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ABSTRACT

RELATIONSHIPS AMONG TEACHERS’ PERSONALITY, LEADERSHIP STYLE, AND EFFICACY OF CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

by Michael Clyde Burkett

May 2011

In this study, research examined a possible relationship between a teacher’s leadership style, personality, experience, certification, and efficacy of classroom management. Six hundred high school teachers were given questionnaires to complete to report their leadership, personality, and classroom management preferences. These teachers were chosen by a random online search for schools in southern Mississippi. Of the questionnaires sent to the teachers, 151 (25%) were returned and analyzed.

Three main instruments were used to conduct this study. For leadership, a teacher’s leadership style was measured using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. While the instrument measures transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles, only transformational leadership was studied. Transformational leadership was included because it describes leaders as leading by example and building trust between themselves and their followers, both of which are suggested practices for effective teaching (Caldwell, 2008; Jones, 1989; Marzano & Marzano, 2003).

To study personality, the Big Five Index was used. This instrument was designed to test the Five Factor Model which measures personality based on five overarching factors which contain several specific personality traits each. These factors are extraversion, openness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and agreeableness. Extraversion relates to how outgoing and talkative a teacher is, openness is about being creative and
receptive to new ideas, conscientiousness is about following rules, neuroticism pertains to negative emotions such as stress and anxiety, and agreeableness deals with how well a person gets along with others.

Classroom management can be considered to be the efforts made by the teacher to oversee learning, student interaction, and behavior (including discipline) (Martin, 1995). To measure for classroom management, the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale was used. It measures the degree to which a teacher believes he is effective in handling classroom management.

Small, but significant relationships were found between transformational leadership, the personality factors for openness and conscientiousness, and efficacy of classroom management. No statistical relationship with efficacy of classroom management was found with experience, certification, and extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism factors. These results may indicate a need to better provide classroom teachers with leadership training in order to provide a better learning environment.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Classroom management and discipline are serious concerns for teachers, administrators, and the general public (Braden & Smith, 2006; Ghafoori & Tracz, 2001; Henson & Chambers, 2002; Jones, 1989; Kraft, 2010; Malmgren, Trezek, & Paul, 2005; Walker, 2009). Braden and Smith (2006) cited evidence to suggest disruptive behavior has become normal in today’s classrooms. If teachers do not use proper classroom management techniques, disruptive behavior by a few students can negatively affect a teacher’s instruction, can lead to other students joining in, and can cause the students to question the abilities of the teacher (Braden & Smith, 2006; Rogers & Freiberg, 1994).

Duke (1984) and Jones and Jones (1986) described three ways teachers typically approach classroom management: (a) the teacher feels discipline is not a part of his job and sends disruptive students to the office for administrators to handle, (b) the teacher uses a standardized management program without consideration for his current students and their needs, and (c) the teacher researches new classroom management techniques and incorporates them into his practices. Teachers often decide which of these approaches to take based on their own personalities (Braden & Smith, 2006).

There are several approaches teachers can take when implementing their own classroom management strategies. Walker (2009) noted that the classroom management style used by the teacher can positively or negatively impact student engagement in the lesson. Trayner (2003) found that a teacher will choose a management style based on his experiences and expectations in the classroom. While they described different amounts of classroom management strategies, Walker (2009) and Trayner (2003) described the
least effective management style as permissive or laissez-faire because it was low in both teacher dominance and student nurturance. In their respective models, both researchers indicated the most effective approach was authoritative. The authoritative approach involves the teacher controlling the students through rules and reasonable consequences to produce a positive classroom environment. Walker found this management style lead to the greatest achievement by the students due to both high dominance and high nurturance.

Researchers like Rogers and Freiberg (1994) have found that students in classrooms controlled by behaviorist strategies like school the least. Unlike the authoritative approach where reasonable consequences are used, these classrooms are dominated by a strict adherence to rules and consequences, both positive and negative, which are used to control student behavior without regard to the students’ individual needs (Hensley, Powell, Lamke, & Hartman, 2007; Rogers & Freiberg, 1994). According to Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, students need to feel safe, and when teachers use fear as a means to control student behavior, learning becomes difficult (Hensley et al., 2007). By understanding the different personality types of their students and using appropriate classroom management techniques, teachers can build better relationships with each student (Talbott, 2005).

There have been several studies which have shown a relationship between a teacher’s Myers-Briggs personality type and his effectiveness in academic instruction and classroom management (Chambers, Henson, & Sienty, 2001; Henson & Chambers, 2002; Martin, 1995; Roberts, Mowen, Edgar, Harlin, & Briers, 2007; Talbott, 2005). These personality types occur as opposing pairs of characteristics and are extraversion or
introversion, intuition or sensing, thinking or feeling, and judging or perceiving.

Chambers, Henson, and Sienty (2001) found that teachers with the sensing and thinking personality types were more firm when interacting with students, with the sensing type assigning work to try to discourage misbehavior. Gordon and Yocke (1999) found that certain personality types used a wider variety of teaching strategies, provided more success opportunities, and were better able to engage the students. Teachers who have the sensing personality type were found to be slightly less efficacious in classroom instruction (Roberts et al., 2007). Roberts, Mowen, Edgar, Harlin, & Briers (2007) also found that teachers with the judging personality type were more effective at classroom management.

While Chambers et al. (2001) found in their study that pre-service teacher’s personality type was the dominant predictor in the choice of classroom management strategies, Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2007) and Wolters and Daugherty (2007) found that once teachers had several years in the classroom, their experiences lead them to be more effective at classroom management and instructional practices. In their study, they found that teachers with less than three years experience scored lower for teacher efficacy than teachers with five or more years experience. The older group of teachers was able to rely on their own experiences while the newer teachers had to rely on the experiences of others in order to choose effective classroom management and instructional approaches (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007).

While years of teaching experience has been shown to be a predictor of effectiveness at classroom management in several studies, a teacher’s route to certification has shown mixed results in making the same prediction (Darling-Hammond,
Holtzman, Gatlin & Heilig, 2005; Linek et al., 2009; Ludlow, 2010; Suell & Piotrowski, 2006). According to Darling-Hammond, Holtzman, Gatlin, and Heilig (2005), alternate route teachers were less effective than teachers from traditional backgrounds, and Linek et al. (2009) found that fully certified teachers received higher evaluations than alternate route teachers. However, Suell and Piotrowski (2006) and Ludlow (2010) found little difference between traditional and alternate route teachers based on their teaching efficacy.

Another factor which may contribute to improvement in the effectiveness of classroom management is the educational level of the teacher (Brown, 2009; Campbell, 1996; Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993). In Brown’s study of 297 special education teachers, she found that teachers with master’s degrees were more effective at classroom management than teachers with only a bachelor’s degree. Those teachers with specialist’s degrees were the most effective of all education levels (Brown, 2009). In another study, Campbell (1996) also found that teachers with advanced degrees were rated higher on effectiveness by their administrators (Campbell, 1996).

Finally, another teacher characteristic which may influence a teacher’s efficacy of classroom management is leadership style. Teachers must possess some leadership ability so they know how to motivate their students to want to learn and behave better (Stein, 2010). Teachers need to have a vision, be adaptable, take risks, and be honest (Can, 2009). According to Stein (2010), most teachers simply receive training in managing their classrooms, but to successfully achieve, students need teachers to lead and guide them in ways they would not do on their own. Teachers, as leaders, are able to
affect their students’ performances, goal attainment, and behaviors (Bull, 2010; Can, 2009).

Leaders can be *translational, transactional, or situational* (Thomas, 2007; Yukl, 1989). Translational leaders use ideals and values to get people to follow them, and they work with their followers to set goals and consequences (Thomas, 2007). Transactional leaders, on the other hand, are more concerned about carrying out routine tasks and tend to set goals and consequences themselves with little input from their followers (Thomas, 2007). Yukl (1989) argues that leaders need to be both translational and transactional, depending on the situation, and therefore situational leadership is most appropriate. Others have also found that the most effective leaders are the ones who are most capable of adapting their leadership styles based on the situation (Fidler, 1997; Larkin, 1973; Thomas, 2007; Walter, Caldwell, & Marshall, 1980; Yukl, 1989).

Studies by Leithwood (1993, 1995, 2006) have shown that translational leadership by the principal can impact teachers’ instructional practices (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006), teachers’ commitment to change (Leithwood et al., 1993), and teachers’ perceptions of transformational leadership in others (Jantzi & Leithwood, 1995). Bolkan and Goodboy (2009) found that the transformational leadership ability of college professors led to improved student learning, participation, and perceptions of the teachers’ credibility. Treslan (2006) found that transformational leadership is often used by teachers who consistently practiced effective teaching practices as the teachers attempted to inspire their students to try to perform better.
Statement of the Problem

The No Child Left Behind Act (2001) requires individual states to establish standards by which each of their schools will be held accountable. Each state establishes accountability standards using statewide testing programs to measure student achievement at various grade levels in math, language, and science. For instance, in Mississippi, students at the high school level are tested in Algebra I, Biology I, and English II. According to Massey (2009), student scores are determined and classified as minimal, basic, proficient, or advanced. These scores are then averaged according to a weighted percentage, added together and combined with a school’s growth level and graduation rate to determine the school’s accountability level (Massey, 2009). In order to reach the highest accountability ratings, teachers provide a quality education to each of their students (Massey, 2009).

However, disruptive student behavior in the classroom can negatively impact the learning environment of the classroom (Braden & Smith, 2006; Etheridge, 2010). Mayer and Patriarca (2007) indicated that there is a complicated relationship between academic achievement and behavioral problems in the classroom. When discipline issues continue in a classroom due to inadequate classroom management and discipline strategies, all students are impacted because of the time it takes for a teacher to handle the disruptions (Etheridge, 2010). When teachers are unable to handle discipline issues, administrators find it easy to turn to discipline programs such as assertive discipline which makes it easier for teachers to implement and follow (Ellis & Karr-Kidwell, 1995; Malmgren et al., 2005). Unfortunately, some studies have shown that programs like assertive
discipline only react to the misbehavior instead of dealing with the source of the problem (Jones, 1989).

One of the reasons schools do not reach their academic goals is a lack of teacher leadership (Stein, 2010). Leaders are able to bring about change and adjust to new circumstances (Bull, 2010). In the classroom, teachers must accurately identify the needs and ability levels of their students and adjust their leadership style in order to best teach these students so that they learn and improve (Thomas, 2007). A teachers’ leadership style can be influenced by their personal characteristics such as their personality (Bull, 2010). While several studies have shown that both leadership and personality can influence a teacher’s effectiveness at classroom management, other studies show that the teacher’s experience level and possibly educational level has just as big of an impact (Gordon & Yocke, 1999; Lillig, 2009; Martin, 1995; Smith, 1981; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007).

The purpose of this study was to determine if a teacher’s leadership ability, personality, experience, and certification significantly influenced their efficacy of classroom management. High school teachers across southern Mississippi were given questionnaires containing three instruments: the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, the Big Five Inventory, and the Teachers Sense of Efficacy Scale. Demographic questions were also asked to determine years of experience and certification type. Questionnaires were mailed to 358 teachers at six high schools chosen by a search of school websites to find which ones listed their faculty members. The remaining questionnaires were given to 242 teachers at four schools in which permission was gained.
from the superintendents to meet with their high school teachers. There were 151 questionnaires that were returned for a return rate of approximately 25%.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The purpose of this study was to determine if a teacher’s leadership ability, personality, experience, and certification significantly influenced their efficacy of classroom management. Research questions included:

Research Question 1: Is there a relationship between personality, leadership style, experience, certification and efficacy of classroom management?

$H1$: There is a statistically significant relationship between a teacher’s personality, leadership style, experience, certification and efficacy of classroom management.

Research Question 2: When teachers are categorized based on experience, is there a relationship between personality, leadership styles, certification, and efficacy of classroom management?

$H2$: There is a statistically significant relationship between personality, leadership styles, certification and efficacy of classroom management in different stages of experience.

Definition of Terms

*Agreeableness* – a personality factor in the Five Factor Model that describes a prosocial orientation toward others (John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008).

*Big Five Inventory (BFI)* – an instrument created by John, Donahue, and Kentle (1991) to measure personality traits along the five domains of agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion, neuroticism, and openness (Benet-Martinez & John, 1998; John, Donahue, Kentle, 1991; John et al., 2008); the Big Five Inventory is one of the questionnaire instruments used in this study.
Certification – type of teacher license issued by the state of Mississippi categorized as A, AA, AAA, and AAAA based on the educational level of the teacher; for the purposes of this study, the path of certification will be included with educational level

Classroom management – efforts made by the teacher to oversee learning, student interaction, and behavior (including discipline) (Martin, 1995).

Conscientiousness – a personality factor in the Five Factor Model that describes a person with socially approved impulse control and who follow rules and norms (Humbyrd, 2010; John et al., 2008).

Efficacy of classroom management – the degree to which a teacher believes he can control disruptive behavior in the classroom (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007); measured by the degree to which a teacher believes he can influence the behavior of his students.

Extraversion – a personality factor in the Five Factor Model that describes an energetic approach to the outside world (John et al., 2008).

Experience – the number of years a teacher has taught.

Follower – someone who follows the direction of another (Bull, 2010); for the purposes of this study, a follower will be a student.

Full-Range Leadership Theory (FRLT) – a leadership theory established by Bass (1985) made up of nine factors across three leadership styles: transformational, transactional, laissez-faire style of leadership (Antonakis, Avolio & Sivasubramaniam, 2003); for the purposes of this study, only transformational leadership will be used from the Full-Range Leadership Theory.
**Idealized influence** – a transformational leadership quality that describes a leader as one who is perceived to be a strong role model (May, 2010; Sutherland, 2010).

**Individual consideration** – transformational leadership quality that describes a leader as one who cares about the needs of his followers (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005; May, 2010).

**Inspirational motivation** – transformational leadership quality that describes a leader as one who communicates high performance expectations (Marzano et al., 2005; May, 2010; Sutherland, 2010).

**Intellectual stimulation** – transformational leadership quality that describes a leader as one who encourages innovation (May, 2010).

**Leader** – anyone who is exerting influence on another person in order to bring about some type of change (Osburne, 1991); for the purposes of this study, the leader will be the teacher in the classroom.

**Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Form 5X (MLQ-5X)** – an instrument created by Bass and Avolio (1995) to measure transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership behavior (May, 2010; Sutherland, 2010); this is a questionnaire instrument used to measure transformational leadership qualities only.

**Neuroticism** – a personality factor in the Five Factor Model that contrasts a person’s emotional stability with negative emotions such as anxiousness, nervousness, and self-consciousness (John et al., 2008).

**Openness** – a personality factor in the Five Factor Model that describes a person who is more open to new ideas, is more creative, and is innovative (Humbyrd, 2010; John et al., 2008).
**Personality** – a person’s characteristic patterns of thought, emotion, and behavior (Chan, 2003); for the purposes of this study, personality factors will be determined using the Five Factor Model as measured by the Big Five Inventory.

**Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale** – an instrument developed by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) to measure a person’s efficacy of three teaching dimensions: instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007); the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale will be used as a questionnaire instrument in this study to determine efficacy of classroom management only.

**Transformational leadership** – a leadership style that appeals to the values, morals, and ethics of both the leader and followers in order to create a shared vision and motivate followers to perform at their best (Antonakis et al., 2003; Sutherland, 2010); in this study, only transformational leadership will be measured using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire.

**Delimitations**

The sample was guided by the following delimitations:

1. The population was delimited to high school teachers (grades 9 – 12) from schools in south Mississippi who were chosen for the convenience of the researcher.

2. The population was delimited to teachers who were selected by finding schools in southern Mississippi which listed their staff members online and by contacting selected superintendents for permission to include their high school faculties in the study.
3. The population was delimited to teachers who returned their questionnaires within the two weeks provided.

4. The study was delimited by sample size as to the statistical tests that could be conducted.

5. The variable for leadership was delimited to include only the transformational leadership style (Burns, 1978).

6. The variable for personality was delimited by the use of the Five Factor Model (John et al., 1991).

Assumptions

This study will be guided by the following assumption:

1. All participants will answer honestly.

Justification

According to Rogers and Freiberg (1994), the amount of order in the classroom affects the types of learning activities that can take place. Classroom management has been identified as an important component of effective instructional practices (Kraft, 2010; Marzano & Marzano, 2003; Marzano, Pickering, & Pollack, 2001; Jones, 1989). Since classroom management is an important component to effective teaching, it is important to identify any possible factors that lead to some teachers having better classroom management than other teachers (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007).

Quality teachers possess many characteristics such as personality, self-esteem, and commitment that influence their instructional practices (Chambers et al., 2001). Because personality affects so many human behaviors, it is relevant to study its effects on classroom management (Chambers et al., 2001; Henson & Chambers, 2002). For
example, Chambers et al. (2001) found personality traits affecting classroom management were assertiveness, self-confidence, willingness to take risks, and being friendly and caring. According to Henson and Chambers (2002), a teacher’s personality has been shown to impact his use of different instructional techniques.

Teachers are obviously managers of the classroom in that they plan, organize, and control in order to optimize the production of their students (Bull, 2010). However, one of the reasons Stein (2010) believes schools aren’t achieving to their potential is the lack of teacher leadership. Leaders are able to do all the things a manager can do, but he can also motivate his followers in order to bring about change (Bull, 2010). The change in students is learning (Stein, 2010). The degree to which a teacher can correctly apply the different leadership factors included in the Transformational Leadership model, the more effective the teacher has been found in terms of their effectiveness (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2009; Treslan, 2006).

This study is needed because two of the major problems teachers consistently report are classroom management and discipline issues (Braden & Smith, 2006; Ghafoori & Tracz, 2001; Henson & Chambers, 2002; Jones, 1989; Kraft, 2010; Malmgren et al., 2005; Martin, 1995; Walker, 2009). The beginning years of teachers’ career are seen by many educators to be the toughest years of their careers, especially in terms of classroom management and discipline issues, with estimates indicating that about 30% of teachers leave the profession after three years and that almost 50% of teachers leave within their first five years of entering teaching (Etheridge, 2010; Fry, 2009; Ludlow, 2010).

