Central Washington University

ScholarWorks@CWU

1968

An Analysis of Teachers' Perceptions of Classroom Management

Edward A. Anderson
Central Washington University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd

Part of the Educational Methods Commons, and the Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons

Recommended Citation

AN ANALYSIS OF TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS

OF CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

———————

A Thesis

Presented to

the Graduate Faculty

Central Washington State College

———————

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Education

———————

by

Edward A. Anderson

July 1968

APPROVED FOR THE GRADUATE FACULTY

_____

Roy F. Ruebel, COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

_____

Conrad H. Potter

_____

Donald G. Goetschius

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS USED

I. INTRODUCTION

Teachers and administrators lack general agreement concerning what constitutes good classroom management. The authoritarian approach lives next door to the democratic with laissez faire just across the hall. Educators diligently seek solutions to problems and ways to counter the complexities inherent in the general area of classroom management.

The beginning teacher enters the classroom for which he has prepared and to his dismay finds that all of his students are not equally enthusiastic about acquiring knowledge. The degree of motivation to learn varies considerably among students in any given classroom. The teacher readily observes that he cannot teach until a learning situation is established. The classroom management factor becomes more dominant as he realizes that his ability to manage the classroom and direct learning situations will be reflected in the evaluation of his work by his administration. Nervous tension, created by the lack of experience, brings the beginning teacher to his associates for help. The experienced teacher or administrator

can only give advice as to methods of classroom management that have proven successful for others. This dilemma has been a significant contributing factor in many beginning teacher failures.

The Wyoming Education Bulletin (16:5) related:

The poor misguided beginning teacher starts his career with the concept that the children, by themselves, can do no wrong; only the ineptitude of the teacher will cause difficulties. Thus, by the end of the first semester the teacher is miserable, a mass of frustrated nerves, and thoroughly convinced he is a complete wash-out.

Trygve Blix (5) stated:

The failure of beginning teachers is seldom due to a lack of subject matter knowledge. It is most often due to the teacher's inability to control the classroom and a lack of good human relations with students, colleagues and parents.

Another observer (16:1) reported:

Usually the young teacher begins a career very well equipped with knowledge of subject matter, but painfully deficient in knowledge of group control and discipline. Logically, control and discipline MUST precede dissemination of subject matter; a learning atmosphere must be established in the classroom before learning itself can occur.

A majority of educators will agree in principle with the above statements. There is, however, limited observation and experimental evidence to substantiate them.

II. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. The purpose of this study

was twofold: (1) to compile data supplied by educators of
the Tacoma Public School District who responded to ques-
tionnaires designed to report information related to class-
room management; and (2) to analyze the above mentioned data
in an effort to determine how beginning teachers perceive
classroom management practices and procedures, and to note
changes of practice during initial teaching experiences.

The hypotheses were: (1) there are no significant
differences between beginning teachers' perceptions of class-
room management prior to, and after seven months' experience,
(2) there are no significant differences between beginning
and experienced teachers' perceptions of classroom manage-
ment, and (3) there are no significant differences between
beginning teachers' and administrators' perceptions of
classroom management.

Importance of the study. To gain insight into
teachers' perceptions of classroom management and to assess
the extent and scope of perceptual change is deemed important
to the profession.

III. DEFINITION OF TERMS USED

Beginning teachers. Beginning teachers are indi-
viduals who have never been gainfully employed as class-
room teachers.

Experienced teacher. For the purpose of this study,
experienced teacher refers to those having completed five
or more years of classroom teaching.

Administrator. An administrator is principal or
assistant principal of an educational unit.

Levels. Reference is made to the instructional
levels; elementary, junior high school and senior high
school. The elementary level consists of kindergarten
through grade six, junior high school grades seven through
nine, and senior high school grades ten through twelve.

Pre-test. Pre-test identifies the questionnaire
completed by beginning teachers prior to classroom experi-
ence.

Post-test. Post-test identifies the identical ques-
tionnaire mentioned above but completed by beginning
teachers after seven months classroom experience.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

I. INTRODUCTION

Literature related to teachers' perceptions of
classroom management was limited. This field of inter-
personal perception, however, is relatively new. The act
of seeing one's self as seen by another, or having one's
behavior conditioned by the way in which another perceives
of the perceiver is in need of empirical studies to gain
insight and understanding in the field of interpersonal
perception.

