropriate curriculum and instruction, and positive reinforcement. Jane, T6 and T7 marked these strategies with 5's in all three areas of knowledge, importance, and use. However, T6 marked an additional seven strategies with all 5's and T7 marked five additional strategies with all 5's.

Summary of Case Study Three: Jane

Jane brought strong beliefs from her former schooling into her student teaching experience. She spent 15 weeks with T6 and one week with T7. Both cooperating teachers provided effective classroom management strategies that
Jane said she would use when she began teaching. She noted no strategies that she had seen that she disliked.

There were subtle changes between Jane's first and second concept maps but these were more a result of an expansion of already recognized concepts, not new ideas or beliefs. The concepts were supported by the cooperating teachers classroom management systems and their beliefs as evidenced on the ICMS and the Classroom Management Questionnaire.

Jane's scores moved consistently toward a more teacher-centered power for control of the student, although only the instructional sub-scale showed a high level of interventionist philosophy. Her cooperating teachers scored more in the interactionalist range where students' abilities, emotions, and thought processes are perceived as important as the teacher's in the development of classroom management. However, both cooperating teachers provided detailed management systems and structured classroom environments. Additionally, they both provided consistency and follow-through with rules and procedures. These were the same areas where Jane's scores increased, so although her scores did not appear to move toward the cooperating teachers' beliefs, the change in scores demonstrated a move in the direction of their strengths in classroom management.
Case Study Four: Joy

Key Influences On Management Beliefs Prior to Student Teaching

Joy grew up the oldest of five children. She took care of them and her 21 cousins who all lived nearby. So although teaching wasn’t her first choice for a college major, she soon discovered that it would be the right profession. She explained:

Actually, my fiancé commented about how good I was with children and that I would make a really good teacher. I had chosen business as my major but that wasn’t working out too well. I started thinking about what he and my family were saying. I’ve always loved working and being around kids. And once I started taking the education courses, I knew that I had made the right choice.

Joy was asked to describe the school environment in which she had been raised. She admitted that she was always a very good student and never got in trouble. Joy spoke of her third grade class, which she still remembers vividly:

That class had some really bad kids. I remember the room being pretty much chaotic all of the time. The teacher was not a good manager. There was no progressive discipline. She just yelled and screamed a lot. I still remember it. I was very quiet in that class because she scared me.

When asked what educational classes Joy had completed that had helped her develop classroom management beliefs and strategies, she talked about the class she had just completed. This class focused on learning and applying specific classroom management strategies. Joy stated, “I think I’ve learned most of my strategies in there and applied them to the classroom”. She described the project she had to complete:

We had to do this in class. At the end of the year, we had to show how we would have our classroom set up. The set up, the management plan, the way
we would do lunch count, every last detail. I had to write the things that we learned throughout the semester in a paper and do my presentation. It was really neat because I went out and got real bathroom passes. Then you showed how you would do everything in the presentations. That helped me a lot.

The discussion turned to the practicum experiences that Joy had completed. She explained that she mostly observed during the practicum classes although she did have to teach several individual lessons. She never taught the whole day, though.

When asked what she had observed in her field experiences, she admitted without hesitation that her second practicum, a first grade classroom, lacked any kind of structure. She concluded, “I learned a lot about what I wouldn’t do.” When asked to elaborate, she mentioned the lack of routines, rules, and consistency. “The team teachers were always reminding the students to behave appropriately and reprimanding them for not following the rules, even though there were none consistently in place. The students weren’t sure what to do.”

Joy then discussed her first practicum, a third grade class, which she seemed to enjoy. Her comment about this class, “It was structured right down to the bathroom procedures and everything”, indicated that she valued a structured classroom with specific procedures as an important component of effective management.

Joy completed her explanation about her practicum experiences by describing a two-day observation in a third grade classroom. She commented, “I picked up a lot from that class. How she did lunch count and just everything. The
way she disciplined her children. I learned extremely a lot.” Joy gave the
following example:

She did specific things. If the children had to go to the bathroom, she gave
them tickets. They could take two bathroom breaks throughout the day, using
these tickets. They would have signals, to get the teacher’s attention instead
of interrupting the class by coming up to the front. It reduced a lot of the
noise and movement.

Joy revealed what she liked about the teacher’s behavior management:

For her discipline, the kids were in charge of their own discipline. Each kid
had a card on their desk and it stated the classroom rules, the school rules.
Instead of turning cards, they would check it themselves. I found that they
were really doing it. If they did something they knew was wrong, they would
check it themselves. Then the cards went home at the end of the week for
parents to sign. I thought it worked really well.

When questioned if the teacher monitored their marks, Joy admitted that she
had asked the same question. The teacher explained that, as she taught the
procedure, she would monitor for the first three weeks, but after that, the
students did it themselves. I sensed that Joy was quite surprised at the students’
ability to self-monitor.

Beliefs About Effective Classroom Management

Prior To Student Teaching

From Joy’s initial discussions about her own schooling and her educational
experiences, she consistently emphasized structure and rules and procedures
for everything. She was beginning her student teaching with a belief that these
concepts were necessary for good classroom management.
Joy's first graphic organizer (Figure 7) also emphasized these concepts. When asked to complete the map using the question, "How do teachers establish and maintain effective classroom management?", Joy identified 12 concepts in mostly two levels. The five primary levels of concepts included: incentives for students to follow rules and daily procedures; teacher must establish a leadership role; consistency; first weeks of school establishing rules and procedures; and model rules and procedures. Joy began an explanation of her choices:

I think that the most important thing, and I put it closest to the front right here, (points) is that the teacher should establish a leadership role and it should be done in the first days, weeks of school. I also put the first weeks of school. To establish rules and procedures is really important. And to be consistent. They need to see that you're consistent in what you want.

There was a secondary level to the concept map that defined and provided examples of the primary beliefs. When discussing these beliefs, Joy added:

I think it's a good idea that students have a chance to get up and model the rules and procedures instead of just the teacher doing it. I should have put that your effective classroom management plan had to be individualized but I've seen teachers that had to change their management plan halfway through the year because it just doesn't work. I think it's okay to do that, to have a backup plan, even if it's for one student.

Joy's map produced concepts only in the discipline areas. She did not address any personal or instructional concepts. These choices supported her earlier statements that defined structure, rules, and procedures as most important in classroom management.
Figure 7. Initial concept map for Joy, before student teaching
Surveys

The results from the ICMS and the Classroom Management Questionnaire were examined to determine Joy’s theoretical beliefs about classroom management. On the ICMS (see Table 19), her overall score was 42, on a range of 24-48. This score placed Joy in the middle between interactionalist and interventionist beliefs. Using this score, Joy indicated that she would strongly support a classroom management system that the teacher had most control over. Some student involvement would be slightly supported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Joy's score (X)</th>
<th>Non-interventionist</th>
<th>Interactionalist</th>
<th>Interventionist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum score</td>
<td>Maximum score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person Dimension</td>
<td>10   6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction Dimension</td>
<td>21 12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline Dimension</td>
<td>11 6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>42   24</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Looking at the sub-scale scores showed a consistent pattern of teacher control in all areas. The score of 10, on the 6-12 range, on the person dimension demonstrated a belief that the teacher should strongly influence the climate of the classroom. The teacher should be responsible for establishing appropriate rules and guiding the students in forming acceptable social capabilities.

Joy rated the instructional dimension with a focus on teacher power. Her score, 21 on a range of 12-24, again emphasized her belief that the teacher should control such classroom functions as the physical environment, classroom routines and activities, and instructional planning. Students would have minimum input into their instructional day.

The discipline sub-scale score also confirmed Joy's belief in a high degree of teacher control over the classroom rules, rewards, and consequences. Scoring 11 on a scale of 6-12 found Joy in the interventionist range and clearly established her belief that the teacher controls the behavior of the classroom. Joy would likely establish the classroom rules and tell the students what rewards and consequences they could expect.

The Classroom Management Questionnaire that Joy completed was analyzed to determine her beliefs about the importance of specific classroom strategies (see Table 20). She initially scored only 2 of the 21 strategies as most important, classroom expectations and routines, and establish/enforce rules. These choices supported her previous statements and the concepts on her graphic organizer. Looking at the individual approaches from the least to
Table 20

*Initial scores on the Classroom Management Questionnaire for Joy*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Group 5-25</th>
<th>Socio-Emotional 3-15</th>
<th>Instruction 2-10</th>
<th>Behavior Modification 4-20</th>
<th>Authoritarian 3-15</th>
<th>Intimidation 4-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

most teacher-controlled, we again see the same pattern of teacher power in the category of importance.

On the group strategies, Joy scored 18/25. She rated all of the approaches either a 3 or 4, showing some degree of importance. The socioemotional strategies were also rated with a 3 or 4, giving her an overall score on this approach of 11/15. The instructional approach, with a score of 8/10 did support one rating of 5, but Joy rated interesting and relevant curriculum only a 3.

The more teacher power strategies showed a mixed range of scores in the importance category. Behavior modification strategies were rated 13/20 overall; however, Joy did rate positive reinforcement with a 4. The authoritarian approach received a rating of 13/15 with the strategy for establishing/enforce rules rating most important. The intimidation approach generally rated lowest
due to the harshness of the strategies and Joy only gave these techniques an 8/20.