There are several research studies that have only focused on one of the factors of teacher personality, leadership style, experience, or certification at a time and have not
studied a possible interaction between these (Brown, 2010; Ellis & Karr-Kidwell, 1995; Ghafoori & Tracz, 2001; Gordon & Yocke, 1999; Lillig, 2009; Miller, 2008; Schussler, 2009; Talbott, 2005; Traynor, 2003; Walker, 2009; Zuckerman, 2007). It is important to determine any unique characteristics of teachers who are effective in classroom management in order to help teachers so they’ll remain in the classroom (Walker, 2009).
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Classroom Management

According to Walker (2009), “The best teachers don’t simply teach content, they teach people” (p. 122). Marzano, Pickering, and Pollack (2001) stated that to effectively teach their students, teachers need to use effective classroom management strategies, implement appropriate instructional strategies, and design a strong curriculum. When teachers implement an organized strategy for classroom management, they can positively impact student behavior and decrease aggressiveness between students (Bonner, 2010).

Discipline and classroom management are consistently reported as problems by teachers, administrators, students, parents, and the general public (Braden & Smith, 2006; Etheridge, 2010; Ghafoori & Tracz, 2001; Henson & Chambers, 2002; Jones, 1989; Kraft, 2010; Malmgren et al., 2005; Martin, 1995; Walker, 2009). While the public focuses on high-profile discipline issues such as school violence which are reported in the news, teachers often face continuous minor offenses that include students getting out of their desks without permission, chewing gum, texting on cell phones, cursing, and talking to their friends (Etheridge, 2010). Discipline issues in all levels of education are no longer the exception, but have become normal occurrences in the classroom and threaten to impede learning and instruction (Braden & Smith, 2006; Etheridge, 2010).

Discipline typically refers to efforts by the teacher to make students comply with school and classroom rules, while classroom management includes efforts by the teacher to oversee efforts in the classroom such as learning, social interactions, and student behavior (Etheridge, 2010; Martin, 1995). As such, discipline, along with meeting the
needs of the students, forming positive relations, communication, and instructional engagement, is a part of an effective classroom management strategy (Bonner, 2010; Bowman, 2004; Martin, 1995).

There appears to be a relationship, although complicated, between academic achievement and behavioral problems in the classroom (Etheridge, 2010; Mayer & Patriarca, 2007). In a study by Myers, Baker, Milne, and Ginsberg (1987), they found that students who report low grades in their sophomore year tend to have an increase in misbehavior by their senior year and students who report more misbehavior their sophomore year tend to have a decrease in academic performance by their senior year. When students with behavior problems are not addressed properly, studies have shown that they can negatively impact the learning environment by encouraging others to join them, by causing the teacher’s effectiveness to be questioned, and by causing increased stress for the teacher (Braden & Smith, 2006; Etheridge, 2010). In addition, it has been shown that students who are most disruptive are more likely to drop out of school (Etheridge, 2010; McIntosh, Flannery, Sugai, Braun, & Cochrane, 2008). McIntosh et al. (2008) described dropping out as a series of events in a student’s life that is influenced by academic performance and a history of behavior. Therefore, it is important for a teacher to not only use the best teaching strategies, but to also employ effective classroom management techniques (Mayer & Patriarca, 2007).

One of the biggest and most important challenges for teachers is incorporating discipline into their classrooms because of how it can impact instruction and learning (Etheridge, 2010). When discipline issues go undeterred through classroom management and discipline strategies, all students are impacted (Etheridge, 2010). The problem many
teachers face is that disruptive behavior from students is increasing in frequency, duration, and intensity (Etheridge, 2010). Teachers must constantly decide whether they need to address disruptive behavior through disciplinary actions or continue to try to teach their students (Etheridge, 2010). However, when they choose to address discipline, they move away from their instructional area of expertise to a possibly weaker and under-trained skill of classroom management (Etheridge, 2010). When teachers are not able to control their room, little instruction occurs and students are negatively impacted (Etheridge, 2010).

According to Etheridge (2010), because teachers receive very little formal training on classroom management techniques, their reactions to classroom discipline stem from their personal characteristics. As a result, some teachers scream and yell at their misbehaving students while others stand back and let the students do whatever they want (Etheridge, 2010). Administrators are often likely to see the majority of office discipline referrals coming from teachers who lack the ability to effectively manage their classrooms because writing referrals becomes the easiest way to deal with discipline (Etheridge, 2010).

Trayner (2003) studied what contributes to a teacher’s choice in classroom management style. He found a connection between a teacher’s expectations and his actual classroom experiences. When these matched, Trayner found the teacher was better able to determine and use appropriate pedagogically sound classroom management strategies. When a teacher’s expectations did not match his experiences, Trayner noted the teacher was more likely to react by using management strategies that were not pedagogically sound such as coercion or task-orientation. When teachers chose an
appropriate management strategy, their students were more likely on-task, academically challenged, and more successful (Trayner, 2003).

In his review of different classroom management theories and practices, Jones (1989) noted that research on teacher effectiveness has begun to focus on different behaviors: teacher-student relationships, classroom management, and instructional skills. Other behaviors that have been found to be important are using the correct levels of dominance, creating an environment of cooperation, and attending to the needs of all students (Marzano & Marzano, 2003). Several classroom management approaches are described in Table 1. Effective teaching and learning has a better chance of occurring in a well-managed and disciplined classroom (Etheridge, 2010; Kraft, 2010).

Schussler (2009) studied how classroom management can be used by teachers to engage students intellectually. He found that when teachers are flexible and show their students respect, they are much more capable of providing challenges and making learning relevant. Conversely, Schussler (2009) and Jones and Jones (1986) argued teachers should not lower their academic standards in exchange for the students agreeing to behave. Jones and Jones (1986) described teachers often choose to utilize a lecture strategy and seatwork because it allows for students to be more easily controlled. Schussler (2009) asserted that teachers need to find ways to effectively manage classroom behavior so that students are successful.

Walker (2009) found that the classroom management style employed by the teacher could impact academic achievement of the students. Walker studied three different approaches to classroom management: authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive. These styles vary in terms of dominance and nurturance. Walker described
the authoritative style as being high in both dominance and nurturance and produced the highest levels of academic achievement. He said the authoritarian style is high in teacher dominance but low in nurturance towards students. The permissive style is low in dominance but higher in nurturance (Walker, 2009). He noted that the teacher using a more authoritarian style required the students to comply without allowing them to work on their own, and the permissive style of classroom management led to the least amount of academic gain despite students being engaged in the lessons. Walker found the students in the authoritative classrooms which are high in both dominance and nurturance to be more confident and engaged. Walker (2009) stated, “Students’ remarkable sensitivity to the relational quality of classrooms is also consistent with the idea that the effectiveness of a specific teaching practice can be mediated by students’ receptivity to adult influence. Style can lead students to tune in and tune out” (p. 127).

Due to the connection between classroom management and effective instruction, teachers must make sure their management techniques do not hinder the academic achievement of their students (Jones & Jones, 1986; Trayner, 2003). Trayner explained that teachers will use a variety of techniques to try to keep control of the classroom, but they will only use techniques they feel are pedagogically sound. In this study, Trayner (2003) identified and described five different classroom management strategies: coercive, laissez-faire, task-oriented, authoritative and intrinsic. The coercive strategy is characterized by the use of intimidation to control students, but it may lead to problems with student motivation and behavior. The laissez-faire strategy uses social interactions to create a low-risk environment with few challenges. Students in this type of classroom environment do not have the behavioral problems, but they tend to have problems with
academic growth and achievement. The task-oriented strategy calls for the teacher to control student behavior by assigning work. These teachers give lots of worksheets and seatwork in class with little regard for the benefits. The authoritative classroom is controlled through the use of rules and reasonable consequences to create a positive learning environment (Trayner, 2003). Finally, the intrinsic strategy uses rewards for desired behavior to teach the students to self-regulate their behavior, which is a very important strategy for students to acquire, especially those from a poverty culture (Malmgren et al., 2005; Payne, 2006).

Besides the classroom management strategies suggested by Trayner (2003), there are many other approaches to classroom management. Wolfgang and Glickman (1980) created a classroom model in which strategies were called interventionist, interactionalist, and non-interventionist (Martin, 1995; Ritter & Hancock, 2007). Interventionists believe in strong teacher control of the classroom and feel that students will only behave if they are rewarded for their behavior (Martin, 1995; Ritter & Hancock, 2007). Non-interventionists believe that students need to learn how to correctly express their inner drive and teachers should be less active in directing student behavior (Martin, 1995; Ritter & Hancock, 2007). Ritter and Hancock describe interactionalists as believing that students learn by interacting with others and with their environment. Teachers who are interactionalists work with students to develop a shared classroom management strategy (Ritter & Hancock, 2007).

An interventionist approach to classroom management is assertive discipline. According to Ellis and Karr-Kidwell (1995), assertive discipline is a program created by Lee Canter (1979) and is based on behavior psychology theory. Because of its reported
ease of implementation Ellis and Karr-Kidwell (1995) stated it has been one of the most popular classroom management approaches. It was developed as a result of dissatisfaction with increasing disruptive classroom behavior and moved classroom discipline back towards being teacher controlled (Jones & Jones, 1986). In his study, Etheridge (2010) found that when assertive discipline was implemented in a school, the number of referrals decreased by almost half, the number of in-school suspensions declined (but not enough to be statistically significant), and out-of-school suspensions increased.

Assertive discipline is based on teachers creating a predetermined series of rewards and punishments for student behavior in the class (Ellis & Karr-Kidwell, 1995; Jones & Jones, 1986; Lake, 2004). By students knowing exactly what consequences they will face for each consequence, they are deterred from misbehaving and will spend more time on task (McCormack, 1987). This is similar to the classroom-management theory of Wolfgang and Glickman (1980) which describes interventionists in a similar way (Martin, 1995; Ritter & Hancock, 2007). Like behaviorists, interventionists focus on ways to make the students develop in a certain way, are more controlling, and utilize more behavior modification strategies (Chambers et al., 2001; Martin, 1995; Ritter & Hancock, 2007). Both theories have become targets as schools have shifted away from teacher-centered behaviorist theories to support more constructivist theories that are centered on the students and their needs (Etheridge, 2010).

Many researchers and educators believe offering students rewards and punishments is the only type of effective classroom management technique (Etheridge, 2010; Lake, 2004). Lake argued this creates a dichotomy between behaviors students are
expected to display in school and out of school. In school, students are expected to follow a teacher’s and administrator’s demands without question, while out of school educators expect the students to act autonomously. Instead, the students who are most capable of adapting to the school’s demands are the ones who are most successful in school because teachers don’t have to time needed to adequately teach students the necessary social skills (Lake, 2004).

Malmgren, Trezek, and Paul (2005) discussed another classroom management strategy which addresses the students’ social needs. This approach was proposed by Rudolf Dreikurs (1968) based on the work of psychiatrist Alfred Adler. This approach to discipline and classroom management is what Wolfgang and Glickman (1980) would call interactionalist due to the focus on creating discipline outcomes that are beneficial to both students and teachers (Chambers et al., 2001; Martin, 1995; Ritter & Hancock, 2007). The basic tenet behind Dreikurs’ (1968) strategy was that students act out because their social needs are not met, and if the situation continues in the classroom, the students will escalate their misbehavior (Jones & Jones, 1986; Malmgren et al., 2005). In response, Malmgren et al. (2005) said teachers need to develop consequences which logically connect to the misbehavior and have been discussed and agreed upon by the teacher and student. Dreikur’s model, according to Jones and Jones (1986), also gave teachers help in identifying the sources of their students’ misbehavior and addressed one of the problems of assertive discipline. According to Etheridge (2010), assertive discipline tends to be reactive to problem behavior instead of dealing with the source of that behavior.
The final strategy reviewed by Malmgren et al. (2005) is called Teacher Effectiveness Training and was created by Thomas Gordon (1977). Teacher Effectiveness Training developed from humanistic psychology which stressed the relationship between students’ self-concept, learning, and productive behavior (Jones & Jones, 1986). It shifts the responsibilities of classroom management from the teacher to the students as they are taught to self-regulate their own behavior (Malmgren et al., 2005). This strategy correlates to the non-interventionist strategy described by Wolfgang and Glickman (Chambers et al., 2001; Martin, 1995; Ritter & Hancock, 2007). Non-interventionists see students as having an inner drive and need to find a way to properly express that drive in the real world (Chambers et al., 2001; Martin, 1995; Ritter & Hancock, 2007). Non-interventionists use the least amount of control and direction when applying classroom management strategies (Chambers et al., 2001).

In a study of over 700 elementary students (Grades 4 – 6), Chiu and Tulley (1997) sought to study student preferences to three different discipline approaches. The three approaches they studied were confronting-contracting which emphasizes teacher-student interaction and cooperation, relationship-listening which is based on humanistic psychology, and rule/reward-punishment which involves a set consequence for particular behavior regardless of the situation. They found students favored the confronting-contracting approach where they were more involved in the discipline process and had more guidance from the teacher. The least effective approach was the relationship-listening where the teacher was more laid back and not as involved with the students (Chiu & Tulley, 1997). These results were similar to those found by Trayner (2003) and
Walker (2009) when they found similar styles produced different degrees of academic success.

In an attempt to constantly react to behavior problems and to help increase academic success of students, classroom management has moved from strictly teacher controlled to student-centered and back to teacher controlled before becoming focused on teacher effectiveness (Jones & Jones, 1986). The teacher effectiveness approach does not focus on a teacher’s reaction to student misconduct (Jones & Jones, 1986). Instead, they described it as the things teachers do in the classroom to either prevent or create student discipline issues with effective teachers having a variety of prevention methods. There are three components to teacher effectiveness: organizing and managing the classroom, presenting instructional material, and creating teacher-student relationships (Jones & Jones, 1986).

One of the major components of effective classroom management is a positive teacher-student relationship built on mutual respect (Marzano & Marzano, 2003). When teachers form positive relationships with their students, research has shown that the number of discipline problems decline (Marzano & Marzano, 2003). The relationship does not have to be one of friendship, and in fact, studies show that students respond more favorably when the teacher provides more guidance instead of being more permissive (Chiu & Tulley, 1997; Marzano & Marzano, 2003; Walker, 2009).

Another approach to classroom management which focuses on the relationship between the teachers and students is a person-centered approach, and it balances the wants of the teacher and the needs of the students (Freiberg & Lamb, 2009). They argued that after years of students in behaviorist classrooms where they try to get rewards and
avoid consequences there has not been an improvement in the discipline situation in classrooms. Instead, Freiburg and Lamb (2009) suggested the better approach is one in which the teacher gradually builds trust with the students in order to give them more responsibility in the classroom. Students want to know they belong (Freiberg & Lamb, 2009). They and others have found that by sharing responsibility and leadership, teachers show the students they care about them so that students are then free to demonstrate creativity, academic curiosity, and critical thinking (Freiberg & Lamb, 2009; Karmacharya, 2007). Inherent in the person-centered approach is that students have choices and are therefore put in a position where they may make mistakes, but through guidance from the teacher, learn from those mistakes in order to grow socially and emotionally (Freiberg & Lamb, 2009; Payne, 2006).

Another program which focuses on the teacher-student relationship, the Boys and Girls Town Model, was studied by Caldwell (2008) to determine if it could decrease the amount of misbehaviors in a classroom. This model is based on social learning theory, which states that some at-risk or emotionally disturbed students need to be taught how to behave better in a variety of social situations (Caldwell, 2008). Caldwell noted that many teachers are open to re-teaching an academic lesson in which the students are unable to show mastery, but they can be less likely to teach social skills they feel the students should have learned at a younger age (Caldwell, 2008). Caldwell found a significant decrease in the problem behaviors displayed by the students and in the number of office referrals after the implementation of this model. Caldwell suggested that one reason for the decrease in referrals may be that the teacher, trained in the tenets of the model, are
more tolerant of minor classroom disruptions and work with the students to prevent the behaviors from escalating (Caldwell, 2008).

Table 1

*Description of Classroom Management Styles Based on Levels of Teacher Dominance and Student Nurturance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Dominance</th>
<th>Student Nurturance</th>
<th>Classroom Management Style and Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td><strong>Authoritarian</strong>: students comply without working on their own (Walker, 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Coercive</strong>: students controlled through intimidation (Trayner, 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Task-oriented</strong>: students controlled through assigning work (Trayner, 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Interventionist</strong>: teachers control students through rewards for their behavior (Wolfgang &amp; Glickman, 1980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Assertive Discipline</strong>: teachers create predetermined rules and consequences (Canter, 1979)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Rule/reward-punishment</strong>: teachers create set consequences regardless of the situation (Chiu &amp; Tulley, 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td><strong>Authoritative</strong>: students are confident and engaged (Walker, 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Authoritative</strong>: students controlled through rules and reasonable consequences to create positive environment (Trayner, 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Intrinsic</strong>: students self-regulate their behavior through receiving rewards (Trayner, 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Interactionalist</strong>: teachers and students develop a classroom management strategy (Wolfgang &amp; Glickman, 1980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Dreikurs Model</strong>: teachers and students develop and agree on consequences to misbehavior (Dreikurs, 1968)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Confronting-contracting</strong>: teachers and students work cooperatively to control behavior (Chiu &amp; Tulley, 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Person-centered</strong>: teachers build trust with the students as they are given more responsibility in the classroom (Freiberg &amp; Lamb, 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Boys and Girls Town Model</strong>: teachers teach students how to behave appropriately in class (Caldwell, 2008)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Dominance</th>
<th>Student Nurturance</th>
<th>Classroom Management Style and Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td><strong>Permissive:</strong> engaged in the lesson but not pushed to learn (Walker, 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Laissez-faire:</strong> social interactions create a low-risk environment with few challenges (Trayner, 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Non-interventionist:</strong> teachers provide little direction to students as they learn to express themselves (Wolfgang &amp; Glickman, 1980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Teacher Effectiveness Training:</strong> teachers provide little direction as students learn to self-regulate their behavior (Gordon, 1977)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Relationship-listening:</strong> teachers are more laid back and not as directive (Chiu &amp; Tulley, 1997)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Classroom management issues can be major problems for teachers, and when students’ misbehavior in those classes escalates to discipline issues, they become problems for administrators and the public, too (Cruickshank, 1990; Ghafoori & Tracz, 2001; Jones, 1989; Zuckerman, 2007). Zuckerman (2007) studied strategies teachers could follow to prevent minor classroom management issues from becoming larger discipline issues. He found that certain strategies can possibly create a longer lasting effect than others. These include changing the pace of the lesson, using the least restrictive intervention, and conferencing with students who express chronic discipline behavior. He felt these strategies promoted self control and an interesting in learning (Zuckerman, 2007).

