ERIN THERESE MALLOY WEAVER
The Impact of Formal Classroom Management Training on Beginning Early Childhood Teachers
(Under the Direction of WILLIAM W. SWAN)

This study investigated whether a formal educational intervention in classroom management would improve the classroom management knowledge and skills of beginning teachers. The independent variable was the completion of a formal unit of classroom management training using the Harry and Rosemary Wong video tape series, "The Effective Teacher." The dependent variables were the domain scores on the Classroom Management Observation Instrument and the time-on-task of the students in the beginning teachers' classrooms. Analysis of covariance was conducted.

Post hoc interviews conducted with principals, host teachers, and student teachers from both groups revealed that the principals and the host teachers were serious about their job of teaching classroom management. The student teachers were placed by the university with host teachers who were effective classroom managers. As effective classroom managers, the host teachers were committed to helping the student teachers acquire the knowledge and skills needed in efficient and effective classroom management. The placement of student teachers by the college/university had provided the student teachers with their own personal coaches.

The results of the ANCOVA indicated that the two groups of beginning early childhood educators were not significantly different on adjusted mean scores for the three domains on the Classroom Management Observation Instrument. The three domains are teacher behaviors that attempt to create and maintain a positive learning environment, teacher behaviors that attempt to restore the learning environment, and other behaviors

not associated with classroom management knowledge and skills. The results of the ANCOVA conducted on the data concerning the time-on-task hypothesis indicated that the two groups of beginning early childhood educators differed significantly favoring the student teachers who completed “The Effective Teacher” video tape series.

INDEX WORDS: Field-based Education, Beginning Teachers, Classroom Management, Partnerships, Collaboration, Harry Wong, Classroom Management Observation Instrument (C-MOI)

THE IMPACT OF FORMAL CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT TRAINING ON BEGINNING EARLY CHILDHOOD TEACHERS

by

ERIN THERESE MALLOY WEAVER

B.S. Ed., Iowa State University, 1973

M. Ed., Georgia College, 1986

Ed. S., Georgia College, 1993

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty

of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment

of the

Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2001

THE IMPACT OF FORMAL CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT TRAINING ON BEGINNING EARLY CHILDHOOD TEACHERS

by

ERIN THERESE MALLOY WEAVER

Approved:

Major Professor: William W. Swan

Committee: Tom Holmes
David Weller
Anthony Strange
Kan Chandras

Electronic Version Approved:

Gordhan L. Patel
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
December 2001

DEDICATION

To Bill Swan, Tom Holmes, David Weller, Anthony Strange and Kan Chandras: Thank you for helping your graduate students become successful. Your dedication to helping us has helped all the students whose lives we touch daily.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Since beginning this doctoral program, my life has been like a crazy quilt. From friends, to strangers, people have added their scraps to help me design a piece totally unique – bits and pieces that separately wouldn't make any sense or have any worth, but when combined with the scraps of others helped me change my professional life.

Dr. Swan – You have been the needle that has guided the entire process. My thanks aren't adequate to express what you have done for me professionally and personally. I will never forget your pointed questions or your attention to detail. You are a fine craftsman and I appreciate you.

Mom – You have always been my best friend and most loyal supporter. Thank you for showing me the way. If I can be half the administrator you were, I'll be lucky.

Drs. Kathryn Powell and Ed Wolpert – You have trusted me, challenged me, and inspired me to always do my best. You are wonderful role models and I hope I can be a mench.

Dan, Jim, and Aunt Helen – What a support system you three are! Thank you for your unconditional love and service to others. I am proud that you are my foundation and the memories of my youth.

Dad, Uncle Charlie, and the rest of the Malloys – I attribute my creativity and my love of laughter and language to my Irish heritage and your belief in me. I know that even though you're not here on earth, you are still a part of me.

To my colleagues – Jeannie, Steve, Pam W., Janet, Jeannie, Dale, Pam S., Pat B., Pat. G, Penny, Greg, Sonya, Ellen, and the members of the first cohort class – You've challenged me and supported my quest to further my education. You are making a difference in the lives of children by your knowledge and commitment to the future.

Beth, Cathy, and Grace – You three stepped in and made sure my kids got where they were supposed to go, had on what they were supposed to wear, and fed them when they were hungry during the past three years.

To the firemen at the Riverside Station – Thank you for rescuing my cat from the tree or I never would have finished this semester.

Jane Bowes – Thank you for sharing your baby with me – The Classroom Management Observation Instrument!

And my family, the thread that held it all together …..

Bill, Molly, Mike and Dan – I couldn't find a nicer group of people to call my family. You've loved me and put up with so much. I've been in school forever and I have never heard you complain – from macaroni and cheese in the box to stacks of research articles in every room of the house, you've never given me anything except encouragement. Bill, thank you for all that you have put into my dissertation. I love you all dearly and thank you for your encouragement, sympathy, laughter, and all around good times.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Classroom management begins in the first minutes of the new school year as the teachers meet and greet the students. By lunchtime, many new teachers are bemoaning the fact that their college preparation programs had not given them a true picture of the real world. As stated by Halford (1998, p.36), "teaching is the only profession that eats their young." Gonzales and Sosa (1993) found that the most talented new educators are often the most likely to leave because of classroom management issues.

But what is this elusive aspect of teaching? Classroom management is purported to be one of the most critical aspects of teaching, yet there is not one common definition of this term. From Skinner's (1982) behavior modification theories to the socioemotional climate theories professed by Ginott (1993), effective classroom management is a dimension of teaching that leads to academic achievement (Wang, Haertel, & Walberg, 1993) but is not commonly defined.

Teaching consists of two sets of activities: instruction and management (Weber, 1986). Instructional activities are designed to facilitate directly the student's achievement of specific education objectives. Asking questions, evaluating learner progress, and presenting information are examples of instructional activities. Managerial activities are intended to create and maintain conditions in which instruction can take place efficiently and effectively. Classroom management, according to Weber, is "the set of behaviors by

which the teacher establishes these conditions; these behaviors are what lead to student achievement" (p.7).

Since the mid-eighties, some teachers, administrators, and higher education faculty have collaborated in classrooms to improve instruction, facilitate curriculum development, and enhance student achievement (Combs, 1988). Establishment of a collaborative partnership recognized that by educating both groups, the mutual goals of higher education and the Georgia P-16 (preschool through undergraduate) community would be well served by an organizational structure designed to facilitate the effectiveness of public education. The common goal would be to increase student achievement throughout the state.

The state of Georgia (Wolpert & Powell, 1990) and the P-16 initiative (Kettlewell, personal communication, July 18, 2000) have focused attention on the need of public schools to form partnerships with institutions of higher education. Simultaneously, as the public began to seriously scrutinize the education of children, programs of higher education examined the components of quality teacher education programs. Scherer (1990) reported that administrators of teacher preparation institutions in Central Georgia believed partnerships with public schools would enhance preparation of teachers.

Georgia College & State University began its field-based teacher education program in the fall of 1989 with funding from the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia to improve teacher education in Georgia (Wolpert & Weaver, 1991). The vision of the planning committee was to establish a collaborative teacher preparation program in which both coursework and fieldwork could be blended and articulated in a

variety of culturally diverse settings. At the same time, natural classroom settings were to be used for instruction and as laboratories in which to learn effective classroom management skills (Clarke, 1992). K. T. Powell (personal communication, April 1999) stated that during the year of weekly planning meetings, the traditional teacher preparation junior and senior level courses were reconfigured into an interdisciplinary field-based teacher preparation curriculum. A representative of the Georgia Department of Education, Nevelle, attended a planning session to review the innovative plans (Wolpert, personal communication, April 8, 2001). This representative provided administrative approval at this time for Georgia College & State University to begin the field-based teacher education program.

By joining the responsibilities of the college and the public school, teacher preparation changed (Powell & Weaver, 1993). This team encouraged individuals in Georgia teacher education faculties and public schools to assume vested interest in simultaneously improving the education of students in colleges, universities, and public schools (Weaver, Powell, & Fields, 1994). A strong structure was created for the formation of partnerships that met the college, university, and school system needs by ensuring excellence, flexibility, and accountability (Shumake, 1991).

The Georgia College & State University field-based teacher preparation program has been in operation since 1989 (Wolpert & Powell, 1990). Qualitative studies have investigated the role of the mentor, the perception of the student as teacher, and the teacher as a teacher of teachers (Fields, 1999). The utilization of the public school as a classroom, children as teachers, and the role of parents as teachers also have been documented in qualitative research articles about the field-based program.

In the 2000-2001 school year, the field-based teacher education program at Georgia College & State University was undergoing more change as a result of the mandates from the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia. Smith (2000) stated that the partnerships between higher education and the P-12 communities were being defined in yet another way. The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia determined that guarantees were to be issued by the colleges and universities formally pledging the performance of first year teachers by 2002. Student achievement is the goal of both halves of the partnership.

Problem Statement

The problem of the study was to determine if a formal educational intervention in classroom management would improve the classroom management knowledge and skills of beginning teachers. Student academic achievement is foremost in the minds of educators and the general public as we enter the 21st century. Raising test scores is copy for newspapers as they quote President Bush and his calls for reform in education (Schemo, 2001) and Governor Barnes as he states that our schools in Georgia must improve (Jacobson, 2000). It is necessary for researchers to explore avenues for increased academic achievement of all students. Wang, et al. (1993) determined in their study student academic achievement is significantly related to classroom management.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to compare the classroom management knowledge and skill of beginning early childhood teachers who graduated from a field-based teacher education program, which included formal classroom management training, with the management ability of beginning early childhood teachers who graduated from a field-

based teacher education program which did not include a formal management training and to determine differences between these two groups.

Definition of Terms

This section defines the terms important to this study.

Beginning teacher: A beginning teacher is defined as a field-based teacher engaged in his/her solo teaching from the start of student teaching until the end of the second year of contractual teaching with a school system.

C-MOI: The Classroom Management Observation Instrument (Bowes, 1997) was designed to record teacher behaviors that have been identified by researchers as important for effective classroom instruction. Three domains make up the C-MOI. These domains are maintaining behaviors, restoring behaviors, and other behaviors. The three C-MOI domains consist of 11 classroom management categories which are coded on an observation sheet.

Coder: These were observers who were the university supervisors collecting data using the C-MOI.

Field-based teacher education: Field-based teacher education is described as the last two years of an undergraduate teacher preparation program characterized by a minimum of 20 hours per week spent in a public school classroom with experienced teachers and their public school students and the special way of moving theory and college coursework to practice in these classrooms.

Formal educational management unit of instruction: The videotape series "The First Days of School" (Wong & Wong, 1998b) is the formal management intervention. This

eight-tape video series offers five hours of effective management tips for teaching and the practical application of these principles.

Host Teacher: This term was used by Georgia College & State University to designate the cooperative teacher who has been assigned a student teacher. This teacher was employed by the public school system and has been designated at a mentor teacher for new teachers.

Research Questions

1. Does formal classroom management training increase the skill of a beginning early childhood teacher in managing his/her classroom?
2. Does formal classroom management training increase the time-on-task of students in the beginning early childhood teachers' classroom?
3. Does formal classroom management training decrease the number of discipline referrals of students in the beginning early childhood teachers' classroom?

Hypotheses

In order to answer the three research questions, the following hypotheses were tested:

H: 1

There was a statistically significant difference in the classroom management effectiveness as measured by the mean scores corrected for pretest scores on the three domains (a. Maintaining, b. Restoring, and c. Other) of the Classroom Management Observation Instrument of beginning early childhood teachers who participate in formal management training and those beginning early childhood teachers who do not participate in the formal classroom management training.

H: 2

There was a statistically significant difference in the classroom management effectiveness of beginning early childhood teachers who participate in formal management training and those beginning early childhood teachers who do not participate in the formal management training as indicated by the mean scores corrected for the pretest scores of the students' time-on-task.

H: 3

There was a statistically significant difference in the classroom management effectiveness of beginning early childhood teachers who participate in formal management training and those beginning early childhood teachers who do not participate in the formal management training as indicated by the number of discipline referrals to the office as corrected for the pretest scores.

Limitations of the Study

1. This study was limited to second semester seniors in early childhood education who attended their junior and senior years at Georgia College & State University.
2. All of the members of the early childhood cohort at Georgia College & State University were Caucasian.

Assumptions of the Study

1. The varied teaching strategies of Wong and Wong were used with the public school students taught by the two groups.

Research Basis for the Study

A review of the research on classroom management indicated some commonalities that existed across models. For example, some of the commonalities

included maintaining discipline in order to increase student achievement, treating students with respect, and maximizing involvement of students in classroom activities.

The most effective way to influence behavior is by controlling select elements in the students' environment (Wong & Wong, 1998a). Wong and Wong (1998b) credited Good and Brophy (1994) for three research findings that were significant bases in their approach. Good and Brophy (1994) found the three characteristics of effective teachers were as follows: effective teachers have classroom management skills; effective teachers teach for lesson mastery; and effective teachers practice positive expectations. Wong and Wong (1998b) credited another group of researchers for the fourth of their underlying beliefs. Wang, et al. (1993) stated that the number one factor governing student learning is classroom management.

Jones (1987) conducted research on a classroom practices model, which emphasized the need for teachers to employ just enough of their physical presence in the classroom to ensure that students remained on-task and avoided disrupting their neighbors. Jones reported that classroom management procedures must be positive. The procedures must affirm the student while setting limits and promoting cooperation. Coercion must be avoided. Jones also stated that discipline procedures must be practical, simple, and easily mastered.

Justification for the Study

A review of the literature indicated that most of the data reported in this area were anecdotal (Fields, 1999; Powell & Weaver, 1993; Wolpert & Powell, 1990; Wolpert & Weaver, 1991). The American public in the Gallop Poll of August 24-26, 1999 ranked

discipline as the number two concern with 17% of those polled stating that discipline in the classroom was a very serious concern (Rose & Gallup, 1999).

A survey was distributed to all Georgia principals who supervised first year teachers in 1996. First year teachers and their corresponding principals in the state of Georgia ranked discipline as the number one concern for the beginning teacher (Georgia Department of Education, 1997). Classroom management was described as a systematic process that created, maintained, and restored the learning environment so that instructional goals could be achieved (Borko & Gall, 1995; Evertson & Emmer, 1982; Jones, 1989; Van Der Sijde & Tomic, 1993). This topic is of significant national, regional, and local interest for any teacher, any preservice teacher, or any school administrator. Fink and Siedentop (1989) concluded that if teachers acquire effective management skills during their preservice programs, they may not be as overwhelmed by managerial problems thus allowing them to be more effective teachers.

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia and the Georgia Professional Standards Commission (Smith, 2000) require schools and colleges of education to stand behind their product, beginning teachers, with a guarantee starting in 2002. This guarantee ensures the school system with a beginning teacher who is able to effectively maintain a positive learning environment for the students in his/her care. This will require more teacher education institutions to study their graduates and study what those graduates need to be successful in the eyes of a school system. Institutions of higher education have a vested interest in how their product, beginning teachers, succeed or fail during their first three years of formal classroom teaching. Classroom management is critical in the success of beginning teachers.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I introduced the topic, stated the problem, defined the terms, presented the research questions, discussed the significance of the study, presented the limitations of the study, and detailed the justification for the study. Chapter II provides a definition of classroom management, an overview of the need for change, perceptions of beginning and experienced teachers, characteristics and methods of effective classroom managers, and collaborative or field-based teacher preparation. The procedures followed in conducting the study are presented in Chapter III. It includes the restatement of the purpose, null hypotheses, research approach, population, sample of the study, variables, research design, training of the data coders, data collection, instrumentation, validity and reliability, statistical a1nalyses, and level of significance. Chapter IV presents the research findings of the study, and Chapter V discusses implications and recommendations based on the results of the study.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The review of the literature first addresses the definition of classroom management. The second section addresses the need for change in preparing teachers in classroom management. The third section summarizes perceptions of classroom management of both inexperienced and experienced teachers. A fourth section reviews studies that identify characteristics of effective classroom managers and some of the strategies used by effective managers. The fifth section contains a review of the literature on field-based or collaborative teacher training programs as an approach to preparing beginning teachers for successful classroom management experiences. The last section is a summary of the findings of research related to classroom management.

Classroom Management Defined

Dupper and Bosch (1996) noted that disruptive behavior could be defined as any behavior from chewing gum during class to throwing objects, from whispering to loud backtalk. It depended entirely on the context on the situation. Classroom management can be defined as a systematic process that creates, maintains, and restores the learning environment so that instructional goals can be achieved (Borko & Gall, 1995; Evertson & Emmer, 1982; Jones, 1989; Van Der Sigde & Tomie, 1993). Researchers have acknowledged that effective classroom management skills are necessary in order for teachers to maintain a positive learning environment which is conductive for effective

instruction (Evertson, 1985; Sanford, Clements & Emmer, 1983; Scheiske & Deno, 1994).

This complex relationship between a teacher's classroom management skills and effective instruction of her/his students is part of a larger schema which suggests that teacher behavior can influence student behavior (Strother, 1985). Eventually, however, the impact of classroom management success cycles back to the teacher by impacting the longevity of his or her career (Brooks, 1986; Labonty & Danielson, 1988). Teachers with ineffective classroom management skills are much more likely to leave the profession (Lasley, 1994). However, teachers with effective management skills stay in the profession and impact student achievement in a positive manner (Wang, et al., 1993).

Misbehavior has been defined as disruptions that range from minor infractions such as talking out, inappropriate movement, and clowning around to major disturbances such as having weapons, fighting, and severe willful disobedience (Kounin & Gump, 1974; McGarity & Butts, 1984; Palardy, 1993). Kounin (1977) posited that teachers entering the profession needed support in managing behavior in the classroom as many of them have had little preparation or experience in behavior management.

There have been attempts to classify classroom misbehaviors to define classroom management (Dinkmeyer, McKay, & Dinkmeyer, 1980). Classroom misbehavior was also classified by some as the students' desire for revenge, withdrawal from the situation, or feelings of inadequacy in the classroom (Dinkmeyer, et al., 1980; Porter, 1983).