The Classroom Environment During Student Teaching

Joy began her student teaching bringing in strong beliefs about teacher control of the classroom management. She was assigned to a third grade classroom on track 4. This class would be in session for nine weeks before the students went on track break. During their break, Joy would be going into another third grade classroom. Her internship began the first day that teachers reported back to school for the new school year, so Joy was able to witness the entire starting school procedures.

Joy was asked to describe the management plan she had just observed as it was implemented in the classroom where she was interning. Her comments included:

I like the school wide citations. The kids seem to take it very seriously. A lot of the students that have been here, they’ve come from grade two, and they already know what the deal is with the citations. It’s used a lot in the class. I haven’t seen a citation given but you know one warning is enough for some of the kids.

She clarified that the citations were issued to students if they broke any of the major school rules: keep your hands and feet to self, follow directions, and respect self and others. On the receipt of the third citation, the student was sent to the office to speak with an administrator. Joy reiterated that the students knew what a citation was and did not want to receive one.
Joy explained how interesting it was to actually see how the cooperating teacher had set up the classroom rules. She began her explanation:

It was very interesting to see how the rules and procedures were set up. I've only seen it in my management classes and when you go into a classroom, you don't know how it actually started. She showed them the school rules and then she started the classroom rules. She did about two of them. She asked the kids, "What do you think would be an important classroom rule." They would give their ideas and we'd talk about their ideas. The next day, she had them tally to see which ones the kids thought were the most important. They did it together and came up with their own class rules. I really like it cause the kids come up with some good rules that way.

Joy concluded by explaining that during the first week, the cooperating teacher was a little more lenient until everyone had a chance to learn the rules. From then on, they were told they would need to remember and follow the rules.

The Cooperating Teachers

Joy spent 13 weeks with her major cooperating teacher, T8. This teacher is in the 20 to 29 year old range and has been teaching four years in third grade. She currently holds a Master's Degree. T8 was chosen by the administration to mentor a student teacher because of her good classroom management skills, her students' continual academic achievement, her ability to work well with others, and her interest in technology. T8 was a quiet, soft-spoken teacher who was known throughout the school site for her patience and caring attitude towards her students.

T8 completed the ICMS and the Classroom Management Questionnaire so that her beliefs about classroom management could be identified. T8 scored 35 in a range of 24-48 on the ICMS. This score placed her in the interactionalist
range. According to this score, her classroom management beliefs could be defined as a combination of student and teacher input. This teacher would likely use joint student and teacher solutions when designing and implementing the classroom management.

On the sub-scale dimensions, T8 scored 8 in a range of 6-12 on the person dimension, staying between the non-interventionist and interactionalist beliefs. Her students would likely feel comfortable, capable, and be highly motivated. The classroom climate would be student centered, and students would be allowed to work creatively in groups.

The score on the instruction dimension, 18 in a range from 12-24, continued to portray T8 as an interactionalist, as did the score on the discipline sub-scale, 9, in a range of 6-12. From her responses, this teacher wanted to control the physical environment, the classroom routines, monitoring of student learning, and the effectiveness of positive/negative consequences. The students would be allowed to determine the time-on-task behaviors, choice of instructional activities, and the rules for the classroom.

T8 also completed the Classroom Management Questionnaire so that specific strategies could be identified that she thought were important and were also used often in the classroom. T8 rated 9 out of 21 strategies as most important. She also rated these as used very frequently in the classroom. These included four of the five strategies in the group approach, giving this area a
23/25 score. T8 also scored both instructional strategies as most important, 10/10, and two of the three authoritarian strategies the same, 13/15.

In the socioemotional approach, T8 did identify reality therapy as most important and used often in the classroom, although praise and logical consequences were not rated as highly, giving that section an overall score of 12/15. Overall these scores fell mostly on the left to middle line of the continuum from student-centered to teacher-centered control. The Classroom Management Questionnaire supported the ICMS scores in determining T8’s classroom beliefs.

When asked to explain how she set up her classroom management, T8 responded:

Students are told on the first day of school what their behavior plan is. I stress the fact that I follow through. I always follow through. I have a class list where I have all the students’ names. I give them three warnings/checks throughout the week. I will verbally warn the students if they are misbehaving. If they continue with the same misbehavior, I give them a check. My rules include not talking, respecting others, no disruptive behavior. If they get three throughout the week, I call their parents and give a citation, depending on the severity. I follow the school-wide behavior plan with the three citations and go to the office.

T8 did add that she makes adjustments to this plan depending on what kind of class she has. Very few students have ever earned three citations and a trip to the office. The teacher states that using her management style, which reflects the group, instructional, and socioemotional strategies, helps the students control their own behavior. A warning would usually be enough.

Although Joy only observed in T9’s room for three weeks, his beliefs should be identified. T9 is in the 20-29 year old range as well. He has been teaching for
four years, in third and fourth grades. He is currently working on a Master’s Degree. This teacher was chosen by the administration to mentor Joy because of his technological skills and his use of technology in his classroom.

Looking at his ICMS results, T9 scored overall in the interactionalist range, 36 in a range of 24-48. This score indicated that T9 would seek input from students, and allow them to have some power over their classroom environment. The person dimension showed a score of 10, on a scale of 6-12. T-9’s responses indicated that he felt it was his responsibility to set the guidelines, and help students in their decision making and working cooperatively, although he did feel they were capable of doing so.

On the instructional sub-scale, 17 on a scale of 12-24, T9 indicated that he would most likely take control of the physical environment and the classroom routines. The students would have input into the learning behaviors of the classroom. The responses from the discipline sub-scale, 9 on a scale of 6-12, demonstrated the same division between student and teacher control. T9 believed that classroom rules were important but the students also needed to understand them. Additionally, his acknowledgement of positive and negative behaviors would be with praise and non-verbal communication.

The Classroom Management Questionnaire identified only two strategies that T9 believed most important and only one of those, classroom expectations and routines was also rated as very frequently used. Establishing and enforcing rules was identified as most important but the teacher rated it a 4 in the used
category. In looking at the scores on a continuum from student power to
teacher power, T9 rated the group strategies, 19/25, socioemotional, 11/15, and
instructional 9/10. The more teacher-controlled approaches received less ratings
for importance and use.

When asked to describe his classroom management system, T9 commented:

My classroom management changes throughout the year. I start the year off
with very structured class points and rewards system. In this system, the
class earns points every time someone meets the preset expectations. When
someone makes a minor infraction, then I earn a point. I set up a number of
points for a goal. Then if the class reaches it, they get a reward (extra recess,
ice cream, etc.). If I reach the goal first, then all points are erased and we
start over. As the year progresses, the students begin to self monitor their
behavior, and I no longer have to strictly reinforce every behavior. Usually, a
stern look or mean teacher voice is enough to correct most problems.

This management supported T9's beliefs that positive interpersonal
relationships, logical consequences, praise, classroom routines and rules, and
positive reinforcement were needed to effectively manage a classroom.

The Student Teaching Experience

During the sixteen weeks that Joy was student teaching, two formal
classroom observations were made to specifically observe her teaching. Field
notes were utilized and supervisory conferences were conducted to gain insight
into the management style that she utilized. On both occasions she had made
satisfactory progress in all areas of her teaching.

When examining the learning environment observed in her classroom, Joy
used many effective strategies. She used verbal praise often to encourage
student success, achievement, and participation during class discussions.
Additionally, she modeled respect and courtesy when interacting with the students. When one student answered incorrectly, she said, "That's a good answer, but think about it this way," instead of just telling him he was wrong. She had the students working in groups, and they were given table points during transitions and when appropriate behaviors were recognized.

Viewing her instructional management, students were focused on the assignments and seemed to enjoy the activities. Allocated learning time was quick paced and student on-task behavior was focused through the use of effective questioning techniques. Joy set the stage for instruction and followed the elements of a good lesson by modeling and then allowing the student to work in groups on the assignments. She used a technology device, called the Elmo, during one observation, to record student answers during teacher-directed instruction.

The students followed the classroom rules, which were posted. When needed, Joy used verbal redirection to call a student back on task. Additionally, she used the count down method, 5,4,3,2,1 to gain whole class attention. She did follow through by waiting until she had everyone's attention before speaking. Joy used non-verbal cues, such as "the look", and close proximity to keep students focused.

When asked how she felt the observed lessons went, she began her explanation, "I think the lessons went well. The students met my overall objectives. I feel the students respect me when I am teaching." When asked to
elaborate why she felt the students respected her, she concluded that she followed the rules and procedures in the classroom and having realized the importance of follow-through, had been consistent. She felt this had made the difference in their behaviors toward a student teacher.

The researcher observed more of a student-focused approach with Joy’s interaction with the students, than had been expected from previous conversations and her responses on the concept map and questionnaires. She had certainly established a leadership role in the classroom but she was able to interact freely with the students, and comfortably solicited their participation and input. Joy did expect students to behave appropriately and had to occasionally correct a student, but it was done in a genuine, caring manner instead of with authority and a firm hand.