Fiedler (22:234) stated:

    . . . the field of interpersonal perception has at
    present neither a well-substantiated body of theory or,
    in fact, generally accepted axioms and definitions of
    terms.

A body of theory in the field of interpersonal per-
ception is dependent upon studies of perceptual processes
in which persons view other persons. Studies in "pure" or
"object" perception may be helpful, but the most fruitful
studies should be in relation to how perception conditions
behavior.

Tagiuri and Petrullo (22:22) indicated:

    Studies of perception . . . should always have at
    the forefront the relationship of the perceptual act
    under consideration to some other aspect of the social
    behavior of the perceiver. Our argument is that in

the long pull, the helpful empirical studies are those that specifically tie a perceptual act to other aspects of behavior.

An analysis of teachers' perceptions of classroom management was a study of perception as it related to behavior. This review of literature will therefore present materials that may be helpful in understanding perception and how it relates to conditioning behavior.

II. PERCEPTION

As previously stated, there are two areas of perceptual inquiry. The first of these is "pure" or "object" perception, and the other is "interpersonal perception." The first part of this review of related literature will be directed toward an understanding of the processes of "pure" perception.

Pure perception. Sources indicated that the perceptual process is one in which sensations are given meaning. McCandless (21:15) reported: "By perception, then, is meant awareness of sensory stimuli, attention to them, and attachment of meaning to them."

Another source (9:109) stated:

Sensations are experienced when a sense organ such as the eye, ear, or skin is acted upon by some form of stimulus such as light, sound, or pressure. The stimulus acts upon nerve endings called receptors. When a receptor is stimulated, a message called an impulse travels over a nerve fiber to the brain. The activity

in the brain, caused by the impulse from the receptor, results in a sensation. If the brain adds nothing from memory or understanding, the experience remains a sensation. If the brain adds something, the experience becomes a perception.

Van Dalen (23:49) defined perception as: " . . . the act of linking up what is sensed with some past experience to give the sensation meaning." Vernon (24:22) supported other sources and indicated: "The last essential stage of the perceptual process then is that of identification and understanding of meaning." Bartlett and Gemelli (24:23) suggested that this final stage of the perceptual process is naming.

Additional studies indicated that past experiences condition the perceptual meaning of sensations. Doob (11:82) stated: "In general, past experience almost always affects perception." And, the meaning attached to sensations may be an integral part of the perceiver. Van Dalen (23:49) reported: "Meanings are in men's minds rather than in the objects themselves." In support of Van Dalen, Doob (11:325) stated: "Judgments are made in advance of perceived facts and thus influence the actual perception of, and subsequent reaction to, those facts."

Other studies indicated that man perceives many objects that are relevant to his environment. Items such as the car, television, home, office, etc., fit into a pattern of living. Heider (22:22) called this "thing" perception and

indicated that the perception of such objects is so rapid
that the individual is not aware of the perceptual process.

Heider (22:22) stated:

In thing perception we see objects that have color,
that are placed with the surrounding space in a partic-
ular position, and that have functional properties which
make them fit . . . into our purposes.

Vernon (24:28) suggested that "thing" perceptions
can be placed in four categories. He, however, indicated
that "things" are objects, both real and representative,
symbols, shapes and patterns.

Vernon (24:28) listed:

1. Perception of real objects. The greater part
of the perceptions of ordinary every day life are con-
cerned with real objects.

2. Perception of representations of real objects
includes not only drawings and pictures such as are
familiar in ordinary every day life, but also a great
deal of the material which has been used in perceptual
experiments.

3. Perceptions of abstract shapes and patterns
include familiar abstract patterns of material used
for decorative purposes--for fabrics, tessellated pave-
ments, carved furniture, architectural ornaments, and
abstract paintings.

4. Perception of symbolic materials include geo-
metrical figures, diagrams, and written and printed
material.

In the development of these perceptual categories,
Vernon explained that perception of symbolic materials is
important to education. He indicated that the student's
ability to perceive the symbolic written or printed word may

be relevant to his academic success. Gage supported Vernon
in his assumption of the importance of perception in rela-
tion to education.