Classroom misbehavior can be categorized as attention seeking or power seeking (Porter, 1983). More serious disturbances such as physical violence, aggressive acting-out behavior, refusing to participate in activities, arguing, and refusing to comply with

teacher requests were also discovered to be part of classroom management problems (Greenlee & Ogletree, 1993; Mishra, 1992; Moore & Cooper, 1984; Novelli, 1993; Rhone, 1992; Shrigley, 1985; Smith & Misra, 1992; Storey, Lawry, Ashworth, Danko, & Strain, 1994).

One study reviewing office referrals showed that 91% of discipline problems were in the area of disruptions, defiance, and inattention (Tully & Chiu, 1995). These researchers concluded that student misbehaviors were disruptions such as interrupted instruction and talking; defiance such as disrespectful behavior or disobedience; inattention such as off-task behavior, inattentive, not doing work, out of seat; aggression such as fighting, pushing, name calling; and miscellaneous such as crying, lying, tardiness, cheating, stealing, and gum chewing.

Furthermore, one aspect of classroom management that required sophisticated skill to be effective was disruptive behavior. However, the definition of disruptive behavior varied among classrooms and from school to school depending on the tolerance levels of the teachers within a particular school and the school's discipline policies and practices.

Classroom management was viewed as a psychological functioning explained in terms of a "continuous reciprocal interaction of personal and environmental determinants. Within this approach, symbolic, vicarious, and self-regulatory processes assumed a prominent role" (Bandura, 1977, p 11-12). Classroom management has also been defined as the set of activities and strategies used to establish and maintain a classroom environment (Cooper, 1990). Maintaining behavior that was conducive to academic achievement remained a challenge that every teacher faced throughout their teaching

career (Evertson & Harris, 1992). Both experienced teachers and beginning teachers expressed concerns about maintaining appropriate student behavior.

Experienced and beginning teachers needed support in managing behaviors of diverse groups of students (Black, 1994; Brophy & McCaslin, 1992; Purcell & Seifert, 1982). Martin and Baldwin (1994) proposed that classroom management was a multi-faceted process that included three broad dimensions–the people, the instruction, and the discipline. These three broad dimensions are constantly changing with the population being taught.

Classroom management was found to be the most essential and the most difficult aspect of education; for without effective classroom management there was no effective teaching (Hastings & Schwieso, 1995). Dupper and Bosch (1996) found that the teacher's definition of proper classroom behavior could be more problematic than the students' behavior. What was acceptable to one teacher was not acceptable to another teacher. Behavior was viewed by the teacher within the context of the individual classroom or the individual school. For example, a loud voice might be appropriate in a gym but not in an academic classroom.

The concept of classroom management is constantly being defined and redefined by the teacher throughout the school day (Dupper & Bosch, 1996). Proactive, preventive, and early intervention strategies were found to be the keys in reducing suspensions for relatively minor offenses such as physical aggression toward other students. Classroom management was found to be a part of every instructional and non-instructional moment in a classroom (Hart & Rowly, 1997; Idaho State Department of Education, 1994).

Classrooms were dynamic and complex entities in which teachers daily demonstrated their classroom management skills (Hawkins, 1997). Several researchers (e.g., Hedges, 1997; Johnson, 1994) agreed that classroom management had two broad goals: (a) ensure the safety of staff and students, and (b) create an environment conducive to learning. Also, classroom management was a skill that all teachers needed to enhance.

For the purposes of this study, classroom management can be defined as the knowledge and skills required to maintain a classroom environment where teachers can teach and students can learn in an orderly and productive manner. Teachers will be accountable for student achievement and classroom management is ranked number one as a factor for high student achievement (Wang, et al., 1993). The desire by the populace for all educators to meet the needs of a changing society has increased with the implementation of Georgia Governor Roy Barnes A+ Education Act of 2000 (Georgia House, 2000).

Need for Change

On March 18, 1876 the following article appeared on the front page of a newspaper in Iowa, the State Center Enterprise. Taylor (1876) states, "The teacher at Illinois Grove Country School had to leave her school last week – nearly two weeks before it would have closed. She could not control the scholars [students], so she quietly put on her things and started for home" (p.1). Classroom management is a continuing concern in schools. There are still teachers "putting on their things" and quietly leaving the profession at a high rate (Archer, 1999).

During the past two decades, research has addressed the role of classroom management skills in successful teaching experiences. Also, this review of the literature

indicated that the changing society and the simultaneous change in characteristics of the student population mandated that educators continued the research on effective classroom management. Wong and Wong (1998a) have emerged as one voice of the teacher in the past decade. Over 1,000,000 copies of their book have been sold in the past 10 years and Dr. Harry Wong's speaking engagements are currently booked until 2003 (Starr, 1999).

Elam (1995) introduced classroom management by calling attention to the public's declaration that behavior management in schools was an issue since the first record in the Gallup polls in 1969. The public outcry for safety in the schools has created new expectations for educators (Darling-Hammond, 1996). She proposed that a more complex, knowledge-based, multi-cultural, and potentially violent society has created new expectations for teachers as classroom managers.

Teacher behaviors and classroom organization were originally linked in the early 1970's with classroom management (Rosenshine & Stevens, 1986). Research on teaching identified conditions such as having materials readily available and the physical organization of the classroom as two factors that depended directly on the ability of teachers to organize and manage their classrooms (Anderson, Evertson, & Brophy, 1979; Evertson, 1989).

Work was also proceeding at a national level to improve the classroom management in the public schools during the end of the 1980's with the creation of the National Goals for Education. A focus of the National Goals for Education (1990) for the year 2000 was that every school in America should be free of drugs and violence while offering every student a disciplined environment conducive to learning. Not only did the government want the schools to operate in an orderly manner, but also students still

wanted and needed to recognize that teachers were in charge and that the responsibilities for managing and leading the class were part of a teacher's duties (Howard, 1995; O'Connor, 1995).

Classroom management continues to be a concern of teachers of all ages and experience levels (Amos & Orem, 1967; Fuller, 1969; Ingersoll, 1976; Latz, 1992). Kritsonis and Adams (1986) and Haroun and O'Hanlon (1997) concluded that the expectations of beginning and experienced teachers placed effective discipline as a necessary and essential aspect of successful teaching and learning; however, there were different views among the groups as to what constituted effective classroom management.

Throughout the last 20 years various studies have shown that beginning teachers have feelings of inadequate preparation. Survey results confirmed by Englander (1986) and supported by other studies (e.g., Pilarski, 1994) indicated feelings of inadequate preparation as one reason inexperienced teachers reverted to personal experience when handling situations that required expertise in behavior management problems. Other studies (Levin, Hoffman, & Badiali, 1985; Lindgren, 1972; Montgomery, 1997; Page & Page, 1981; Reed, 1989; Wesley & Vocke, 1992) found that the belief of inadequate preparation in maintaining discipline was rated as a concern and source of anxiety and uncertainty for preservice teachers. Kearney, Plax, Sorenson, and Smith (1988) asserted that lack of skill in managing classroom behavior of students demanded that beginning teachers must restructure their initial classroom management schemes, a demand for which they had little or no skill and no experience.

Additionally, several studies (Amos & Oren, 1967; Greenlee & Ogletree, 1993; Rancifer 1993; Rickman & Hollowell, 1981) suggested that lack of confidence and inadequate preparation in behavior management are the two primary causes for preservice teachers' failure in student teaching and for the high attrition rate during the first three years of teaching. In Kelly's and Kelly's (1985) search for a link between teacher attrition and teacher training programs, they found that university students enrolled in non-traditional teacher training programs experienced classroom management skills daily in field placements. The preservice teachers were concerned about accommodating for individual differences rather than classroom management. In a follow-up study, Kelly (1997) identified significant changes in concerns among respondents from traditional teacher training programs when the issues of discipline and classroom management became high priorities. The beginning teachers wanted more information and strategies on classroom management before they were faced with the challenges of field placements.

Teachers who left the profession cited conflicts with students or lack of classroom management skills and the resulting anxiety associated with feelings of inadequacy in handling classroom management situations as primary reasons for their dropping out of teaching (Applegate & Lasley, 1979). Other studies concluded the finding that lack of skills in managing classroom behavior was a major cause of preservice teachers' failure (Borko, Lalik, & Tomchin, 1987; Rickman & Hollowell, 1981).

Survey results of beginning teachers indicated that discipline was one area in which they were not adequately prepared (Kelly & Kelly, 1985; Purcell & Seifert, 1982).

Likewise, several studies found that beginning teachers acknowledged feelings of inadequacy in the role of disciplinary agent while managing students (Abernathy, Manera, & Wright, 1985; Barrett & Curtis, 1986; Borko, et al., 1987; Goodlad, 1990; Ingersoll, 1976; Perry & Taylor, 1982; Reed, 1989).

Several studies showed a need for further study with findings that focused on a variety of causes. For example, behavior problems ranked high as a concern in a survey of preservice teachers in Barrett and Davis's study (1995); however, the teachers indicated that student motivation ranked highest as a concern. They discovered that beginning teachers ranked the need for in-service training in student motivation first with practical classroom management ideas and positive reinforcement next. Behavior problems and diversity also received high rankings of need in this study.

Principals ranked behavior management as the number one problem of beginning teachers (Veenman, 1984). Subsequently, Black's (1994) study ten years later extended Vennan's findings that administrators still identified behavior management as a problem. This study recognized the limited time administrators have to work with individual teachers with classroom disruptions, although it was found that up to 50% of administrators' time was used with students who caused disruptions.

Training in discipline and management has been neglected in preservice preparation programs (Yenchko & DeBeal, 1983). In this study, 900 professors of education were sampled concerning their personal views on teaching classroom management in undergraduate college classes. This was done by completing a phone interview of approximately one hour with each professor. Forty-one percent of these teacher educators believed that being trained in the pragmatic issues of running a

classroom was wasted time for preservice teachers. McDaniels (1998) supported this finding showing that only 37% of the interviewed teacher educators believed that maintaining discipline and order in the classroom was essential for student achievement.

A series of behavior management workshops were conducted by one researcher (Evertson, 1989). The teachers in the treatment group were provided with a classroom management workshop prior to the beginning of the year and in mid-October. The researcher found that the treatment group teachers exceeded the comparison group in the use of key management principles, had better student task engagement, and had less inappropriate behavior. The treatment group described the objectives clearly, used a variety of materials to keep the children on task, and monitored the student understanding by using appropriate questions and pacing.

Persistent inadequate behavior management still existed and appeared prevalent in classrooms even though teachers and administrators sought effective ways for several decades to manage behavior (Elam, Rose, & Gallup, 1991). Administrators admit that it is a problem (Georgia Department of Education, 1997), new teachers admit that it is a problem (Wilson & Ireton, 1997), and society admits that it is a problem (Rose & Gallup, 1999).

Perceptions of Beginning and Experienced Teachers

In this section, the differences between the perceptions of beginning and experienced teachers are examined. Perceptions of both groups of teachers have been studied, researched, and surveyed. As a consequence of prior research, studies were conducted to identify the differences in the classroom management skills of experienced teachers and beginning teachers.

Classrooms of experienced teachers were video taped and found to be one of two types (Kounin, 1970). One classroom type showed teachers who fought to maintain order with much of their time spent in dealing with students' misbehavior. The second classroom type functioned smoothly and revealed planning, organization, and scheduling. An analysis of these classrooms indicated that the effective teachers had a strong sense of "what's going on" or "with-it-ness" in the classroom. Furthermore, Shockley and Sevier (1991) furthered this concept as they found students believed it was difficult to misbehave without the teacher's knowledge. Subsequently, a cross-section of teachers admitted viewing students' behavior through their own individual, personal lens, according to numerous studies (Green, 1998; Gump, 1982; Kearney & Plax, 1987; Plax, Kearney, & Tucker, 1986).

Experienced teachers were only minimally influenced by misbehavior intensity in their management strategy selections (Kearney & Plax, 1987). Experienced teachers reported greater flexibility across the diversity of techniques available for the management of student behaviors in the classroom (Plax, et al., 1986). Experienced teachers, however, held varied management schema. This variety gave them diversity and an array of techniques available and effective for gaining students' compliance (Kearney, et al., 1988). In a study of two groups of junior high teachers, Mosdowitz and Hayman (1976) affirmed that on the first day of school, the experienced teachers took time to orient the students to the environment and conditions of the classroom whereas the inexperienced teachers tended to leap immediately into curriculum content.

Experienced teachers developed integrated and sophisticated schemes for classroom management in several ways not generally available to beginning teachers

(Kearney, et al., 1988). Experienced teachers dealt with student resistance to their compliance-gaining attempts. However, the experienced teachers had access to feedback from colleagues and administrators while dealing with student resistance to their compliance-gaining attempts. Beginning teachers did not have a network of colleagues and administrators established at the beginning of their career.

Teachers were expected to manage the behavior of students on the first day of school whether it was the teacher's first year of teaching or his/her thirtieth (Canter & Canter, 1992; Lortie, 1975). Canter and Canter's (1992) research focused on verbal commands that teachers gave their students. It was found that beginning teachers needed to change their indecisive requests concerning discipline. Experienced teachers were more assertive and assertive teachers let the students know from the start that they meant what they said and said what they meant. Unfortunately, beginning teachers did not know what they meant. The assertive, experienced teacher had more students on task.

Beginning teachers and experienced teachers viewed student discipline in different ways (Kagan, 1992). Kagan found that beginning teachers rated control as a major objective until standard routines were established and the beginning teacher became comfortable in the role of teacher. The study suggested that beginning teachers entered classrooms with inappropriate and over-simplified schemes for handling student behavior. For example, one common belief of beginning teachers was if they planned an interesting lesson, the students would all stay on task.

Beliefs of beginning teachers and experienced teachers were evaluated as to how they were similar and different in their perceptions of classroom management (Martin & Baldwin, 1996). A total of 238 subjects were studied with 55 percent being classified as

novice teachers and 45 percent being classified in the experienced group. The subjects completed a Likert format survey entitled the Inventory of Classroom Management Styles. This study focused on how elementary school counselors could help new teachers develop healthy learning environments for their students. The researchers collected the two groups of teachers' classroom management beliefs and found that beginning teachers may have unrealistic expectations of effective classroom management. The beginning teachers revealed their belief that if they were well prepared there would never be any problems in their classrooms and that the students would always get along.

The critical challenge for both experienced and beginning teachers was how to deal effectively with pupils labeled as "difficult, "disruptive," or "disinterested" (Borisch, 1992; Ralph, 1982). Experienced teachers were compelled at times to resort to antisocial techniques that could be interpreted as primarily desist-oriented (Kearney & Plax, 1987). The experienced teachers would separate a child from the group and place them in time-out or would keep a misbehaving child in from recess. Beginning teachers avoided these techniques.

Numerous studies, throughout the late 1970's and 1980's, discovered that beginning teachers reduced the number of student disruptions that occurred in their classrooms using a custodial approach to management instead of a traditional approach to management during student teaching experiences. The custodial approach is one in which the student teacher is a benevolent caretaker. The traditional approach to management is one in which the teacher is the boss (Doyle, 1979; Garrison, 1984; Palmer & Simmons, 1995; Repp, Baron, & Brulle, 1982; Rifkind & Harper, 1993). Allen and Shaw (1990) found that the strategy employed to achieve an environment conducive to learning was

not the important aspect of a well-managed classroom. These researchers found that successful classroom managers minimized the total number of student disruptions that interfered with learning objectives in a number of ways such as immediate correction for any rule breaker, zero tolerance for students who were not complying to the rules, proximal placement of the teacher in various situations, and having the rules posted and agreed upon by the entire class.

Beginning teachers have turned to personal experience to handle situations when faced with behavior management problems whereas experienced teachers gained a repertoire of skills (Englander, 1986). Beginning teachers used the methods modeled by their cooperating teachers or they reverted back to their own childhood experiences concerning discipline when faced with an uncomfortable situation in classroom management (Brophy & McCaslin, 1992; Bullough, Knowles, & Crow, 1992; Englander, 1986; Ethridge, James, & Bryant, 1981; Yenchko & DeBeal, 1983).

In summation, beginning teachers and experienced teachers had different degrees of with-it-ness. All teachers are expected to manage their classrooms starting on the first day of school. However, the beginning teacher was found to be more indecisive concerning requests concerning management. The experienced teacher was more assertive from the start of the school year. Prior experiences played a large role in the classroom management knowledge and skills for beginning and experienced teachers.

Characteristics and Methods of Effective Classroom Managers

Classroom management has been a topic of interest since there were classrooms. Kounin's (1970) work on classroom management has shaped the thinking of researchers during the past three decades. After watching hundreds of hours of video-taped lessons,

he defined the difference between effective and ineffective classroom managers as the way the effective teacher systematically decreased the frequency of disruptive behavior. Stanford (1993) supported Kounin's work when he found a consistency of the relationship of classroom management skill of the teacher to controlling student behavior.

Identifying characteristics of effective classroom managers was the focus of several studies. Defining effective classroom management from the literature was not a simple task. The beliefs regarding appropriate and inappropriate behavior and how to control those behaviors vary among teachers (Willower, et al., 1967; Wolfgang & Glickman, 1986). Each teacher brings his/her own schema into the classroom. Furthermore, Shockley and Sevier (1991) advocated factors such as departmentalization and lecture oriented instruction which compounded classroom management challenges and added to the complexity of a definition.

Teachers must learn a variety of strategies to help students monitor their behavior to achieve academically (Brophy, 1988). He suggested that many behavioral problems were eliminated when teachers understand individual differences among students. One study by Hocutt (1996) indicated that the recent emphasis on inclusion of students with disabilities in general education underscored the need for providing teachers with effective instructional strategies to accommodate these children's diverse behavioral and learning needs. The more strategies the teacher knew, the more students were kept on task.