There are several issues teachers must face which make it more difficult for them to effectively implement classroom management and discipline strategies. One of the hurdles is a historical dependence on using a loud voice, a paddle, and other forms of intimidation in an attempt to force students to behave (Jones, 1989). Another problem according to Jones (1989) was the lack of agreement on the characteristics of effective
classroom management strategies. Some researchers have focused on improving instructional strategies as a way to improve student behavior, but these fail to deal with disruptive student behavior (Jones, 1989). While research has focused on the need to improve classroom management strategies, some fail to deal with proactively preventing behavior and instead deal with what to do with students once the misbehavior has occurred (Jones, 1989). Jones explained that the problem with either of these approaches is that teachers and administrators only receive information about part of the problem with problem behavior and therefore are unable to make clear decisions on best how to approach the issue. As a result, administrators look for quick and simple fixes that involve classroom management programs which are designed to be implemented by all teachers regardless of their skills and needs (Jones 1989).

Another issue Jones (1989), Jones and Jones (1986), and Duke (1984) discussed is the different roles teachers take on when dealing with classroom management. Jones (1989) reported that because some teachers believe dealing with discipline issues in the classroom is strictly a responsibility for the administrators to handle, these teachers think it’s simply their job to teach. A second approach is to simplify the teacher’s role with classroom management by instituting a systemic discipline policy such as assertive discipline or the Boys and Girls Town Model (Caldwell, 2008; Duke, 1984; Etheridge, 2010; Jones, 1989). A third approach is more time consuming and requires teachers to become familiar with a variety of discipline and classroom management strategies (Jones, 1989). Jones (1989) suggested that the third option is the most likely to cause students to be independent, creative, and motivated.
To accomplish these improvements in the students, Jones (1989) provided five strategies for classroom management: (a) management should be based on students’ personal, psychological, and educational needs; (b) management should establish positive student-teacher relationships; (c) management should utilize organizational strategies to increase on-task behavior; (d) management should use appropriate instructional techniques; and (e) management should involve students in analyzing and learning to correct their own behavior (Jones, 1989). Jones (1989) stated, “Teachers’ understanding of students’ needs must include not only knowledge of children’s cognitive and emotional development, but also methods for determining the quality of match between student development and the instructional and behavior management methods employed in the classroom” (p. 333).

Leadership

According to Can (2009), “Leadership is the ability to gather individuals around some specific objectives co-operatively” (p. 436). Bull (2010) reported that managing concerns planning, organizing, and controlling in order to optimize the production of the group. Leadership, on the other hand, helps the organization grow and adjust to new circumstances (Bull, 2010). Leadership is different from management, in that managers are seen as organizers who maintain the status quo and leaders bring about change (Bull, 2010; Koh, 2008).

There are several definitions for leadership as seen in Table 2. One of the ways leadership has been defined is it is how managers influence others to work towards a common goal (Bull, 2010). Koh (2008) described classroom leadership in similar terms in that it is the actions teachers must take in order to help students attain their learning
goals. Leadership can be influenced by personal characteristics including personality (Bull, 2010). Leadership can be seen as a set of actions that causes change in others or as the ability to get others to work together towards accomplishing a common goal or task (Bull, 2010). In the classroom, change is created when the students learn.

Table 2

*Descriptions of Leadership Styles*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aversive</td>
<td>Teachers use intimidation, reprimands, and punishment to motivate students to do their work (Koh, 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>Teachers use commands and directions to set expectations and tell students exactly what to do (Koh, 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translational</td>
<td>Teachers use ideals and values to get students to follow them and they work with students to set expectations and consequences for not meeting those expectations (Thomas, 2007). Transformational teachers give individual attention to their students, allow students to find new ways to solve problems, communicate high expectations, and model expected behavior through their achievements and character (Marzano et al., 2005).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>Teachers use rewards to encourage students’ loyalty, set clear expectations and correct students when they don’t meet their expectations (Thomas, 2007); teachers are more concerned about carrying out routine tasks (Fidler, 1987); Passive teachers set standards and wait for there to be problems before exerting leadership, active teachers are stricter in maintaining behavior, and constructive teachers set goals and give praise when deserved (Marzano et al., 2005).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational</td>
<td>Effective teachers adjust their leadership styles to fit a particular situation based on the abilities of their students (Lillig, 2009). When a teacher correctly matches the leadership style with the ability level of the students, the level of productivity should increase (Bull, 2010).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The study of teacher leadership is not a new one, but what is new is the recognition, based on increased understanding of organizational characteristics, that it takes leadership on all levels to enact and create lasting change (York-Barr & Duke, 2004). York-Barr and Duke described three phases of teacher leadership: teachers as formal leaders such as department heads, teachers as curriculum leaders outside of the classroom, and teachers as central leaders of the reshaping of school culture. This last stage requires teachers to be leaders in and out of the classroom (York-Barr & Duke, 2004). Despite these developments, the concept of teachers as leaders usually describes teachers outside the classroom in more administrative roles (Koh, 2008).

One of the reasons it is thought schools haven’t reached their educational goals is a lack of teacher leadership (Bowman, 2004; Stein, 2010; York-Barr & Duke, 2004). Part of the problem is that typically people who enter the teaching profession don’t see themselves as leaders (Bowman, 2004; Koh, 2008; Stein, 2010). Teachers, though, must possess some leadership ability because they must know how to motivate their students to want to learn (Stein, 2010). Teachers, as leaders, need to have a vision, be adaptable, take risks and be honest and courageous (Bowman, 2004; Can, 2009; York-Barr & Duke, 2004).

Koh (2008) conducted a study to determine the relationship between a teacher’s leadership ability and his classroom management. The study consisted of 84 teachers, with 51 of them being secondary and the rest elementary pre-service teachers. The study used Kouzes and Pozner’s (2002) leadership model that includes five factors: inspiring, challenging, enabling, encouraging, and modeling. Scores on these indicators were compared to the teachers’ rating in classroom management as determined by their faculty
supervisors. Koh’s results showed no significant correlation between the five tested factors for leadership and classroom management. Therefore, Koh argued that teachers should be taught leadership skills in addition to classroom management as learning one doesn’t impart knowledge of the other in the study (Koh, 2008).

According to Stein (2010), the training most teachers receive is in managing students, but to successfully achieve, students need teachers to lead and guide them in ways they would not do so on their own. As classroom managers, teachers must have organization skills, discipline, show respect to the students, communicate appropriately, create and have high expectations, develop trust between themselves and the students, offer praise, listen, and design meaningful challenges (Koh, 2008). While teachers must be good classroom managers, leadership is becoming a major qualification of teachers because leaders affect the group’s performance, goal attainment, and followers’ behaviors while managers tend to accept the status quo (Bull, 2010; Can, 2009).

Can (2009) found that part of the problem teachers have with implementing leadership qualities is the amount of requirements they face in trying to prepare students for high-stakes tests. Most teachers possess some degree of leadership qualities such as classroom management, influencing and motivating, effective communication, problem solving, and controlling negative behaviors (Can, 2009). However, Can found that the teachers in his study were deficient in establishing a shared vision and school culture, and administrators were weak on helping teachers develop their leadership skills further. Even when teachers were able to express leadership behavior, some were faced with ridicule and a lack of support from their peers (Bowman, 2004). Lack of administrator and parent support, limited time, a focus on high-stakes testing, and a lack of formal
training were all hindrances to a teacher becoming an effective leader (Bowman, 2004; Can, 2009).

Another set of problems with teachers displaying leadership roles is that many teachers do not enter the teaching profession to become leaders (Stein, 2010). Stein suggested that unless teachers realize that leadership is not the sole responsibility of administrators, schools will never meet their full potential in preparing students adequately. Part of the problem, according to Stein, is that teachers aren’t prepared to be leaders. Instead, they are prepared to be simple managers of the classroom and of students (York-Barr & Duke, 2004).

Maxwell (1998) suggested that leaders influence people while managers work to meet organizational goals and don’t have training in motivational theory, personnel management, or team building (Stein, 2010; Maxwell, 1998). In his research, Stein (2010) found three strategies for helping teachers become better teachers: begin the year with a clear vision and high expectations, provide support for students and parents to meet the expectations, and motivate the students to be excited about learning. Even with setting high expectations, providing support, and motivating students, there are outside influences which affect a teacher’s ability to be a leader.

Larkin (1973) studied two influences on teachers that may affect teacher leadership characteristics. The two influences he included were community context and internal aspects of the school. Larkin wanted to determine if those influences determined if a teacher was more task-oriented, power-oriented, or expressive-oriented. Larkin found that the main influence was the community context. He did not find a significant relationship between class size, school size, or organizational structure of the school. The
results involving the community context revealed that the more urban and larger is a school’s community, the more task-oriented the teacher becomes. Also, there was a positive relationship between the community’s socioeconomic status and the leadership orientation of the teacher (Larkin, 1973).

There are many forms of leadership a teacher can display. One of the traditional forms of leadership found in schools and some businesses is aversive leadership (Koh, 2008). Aversive leadership is described as using intimidation, reprimands, and punishment to motivate followers to do their work (Koh, 2008). It originates from Arvery and Ivancevitch’s (1980) study on punishment research. While it is no longer accepted as a viable leadership option, it was heavily used in schools to harshly punish rule breaking, disrespect, and any other behavior infraction through the use of paddling or other means of corporal punishment (Koh, 2008). Koh explained that one reason it has been largely abandoned as a typical option is it can cause resentment towards the teacher from the students, which can lead to negative academic outcomes.

Another type of leadership that has been found to be useful to educators is directive leadership (Koh, 2008). Koh describes directive leadership as still using some fear and intimidation like aversive discipline, but it really focuses on using commands and directions to set expectations and to tell followers exactly what they are to do. Classroom teachers may use this style when first teaching students a new skill or when dealing with misbehaving students (Koh, 2008). Teachers using this style would typically use a stern voice and harsh body language instead of yelling to return misbehaving students to compliance (Koh, 2008).
Two other leadership descriptions which may explain teacher leadership behaviors are translational and transactional (Marzano et al., 2005; Thomas, 2007). Thomas described both of these in a review of leadership theories. Translational leaders have been found to use ideals and values to get people to follow them, while transactional leaders use their followers own self interests by offering rewards to get their loyalty (Koh, 2008; Thomas, 2007). Transformational leadership is thought to empower others to become leaders and there are four dimensions: influence or charisma, intellectual stimulation, individual consideration, and inspirational motivation (Thomas, 2007).

Fidler (1987) conjectured that transactional leaders are more concerned about carrying out routine tasks rather than taking on new challenges. Thomas (2007) described transactional leaders as setting clear expectations and correcting followers who fail to meet these expectations. There are three types of transactional leadership: management-by-exception-passive, management-by-exception-active, and constructive transactional (Marzano et al., 2005). Passive management involves the leader setting standards but waiting for there to be problems to exert any type of leadership activity. Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2007) shared leaders of this type believe in maintaining the status quo and don’t try to make any changes. The active transactional style is stricter in maintaining behavior for which they have set standards, and because of this strictness, these leaders are often unwilling to make changes or show initiative. Finally, they say that constructive transactional leaders set goals, describe desired outcomes, provides feedback and rewards for accomplishments, and gives praise when it’s deserved (Marzano et al., 2005).
Thomas (2007) described transformational leaders as working with followers to set expectations and consequences for not meeting those expectations, and then they work with their followers and provide support as needed to help them improve. There are four factors that describe transformational leadership: individual consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and idealized influence (Marzano et al., 2005; Thomas, 2007). Marzano, Waters, and McNulty suggested that when leaders give individual attention, they recognize and pay attention to followers who often seem ignored. To show intellectual stimulation, leaders allow their followers to find new ways to solve problems (Marzano et al., 2005). Inspirational motivation involves communicating high expectations through a confident presence that motivates followers, and idealized influence involves modeling expected behavior through achievements and character (Marzano et al., 2005). In Thomas’ (2007) study, transformational leadership accounted for 25% variance in job satisfaction and 40% in teacher job efficacy. Transactional leadership only accounted for 11% variance in job satisfaction and 13% of variance in teacher job efficacy.

According to Yukl (1989), leaders that have both transactional and translational skills are more effective than leaders who are one or the other. Therefore, effective leaders are the ones who use a variety of strategies and select the ones that best fit a situation (Fidler, 1997; Larkin, 1973; Thomas, 2007; Walter et al., 1980; Yukl, 1989). In his review of different leadership theories, Yukl (1989) found that situational leadership is dependent on the contextual factors of a situation. These factors included the amount of authority the leader has, the nature of the working needing to be done, the ability of his subordinates, and the environment, and the ability of the leader to understand these
factors will determine his success (Yukl, 1989). Of these four factors, Yukl (1989) explained that the Situational Leadership theory proposed by Hersey and Blanchard (1977) is dependent on the maturity of his followers (Lillig, 2009; Walter et al., 1980; Yukl, 1989).

Lillig (2009) conducted research which studied the implementation of situational leadership as an effective classroom management model in the middle school classroom. Situational Leadership is a leadership theory established by Hersey and Blanchard (1977). Hersey’s and Blanchard’s (1977) theory described an effective leader as one who adjusts his leadership style to fit with a particular situation, taking into account the abilities of his followers (Bull, 2010; Lillig, 2009). This recognition of subordinate readiness levels is very important to using the correct leadership style (Bull, 2010). When the appropriate leadership style is paired with the ability level of subordinates, their participation and effort should increase to more productive levels (Bull, 2010).

Situational leadership has been used to study leadership qualities in a variety of situations, including business, health care, and education (Bull, 2010).

Through an extensive literature review, Lillig (2009) built the case for why effective teachers are those who are able to respond and adapt to different situations which occur in the classroom. This study involved teachers located at seven schools where they responded to a leadership style instrument and their administrators evaluated their classroom management effectiveness. In the study, the teachers who scored highest with their ability to apply different leadership styles according to the Hersey and Blanchard Situational Leadership (1977, 1982) modeled also had the highest rates on the classroom management observation form. Other researchers have also found that the
most effective teachers are the ones who can adapt their leadership style in the classroom (Fidler, 1997; Larkin, 1973; Thomas, 2007; Walter et al., 1980).

Walter, Caldwell, and Marshall (1980) also made the case for the validity of situational leadership. Their research indicated that no one style of leadership is better than another. There are two major dimensions to leadership: the organization’s performance and the needs of the subordinates. They found that leaders who attend to both are perceived to be more effective. When leaders follow the Situational Leadership theory, they must be aware of the maturity of their followers. They noted that there are three components of group maturity: the ability to set high goals, the willingness to accept responsibility, and sufficient experience. When the group is immature, the leader needs to have a high task orientation with low relationship behavior (Walter et al., 1980). When the group is mature, the leader needs to display a low task and low relationship behavior because the subordinates need to be left alone to accomplish their tasks. As the subordinates become more mature, the effective leader will gradually change their leadership style to meet the changing needs of their followers (Walter et al., 1980).

Despite these findings, Yukl (1989) admitted that while the Situational Leadership theory has become popular at leadership workshops, it has not been popular with many scholars who find only partial and weak support for it.

One accepted theory is translational leadership. There has been much research done comparing the transformational leadership of principals to different teacher behavior. Ross and Gray (2006) and Ngumi, Leegers, and Denessen (2006) found that the transformational leadership of the principal had an impact on teacher commitment to the school and teacher efficacy. In a meta-analysis by Chin (2007), transformational
leadership was found to have a positive effect on teacher job satisfaction, school effectiveness, and student achievement. Transformational leadership has been shown to have a positive impact on teachers’ commitment to change (Leithwood et al., 1993).

Finally, Leithwood and Jantzi (2006) used a four-year longitudinal study of teachers in England to show that transformational leadership by the principal had a significant impact on teacher’s classroom practices but not on student achievement.

In a study of college classrooms by Bolkan and Goodboy (2009) the transformational leadership skills of the professor were compared to student learning outcomes, participation, and perception of teacher credibility. They found that transformational leadership was positively related to each of these things. Bolkan and Goodboy (2009) believed these relationships exist because of the nature of transformational leaders to deal with the individual needs of each of their followers. Teachers who were high in idealized influence and individualized consideration were able to energize their students about learning and motivate them to do better (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2009). When teachers engaged in individualized consideration of the needs of their students inside and outside the classroom, they were more likely to create positive relationships that better foster learning from their students (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2009). Their study consisted of 165 college participants who completed the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5X), the Class Participation Scale, the Revised Cognitive Learning Indicators Scale, the Affective Learning Scale, the Student Motivation Scale, the Source Credibility Scale, and the Student Communication Satisfaction Scale to rate the leadership qualities of their professors and their own academic growth in their courses.
In his study, Treslan (2006) made a comparison of effective teaching domains with components of transformational leadership. He found evidence that transformational leadership was used by teachers who commonly used effective teaching strategies. The relationship Treslan found included planning and preparation by the teacher with goal clarification and commitment in transformational leadership, creating an organized classroom which is conducive to learning compares to focusing on accomplishment, decision-making flexibility, and instilling responsibility, finally instructional practices that engage students, provide them with feedback, and use questioning and discussion relate to encouraging empowerment and shared ownership in translational leadership. When teachers practiced transformational leadership, they were able to focus on the individual needs of their students and moved away from instruction that involved students doing what the teacher says and towards instruction where the students’ interests were used and where students were encouraged to perform at their best (Treslan, 2006).