Gage (15:42) stated:

Perception is important to education both as means
and as end. One part of the learning process consists
of perceiving the specific cue for a specific response,
or acquiring more differentiated perceptions of stimuli;
hence, learning to perceive is prerequisite to all kinds
of learning. Perception of certain visual forms is a
means of learning to read.

Another source (24:35) related:

There are two factors of essential importance which
must be taken into consideration in studying the per-
ception of words. First, all words are primarily
speech units; the word as written and read derives
directly from the word as spoken, ... Secondly, the
perception of the word is not completed by a mere appre-
hension of its visual and auditory form or structure.
Because every word is a symbol, awareness of its mean-
ing necessitates at least some awareness of the idea or
experience it connotes.

Sources have helped to define the perceptual process
as it relates to "things" or "objects." They have suggested
that perception is the individual's ability to process sen-
sations and give them meaning as prescribed by the per-
ceiver's experience. They also suggested that perceptual
processes may be considered as fundamental to learning.

Interpersonal perception. Other source materials
suggested that interpersonal perception differs from pure
perception in that it is fundamental to social behavior.

They also suggested that the social behavior of the perceiver can be conditioned by social environment and by how the individual is perceived by society.

Heider (22:23) stated:

Let us assume that we enter an unfamiliar room for the first time and that in it we find a few people we have never met before. A glance around the room will suffice to get an approximately correct idea of the shape of the room and of the objects in it. We shall be much more insecure about our judgments of people. We may get a global first impression of them but we do not right away perceive the relevant properties of the social situation.

Another source (22:22) reported:

In contrast to things, persons are rarely mere manipulands; rather, they are action centers, they can do something to us, they can benefit or harm us intentionally, and we can benefit or harm them. Persons are perceived as having abilities, as acting purposefully, as having wishes or sentiments, as perceiving or watching us. They are systems having representations, they can be our friends or our enemies, and each has his characteristic traits.

Tagiuri and Petrullo (22:x) suggested that the perception of people, and in turn, the perceivee's perception of the perceiver and how this process conditions the behavior of both the perceivee and the perceiver is important to an understanding of interpersonal perception. They indicated that interpersonal perception is the observation of: " . . . intentions, attitudes, emotions, ideas, abilities, purposes, traits and events that are, so to speak, inside the person."

An example of these "inside the person" traits was

cited by Laing (18:27). "What I think you think of me reverberates back to what I think of myself, and what I think of myself in turn affects the way I act toward you." Another source (22:141) stated: " . . . people, when they are with other people, are preoccupied with the cognitive task of assessing each other's fundamental nature."

This task of assessing each other's fundamental nature may in part depend upon the perceiver's field of experience. Laing (18:4) indicated that his field of experience is: "filled not only by my view of myself (ego) and of the other (alter), but of what we shall call metaperspective--my view of the other's (your, his, her, their) view of me." MacLeod (22:45) stated: "The way in which we apprehend the other person is basic to the dynamics of interpersonal relations, to the group-structure of the world of people as we see it." And, another source (17:17) indicated: " . . . we often think that our perception of the world is the only possible one, that other people see the world the same way that we do."

Brain (7:47) supported the previous comments on perceptual self injection and suggested:

> . . . much of what we perceive is our own contribution to the perceptual object, and that our attitude to people may be influenced by emotional characteristics which we imagine them to possess, or which society confers upon them.

Van Dalen (23:51) suggested: "Perceptions are subject

to distortions because of the observer's emotions, motivations, prejudices, mental sets, sense of values, physical conditions and errors of inference."

Source materials indicated that interpersonal perception is not reliable. This lack of reliability appears to stem from the human elements, inside the person, so to speak. The individual's emotions and prejudices appear to condition the perceptual process.

Doob (11:70-83) reported on several perceptual studies that further substantiated the premise that perception can be conditioned by emotion and prejudice. One of the studies was conducted by Leuba and Lucas. The subjects were students in their early twenties, picked from a number of volunteers because of the ease with which they could be made to pass into the deepest stages of hypnosis. Each student was asked to describe photographs, chosen from current magazines, while under different induced hypnotic moods. The subjects completed their portion of the experiment at one sitting and independent of the others. The students were not aware of the experimenter's purpose. Each hypnotized subject was first placed, through verbal suggestion, in a "happy" mood. He was then asked to comment on each of the six pictures. After this, he was told to relax, close his eyes, and rest a while. The "happy" mood was removed and the subject brought back to his normal hypnotic

state. He was told that he would forget having seen the
pictures and what he had said about them. The subject was
then placed in a "critical" mood and underwent a similar
descriptive procedure. This method was also used to reveal
comments on the pictures from an "anxious" hypnotic mood.
The following is a protocol from one of the subjects as he
viewed the photograph of "young people digging in a swampy
area".