Rules were also found to play an essential role in effective classroom management (Akbaba & Altun, 1998). Teachers who developed and implemented effective rule management routines and systematically taught their students how and why

to follow the rules were seen as effective managers by their surveyed peers (Rademacher & Callahan, 1998). Brophy and Good (1986) found that teachers who used effective classroom management procedures promoted independent learning and success for their students in classrooms that were productive, orderly, and pleasant. Rules and procedures used were clear, concise, and unambiguous. Effective classroom managers dealt with inappropriate behavior quickly and consistently without undermining the students' sense of dignity (Attwood, 1983). The classrooms were orderly.

Other studies concurred with Brophy and Good's findings and suggested that rules and procedures should be accomplished during the first days of a school term (Dawson-Rodriquez, Lavay, Butt, & Lacourse, 1997; Wong & Wong, 1998ab). This time of the school year is the time to set rules and learn procedures and routines (Wong & Wong, 1998a).

Effective classroom managers maintained a level of alertness in a manner that was not necessarily seen by students as negative, threatening, or suspicious (Ralph, 1989). Hartwig and Ruesch (1994) pointed out that all teachers viewed their students' behavior through the teacher's individual lens. Numerous researchers suggested that teachers could have under-reported the use of negative strategies and over-reported the use of positive techniques in an effort to represent themselves as "good" teachers (Kearney, et al., 1988; Plax, et al., 1986). For example, one teacher may view a student with a high activity level as disruptive, but that same behavior can be seen as developmentally appropriate and tolerated by another teacher (Dupper & Bosch, 1996; Hoy, 1967).

Successful classroom managers taught classroom rules as needed over a period of the first two to three weeks (Appleton, 1995). Borisch (1992) presented that the rules

tended to generate the behaviors expected of the students. Effective classroom rules were designed to govern forms of individual behaviors that were likely to interfere with activities, cause injury, or destroy property (Dunton, 1998). Rules helped the students know the expected behavior and the consequences if they didn't follow the rules.

Additionally, effective classroom managers established rules and procedures in order to effectuate their expectations and position themselves as leaders of their classes (Bellon, Bellon, & Blank, 1992). Classroom routines and procedures were acceptable ways of dealing with various duties during the day (Doyle, 1986). Effective classroom managers spent the first few days of school teaching rules and procedures to their students as if rules and procedures were a cognitive subject (Arnold, Bohannon, Harmon, & Manantov, 1992; Howard, 1995).

Observations of three 4th grade teachers were conducted during their first seven weeks of school (Tikunoff, Ward, & Dasho, 1978). This study revealed the dominant role of rule setting in regards to effective classroom management. This study focused on the students' socialization within the teachers' infrastructure of rules and procedures. The researchers found that these teachers were all considered excellent managers by their peers, the parents, and students. All three teachers posted the rules and all three teachers were consistent in enforcing the rules.

In a study of a junior high English classroom, behavior management characteristics were identified by watching the teachers teach (Doyle, 1984). During the time when students were involved in completing seatwork in the initial weeks, teachers circulated among the students in the room, limiting individual student contact while maintaining a whole-group focus. If teachers encountered inappropriate behavior, they

focused on the curriculum and not the misbehavior. Doyle found in later observations that once the effective managers' activity work system was established, the teacher would spend more individual time with the students and less time instructing the whole group. Whereas, if the activity system/management system was not established at the beginning of the relationship with the students, the shift from whole group instruction to individual instruction either could not occur or behavior of the students deteriorated.

Alert monitoring by the teacher was effective in taking care of individual student needs and difficulties while keeping the teachers alert to the needs of the class (Evertson & Anderson, 1979). Later it was found that effective monitors, those teachers who effectively managed their classrooms, were found to give more information and constructive feedback to their students (Emmer, et al., 1980; Evertson & Anderson, 1979). Howard (1995) supported this by finding that effective teachers monitored their students and their classrooms continuously. Monitoring helped the teachers supervise the student performance for accountability and maintain momentum, timing, and pacing during the activity.

Experienced teachers held management schemes that suggested the diversity and complexity of techniques potentially available and effective for gaining students' compliance (Plax, et al., 1986). Supporting this finding, Doyle (1987) and Evertson (1989) related that experienced teachers planned and implemented specific management principles by engaging in these three basic processes: doing proactive preplanning, using a deliberate introduction, and practicing immediate assertiveness. Ralph (1989) found that effective classroom managers maintained a level of alertness in a manner that was not seen by students as negative, threatening, or suspicious.

Effective classroom managers reported greater flexibility across the diversity of techniques available for the managing of student behaviors in the classroom (Plax, et al., 1986). Furthermore, Kearney and Plax (1987) concluded that effective classroom managers were only minimally influenced by misbehavior intensity in their discipline strategy selections.

Effective classroom managers concerns were more student-centered and focused on attention to learning outcomes (Fuller, Watkins, & Parsons, 1973). On occasion these student-centered teachers resorted to antisocial techniques that could be interpreted as desist-oriented (Kearney & Plax, 1987). These antisocial techniques involved removing misbehaving children from their peers in some manner.

Skill in engaging students in academic endeavors was identified as an important characteristic of effective classroom managers (Clarizio, 1986). Several studies found that effective classroom managers continually directed attention to the academic on-task behavior of students (Denham & Lieberman, 1980; Martin & Baldwin, 1996; Rosenshine, 1979; Woolfolk & McCune-Nicolich, 1984). Students who were not actively engaged in the pursuit of academic knowledge became passive learners; gave up easily on academic tasks; often became anxious, withdrawn, or angry about their school experience; and failed in later grades (Kolb & Jussin, 1994; Skinner & Belmont, 1993).

Class mean time-on-task increased substantially, while the time-on-task of the three-targeted pupils increased dramatically, by having the teacher continuously monitor the class by verbal questioning and moving around the room (Kaplan & White, 1980). Hastings and Schwieso (1995) validated the management strategy of seating in rows to improve time-on-task for individual work. The students who gained most from this

seating arrangement were those students who were least on-task when seated in groups. Evertson (1982) expanded on the finding that time-on-task was improved by seating the students in rows. Momentum, timing, and pacing were employed to help keep the lessons moving smoothly so the flow was not interrupted and the students remained on task (Corrie, 1997).

While acknowledging that classroom management was a multi-faceted task, some researchers posited that ineffective classroom management resulted from teachers' inability to nurture learning of developmentally different students (Darling-Hammond, 1996; Kearney, et al., 1988). Short and Short (1994) and Letts (1995) indicated a discrepancy between the limited attention given to teachers as professional classroom managers and the abundance of literature for teachers on specific classroom management techniques designed to change and to comparison student behavior.

Of the 1,981 elementary and secondary teachers surveyed by Metropolitan Life Insurance Company in 1984, student apathy and discipline were the most serious problems classroom teachers faced. A study by Allen and Shaw (1990) reminded educators that teachers must minimize student disruptions that interfere with learning objectives. Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) emphasized teacher expectancy, which also played a large part in managing behavior in the classroom, as a means to curtail student disruptions.

An effective classroom manager's selection and use of prevention strategies depended on accurate analysis of a student's behavior (Montague, 1997). This skill included the ability to target personal, social, and academic behaviors that interfere with school success. If left unattended, Montague posited, these behaviors might be

exacerbated, leading to even more serious behaviors. In addition to management skills, the development of a workable behavior management plan takes much time, skill, and energy (Black, 1994; Canter & Canter, 1992; Dinkmeyer, et al., 1980; Magliaro, Wildman, Niles, McLaughlin, & Ferro, 1989).

Effective classroom managers systematically decreased the frequency of disruptive behavior in their classrooms. As teachers understood the differences among students, many behavioral problems were eliminated. Rules and procedures were an integral part of an effective classroom manager's plan starting on the first day of school. The effective teacher was an alert monitor who had many management schemes for effectively gaining students' compliance.

Collaborative or Field-Based Teacher Preparation

The literature documented dissatisfaction with traditional approaches to teaching classroom management skills from teachers, administrators, and the general public. One approach to enrich classroom management learning was the investigation of alternative ways of engaging beginning teachers in activities using videotape simulations, role-playing, and case studies (Ratliffe, 1987; Wright, O'Hair, & Alley, 1988). Actively engaging preservice teachers in rating videotape simulations, role-plays, and case studies gave preservice teachers vicarious classroom experience.

Sensing that vicarious experiences were not sufficient to developing effective management skills, selected teacher training institutions and public schools have joined in a collaborative approach in the preparation of teachers. This collaboration was based on the belief that public school teachers and their students could make substantive contributions in improving teacher preparation particularly in the area of classroom

management. Two major facets of education reform made this movement toward collaboration possible: restructured, field-based management within public school systems and collaborative, field-based teacher education (Combs, 1988; Lieberman, 1992; Sirotnick & Goodlad, 1988). These two concepts were the foundation for field-based teacher preparation.

Collaboration between a college/university and a public school setting was identified in the literature as beneficial to the beginning teacher, the school, and the university (Goodlad, 1990; Guyton, Paille, & Rainer, 1993; Jackson, 1999). For beginning teachers, the benefits were having a liason between the theory and the practice of their new profession; for the school, the benefits were the continuing staff renewal; and for the college/university, it was the clinical site for the preparation of teachers (McDaniels, 1998). The most important outcome for all the participants was the increased knowledge and skills as members of a team as noted in this study.

Central to the studies of field-based teacher preparation programs was a consistent finding that effective classroom management was necessary for student academic achievement. Walker, Colvin, and Ramsey (1995) examined effective classroom management. This was a fundamental component of the teaching-learning process. Classroom management promoted active learning and appropriate behavior in students. Therefore, it was critical that teachers in training and teachers in the field learned to be effective classroom managers.

Knowledge and skills essential to effective classroom managing could best be learned by preservice teachers within the complex environments of dynamic classrooms. Dawson-Rodriquez, et al. (1997) and Evertson and Harris (1992) concluded that effective

classroom managers gave daily assignments with clear, precise directions for carrying out the work, made explicit their expectations for completion dates and grading, monitored the work closely, and emphasized students' accountability for the work. Clarity in presentation of the activities and directions produced more compliance in the completion of the assignment and on-task behavior. This would be practiced by beginning teachers in their field placements.

Scholars have suggested that establishing a well-managed classroom started with prearrangement, anticipation, and planning before the school year began (Appleton, 1995; Brophy & Putnam, 1978; Good & Brophy, 1978; Rose, 1998). Doyle (1979) posited that an important feature of maintaining order and obtaining cooperation appeared to be pre-instructional planning. He explained these were strategies acquired through experience in classrooms. The collaboration between the university and the public school could design field placements where beginning teachers could participate in well-managed classrooms.

Other essential skills were described as procedures for performing tasks, clearly communicated expectations for students' behavior, ongoing positive and corrective feedback, and fair and consistent treatment of students (Reynolds & Birch, 1988). The components were found to be requisites for effective classroom management. Lavay, French, and Henderson (1997) described routines and procedures that included rituals in opening, closing, and conducting the activities and lessons. These routines could be shared between the university and the public schools involved.

An awareness of when an activity was working or when an activity wasn't working was one aspect of an effective manager (Broadkin, 1997). Students who knew

when to move to another activity avoided off-task behaviors. Effective teachers were found to help students socialize with each other using acceptable classroom behavior while completing the assigned tasks (Erickson & Shultz, 1981; Shultz & Florio, 1979). The highly rated effective teachers smiled more, bantered more, dealt with student emotions, spoke more, and had less off-task behavior (Mosdowitz & Hayman, 1976). These skills and behaviors were more easily developed within the complexity of classrooms in field-based settings.

Skills that prevented misbehavior appeared to be learned best in classrooms (Brophy, 1983). Evertson (1989) tracked a distinguishing characteristic of effective classroom managers - the manner in which they maintained order and cooperation to prevent problems from occurring rather than on what they did to deal with problems after problems have occurred. Good and Grouws (1977) had discovered that the intuitive skill of group alerting was positively related to student learning. Brophy and Good (1986) declared that establishing specific routines for managing materials, time, instruction, and student behavior helped increase instructional time and student involvement in appropriate learning activities.

Beginning teachers' schemes for classroom management reflected limited, oversimplified interpretations of compliance gaining (Plax, et al., 1986). Kearney, et al. (1988) affirmed that beginning teachers were naive about their management strategies. This study discovered that the underdeveloped and oversimplified cognitive schemes of beginning teachers in relation to classroom management restricted the teacher's ability to selectively discriminate among situational determinants of misbehavior type and

intensity. Willful disobedience could be anything from a child refusing to do something to a child screaming and running from a room.

Programs that were started specifically to address the needs of beginning teachers were described by Runyan, White, Hazel, and Hedges (1998). For example, Kansas's Goals 2000 has a professional development component that involved universities, an educational service center, and 68 school districts. Assistance from these agencies was available in a seamless format for teachers during their first three years in the profession. The program relied heavily on trained mentors who provided daily support. The mentors, as found by Sheeler (1996), were trained to focus on areas such as facing fears, conferencing skills, student motivation, discipline, teaching and learning styles, and instructional strategies. Results showed that the program was very effective in the retention of teachers past their third year of teaching.

The Alternative Secondary Education Program (ASEP) was studied by Shannon and Bergdoll (1998). This program was designed to provide an alternative pool of teachers with maturity to interact with today's adolescents. The ASEP emphasized cultural diversity, classroom management, and multiple intelligences. Surveys of this intensive program indicated the college students liked the program because it was tailored to their needs and offered quality instruction.

The challenge of collaboration between universities and public schools was multi-faceted (Lasley, Matczynski, & Williams, 1992). Collaboration included the sensitive aspects of interpersonal relationships, conflicting agendas, incongruent organizational patterns, and the ever-present threat of dissolving the college/university and the public schools partnership. Clemson's (1990) surveys discovered that the fellowship,

mentorship, assistance in obtaining personal and professional goals, and accomplishment were energizing forces for teacher education for both parties involved in the collaboration. Auger and Smith (1985) identified other conditions that facilitated effective collaboration such as timeliness, mutuality, trust, and positive results.

A cartel of 11 teacher preparation programs comparing graduates of 4-year and 5-year programs was studied by Baker, (1998). The graduates of the Austin Teacher Program (a five year program), which had the strongest emphasis on collaboration and field placements, continued to enter the profession with higher principal ratings than the 10 other Texas institutions with teacher preparation programs. Principals surveyed rated the Austin graduates with higher abilities in classroom management than even the graduates rated themselves.

A major theme in teacher reform in the decade of the 1980's (Combs, 1988; Lieberman, 1992; Sirontnik & Goodlad, 1988) noted that collaborative, field-based teacher education preparation could be an effective method to prepare teachers in dealing with the complexities of the classroom, including classroom management. Bennet, Ishler, and O'Loughlin (1992) reviewed the literature and identified two major principles that signified a collaborative partnership contained in field-based teacher education. First, effective collaboration occurred only when there was parity between the members. If there was any suggestion that theoretical knowledge was superior or that one partner's practical knowledge did not count, then no truly collaborative relationship was possible. Second, all parties, including students, were committed to engaging in dialogue and mutual inquiry. All participants must have opportunities to experience each other's reality in mutually supportive environments and to probe any issue through group dialogues. A

true collaborative according to Bennet, et al. (1992) exemplified a true partnership according to this data.

There was no doubt that persistent inadequate behavior management in classrooms still existed in the minds of the general public even though teachers and administrators have sought effective ways for several decades to improve the management of behavior (Elam, et al., 1991). While there have been many studies related to classroom management skills of beginning teachers, researchers have not yet identified a best way of assuring that all beginning teachers were skilled classroom managers (Wong & Wong, 1998a&b). While some limited skill can be gained from college classrooms, observations in classrooms with students, and field placements in the public schools, there was a need for further study of a more effective way of acquiring skill in classroom management.

Summary

Researchers have not yet identified the best way of assuring that all beginning teachers are skilled classroom managers. A review of the literature revealed a widespread concern about the lack of classroom management knowledge and skills by classroom teachers. This lack of skills, which was particularly obvious with beginning teachers, appeared to contribute directly to teacher attrition during the first three years of teaching.

Our changing society and the simultaneous change in the characteristics of the student population mandated that educators continue research on classroom management.

Wang, et al. (1993) concluded that classroom management was the number one indicator of student academic achievement. Furthermore, the public outcry for safety in the schools created new expectations for educators. Teachers, students, administrators,

parents, and the public rated classroom management as a concern and a source of anxiety and uncertainty.

The literature revealed differences in the perceptions of beginning teachers and experienced teachers. Beginning teachers were naïve in their expectations concerning classroom management, whereas experienced teachers have developed integrated and sophisticated schemas for dealing with classroom management issues. Experienced teachers were more assertive with their oral requests and they let their students know immediately that they said what they meant and meant what they said.

Effective managers have shared several characteristics. Decreasing the frequency of disruptive behavior accompanied by a strong sense of "with-it-ness" in their classrooms were techniques employed by effective managers. Effective managers used consistency to enforce rules and procedures in a clear and concise manner while dealing with inappropriate behavior quickly and consistently without undermining the students' sense of dignity. The effective manager also maintained a high level of alertness in a manner not necessarily seen by the students as negative, threatening, or suspicious.

Classroom management has many components. Researchers agree that effective classroom management skills are necessary in order to maintain a positive learning environment needed for maximum student achievement. Classroom management can be defined as the knowledge and skills used to establish and maintain a positive classroom environment where teachers can teach and students can learn.

Field-based teacher education programs were developed to move education theory into the practice of education. Beginning teachers were engaged in classroom management in authentic settings, in real classrooms with real students. The beginning

teachers developed classroom management and skills while emulating effective experienced teachers in the public schools. The beginning teachers were able to learn other strategies for effective classroom management while working and learning in the public schools.

In a fast-paced, ever-changing, diverse society, teacher educators were rethinking teacher preparation programs to include approaches and methodologies that assured management skills acquisition by beginning teachers. One approach or organizational pattern that enhanced this acquisition of knowledge and skills was the field-based teacher-training program. There was a need to investigate the contribution of the field-based approach to management skills acquisition by beginning teachers.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

A description of the methods and research are presented in this chapter by specifying the procedures to gather data, analyze data, and test the hypotheses. The sections include a restatement of the purpose of the study, the null hypotheses, research approach, population of the study, sample of the study, variables, research design, training of the data coders, data collection procedures, instrumentation, validity and reliability, statistical analysis, and level of significance.