In research by Jantzi and Leithwood (1995), they attempted to determine how the perceptions developed that female teachers, new teachers, and elementary teachers were more likely to develop transformational leadership skills than male teachers, more experienced teachers, and high school teachers. They found that doing good work for the school was the most effective strategy in influencing other’s opinions of a teacher’s leadership skills. They also found that female leaders were seen as more transformational than male leaders, but Jantzi and Leithwood note that their study participants contained a higher percentage of female teachers than male teachers, younger teachers than older
teachers, and elementary teachers than high school teachers, thus impacting all three perceptions of transformational leadership.

**Personality**

Fidler (1987) found that an appropriate form of leadership style is situational leadership because it can adapt to different situations, but he recognizes that each leader is going to have a dominant leadership style based on his personality. Personality can impact how teachers teach and students learn, as effective teachers tend to have certain personality traits and teaching styles (Chambers et al., 2001; Talbott, 2005). Chambers et al. (2001) found several personality traits associated with effective teaching. These are assertiveness, a willingness to take risks, independence, creativity, and self confidence.

Personality differences among teachers can affect how teachers communicate with students, can influence teachers’ abilities to meet the needs of their students, and account for differences in thoughts about discipline and classroom management (Chambers et al., 2001). Because teachers are often not trained in management techniques, they must rely on their personal characteristics on which to base their decisions about how to handle unruly and disruptive students (Etheridge, 2010). This causes some teachers to yell and scream at their students when they misbehave and others to act calmer and in control when dealing with discipline issues in the classroom (Etheridge, 2010).

Personality styles were studied by Isabel Myers and Katharine Briggs (1985) as an extension of Carl Jung’s theory (1926) of psychological types (Gordon & Yocke, 1999; Kroeger & Thuesen, 1988; Miller, 2008; Pittenger, 1993). Originally, the theory developed around the idea that different jobs attracted different personalities, but it has
grown to be applied to a variety of scenarios (Miller, 2008; Pittenger, 1993). Pittenger (1993) further compared Jung’s theory to the theory of Myers and Briggs because both theorized personality could be used to classify people according to their attitudinal, judgmental, and perceptual preferences. Each of these in turn consisted of a dichotomy of traits, extroversion (E) or introversion (I), thinking (T) or feeling (F), and sensing (S) or intuition (N) (Pittenger, 1993). Myers and McCaulley (1985) explain that Myers and Briggs added a fourth process, judgmental (J) or perception (P) to give a characteristic four-letter personality type for each person. These personality types were measured by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) (Myers & McCauley, 1985) in which people answered a series of questions that indicate their personal preference for different situations, and the scores are totaled for each of the four processes and the personality type is determined (Miller, 2008; Pittenger, 1993).

Gordon and Yocke (1999) found some correlations between certain personality types and effectiveness strategies in a study involving career and technical education teachers. In their study, they found a correlation between the sensory and intuition type (S/N) and the use of more variety of instructional strategies, the ability to create a more positive learning environment, the providing of more opportunities for success, the use of a variety of materials, and the ability to better gain the students’ interest and actively involve them in the lesson. They found that the judging and perception type (J/P) of teachers accounted for variation in better monitoring of student understanding (Gordon & Yocke, 1999). They also found teachers with the ISFJ personality accounted for over 33% of the effective teachers in the study. ESTJ and ESFJ personality types were the least effective of the teachers, according to Gordon and Yocke (1999).
Roberts et al. (2007) were also able to find some correlation between teacher personality types and teacher efficacy. They described teacher efficacy as a teacher’s perception of his ability to positively impact student learning and consists of three components: student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management. Teachers who rated themselves high in teacher efficacy were found to be better able to challenge their students, to create effective learning environments, and to improve student achievement (Roberts et al., 2007). These teachers were also more likely to stay in the teaching field. In 2002, Henson and Chambers found a positive relationship between extroversion and teacher efficacy and found extroverts were less rigid and controlling during interactions with other people.

In the study conducted by Roberts et al. (2007), they measured the teacher efficacy of student teachers at different points during their field experience and compared it to their personality type as determined by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). While they did not find a relationship between extroversion and teacher efficacy, their results did indicate a small negative relationship between the sensory type (S) with efficacy in instructional strategies and a slight positive relationship between the judging type (J) and efficacy in classroom management. Sensory/Feeling (SF) types of teachers have been found to typically be uncomfortable with new instructional methods and technology (Henson & Chambers, 2002), and teachers who are rated as more judging (J) are seen to be controlling in classroom situations (Martin, 1995) so the results from the study by Roberts, et al (2007) are consistent with other findings.

Chambers et al. (2001) used the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) and the discipline strategies suggested by Wolfgang and Glickman (1980) (interactionalist,
interventionist, and non-interventionist) to show that while teacher efficacy was more important in determining the discipline strategy utilized in the classroom, the teachers’ personalities did play a role as well. In their study of 120 pre-service teachers, the thinking/feeling (T/F) aspect of the Myers-Briggs personality type was the dominant predictor of classroom management strategies. Approximately 25% of the participants were identified as either ISTJ or ESTJ which indicates the majority of the teachers in the study have a serious perspective and a more organized personality (Chambers et al., 2001). As a result, Chambers et al. (2001) expect these teachers to establish a goal-oriented and disciplined classroom, which may account for the variation in classroom management strategies. They also found that teachers with the Sensing persuasion were more likely to invoke stricter instructional methods in their classrooms with a possible shift from academically focused assignments to ones designed to discourage misbehavior (interventionist). Finally, they discovered that extroverts were less demanding when dealing with other people (non-interventionist), while those who rated high with the Thinking personality type were more logical and firm (interventionist) when interacting with students (Chambers et al., 2001).

In her study, Martin (1995) also reported several relationships between classroom management strategies and personality traits. Teachers who were seen more as an interventionist according to theory by Wolfgang and Glickman (1980) were less open to change, were more practical, and more aware of social conventions (Martin, 1995). She also reported many of these teachers viewed themselves as bossy, assertive, dominant, and aggressive. The results of their study agreed with earlier studies in that teachers who
scored higher for interventionist tendencies were less open to change, although this was
the only relationship noted (Martin, 1995).

In addition to the personality styles in the MBTI, a recently developed theory on
personality is the Five Factor Model and is commonly called the Big Five Model
(Bonner, 2010; John & Srivastava, 1999). The Big Five personality dimensions are broad
personality characteristics that include extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness,
emotional stability (neuroticism), and openness (Bonner, 2010). As shown in Table 3,
each of these domains contains many distinct personality characteristics (Bonner, 2010).

Extraversion involves sociability, expressiveness, and activity, and extraverted
teachers are seen as reacting positively to students (Bonner, 2010). Agreeable teachers
are able to form caring and positive relationships with their teachers and are typically
seen as altruistic and supportive of others (Bonner, 2010). Those who rated high in
conscientiousness would exhibit impulse control, perseverance, self-discipline,
organized, achievement-oriented, and thoroughness (Bonner, 2010; Chan, 2003). Studies
have shown a positive correlation between conscientiousness and job performance (Chan,
2003). Neuroticism is the negative scale for emotional stability. Those ranking high in
neuroticism would be expected to show high levels of anxiety, irritability, aggression,
fear, disgust, and depression (Bonner, 2010). People high in neuroticism do not cope
well in stressful situations (Bonner, 2010). Finally, openness involves how open a person
is to new and different experiences. Openness deals with originality, creativity, open-
mindedness, curiosity (Bonner, 2010), and people high in openness have shown high
benefit and learning from training opportunities because they tend to be open to new
ideas (Chan, 2003).
In Bonner’s (2010) study, the relationship between empathy and personality vs. perception of student aggressiveness was measured. Bonner found there was not a significant relationship between empathy and the perception of aggressiveness, nor was there a significant overall relationship between personality and perceiving aggressiveness between students. However, high school teachers high in neuroticism scored low on awareness of physical aggression meaning these teachers reported physical aggression less often. Elementary teachers scoring high on neuroticism were less likely to stop social aggression due to an increase in feeling unable to deal with the social aggression (Bonner, 2010). For openness, teachers with high scores were more comfortable with their ability to deal with physical behavior and were more likely to respond to it (Bonner, 2010).

In another study using the Big Five personality model, Chan (2003) studied the relationship between personality and teacher evaluations by students. Chan found significant correlations between all five personality domains and teacher evaluations by students with the strongest relationship occurring with conscientiousness. Additionally, students who thought themselves similar in personality to their teachers rated those teachers as more effective on all scales in their study (Chan, 2003).

There have been several studies that have shown a relationship between the effects of the personality type of teachers in the classroom, but there are others which have not been able to reproduce these results. Talbott (2005) conducted a study to try to determine the relationship between teacher effectiveness and personality types in middle school teachers. While his literature review indicated others had found significant
relationships between personality and effectiveness, his studied showed no significant
relationship (Talbott, 2005).

Likewise, Smith (1981), in a study comparing the personality traits of teachers
and education majors, found a relationship between personality and classroom
management strategies selected by the education majors, but he did not find the same
relationship between regular teachers even though both groups had similar classroom
management styles. The experienced teachers who felt more in control of their own
behavior had higher achieving students, but the student teachers in the study who felt
more in control used a classroom strategy which emphasized the students’ responsibility
in the classroom, used more positive reinforcements, and ignored problem behavior when
necessary (Smith, 1981). Smith found that more experienced teachers were more
resistant to new ideas and were less anxious than the student teachers studied.
Interestingly, the male teachers in his study tended to use more punishment and verbal
reprimands than female teachers, while the female teachers worked more with the
students to help them learn to control their behavior. Smith suggested that it was possible
that student teachers and new teachers initially pick classroom management strategies
based on their personalities, but as they gain experience, they begin to use different
classroom management strategies based on their effectiveness and feedback from both
students and other teachers (Smith, 1981).

Experience

The beginning years of teachers’ careers are seen by many educators to be the
toughest years of their careers, with estimates indicating that about 30% of teachers leave
the profession after three years and that almost 50% of teachers leave within their first
five years of entering teaching (Etheridge, 2010; Fry, 2009; Ludlow, 2010). To help combat this trend, Fry notes that many school districts have tried to provide support to new teachers during the first three years, the induction period, of their careers. This support is designed to help teachers overcome the perceived isolation of being a classroom teacher and the difference between theory and practice many new teachers have to overcome when first entering the classroom (Fry, 2009). In his qualitative study, Fry (2009) notes that as the teachers became more experienced, they found classroom management to be easier which led to better instructional practices.

First and second-year teachers tend to be more unsure of what to do in different situations than more experienced teachers, and they tend to be less able to adapt their approach to dealing with a variety of students and circumstances in the classroom (Ritter & Hancock, 2007). Conversely, because experienced teachers have learned a variety of classroom strategies and skills, they have the ability to deal with unpredictability from the students (Hagger & McIntyre, 2000; Ritter & Hancock, 2007). Experienced teachers are also better able to prioritize and handle a variety of tasks at once (Ritter & Hancock, 2007). Because of their experience, veteran teachers are able to intuitively deal with events that occur in the classroom (Hagger & McIntyre, 2000).

In a study conducted by Ritter and Hancock (2007), the classroom management strategies of teachers with one or two years experience were compared to those of teachers with five or more years of experience. The teachers’ paths to certification were also included in the research study. The population of the study included 158 middle school teachers. The researchers found no statistically significant results for classroom management between new teachers and experienced teachers, nor between teachers with
alternate route certification and traditional route certification. The only significant
difference occurred with traditional route, experienced teachers. The traditional route
teachers scored significantly lower than alternate route experienced teachers, alternate
route novice teachers, and traditional route novice teachers for the instructional
management subscale on the classroom management instrument. Because the
interventionist management style is represented by higher scores on the instrument, these
findings suggest that teachers with a traditional education training and having several
years of experience tend to let students have more say in classroom management affairs
(Ritter & Hancock, 2007). The other results suggest that neither experience nor
preparation affect how controlling teachers felt they needed to be in the classroom (Ritter
& Hancock, 2007).

In another research study conducted by Ng, Nicholas, and Williams (2009), they
shared that pre-service teachers form ideas before they begin teaching on how they
expect students to behave and what they believe to be effective teaching. They argued
these beliefs are important because the experiences the teachers encounter will be filtered
through those beliefs. The difficult part about these beliefs is that they are formed by
observing professors and other teachers and may be hidden until the pre-service teachers
get their own classroom when it’s too late to help change negative beliefs (Ng, Nicholas,
& Williams, 2010). They argued part of the problem with bringing these previously
hidden beliefs is that they can become so deeply entrenched that the teachers dismiss
challenges to their beliefs as non-practical.

Ng et al. (2010) described pre-service teachers as having a tendency to emphasize
the importance of content knowledge over being supportive, caring, approachable, and
friendly towards their students. In their study, they found pre-service teachers thought teachers would have expert control over their students, good teachers would have quiet classrooms, and classroom management isn’t a major issue. However, as they progressed through the education course in which they were studied, they began to see that good teachers know their students and set firm, but fair limits to student behavior (Ng et al., 2010). The researchers also found the pre-service teachers found classroom management training to be a needed area of help, but several of the subjects found they had an increased confidence in dealing with teenage students with the experience of the studied class.

Fives and Buehl (2009) found that practicing teachers were more effective with classroom management while pre-service teachers were more effective with student engagement. In their study, they stated evidence that suggests a strong relationship between a teacher’s experience and sense of teacher efficacy. While it did not appear in their results, they found evidence that suggests new teachers are more effective at using new instructional methods compared to experienced teachers. This difference may account for the results of the study as teachers who can implement new instructional practices may be more effective at getting the students to be interested in the lesson (Fives & Buehl, 2009). They also found a significant difference in teacher efficacy ratings between pre-service teacher and teachers with more than ten years experience (Fives & Buehl, 2009).

Teachers’ self-efficacy has been shown to be related to their classroom behaviors, in the effort they exert, the goals they set, and their persistence (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007). Researchers have argued that a teacher’s range of
experiences contributes to an increased sense of efficacy in dealing with classroom management and instruction (Campbell, 1996; Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007). While experienced teachers have a variety of past successes on which to base their efficacy, new teachers have to have other sources in which to build their self-efficacy (Ludlow, 2010; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007). Efficacy is important to Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy because if a teacher has positive experiences in the classroom, then they are going to feel more confident in their ability, which will then lead to more success in the classroom. Self-efficacy beliefs are powerful indicators of teaching behaviors than educational knowledge (Ludlow, 2010).

Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2007) argued that new teachers have to rely on their preconceived notions about teaching and about how they are going to have a positive impact on their students. For some, though, the realities of teaching cause them to change their views of what good teaching looks like or to even lower their expectations from themselves and from students (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007). They described other new teachers who are able to react more positively to the challenges by continuing to learn new skills and to grow as educators. While the teacher is new, efficacy beliefs can change rather easily, but once they have become established, teachers very rarely change these beliefs in themselves, even in the face of evidence to the contrary (Ludlow, 2010; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007).

In their study, Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2007) divided their subjects into two groups, novice teachers with three or fewer years of experience and career teachers with four or more years of experience. Their research indicated a jump in self-
efficacy scores for teachers after the third year of teaching, indicating that weak teachers either left the profession or improved on their skills (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007, Wolters & Daugherty, 2007). They found that that career teachers had higher self-efficacy scores for instructional strategies and classroom management, and they found that these teachers tended to rely on their memories of past teaching experiences. Novice teachers, on the other hand, tended to rely on other experiences such as verbal persuasion and the stories from other teachers in determining their self-efficacy (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007). While the novice teachers scored lower than the career teachers on two scales, the researchers found no statistical difference between the groups in terms of student engagement efficacy.

In a similar study, Wolters and Daugherty (2007) divided their subjects into four groups based on experience: first year teachers, teaching one to five years, teaching five to ten years, and teaching more than ten years. They found that teacher efficacy improved as teachers gained more experiences and were better able to utilize instructional practices to reach all of their students. Wolters and Daugherty (2007) also found that more experienced teachers were able to employ techniques to avoid classroom disruptions that hinder learning opportunities.

Certification

As the teacher professionalism movement emerged from concerns about the status of classroom teachers in the earlier 1980s, initiatives were made to increase teacher’s status and reward them for continued improvement and training (York-Barr & Duke, 2004). With classroom management being a part of effective instruction, several studies have tried to determine a link between certification and effectiveness. Darling-Hammond
et al. (2005) found teachers with alternate route certificate were less effective than teachers from traditional programs in raising test scores, and Linek et al. (2009) discovered that fully certified teachers received higher evaluations from administrators than alternate route teachers. However, Suell and Piotrowski (2006) conducted a study with teachers involved in the Florida alternate route program and found no difference between the competencies of teachers trained in the alternate route compared to teachers prepared in a traditional route. Ludlow (2010) also reported little difference between alternate route and traditional route teachers and between the length of teacher preparation and teacher efficacy.

Brown (2009) found in her study that special education teachers with just a bachelor’s degree scored the lowest on teacher efficacy while teachers with advanced degrees, masters and specialists, scored highest for teacher efficacy which includes classroom management. Her study included 297 special education teachers who self-reported their sense of efficacy on the instruments sent to them. Brown notes that teachers with advanced degrees could have learned more information to help them with their classroom management. However, she also concluded that the results could mean that teachers who were already more effective with their classroom management and instructional practices sought advanced degrees for increased knowledge (Brown, 2009).

These results match those of Campbell (1986) and Hoy and Woolfolk (1993) who found that a teacher’s educational level was one of the biggest predictors of their personal teaching efficacy. In Campbell’s (1986) study, the teacher’s educational levels were divided into three groups: pre-bachelor’s, bachelor’s, and master’s. There were
significant differences between all three levels. The different teacher educational levels were not listed in the Hoy and Woolfolk (1993) study.