Induced hypnotic "happy" mood:

It looks like fun; reminds me of summer. That's
what life is for: working out in the open, really
living--digging in the dirt, planting, watching
things growing.

Induced hypnotic "critical" mood:

Pretty horrible land. There ought to be something
more useful for kids of that age to do instead of dig-
ging in that stuff. It's filthy and dirty and good
for nothing.

Induced hypnotic "anxious" mood:

They're going to get hurt or cut. There should be
someone older there who knows what to do in case of
accident. I wonder how deep the water is?

Doob (11:73) summarized the results of this study
by indicating:

It may be objected that hypnosis is a rather bizarre
phenomenon and that the "mood" in this experiment there-
fore had been artificially or "unnaturally" induced.
The "mood" or set, however, which affects perception
can be a stable part of the personality.

In a similar study, Harold M. Proshansky (11:74),
used unhypnotized male college students selected from two

institutions. The one group was known to be prolabor,

while the other markedly antilabor. They were asked to

write responses to pictures which had been judged to be

neither anti- or prolabor. The following are reactions of

two students to the same picture.

Student A:

Home of a man on relief--shabby--dresses poorly.
Scene is probably in a shack down south. Also might
be the home of some unemployed laborer. Horrible
housing conditions. Why don't the government pro-
vide for these people? The ordinary worker is always
forgotten and allowed to rot.

Student B:

Picture of one room, very messy, stove in the
center, woman on the left, man standing next to stove,
couple of children near them. This is a room of what
we call "poor people." They seem to be messy, sloppy
people, who seem to enjoy dwelling in their own trash.

Doob (11:75) concluded:

The reader does not need to be told that student A
was prolabor and student B antilabor. Each carried
within himself a different attitude. Each unwittingly
perceived the photograph in a manner which was deter-
mined by, and hence was congruent with, that attitude.

Smith (24:18) suggested that perceptual differences

may be due to the elements of attention and intelligence.

He agreed that the individual could pre-condition his per-

ception of given situations. He suggested, however, that

experience and emotional characteristics should not condition

perceptions of a disaster. Smith's basic procedure was to

interview subjects who had witnessed the same disaster. He

credited the differences in description to education and social background. Further, he suggested that differences in individual perceptions of a disaster may be caused by differences of attention. He reasoned that people of different intelligence and social background would direct their attention to different aspects of the disaster.

Vernon (24:255) stated:

It seems most probable that the individual carries with him into every perceptual situation, either in the laboratory or in normal life, his characteristic sensory abilities, intelligence, interests, and temperamental qualities. In so far as he may specifically relate any of these to that total perceptual situation, his responses will be coloured and to some extent determined by these inherent individual qualities.

Source materials have indicated that interpersonal perception is more complicated than attaching meaning to sensations. They have also stressed the importance of the perceiver's emotional characteristics, social background and intelligence to the interpersonal perception processes. Authorities agreed that interpersonal perception is a relatively new field of inquiry and that the many problems inherent in gaining insight may be remedied by continued empirical studies in how man perceives his environment.

III. RELATED STUDIES

The review of interpersonal perception literature did not reveal any studies similar in design or purpose to

an analysis of teachers' perceptions of classroom manage-
ment. The literature did, however, present examples of
interpersonal perception studies related to group effec-
tiveness.

Fiedler (22:243-256) reported on several studies of
interpersonal perception and group effectiveness. They
hypothesized that interpersonal relations within teams
determine in large measure the operating efficiency of the
groups. They further indicated that relevant aspects of
interpersonal relations could be measured through the use
of interpersonal perception tests, specifically, sociometric
measures and assumed similarity scores.

Fiedler (22:244) reported:

. . . a score which indicates the degree to which
one person perceives another as similar either to him-
self or to a third person may be generally predictive
of his relationships with others. The tendency to
assume another person to be similar was tentatively
interpreted as indicative of an accepting attitude on
the part of the perceiver. The perception of another
as dissimilar appeared to indicate a rejecting, psycho-
logically distant attitude.