Restatement of the Purpose

The purpose of this study was to compare the classroom management knowledge and skills of beginning early childhood teachers who graduated from a field-based teacher education program which included formal classroom management training, with the management knowledge and skills of beginning early childhood teachers who graduated from a field-based teacher education program which did not include formal management training and to determine similarities and differences of these groups.

Null Hypotheses

In order to answer the research questions presented in Chapter 1, the following null hypotheses were tested by:

Ho: 1

There was no statistically significant difference in the classroom management effectiveness as measured by the mean scores corrected for pretest scores on the three

domains (a. Maintaining, b. Restoring, and c. Other) of the Classroom Management Observation Instrument of beginning early childhood teachers who participated in formal management training and those beginning early childhood teachers who did not participate in the formal classroom management training.

Ho: 2

There was no statistically significant difference in the classroom management effectiveness of beginning early childhood teachers who participated formal management training and those beginning early childhood teachers who did not participate in the formal management training as indicated by the mean scores corrected for the pretest scores of the students' time-on-task.

Ho: 3

There was no statistically significant difference in the classroom management effectiveness of beginning early childhood teachers who participated in formal management training and those beginning early childhood teachers who did not participate in the formal management training as indicated by the number of discipline referrals to the office as corrected for the pretest scores.

Research Design

This study was an experimental design, using a two-group, pre-test/post-test format in which "two groups of subjects were compared with respect to measurement on the dependent variable" (Huck Cormier, & Bounds, 1974, p. 245) The self-selection of groups to the treatment (Gay, 1996) occurred without random assignment. Two groups of beginning teachers were selected to participate in the study.

O X O

O O

This design was selected because of the internal validity in the history, maturation, testing, instrumentation, regression, selection, mortality, and interaction of selection and maturation. This design also accounts for the external validity concerning interaction of testing and the workshop. The two groups in this study were comprised of those senior students in a field-based teacher early childhood education program who received classroom management instruction (workshop) and those who did not (comparison).

The independent variable was a one-day classroom management workshop using the "Effective Teacher" videotape series by Wong (1998b) as a major focus. The covariates were the pretests administered to both groups. The three dependent variables were the achievement on the post-test Classroom Management Observation Instrument (Appendix A), the time-on-task of the students in the beginning early childhood teachers' classrooms, and the number of discipline referrals from their classrooms. The C-MOI's three domains are divided into 11 sub-sections. The first domain consisted of behaviors a teacher uses to maintain order. The second domain contained behaviors that a teacher uses to restore order. The third domain contained behaviors that do not deal with classroom management.

Sample of the Study

The research sample included two groups of beginning teachers with majors in early childhood education who participated in student teaching during spring semester 2000. There were 24 members in the comparison group which attended classes at the Milledgeville campus. There were 14 members in the experimental group which attended

classes at the Macon campus. All of the participants graduated with a Bachelor of Science degree in Early Childhood Education from Georgia College & State University. The requirement of attending their junior and senior years of college in a field-based education program was a common characteristic.

The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education accredited Georgia College & State University's programs. This accreditation assures that the programs on the all campuses are similar and that the same departmental syllabi are used for each class taught. Professors teach on all of the three Georgia College & State University campuses. The professors at all three campuses have been through formal search procedures conducted by the School of Education.

This major was selected to participate in the study because of the philosophy of the department of Early Childhood Education, the support of the chairperson, and the number of beginning teachers in the major. This was the level where children enter school and the major impact on their educational success begins with the management of small children's behavior. All of the beginning student teachers in these two groups had the chance to participate in the workshop format with the comparison group attending after the study. The experimental group had their workshop during the end of March. The comparison group had their workshop during the beginning of May.

Variables

Covariate

The scores achieved by the first year teachers on the following pretests were the covariates for the three respective dependent variables. The management ability as measured by the mean domain scores of the C-MOI was the first pretest. The time-on-

task for the students in the beginning teachers' classroom was the second pretest. The number of office referrals was the third pretest.

Independent Variable

The independent variable was the completion of a formal unit of classroom management training. The formal classroom unit of management consisted of the first four video-tapes in "The Effective Teacher" videotapes series by Drs. Harry and Rosemary Wong (1998b). These four tapes explored a wide variety of ideas and concepts dealing with effective management of a classroom. The beginning teachers in this study watched the first four tapes in the series as part of their treatment.

Part one was entitled "The Effective Teacher" and was 32 minutes in length. It covered the definition of effective teacher and how to be a happy first year teacher. This tape stressed the fact that these tapes were research based and that to be successful, a teacher must stay current with research in his/her field. It also highlighted the need to succeed on the first day of school.

"The First Days of School" was the second videotape. This tape told teachers how to help students succeed and how the beginning teacher can dress himself/herself for success. It also encouraged the beginning teacher to invite students to learn. This tape ran 36 minutes.

In 36 minutes, part three detailed "Discipline and Procedures. This tape had five subsections dealing with having a well-managed classroom, how to post assignments, when and how to take roll, how to have an effective discipline plan with rules, and how to have an effective discipline plan with consequences and rewards.

"Procedures and Routines" was the title of part four. The entire message in this 55-minute tape was how to have students follow classroom procedures. This tape informed teachers how to set procedures to enhance the classroom atmosphere.

Dependent Variables

The classroom management ability of the first year teachers was one of the three dependent variables. The C-MOI consisted of three domains: Maintaining and Creating; Restoring; and Other behaviors. These domains consisted of the scores achieved on the 11 subsections of the C-MOI. The first domain consisted of behaviors a teacher uses to maintain order. The second domain contained behaviors that a teacher uses to restore order. The third domain consisted of behaviors that aren't recognized as classroom management skills. The coders scored the C-MOI one 15 minute lesson of the beginning teachers during their second week of student teaching as the pretest and the coders scored the C-MOI the beginning teachers six weeks later as his/her posttest.

The students' time-on-task was the second dependent variable. The time-on-task of the class was gathered by the coder every three minutes during the two 15-minute lessons. One lesson was observed during the second week of the beginning teachers' student teaching and one lesson was observed six weeks later.

The number of discipline referrals was the third dependent variable. The total number of office referrals was kept by the beginning early childhood teacher. The dates of the referrals were also kept to see if the number of referrals decreased for the experimental group after their participation in the management workshop.

The pretest for each served as the covariate. This pretest was given to all of the population during their second week of student teaching. The posttest was given six weeks later.

Training of Data Coders

The data-coding participants were responsible for learning to use the C-MOI and coding the observations using the C-MOI. The coders were college supervisors who were employed by Georgia College & State University to supervise student teachers.

The coders were supplied with a training packet prior to the first instrument training session. The training packet consisted of an explanation of the purpose of the study, categorical descriptions of the teacher behaviors under study, specific teacher examples of the behaviors, and the procedures to follow using the instrument to code classroom management skills (See Appendix A). The material was reviewed and discussed with the coders by the investigator at the initial training session.

The training of the coders in the use of the C-MOI was necessary in order to ensure validity and reliability in understanding and applying the tool. After the investigator reviewed the instrument and any questions posed by the coders were answered, the next step in the training involved viewing teaching segments on videotape. This "practice" set of videos contained lessons from three early childhood education teachers with varying teaching styles.

The initial 15-minute segment reviewed by the coders was coded with the aid of the investigator allowing for live examples of the behavioral categories and further clarification. Then the coders were asked to view a 15-minute segment of teaching and code the teaching behaviors using the C-MOI. At the conclusion of each segment, the

codes generated by the coders were compared to that of the investigator and discussed. Three 15 minute segments were needed until the coders reached at least a 75% criterion-level agreement, the minimal criterion-level acceptable for observers using videotaped teaching set by Landis and Dock in 1977 (Tsai & Denton, 1993). When the minimal criterion level was established using the 15-minute teaching segments, the coders were asked to code one last training tape that was not previously viewed. The codes generated in this effort became part of the criterion-related and intraobserver agreement data (see Table 1).

Data Collection Procedures

Trained data collectors observed the beginning teachers early in their teaching experience. The data collectors used the C-MOI for collecting the data. The data collectors were also the student's student teaching supervisor. The data collector quietly entered the classroom and completed the 15-minute observation.

Observers recorded the teacher's classroom management skills according to the defined categories using a frequency count recording system. Additionally, observers were required to note the context of the lesson and also to indicate changes in context. The C-MOI was designed not only to yield an end count, but also to preserve the sequence in which the behaviors occurred and to identify the context in which they occurred.

Behaviors were coded at the rate at which they were observed. Coding occurred each time the teacher behavior changed categories, or every 15 seconds if the same

Table 1

Reliability of Georgia College & State University Coders

Observations	1	2	3	4
Number of Behaviors Exhibited	60	60	60	60
Observers				
1	43 (72%)	52 (87%)	58 (97%)	57 (95%)
2	52 (87%)	53 (88%)	54 (90%)	56 (93%)
3	39 (65%)	51 (83%)	47 (78%)	53 (88%)
4	48 (80%)	49 (82%)	52 (87%)	54 (90%)
5	37 (62%)	43 (71%)	53 (88%)	52 (87%)

behavior persisted. The coding process captured the frequency of the behaviors, the approximate duration of the behaviors, and the sequence and teaching context in which they occurred. At three-minute intervals, the total number of students on task was also recorded.

After the first set of data was collected, the one-day management workshop was held at an off-campus location. The treatment consisted of a one-day (eight hour) management workshop. The experimental group of beginning teachers watched four videotapes of "The Effective Teacher" by Harry Wong Publications. These tapes spanned a 159 minute time period.

"The Effective Teacher" videotapes by Wong and Wong (1998b) were created to assist teachers. The tapes were each structured in the same way. The tape began with an oral motivational commentary. Next, there was an opening that set the tone of the videotape. During the actual video presentation, Wong told stories to accentuate the concepts that he wished his audience to internalize.

Approximately six weeks after the first observation, the same coder observed all of his/her subjects again. Once again, a 15-minute observation recorded the teacher's behaviors and the number of students on task was recorded. This second observation was at approximately the same time of day, in the same classroom, and with the same group of children.

Instrumentation

Bowes (1997) at Pennsylvania State University developed the Classroom Management Observation Instrument in 1996. This instrument was designed not as a summative evaluation instrument, but as a systematic observation instrument to measure

classroom management skills. This instrument provides feedback to teachers, their supervisors, and college preparation programs.

This instrument was designed to record teacher behaviors that have been identified by researchers as important for effective classroom instruction. The C-MOI consists of three domains. The three domains are coded on the observations sheets by writing one of the 11 subsets of the three domains. These categories have been determined by grouping similar teacher behavioral indicators. The three domains are divided into the following areas of teacher behaviors: a.) teacher behaviors that attempt to create and maintain a positive learning environment, b.) teacher behaviors that attempt to restore the learning environment, and c.) teacher behaviors that do not relate to classroom management.

Construct/Content Validity and Reliability

Construct Validity

Evidence of construct validity was important in this study because classroom management was a psychological construct that may be defined differently by many individuals. "The C-MOI has acceptable construct validity" (Bowes, 1997, p.61). While developing the C-MOI, Bowes (1997) examined many studies and literature reviews on classroom management, from Kounin's early work in the 1970's through the present date. The literature review provided a composite of the universal behaviors common to effective classroom managers. Evidence of construct validity was provided by the inclusion of those teacher behaviors, commonly referred to as classroom management skills in the literature reviewed, in the Classroom Management Observation Instrument.

Content Validity

The evidence of content validity of the C-MOI as it was used in the field test was obtained through a rating scale completed by experts in the field of classroom management. Experts were chosen by Bowes (1997) based on their prominence in the literature on classroom management. Six experts were each sent a copy of the C-MOI behavioral categories and were asked to evaluate each category based on a five-point, Likert-type scale and to comment on any recommendations for change. Four of the six experts responded to the survey.

The ratings from the experts were reviewed collectively to determine the percentage of agreement between the responses. Additionally, two of the four experts made several suggestions for minor revisions in either the definitions for categories or examples provided. Those changes were then incorporated into the tool used in the field test. Responses to the Likert-type scale ranged from 75% agreement to 100% agreement. As judged by this group of four experts, each category of the C-0MOI described teacher behaviors believed to be important in successful classroom management. The evidence provided by the expert panel ratings addressed the question of content validity and suggested that the C-MOI has a valid content when used for its intended purposes

Reliability

The evidence of internal consistency for the C-MOI was collected by several methods throughout the field test conducted by Bowes (1997). In each reliability measure, the investigator examined all of the possible skill totals that could be achieved for the entire lesson as well as for each teaching context. This effort in establishing skill totals was done to ensure that totals for each context and the entire lesson were

consistent. Three different measures were used to determine the consistency with which the C-MOI was employed during the creation of the instrument: Measures of criterion-related agreement, measures of intraobserver agreement, and measures of interobserver agreement. The information produced by these three measures also addressed questions relating to discriminate reliability and generalizability of the data.

The overall mean of the correlation coefficients for criterion-related agreement for the lesson in its entirety was .93. Coefficients produced by comparing component parts of each lesson, referred to as teaching contexts, were also above acceptable agreement levels. The coefficients by context ranged from a .79 to 1.00 agreement levels.

A mean was established for the intraobserver agreement for each category in each context. The range of coefficients for correlations of totals from different contexts was from .558 to .978 with a mean of .804. The range of coefficients for similar contexts was .740 to .992 with a mean of .941. A one way analysis of variance with an alpha level at .05 revealed a significant difference between correlation coefficients from similar context means and correlation coefficients from different context means ($F=21.9$, $df=1.39$, $p=.000$)

The level of agreement for each lesson overall for all teachers was high with coefficients ranging from .817 to .995 agreement levels. These high interobserver agreement levels indicate that educators from several arenas could potentially use the C-MOI in a peer coaching or supervision process with a high level of agreement.

Criterion-related Agreement

Criterion-related agreement in this instrument refers to the consistency with which the coders' data correlated with the criterion or master observer. Measures of criterion-

related reliability are important for determining if the observers have been adequately trained and to monitor maintenance of the observer skills during the study (Frick & Semmel, 1978). This agreement measure was calculated at three points in the study: following training, midway through the data collection process, and following the data collection process.

Intraobserver Agreement

Measures of intraobserver agreement were collected to demonstrate coder consistency across time. Commonly referred to as the test-retest method, the data produced by each coder for the criterion measure on each of the three occasions was compared. Correlations comparing the data recorded on three occasions for the lesson produced high coefficients for the whole lesson as well as by context. The fact that the coders could view a lesson three times over a five-week period and produce data similar to the previous viewing(s) indicates further evidence to suggest that the C-MOI could be used in a reliable manner during the field test and in further use of this instrument.

Interobserver Agreement

The high interobserver agreement levels, achieved by comparing data recorded by the coders, indicated that educators from several arenas could potentially use the C-MOI in a peer coaching or supervision process with a high level of agreement. During Bowes (1997) study, the coders were spot checked in a random manner with the researcher coding the same lessons. The coders were similarly checked in a random manner with the researcher coding the same lessons.

Stability

Stability was established by consistency of time period that the pretest and the post-test occurred and by the two visits per participant . Observation periods were 15 minutes in duration, and participants were observed during different time periods throughout the day. Each participant was visited twice. All visits were official visits where the disruptions of the students were recorded. Observers entered the room as inconspicuously as possible, got settled, immediately began the observation, and left upon completing the 15-minute observation. There was a minimum of contact among the observer, the classroom teacher, and the students. The beginning early childhood teacher participants did not know what data the observers were collecting and the observers did not know what, if any, training the beginning teacher participants had been given.

The University Institutional Review Board of Georgia College & State University granted approval for this study on January 22, 2000. The researcher then met with the participants in this study for the signatures on the consent form to decline or to be part of the study. No one declined participation in the study. The conditions outlined in the proposal were precisely followed (See Appendix B).

Statistical Analyses

The data gathered were analyzed for each group. The analysis of covariance was used to examine the scores of the C-MOI. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the C-MOI, time-on-task and discipline referrals.

The analysis of covariance is a statistical technique that is used to test hypotheses about two or more population means. The analysis of covariance tests whether the population means are equal for all the categories of a factor and whether there is an

interaction between two factors after the effect of a relevant covariate has been extracted (Campbell & Stanley, 1963). The covariate was the pretest using the C-MOI, time-on-task, and discipline referrals.

For an analysis of covariance, the assumptions must be made that independent random samples have been taken from each population, that the populations are normally distributed, and that the population variances are all equal (Norusis, 1998). The analysis of covariance was used to determine if there was a statistically significant difference at the .10 alpha level. The analysis of covariance was conducted to compare each of the domains of the C-MOI.

The beginning teachers' pre-test and post-test scores on the domains of the Classroom Management Observation Instrument were analyzed to determine the effectiveness of formal management training. Statistical processes were conducted on the data concerning the CMOI, time-on-task, and the number of discipline referrals.

Level of Significance

For the purpose of this study, the .10 level of significance was used for testing the null hypotheses. This was considered a reasonable choice for this type of study since the investigation was exploratory in nature and since factors in classes in a school environment cannot always be entirely controlled (Huberty, 1987). Selecting the .10 level of significance increased the probability of rejecting a true null hypothesis (that is, making a Type 1 error). The .10 level of significance was used to provide a reasonable balance for this study because of the limited number in the population.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to compare the classroom management knowledge and skills of beginning early childhood teachers who graduated from a field-based teacher education program which included formal classroom management training, with the management knowledge and skills of beginning early childhood teachers who graduated from a field-based teacher education program which did not include formal classroom management training and to determine the similarities and differences of these groups. The purpose was examined from three different perspectives. First, to determine the impact of the formal management training on the beginning teachers, statistical analyses were conducted comparing classroom management knowledge and skills as measured by the Classroom Management Observation Instrument (C-MOI). The C-MOI measured the behavior of beginning teachers in three domains. These domains were teacher behaviors that attempt to create and maintain a positive learning environment, teacher behaviors that attempt to restore the learning environment, and other behaviors not associated with classroom management knowledge and skills. Second, data were analyzed to determine the impact of the formal classroom management training concerning the time-on-task of the students in the beginning teachers' classrooms. Third, data were analyzed to determine the impact of the formal management training on the number of office referrals.