Joy’s Beliefs About Effective Classroom Management Following Student Teaching

Prior to leaving at the end of her student teaching, Joy again completed a concept map, using the same theme as before, “How do teachers establish and maintain effective classroom management.” Additionally, she completed the ICMS and the Classroom Management Questionnaire so her beliefs about classroom management could be analyzed. A follow-up conference presented clarity on these documents and her overall student teaching experience.

As seen in Figure 8, Joy’s second concept map showed a more sophisticated hierarchical structure including three primary levels, 10 at the secondary and 2 at the tertiary level. Her three primary concepts, down from five on the first map
Be consistent w/ rewards and consequences for every student

Maintain rules and procedures

Establish classroom rules and procedures

Always reinforce and remind

Remind students what he/she should be doing when they are off task

Utilize praise and encouragement

Approval of good behavior

Positive comments & reinforcement

Class meetings every week

Create a positive learning environment

Positive interpersonal relationships w/ students

Promote positive expectations

Group cohesiveness

Promote classroom norms

Promote an environment in which students and teacher work together

Figure 8. Second concept map for Joy, after student teaching
included: utilize praise and encouragement, create a positive learning environment, and establish classroom rules and procedures.

When explaining these concepts, Joy revealed:

Well, after being in the classroom a lot more, I realized that being consistent with each child is very important because if you give a little slack for one child, cause they're usually on task, the other kids pick that up and they catch you on that. I think, no matter what the situation is, it's really important, and I see that more now.

The primary levels changed from incentives, modeling procedures, establishing rules and procedures, consistency, and teacher as a leader. However, all but the teacher/leadership role, were still found in the secondary level of the second concept map under the primary heading, establish classroom rules and procedures. The other two primary concepts were new from the first map and demonstrated Joy's belief in the importance of the personal dimension of management. The third level of the hierarchy offered several specific examples of the concepts she had addressed. Joy still failed to address any of the instructional management beliefs and techniques on the concept map.

Joy was asked to discuss her student teaching experience. She expressed her content with the program and the gains she had made as a teacher. She confided:

My first experience was very good. I learned a lot. I was actually teaching for the first four weeks with T8. It wasn't as hard as I thought. I was scared. I wondered, how will I put it all together. Once I was in the routine, it was wonderful. I think the hardest thing for me was getting used to one teacher's way of doing things and then having to move during track break into another classroom and trying to pick up the way he did everything. It's difficult because I know what will work for me if I had my classroom. But what other teacher's do, it doesn't work.
When asked to explain what didn’t work for her in the classrooms, Joy stated that there was nothing particular. She told of a little boy in T8’s classroom that had a lot of behavior problems. She acknowledged that both she and the teacher had tried at least four different behavior strategies, and none had worked so far. Joy outlined the latest technique:

We even gave him his own piece of paper on his desk. He would get pluses and minuses. At the end of the day, if he had so many pluses, he would get a prize. That did not work for him. We really thought it would be effective and it wasn’t. I don’t know what will work.

Joy did express some ideas about the strategies she saw that she liked and would use in her own classroom:

T9 used the countdown in his classroom and it worked well for me. I don’t know if he uses it very often, but for some reason they just catch on real quick. They did use it in the school-wide assemblies. T8 had a rain stick that I used every once in a while. We played games and that noise really gets their attention. They just drop what they’re doing. I have one and I actually plan to use it in my class.

Joy talked about the group point system she saw in T8’s classroom. She admitted that the group points helped the students work together. The group would be off-task and she’d watch them whisper to each other and get everybody going again. She also mentioned the school bucks that both teachers gave to student for positive rewards. She completed her explanation by revealing, “They’re really excited about that. T8 and T9 both use them. T9 always had them on him. The students know that and it works.”

Joy was asked if she thought her student teaching experience had changed her management beliefs. She explained that she felt that her beliefs
were strengthened instead of changed:

I did go in just from seeing what other teachers did in my practicums thinking, “I'm definitely not going to do that and it worked for me. I think I've grown through the experience. Because once you're doing the whole routine full time, everything comes together. A lot of the decisions are very spontaneous and applies to what is happening at that moment. I think I've grown and I'm not as scared as I used to be.

Interestingly, when she was asked to describe the management system she planned on using in her own classroom, Joy described a chart system she had observed in another classroom:

Each child had a little chart and they get little stickers every time they're good. Also they turn cards for bad behavior. There were five different colors. I really like that. I think my first year I would try multiple things together. I would use a lot of incentives. I like the idea of a group as a whole, a week as a whole. They have such good behavior when they get a pizza party!

This card system and chart system were both examples of a behavior modification approach, which Joy initially rated as a 3 for importance and a 3 for use on her Classroom Management Questionnaire. Looking at the results on the second pair of questionnaires should reveal some changes in her beliefs.

Surveys

On the second ICMS (see Table 21), Joy scored a 37 overall. On a range of 24-48, this score placed her in the interactionalist category and quite a drop from her previous score of 42. This would indicate that Joy had developed a more student-centered approach to classroom management. The interactionalist believed that the management is a result of student and teacher joint solutions.

On the sub-scale dimensions, Joy scored the same on person, 10 on a scale of 6-12, indicating that she still felt that the teacher should have most of the
Table 21

A scattergram of the relationship between Joy’s scores and those of her cooperating teachers’ scores on the ICMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Joy’s initial score (X)</th>
<th>Joy’s second score (Y)</th>
<th>T8 score (*)</th>
<th>T9 score (+)</th>
<th>Non-interventionist Minimum score</th>
<th>Interactionalist Maximum score</th>
<th>Interventionist Maximum score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>XY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Y*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. T8 = cooperating teacher; T-9 = track out cooperating teacher

control over the classroom environment. She changed two responses dealing with student self-expression but neither of these changes were marked the same as T8. She indicated that student self-expression should be nurtured but they need to follow her directions to be successful.

On the instructional dimension, Joy again moved toward a more student-centered approach. Her score, 18 on a scale of 12-24, and down from 21, placed her in the interactionalist range of beliefs. This was the same score as T8. Joy changed 5 of the 12 responses but only 2 of those changed matched...
T8's responses. She gave more student control to such things as the physical environment and learning activities but showed a belief that the teacher should control the time and classroom routines.

The most interesting result was on the discipline sub-scale. Joy dropped her previous score from 11 on a scale of 6-12 to a 9, the same as T8's score. She still showed a strong propensity for teacher control of the rule settings but had changed her belief to include some student input.

Joy seemed to have changed her beliefs to a more student-centered focus, still with strong teacher influence. Her scores moved into the same ranges as her cooperating teachers on the ICMS. A complete table of individual scores for Joy and her cooperating teachers appears in Appendix L.

Joy's overall score on the Classroom Management Questionnaire (see Table 22), showed the following increases: knowledgeable, 64 to 92; importance, 69 to 89; and used, 39 to 84. These scores indicated that Joy had been exposed to many of the strategies during her student teaching. On the second questionnaire, Joy chose 12 of the 21 strategies as most important, compared to only 2 on the initial questionnaire. Of these strategies, her major cooperating teacher, T8, also rated the same 8 strategies as most important and used very frequently.

Moving from most student power to most teacher power, Joy selected 4 of the 5 strategies in the group approach as most important and the other one received a rating of 4 for a total score of 24/25. This compared with 18/25 on the
Table 22

Responses on the Classroom Management Questionnaire for Joy and her Cooperating Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Joy’s initial score</th>
<th>Joy’s second score</th>
<th>T8</th>
<th>T9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K I U</td>
<td>K I U</td>
<td>K I U</td>
<td>K I U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Meetings</td>
<td>2 4 1</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>1 4 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Interpersonal Relationships</td>
<td>3 4 2</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withitness and Overlapping</td>
<td>3 4 2</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>3 4 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting Productive Group Norms</td>
<td>3 3 2</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering Group Cohesiveness</td>
<td>2 3 2</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>4 3 3</td>
<td>4 4 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP Total</td>
<td>13 18 9</td>
<td>24 24 24</td>
<td>24 23 23</td>
<td>15 19 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical Consequences</td>
<td>3 4 2</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 4 4</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reality Therapy</td>
<td>4 3 2</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>1 3 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise/Encouragement</td>
<td>4 4 3</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIOEMOTIONAL Total</td>
<td>11 11 7</td>
<td>15 15 15</td>
<td>15 12 12</td>
<td>10 11 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Expectations and Routines</td>
<td>4 5 4</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>4 5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting, Relevant, Appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>3 3 2</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTRUCTIONAL Total</td>
<td>7 8 6</td>
<td>10 10 10</td>
<td>10 10 10</td>
<td>8 9 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Reinforcement</td>
<td>3 4 3</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>5 2 2</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extinction/Time Out</td>
<td>2 2 1</td>
<td>3 3 2</td>
<td>5 3 1</td>
<td>3 3 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Token Economy Systems</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td>4 4 5</td>
<td>4 4 2</td>
<td>3 3 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency Contracting</td>
<td>3 4 1</td>
<td>5 5 4</td>
<td>5 3 2</td>
<td>4 4 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEHAVIOR MOD. Total</td>
<td>11 13 7</td>
<td>16 16 15</td>
<td>19 12 7</td>
<td>14 14 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Joy's initial score K</th>
<th>Joy's second score K</th>
<th>T8 U</th>
<th>T9 U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mild Desists</td>
<td>4 4 3</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>3 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish/Enforce Rules</td>
<td>5 5 2</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation/Exclusion</td>
<td>3 3 1</td>
<td>4 4 2</td>
<td>4 3 1</td>
<td>2 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHORITARIAN</td>
<td>Total 3-15</td>
<td>12 12 6</td>
<td>14 13 11</td>
<td>10 10 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harsh Reprimands</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
<td>4 4 3</td>
<td>5 1 1</td>
<td>4 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal Punishment</td>
<td>2 1 1</td>
<td>2 1 1</td>
<td>5 1 1</td>
<td>5 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats</td>
<td>3 3 1</td>
<td>3 2 2</td>
<td>5 2 1</td>
<td>4 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>2 2 1</td>
<td>4 3 2</td>
<td>5 2 1</td>
<td>4 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTIMIDATION –</td>
<td>Total 4-20</td>
<td>10 8 4</td>
<td>13 10 8</td>
<td>20 6 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>64 92</td>
<td>102 74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>69 89</td>
<td>76 70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Used</td>
<td>39 84</td>
<td>67 58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** K = knowledge score; I = importance score; U = understanding score. T8 cooperating teacher; T9 track-out cooperating teacher.