One study, cited by Fiedler, on group effectiveness
used high school basketball teams as subjects. They hypoth-
esized that close relations among team members would be con-
ducive to winning many games. That is, they thought that
accepting psychologically close team relationships would be
therapeutic, that they would give team members security, and
that this security would help men in working together

effectively.

This sample consisted of fourteen teams, with from
nine to nineteen men on a squad. With the exception of two
squads, the teams had played no games at the time of test-
ing. Each player was asked to name the person with whom he
could play best, and the one with whom he could play least
well. Players were then asked to describe their most and
their least preferred co-worker. This helped to obtain a
number of sociometric measures as well as assumed similarity
scores. The criterion for team effectiveness was the pro-
portion of games the team had won by mid-season.

The results of this study were considered by the
experimenters to be significant. They were in the opposite
direction from those they had originally hypothesized. First
of all, the team's average assumed similarity did not corre-
late with the criterion; but the assumed similarity scores
of the team's most preferred co-worker--that is, the team's
informal leader, were negatively related to team effective-
ness. The better teams chose relatively distant, reserved
persons as leaders, poorer teams chose the more accepting
persons as informal leaders.

In another study Fiedler used twenty-two college
student surveying parties consisting of three to four men.
Similar background procedures were employed with this group
as in the previously mentioned study. This group, however,

was asked to fill out scale sheets, not for persons within their group but for anyone with whom they had ever worked very well, as well as for someone with whom they had had the most difficulty cooperating. The criterion for group effectiveness was the accuracy with which the assigned plots of land were mapped and measured. The results of this study on surveying parties cross-validated the basketball study findings.

Fiedler conducted similar group effectiveness studies on bomber combat crews, army tank crews, open-hearth steel shop crews and farm supply co-operatives.

In summarizing the results of group effectiveness studies, Fiedler suggested that it was fair to say that they had been generally successful in differentiating the effective and ineffective groups. They were able to show that interpersonal relations, as measured by the experimenters, were different in good and poor groups. They also summarized that they were still not as far as they would like to be, but the identification of the psychological distance variables in effective and ineffective leadership was probably a fair step forward.

Fiedler (22:256) stated:

Our studies do make clear that psychological distance between leaders and followers is an important determinant of group effectiveness and can be used for its prediction.

McCallon and Dumas (20:19-21) conducted a study in which they had forty-seven elementary teachers rate self, most desirable student to teach, and least desirable student to teach. They employed the same techniques and instruments used by Fiedler in previously cited studies.

The results revealed that teachers tend to perceive themselves more favorably than their least desirable student, and less favorable than their most desirable student on all twenty-four items included in the semantic differential scale.

Francke (12:166) proceeded from a theory of administration as a social process. It was hypothesized that meaningful relationships would be found between personal variables of teachers and the consensus among their perceptions of the locus of responsibilities for making instructional and administrative decisions. The population comprised 6,138 teachers and their administrators representing thirty-one Wisconsin school systems. A decision point analysis was used to elicit teachers' perceptions of persons in their school system primarily responsible for making decisions. Those who showed this responsibility, and indication of their own personality variables, beside certain biographical measures, also were assessed and intercorrelated. Among other significant findings, relationships between teachers' indications of primary and secondary decision-makers and

achievement drives, security, dominance, emotionality, social ability, and sex were noted.

The results of the study revealed that teachers higher than others in perceptual consensus were more frequently men, typically with more tenure, teaching experience, and recent formal study. This group liked making decisions that affected their own welfare.

Garrison (14) conducted a study of self concept and teaching in which an effort was made to design a system of testing and interviewing which would bring into some relationship the personal characteristics of college juniors and seniors enrolled in teacher education and the external or setting demands made on public school teachers. The forty participating students were enrolled in a two quarter sequence involving a study of educational psychology and methodology. Each student spent at least one-half day per week taking part in an elementary school classroom in the vicinity of the college. The students were divided into equal numbered control and sample groups. The sample group took the sixteen personality factors test and the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. They also volunteered to meet with the experimenter one hour per week for five or six weeks. The final input was a joint analysis of a video tape recording of the student's teaching performance in the elementary classroom to which he was assigned. The tests, video

tape and interviews were jointly analyzed by the experi-
menter and students. Results of the study concluded (14:4):

>The subjective evaluations of the students were
positive and demonstrated a high degree of enthusiasm.
Most students seemed convinced that their basic feel-
ings and attitudes were changing, and, from their point
of view, in a positive direction. Their reactions, on
the most part, tended to support behavioural outcomes
as manifested by the analysis of the video-tape.