Data were collected regarding the beginning teachers' pretest and posttest scores on the three domains of the C-MOI. Analyses of covariance were conducted comparing the posttest scores of the beginning early childhood samples, using the pretest scores as the covariates, to determine if there were any significant differences in the scores of the beginning teachers who participated in the formal management training as compared to those beginning early childhood teachers who did not participate in the formal classroom management training. The scores were compared by the three domain totals on the C-MOI. These domains were teacher behaviors that created and maintained a positive learning environment, teacher behaviors that attempted to restore the learning environment, and other behaviors not associated with classroom management knowledge and skills. The time-on-task of the two sample groups of beginning teachers' students were analyzed using the ANCOVA method with the pre-test score as the covariate to determine if there were any significant differences in the time-on-task of the two groups. Third, data were collected regarding the number of office referrals by the two groups of beginning early childhood teachers.

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the data regarding the characteristics of Georgia College & State University and the beginning teachers in the study. The beginning teachers in the study were all seniors majoring in early childhood education at Georgia College & State University. The experimental group attended their junior and senior year college classes at the Macon campus and the comparison group attended their junior and senior year classes at the Milledgeville campus. All were taught by the faculty of the School of Education. Table 2 depicts the total School of Education population as

Table 2

Characteristics of Georgia College & State University Undergraduate Majors 2000-2001 Who Participated in Student Teaching During the Spring of 2001

Major	Early Childhood
Number (%)	36 (100%)
Sex	
Female	35 (97%)
Male	1 (3%)
Race/ Ethnicity	
Black	0
White	36 (100%)
Other*	0

* Includes Asian, Hispanic, Indian, and Pacific Islander

reported by the School of Education regarding their undergraduate majors during the 200-2001 school year. In the graduating class of 2001, the Early Childhood majors were 97% female, 3% male and 100% white.

Table 3 depicts the characteristics for the early childhood education sample groups. The Macon cohort had 13 members and the Milledgeville cohort had 23 members. The entire population of the Macon cohort was white (100%) and female (100%). The Milledgeville cohort was 96% female and 4% male. The Milledgeville cohort was 100% white.

Inferential Statistics

Hypothesis 1

The first C-MOI domain of teacher behaviors was "Maintaining and Creating". The teacher behaviors that attempt to maintain and create a positive learning environment are a part of every classroom. The C-MOI domain "Maintaining and Creating" measured how much time a teacher spent maintaining and creating a positive learning environment during his/her teaching.

Table 4 shows that the mean of the pretest on the C-MOI in the domain of maintaining and creating a positive learning environment for the beginning teachers in the experimental Macon cohort was .45, and for the Milledgeville comparison cohort, the mean of the pretest for the C-MOI in maintaining and creating was .35. The mean of the post-test of the population of the beginning early childhood teachers was .47 for the experimental Macon group and .46 for the Milledgeville comparison group. The Macon cohort (experimental group) exhibited a higher mean on the post-test. The post-test

Table 3

Characteristics of the Early Childhood Education Student Teachers in the Sample Groups from the 2000-2001 Spring Semester

	Macon Cohort	Milledgeville Cohort
Total Sample (%)	13 (100%)	23 (100%)
Sex		
Female	13 (100%)	22 (96%)
Male	0	1 (4%)
Race/ Ethnicity		
Black	0	0
White	13 (100%)	23 (100%)
Other *	0	0

* Includes Asian, Hispanic, Indian, and Pacific Islander

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for the C-MOI Domain Maintaining and Creating Positive Behaviors

		Pretest			Post-test		
	Sample Size	Range	Mean	SD	Range	Mean	SD
Experimental	13	.13-.98	.45	.30	.12-.93	.47	.25
Comparison	23	.13-.62	.35	.15	.07-.85	.46	.24

means of the C-MOI domain, maintaining, increased for both groups as compared to the means on the pretest.

The analysis of covariance were used to determine if there were significant differences at the .10 alpha level of the domain scores on the C-MOI of the beginning teachers at the end of student teaching when covaring to the domain scores of the beginning teachers on the C-MOI in the experimental group versus the students in the comparison group. Three analyses of covariance were conducted to compare the three domains. The three domains were a.) teacher behaviors that attempt to create and maintain a positive learning environment, b.) teacher behaviors that attempt to restore the learning environment, and c.) other teacher behaviors not associated with classroom management knowledge and skills.

The ANCOVA statistical analysis of the populations' C-MOI maintaining scores revealed that there was not a significant difference at the .10 alpha level between the scores of the Macon experimental group and the scores of the Milledgeville comparison group (see Table 5). Therefore, this unit of formal management training did not result in a statistically significant difference in the classroom management knowledge and skills of the beginning early childhood teachers in the area of maintaining and creating a positive learning environment as measured by the C-MOI. The null hypothesis was accepted.

Table 6 shows that the means of the pretest on the C-MOI in the domain of "restoring a positive learning environment" for the beginning teachers in the experimental Macon cohort was .13, and for the Milledgeville comparison cohort, the mean of the pretest for the C-MOI in restoring was .11. The mean of the post-test of the population of the beginning early childhood teachers was 7.56 for the experimental

Table 5

Analysis of Covariance for the Classroom Management Domain Maintaining and Creating Positive Behaviors

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Covariate: Pretest Maintaining	3.704	1	3.704	.006	.940
Main Effect: Formal Management Work-Shop vs. Traditional	5.178	5	1.036	.161	.975
Error	1.929	30	6.429		
Total	9.712	36			

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics for C-MOI Restoring Positive Behaviors

		Pretest			Post-test		
	Sample Size	Range	Mean	SD	Range	Mean	SD
Experimental	13	.02-.30	.13	9.26	.00-.18	7.56	6.72
Comparison	23	.00-.02	.11	7.66	.00-.33	9.64	8.04

Macon group and 9.64 for the Milledgeville comparison group. The Milledgeville cohort (comparison) did better on post-test means as adjusted for prior performance on the pretest. The means of the C-MOI domain, restoring, did increase for both groups, Milledgeville and Macon, between the pretest and the post-test.

The C-MOI domain score "Restoring" was a measure of the teacher behaviors that attempted to restore the learning environment in the teacher's classroom. The ANCOVA statistical analysis of the populations' C-MOI "restoring" scores revealed that there was not a significant difference at the .10 alpha level between the scores of the Macon experimental group and the scores of the Milledgeville comparison group (see Table 7). Therefore, this unit of formal management training did not result in a statistically significant difference in the classroom management knowledge and skills of the beginning early childhood teachers in the area of restoring a positive learning environment as measured by the C-MOI. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted.

Table 8 shows that the mean of the pretest on the C-MOI in the domain of "other teacher behaviors" for the beginning teachers in the experimental Macon cohort was .42, and for the Milledgeville comparison cohort, the mean of the pretest for the C-MOI domain other was .53. The mean of the post-test of the population of the beginning early childhood teachers was .46 for the experimental Macon group and .44 for the Milledgeville comparison group. The Macon cohort did better on the post-test as adjusted for prior performance on the pretest. The mean on the post-test of the C-MOI domain, "other", did not increase for the Milledgeville cohort. The Milledgeville cohort had a .09 decrease from pretest to post-test. The Macon cohort exhibited a gain of .03.

The C-MOI domain score entitled "other teacher behaviors" encompassed the

Table 7

Analysis of Covariance for the Classroom Management Domain Restoring Positive Behaviors

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Covariate: Pretest Restoring	4.415	1	4.415	.070	.793
Main Effect: Formal Management Work-Shop vs. Traditional	1.145	1	2.291	.364	.869
Error	.189	30	6.285		
Total	.484	36			

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics for C-MOI Other Teacher Behaviors

		Pretest			Post-test		
	Sample Size	Range	Mean	SD	Range	Mean	SD
Experimental	13	.00-.08	.42	.27	.00-.88	.46	.24
Comparison	23	.23-.83	.53	.17	.03-.88	.44	.27

other behaviors a teacher does throughout the teaching day. These behaviors do not relate to classroom management. The ANCOVA statistical analysis of the populations' C-MOI domain scores in the "other" category revealed that there was not a significant difference at the .10 alpha level between the scores of the Macon experimental group and the scores of the Milledgeville comparison group (see Table 9). Therefore, this unit of formal management training did not result in a statistically significant difference in the classroom management knowledge and skills of the beginning early childhood teachers in the area of other as measured by the C-MOI. The null hypothesis was accepted.

Hypotheses 2

Table 10 shows that the mean of the time-on-task scores at the beginning of student teaching was 15.59 for the experimental Macon group and 16.27 for the Milledgeville comparison group. On the post-test, the Macon time-on-task mean score was 14.80 and for the Milledgeville comparison group, the mean score was 14.98.

The analysis of covariance was used to determine if there were significant differences at the .10 alpha level of the time-on-task during the 15 minute observation during the final week of formal student teaching when covaring to the pretest time-on-task scores of the beginning teachers' students in the comparison group and the experimental group. There was a statistically significant difference at the $p \leq .004$ level among the two groups (see Table 11). Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Hypotheses 3

The analysis of covariance was to be used in comparing the management effectiveness of beginning early childhood teachers who participated in formal

Table 9

Analysis of Covariance for the Classroom Management Domain Other Teacher Behaviors

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Covariate: Pretest Other	4.149	1	2.075	.276	.760
Main Effect: Formal Management Work-Shop vs. Traditional	6.893	1	1.379	.184	.967
Error	2.251	33			
Total	9.491	35			

Table 10

Descriptive Statistics for Time-on-Task for the Students of Beginning Student Teachers

		Pretest			Post-test		
	Sample Size	Range	Mean	SD	Range	Mean	SD
Experimental	13	12-20	15.59	2.90	6-20	14.80	.25
Comparison	23	11-24	16.27	3.85	4-25	14.98	4.16

Table 11

Analysis of Covariance for Time-on-Task of the Students of Beginning Teachers

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Covariate: Pretest Time-on-Task	4.073	1	4.073	.355	.556
Main Effect: Formal Management Work-Shop vs. Traditional	110.815	1	110.815	9.653	.004
Error	367.370	33	11.480		
Total	8567.720	35			

management training and those beginning early childhood teachers who did not participate in the formal management training as indicated by the number of discipline referrals. However, there were only four reported referrals to the office and so visual inspection of the data was used.

There were three children sent to the office. One boy, a kindergartener, was sent twice for serious offenses. His student teacher stated that the classroom teacher made her send him. He was referred for testing and is now enrolled in a special needs program. The other two children had broken school rules which explicitly stated that they needed to be sent to the office.

Post hoc interviews were conducted with cooperating principals, host teachers, and the student teachers. While not originally planned for in the research proposal, these interviews relayed information not found in the C-MOI data, the time-on-task data, nor the office referral data.

Each of the five principals interviewed said that they would never place a student teacher with a host teacher that was a poor classroom manager. Each of the five principals said that placing a student teacher with a poor manager would create more work for them. Numerous comments such as, “Placing a student teacher with a teacher that has weak management skills is an accident waiting to happen. I want my student teachers to emulate the habits of my good teachers.”

The teachers interviewed echoed the words of the principals. The theme of pride in managing their own classroom was evident in each of the eight teachers interviewed. “I take care of my own business. I really don’t have many management problems. I try to keep the children engaged in their class work so that they won’t have a chance to

misbehave." One teacher stated that she wouldn't let the principal know if she had any management problems. "What he doesn't know won't hurt him!" she said. The ten student teachers interviewed said that their host teachers had told them all of the management problems were learning experiences and that the host teachers had told them that the two of them together could handle almost anything. "My teacher [host] was like my mother. … She talked to me about how to head-off the problems before they got started." Another theme that emerged was that their friends had told them not to let the principal see their faults. The number one fault, according to the student teachers, was not being able to manage a group of children. "My friends that graduated last year said that if you were a poor manager, you would never get a job. Even when I wanted to send children to the office, I just sent them to find their teacher and she helped me get them back on track."

Summary of the Findings

The results of the ANCOVA indicated that the two groups of beginning early childhood educators were not significantly different on adjusted mean scores for the three domains on the Classroom Management Observation Instrument. The three domains are teacher behaviors that attempt to (1) create and maintain a positive learning environment, (2) teacher behaviors that attempt to restore the learning environment, and (3) other behaviors not associated with classroom management knowledge and skills. The null hypothesis was accepted.

The results of the ANCOVA conducted on the data concerning the time-on-task hypothesis indicated that the two groups of beginning early childhood educators were statistically significantly different. The statistical significance was $p \leq .004$. That is, the

time-on-task of the students in the rooms of the experimental Macon group were greater than the comparison Milledgeville group. The null hypothesis was rejected.

The number of office referrals was so small that no statistical analysis was possible. Out of the entire 15 week period, the 36 beginning student teachers only referred three children to the office. One child was referred twice for a total of four office referrals. The four referrals all originated from the Macon student teachers before they attended the formal classroom management treatment. No children were reported referred by the Milledgeville cohort. No children were referred after the second week of student teaching by any of the beginning teachers in either group. Post hoc interviews were conducted with cooperating principals, host teachers, and the student teachers. While not originally planned for in the research proposal, these interviews relayed information not found in the C-MOI data, the time-on-task data, or the office referral data. The principals and host teachers were serious about their responsibilities concerning the job of teaching classroom management to the beginning student teacher. As effective classroom managers, the host teachers were committed to helping the student teachers acquire the knowledge and skills needed in efficient and effective classroom management. The school placements were helping the student teachers acquire the knowledge and skills needed to become effective and efficient classroom managers.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter consists of three sections. The first section summarizes the results of the study. The second section includes the conclusions/interpretations from the findings. The last section presents recommendations for future studies.

Summary

The problem of the study was to determine if a formal educational intervention in classroom management would improve the classroom management knowledge and skills of beginning teachers. Student academic achievement was foremost in the minds of educators and the general public as we entered the 21st century. Raising test scores was copy for newspapers as they quoted President Bush and his calls for reform in education (Schemo, 2001) and Governor Barnes as he stated that our schools in Georgia must improve (Jacobson, 2000). It is necessary for researchers to explore avenues for increased academic achievement of all students. Wang, et al. (1993) determined in their study student academic achievement is directly influenced by classroom management.

The purpose of this study was to compare the classroom management knowledge and skill of beginning early childhood teachers who graduated from a field-based teacher education program, which included formal classroom management training, with the management ability of beginning early childhood teachers who graduated from a field-based teacher education program which did not include a formal management training and to determine similarities and differences of these groups. The comparison group was

the cohort of early childhood education majors who had completed their last two years of coursework at the Milledgeville campus of Georgia College & State University. The experimental group was the cohort of early childhood education majors who had completed their last two years of college coursework at the Macon campus of Georgia College & State University. Analysis of covariance were conducted on the beginning teachers' mean scores on the Classroom Management Observation Instrument domains during their final week of formal student teaching adjusting for their score during the second week of their formal student teaching. ANCOVAs were conducted on the subsections of the domains of the C-MOI. Also analysis of covariance were conducted on the time-on-task of the students of the beginning teachers during their final week of formal student teaching adjusting for their mean time-on-task during the first week of formal student teaching. Post hoc interviews were conducted to gather data concerning the low number of office referrals by the student teachers.

Conclusions

The C-MOI appeared to be one effective means of measuring teacher skills in managing classroom behavior. The three domains of the C-MOI contained elements of effective classroom management as cited in the review of the literature. The C-MOI measured the skills of classroom management in the following areas: (1) Maintaining and creating a positive learning environment by stating rules for behavior, effective use of time, predicting when the students will have difficulties, setting high academic expectations, noting differences between students, acknowledging appropriate behavior, monitoring the behavior of the students, and readying the classroom for instruction; (2)

Restoring behaviors by acknowledging inappropriate behaviors, and correcting inappropriate behaviors; and (3) Other behaviors that occur in a classroom.

The Wong tapes did not have a significant positive impact on teachers because of the criteria which principals used when selecting host teachers. While not originally planned for in the research proposal, the post hoc interviews relayed information not found in the C-MOI data, the time-on-task data, nor the office referral data. The principals selected the host teachers with emphasis on their classroom management skills as well as their instructional practices. The principals and host teachers were serious about their responsibilities concerning the job of teaching classroom management to the beginning student teacher. As effective classroom managers, the host teachers were committed to helping the student teachers acquire the knowledge and skills needed in efficient and effective classroom management. The host teachers' desire to help the beginning teachers become successful in classroom management created the network of professionals on which the beginning teacher could depend. This network was missing, stated the literature, for many unsuccessful beginning teachers in the area of classroom management knowledge and skills.

The university training program was incorporating classroom management training via the principals and host teachers. While the university was not cognizant of this fact, beginning classroom teachers were receiving the knowledge and skills concerning classroom management which was essential to their success. The impact of the collaboration between the university and the schools, while unanticipated, was significant and effective.

Recommendations

The recommendations are as follows:

1. Data should be collected to further define and refine the guidelines of effective classroom management knowledge and skills in the host teachers to maximize the benefits accrued to undergraduate students as they progress through their program of study.

2. The collaboration between the university and host principals/host teachers in providing effective field-based and student teaching experiences including classroom management should be explored to determine what are the most effective roles and content for beginning classroom teachers. Criteria should be developed to determine all classroom placements by the college/university containing the elements of classroom management as defined in the literature to formalize and structure the procedure the university is now using. The host teachers are such a major influence on the style of the student teachers that nothing should be left to chance.

3. From the literature, several open-ended, structured questions should be formulated and interviews should take place with the student teachers, the host teachers, and the principals before and after the student teaching placement with relation to their classroom management knowledge and skills. The open-ended interview should supply patterns of change that occur within the student teachers that are observed by the principal, the host teacher and the student teacher.

4. While observing student teachers during their first years of teaching, data should be gathered that would indicate the rate at which teachers become effective

classroom managers as perceived by their principals, their students, their peers, their students' parents, and themselves.