first questionnaire. Likewise, on the socioemotional approach, all three strategies were given a most important rating for a score of 15/15, compared with an 11/15 on the first. The instructional strategies both received a rating of 5 as on the initial questionnaire. These scores show a general tendency to support a student-centered classroom environment and management system. The behavior modification strategies increased somewhat overall, 16/20 but Joy
rated the contingency contracting as a most important strategy. This high rating could have been the result of the problem child in her classroom and the strategies that had been tried with him.

Two of the three authoritarian strategies were rated as most important and these same strategies were rated by T8 as most important and used often. Additionally, Joy increased harsh reprimands to a 4 rating in the intimidation approach.

Overall, Joy increased the importance and use on many of the strategies covered in the Classroom Management Questionnaire but most were along the continuum on the student-centered side.

**Summary of Case Study Four: Joy**

Joy began her student teaching with a strong belief in teacher control of the classroom. She probably developed this power in her early years when she had to take care of her younger siblings and cousins. As seen in her initial concept maps and questionnaires, Joy expected rules, procedures, rewards, and consequences to be established and followed consistently. Her comments about her concerns with the first grade practicum supported her beliefs.

Now looking at the end of her student teaching experience, Joy indicated from her interviews, and her second concept map and questionnaires, that she had moved along the control/power continuum from a teacher controlled to a joint control, between students and teachers, of the classroom management. Her beliefs seemed to gravitate toward her major cooperating teacher’s beliefs,
whom she had spent thirteen weeks observing and working with, at least in
the person area.

It doesn't appear that Joy changed her beliefs substantially. She continued to
demonstrate the belief in the high teacher control over the classroom rules,
routines, schedules, and instructional planning. Instead of giving up the belief of
control, she increased her belief that students are important individuals who can
add valuable input into the classroom management by working in groups and
helping each other.
CHAPTER 5

MAJOR FINDING, GENERAL OBSERVATIONS,
DISCUSSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to identify, describe and examine the belief systems of four student teachers before their student teaching experience and again at the conclusion of their internship. The perspective taken in this study was that the beliefs of student teachers were likely to change due to the influence of their cooperating teachers and the experiences gained from actually working with students on a long-term basis. The research questions addressed were:

1. What are the student teachers' beliefs about effective classroom management prior to and following their student teaching experience?
2. What changes occur in student teachers' beliefs about classroom management as a result of their experience?
3. What influences student teachers' beliefs about classroom management?
4. How do the cooperating teachers impact the student teachers' beliefs about effective classroom management?
Chapter V summarizes and discusses the findings of the study from the basis of these research questions. Conclusions from the general findings are addressed. Finally, implications and suggestions for further research of these questions are drawn.

Major Findings

Eight major findings emerged from this study based on the research questions. Two of these findings relate to student teachers' beliefs prior to their student teaching experiences. The other six relate to their beliefs after the internship. These findings are based solely on the data gathered from the four student teachers and their nine cooperating teachers in this study.

Findings Related To Student Teachers' Beliefs Prior to Student Teaching

1. The student teachers expressed some common beliefs about effective classroom management.

As a result of the data sorting and analysis, topics were constructed that revealed common beliefs of student teachers about effective classroom management. Their concept maps suggested beliefs that certain discipline strategies should be addressed by effective classroom teachers. These specific strategies included the use of follow-through and consistency, the use of consequences, and the establishment of rules and procedures.

The majority of the concepts written on the student teachers' graphic organizers were placed in the discipline category of management. In fact,
discipline was the only dimension of management where all four student teachers wrote concepts. The other management areas, person and instruction, contained some ideas, but not on all four concept maps.

The student teachers' educational experiences produced additional commonalities. When asked about coursework, they all commented that they had taken the required classroom management course and found it useful. When asked about specific strategies they were exposed to in the class, all mentioned that the establishment of rules and procedures was a major objective in the course. These comments reflected, in part, what they took from the theories and pedagogical thinking that they were exposed to during formal educational opportunities.

The student teachers talked about negative experiences in their early fieldwork. They each mentioned the lack of procedures or structure in at least one classroom they had observed that had kept the teacher from what they understood to be an effective classroom manager. This finding would suggest that the student teachers began their internship with a common focus on the necessity for rules, procedures, and consequences when looking at an effective classroom management system.

2. The student teachers also revealed a variety of different and individual beliefs about classroom management.

When comparing the initial ICMS and Classroom Management Questionnaire for general findings, the only conclusive finding was that there were no common
scoring patterns. Although the student teachers all expressed the importance of rules and procedures on these instruments, they chose a variety of strategies and responses that placed their final scores in different ranges and levels on the control continuum.

Of the 21 responses on the Classroom Management Questionnaire, all four student teachers had seven identical responses. These responses contained statements regarding rules, schedules, instructional planning, and consequences. This finding would suggest that although professional schooling does impact student beliefs, certain beliefs may be developed during their personal biographies, including their early schooling, and may not be easily changed. From the above information, it would seem that these student teachers may have entered their internship with preconceived beliefs grounded in their past, and supported in their educational training.

Findings Related to Student Teacher Beliefs Following Student Teaching

1. The second concept maps were similar in substance and structure when compared to the first, but differed in the depth of the beliefs.

All but one of the student teachers increased their responses on the second concept map. However, instead of shifting their beliefs substantially from one perspective to another, the student teachers generally regrouped them under different headings and added additional comments. For example, they would place an emphasis on one concept that wasn’t as prominent on the initial
map, or the order of importance of the concepts had changed. However, most concepts were recognized on both maps to some degree.

Joy added concepts in the person dimension, which she had not listed on the first map. This would indicate that she may have developed a more broad-based defining of classroom management, instead of simply discipline. In all, the student teachers seemed to be more specific about their prior beliefs and add to them, not directly change them.

2. All student teachers identified at least one belief on their second concept map from the person dimension.

The concept maps were studied for individual results after the student teaching experience to determine if the student teachers' beliefs had changed. When looking at all student teacher responses, it was interesting to note that three had added at least one person component to their belief statements. Jane was the only student teacher who mentioned only one concept, respect, on both concept maps. Everyone else had increased the number of statements about the student's personal expression and control of behavior.

The two that added the most concepts to the person dimension were also mentored by cooperating teachers who were very student-centered and promoted a safe, warm, social climate in their classrooms. These student teachers were therefore exposed to the person dimension of classroom management and observed the strategies that encouraged students to be capable, independent, and supportive of a group spirit.
3. The student teachers' belief statements increased in the discipline area on the follow-up concept map.

On the second concept map, the student teachers generally increased belief statements about the discipline dimension of classroom management. Only John listed fewer discipline statements than on his previous map. However, in his interviews, he continually spoke of consistency and consequences, which were the two areas left out on his second map. Additionally, on his questionnaires, these strategies were still identified as important. He may have still valued these beliefs but omitted them on the map.

According to the statements on the concept maps, the student teachers did not decrease their beliefs about discipline as effective management. Their statements seemed to strengthen their original beliefs that the development and implementation of rules, procedures, and consequences were essential elements for effective classroom management.

4. On both questionnaires, most of the changes in the student teachers' scores moved in the direction of their cooperating teachers' thinking on the continuum from student-controlled to teacher-controlled behavior.

When comparing the student teachers' initial and second responses on the questionnaires with their major cooperating teacher's response, an interesting pattern occurred. It appeared that the changes in the student teachers' scores generally moved in the direction of their cooperating teachers' scores. For
example, Joe’s initial score on the person dimension sub-scale of the ICMS was a 9, with his follow-up score, 7, the same as his major cooperating teacher.

Looking individually at each student teacher, Joe’s score stayed the same or moved toward his cooperating teacher’s score on three of the four ICMS scores and on all six management approaches discussed in the Classroom Management Questionnaire. All four of John’s scores on the ICMS stayed the same or moved toward T4, while four of the six management approaches were scored more like his cooperating teacher. Only half of Jane’s scores on both questionnaires stayed the same or moved toward her cooperating teacher’s thinking. Joy changed three of the four scores on the ICMS and four of the six management approaches to reflect her cooperating teacher’s beliefs. This pattern would indicate that the cooperating teachers’ beliefs and practices may have influenced the student teachers’ thinking in many areas.