Garrison (14:5) reflected on the results:

>Were the outcomes a function of some specific error
in the experimental design or did the feelings and per-
ceptions of the students involved actually undergo a
dramatic shift as suggested by the results?

Studies in interpersonal perception are varied and
directed toward and by the individual experimenter's pur-
pose. From these varied studies may emerge axioms that will
be helpful to a better understanding of interpersonal per-
ception.

IV. SUMMARY

Sources have indicated that past experience is prob-
ably the most dominant factor in the perceptual process.
People come to be ready to perceive their environment in
socially approved ways. They change as they mature, and for-
ever after when they are confronted with new or slightly new
situations to which they may make new or slightly new
responses. But a solid foundation from past experience
remains.

Perception, from the viewpoint of the socializing agencies of a society, may depend in large part on heavily reinforced preconceptions from the past. When the matter is reduced to its simplest elements, it may be said that an adult functions well or poorly, succeeds or fails, depending on the way he manages his behavior in terms of his perception of himself and the world around him, and on how his perceptions fit with those of the people among whom he lives. His sense organs and the meanings he gives to the sensations he receives may determine his consonance or dissonance with society.

CHAPTER III

QUESTIONNAIRE RELATED TO CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

I. DEVELOPMENT OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The literature revealed limited information and no samples of instruments designed to measure teachers' perceptions of classroom management. Several studies relating to administrator evaluation of teachers provided general ideas used in formulating questions for this study. Buell (8:12) listed three general problem areas along with six specific problem situations which stimulated thinking in the process of item selection.

Interviews with school personnel directors, teachers, and administrators, combined with personal observations and experiences, served as bases for constructing the questionnaire. It was generally agreed that information in the following areas relating to the ways teachers perceive classroom management should be sought: (1) To whom does the responsibility of classroom control belong? (2) What is the importance of disciplinary action in classroom situations? (3) How do personal attributes of the classroom teacher relate to classroom control?

The questionnaire was designed in three sections with a total of forty-one items. Each item had five possible

responses (1 2 3 4 5) and respondents were asked to indicate
their choice by circling a number representative of the
responses listed at the beginning of each questionnaire
section.

Questionnaire section A. Section A of the question-
naire (Appendix B) listed eighteen student-centered situ-
ations. The participants were asked to consider whether or
not the situation stated in the questionnaire would in fact
create a classroom problem and if corrective measures should
result, to whom should responsibility for this action belong?

The questionnaire provided five choices for each
situation. Respondents were asked to circle a number from
the choices listed below.

1. Immediate action should be taken by the teacher.
2. Deferred action should be taken by the teacher
   at a more appropriate time.
3. No action should be taken by anyone.
4. Deferred action should be taken by the prin-
   cipal, counselor, or parent at an appropriate
   time.
5. Immediate action should be taken by the prin-
   cipal.

Questionnaire section B. This section of the ques-
tionnaire (Appendix B) listed fifteen classroom situations
that could stimulate teacher concern. The respondent's per-
ception of each situation determined the degree of relative
importance to a disciplinary action. The respondent was
asked to circle the number representative of his perceived

degree of importance. The number values were: (1) unimpor-
tant, (2) slightly important, (3) moderately important, (4)
very important, and (5) extremely important.

Questionnaire section C. A third section of the
questionnaire related to eight teacher-centered situations.
The respondent was asked to indicate the relative importance
of listed situations to classroom management. The assigned
number values of importance were the same as in section B.

Instructions to the respondents. The questionnaire
title page (Appendix A) explained that the purpose of the
instrument was to determine how the beginning teacher per-
ceived classroom disturbances. What steps would the begin-
ning teacher take to curb disturbances, and what did he
believe constituted a classroom or school disturbance. In
answering the questionnaire, the respondent was asked to
relate only to the information contained in the question or
situation. Previous knowledge and circumstances surrounding
a situation would condition his response. For the sake of
reasonable validity in the study it was important that the
respondent accept circumstances given as factual situations
which could confront the teacher in initial experiences in
teacher-pupil relationships.