Alternately, in a study by Ludlow (2010), she found that classroom management was not tied to the certification route of the teacher, but instead was more influenced by the experiences the teacher had in the classroom. In fact, claims Ludlow, there was little evidence to support the claim that a traditional education background influenced student achievement. These results were also found in a study by Wayman, Foster, Mantle-Bromley, and Wilson (2003). To gain educational experience, alternate route teachers should be provided with professional development opportunities in order to improve their efficacy because they do not have the experience of veteran teachers nor the student-teaching experience of traditional teachers, they (Ludlow, 2010). New teachers with a high sense of efficacy were less likely to depend on strict classroom rules, threaten disciplinary action, and be controlling (Ludlow, 2010).

In her study, Ludlow (2010) found that personality traits, professional skills, practice, the perception of competence, personal characteristics, and motivation all contributed to the perception of a teacher’s efficacy. In her study involving more than 700 alternate route teachers, their results of teacher efficacy were comparable to the scores for traditional route teachers that have been established for the instrument used. Ludlow (2010) concluded that even though traditional route teachers have had student teacher opportunities, both traditional and alternate route teachers enter the classroom with nearly the same sense of efficacy because neither really have their own mastery experiences.
Theoretical Framework

Classroom Management

Students behave and learn in classrooms where their physical, psychological, and emotional needs are met through appropriate teacher actions, considerations, and management decisions (Mitchell, 2009; Jones & Jones, 1986). Maslow suggested that students must have their basic needs met before they are able to adequately learn (Jones & Jones, 1986; Maslow, 1943). Jones and Jones (1986) described Maslow’s (1943) theory as stating that students want to be competent and accepted, and when they aren’t, they become frustrated and act out. Mitchell (2009) described this motivational theory as a natural drive for humans. According to Maslow (1943), people tend to take care of low level needs before addressing higher needs that allow them to learn (Jones & Jones, 1986; Mitchell, 2009). Therefore, teachers must make an effort to meet the basic needs of their students to help with classroom management and improve their students’ academic abilities (Chauncey, 2009; Jones & Jones, 1986; Mitchell, 2009). According to Maslow’s (1943) theory, when teachers are developing their classroom management strategies, there is a hierarchical list of needs that should be considered: physiological needs, safety needs, belonging needs, self-esteem needs, and self-actualization needs (Chauncey, 2009; Mitchell, 2009).

Jones and Jones (1986) described this first level of needs as consisting of several physiological variables such as the amount of sound and light in the room, the classroom’s temperature and design, and mobility. Teachers need to provide a suitable and comfortable classroom environment because if students are unsure of their surroundings, they tend to focus more on themselves than on being an active member of
the learning culture of the classroom (Hensley et al., 2007). Jones and Jones (1986) also said teachers should keep in mind their students’ need to move and be involved when they are designing their classroom rules and procedures, and that often times when this physical need isn’t met, more than the others, it leads to disruptive behavior.

The second level of needs is safety (Maslow, 1943). Teachers have to ensure that students are safe from physical harm from other students, and they must make sure that the students are safe from undo psychological pressure from teachers and other staff members (Jones & Jones, 1986). One way that teachers can protect students from psychological pressure is to provide positive reinforcing comments and create success opportunities by giving work that meets their learning abilities (Jones & Jones, 1986; Rogers & Freiberg, 1994). Etheridge (2010) argued that teachers can use effective classroom management strategies to create classrooms that are safe so students can take risks and feel a part of the larger community. Rogers and Freiberg (1994) and Hensley et al. (2007) have found that students tend to view school more positively when their teachers make positive comments about them, their efforts, and their work.

When students don’t feel they belong, they are more likely to engage in disruptive behavior (Jones & Jones, 1986; Mitchell, 2009). The third level of needs is a sense of belonging. Jones and Jones (1986) reported students can have this need met is by receiving respect from their teachers through positive relationships. Rogers and Freiberg (1994) described effective classroom management as being caring, guiding, and cooperative which helps to ensure a better environment for learning and behavior. When students feel the teacher cares about and respect them, they are more likely to follow the teacher’s rules and directions (Hensley et al., 2007).
Once physiological, safety, and belonging needs are met, the next level is self-esteem. Self-esteem deals with how a person sees himself, whether positively or negatively (Jones & Jones, 1986). When teachers don’t foster positive relationships and provide success opportunities, students will more than likely develop a negative self-image that hinders their learning and drives them towards disruptive actions (Jones & Jones, 1986; Mitchell, 2009). Jones and Jones (1986) shared that teachers can help their students learn by providing instructional activities with clear learning goals that allow the students to be active participants.

Finally, in order for students to learn, their need of self-actualization must be met (Jones & Jones, 1986). Self-actualization deals with a person’s need to meet his own potential, recognition of his own abilities, and achieving personal goals (Jones & Jones, 1986; Mitchell, 2009). One of a teacher’s responsibilities in helping students meet these needs is providing choices to them which allow them to follow their own natural curiosity (Freiberg & Lamb, 2009; Jones & Jones, 1986; Mitchell, 2009; Payne, 2006). Through these activities, students should be more manageable and will learn more (Jones & Jones, 1986).

Students are not only motivated to behave certain ways in order to meet their personal needs, but they also behave in certain ways because of the positive and negative consequences they receive (Etheridge, 2010). The theory behind these behaviors is called operant conditioning, and it was proposed by B.F. Skinner (1954). Etheridge (2010) described one of Skinner’s goals to be to use different consequences in order to shape someone’s behavior to be more acceptable. When a person’s behavior is reward through positive consequences in the environment, the behavior will continue, but when the
person receives negative consequences, the behavior will cease (Etheridge, 2010; Slavin, 1997). According to Etheridge (2010), “Broadly speaking, most preventive discipline strategies, including elements of assertive discipline, remain authoritarian and behaviorist in orientation…” (p. 28).

Consequences in operant conditioning are called reinforcers (Etheridge, 2010; Slavin, 1997). Positive reinforcers produce the desired result when applied, while negative reinforcers produce the desired result when taken away (Etheridge, 2010; Slavin, 1997). Etheridge (2010) says extrinsic positive reinforcers typically involve praise from others. Punishment is designed to either implement negative consequences or take away positive reinforcers. The goal of operant conditioning in the classroom would involve teachers applying the appropriate reinforce or consequence so a particular behavior either continues or comes to an end (Etheridge, 2010; Slavin, 1997).

Another behavioral theory similar to operant conditioning that is possibly involved in classroom behavior is the law of effect created by E.L. Thorndike (Etheridge, 2010). According to the law of effect, present behavior produces consequences that affect and determine future behavior (Etheridge, 2010; Slavin, 1997). There are three main laws to this theory: effect, readiness, and exercise. The law of effect says that behavior followed by some type of reward will continue and become habit, the law of readiness says actions can be linked together to achieve a goal, and the law of exercise claims that behavior-consequence connections become stronger when practiced and weaker when not used (Etheridge, 2010). In the classroom, behaviors that are less likely to receive a reward would be weakened and would eventually cease, and it is the responsibility of the teacher to create situations that reward positive behavior so it
continues and remove rewards and establish negative consequences to end misbehavior (Etheridge, 2010; Slavin, 1997).

To test for a teacher’s efficacy of classroom management, the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) was developed by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001). This instrument is a twenty-four item questionnaire that is rated using a nine-point Likert scale. The TSES contains three subsets of scores: efficacy of instructional strategies, efficacy of classroom management, and efficacy of student engagement (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007). According to Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2007), previous research has established that reliability ranges from .92 to .95 for the overall instrument and ranges from .86 to .90 for the subscales. In a comparison with other teacher efficacy instruments, Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) found the TSES showed positive correlations and therefore had construct validity. They consider the TSES to include a wider range of behaviors and strategies effective teachers would be expected to display and use (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001).

**Leadership**

A current theory on leadership is called the full-range leadership theory (FRLT) and was established by Bass in 1985 (Antonakis, Avolio & Sivasubramaniam, 2003). At the time, Bass (1985) noted that most leadership theories primarily focused on follower behavior and ways that leaders rewarded or punished that behavior. This leadership style is called transactional is typically seen as only being able to bring about basic interaction with followers. Bass proposed that transformational leadership based on Burns’ (1978) research was necessary for organizations to achieve optimal levels of success and performance (Antonakis et al., 2003). The FRLT is currently made up of nine factors.
which include five factors for transformational, three for transactional, and one factor for laissez-faire style of leadership (Antonakis et al., 2003).

Through Burns’ (1978) research, transformational leadership established a connection between leaders and followers where the leaders use values to motivate his followers to achieve his goals (Sutherland, 2010). By using values and morals, Burns described a situation where leaders and followers could work together to raise each other to higher levels of motivation (Sutherland, 2010). Transformational leadership is seen as proactive and influencing followers’ attitudes to achieve a higher level of accomplishment through inspiration (Antonakis et al., 2003; Sutherland, 2010). There have been four areas that have been theorized to be a part of transformational leadership: idealized influence (charisma), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (May, 2010; Sutherland, 2010).

Idealized influence (charisma) describes a leader who is perceived to be a strong role model (May, 2010; Sutherland, 2010). The leader provides a vision and mission that others want to follow (May, 2010). Leaders acting with idealized influence are seen by followers as putting the needs and interests of the group ahead of the leader’s personal interests (Sutherland, 2010). There are two components of idealized influence: idealized influence attributed and idealized influence behavior (May, 2010). Idealized influence attributed deals with the socialized charisma of the leader and whether he is perceived as being powerful and confident (Antonakis et al., 2003; May, 2010). Idealized influence behavior deals with the actions taken by the leader that are perceived as being centered on values and a sense of mission (Antonakis et al., 2003; May, 2010).
Inspirational motivation describes a leader who communicates high performance expectations (Marzano et al., 2005; May, 2010; Sutherland, 2010). The leader inspires followers to pursue a shared vision (May, 2010). Leaders high in inspirational motivation are able to energize their followers with a positive and optimistic view of the future (Antonakis et al., 2003). These leaders stress ambitious, but achievable goals and work to communicate those goals with their followers (Antonakis et al., 2003).

Intellectual stimulation describes a leader who encourages innovation (May, 2010). To do this, the leader provides an environment conducive to risk-taking, empowerment, and new approaches to solving problems (Marzano et al., 2005; May, 2010; Sutherland, 2010). Intellectually stimulating leaders also appeal to their followers sense of logic by challenging them to find creative solutions to difficult problems (Antonakis et al., 2003).

Individual consideration refers to a leader who cares about the needs of his followers (Marzano et al., 2005; May, 2010). The leader may act like a coach or mentor to provide individualized attention to followers (May, 2010). These types of leaders allow their followers to develop self-actualization (Antonakis et al., 2003). They pay attention to followers who often seem ignored (Marzano et al., 2005).

Transactional leaders exchange rewards and consequences with followers for them meeting their obligations to the organization (Antonakis et al., 2003). Transactional leaders set the objectives and goals themselves, and they tend to closely monitor and control the outcomes (Antonakis et al., 2003), and they are more concerned about maintaining the organization rather than taking on new challenges (Fidler, 1987). There are three factors that comprise transactional leadership in the FRLT: contingent reward
Leadership, management-by-exception active, and management-by-exception passive (Antonakis et al., 2003; Marzano et al., 2005).

Leaders high in the area of contingent reward use rewards to get followers to produce desired outcomes (Antonakis et al., 2003; May, 2010). Marzano, et al (2007) calls this type of leadership constructive transactional leadership. These leaders set goals, provide feedback, and give praise when it’s deserved (Marzano et al., 2005).

Management-by-exception active leaders use criticism and negative consequences to make followers achieve outcomes (Antonakis et al., 2003; May, 2010). These leaders maintain a strict environment and are often reluctant to make changes or show initiative (Marzano et al., 2005).

Management-by-exception passive leaders only intervene after mistakes are made by followers (Antonakis et al., 2003). These passive leaders set standards for the organization, but they tend wait for problems until they exert any leadership influence (Marzano et al., 2005). Marzano et al. (2007) describe these leaders as maintaining the status quo above all else.

Laissez-faire describes a leader who minimizes exchanges with followers and provides minimal feedback or support (May, 2010). It represents a nonleadership style in that the leader avoids making a decision and does not use his authority (Antonakis et al., 2003).

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Form 5X (MLQ-5X) was developed by Bass and Avolio (1995) to measure transformational leadership behavior (May, 2010; Sutherland, 2010). This instrument consists of 45 items that are answered by responding to a 5-point Likert scale with description ranging from 0 (not at all) to 4 (frequently, if
not always) (May, 2010). The MLQ-5X is designed to measure the three different leadership styles that constitute the full-range leadership theory (FRLT) proposed by Avolio and Bass (1991): transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire (Antonakis et al., 2003; May, 2010). Within these three leadership styles, nine leadership qualities are measured: idealized influence (IIA and IIB), inspirational motivation (IM), intellectual stimulation (IS), and individual consideration (IC) for translational, contingent reward (CR), management-by-exception active (MBEA), management-by-exception passive (MBEP) for transactional, and laissez-faire (LF) (May, 2010). Reliabilities for the MLQ-5X range from .74 to .94 (May, 2010; Sutherland, 2010). Antonakis, Avolio, and Sivasubramaniam (2003) found in their study that the MQL-5X was a valid test for the full-range leadership theory and that it does exhibit construct validity.

**Personality**

Like leadership, researchers have attempted to describe personality through a variety of theories and models (Humbyrd, 2010; John et al., 2008). In the past couple of decades, a personality theory has arisen that has categorized different personality traits into five domains (Bonner, 2010; Chan, 2003; Humbyrd, 2010; John et al., 2008). This theory is known as the Five Factor Model (FFM) or the Big Five, and its purpose is not to replace other personality theories, but to integrate them into overarching categories to create a common framework (Humbyrd, 2010; John et al., 2008).

The first to attempt to categorize personality classified over 4500 personality descriptors into 16 categories (Humbyrd, 2010; John et al., 2008). Continuing to study these factors, researchers found five factors which were replicable and reoccurred through their studies (Humbyrd, 2010; John et al., 2008). The sixteen categories were
reduced into the five categories of extraversion, openness, neuroticism, conscientiousness, and agreeableness; and John et al. (1991) created the Big Five Inventory (BFI) to adequately measure the five factors (Humbyrd, 2010). This model is not meant to reduce personality to just five factors, but to use these factors to describe the broadest levels of personality with the traits that make up those factors differentiating one person from another (Humbyrd, 2010; John et al., 2008).

As shown in Table 3, each of the factors, extraversion, openness, conscientiousness, emotional stability (neuroticism), and agreeableness, has traits associated with it that may describe each person’s personality (Humbyrd, 2010). The factor for extraversion describes an energetic approach to the outside world (John et al., 2008). It includes traits for being energetic, social, talkative, outgoing, assertive, dominant, cheerful, enjoying being with people, and seeking excitement (Humbyrd, 2010; John et al., 2008). People who score low for extraversion tend to prefer to work alone, are more independent and reserved. The agreeableness factor describes a prosocial orientation toward others (John et al., 2008). Agreeable people tend to be trusting, empathetic, cooperative, caring, sensitive, kind, forgiving, generous, and good-natured (Humbyrd, 2010; John et al., 2008). A person scoring low in agreeableness would likely be seen as critical, hostile, cold, unfriendly, stern, and distrustful (John et al., 2008). A person ranking high in Factor III, conscientiousness, is likely to be dependable, organized, disciplined, hard workers, and goal-oriented, and they tend to follow rules and norms (Humbyrd, 2010; John et al., 2008). People at the opposite end of the scale for conscientiousness tend to be careless, frivolous, irresponsible, forgetful, and undependable (John et al., 2008). A person who is emotionally stable (low neuroticism)
will often appear confident and will remain calm and collected in times of crisis (Humbyrd, 2010). People who are high in neuroticism express more negative personality traits, such as anxious, nervous, moody, stressed, sad, fearful, touchy, high-strung, depressed, and self-conscious (John et al., 2008). When a person is rated high for openness or open-mindedness, he is more open to new ideas, is more creative, insightful, sophisticated, witty, resourceful, imaginative, and innovative (Humbyrd, 2010; John et al., 2008). Others who are not open have more narrow interests and are seen as simple, shallow, and unintelligent (John et al., 2008).

Table 3

*Personality Descriptors for the Big Five Factors for Upper and Lower Scores on the Big Five Inventory*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extraversion</th>
<th>Agreeableness</th>
<th>Conscientiousness</th>
<th>Neuroticism</th>
<th>Openness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talkative</td>
<td>Sympathetic</td>
<td>Organized</td>
<td>Tense</td>
<td>Wide interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td>Kind</td>
<td>Thorough</td>
<td>Anxious</td>
<td>Imaginative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Appreciative</td>
<td>Efficient</td>
<td>Nervous</td>
<td>Intelligent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energetic</td>
<td>Affectionate</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Moody</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgoing</td>
<td>Soft-hearted</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>Worried</td>
<td>Insightful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outspoken</td>
<td>Generous</td>
<td>Dependable</td>
<td>Touchy</td>
<td>Curious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>Trusting</td>
<td>Conscientious</td>
<td>Fearful</td>
<td>Sophisticated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forceful</td>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>Precise</td>
<td>High-strung</td>
<td>Artistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td>Forgiving</td>
<td>Practical</td>
<td>Self-pitying</td>
<td>Inventive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show-off</td>
<td>Good-natured</td>
<td>Deliberate</td>
<td>Temperamental</td>
<td>Sharp-witted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociable</td>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>Painstaking</td>
<td>Unstable</td>
<td>Ingenious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventurous</td>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>Cautious</td>
<td>Self-punishing</td>
<td>Witty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noisy</td>
<td>Unselfish</td>
<td></td>
<td>Despondent</td>
<td>Resourceful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bossy</td>
<td>Praising</td>
<td></td>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>Wise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extraversion</th>
<th>Agreeableness</th>
<th>Conscientiousness</th>
<th>Neuroticism</th>
<th>Openness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet</td>
<td>Fault-finding</td>
<td>Careless</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>Commonplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>Disorderly</td>
<td>Calm</td>
<td>Narrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shy</td>
<td>Unfriendly</td>
<td>Frivolous</td>
<td>Contented</td>
<td>interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>Quarrelsome</td>
<td>Irresponsible</td>
<td></td>
<td>Simple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>Hard-hearted</td>
<td>Undependable</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shallow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retiring</td>
<td>Unkind</td>
<td>Forgetful</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unintelligent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cruel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thankless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stingy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Obtained from Humbyrd (2010) and John et al. (2008).