There seemed to be a general exception to this finding, however. Three of the four student teachers increased their discipline scores on the ICMS, regardless of the direction of the major cooperating teachers’ scores. This pattern would indicate a strong belief that a more teacher-controlled discipline was essential in effective management, regardless of the cooperating teachers’ beliefs.

As noted earlier, Joy’s discipline score fell slightly, but the responses that changed did not deal directly with rules or procedures. So even though her score fell, she still demonstrated a strong belief through her graphic organizer and her
interviews that teacher-focused rules, procedures, and consequences were necessary. When discussing what type of management system she planned to use, she talked about a behavior modification technique, the color card system and incentives, which were certainly teacher-controlling behaviors.

When looking at the classroom strategies that cooperating teachers rated high in all three areas, knowledgeable, importance, and used, it should be noted that the student teachers' second scores increased most of the time to higher ratings also. Again, the belief and practice of these strategies in the classroom may have had an influence on the student teachers' beliefs and practices.

Also of importance to point out, is the initial difference of importance in the strategies, and the changes in scores. Where there was initially at least a two point difference between the student teachers' scores and the cooperating teachers' scores on specific strategies, it appears that in most cases, the student teachers' second score moved to within one point of the teachers' score. Again, this would indicate that the student teachers' beliefs may have been influenced by the beliefs and practices of their cooperating teachers.

5. Overall, the student teachers' beliefs stayed the same or moved more toward student-controlled behaviors, except in the area of discipline.

Already mentioned above was the increase in concept statements that reflected a person dimension of management on the concept maps. Specifically, Joe and John each added one person concept statement and Joy added four.
This increase indicated a possible tendency for the student teachers to become more student-focused during their internship.

The questionnaires also supported this finding. Three of the student teachers stayed the same or moved away from the interventionist belief on the ICMS sub-scales of person and instruction. On the Classroom Management Questionnaire, most of the scores on the group, socioemotional and instructional approaches were rated high for importance and use.

6. **The student teachers liked reporting at the beginning of the school year.**

This was the first time that the university had arranged for student teachers to report to their assignments on the first day of the new school year. Because they reported at the same time as the general education teachers, these student teachers were exposed to the very beginnings of the school year. They attended the staff development meetings, helped the teachers set up the physical environment of the classrooms, and observed as the cooperating teachers began the first day of school. The response from the student teachers was overwhelmingly positive about the rich experiences they had gained by being at school from the very beginning. This has important implications for student teaching. They felt they had a better idea of how to set up their own classrooms when they began teaching, because they had observed the entire process, instead of stepping into the classroom a few weeks into the school year.
General Observations

From this study, the researcher was able to find some consistencies between the findings of this study and the conclusions from some of the recognized research on preservice teachers' beliefs about effective classroom management. This investigation of four student teachers' beliefs supports previous studies in the following ways:

1. Biographical and education socialization help develop preconceived beliefs about effective classroom management.

   Preservice teachers do bring preconceived beliefs to their teaching. These beliefs are partly a result from experiences of being a student themselves (Lortie, 1975; Borko & Mayfield, 1995; Tatko, 1998; Wilson & Cameron, 1996; Bolton, 1997). These education students have logged many classroom experiences, and these have influenced their attitudes about classroom management.

   Additionally, education coursework and field experiences provide student teachers with specific strategies and techniques that they believe are useful in providing effective classroom management (Uhlenberg, Fuller & Slotnik, 1990; Johnson, 1994; Neale & Johnson, 1994).

2. Cooperating teachers’ beliefs and practices affect student teachers’ thinking.

   It does appear that the cooperating teacher had a substantial influence on student teacher beliefs about classroom management. Although there was no
pattern found with this study to indicate whether cognitive discomfort was useful, the cooperating teachers' beliefs did seem to influence the student teachers' thinking (Smith, 1997; Kagan, 1992; Borko & Mayfield, 1995; Glickman & Bey, 1990).

3. **Student teachers become more authoritarian and teacher controlling in their discipline behavior at the end of the internship but more child-centered in other areas of management.**

The four student teachers in this study began their internships with definite beliefs about classroom management, focused on the discipline dimension. As they moved through their student teaching experiences, they did appear to develop their thinking in student-centered (person dimension) areas (Wilson & Cameron, 1996). However, as evidenced by the data, these teachers seemed to have strengthened their teacher-controlled beliefs about discipline by the end of student teaching (Kagan, 1992).

4. **Student teacher beliefs do not shift in their management orientation. They become broader and more detailed.**

The beliefs about effective classroom management that the four student teachers brought to their internship did not seem to shift substantially on the continuum through the course of their student teaching. The data indicated that student teachers' beliefs did move on the control continuum toward that of their major cooperating teachers' beliefs in many instances. However, the data did not reflect any student teacher's belief changing from one extreme perspective
on the continuum to the other. Overall, their beliefs seemed to broaden, deepen, and increase instead of drastically shift. This would support the research by Neale and Johnson (1994).

Discussion

The four case studies have provided a rich description of the classroom management beliefs of four student teachers prior to their student teaching and again at the completion of their internship. The descriptions have been categorized according to the three broad dimensions of classroom management: person, instruction, and discipline (Martin & Baldwin, 1993). Additionally, these dimensions were placed on a behavior and control continuum ranging from a student-controlled behavior perspective, non-interventionist, to a teacher-controlled behavior, interventionist (Glickman & Tamashiro, 1980).

This study examined the data to determine how student teacher thinking had changed during the classroom experiences and looked at factors that might have influenced these changes. Some researchers have concluded that student teachers begin their final field experience with preconceived concepts that strongly influence what they learn (Goodman, 1988; Kagan, 1992; Pajaras, 1992; Richardson, 1996). These student teachers did express definite beliefs about management, especially in the area of discipline, which they attributed to their own life history, including schooling experiences, the curriculum from the
coursework they had taken in the education program, and their field experiences.

Additionally, the research presents evidence that professional socialization (Wright, 1997) connects these beliefs with the real world of teaching, providing opportunities for practicing the learned strategies and prior concepts (Richardson, 1996; Smith, 1997; Uhlenberg, Fuller & Slotnik, 1990). The cooperating teachers were found to have an impact on the student teachers' beliefs by providing knowledge, practice, and activities and strategies, using their identified classroom management approaches and philosophies. The student teachers did identify certain procedures and teacher behaviors that they had observed in their student teaching that they thought were important. These did not necessarily conform to their previous management beliefs. This is indicative of the effect that cooperating teachers' beliefs may have had on their student teachers' thinking.

The experience of working with students for an extended amount of time also bears responsibility for the expressed beliefs of these student teachers. This was the first opportunity that these student teachers had experienced when they could practice the techniques they had perceived as important. The combination of prior knowledge, experimenting, experience, and the cooperating teachers' style of management may certainly have influenced the belief outcomes of the student teachers.
These teachers continued to express the belief that a strong discipline approach was necessary for an effective classroom management, but also seemed to have recognized other areas of management that were significant in providing effective management. Their comments about their own management styles suggested that they were entering the teaching profession with limited supervised experiences and a broad base for effective management. Realistically, their readiness for the mammoth task ahead of them and their ability to cope successfully with the classroom environment must still be questioned.

Implications For Future Research

Findings from this study suggest the need for further research in the development of teachers' beliefs about effective classroom management. Sustained research efforts must continue in the teacher education field to determine what can be done to strengthen our preservice teachers' knowledge and experiences so they can be successful classroom teachers.

1. **How can student teacher beliefs be further investigated?**

One of the limitations of this study was the small number of student teachers in the sample. It would be beneficial to conduct a study on a much larger scale to see if the same patterns could be identified. This study could be completed through the entire school district in order to gain a better picture of student teacher beliefs following their student teaching experiences.
Additionally, a longitudinal study of the student teachers could be conducted through their first year of teaching. This study could provide information about evolving teacher beliefs. The beliefs that these interns demonstrated at the end of their student teaching could be examined to determine if they continue during their own teaching experience or if their conceptual thinking changes with experience.

2. Would surveying student teachers and cooperating teachers about classroom management prior to placement more effectively prepare them as successful managers?

The student teachers in this study suggested that different classroom environments would provide them with additional experiences. Preservice teachers need to be put in optimal environments where they can observe and practice meaningful experiences that will prepare them to manage today's classes. The cooperating teacher needs to be carefully selected. Whether placing teachers in environments that will produce cognitive discomfort to adjust their beliefs, or pairing them with cooperating teachers who share similar beliefs continues to be a topic for further research. In order to prepare our student teachers successfully with the optimum experiences they need to become effective teachers, researchers are obliged to investigate the elements that would best provide these experiences.

3. How can teacher education programs effectively prepare preservice teachers for the task of effectively managing students?
Teacher education programs should include both college coursework and fieldwork in order to prepare student teachers successfully to become effective classroom managers. Information gained through theory combined with situated learning, cognitive apprenticeships, and assisted performance must give students the experiences to adequately prepare them to deal with management issues in the classroom.