Personal information was supplied by the respondents
by indicating their sex, teaching level and years of experi-

ence. Space was provided for the respondent's name and assigned school to be completed at the option of the participant.

II. PARTICIPANTS IN THE STUDY

School district involvement. The Tacoma School District administrative officials examined the questionnaire and study proposal and granted permission to submit the questionnaire to appropriate members of the staff.

Beginning teacher pre-test. The study questionnaire was distributed to all beginning teachers during the district-wide new teachers' orientation meeting. They were instructed to complete the questionnaire and return it on the following day. Forty-one completed questionnaires were returned, representing a 63 per cent return. The sample group consisted of twenty-two elementary, thirteen junior high school and six senior high school beginning teachers.

Experienced teachers. One sampling rule for the judgment sampling selection of the experienced teacher group was that each teacher would have completed a minimum of five years of teaching.

This group included forty-two experienced teachers; twenty-two elementary, fourteen junior high and eight senior high school teachers. This represented an 84 per cent return

of questionnaires. The questionnaires were distributed by the building principal and returned through the mail.

Administrators. In the judgment sampling selection of the administrative group, the questionnaires were distributed and returned through the mail. Forty-seven completed questionnaires were returned, representing a 94 per cent return. This sampling group included twenty-five elementary, fourteen junior high school and eight senior high school administrators.

III. PROCEDURES

The beginning teachers completed the pre-test questionnaire before meeting their first class to eliminate the possibility of conditioning their response.

During the ensuing school year, the questionnaire was administered to two other groups. Questionnaires were completed by experienced teachers and administrators that met the stated sampling qualifications. The purpose for asking administrators and experienced teachers to respond to the questionnaire was to establish a measurable base which would be valuable in revealing recorded differences between the beginning teacher pre-test and post-test.

Seven months after the pre-test, the identical questionnaire was again administered to the beginning teachers.

The post-test was accomplished by mailing the questionnaire, with a pre-stamped return envelope, to qualified respondents. Forty-six beginning teachers; twenty-two elementary, sixteen junior high school and eight senior high school teachers responded to the beginning teacher post-test. This represented a 71 per cent return.

Scoring of the questionnaire. Questionnaire sections A, B, and C were scored individually. Scoring was accomplished by adding all number responses and dividing by the total number of situations in each section. This established individual mean scores for each section of the questionnaire. The mean scores were then related to continuum scales extending from one to five.

Explanation of five point scale. In section A, the choices moved from number one (teacher centered) to number five (principal centered). The teacher who perceived of himself as responsible in the questionnaire situations would select column one more often than the teacher who did not perceive of himself as responsible. Choice number two related to number one in that it was teacher centered. Number four related to choice five in that it was not teacher centered. Therefore, the teacher who perceived responsibility for the questionnaire situations would establish a lower mean score than the teacher who did not perceive responsibility.

The third column was used as a spacer between teacher cen-
tered and non-teacher centered responses.

Sections B and C were treated with this same gradual
shift of importance. A low mean score indicated the respon-
dent perceived little importance for disciplinary action
attached to the situations. A high mean score indicated
the respondent perceived more importance for disciplinary
action to the situations.

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS

Several methods were employed in the analysis of
raw data collected from the questionnaire and presented in
Appendix C, Tables V, VI, VII and VIII. Individual ques-
tionnaire items were tallied to determine mean scores for
each test section. The individual mean scores were com-
puted into sampling group mean scores. This computation
provided information useful in comparing the mean scores of
the various sampling groups. The sampling groups were sub-
divided into educational levels to provide still further
tables for comparison. Statistical computation of reported
data was made to determine significant difference, at the
.05 level, between sampling groups.

I. MEAN SCORES

The individual mean scores of questionnaire sections
A, B, and C were computed into group mean scores. Table I
shows the results of that computation.