The Five Factor Model is measured using the Big Five Inventory (BFI) (Benet-Martinez & John, 1998; John et al., 1991; John et al., 2008) created by John et al. in 1991 (Bonner, 2010; Chan, 2003; Humbyrd, 2010). It is a 44-question instrument that uses a 5-point Likert-type scale to allow a person the opportunity to rate himself on a series of descriptive phrases. The developers of the test have found that short phrases are answered more consistently than single-word adjective items (John et al., 2008). Each question begins “I am someone who…”; and respondents then rate how strongly he disagrees or agrees with the rest of the statement. An example question may read “I am someone who perseveres until the job is done” (p. 130).

To get an individual’s score, the researcher would add and then average the scores for items that pertain to each factor. The higher the score, the higher level of personality trait for that factor. The BFI (Benet-Martinez & John, 1998; John et al., 1991; John et al., 2008) has been shown to be reliable in a variety of situations with alpha reliabilities ranging from .75 to .90 (Humbyrd, 2010; John et al., 2008; Rammstedt & John, 2007).
The BFI has also shown construct validity in comparison with three other similar personality tests, with a range of validity correlations of .68 - .80 (Humbyrd, 2010; Rammstedt & John, 2007).
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Overview

The purpose of this study was to determine if a teacher’s leadership ability, personality, experience, and certification significantly influenced their efficacy of classroom management. High school teachers across southern Mississippi were given questionnaires containing three instruments: the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, the Big Five Inventory, and the Teachers Sense of Efficacy Scale. Demographic questions were also asked to determine years of experience and certification type. Questionnaires were mailed to 358 teachers at six high schools chosen by a search of school websites to find which ones listed their faculty members. The remaining questionnaires were given to 242 teachers at four schools in which permission was gained from the superintendents to meet with their high school teachers. There were 151 questionnaires that were returned for a return rate of approximately 25%.

Research Design

The design of this study was quantitative using multiple regression to measure the relationship between eight independent variables: five personality traits, transformational leadership, experience, and certification, and the dependent variable, efficacy of classroom management. The teacher’s personality was based on the Five Factor Model and includes: extraversion (E), openness (O), neuroticism (N) (emotional stability), agreeableness (A), and conscientiousness (C). These factors were measured using the Big Five Inventory (Appendix A). The leadership style of the teacher was conceptualized by the Full-Range Leadership Theory and measured by the Multifactor Leadership
Questionnaire (Appendix B). Teachers’ experience was the total number of years in education. Certification was based on the highest degree received (Bachelor’s, Master’s, Specialist’s, or Doctorate as indicated by the designations A, AA, AAA, and AAAA, respectively) and certification route (traditional or alternate). Certification and experience, along with the participants’ race, gender, and other demographic information, were collected with a form created by the researcher for the purposes of this study (Appendix C). These variables were determined and compared to the teacher’s efficacy of classroom management as determined by the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (Appendix D).

Participants

The participants of this study were teachers from high schools in the southern part of Mississippi. The teachers who volunteered to return the completed questionnaires represent a convenience sample. The teachers were chosen using two methods: four superintendents were asked for permission to speak directly to the faculty (Appendix E) and an Internet search was conducted to find schools which listed faculty names online. The superintendents were chosen because of prior relationships with the researcher, and each gave permission to contact the teachers at their high schools directly (Appendix F–I). All teachers at the chosen schools were contacted and given the opportunity to volunteer for the study (Appendix J–K). The number of participants was determined through a power calculation where the number of variables (eight) was multiplied by ten and took into account an estimated average return rate of 20 – 25% for questionnaires. At least 80 participants were needed, but 150 were preferred. Six hundred teachers were
contacted: approximately 350 through the U.S. post office and 250 through direct contact at school meetings.

Instrumentation

John et al. (1991) created the Big Five Inventory (BFI) to measure each of the personality traits related to the Five Factor Model (Benet-Martinez & John, 1998; John et al., 1991; John et al., 2008). Oliver John, copyright holder of the Big Five Inventory, granted permission for its use in this study (Appendix L). The BFI is a 44-question instrument (Appendix A) that uses a 5-point Likert-type scale to allow respondents the opportunity to rate themselves on a series of descriptive questions. The 5-point scale for the BFI was 1 – *Disagree strongly*, 2 – *Disagree a little*, 3 – *Neither agree nor disagree*, 4 – *Agree a little*, and 5 – *Agree strongly*. Respondents rated how strongly they agree or disagree with each of the 44 statements. Each statement begins “I am someone who…”, and a sample question includes, “I am someone who is original, comes up with new ideas.”

To get an individual’s score on the BFI (Benet-Martinez & John, 1998; John et al., 1991; John et al., 2008), the researcher added and averaged the scores for items that pertained to each factor: Extraversion – 1, 6, 11, 16, 21, 26, 31, 36, Agreeableness – 2, 7, 12, 17, 22, 27, 32, 37, 42, Conscientiousness – 3, 8, 13, 18, 23, 28, 33, 38, 38, 43, Neuroticism – 4, 9, 14, 19, 24, 29, 34, 39, and Openness – 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40, 41, 44. The higher a score in any area, the stronger the personality trait is for that factor.

The BFI has been shown to produce reliable scores in a variety of studies with alpha reliabilities ranging from .80 to .90 (Humbyrd, 2010; Rammstedt & John, 2007).
The BFI has also shown construct validity (.68 -.80) in comparison with three other similar personality tests (Humbyrd, 2010; Rammstedt & John, 2007).

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Form 5X (MLQ-5X) (Appendix B) was developed by Bass and Avolio (1995) to measure transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership behavior (May, 2010; Sutherland, 2010). Permission to use this instrument was obtained from Mind Garden, Inc. (Appendix M). This instrument consists of 45 items that are answered using a 5-point Likert-type scale with the following descriptions: 0 – not at all, 1 – once in a while, 2 – sometimes, 3 – fairly often, and 4 – frequently, if not always.

Within these three leadership styles, nine leadership qualities were measured on the MLQ-5X: idealized influence attributed (IIA) – # 10, 18, 21, and 25, idealized influence behavior (IIB) – # 6, 14, 23, and 34, inspirational motivation (IM) - # 9, 13, 26 and 36, intellectual stimulation (IS) - # 2, 8, 30, and 32, and individual consideration (IC) - # 15, 19, 29, and 31 for translational, contingent reward (CR) - # 1, 11, 16, and 29, management-by-exception active (MBEA) - # 4, 22, 24, and 27, and management-by-exception passive (MBEP) - # 3, 12, 17, and 20 for transactional, and laissez-faire (LF) - # 5, 7, 28, and 33. The reported reliability for the MLQ-5X ranges from .74 to .94 (May, 2010; Sutherland, 2010). Antonakis et al. (2003) found that the MQL-5X was a valid test for the Full-Range Leadership Theory and that it does have construct validity.

Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) developed the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) (Appendix D) which was used in this study to test for a teacher’s efficacy of classroom management. Permission to use this instrument was obtained from Megan Tschannen-Moran (Appendix N). This instrument is a 24-item questionnaire that
incorporates a nine-point Likert-type scale. The descriptors are 1 – nothing, 3 – very little, 5 – some influence, 7 – quite a bit, and 9 – a great deal. The values 2, 4, 6, and 8 allow for respondents to choose in-between values for these descriptions. The TSES yields three subsets of scores: efficacy of instructional strategies, efficacy of classroom management, and efficacy of student engagement (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007). Efficacy of classroom management is measured using questions 3, 5, 8, 13, 15, 16, 19, and 21 on the TSES. Efficacy of student engagement is measured using questions 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 12, 14, and 22, and efficacy of instructional strategies is measured using questions 7, 10, 11, 17, 18, 20, 23, and 24.

According to Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy, previous research had established reliability ranges from .92 to .95 for the overall instrument and ranged from .86 to .90 among the subscales. In a comparison with other teacher efficacy instruments, Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) found the TSES showed positive correlations and, therefore, had construct validity. However, the TSES is considered to include a wider range of behaviors and strategies effective teachers should be expected to display and use (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001).

Procedures

After permission was given by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at The University of Southern Mississippi (Appendix O), some participants in the study were mailed a packet of information consisting of a cover letter (Appendix J), a demographic survey (Appendix C), the Big Five Inventory (Appendix A) (Benet-Martinez & John, 1998; John et al., 1991; John et al., 2008), the Multifunctional Leadership Questionnaire (Appendix B), the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (Appendix D) (Tschannen-Moran &
Woolfolk Hoy, 2001), along with a self-addressed stamped envelope to their school address through the US Post Office. Questionnaires were mailed to each individual teacher. These participants were selected through an Internet search of schools in southern Mississippi. These selected teachers were the ones who worked at schools which listed their faculties’ names on their websites. The teachers choosing to participate in the study were asked to complete the questionnaires and return them in the provided envelope within two weeks.

Other teachers were contacted through a meeting with the researcher at their schools during a faculty meeting. These schools were selected because of a personal relationship between the researcher and each of the superintendents. The researcher had previously worked at three of the schools. Permission was granted by the superintendent of each school (Appendix F – I), and the principals were contacted to schedule these meetings. Once the meeting was held, a drop box was provided at each school for the teachers to return the questionnaires within one week if they chose to participate. For teachers who could not attend the meeting, questionnaires were placed in their teacher mail boxes by school personnel. Data from all returned surveys was entered into and analyzed using SPSS statistical software.

Data Analysis

Once all data was collected, statistical tests were run using SPSS statistical software for this quantitative study.

Research Question 1: Is there a relationship between personality, leadership style, experience, certification and efficacy of classroom management?
H1 - There is a statistically significant relationship between a teacher’s personality, leadership style, experience, certification and efficacy of classroom management.

To test for the relationships between personality, leadership style, experience, certification and efficacy of classroom management, a multiple regression test was used. The alpha level was set at .05. This allowed for all eight independent variables (the five personality domains of conscientiousness, openness, neuroticism, extraversion, and agreeableness, transformational leadership, experience, and certification) to be tested and compared. It also allowed variability ($R^2$) to be calculated which gave an overall value of the amount of variability in the efficacy of classroom management (Field, 2009).

For personality, items on the Big Five Inventory (BFI) (Benet-Martinez & John, 1998; John et al., 1991; John et al., 2008) were categorized into their five domains with an overall score for each domain calculated by averaging the Likert-type scale scores (Humbyrd, 2010). For the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5X), the subscale scores for transformational leadership (idealized influence attributed (IIA) – items # 10, 18, 21, and 25, idealized influence behavior (IIB) – items # 6, 14, 23, and 34, inspirational motivation (IM) – items # 9, 13, 26 and 36, intellectual stimulation (IS) – items # 2, 8, 30, and 32, and individual consideration (IC) – items # 15, 19, 29, and 31) were added together and averaged to give an overall transformational leadership score (May, 2010). These scores were used for each participant in the multiple regression, along with their years of experience and certification type. These was related to the teachers’ scores on the efficacy of classroom management subscale on the TSES, questions 3, 5, 8, 13, 15, 16, 19, and 21.
Experience was collected through demographic information. Certification information was collected from two demographic sources, route of certification and education level. Because certification is a nominal variable, it was broken down into the following dichotomous variables: Bachelor’s traditional route, Master’s traditional route, Specialist’s traditional route, Doctoral traditional route, Bachelor’s alternate route, Master’s alternate route, Specialist’s alternate route, and Doctoral alternate route.

**Research Question 2:** When teachers are categorized based on experience, is there a relationship between personality, leadership styles, certification, and efficacy of classroom management?

**H2:** There is a statistically significant relationship between personality, leadership styles, certification and efficacy of classroom management in different stages of experience.

Teachers were categorized based on their years of experience into the following possible groups: 0-5 years, 6-10 years, and more than 10 years. Experience early in a teacher’s career has been shown to be the most important for either continuing in the profession or in becoming efficacious (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007). Some studies have shown that teacher efficacy, including effectiveness at classroom management, increases after year three to five in a teacher’s career (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007; Wolters & Daugherty, 2007). To determine this hypothesis, enough teachers for each category were needed to respond to meet the necessary power and effect size requirements for a valid statistical test to be run. Because the appropriate sample sizes were not achieved, a multiple regression model could not be run. Instead, correlations were run to describe possible significant relationships between the dependent
and independent variables for teachers with 0-5 years of experience, teachers with 6-10 years of experience, and teachers with more than 10 years experience.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine if a teacher’s leadership ability, personality, experience, and certification significantly influenced their efficacy of classroom management. High school teachers across southern Mississippi were given questionnaires containing three instruments: the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, the Big Five Inventory, and the Teachers Sense of Efficacy Scale. Demographic questions were also asked to determine years of experience and certification type. Questionnaires were mailed to 358 teachers at six high schools chosen by a search of school websites to find which ones listed their faculty members. The remaining questionnaires were given to 242 teachers at four schools in which permission was gained from the superintendents to meet with their high school teachers. There were 151 questionnaires that were returned for a return rate of approximately 25%.

Nearly all the questionnaires were returned completed, although two respondents did not answer the questions on the Big Five Inventory correctly, and their replies could not be used. Only a small amount of teachers left various demographic information blank. A concern with the instruments was the number of respondents who rated themselves very high on the majority of questions, especially for efficacy. There were several questionnaires returned where all items for efficacy were marked with 8’s and 9’s. One possible reason for this occurrence is rater fatigue, as the efficacy instrument was the last to be completed and variability appeared more apparent on the other two instrument components.
Descriptive Analysis

As shown in Table 4, the majority of the responding teachers were female and Caucasian. Twice as many female teachers than male teachers responded to the study. Caucasian teachers made up 86% of the population, African American teachers made up 9.3%, and all others made up 4.7%. Fifty-eight percent of respondents had a master’s degree, and 37% only had a bachelor’s degree. A small number of teachers had a specialist’s or doctoral degree. The mean for experience was approximately 13.53 years with a range of experience from 1 year to 37 years (Table 5). Amongst the teachers who responded, most indicated writing less than one office referral for classroom discipline per day and less than three per month.

Table 4

*Frequencies of Teacher Demographic Data (N =151)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>86.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Certification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate route</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional route</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Board</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>87.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist’s</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

Descriptive Data for Teacher Demographic Information (N = 151)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13.53</td>
<td>9.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals per Week</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals per Month</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, as seen in Table 6, responding teachers had a mean scale score of 3.25 and a standard deviation of .41 for transformational leadership on the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Form 5X (MLQ-5X). This instrument’s Likert-type scale ranged from 0 (Not at all) to 4 (Frequently, if not always). The transformational scale score was obtained by summing the scores for each item related to transformational leadership and an average calculated. Teachers in the study had a transformational leadership mean score ranging from 2.05 to 4.00. This indicates the subjects rated themselves as sometimes to almost always displaying transformational leadership characteristics. Teachers who are transformational are perceived as being strong role models who put the needs of the group first, who are confident, establish and communicate high expectations, promote innovation, and care about their students (May, 2010).

On the Big Five Inventory (Benet-Martinez & John, 1998; John et al., 1991; John et al., 2008) for personality factors, teachers self-reported their personality traits using a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (Disagree Strongly) to 5 (Agree Strongly). Scores for each of the five factors were added and then an average found for each. Scores of three and above indicate teachers are more likely to express personality traits associated with
higher scores for each factor, and scores in the lower half indicate personality traits associated with lower scores for each factor (Table 3).

The factor for extraversion had an overall mean of 3.72 with a range from 1.63 to 5.00. This indicates that, on average, the responding teachers were somewhat more likely to be energetic, social, talkative, outgoing, assertive, dominant, cheerful, and enjoy being with people, although several teachers scoring lower would tend to work alone, be more independent, and reserved (Humbyrd, 2010; John et al., 2008). The agreeableness factor had scores ranging from 2.00 to 5.00 with a mean of 4.26. Responding teachers are more likely to be trusting, empathetic, cooperative, caring, sensitive, kind, forgiving, generous, and good-natured (Humbyrd, 2010; John et al., 2008). The third factor, conscientiousness, also had a high mean score of 4.13 as seen in Table 6. Teacher average scores ranged from 2.44 to 5.00. The responding teachers are more likely to be dependable, organized, disciplined, hard workers, and goal-oriented, and they tend to follow rules and norms (Humbyrd, 2010; John et al., 2008). For neuroticism, a lower score indicates a more positive emotional stability. For this study, neuroticism scores ranged from 1.00 to 4.25 with a mean of 2.38. This indicates that the average teacher thought of themselves as being emotionally stable. A teacher who is emotionally stable will often appear confident and will remain calm and collected in times of crisis (Humbyrd, 2010). Finally, when a teacher is rated high for openness, he is more open to new ideas, is more creative, insightful, sophisticated, witty, resourceful, imaginative, and innovative, while those who are not open have more narrow interests and are seen as simple, shallow, and unintelligent (John et al., 2008). Responding teachers were near the
middle of scores with an average of 3.71. The minimum score for openness was 1.60 and the maximum score was 5.00.

The final instrument in the questionnaire was the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale which also used a Likert-type scale for teachers to self-report their beliefs on their own effectiveness for classroom management. This was a 9-point scale that measured what a teacher can do on a range of 0 (Nothing) to 9 (A Great Deal). Scores for items dealing just with classroom management were averaged to give each subject an overall score for efficacy of classroom management. As shown in Table 6, the low score for teachers was 4.14 and the high score was 9.00. There was a standard deviation of .961 and the mean score was 7.72. A score of 7 indicated that teachers felt they could do “Quite a Bit” to influence classroom management on the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale.