The theory and pedagogy introduced during college classes need to prepare education students successfully with the information, strategies, and skills necessary to provide effective classroom management. One class may not provide enough time to present the information. There may be the need for more courses in classroom management. Further research into quality programs that provide necessary objectives and time to teach these objectives should be a continual goal of teacher education programs.

Cohort programs and university schools may create the optimal environment where students can experience both theoretical and project-based learning experiences. These classrooms could offer repeated opportunities to apply the learned theory across a variety of activities and situations. How best to present theory and practice should be a continued topic for investigation.

4. How can teacher educators and school administrators offer appropriate field experiences to increase the on-the-job training so preservice teachers can be successful classroom managers in their first year?
First, we need to decide what the preservice teachers need to learn and how best they will learn it. It is important for teacher educators to recognize and understand preservice teachers' beliefs. Exposure to a broader repertoire of beliefs can help student teachers develop more productive and meaningful management strategies through theory and/or appropriate experiences.

The quality of the student teaching experience depends on the specific placement. Therefore, certain factors must be considered when choosing placement for student teachers. Systematic studies should be conducted to determine the relationship between successful internships and the social settings of the school, the levels of training needed for cooperating teachers, and the personalities of the people working together.

Prior to placing a student teacher, the student population of the school should be researched and identified. Then, specific strategies and techniques can be introduced to the student teacher that could assist him or her in working with that specific population. Student teachers need to be exposed to the representative conditions for which they have received theory and practical applications. They must be provided opportunities to experience teaching dilemmas in a controlled learning environment so they can practice appropriate skills.

Researchers should continually pursue additional programs that can support student teachers when they enter the teaching field. Mentor teachers, other than the cooperating teacher, can be assigned to provide advice, assistance, and
ideas to the student teacher without fear of supervisory fallout. Additionally, support groups could be made available so that student teachers can practice, analyze, and reflect on their experiences. These added programs could respond to preservice teachers’ needs, and help them deal with the stress of initial teaching.

Additional information about student teachers and their cooperating teachers would be beneficial when determining appropriate placements for their internship. Cooperating teachers are selected because of their ability to teach children. This does not mean they would be good teachers for adults. Opportunities for training should be provided to these cooperating teachers using continuing research to address appropriate strategies and techniques.

In one case study, the student teacher almost failed his student teaching experience. At first, his beliefs were compared with his cooperating teacher’s beliefs to determine if opposite beliefs could affect his performance. However, both teachers had similar beliefs about classroom management. Opposite and different beliefs were then ruled out as the source of his unsuccessful experiences. However, a positive personal relationship did not develop between the two.

After getting to know Joe, it became apparent that his personality was completely opposite from that of his cooperating teacher. He admitted during his first interview that he was quite shy growing up and he still demonstrated a reserved demeanor. His major cooperating teacher, however, was very out-
going and demonstrative. It could be that the difference in personalities may have then played a role in Joe’s struggle to successfully complete his internship.

It might be beneficial to determine personality types or research conditions for developing positive relationships, in addition to classroom management beliefs, before placing student teachers. Additional research into the important factors for matching student teachers and their cooperating teachers could provide valuable information that could ensure successful student teaching experiences.

As earlier noted, data indicated the student teachers liked starting on the first day of school. They explained the importance of observing the cooperating teacher design and implement the classroom management system. When scheduling the student teaching calendar, teacher educators and site administrators should arrange this field experience to coincide with the first day of school so that the student teachers have an opportunity to observe the cooperating teachers as they initially develop effective classroom management.

5. **How do we keep first year teachers from leaving the profession because of classroom management issues?**

This is the major question. As research has shown, many teachers will leave the profession after one year. It is imperative that researchers continue to pursue studies that can identify factors that cause this drop-out, and provide programs that can prepare our student teachers for a successful teaching career.
A Final Note

At the conclusion of this study, three of the four student teachers began teaching immediately. The fourth elected to wait until the following year. They were hired mid-year and placed as teachers into classrooms that had been set up and managed by long term substitutes or vacated by teachers leaving the district. When visiting with them, these new teachers all expressed their love of the job and how much they were enjoying teaching so far. However, they all expressed the idea that it was really different being on their own. They were somewhat overwhelmed but surviving. When asked about their management, they admitted that it would take them a while to get everything running smoothly. I am confident that they will be successful teachers. My hope is that we can continue to prepare our new teachers more effectively so that the transition to the real world of teaching is smoother and easier for both the novice teachers and their students. The importance of providing support to novice teachers in their induction into teaching cannot be understated.
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APPENDIX B

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, LAS VEGAS
DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION
INFORMED CONSENT
(Student teachers)

Title Of Study: Changes in Student Teachers Beliefs about Classroom Management

I am Bonnie Ballard, a doctoral student in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at UNLV. I am currently working on my dissertation under the direction of Dr. Jane McCarthy.

Purpose: You are being asked to participate in a research study. I hope to determine if your field experience in student teaching affects your beliefs about classroom management.

Procedures: As a volunteer, you will be asked to complete an inventory, questionnaire, concept map and a one-to-one interview with me, using a tape recorder. These procedures will be completed twice, once prior to your student teaching and again at the end of your experience. This will take approximately one hour to complete.

Benefits: As a participant, you may gain a deeper understanding of the significance of classroom management theory. I hope to better understand preservice teacher beliefs about classroom management and better support new teachers as they begin their teaching professions.

Confidentiality: Pseudonyms will be used in the report so your answers will be kept confidential. Records will be maintained in a filing cabinet in my study for a period of three years.
Right to refuse of withdraw: Your participation is strictly voluntary and you may withdraw from participation at any time. You will be informed if the study design or use of the data is to be changed.

Questions: If you have any questions regarding this research, please contact Bonnie Ballard at 799-7700 or Dr. Jane McCarthy at the UNVL Department of Curriculum and Instruction at 895-1208. For questions involving the rights of human subjects, please contact the UNLV Office of Sponsored Programs at 895-1357.

I have read the above information and agree to participate in this research study.

__________________________________________  ________________
Signature of Participant                          Date

__________________________________________  ________________
Signature of Researcher                          Date
APPENDIX C

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, LAS VEGAS
DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION
INFORMED CONCENT
(Cooperating teachers)

Title Of Study: Changes in Student Teachers Beliefs about Classroom Management

I am Bonnie Ballard, a doctoral student in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at UNLV. I am currently working on my dissertation under the direction of Dr. Jane McCarthy.

Purpose: You are being asked to participate in a research study. I hope to examine what happens to your student teacher's beliefs about classroom management as a result of their field experiences. I want to identify your management system to determine your influence on your student teacher's ideas and beliefs.

Procedures: As a volunteer, you will be asked to complete an inventory and questionnaire asking about your classroom management styles. This will take approximately one hour to complete.

Benefits: There will be no direct benefits from this study. However, I hope to better understand preservice teacher beliefs about classroom management and better support new teachers as they begin their teaching profession.

Confidentiality: Pseudonyms will be used in the report so your answers will be kept confidential. Records will be maintained in a filing cabinet in my study for a period of three years.
Right to refuse of withdraw: Your participation is strictly voluntary and you may withdraw from participation at any time. You will be informed if the study design or use of the data is to be changed.

Questions: If you have any questions regarding this research, please contact Bonnie Ballard at 799-7700 or Dr. Jane McCarthy at the UNVL Department of Curriculum and Instruction at 895-1208. For questions involving the rights of human subjects, please contact the UNLV Office of Sponsored Programs at 895-1357.

I have read the above information and agree to participate in this research study.

__________________________________________  ________________
Signature of Participant                     Date

__________________________________________  ________________
Signature of Researcher                     Date
APPENDIX D

INVENTORY OF CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT STYLE

Directions: Please circle the one statement (either a or b) for each item that best fits your belief or describes what you would do in your own classroom. There are no right or wrong answers. If you disagree with both options, circle the one you disagree with the least. If you agree with both options, circle the one that you agree with the most. Answer every question one way or another. Do not skip any.

Sub-scale A: PERSON DIMENSION

1.

a. Student’s creativity and self-expression should be encouraged and nurture as much as possible. (1)

b. Teachers must set guidelines for students in order for them to understand the importance of living by rules and laws. (2)

2.

a. Although students do think, the decisions they make are not yet fully rational and moral. (2)

b. Student’s inner emotions and decision-making processes must be considered legitimate and valid. (1)
3.
   a. My responsibility as a teacher is to aid students' self-discovery. (1)
   b. My responsibility as a teacher is to reward those students who do well. (2)

4.
   a. Students must be allowed the freedom to pursue their own interests and to succeed in those areas. (1)
   b. If students work hard and follow my directions, they will be successful in school. (2)

5.
   a. A class is made up of unique individuals; students will develop their own ways of working and playing with each other. (1)
   b. My responsibility as a teacher is to direct students in how to work together cooperatively toward academic goals. (2)

6.
   a. I encourage students to treat each other with courtesy and respect. (1)
   b. I would never allow students to treat each other with anything other than friendliness, courtesy, and respect. (2)

Sub-scale B: INSTRUCTION DIMENSION

7.
   a. The assignment at hand determines how the space should be used. (1)
   b. I would be annoyed if a student sat at my desk without permission. (2)
8. 
   a. Generally, I think it's best to assign students to specific seats in the classroom. (2)
   b. Generally, I think it's best to allow students to select their own seats. (1)

9. 
   a. The teacher knows best how to allocate classroom materials and supplies to optimize learning. (2)
   b. Students in my classroom may use any materials they wish during the learning process. (1).