5. Colleges and universities should include classroom behavior management courses in their curricula for beginning teachers. Also, beginning teachers should be placed with host teachers with classroom management knowledge and skills to maximize the knowledge and skills of the student teachers in effectively educating all students.

REFERENCES

A Plus Education Reform Act (2000). Georgia General Assembly. HB 1187. (2000). Atlanta, Georgia.

Abernathy, S., Manera, E., & Wright, R.E. (1985). What stresses student teachers most? The Clearing House, 58,361-362.

Akbaba, S., & Altun, A. (1998). Teachers' reflections on classroom management. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 425 148).

Allen, J.L., & Shaw, D.H. (1990). Teachers' communication behaviors and supervisors' evaluation of instruction in elementary and secondary classrooms. Communication Education, 39, 308-322.

Amos, W., & Orem, R. (1967). Managing student behavior. St. Louis, MO: Warren H. Green.

Anderson, L.M., Evertson, C.M., & Brophy, J.E. (1979). An experimental study of effective teaching in first-grade reading groups. Elementary School Journal, 79, 193-223.

Applegate, J.H., & Lasley, T.J. (1979, April). The second year of teaching: A follow-up study. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Francisco. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 169 028).

Appleton, K. (1995). Routines and the first few weeks of class. The Clearing House, 68(5), 292-294.

Archer, J. (1999). New teachers abandon field at high rate. Education Week, 18(27), 1.

Arnold, C. B., Bohannon, D., Harmon, K., & Manantov, C. (1992). Positive classroom management. Mathematics Teacher, 85(9), 720.

Attwood, R. (1983, April). The interacting effect of task form and activity structure on students' task involvement and teacher evaluations. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.

Auger, K., & Smith, S. (1985). Conflict or cooperation? Keys to success in partnerships in teacher education. Action in Teacher Education, 7(4), 1-9.

Baker, T. E. (1998, February). Learning from follow-up surveys of graduates: The Austin teacher program and the benchmark project. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, New Orleans, LA.

Bandura, A. (1977). Social learning theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Barrett, E.R., & Curtis, K. F. (1986). The effect of assertive discipline training on student teachers. Teacher Education and Practice, 3(1), 53-56.

Barrett, E.R., & Davis, S. (1995). Perceptions of beginning teachers' in-service needs of classroom management. Teacher Education and Practice, 11(1), 22-27.

Bellon, J., Bellon, E., & Blank, M. (1992). Teaching from a research knowledge base: a development and renewal process. New York: Merrill.

Bennett, R., Ishler, M., & O'Loughlin, M. (1992). Effective collaboration in teacher education. Action in Teacher Education, 14(1), 52-56.

Black, S. (1994). Throw away the hickory stick. The Executive Educator, 16(4), 44-47.

Borisch, G.D. (1992). Effective teaching methods (2nd ed.). New York: Merrill.

Borko, H., Lalik, R., & Tomchin, E. (1987). Student teachers' understandings of successful and unsuccessful teaching. Teaching & Teacher Education, 3(2), 77-90.

Borko, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1995). Expanding a teacher's knowledge base: A cognitive psychological perspective on professional development. In T. R. Guskey & M. Huberman (Ed.), Professional development in education. (pp. 35-66). New York: Teacher's College Press.

Bowes, J. L. (1997). The development and validation of an observation instrument to measure classroom management skills (Doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University.

Boyer, C.E. (1997). A portrait of the principalship in Georgia. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Georgia Southern University, Statesboro.

Britt, P.M. (1997, November). Perceptions of beginning teachers: Novice teachers reflect upon their beginning experiences. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Memphis.

Broadkin, A.M. (1997). Tricky transitions: Helping children cope with transition woes. Instructor, 106(5), 66-71.

Brooks, D. (1986). Are we evading the issue of disorder in the schools? Education Digest, 51, 8-11.

Brophy, J. E. (1983). Classroom organization and management. Elementary School Journal, 83, 265-285.

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

Brophy, J. E., & Good, T. L. (1986). Teacher behavior and student achievement. In M.D. Wittrock (Ed.). Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed., 328-375). New York: Macmillan.

Brophy, J., & McCaslin, M. (1992). Teachers' reports of how they perceive and cope with problem students. The Elementary School Journal, 93, 3-63.

Brophy, J. E., & Putnam, J. C. (1978). Classroom management in the elementary grades. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 167 537).

Bullough, R. V., Knowles, J. G., & Crow, N. A. (1992). Emerging as a teacher. London: Routledge.

Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1963). Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Canter, L., & Canter, M. (1992). Assertive discipline: Positive behavior management for today's classroom. Santa Monica, CA: Lee Canter & Associates.

Clarizio, H. (1986). Toward positive classroom discipline. (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Clarke, M. (1992, October 31). Teaching teachers to teach differently. The Macon Telegraph, p.18.

Clemson, S. (1990). Four models of collaborative teacher education: A comparison of success factors and maturation. Action in Teacher Education, 12(2), 31-37.

Combs, A. (1988). New assumptions for educational reform. Educational Leadership, 45(5), 38-40.

Cooper, J.M. (Ed.). (1990). Classroom teaching skills (4th ed.). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Co.

Corrie, L. (1997). The interaction between teachers' knowledge and skills when managing a troublesome classroom. Cambridge Journal of Education, 27(1). 93-106.

Curwin, R.L., & Mendler, A.N. (1999). Zero tolerance for zero tolerance. Phi Delta Kappan, 81(2), 119-120.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1996). What matters most: A competent teacher for every child. New York: National Commission on teaching and America's Future. http://www.pdkintl.org/darling.htm

Dawson-Rodriques, K., Lavay, B., Butt, K., & Lacourse, M. (1997). A plan to reduce transition time in physical education. The Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, & Dance, 68(9), 30-34.

Denham, C., & Lieberman, A. (1980). Time to learn. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.

Dinkmeyer, D., McKay, G., & Dinkmeyer, D., Jr. (1980). Systematic training for effective teaching. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service.

Doyle, W. (1979). Making managerial decisions in classrooms. In D. Duke (Ed.). Classroom management. West Lafayette, IN: Kappa Delta Pi.

Doyle, W. (1984). How order is achieved in classrooms: An interim report. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 16(3), 259-277.

Doyle, W. (1986). Classroom organization and management. In M.L. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd Ed.). New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

Doyle, W. (1987). Research on teaching effects as a resource for improving instruction. In M. Wideen & I. Andrews (Eds.), Staff development for school improvement: A focus on the teachers (pp. 91-102). New York: Falmer.

Dunton, J. (1998). The four B's of classroom management: Achieving a distraction-free learning environment. Techniques, 73(1), 32-34.

Dupper, D., & Bosch, L. (1996). Reasons for school suspensions: An examination of data from one school district and recommendations for reducing suspensions. Journal for a Just and Caring Education, 2(2), 140-150.

Elam, S. (1995). How America views its schools: The PDK/Gallup polls, 1969-1994. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Elam, S.M., Rose, L.C., & Gallup, A.M. (1991). The 23rd Gallup poll of the public's attitudes toward public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 73(1), 41-57.

Englander, M. (1986). Strategies for classroom discipline. New York: Praeger.

Enmer, E., & Evertson, C. (1981). Synthesis of research on classroom management. Educational Leadership, 38(4), 342-347.

Enmer, E., Evertson, C., & Anderson, L. (1980). Effective classroom management at the beginning of the school year. Elementary School Journal, 80(5), 219-231.

Erickson, F., & Shultz, J. (1981). When is a context? Some issues and methods in the analysis of social competence. In J.L. Green & C. Wallat (Eds.), Ethnography and language in educational settings. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Ethridge, G., James, T., & Bryant, G. (1981). Discipline: Beliefs of student teachers and directing teachers. Unpublished manuscript, Memphis State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 215 958).

Evertson, C. (1982). Differences in instructional activities in higher and lower-achieving junior high English and math classes. Elementary School Journal, 82, 329-350.

Evertson, C. M. (1985). Training teachers in classroom management: An experimental study in secondary school classrooms. Journal of Educational Research, 79(1), 51-57.

Evertson, C. (1989). Improving elementary classroom management: a school-based training program for the beginning of the year. Journal of Educational Research, 83(2), 82-90.

Evertson, C. M. (1989). Classroom organization and management. In M. C. Reynolds, (Ed.) Knowledge base for the beginning teacher. New York: Pergamon Press and the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education.

Evertson, C.M., & Anderson, L.M. (1979). Beginning school. Educational Horizons, 57, 164-168.

Evertson, C. M., & Emner, E. T. (1982). Preventive classroom management. In D. Duke (Ed.), Helping teachers manage classrooms. (pp.2-31). Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Evertson, C.M., & Harris, A. H. (1992). What we know about managing classrooms. Educational Leadership, 49(7), 74-78.

Fields, J. S. (1999). Harmony, cacophony, and melody: Voices supporting and informing the practice of beginning teachers (Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1999). Dissertation Abstracts International, AAT9929022.

Fink, J., & Siedentop, D. (1989). Development of routines, rules, and expectations at the start of the school year. Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 8(3), 198-212.

Frick, T., & Semmel, M. I. (1978). Observer agreement and reliabilities of classroom observational measures. Review of Educational Research, 48(1), 157-184.

Fuller, F. F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization. American Educational Research Journal, 6, 207-226.

Fuller, F. F., Watkins, J. E., & Parsons, J. S. (1973). Concerns of teachers: Research and reconceptualization. Austin, TX: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Garrison, L.L. (1984). Communicating – The nonverbal way. Journal of Business Education, 59(5), 190-92.

Gay, L.R. (1996). Education research competencies for analysis and application (5th ed.). New Jersey: Englewood Cliffs.

Georgia Department of Education. (1997). Survey of beginning teachers and their principals. Georgia Department of Education. Atlanta.

Ginott, H. G. (1993). Teacher and child: A book for parents and teachers. New York, NY: Maxwell Macmillan International.

Gonzales, F., & Sosa, A. S. (March, 1993). How do we keep teachers in our classrooms? The TNT response. IDRA Newsletter 1, 6-9.

Good, T., & Brophy, J. (1978). Looking in classrooms (2nd ed.). New York: Harper and Row.

Good, T., & Brophy, J. (1994). Looking in classrooms (6th ed.). New York: Harper and Row.

Good, T., & Grouws, D. (1977). Teaching effects: A process-product study in fourth grade mathematics classrooms. Journal of Teacher Education, 28(3), 49-54.

Goodlad, J. (1990). Teachers for our nation's schools. San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Green, R. L. (1998). Nurturing characteristics in schools related to discipline, attendance, and eighth grade proficiency scores. American Secondary Education, 26(4), 7-14.

Greenlee, A.R., & Ogletree, E.J. (1993). Teachers' attitudes toward student discipline problems and classroom management strategies. Chicago Public Schools, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 364 330).

Gump, P. (1982). School settings and their keeping. In Duke, D. (Ed.), Helping teachers manage classrooms. (pp. 98-114). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Guyton, E., Paille, E., & Rainer, J. (1993). A collaborative field-based teacher education program. Action in Teacher Education, 15(3), 7-11.

Halford, J.M. (1998). Easing the way for new teachers. Educational Leadership, 55(5), 33-36.

Hargreaves, D. (1975). Interpersonal relations and education (rev. ed.). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Haroun, R., & O'Hanlon, C. (1997). Do teachers and students agree in their perception of what school discipline is? Educational Review, 49(3), 237-251.

Hart, P.M., & Rowley, J.B. (1997). Becoming a star teacher: Practiced strategies and inspiration for K-6 teachers. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 414 269).

Hartwig, E.P., & Ruesch, G. M. (1994). Discipline in the school. Horsham, PA: LRP Publications.

Hastings, N., & Schwieso, J. (1995). Tasks and tables: The effects of seating arrangements on task engagement in primary classrooms. Educational Research, 37(3), 279-291.

Hawkins, D. L. (1997). It's more than teaching history. Social Studies, 88(3), 108-112.

Hedges, L.E. (1997). Anticipation and preparation: A teacher's survival guidebook. Columbus, OH: Agricultural Education Curriculum Materials Service.

Hocutt, A. (1996). The effectiveness of special education: Is placement the critical factor? Monographs of the Center for the Future of Children, 56. Las Altos, CA: Lucile Packard Foundation.

Howard, D. L. (1995). An air of expectation: Hints for effective classroom management. The Vocational Education Journal, 70(1), 17-18.

Hoy, W.K. (1967). Organizational socialization: The student teacher and pupil comparison ideology. Journal of Educational Psychology, 61, 153-155.

Hoy, W. K., & Woolfolk, A.E. (1990). Socialization of student teachers. American Educational Research Journal, 27, 279-300.

Huberty, C. J. (1987). On statistical testing. Educational Researcher, 16(8), 4-9.

Huck, S.W., Cormier, W.H., & Bounds, W.G. (1974). Reading statistics and research. New York: Harper & Row.

Idaho State Department of Education. (August 1994). Beginning educator handbook: A resource for first year educators. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 409 310).

Ingersoll, G. M. (1976). Assessing in-service training needs through teacher responses. Journal of Teacher Education, 27, 169-173.

Jackson, C.D. (1999). A view from the top on collaboration: School administrators' perspectives on a field-based teacher education program. Education, 119(3), 431-438.

Jacobson, L. (2000). Most Georgia legislators survive bid to oust them over school law. Education Week, 20(11), 20-22.

Johnson, V. G. (1994). Student teachers' conceptions of classroom comparison. Journal of Education Research, 88(2), 109-117.

Jones, F. H. (1987). Positive classroom instruction. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Jones, V. F. (1989). Classroom management: Clarifying theory and improving practice. Education, 109(3), 330-339.

Kagan, D. M. (1992). Professional growth among preservice and beginning teachers. Review of Educational Research, 62, 129-169.

Kaplan, C. H., & White, M.A. (1980). Children's direction-following behavior in grades k-5. Journal of Educational Research, 74(1), 43-48.

Kearney, P., & Plax, T. (1987). Situational and individual determinants of teachers' reported use of behavior alteration techniques. Human Communication Research, 14(2) 145-166.

Kearney, P., Plax, T., Sorenson, G., & Smith, V. (1988). Experienced and prospective teachers selections of compliance-gaining messages for "common" student misbehaviors. Communication Education, 37, 151-164.

Kelly, J. (1997, March). Effects of traditional and professional development school preservice training models on teacher attrition after three years. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Kelly, J. L., & Kelly, M.J. (1985). The successful elementary teacher. Lanhan, MI: University Press of America.

Kolb, K., & Jussin, L. (1994). Teacher expectations and underachieving gifted children. Roeper Review, 17, 26-30.

Kounin, J. (1970). Discipline and group management in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Kounin, J. S. (1977). Discipline and group management in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Kounin, J., & Gump, P. (1974). Signal systems of lesson settings and the task related behavior of preschool children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 66, 554-562.

Kritsonis, W.A., & Adams, S. (1986). School discipline the art of survival. Baton Rouge, LA: Land and Land.

Labonty, J., & Danielson, K. E. (1988). Effective teaching: what do kids say? Clearing House, 61, 394-398.

Lasley, T. J. (1994). Teacher technicians: A "new" metaphor for new teachers. Action in Teacher Education, 16(1), 11-19.

Lasley, J., Matczynski, T., & Williams, J. (1992). Collaborative and noncollaborative partnership structures in teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 43(4), 257-261.

Latz, M. (1992). Preservice teachers' perceptions and concerns about classroom management and discipline: A qualitative investigation. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 3, 1-4.

Lavay, B., French, R., & Henderson, H. (1997). Positive behavior management strategies in physical education. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Letts, N. (1995). What do we mean by bad behavior? Teaching PreK-8, 61-62.

Levin, J., Hoffman, N., & Badiali, B. (1985, April). Positive and negative experiences during student teaching experience. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Chicago.

Lieberman, A. (1992). School/university collaboration: A view from the inside. Phi Delta Kappan, 74(2), 147-156.

Lindgren, H. (1972). Educational psychology in the classroom (4th ed.). New York: Wiley.

Lortie, D. (1975). School teacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Magliaro, S., Wildman, T., Niles, J., McLaughlin, R., & Ferro, S. (1989, April). Modeling the transition from novice to expert: A three-year study of teacher problem solving. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 261 999).

Martin, N., & Baldwin, B. (1994, January). Beliefs regarding management style: Differences between novice and experienced teachers. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Southwest Educational Research Association, San Antonio, TX. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 387 471).

Martin, N. K., & Baldwin, B. (1996). Helping beginning teachers foster healthy classroom management: Implications for elementary school counselors. Elementary School Guidance & Counseling, 31(2), 106-113.

McDaniels, G.L. (1998). Teacher of teachers: Are they out of touch? Curriculum Administrator, 33(6), 26-27.

McGarity, J.R.,Jr., & Butts, D. P. (1984). The relationship among teacher classroom management behavior, student engagement, and student achievement of middle and high school science students of varying aptitude. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 21, 55-61.

Mendler, A. (1985, January). High standards for effective discipline. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, New Orleans. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 254 956).

Metropolitan Life Insurance Company. (1984). The Metropolitan Life survey of the American teacher. New York: New York Metropolitan.

Mishra, A.K. (1992, May). Dealing with disruptive classroom behavior. Unpublished manuscript, Red Deer College, Red Deer, Alberta, Canada. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. Ed 348 084).

Montague, M. (1997). Using prevention strategies in general education. Focus on Exceptional Children, 29(8), 1-12.

Montgomery, K. (1997). Student teacher portfolios: A portrait of the beginning teacher. Teacher Education, 32(4), 216-225.

Moore, W.L., & Cooper, H. (1984). Correlations between teacher and student background and teacher perceptions of discipline problems and disciplinary techniques. Psychology in the Schools, 21, 386-392.

Mosdowitz, G., & Hayman, M.L. (1976). Success strategies of inner-city teachers: A yearlong study. Journal of Educational Research, 69(8), 283-289.

National Goals for Education. (1990). Washington, DC: Department of Education.