Table 6

Descriptive Data for Instrument Results (N = 151)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Scores</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLQ Transformational</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFI Extraversion</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFI Agreeableness</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFI Conscientiousness</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFI Neuroticism</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFI Openness</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSES Classroom</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The population was broken down into three groups to determine if any significant differences existed between teachers with different levels of experience: 1-5 years, 6-10
years, and more than 10 years. Within all teachers responding to the study, 38 had 1-5 years experience, 31 had 6-10 years experience, and 82 had more than 10 years experience (Table 7). Teachers with 1-5 years were more likely to have a bachelor’s degree with a traditional route certificate. The majority of teachers in all categories were female and Caucasian. The teachers with 6-10 yrs experience had the highest proportion of minority teachers and male teachers, although this was the smallest group to respond. Respondents with 6-10 years experience were the most likely to be certified through an alternate-route process. Only one responding teacher with 1-5 years experience and three teachers with 6-10 years experience had completed the process for National Board Certification and only one teacher in both groups had a Specialist’s degree.

Table 7

| Demographic Frequencies for Teachers from Different Experience Groups (N = 151) |
|----------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
|                                  | 1-5 yr. (n = 38) | 6-10 yr. (n = 31) | 11+ yr. (n = 82) |
| Gender                          | f   | Percent | f   | Percent | F   | Percent |
| Female                         | 25  | 16.6    | 20  | 13.2    | 60  | 39.7    |
| Male                           | 13  | 8.6     | 11  | 7.3     | 22  | 14.6    |
| Ethnicity                      |     |         |     |         |     |         |
| African-American               | 5   | 3.3     | 5   | 3.3     | 4   | 2.6     |
| Caucasian                      | 32  | 21.2    | 24  | 15.9    | 74  | 49.0    |
| Other                          | 1   | 0.7     | 2   | 1.3     | 4   | 2.6     |
| Certification                  |     |         |     |         |     |         |
| Alternate route                | 17  | 11.3    | 16  | 10.6    | 19  | 12.6    |
| Traditional route              | 21  | 13.9    | 15  | 9.9     | 63  | 41.7    |
| National Board                 |     |         |     |         |     |         |
| No                             | 37  | 24.5    | 28  | 18.5    | 67  | 44.4    |
| Yes                            | 1   | 0.7     | 3   | 2.0     | 15  | 9.9     |
| Education                      |     |         |     |         |     |         |
| Bachelor’s                     | 24  | 15.9    | 9   | 6.0     | 23  | 15.2    |
| Master’s                       | 13  | 8.6     | 20  | 13.2    | 54  | 35.8    |
| Specialist’s                   | 1   | 0.7     | 1   | 0.7     | 2   | 1.3     |
| Doctoral                       | 0   | 0       | 0   | 0       | 3   | 2.0     |

*Note: Percentages are based on the overall population.*
As shown in Table 8, teachers with 1-5 years experience had the lowest scale scores for transformational leadership as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. However, the scores from the three groups only varied from a minimum value around 3.22 to a maximum value of 3.26 on a 4-point scale and do not represent a large difference between the groups. Similar small ranges occurred on the Big Five Inventory (Table 9) and the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (Table 10). Although small, transformational leadership scores increased from teachers with 1-5 years experience to teachers with 6-10 years experience to a larger jump to teachers with more than 10 years experience.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 yr.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 yr.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11+ yr.</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the Big Five Inventory (Table 9), there were only small variations in scores. However, a notable trend occurs in the neuroticism factor. Where low scores represent more emotional stability and less stress and anxiety, scores dropped from new teachers, to teachers with 6-10 years experience, to the most experienced teachers. This trend indicates the most experienced teachers are more emotionally stable than new teachers. Except for the factor for extraversion, the teachers with the most experience scored more positively than teachers with only 1-5 years of experience. All groups tended to follow
the same overall trend. The factors for agreeableness and conscientiousness had the highest averages between 4.0 and 4.5 on a 5-point scale, the extraversion factor and the openness factor had values a little lower between 3.5 and 4.0, and neuroticism for all groups had the lowest values between 2.55 and 2.0.

Table 9

*Experience Groups’ Score Descriptions for the Big Five Inventory*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extraversion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 yr.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 yr.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11+ yr.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agreeableness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 yr.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 yr.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11+ yr.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conscientiousness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 yr.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 yr.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11+ yr.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neuroticism</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 yr.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 yr.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11+ yr.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Openness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 yr.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 yr.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11+ yr.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scores for the different experience groups of teachers on the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (Table 10) varied from a minimum of approximately 7.46 to a maximum of 7.84 on a 9 point scale. Teachers with less than 5 years experience had the lowest scores for classroom management, indicating a smaller degree of efficacy compared to the other two groups. Mean scores for the teachers with 6-10 years experience and teachers with more than 10 years experience were closer with a difference of approximately .1 point. Scores jumped approximately .3 points from teachers with 1-5 years experience to teachers with 6-10 years experience.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 yr.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 yr.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11+ yr.</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical Analysis

The hypotheses for this study were tested using multiple regression tests. The purpose of this study was to determine if a teacher’s leadership ability, personality, experience, and certification significantly influenced their efficacy of classroom management. The hypothesis for the first research question stated that there is a statistically significant relationship between a teacher’s personality, leadership style, experience, certification and efficacy of classroom management. The overall regression model had a $R^2 = .34$ and was statistically significant [$F(14,134) = 5.106, p < .001$]. The results of the multiple regression test suggests that there is a significant relationship
between transformational leadership, openness, conscientiousness, and efficacy of classroom management at an alpha of .05 (Table 11). Hypothesis 1, there is a relationship between a teacher’s personality, leadership style, experience, certification and efficacy of classroom management, is statistically significant and is therefore not rejected, and three independent variables were found to be statistically significant.

Table 11

*Multiple Regression Results for Hypothesis 1 (N = 151)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>SE $b$</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.903</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFI Extraversion</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFI Agreeableness</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFI Conscientiousness</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFI Neuroticism</td>
<td>-0.061</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFI Openness</td>
<td>-0.307</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>-.238</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ Transformational</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Traditional Route</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist’s Traditional Route</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Traditional Route</td>
<td>-0.842</td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Alternate Route</td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Alternate Route</td>
<td>-0.203</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>-.079</td>
<td>.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist’s Alternate Route</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Alternate Route</td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. $R^2 = .35.$

Of the three significant independent variables, transformational leadership had the highest impact on efficacy of classroom management at $B = .386$. The personality factor for conscientiousness ($B = .169$) had the second highest positive impact, and all other
independent variables also had positive effects on efficacy even though they were not significant. The personality factor for agreeableness has the smallest impact. Conversely, the personality factor for openness had the largest negative impact on efficacy of classroom management at $B = -0.238$. Although not significant, traditional route teachers with a doctorate, alternate route teachers with a master’s degree, and the personality factor for neuroticism also had negative effects on efficacy of classroom management.

For the second hypothesis, there was a statistically significant relationship in personality, leadership styles, certification and efficacy of classroom management in different stages of experience, multiple regression tests could not be run due to an insufficient number of subjects in each experience group. As shown in Table 7, only 38 responding teachers had 1-5 years experience, 31 teachers had 6-10 years experience, and 82 teachers had more than 10 years experience.

While there were not enough subjects within each experience group to run a multiple regression, each experience group can be compared on the correlations between the variables as shown in Table 12. As shown in Table 12, scale scores on the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire for transformational leadership were significantly correlated with Teacher Sense of Efficacy of Classroom Management scores for all experience groups. Besides this variable, there were no other variables which were significant for all experience groups, and there was no overall trend for any variable showing an increase or decrease in means as experience increased.

The personality factor for extraversion was significant for teachers with 1-5 years experience and for teachers with more than 10 years experience. The personality factor for conscientiousness was significant for experience groups of 6-10 years and more than
10 years. The teachers with 6-10 years were the only ones in which the personality factors for agreeableness and neuroticism were significant. Despite the personality factor for openness being significant in the overall model, it was not significantly correlated to classroom management for any experience group.

Table 12

*Correlations for Independent Variables and TSES for Classroom Management for Different Experience Groups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1-5 years (n = 38)</th>
<th>6-10 years (n = 31)</th>
<th>11+ years (n = 82)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLQ Transformational</td>
<td>.421**</td>
<td>.470**</td>
<td>.401***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFI Extraversion</td>
<td>.431**</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.234*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFI Agreeableness</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.523**</td>
<td>.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFI Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.514**</td>
<td>.409***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFI Neuroticism</td>
<td>-.225</td>
<td>-.457**</td>
<td>-.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFI Openness</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>-.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>-.130</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001*
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine if a teacher’s leadership ability, personality, experience, and certification significantly influenced their efficacy of classroom management. High school teachers across southern Mississippi were given questionnaires containing three instruments: the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, the Big Five Inventory, and the Teachers Sense of Efficacy Scale. Demographic questions were also asked to determine years of experience and certification type. Questionnaires were mailed to 358 teachers at six high schools chosen by a search of school websites to find which ones listed their faculty members. The remaining questionnaires were given to 242 teachers at four schools in which permission was gained from the superintendents to meet with their high school teachers. There were 151 questionnaires that were returned for a return rate of approximately 25%.

For this study, three instruments were used. To study leadership, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire was used. While it provided results for three different leadership styles: transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire, for the purposes of this study, only transformational leadership was used. The Big Five Inventory was used to study personality. This instrument was designed to test the Five Factor Model which measures five personality factors: extraversion, openness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and agreeableness. Finally, the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale was used to measure efficacy of classroom management. These instruments, along with a demographic
questionnaire to gather certification and years of experience information, were provided to teachers to complete.

Conclusions and Discussion

This study was conducted with two hypotheses. Due to insufficient sample sizes in the experience categories (1-5 yr., 6-10 yr., and 11+ yr.) the second hypothesis could not be tested. Hypothesis 2 stated there is a relationship between personality, leadership styles, certification and efficacy of classroom management in different stages of experience. If significant, the results could have shown possible differences between teachers within each experience group in an attempt to determine if different characteristics were more statistically significant at different stages of a teacher’s career.

Hypothesis 1 was tested: there is a relationship between a teacher’s personality, leadership style, experience, certification and efficacy of classroom management. The overall regression model had a $R^2 = .34$ and was statistically significant [$F(14,134) = 5.106, p < .001$]. The results of the multiple regression test suggests that there is a significant relationship between transformational leadership, openness, conscientiousness, and efficacy of classroom management at an alpha of .05 (Table 8). While not all of the independent variables are significant, Hypothesis 1, there is a relationship between a teacher’s personality, leadership style, experience, certification and efficacy of classroom management, is statistically significant and is therefore not rejected.

When teachers are transformational leaders, they use ideals and values to get students to follow them and they work with students to set expectations and consequences for not meeting those expectations (Thomas, 2007). Transformational
teachers give individual attention to their students, allow students to find new ways to solve problems, communicate high expectations, and model expected behavior through their achievements and character (Marzano et al., 2005). According to several researchers, classroom management strategies that emphasize this type of teacher-student relationship, especially mutual respect between teachers and students, produce the most effective results concerning both classroom behavior and academics (Caldwell, 2008; Chiu & Tulley, 1997; Dreikurs, 1968; Freiburg & Lamb, 2009; Trayner, 2003; Walker, 2009; Wolfgang & Glickman, 1980).

Treslan (2006) also found a correlation between transformational leadership and the use of effective teaching practices. The relationship Treslan found included planning and preparation by the teacher with goal clarification and commitment in transformational leadership, creating an organized classroom which is conducive to learning compares to focusing on accomplishment, decision-making flexibility, and instilling responsibility, finally instructional practices that engage students, provide them with feedback, and use questioning and discussion relate to encouraging empowerment and shared ownership in translational leadership. When teachers practiced transformational leadership, they were able to focus on the individual needs of their students and moved away from instruction that involved students doing what the teacher says and towards instruction where the students’ interests were used and where students were encouraged to perform at their best (Treslan, 2006).

Results from this present study found a relationship between efficacy of classroom management and two personality factors: openness and conscientiousness. These findings were consistent with Smith (1981). Smith (1981) found a significant
relationship between personality and classroom management strategies for preservice education majors.

Teachers who are more conscientious tend to be more organized, efficient, practical, and cautious as shown in Table 3. This personality factor may cause teachers to be better able at planning effective classroom management strategies allowing them to have a higher efficacy of classroom management. Additionally, teachers who are more conscientious tend to follow through with their plans. When teachers create procedures and discipline policies in their rooms, conscientious teachers may be more likely to consistently implement those policies. Conscientious teachers are also not easily distracted, so they may be more likely to notice smaller problems before they become major classroom issues. When students’ misbehavior in their classes escalates to major discipline issues, they become problems for administrators and the public, too (Cruickshank, 1990; Ghafoori & Tracz, 2001; Jones, 1989; Zuckerman, 2007).

For openness, teachers who have high scores tend to be more imaginative, insightful, and inventive, but the results of the study indicated a negative relationship between openness and efficacy of classroom management as shown in Table 3. A suggestion for this outcome could be that teachers who are more open to new ideas try things that do not work. Another aspect to the openness personality factor is that teachers high in openness do not like routine tasks. To be effective at classroom management, teachers need to be able to follow through with their plans. Also, open teachers, because they are imaginative and inventive, are open to new ideas. Since they also don’t like routine tasks, these teachers who scored high for openness may have scored low for efficacy of classroom management because they are constantly trying new things in class.
instead of sticking with a classroom management strategy. According to some researchers, teachers who do not provide consistent rules and procedures for their students are not able to create a classroom environment conducive to learning (Chiu & Tully, 1997; Trayner, 2003; Walker, 2009; Wolfgang & Glickman, 1980).

There were two studies which also found significant relationships between teacher behavior and these two factors: openness and conscientiousness. Chan (2003) found teachers who had high scores for the personality factor for conscientiousness had the highest evaluations by students. Bonner (2010) studied the relationship between personality and the perception of student aggressiveness. Bonner found that teachers scoring high for the personality factor for openness were more able to deal with physical aggression between students. However, while Bonner found a positive relationship with openness, openness in the current study was found to be negatively related to efficacy of classroom management.

The current study found no significant relationship between the type of certification and efficacy of classroom management. This result agrees with some research studies. In a study by Ritter and Hancock (2007), they found that neither experience nor certification was shown to be significantly related to classroom management. Suell and Piotrowski (2006) found no relationship between teachers in the Florida alternate route program and teachers in a traditional certification route for teacher competencies. Likewise, Ludlow (2010) also found classroom management was not tied to certification as all new teachers enter the classroom with a minimum amount of mastery experience.
In a study conducted by Brown (2009), she suggested a connection between a teacher’s education level and efficacy. While the current study found no relationship, Brown suggests one reason for the possible results in her study is that the more efficacious teachers continued with their education instead of becoming more efficacious due to the extra education. In the current study, there was a larger percentage of the sample population which had their Master’s degrees (58%). Thirty-seven percent had a bachelor’s degree. This uneven distribution may have lead to certification not being significant when testing for Hypothesis 1.

The results for experience in the current study differed the most from research. Wolters and Daugherty (2007) divided their subjects into experience groups of 1-5 years, 6-10 years, and more than 10 years. They found classroom management improved as teachers gained experience because they learned which techniques were better at preventing student disruptions. Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2007) also found that efficacy of classroom management tended to improve as teachers gained experience. In the current study, the results for Hypothesis 1 indicated a positive relationship that was too small to be significant. Additionally, while Hypothesis 2 could not be tested due to insufficient sample sizes, a comparison of the averages on the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale was made for each experience group (Table 10). There was an increase in efficacy of classroom management scores as experience increased, but again the averages could not be compared directly to determine if a statistically significant difference existed.

Limitations

Because teachers in the study self-reported their information, many of the limitations involve the population who volunteered to return the questionnaires. With the
mean score on the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale being 7.25 on a 9-point scale (Table 6), one of the limitations of this study may be the possibility of teachers exaggerating their efficacy of classroom management. Likewise, scores on the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire were also fairly high at mean of 3.25 out of 4 (Table 6). With only 25% of the teachers returning their questionnaires, perhaps only teachers with high efficacy of classroom management and who were transformational leaders responded to the study.

Because the researcher asked participants who responded to self-report answers to survey questions, a limitation to the validity of the study was teachers who answer with what they consider socially acceptable answers instead of with honest ones. For instance, teachers on the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale may have responded to the items as if they should do them instead of if they are capable of doing them. Additionally, the design of the study did not allow for verification of the teachers’ responses as no direct observations were made of teacher’s classroom management practices nor were any students or administrators contacted to provide additional information about the teachers’ classroom management, leadership style, or personality.

Another possible limitation of the study is the design of the research instrument. There were four parts to the instrument: a demographic section, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, the Big Five Inventory, and the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale. With so many different components, some teachers may have felt inclined to move through the questionnaire too quickly to carefully consider their responses to each of the items in order to finish in a timely manner. Also, especially with the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale instrument placed last in the questionnaires, there may have been
some degree of fatigue by the time teachers reached it causing them to mark all high scores for themselves.

Another limitation is that the study only included schools which have a developed website that listed their faculty members. This may have limited the study to schools which are technological or financially able to produce such a website. This may have excluded more rural schools from participating in the study which do not have the funds to develop a website.

Recommendation for Policy or Practice

There are several implications from the results of this study. Because transformational leadership was statistically significant relative to efficacy of classroom management, educational administrators could find an instrument to use to measure the leadership ability of teachers before they are hired or to help them recruit new teachers to the profession. Also, administrators should provide opportunities for teachers outside the classroom to develop their leadership skills. These opportunities could allow teachers who are not typically taught to be leaders to become better classroom and school leaders.