10. 
    a. I specify a set time for each learning activity and try to stay within my plans. (2)
    b. The time spent on each learning activity can only be determined by the students' needs and interests. (1)

11. 
    a. During a lesson on the Bill of Rights, a student begins to tell a story about a neighbor who was falsely arrested for selling drugs. I would most likely remind the student gently but firmly that the class has to finish the lesson before the end of the class period. (2)
    b. During a lesson on the Bill of Rights, a student begins to tell a story about a neighbor who was falsely arrested for selling drugs. I would
most likely let the student tell the story so (s)he could find the association between the lesson objective and the incident. (1)

12.

a. Students need the structure of a daily routine that is organized by the teacher. (2)

b. Responsibility and self-discipline are fostered when students create their own daily routines. (1)

13.

a. When moving from one learning activity to another, I will most likely allow students to progress at their own rate since we all learn at a different pace. (1)

b. When moving from one learning activity to another, I will most likely give students directions regarding how to proceed. (2)

14.

a. When a student is repeatedly off-task, I will most likely remove a privilege such as recess or require detention. (2)

b. When a student is repeatedly off-task, I will most likely ask a question such as, “Chris, why aren’t you working?” (1)

15.

a. During seatwork, it is important to circulate around the room in order to manage students’ learning behavior. (2)
b. It is not necessary to circulate during seatwork since students can monitor their own learning behavior and seek out the teacher if there are questions. (1)

16.

a. Teachers should conference with students regarding the quality of their work. (1)

b. Teachers should provide feedback regarding the quality of performance. (2)

17.

a. The teacher should decide what topics the students study and the tasks used to study them. (2)

b. Learning becomes meaningful when students have input regarding learning topics and tasks. (1)

18.

a. The primary purpose of homework is to provide supplementary activities that meet the students’ needs and interests. (1)

b. The primary purpose of homework is to reinforce skills learned in the classroom. (2)

Sub-scale C: DISCIPLINE DIMENSION

19.

a. If students agree that a classroom rule is unfair, then I should explain the reason for the rule. (2)
b. If students agree that a classroom rule is unfair, then the rule should be replaced by a rule that students think is fair. (1)

20.

a. During the first week of class, I will most likely announce the classroom rules and inform students of the penalties for disregarding the rules. (2)

b. During the first week of class, I will discuss class rules with the students. (1)

21.

a. Rules are important because they shape the student's behavior and development. (2)

b. Class rules stifle the student's ability to develop a personal moral code. (1)

22.

a. When one of the more conscientious students does not complete an assignment on time, I will most likely assume that the student has a legitimate reason and that the student will turn in the assignment when it is completed. (1)

b. When one of the more conscientious students does not complete an assignment on time, I will most likely remind the student that the assignment is late. (2)
23.
   a. When students behave appropriately, I will most likely comment on their 
      good behavior and provide verbal encouragement such as, "You've been 
      working well for over an hour!" (1)
   b. When students behave appropriately, I will most likely provide a reward of 
      some kind such as stickers or points toward a party. (2)

24.
   a. When a student disrupts class or bothers other students, I will most likely 
      say nothing but look directly at the student and frown. (1)
   b. When a student disrupts class or bothers other students, I will most likely 
      tell the student to be quiet and request a conference with the student at a 
      more convenient time. (2)
APPENDIX E

CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE
Classroom Management Questionnaire

This questionnaire consists of two parts. Part 1 asks that you provide some information about yourself so that your responses to the second part of the questionnaire can be better understood. Part 2 provides you with an opportunity to indicate how knowledgeable you feel with regard to each of a number of classroom management strategies, how important you believe each of those strategies to be, and how frequently you employ each of those strategies.

Thank you for taking your valuable time to complete and return this questionnaire.

Part 1. Please check the appropriate spaces below to provide information about yourself and the school in which you are presently teaching.

1. Sex
   ____ Female
   ____ Male

2. Age
   ____ 20-29
   ____ 30-39
   ____ 40-49
   ____ 50-59
   ____ 60-69

3. Ethnicity
   ____ Black
   ____ Hispanic
   ____ Asian
   ____ Caucasian
   ____ Other (list) ____________________________

4. Years of Teaching
   ____ 1 or 2
   ____ 3-5
   ____ 6-10
   ____ 11-20
   ____ 21 or more

5. Level of Educational Training
   ____ Bachelor's degree
   ____ Bachelor's + hours
   ____ Master's degree
   ____ Master's + hours
   ____ Doctorate degree
   ____ Undergrad college or University coursework
   ____ Graduate college or university coursework
   ____ School district in-service session
   ____ CCSD in-service session
   ____ Other (list) ____________________________

6. Formal Training in Classroom Management
   ____ Undergrad college or University coursework
   ____ Graduate college or university coursework
   ____ School district in-service session
   ____ CCSD in-service session
   ____ Other (list) ____________________________

7. Grade Level Assignment
   ____ Kindergarten
   ____ First Grade
   ____ Second Grade
   ____ Third Grade
   ____ Fourth Grade
   ____ Fifth Grade
   ____ Sixth or above

8. Size of School
   ____ 100-300 students
   ____ 301-500 students
   ____ 501-700 students
   ____ 701-900 students
   ____ 901-1100 students
   ____ 1101 + students

9. Location of school
   ____ Inner city
   ____ Urban
   ____ Suburban
   ____ Rural

10. Ethnic Majority of Students
    ____ Black
    ____ Hispanic
    ____ Asian
    ____ Caucasian
    ____ Other
    ____ Other (list) ____________________________

11. Title I School
    ____ Yes
    ____ No
Part 11. This part of the questionnaire provides an opportunity for you to indicate: (1) how knowledgeable you feel with regard to each of twenty-one classroom management strategies; (2) how important you believe each of those strategies to be; and (3) how frequently you employ each of those strategies. Each strategy has been listed and defined; in addition, three rating scales have been provided for each strategy. The first rating scale allows you to indicate how knowledgeable you feel about the strategy; the second rating scale allows you to indicate how important you believe the strategy to be; and the third rating scale allows you to indicate how frequently you use the strategy. Please indicate your feelings by circling the appropriate numbers on each scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTILIZING POSITIVE REINFORCEMENT</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A strategy in which the teacher rewards student behaviors; that is, the teacher responds to the student's behavior in a manner that results in an increase or maintenance of that behavior; the intent of teacher is to reward appropriate student behavior so that it will be strengthened and continued.</td>
<td>Not Knowledgeable</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>Never Used</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMPLOYING LOGICAL CONSEQUENCES</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A strategy in which the teacher structures and arranges consequences that are viewed by the student to be logical and a reasonable result of the student's own behaviors; that is, the student feels that his or her actions have caused the teacher to act in a manner that is deserved.</td>
<td>Not Knowledgeable</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>Never Used</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTILIZING HARSH REPRIMANDS</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A strategy in which the teacher provides the student with verbal feedback of a very negative nature; that is, the teacher scolds the student for behaving inappropriately in an effort to discourage further such conduct.</td>
<td>Not Knowledgeable</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>Never Used</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EMPLOYING CLASSROOM MEETINGS

A strategy in which the teacher holds a meeting of the class in which they discuss the behavior and misbehavior of students; the teacher engages students in a frank discussion about problems that are "owned" by the group and students are encouraged to take responsibility for solving those problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-answered</th>
<th>Not Very Knowledgeable</th>
<th>Very Knowledgeable</th>
<th>Not Very Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Never Used</th>
<th>Frequently Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### UTILIZING EXTINCTION AND/OR TIME OUT

Strategies in which the teacher withholds reinforcing previously reinforced student behavior or isolates a misbehaving student for a short period of time following inappropriate behavior so that the student is not rewarded for misbehaving; in both instances, the intent of the teacher is to discourage misbehavior.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-answered</th>
<th>Not Very Knowledgeable</th>
<th>Very Knowledgeable</th>
<th>Not Very Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Never Used</th>
<th>Frequently Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ADMINISTERING CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

A strategy in which the teacher inflicts physical pain on the student in an attempt to punish the student for misbehaving and to discourage further such misbehavior.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-answered</th>
<th>Not Very Knowledgeable</th>
<th>Very Knowledgeable</th>
<th>Not Very Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Never Used</th>
<th>Frequently Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EMPLOYING THREATS

A strategy in which the teacher makes a statement which communicates the teacher's intent to punish the student if the student does not comply with the teacher's wishes; the intent is to discourage student misbehavior.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-answered</th>
<th>Not Very Knowledgeable</th>
<th>Very Knowledgeable</th>
<th>Not Very Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Never Used</th>
<th>Frequently Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UTILIZING TOKEN ECONOMY SYSTEMS
A strategy in which the teacher uses tokens to reinforce students for desired behaviors; these tokens can be exchanged for a variety of rewards; token economy systems are also known as token reinforcement systems and as contingency management systems.