Norusis, M.J. (1998). SPSS 8.0 guide to data analysis. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Novelli, J. (1993). Better behavior for better learning. Instructor, 103(1), 74-79.

O'Connor, J. (1995, January). You're in charge – and don't let them forget it: Maintaining classroom discipline in British schools. Times Educational Supplement, (4098), A 29.

Page, J.A., & Page, F. M., Jr. (1981). Pre-service and in-service teachers' perceptions of the teaching profession. Statesboro, GA: GA Southern College, Department of Elementary Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 213 671).

Palardy, J.M. (1993). Classroom discipline: The diagnostic approach. Streamlined Seminar, 11(6), 1-4. Alexandria, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals.

Palmer, M.T., & Simmons, K.B. (1995). Communicating intentions through nonverbal behavior: Conscious and nonconscious encoding of liking. Human Communication Research, 22, 128-160.

Perry, F., & Taylor, H. (1982). Needed: A methods course in discipline for preservice teachers. Education, 102, 416-419.

Pilarksi, M.J. (1994). Student teachers: under prepared for classroom management? Teaching Education, 6(1), 77-80.

Plax, T. G., Kearney, P., & Tucker, L.K. (1986). Prospective teachers use of behavior alteration techniques on common student misbehaviors. Communication Education, 35, 32-42.

Porter, R. (1983, March). Classroom management. Unpublished manuscript, Macquarie University, North Ryde, Australia. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 243 577).

Powell, K. T., & Weaver, E. M. (1993). Perceptions of characteristics in two teacher education programs. Milledgeville, GA: School of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 355 223).

Purcell, T. D., & Seifert, B.B. (1982). A tri-state survey of student teachers. College Student Journal, 16, 27-29.

Rademacher, J.A., & Callahan, K. (1998). How do your classroom rules measure up? Intervention in School & Clinic, 33(5), 284-290.

Ralph, E. (1982). The unmotivated second-language learner: Can students' negative attitudes be changed? The Canadian Modern Language Review, 38, 493-502.

Ralph, E. G. (1989). Research on effective teaching: How it can help L2 teachers motivate the unmotivated learner? The Canadian Modern Language Review, 46(2), 135-146.

Ralph, E. G., Keston, C., Lang, H., & Smith, D. (1998). Hiring new teachers: What do school districts look for? Journal of Teacher Education, 49(1), 47-56.

Rancifer, J. (1993, October). Effective classroom management: A teaching strategy for a maturing profession. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 364 541)

Ratliffe, T. (1987). Overcoming obstacles beginning teachers encounter. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, 58, 18-53.

Reed, D. (1989). Student teacher problems with classroom discipline: Implications for program development. Action in Teacher Education, 11(3), 59-65.

Repp, A., Barton, L., & Brulle, A. (1982). Naturalistic studies of retarded persons V: The effects of staff instructions on student responding. Applied Research in Mental Retardation, 3(1), 55-65.

Reynolds, M. C., & Birch, J. W. (1988). Adaptive mainstreaming: A primer for teachers and principals (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.

Rhone, E. (1992). Improving negative behavior in adolescent pupils through collaborative initiatives. Unpublished manuscript, Nova University, Fort Lauderdale, FL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 346 418).

Rickman, L., & Hollowell, J. (1981). Some causes of student teacher failure. Improving College and University Teaching, 29, 176-179.

Rifkind, L.J., & Harper, L.F. (1993). Competent verbal and nonverbal cross gender immediacy behaviors. CUPA Journal, 44(2), 41-54.

Rose, L.C., & Gallup, A.M. (1999). The 31st annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 81(1), 41-57.

Rose, M. (1998). So much to do, so little time: Preparations for setting up a classroom. Instructor, 108(1), 58-61.

Rosenshine, B.V. (1979). Content, time, and direct instruction. In P. Peterson & H. Walberg (Eds.), Research on teaching: Concepts, findings, and implications. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Rosenshine, B., & Stevens, R. (1986). Teaching functions. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed., 376-391). New York: Macmillan.

Rosenthal, R., & Jacobson, L. (1968). Pygmalion in the classroom: Teacher expectations and pupils' intellectual development. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Runyan, K., White, V., Hazel, L., & Hedges, D. (1998, February). A seamless system of professional development from preservice to tenured teaching. Paper presented to annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, New Orleans.

Sanford, J. P., Clements, B. S., & Emmer, E. T. (1983). Helping teachers with classroom management: Selected workshop activities. R & D # 6051, Austin: TX: Research and Development for Teacher Education.

Scheiske, M. & Deno, S. (1994). The effects of content-specific seminars on student teacher's effectiveness. Action in Teacher Education, 16(1), 20-28.

Schemo, D. J. (2001, January 24). Schoolbook balancing act. New York Times, p.1A.

Scherer, S. (1990, August 21). Teaching to learn. The Macon Telegraph, p.3B.

Shannon, I.L., & Bergdoll, C.B. (1998, February). ASEP: A model for professionalism in a successful post baccalaureate secondary certification program for career changers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher education, New Orleans.

Sheeler, K.K.H. (1996, November). Mentors in the classroom, not just someone who can show you to your office: A brief summary of the literature. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, San Diego.

Shockley, R., & Sevier, L. (1991). Behavior management in the classroom: Guidelines for maintaining comparison. Schools in the Middle, 1(2), 14-18.

Short, R.J., & Short, P.M. (1994). An organizational perspective on student discipline. Education, 114, 567-569.

Shrigley, R.L. (1985, March). Curbing student disruption in the classroom-Teachers need intervention skills. NASSP Bulletin, 69(479), 26-32.

Shultz, J., & Florio, S. (1979). Stop and freeze: The negotiation of social and physical space in a kindergarten/first grade classroom. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 10(3), 166-181.

Shumake, F. (1991). Innovative teacher education. Page One, (13)1, 4.

Sirontnik, K.A., & Goodlad, J. (Eds.). (1988). School-university partnerships in action. New York: Teachers College Press.

Skinner, B. F. (1982). Skinner for the classroom. Champaign, IL: Research Press.

Skinner, E., & Belmont, M. (1993). Motivation in the classroom: Reciprocal effects of teacher behavior and student engagement across the school year. Journal of Educational Psychology, 85, 571-581.

Smith, M.A., & Misra, A., (1992). A comprehensive management system for students in regular classrooms. The Elementary School Journal, 92, 351-371.

Smith, P.L. (2000). Georgia College & State University second annual progress report: Principals and actions for the preparation of educators for the school. Milledgeville, GA: John H. Lounsberry School of Education.

Stanford, S. C. (1993). Private measures of good teaching. Teaching of Psychology, 19(3), 133-136.

Starr, L. (1999, September). Speaking of classroom management: An interview with Harry K. Wong. Education World. [on-line]. Available FTP: http://education-world.com.a/a_curr161.html

Storey, K., Lawry, J.R., Ashworth, R., Danko, C.D., & Strain, P.S. (1994). Functional analysis and intervention for disruptive behaviors of a kindergarten student. Journal of Educational Research, 87, 361-370.

Strother, D. B. (1985). Practical applications of research: Classroom management. Phi Delta Kappan, 66(10), 725-728.

Taylor, T. (1876, March 18). Teacher leaves. The State Center Enterprise, p.1.

Tikunoff, W.J., Ward, B.A., & Dasho, S.J. (1978). Volume A: Three case studies (Report A78-7). San Francisco, Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Tsai, C.Y., & Denton, J. J. (1993). Reliability assessment of a classroom observation system. Journal of Classroom Interaction, 28(2), 23-32.

Tulley, M., & Chiu, L.H. (1995). Student teachers and classroom discipline. Journal of Educational Research, 88, 164-171.

Van Der Sijde, P. C., & Tomic, W. (1993). A model for classroom management activities. Education, 113(3), 439-449.

Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived needs of beginning teachers. Review of Educational Research, 54, 143-178.

Walker, H.M., Colvin, G., & Ramsey, E. (1995). Antisocial behavior in school: Strategies and best practices. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/ Cole.

Wang, M.C., Haertel, G.D., & Walberg, H.J. (1993). Toward a knowledge base for school learning. Review of Educational Research, 63(3), 249-294.

Weaver, E. M., Powell, K. T., Fields, J. S. (1994). Innovative teacher preparation programs [brochure]. Milledgeville, GA: School of Education.

Weber, W.A. (1986). Classroom management. In J.M. Cooper(Ed) Classroom teaching skills (3rd ed., p. 275).Lexington, MA: Heath.

Wesley, D.A., & Vocke, D.E. (1992, February). Classroom discipline and teacher education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Orlando, FL. (ERIC document Reproduction Service No. ED 341 690).

Willower, D., Eidell, T., & Hoy, W. (1967). Conceptual framework. The Pennsylvania State University Studies, 26, 3-8.

Wilson, B., & Ireton, E. (1997). Beginning teacher fears. Education, 117(3), 396-402.

Wolfgang, C.H., & Glickman, C. D. (1986). Solving discipline problems: Strategies for classroom teachers (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Wolpert, E. M., & Powell, K. T. (1990). Early childhood & middle grades education: An innovative plan for teacher preparation. [Brochure}. Milledgeville, GA: Department of Curriculum and Instruction, School of Education.

Wolpert, E.M., & Weaver, E. M. (1991). Field based teacher education. In Frank Lowney (Ed.), Regional teacher education center. Milledgeville, GA: Georgia College School of Education.

Wong, H., & Wong, R. (1998a). How to be an effective teacher: The first days of school. Mountain View, CA: Harry Wong Publications.

Wong, H, & Wong, R. (Producers). (1998b). The effective teacher. [An eight-part videotape series]. (Available from Harry K. Wong Publications, 1030 West Maude Avenue #507, Sunnyvale, CA 94086).

Woolfolk, A.E., & McCune-Nicolich, L. (1984). Educational psychology for teachers (2nd Ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Wright, R., O'Hair, M., & Alley, R. (1988). Student teachers examine and rate classroom discipline factors: Help for the supervisor. Action in Teacher Education, 10, 85-91.

Yenchko, A., & DeBeal, M.K. (1983, March). An innovative approach to discipline and management. Paper presented at the American Personnel and Guidance Association, Washington, DC (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. Ed 246 019).

Zeichner, K. (1992). Rethinking the practicum in the professional development school partnership. Journal of Teacher Education, 43(4), 296-307.

APPENDIX A

CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT

THE CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT OBERSEVATION INSTRUMENT

Purpose of the C-MOI

This instrument is designed to record teacher behaviors that have been identified by researchers as important for effective classroom instruction. The literature on classroom management reveals many variables that have been found to distinguish effective classroom managers from ineffective managers. It is these variables on which the C-MOI has been developed that have been consistently identified in studies involving classroom teaches kindergarten through grade twelve.

The intended use of the C-MOI is to provide the classroom teacher with nonsubjective data, which is reflective of the teacher behaviors exhibited. This means that the results will be nonevaluative and will not convey effective or ineffective practices. Instead, the data will reveal the frequency with which certain teacher behaviors are demonstrated and during which teaching situations, or contexts. In addition, behaviors will be recorded in the sequence in which they occur which may provide useful information in interpretation of the results.

The results obtained from this instrument will be useful to the classroom teacher in determining the extent to which classroom management teacher behaviors are used in his or her teaching, and during which teaching context. This information will be useful if the teacher has the desire to change certain classroom management behaviors. Repeated use of the C-MOI will allow the teacher to compare his or her own performance during specified teaching contexts to determine change in classroom management skills used.

Descriptions of Categories and Behavioral Indicators

The C-MOI consists of twelve classroom management categories which are coded on a given observation sheet. These categories have been determined by grouping similar teacher behavioral indicators. To ensure the categories maintain the spirit of the definition of classroom management, categories have been grouped into two domains:

1. Teacher behaviors that attempt to create and maintain a positive learning environment.
2. Teacher behaviors that attempt to restore the learning environment.

The categories in each domain and the behavioral indicators are:

Behaviors that create and maintain the learning environment

1. B – Uses established rules and procedures or identifies new parameters for student behavior

   Teacher behaviors that comprise this category consist of those that indicate to the students how they are to conduct themselves during the learning activities. The emphasis of these teacher behaviors is on establishing and maintaining guidelines for student behavior during the learning process. Depending on the lesson observed the teacher may state new rules or procedures, verbally review rules of procedures, and/or use verbal or nonverbal signals to remind students of preestablished rules. Specific examples of behavioral indicators for this category include, but are not limited to, are as follows: stating reference to cooperative learning group rules, using preestablished signals, such as lights out means quiet or stating “hands” meaning raise your hands, or establishing the procedure of when students are to move to a new center in the classroom. These teacher behaviors are proactive meaning the

teacher exhibits them prior to student misbehavior, and do not include reactive responses by the teacher to inappropriate behavior.

2. E – States objectives for student academic performance

Teacher behaviors that define this category are those which impart information to the student concerning what is expected of their academic performance. Unlike the first category on rules which emphasizes student behaviors to be demonstrated during the learning process, this category consists of teacher behaviors which reveal information to the students regarding academic expectations for student productivity. Some examples of teacher behaviors which define this category include, but are not limited to, are as follows: stating the lesson objective, referring to accountability measures such as "You need to have ten problems completed before lunch", or modeling an acceptable product such as a completed graph.

3. M – Monitors student behaviors

This category of behaviors refers to any means that the teacher uses to ensure that the students are working within the parameter set and are making progress in achieving the learning objectives. Teacher behaviors that fall into this category include, but are not limited to: teacher movement throughout the classroom, teacher question students about their independent progress, or recording student verbalizations while listening to small group discussions.

4. A – Acknowledges appropriate behavior

Teacher behaviors included in this category are those which project acceptance to the student that their behavior is pleasing or appropriate. Some examples of teacher behaviors in this category include, but are not limited to, are as follows: verbal praise

such as “good job” or “I like the way you wrote your name”, smiling after a student response, patting the student on the back, awarding secondary reinforcers such as stickers, or using adjacent reinforcement such as “I like the way Patty has her desk cleared and is ready to work.”

5. D – Accommodates for student differences

Teacher behaviors that define this category are those which project acceptance of individual learning differences. Although the observer may not be able to distinguish those behaviors which are planned and those which occur spontaneously, behaviors to be included in this category are those which allow for individual differences, and thus may mean customizing expectations. Also to be included are those behaviors which are evident of an aborted attempt to accomplish and objective. Specifically, teacher behaviors that belong in this category include, but are not limited to, the following categories: offering students choice of task or materials, aborting a step in the instructional process and reteaching a previously taught concept to the whole group, to a small group or to an individual who does not have the knowledge to complete the desired goal, or assigning different projects or tasks to selected groups of students.

6. P – Predicts student confusion and concerns

This category refers to teacher behaviors which demonstrate an awareness of concepts or procedures which are difficult for students to grasp. As a result of this awareness, the teacher has predicted problems areas and thus is prepared to provide students with visual or verbal examples, provide students with elaborate explanations, or has prepared materials to demonstrate the task or a particular process. These teacher actions are viewed to be planned if the teacher reveals the

planned examples or materials during the preconference or if the examples do not appear to occur as a result of teacher monitoring or student questioning behaviors. Behaviors included in his category should be consistent with the previously mentioned examples, but are not limited to them.

7. T – Demonstrates awareness of time

Teacher behaviors that define this category are those which reveal attempts on the part of the teacher to use the allotted instructional time effectively. Behavioral indicators in this category include, but are limited to: starting the lesson at the specified time, setting time limitations for task completion, using timing devices such as a stop watch or timer, or using a closure technique such as summarizing the main concepts in the lesson at the specified ending time.

8. R – Preparing for the lesson by readying the classroom and the students

Teacher behaviors included in this category are those which focus on preparing the class for instruction. Part of this preparation may include changing the physical arrangement of the classroom as a whole or just bringing forth specific materials or equipment that will be used in the lesson. The other element in the preparation process is the students. Teacher behaviors that attempt to focus student attention prior to the start of the lesson are included in the readying process. Ideally these behaviors should occur prior to instruction and will be coded only at that time, however, some less effective managers may demonstrate readying behaviors throughout the lesson. Determination of appropriate or inappropriate timing of readying behaviors may surface during the post conference. Behavioral indicators in this category include, but are not limited to, the following categories: teacher gathering materials or instructing students to retrieve materials,

displaying information on the blackboard that will be used during the lesson, bringing students to the front of the class to sit on the floor, requesting students attention using statements such as “All eyes her” or “I need your attention.” Focusing attention for the first time should be coded as a readying behavior, however, refocusing attention would be coded as a rehabilitating behavior.

Behaviors that restore the learning environment

9. I – Responds to inappropriate behavior

This category refers to any teacher behavior that projects an awareness of a student’s misbehavior. Examples of teacher behaviors in this category include, but are not limited to: glancing or staring at an off-task student, using proximity comparison by moving closer to an off-task student, verbally addressing a student concerning inappropriate behavior, requesting students to stop a behavior or imposing consequences.

10. C – Attempts to rehabilitate student by correcting inappropriate behavior

The teacher behaviors that comprise this category are those which attempt to rehabilitate the student by indicating to him/her the correct method of responding, or what behavior is acceptable. While acknowledging inappropriate behavior (category 9) signals to the child that their response is wrong, it does not tell them what response is acceptable. Rehabilitation involves getting the students back on track by providing them with an alternate behavioral choice. Examples of teacher behaviors in this category include, but are not limited to: stating what behavior is acceptable such as “I’ll call on only those students who are sitting quietly”, demonstrating the correct response such as showing a student an acceptable way to write his/her math problems on his/her homework sheet, reminding students of task at hand by saying

something like “We are all working with just on partner,” or refocusing student attention by stating “Let’s get back to work.”

Behaviors that are not recognized as classroom management skills

11. O – Other teacher behaviors

This category will include all other behaviors not identified by the previously named categories.