As for personality, administrators need to be aware of how a teacher’s personality may influence his classroom management strategies. Administrators should understand that certain personality traits may allow some teachers to be more effective than others at controlling student behavior in the classroom. By having a better understanding of how teachers approach classroom management, administrators could better assign students to teachers in an attempt to avoid personality conflicts which hinder the students’ ability to learn.
Recommendations for Future Research

With one of the limitations of this study being the volunteer basis for participation, further research should consider using direct observations to determine a teacher’s efficacy of classroom management or pairing teacher self-evaluations with evaluations by supervisors or students to determine the validity of their efficacy of classroom management.

Future researchers should replicate this same study but link the teachers’ efficacy of classroom management to their students’ academic performance. With the link between student behavior and academic performance not being completely clear, it may be beneficial to determine if teachers who are more efficacious for classroom management also produce better academic results in their students. It may also be beneficial to determine if any of these characteristics lead to academic success in students.

Future researchers should replicate this study but focus on the differences between the different experience groups. Because Hypothesis 2 could not be tested for this study due inadequate sample sizes for each group, the next study could actively seek teachers in each age group. School administrators could be contacted and asked to distribute questionnaires specifically to teachers within a specific range of experience. Smith (1981) found a relationship between personality and classroom management, but he found that the same relationship vanished as the teachers gained experience in the classroom. Knowing if different characteristics are evident at different levels of experience may help administrators better retain teachers or be more supportive of new teachers as they gain experience.
Future researchers should replicate this study to include all types of leadership styles according to the Free Range Leadership Theory. With transformational leadership having a statistically significant relationship to the efficacy of classroom management, additional studies should be conducted to determine if any one particular leadership style is more effective than another. Since the factors within transformational were grouped for one overall variable in this study, further studies could be done to determine if any of those particular transformational leadership factors were more significant than others. Additionally, a study could be conducted to determine if a connection exists between different leadership styles and different classroom management strategies. It may be that when a teacher’s leadership style matches his classroom management style, he becomes more effective and his students achieve higher academic success.
APPENDIX A

BIG FIVE INVENTORY SAMPLE QUESTIONS

The Big Five Inventory (BFI)

Here are a number of characteristics that may or may not apply to you. For example, do you agree that you are someone who likes to spend time with others? Please write a number next to each statement to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with that statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree a little</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree a little</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I see Myself as Someone Who...

___1. Is talkative
___2. Tends to find fault with others
___3. Does a thorough job
___23. Tends to be lazy
___24. Is emotionally stable, not easily upset
MLQ  Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire
Leader Form (5x-Short)

This questionnaire is to describe your leadership style as you perceive it. Please answer all items on this answer sheet. If an item is irrelevant, or if you are unsure or do not know the answer, leave the answer blank.

Forty-five descriptive statements are listed on the following pages. Judge how frequently each statement fits you.
The word “others” may mean your peers, clients, direct reports, supervisors, and/or all of these individuals.

Use the following rating scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Once in a while</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Fairly often</th>
<th>Frequently, if not always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I provide others with assistance in exchange for their efforts..................................................... 0 1 2 3 4
2. I re-examine critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate.............................. 0 1 2 3 4
3. I fail to interfere until problems become serious ........................................................................ 0 1 2 3 4
4. I focus attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards .......... 0 1 2 3 4
5. I avoid getting involved when important issues arise........................................................................ 0 1 2 3 4

Continued =>
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Thank you for your participation in this survey. It should take approximately 30 minutes.

Place an X in the spot that accurately describes you for each item below.

1. Gender:  _____ Male  _____ Female

2. Race:  _____ African American  
          _____ Caucasian  
          _____ Hispanic  
          _____ Other

3. Certification:  _____ Traditional  _____ Alternate Route

4. National Board Certification:  _____ Yes  _____ No

5. Level of Education:  _____ Bachelor’s  Area of study: ____________________  
                       _____ Master’s  Area of study: ____________________  
                       _____ Specialist’s  Area of study: ____________________  
                       _____ Doctorate  Area of study: ____________________

6. Years of Experience:  _____

7. Average number of Office Discipline Referrals written
   per week for classroom misbehavior:  _____
   per month for classroom misbehavior:  _____


### Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (long form)

**Teacher Beliefs**

Directions: This questionnaire is designed to help us gain a better understanding of the kinds of things that create difficulties for teachers in their school activities. Please indicate your opinion about each of the statements below. Your answers are confidential.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How much can you do?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite A Bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Great Deal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1. How much can you do to get through to the most difficult students? | (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) |
| 2. How much can you do to help your students think critically? | (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) |
| 3. How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom? | (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) |
| 4. How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in school work? | (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) |
| 5. To what extent can you make your expectations clear about student behavior? | (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) |
APPENDIX E

SAMPLE LETTER TO SUPERINTENDENTS

October 12, 2010

Dear Mr. M.:  

I am the chemistry and physics teacher at S. High School, and I am currently working on my doctoral degree in administration at the University of Southern Mississippi. The research project I have chosen to study for my dissertation is titled, *What is the relationship between a teacher’s personality, leadership style and efficacy of classroom management?* The goal of this project is to try to determine if teachers with different personal characteristics are better able to keep control of their classrooms. This may allow for more focused staff development to help teachers in terms of their classroom management. Research shows there is a connection between academic performance and behavior in the classrooms, so along with improved instruction, if teachers can maintain their classrooms, then their students should be more academically successful.

Once permission is granted by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of The University of Southern Mississippi in mid-December or early January, my study will involve high school teachers at different schools across southern Mississippi. I would like your permission to speak to the teachers at your high school during one of their faculty meetings for approximately 10 minutes. The purpose of this meeting would be to describe my study to the teachers, give them an opportunity to ask questions, and to pass out questionnaires directly to them. As the questionnaire will take about 30-45 minutes to fill out, I would leave a drop box at the school for the teachers to return the anonymous questionnaire at their convenience. There will be no need to identify the school in any way throughout the research project, and the results of the research will be made available to you and to the staff.

If there are any questions I can answer about my dissertation research or if there is a procedure I need to follow to get permission, please contact me at xxx-xxx-xxxx or xxxxxx. If you grant me permission, please make a copy of the enclosed letter on district letter head, sign, and return it in the envelope provided or fax it to xxx-xxx-xxxx by Wednesday, October 27, 2010.

Thank you for any help you can provide.

Sincerely,

Michael Burkett
APPENDIX F

SUPERINTENDENT PERMISSION LETTER

Pearl River County

DENNIS PENTON
Superintendent of Education

7441 Highway 11
Carriere, Mississippi 39426

(601) 798-7744
FAX: (601) 798-3527

NINA GUTHRIE
Assistant Superintendent

October 18, 2010

Michael Burkett
103 Hilltop Drive
Carriere, MS  39426

Dear Mr. Burkett,

Upon approval of The University of Southern Mississippi’s Institutional Review Board (IRB), Michael Burkett has my permission to meet with teachers at Pearl River Central High School. The purpose of this meeting is to survey teachers to collect data for his research project, *What is the relationship between a teacher’s personality, leadership style and effectiveness at classroom management?*

I understand that all participation is voluntary and that individual responses and the school’s identity will be kept confidential. Further, any changes in the research protocol must be approved by the Southern Miss IRB.

Dennis Penton
Superintendent of Education
Pearl River County School District
APPENDIX G

SUPERINTENDENT PERMISSION LETTER

October 25, 2010

To Whom It May Concern:

Upon approval of The University of Southern Mississippi's institutional Review Board (IRB), Michael Burkett has my permission to meet with teachers at Hancock High School. The purpose of this meeting is to survey teachers to collect data for his research project, What is the relationship between a teacher's personality, leadership style and effectiveness at classroom management?

I understand that all participation is voluntary and that individual responses and the school's identity will be kept confidential. Further, any changes in the research protocol must be approved by the Southern Miss IRB.

Alan Dedeaux
Superintendent
Hancock County School District
APPENDIX H

SUPERINTENDENT PERMISSION LETTER

Stone County Schools
JAMES MORRISON, Superintendent
214 Critz Street
Wiggins, MS 39577
Telephone: (601) 928-7247
Fax: (601) 928-5122

NINA SHAW
Beat One

GERTIE BROWN
Beat Two

PATTY ROGERS
Beat Three

JON BOND
Beat Four

DORIS MATTHEWS
Beat Five

Upon approval of The University of Southern Mississippi’s Institutional Review Board (IRB),
Michael Burkett has my permission to meet with teachers at Stone High School. The purpose of this
meeting is to survey teachers to collect data for his research project, *What is the relationship between a
teacher’s personality, leadership style and effectiveness at classroom management?*

I understand that all participation is voluntary and that individual responses and the school’s
identity will be kept confidential. Further, any changes in the research protocol must be approved by the
Southern Miss IRB.

[Signature]

James Morrison
Superintendent
Stone County School District
APPENDIX I

SUPERINTENDENT PERMISSION LETTER

To Whom it may concern:

Upon approval of The University of Southern Mississippi’s Institutional Review Board (IRB), Michael Burkett has my permission to meet with teachers at McComb High School. The purpose of this meeting is to survey teachers to collect data for his research project, What is the relationship between a teacher’s personality, leadership style and effectiveness at classroom management?

I understand that all participation is voluntary and that individual responses and the school’s identity will be kept confidential. Further, any changes in the research protocol must be approved by the Southern Miss IRB.

Therese Palmertree
Superintendent
McComb School District
Dear Teacher,

I am a chemistry and physics teacher at S. High School. I am conducting a dissertation study concerned with the relationship between a teacher’s personality, leadership, years of experience, certification level, and efficacy of classroom management. The attached questionnaire is concerned with these dimensions and should take approximately thirty to forty minutes to complete. I am aware of the demands on your time and would greatly appreciate you completing this instrument. Please complete and return the questionnaire within one to two weeks in the envelope provided.

Your participation is completely voluntary and non-compensated, and I want you to feel free to decline participation or to discontinue participation at any point. All data collected will be completely anonymous. For this reason, I ask that you put no identifying information on the questionnaire. Any information inadvertently obtained during the course of this study will remain completely confidential. At the end of this study, questionnaires will be destroyed, and the results will be provided to my dissertation committee, used as part of my dissertation at USM, and may be presented to a professional audience.

By participating in this study you will help me to better understand any relationship between a teacher’s personal characteristics and efficacy of classroom management. It is hoped that this study will be of practical as well as theoretical benefit. The results of this study may be useful, for example, in developing more effective systems of discipline in order to improve test scores. This in turn could benefit both students and school faculty members. I will be presenting the results of this study at a dissertation defense and will provide the results to each of my dissertation committee members. Neither you nor the school will be identifiable within these published findings.

By completing and returning the attached questionnaire you are granting permission for this anonymous and confidential data to be used for the purposes described above. Please return the questionnaire within one to two weeks in the envelope provided.

This project has been reviewed by the Human Subjects Protection Review Committee, which ensures that research projects involving human subjects follow federal regulations. Any questions or concerns about rights as a research subject should be directed to the chair of the Institutional Review Board, The University of Southern Mississippi, 118 College Drive #5147, Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001, (601) 266-6820.

If you have any questions concerning this survey research project, please feel free to contact me at xxx-xxxx or xxxxx or my dissertation committee chairperson, Dr. Rose McNeese, at xxxxx.

Thank you for your consideration in helping me with this study.

Michael Burkett
APPENDIX K

COVER LETTER TO TEACHERS CONTACTED THROUGH MEETINGS

Dear Teacher,

I am a chemistry and physics teacher at S. High School. I am conducting a dissertation study concerned with the relationship between a teacher’s personality, leadership, years of experience, certification level, and efficacy of classroom management. The attached questionnaire is concerned with these dimensions and should take approximately thirty to forty minutes to complete. I am aware of the demands on your time and would greatly appreciate you completing this instrument. Please complete and return the questionnaire within one week in the labeled drop box provided at your school.

Your participation is completely voluntary and non-compensated, and I want you to feel free to decline participation or to discontinue participation at any point. All data collected will be completely anonymous. For this reason, I ask that you put no identifying information on the questionnaire. Any information inadvertently obtained during the course of this study will remain completely confidential. At the end of this study, questionnaires will be destroyed, and the results will be provided to my dissertation committee, used as part of my dissertation at USM, and may be presented to a professional audience.

By participating in this study you will help me to better understand any relationship between a teacher’s personal characteristics and efficacy of classroom management. It is hoped that this study will be of practical as well as theoretical benefit. The results of this study may be useful, for example, in developing more effective systems of discipline in order to improve test scores. This in turn could benefit both students and school faculty members. I will be presenting the results of this study at a dissertation defense and will provide the results to each of my dissertation committee members. Neither you nor the school will be identifiable within these published findings.

By completing and returning the attached questionnaire you are granting permission for this anonymous and confidential data to be used for the purposes described above. Please return the questionnaire within one week in the labeled drop box provided.

This project has been reviewed by the Human Subjects Protection Review Committee, which ensures that research projects involving human subjects follow federal regulations. Any questions or concerns about rights as a research subject should be directed to the chair of the Institutional Review Board, The University of Southern Mississippi, 118 College Drive #5147, Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001, (601) 266-6820.

If you have any questions concerning this survey research project, please feel free to contact me at xxx-xxx-xxxx or xxxxxx or my dissertation committee chairperson, Dr. Rose McNeese, at xxxx.

Thank you for your consideration in helping me with this study.

Michael Burkett
OFFICIAL BFI PERMISSION:

TO: Michael Burkett
FR: Oliver P. John
RE: Permission for reprinting BFI items

Dear Michael,

I am pleased to hear that you would like to use the Big Five Inventory (BFI) for your research. As copyright holder on the BFI, I give you permission to use it.

The BFI should be cited with the original and a more accessible, recent reference:


For reliability and validity information, you should reference our most recent Handbook chapter. Table 4.5 on page 132 has the reliability and convergent validity correlations for the BFI and several other prominent B5 measures. It can be downloaded here:

http://www.ocf.berkeley.edu/~johnlab/2008chapter.pdf

Good luck with your work!
Best wishes,

Oliver P. John
Professor and Research Psychologist
APPENDIX M

PERMISSION TO USE THE MULTIFACTOR LEADERSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE

For use by Michael Burkett only. Received from Mind Garden, Inc. on October 12, 2010

mind garden

www.mindgarden.com

To whom it may concern,

This letter is to grant permission for the above named person to use the following copyright material;

Instrument: Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

Authors: Bruce Avolio and Bernard Bass

Copyright: 1995 by Bruce Avolio and Bernard Bass

for his/her thesis research.

Five sample items from this instrument may be reproduced for inclusion in a proposal, thesis, or dissertation.

The entire instrument may not be included or reproduced at any time in any other published material.

Sincerely,

Robert Most
Mind Garden, Inc.
www.mindgarden.com

© 1995 Bruce Avolio and Bernard Bass. All Rights Reserved. Published by Mind Garden, Inc., www.mindgarden.com
APPENDIX N

PERMISSION TO USE THE TEACHER SENSE OF EFFICACY SCALE


The College Of
WILLIAM & MARY
School of Education
Post Office Box 8795
Williamsburg, Virginia 23187-8795
Fax: (757) 221-2988
Megan Tschannen-Moran, Ph.D.
Wakefield Distinguished Associate Professor
mtyisch@wm.edu
(757) 221-2187
November 2010

Michael Burkett
University of Southern Mississippi
Hattiesburg, MS 39406

Dear Michael Burkett:

You have permission to use the Teachers Sense of Efficacy Scale that I developed with Dr. Anita Woolfolk Hoy for your dissertation research. Please use the following citation when referencing the scale:


Although the name of the measure has been changed since that article was published, the contents of the scale remain the same.

You may download a copy of the instrument and directions for administration from my website at http://mtyisch.people.wm.edu. I would like to receive a brief summary of your results when you are finished.

Sincerely,

Megan Tschannen-Moran
APPENDIX O

HUMAN SUBJECTS PROTECTION REVIEW COMMITTEE APPROVAL

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI

Institutional Review Board

118 College Drive #5147
Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001
Tel: 601.266.6820
Fax: 601.266.5509
www.usm.edu/irb

HUMAN SUBJECTS PROTECTION REVIEW COMMITTEE
NOTICE OF COMMITTEE ACTION

The project has been reviewed by The University of Southern Mississippi Human Subjects Protection Review Committee in accordance with Federal Drug Administration regulations (21 CFR 26, 111), Department of Health and Human Services (45 CFR Part 46), and university guidelines to ensure adherence to the following criteria:

- The risks to subjects are minimized.
- The risks to subjects are reasonable in relation to the anticipated benefits.
- The selection of subjects is equitable.
- Informed consent is adequate and appropriately documented.
- Where appropriate, the research plan makes adequate provisions for monitoring the data collected to ensure the safety of the subjects.
- Where appropriate, there are adequate provisions to protect the privacy of subjects and to maintain the confidentiality of all data.
- Appropriate additional safeguards have been included to protect vulnerable subjects.
- Any unanticipated, serious, or continuing problems encountered regarding risks to subjects must be reported immediately, but not later than 10 days following the event. This should be reported to the IRB Office via the "Adverse Effect Report Form".
- If approved, the maximum period of approval is limited to twelve months. Projects that exceed this period must submit an application for renewal or continuation.

PROTOCOL NUMBER: 10110203
PROJECT TITLE: The Relationship Between a Teacher's Personality, Leadership Style, and Efficacy of Classroom Management
PROPOSED PROJECT DATES: 11/01/2010 to 10/31/2011
PROJECT TYPE: Dissertation
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS: Michael Burkett
COLLEGE/DIVISION: College of Education & Psychology
DEPARTMENT: Educational Leadership
FUNDING AGENCY: N/A
HSPRC COMMITTEE ACTION: Expedited Review Approval
PERIOD OF APPROVAL: 01/03/2011 to 01/02/2012

Lawrence A. Hosman, Ph.D.
HSPRC Chair

Date

12-15-2011
REFERENCES


(Publication No. AAT 3308408)


doi:10.1080/0300443042000187077


Ng, W., Nicholas, H., & Williams, A. (2010). School experience influences on pre-service teachers' evolving beliefs about effective teaching. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 26*(2), 278-289. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2009.03.010