UTILIZING MILD DESISTS
A strategy in which the teacher makes a brief statement of disapproval that describes student misbehavior and describes what should be done about it; it is a simple request, issued in a non-threatening manner, that calls for the restoration of order when there have been a disturbance; it is intended to remind the student of what it is he or she should be doing.

ESTABLISHING CLASSROOM EXPECTATIONS AND ROUTINES
A strategy in which the teacher, beginning with his or her first encounter with the classroom group, helps students understand what it is they are to do with regard to daily activities.

FOSTERING POSITIVE INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS
A strategy in which the teacher works to build positive interpersonal relationships with each of his or her students by displaying such behaviors as genuineness, empathy, and unconditional positive regard; the intent of the teacher is to build relationships that will result in a positive climate in the classroom.
EXHIBITING WITHITNESS AND OVERLAPPING
Strategies in which the teacher communicates the ability to be observant of and attentive to what is going on in the classroom and the ability to attend to more than one issue at the same time; the teacher lets students know that he or she is aware of what students are doing – or not doing – and that he or she can handle two situations simultaneously without becoming so immersed in one that the other is neglected.

PROMOTING PRODUCTIVE GROUP NORMS
A strategy in which the teacher works to help the classroom group establish and maintain shared expectations about how members of the group should act in the group; the intent of the teacher is that the members of the classroom group will develop standards of behavior that are productive and adhered to by members of the group.

UTILIZING REALITY THERAPY
A strategy in which the teacher conferences with the student, confronts the student with a description of his or her inappropriate behavior, assists the student in planning a better course of action, and helps the student to become more responsible for his or her own behavior.
### UTILIZING CONTINGENCY CONTRACTING
A strategy in which the teacher and the student draw up a "contract" which states that the teacher will provide the student with a reward if the student exhibits certain predetermined and specified behaviors; the agreement defines the expected behaviors and the consequences for unacceptable behavior; contingency contracts are also called behavioral contracts.

### ESTABLISHING AND ENFORCING RULES
A strategy in which the teacher sets limits by telling the students what is expected of them and why; it is a process which clearly and specifically defines the teacher's expectations concerning classroom behavior; rules are intended to guide the student's behavior; the teacher enforces established rules in a fair and consistent manner.

### ADMINISTERING PUNISHMENT
A strategy in which the teacher introduces an aversive stimulus, a consequence which the student finds unpleasant; the intent of the teacher is to discourage the student behavior that caused the teacher to use punishment.

### UTILIZING ISOLATION AND EXCLUSION
A strategy in which the teacher uses isolation, exclusion, inschool suspension, and other forms of non-punitive exile in response to serious student misbehavior.
PROVIDING INTERESTING, RELEVANT, AND APPROPRIATE CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION
A strategy in which the teacher attempts to plan and implement instructional activities that hold the interest of the student and reduce the likelihood of student misbehavior.

UTILIZING PRAISE AND ENCOURAGEMENT
Strategies in which the teacher conveys approval (praise) or acceptance (encouragement); the intent of the teacher is to communicate that the teacher approves of the student and/or of his actions or products or that the teacher accepts the student and encourages him or her to behave in an appropriate manner.

FOSTERING GROUP COHESIVENESS
A strategy in which the teacher attempts to help students develop positive feelings about their classroom group as a whole; the intent of the teacher is to promote a climate in which students work together with a minimum of discord and dissension.

Once again, thank you so much for taking the time to complete and return this questionnaire.
FIRST SET OF INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Where did you grow up? What kind of elementary, middle school and high school did you attend?

2. What do you remember as a student growing up? Were you a good student? What happened to the students who got in trouble?

3. Describe your favorite teacher or classroom? Explain why it was your favorite.

4. Tell me about a class you remember. Why?

5. Why did you decide to become a teacher?

6. What classes have you had that dealt specifically with classroom management?

7. What important points do you remember from those classes?

8. Describe your practicums and field experiences. What did you observe that you liked? Disliked?

9. Let's talk about your concept map. Would you put these concepts in any particular order of importance?
APPENDIX G

Second Set of Interview Questions

1. Tell me about your student teaching experience.

2. Looking at classroom management, what techniques or strategies did your cooperating teachers use that you liked? Disliked? Explain.

3. Do you think that student teaching made a difference in your prior beliefs about effective classroom management?

4. Tell me about the management system you are planning to implement in your classroom.

5. Let's discuss your concept map. Would you put the concepts in any kind of order of importance?

6. Tell me what you thought about switching classes during track break.
Framework for Inventory of Classroom Management Style

Dimensions of Teacher Classroom Management Behavior

I. PERSON DIMENSION – what teachers believe about students as persons and what teachers do to enable students to develop as persons.

A. TEACHER’S PERCEPTIONS OF THE NATURE OF STUDENTS
   1. personal attributes
   2. independence/capabilities of students

B. PSYCHOSOCIAL CLIMATE
   1. personal attention/growth
   2. opportunity for success
   3. group spirit and purpose
   4. classroom climate (warmth, friendliness, courtesy, respect)

II. INSTRUCTION DIMENSION – what teachers do to enable students to learn

A. PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT
   1. territory
   2. seating
   3. materials
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B. TIME
   1. how to allocate time
   2. diversions from task

C. CLASSROOM ROUTINES
   1. daily routines
   2. transitions

D. MONITORING LEARNING BEHAVIOR
   1. keeping on-task
   2. circulating
   3. feedback on performance
   4. choice of learning topic/task
   5. purpose of homework

III. DISCIPLINE DIMENSION — what teachers do to set standards for behavior and to enforce those standards

A. RULE SETTING
   1. who sets rules
   2. importance of rules

B. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF APPROPRIATE/INAPPROPRIATE BEHAVIOR
   1. importance of praise
   2. effectiveness of punishment/negative consequence
APPENDIX I

RESPONSES TO THE ICMS FOR JOE AND HIS COOPERATING TEACHERS
### Responses on the ICMS for Joe and his Cooperating Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Joe Pre</th>
<th>Joe Post</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Class space | 1       | 1        | 1  | 1  | 1  |
| Seating     | 2       | 2        | 1  | 1  | 1  |
| Materials   | 2       | 2        | 2  | 1  | 1  |
| Allocated   | 2       | 2        | 1  | 2  | 2  |
| Time        | 2       | 1        | 1  | 1  | 1  |
| Structure   | 2       | 2        | 2  | 2  | 2  |
| Directions  | 2       | 2        | 2  | 2  | 2  |
| Off task    | 2       | 2        | 1  | 1  | 1  |
| Monitoring  | 2       | 2        | 2  | 1  | 1  |
| Feedback    | 2       | 1        | 1  | 2  | 1  |
| Instruction activities | 2       | 2        | 2  | 2  | 2  |
| Homework    | 2       | 2        | 2  | 2  | 2  |
| Instruction Total | 22 | 19       | 17 | 20 | 19 |

| Student rules | 1       | 1        | 1  | 2  | 1  |
| Class rules   | 1       | 1        | 2  | 1  | 1  |
| Importance of rules | 1       | 2        | 2  | 2  | 2  |
| Flexibility   | 2       | 2        | 1  | 2  | 2  |
| Rewarding     | 1       | 2        | 1  | 1  | 1  |
| Consequence   | 2       | 2        | 1  | 1  | 1  |
| Discipline Total | 9       | 11       | 7  | 9  | 8  |

| All Dimensions Total | 40 | 37 | 31 | 35 | 34 |
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RESPONSES TO THE ICMS FOR JOHN AND HIS COOPERATING TEACHERS
Responses on the ICMS for John and his Cooperating Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>John Pre</th>
<th>John post</th>
<th>T4</th>
<th>T5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directions</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Person Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class space</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seating</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>9.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated Time</td>
<td>10.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated Time</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>12.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directions</td>
<td>13.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off task</td>
<td>14.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>15.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>16.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional activities</td>
<td>17.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework</td>
<td>18.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instruction Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student rules</td>
<td>19.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class rules</td>
<td>20.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of rules</td>
<td>21.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>22.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewarding</td>
<td>23.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequence</td>
<td>24.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discipline Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Dimensions Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RESPONSES TO THE ICMS FOR JANE AND HER
COOPERATING TEACHERS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Jane Pre</th>
<th>Jane post</th>
<th>T6</th>
<th>T7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class space</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seating</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated Time</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated Time</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directions</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off task</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional activities</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student rules</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class rules</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of rules</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewarding</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequence</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Dimensions Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX L

RESPONSES TO THE ICMS FOR JOY AND HER COOPERATING TEACHERS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Joy Pre</th>
<th>Joy post</th>
<th>T8</th>
<th>T9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directions</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class space</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seating</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>9.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated Time</td>
<td>10.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated Time</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>12.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directions</td>
<td>13.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off task</td>
<td>14.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>15.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>16.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional activities</td>
<td>17.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework</td>
<td>18.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student rules</td>
<td>19.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class rules</td>
<td>20.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of rules</td>
<td>21.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>22.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewarding</td>
<td>23.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequence</td>
<td>24.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Dimensions Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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