Types of Teaching contexts or Situations

Because the classroom management skills displayed by the teacher are often functions of the type of teaching situation occurring, it is important that teacher behaviors are not recorded in isolation. Therefore, observers will also need to identify the contest of the lesson as whole or in parts. The following types of teaching situations will be noted on the observation record:

1. Lecture
2. Discussion or recitation
3. Small group activity
4. Independent seatwork or study time
5. Transition activity

Procedures for Using the Instrument

Observers will record the teacher’s classroom management skills according to the codes outlined in the previous section. To indicate the occurrence of a particular teacher behavior, the observer will write the code letter on the observation sheet. Behaviors will be recorded from left to right on the observation sheet provided in an attempt to preserve sequence, which may be useful in interpretation of scores.

Additionally, observers must also note the teaching context in which the lesson is occurring. To identify the teaching context, the observer is asked to circle the number of the identified context and record the start time of the lesson segment. Any change of teaching context requires the observer to move to a new observation sheet, circle the new context, and record the start time of the new teaching segment. If the context does not change during the lesson, the observer is just asked to move to a new page when record spaces have been depleted on the first page. Observers are asked to make sure pages are numbered in order of use.

Observation Procedures

The observer should position him or herself where s/he can see the teacher, but as not to interfere with the lesson. Observation of the entire lesson should be conducted. Coding will occur each time the teacher behavior changes categories or every 15 seconds if the same behavior persists. For example the teacher may being the lesson by readying materials (R), followed by stating academic expectations (E). The first behavior is coded by R:R:R:R:R:R, because the teacher exhibited the behavior for 1 and ½ minutes, and then the coding continues E:E, because the teacher spent 30 seconds on telling the students the lesson objectives. Observers should utilize the observation record sheets provided for ease in coding.

C-MOI OBSERVATION RECORD SHEET

Page #______
Start Time_____
Number of Students _____

Type of Teaching Context:

1. Lecture
2. Discussion or recitation
3. Small group activity
4. Independent seatwork or study time
5. Transition activity

Behavioral categories

B – Rules for behavior
T - Time
P – Predicts
E – Academic expectations
D – Differences
C – Corrects
M – Monitors
R – Readying
O – Other
A – Acknowledges appropriate behavior
I – Acknowledges inappropriate behavior

Number of Students On Task

___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ________

___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ________

___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ________

___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ________

___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ________

___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ________

___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ________

___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ________

___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ________

APPENDIX B

HUMAN SUBJECTS' FORMS

Georgia's Public Liberal Arts University

Graduate School and Research Services
Office of Academic Research
Institutional Review Board
Campus Box 90
Milledgeville, Georgia 31061-0490
Phone (478) 445-0870
Fax (478) 445-0856
E-mail mdaugher@mail.gcsu.edu

January 23, 2001

Good luck with your project, Erin!

Ms. Erin Weaver
c/o Dr. Janet Fields
School of Education
Georgia College & State University
Milledgeville, Georgia 31061

Dear Ms. Weaver:

The proposal you submitted, The Impact of Formal Management Training on Beginning Teacher Effectiveness, has been granted approval with comments by the Georgia College & State University Institutional Review Board. You may proceed but are responsible for complying with the enclosed comments and all stipulations described under the Code of Federal Regulations 45 CFR 46 (Protection of Human Subjects). This document can be obtained from our web site at the following address:

http://Callisto.gcsu.edu/OIR/45_CFR_46.html

The approval period is for one year. After that time, an extension may be requested. It is your responsibility to notify this committee of any changes to the study or any problems that occur. You are to provide the committee with a summary statement. Please use the enclosed statement to request an extension, for reporting changes, or reporting the completion of your study.

Yours sincerely,

Martha Daugherty

Martha Daugherty, Ed.D.
Chair, IRB

Georgia College & State University
Office of Institutional Research
Institutional Review Board
Campus Box 090
Milledgeville GA 31061
(478) 445-0870
(478) 445-4574
http://callisto.gcsu.edu/OIR/OAR

REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF HUMAN SUBJECTS RESEARCH
Cover Form (97.9-3)
Student Form

Primary Investigator: _____Erin Weaver _____ Phone: 478-477-2275_____

Co-PI(s): _____ Phone: _____

_____ Phone: _____

_____ Phone: _____

Supervising Faculty Member: ___Dr. Janet Fields____ Phone: _445-4546_____

Department: ____School of Education_____

Title of Research Project: __The Impact of Formal Management Training on Beginning Teacher Effectiveness

****

[ ] **APPROVED AS IS** [X] **APPROVED WITH COMMENTS**

[ ] **DISAPPROVED** [ ] **REVIEW NOT APPLICABLE**

COMMENTS:

See consent form

****

Martha Daughtrey 1-22-01
Chair, IRB Date

Marion P. Rose, Ph.D. 01-17-01
Member, IRB Date

_____
Member, IRB Date

GEORGIA COLLEGE & STATE UNIVERSITY
REQUEST TO CONDUCT STUDIES WITH HUMAN SUBJECTS (IRB-Form 1) (97.91)

Use this form when submitting a new protocol or five-year renewal. Annual renewals for a previously approved protocol require "*Request to Renew Human Subjects Protocol (IRB-2)*" form. All information must be typed.

1. Protocol Title: The Impact of Formal Management Training on Beginning Teacher Effectiveness

2. Date Research will begin: January 29,2001 Date of expected completion: August 2001

3. Principal Investigator & Administrative Contact (individual responsible for completing paperwork):
   Name: Erin Weaver Email: WapelloBil@aol.com
   Phone: 478-477-2275 Campus Box or Mailing Address:
   Department/section: School of Education 811 Winchester Circle, Macon, GA 31210

4. Supervising Faculty (for student conducted research):
   Name: Dr. Janet Fields Email: jfields@mail.gcsu.edu
   Phone: 478-445-2514 Campus Box or Mailing Address:
   Department: Early Childhood

5. Associated Personnel
   Name: Email:
   Phone: Campus Box or Mailing Address:
   Department:

   Name: Email:
   Phone: Campus Box or Mailing Address:
   Department:

6. Sponsor (funding source): None

7. Location of Research (place an X in the brackets of all that apply):
   [X] Georgia College & State University
   [ ] Oconee Regional medical Center
   [ ] Northside Hospital
   [ ] Central State Hospital
   [ ] Georgia School for the Blind
   [ ] Other:
   [ ] River Edge Behavioral Health Center
   [ ] Medical Center of Central Georgia
   [ ] HCA Coliseum Hospital
   [ ] The Methodist Home
   [ ] Charter Hospital

8. Tissue only: [ ] Yes [X] No
(please note: discarded tissue – no identifying link to subject and/or no possibility of need of cell line waiver.)

9. Subject sex: [ ] Male [ ] Female [X] Both

10. Subjects' age: [ ] Infant/Toddler (0-2 years) [ ] Child (3-12 years) [ ] Adolescent (13-19 years)
    [X] Adult (20+ years) [ ] Geriatric (65+ years)

11. For initial submission, please note the expected number of subjects to be enrolled in the investigation:
    a. Total # of subjects included on-campus.
    b. Total # of subjects included off-campus.
    c. Total # of subjects included at all centers. 34

12. What type of study is proposed?

[ ] Survey	[ ] Retrospective (case-control)	[ ] Community Intervention
[ ] Pilot Study	[ ] Cohort (longitudinal) study	[ ] Laboratory Experiment
[ ] Clinical trial	[x] Multi-center investigating	[ ] Program/policy study
[ ] Cross-sectional	[ ] Compassionate use	

[ ] Other: _____

13. Keywords (used to describe the research in this protocol): _Comparison Classroom Management Beginning Teachers Quasi-experimental, Pretest-Post-test

14. I certify that this protocol conforms to the OSHA/HHS guidelines for HIV/HBV occupational safety.

Cathrin Weaver 1/11/01

Signature of Principal Investigator Date

15. Description of the Research (provide sufficient detail):

a. Statement of the problem:

The problem of the study was to determine if a formal educational intervention unit in classroom management would improve the classroom management skills of beginning early childhood education teachers.

b. Data collection methods:

_____Trained data collectors will observe the beginning teachers early in their teaching experience. The data collectors will use the C-MOI for collecting the data. The data collectors will also be the student's student teaching supervisor. The data collector will quietly enter the classroom and complete the fifteen-minute observation.

Observers will record the teacher's classroom management skills according to the defined categories using a frequency count recording system. Additionally, observers will be

required to note the context of the lesson and also to indicate changes in context. The C-MOI is designed to not only yield an end count, but to preserve the sequence in which the behaviors occurred and to identify the context in which they occurred.

Behaviors will be coded at the rate at which they are observed. Coding will occur each time the teacher behavior changes categories, or every 15 seconds if the same behavior persists. The coding process will capture the frequency of the behaviors, the approximate duration of the behaviors, and the sequence and teaching context in which they occur. At three-minute intervals, the total number of students on task will also be recorded.

After the first set of data is collected, a one-day management workshop will be held at an off-campus location. The treatment will consist of a one-day (eight hour) management workshop. The experimental group of beginning teachers will watch eight videotapes of "The Effective Teacher" by Harry Wong publications. These tapes span a five hour time period.

"The Effective Teacher" videotapes by Harry and Rosemary Wong were developed to assist teachers. The tapes are each structured in the same way. The tape will begin with an oral motivational commentary. Next, there will be an opening that sets the tone of the videotape. During the actual video

presentation, Dr. Wong tells stories to accentuate the concepts that he wishes his audience to internalize.

Approximately six-weeks after the first observation, the same coder will observe all of their subjects again. Once again, a fifteen-minute observation will record the teacher's behaviors and the number of students on task will be recorded.

Data will be collected from the participants concerning their Praxis I score, their grade point average, their Praxis II score, their SAT/ACT scores, and the location of their cohort.

c. **Instruments to be used: (attach new or nonstandard ones, including researcher generated surveys.)**

Bowes (1997) at Pennsylvania State University developed the Classroom Management Observation Instrument in 1996. This instrument was designed **not** as a summative evaluation instrument, but as a systematic observation instrument to measure classroom management skills. This instrument provides feedback to teachers, their supervisors, and college preparation programs.

This instrument was designed to record teacher behaviors that have been identified by researchers as important for effective classroom instruction. The C-MOI consists of twelve classroom management categories which are coded on a given observation sheet. These categories have been determined by grouping similar teacher behavioral indicators. To ensure the

categories maintain the spirit of the definition of classroom management the categories were grouped into two domains consisting of teacher behaviors that attempt to create and maintain a good learning environment and teacher behaviors that attempt to restore the learning environment.

All of the coders will be trained using videotapes in the Classroom Management Observation Instrument.

Method of recruitment of participants: (send in any advertisements)

I will ask for participants from the Early Childhood Milledgeville and Macon cohorts that will be student teaching during spring semester 2001.

d. Incentives, follow ups, compensation to be used:

Personal growth

e. Detail stress, psychological, social, legal, or physical harm that might occur to participants. How are these held to the absolute minimum? What remediation is offered?

None.

f. Benefits of the research: University policy requires that any risk associated with participation be outweighed by potential benefits to participants and to humankind in general.
   a. Identify any benefits to participants resulting from this research:
   Classroom management is the number one problem stated by beginning teachers and their principals in a 1996 survey of Georgia principals and their beginning teachers. Classroom management is also the number one indicator of student achievement according to Wang (1993). If classroom management can be improved, so can student achievement. The beginning teachers will enjoy their new career more and are more apt to stay in this profession if they have better control of their classrooms.

   b. Identify any benefits to humankind in general resulting from this research:
   Student achievement will benefit if beginning teachers can improve their classroom management.

g. Consent Forms: How will legally effective informed consent be obtained from all participants (or their parent(s) or guardian(s))? **Include** form(s) to be used. (A model for appropriate informed consent is available at the IRB website or can be obtained through CBX 090.) If deception is necessary, please justify, and describe and submit debriefing procedures.

The student teachers will have the opportunity to participate in this one-day classroom management workshop. The control group will be offered the same workshop once the data has been collected.

h. Minors and others: If minors or other vulnerable participants are involved, please outline procedures to be used in obtaining their agreement (assent) to participate, in addition to the consent of the parent(s) or guardian(s). An assent agreement, similar to informed consent, must be obtained from children and adolescents ages 12-18 years.

i. Future Risk: How are all participants protected from the potentially harmful future use of the data collected in this research? Describe measures planned to ensure anonymity or confidentiality. If audio or videotapes are used, when will they be erased?

No names will be used at anytime. The researcher will not be the data collector…she will not be given the full names of any of the participants. This study will not harm the student's grade during student teaching.

j. Illegal Activities: Do the data to be collected relate to illegal activities? If so, please explain.

NO

16. Signature Page: By signing below, you agree that you have read the University's "Assurance of Compliance with HHS…Excerpts" and agree to provide proper guidance of this research to ensure that the rights and welfare of the human participants ("subjects") are protected. You also agree to submit significant changes in procedures and/or instruments to the Institutional Review Board for prior approval.

Signature of Principal Investigator	Date
Signature of Student Investigator (if applicable)	1/11/01 Date
PI's Department Chair	Date
Co-Investigator Department Chair (if different from PI)	Date

17. For research conducted by student or non-faculty staff:
This research involving human participants, if approved, will be under my direct supervision.

Janet Fields	Janet Fields	1-11-01
Name of Faculty Advisor (type or print)	Signature (original signature only)	Date

Put on GCSU letterhead - or School letterhead

CONSENT FORM

I, _____
Please print your name

Agree to be a participant in the research titled The Impact of Formal Management Training on Beginning Teacher Effectiveness, which is being conducted by *Erin Weaver*, who can be contacted at *478-477-2275*. I understand that this participation is entirely voluntary; I can withdraw my consent at any time and have the results of the participation returned to me, removed from the experimental records, or destroyed.

The following points have been explained to me:

1.) The purpose of this study is to compare the management skills of beginning teachers who have attended a one-day classroom management workshop and participated in the follow-up activities with beginning teachers who have not attended a one-day classroom management workshop.
2.) The procedures are as follows: You will be asked to fill out a data sheet. You will not list your name on the data sheet. Therefore, the information gathered will be completely anonymous. You will be asked to sign two of these consent forms. One form will be returned to the investigator and the other consent form will be kept for your records. ~~The consent forms will be placed in one box and the data forms will be placed in a separate box. You may shuffle all forms in either box to insure complete anonymity~~.) unless you are really going to do this.
3.) You may find that many questions are invasive or personal. If you become uncomfortable answering any questions, you may cease participation at that time. No discomforts or distresses will be faced during this research.
4.) No physical, psychological, social or legal risks exist in this study.
5.) The results of this participation will be anonymous and will not be released in any individually identifiable form without my prior consent unless required by law.
6.) The investigator will answer any further questions about the research (see above phone number).
7.) In addition to the above, further information, including a full explanation of the purpose of this research will be provided at the completion of the experiment.

Erin Weaver _____ 1/11/01 _____
Signature of Investigator Date

_____ _____
Signature of Participant Date

Research at Georgia College & State University, which involves human participants, is carried out under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board. Questions or problems regarding these activities should be addressed to Dr. Kenneth Jones, Dean of the Graduate School & Research Services, Campus Box 73, Georgia College & State University, Milledgeville, GA 31061. 478-445-1228

DATA SHEET

LOCATION OF COHORT_____

PRAXIS I SCORES: MATH_____

READING_____

WRITING_____

SAT/ACT SCORES: VERBAL_____

MATH_____

TOTAL_____

GRADE POINT AVERAGE AT THE BEGINNING OF STUDENT TEACHING: _____

PRAXIS II SCORES: Test of General Knowledge_____

Test of Communication Skills_____

Test of Professional Knowledge_____

GEORGIA COLLEGE & STATE UNIVERSITY
THE JOHN H. LOUNSBURY SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Office of the Dean
Campus Box 70
Milledgeville, Georgia 31061-0490
Phone (912) 445-4546
Fax (912) 445-6582

CONSENT FORM

I, _____
Please print your name

Agree to be a participant in the research titled The Impact of Formal Management Training on Beginning Teacher Effectiveness, which is being conducted by *Erin Weaver*, who can be contacted at *478-477-2275*. I understand that this participation is entirely voluntary; I can withdraw my consent at any time and have the results of the participation returned to me, removed from the experimental records, or destroyed.

The following points have been explained to me:

1.) The purpose of this study is to compare the management skills of beginning teachers who have attended a one-day classroom management workshop and participated in the follow-up activities with beginning teachers who have not attended a one-day classroom management workshop.
2.) The procedures are as follows: You will be asked to fill out a data sheet. You will not list your name on the data sheet. Therefore, the information gathered will be completely anonymous. You will be asked to sign two of these consent forms. One form will be returned to the investigator and the other consent form will be kept for your records. The consent forms will be placed in one box and the data forms will be placed in a separate box. You may shuffle all forms in either box to insure complete anonymity.
3.) You may find that many questions are invasive or personal. If you become uncomfortable answering any questions, you may cease participation at that time. No discomforts or distresses will be faced during this research.
4.) No physical, psychological, social or legal risks exist in this study.
5.) The results of this participation will be anonymous and will not be released in any individually identifiable form without my prior consent unless required by law.
6.) The investigator will answer any further questions about the research (see above phone number).
7.) In addition to the above, further information, including a full explanation of the purpose of this research will be provided at the completion of the experiment.

Erin Weaver _____ 1/11/01 _____
Signature of Investigator — Date

_____ 1/22/01 _____
Signature of Participant — Date

Research at Georgia College & State University, which involves human participants, is carried out under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board. Questions or problems regarding these activities should be addressed to Dr. Kenneth Jones, Dean of the Graduate School & Research Services, Campus Box 73, Georgia College & State University, Milledgeville, GA 31061. 478-445-1228

APPENDIX C

PERSONAL COMMUNCIATION ADDRESSES

PERSONAL COMMUNICATION ADDRESSES

Dr. Jan Kettlewell

Associate Vice Chancellor

P-16 Initiatives

270 Washington Street, SW

Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Dr. Kathryn Powell

Retired, Associate Assistant Dean

Georgia College & State University

104 Live Oak Lane, NE

Milledgeville, Georgia 31061

Dr. Edward M. Wolpert

Dean Emeritus

Georgia College & State University

225 East Ponce de Leon Avenue, # 329

Decatur, Georgia 30030=3446