The data shown in Table I provided evidence that
beginning teachers' perceptions of classroom situations
listed in the questionnaire had not changed appreciably. The
beginning teacher post-test mean scores of sections B and C
had changed only slightly from the beginning teacher pre-test

TABLE I

COMPUTED GROUP MEAN SCORES RELATED TO
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

Sample groups	N	Section A mean scores	Section B mean scores	Section C mean scores
Beginning Teacher Pre-Test	41	2.14	3.07	4.42
Beginning Teacher Post-Test	48	2.14	2.98	4.29
Experienced Teachers	42	2.25	2.85	4.33
Administrators	47	2.35	2.82	4.28

mean scores. It should be noted that this change was in a direction to more closely coincide with the mean scores established by the experienced teachers and administrators.

A second step in group mean scores involved dividing respondents according to teaching levels and comparing the data accordingly. This provided an opportunity to compare the elementary level pre-test mean score with the elementary level post-test, experienced teacher and administrative mean scores. This information was detailed in Table II.

Data in this category shows that participants at various teaching levels perceive classroom situations differently.

TABLE II

MEAN SCORES RELATED TO CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT ITEMS
ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF RESPONDENTS

Sample groups	Section A mean scores	Section B mean scores	Section C mean scores
Elementary Level			
Beginning Teacher Pre-Test	2.00	3.07	4.50
Beginning Teacher Post-Test	2.04	3.01	4.27
Experienced Teachers	2.13	2.79	4.34
Administrators	2.21	2.77	4.11
Junior High Level			
Beginning Teacher Pre-Test	2.23	3.14	4.24
Beginning Teacher Post-Test	2.22	2.94	4.31
Experienced Teachers	2.40	3.00	4.35
Administrators	2.42	2.81	4.41
Senior High Level			
Beginning Teacher Pre-Test	2.46	2.96	4.50
Beginning Teacher Post-Test	2.27	2.98	4.32
Experienced Teachers	2.32	2.70	4.25
Administrators	2.67	2.99	4.57

Section A mean scores indicated that elementary
level participants in the study perceived more teacher
responsibility for classroom management than the junior or
senior high school respondents. The senior high level mean
scores indicated that this group views questionnaire situ-
ations with less responsibility or tends to pass the respon-
sibility of dealing with classroom problem situations to

counselors or administrators. Participants from each level indicated that the building principal would like to be more involved in classroom management problems than the teacher groups think he should be.

Section B mean scores show that little perceptive change has occurred between the beginning teachers pre-test and post-test. The noted change was in the direction of coinciding with the mean score of the experienced teachers and administrators.

Section C indicated that the elementary and senior high school post-test participants perceived teacher personal traits as less important than they did in the pretest. The junior high school beginning teacher post-test revealed an increase of importance attached to teachers' personal traits.

Table II indicated that participants' reaction to the questionnaire situations was conditioned by the teaching level at which they were employed. Level mean score comparisons indicated slight trends. The trends, however, were so slight that they were considered negligible.

II. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

A statistical analysis of the raw data was made in an effort to determine if there was a significant difference between the various groups or levels studied. This

statistical analysis also served to determine whether or not
the scores reported by the beginning teacher post-test were
significantly different from those reported by the beginning
teacher pre-test.

Computer aid. The computer center of Central
Washington State College was used to expedite the statis-
tical analysis. The raw scores and identification mate-
rials were recorded on I. B. M. cards. This coding included
group identification, educational level, individual mean
scores for each section of the questionnaire and identifi-
cation of the individual respondent. From this recorded
material, computed mean scores, standard deviation, variance
and standard error for each teaching level and total sampling
groups was recorded. It was not pertinent to this study to
provide a table of these results. The results, however, were
essential for the computation of t-Test scores. Computed
t-Test comparisons between the various sampling groups are
reported by educational levels in Table III.

The formula for computing the t-Test scores was as
follows:

$$\frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\dfrac{S^2_1}{N_1} + \dfrac{S^2_2}{N_2}}}$$

Sampling groups shown in Table III are identified by numbers 1, 2, 3, and 4. Numbers were used to replace the lengthy titles that identify the respondents. Number 1 was equated to the beginning teacher pre-test; number 2 to the beginning teacher post-test; number 3 to the experienced teachers; and number 4 to the administrative sample. Significant difference, at the .05 level, was indicated by an asterisk. Blommers and Lindquist (6:516) provided the table used to determine significant differences.

Results of the t-Test comparisons reported in Table III indicated that four comparisons - all found in the elementary teaching level - produced significant difference. Significant difference was reported between the elementary level beginning teacher pre-test and experienced teacher responses to questionnaire section B. There were also three examples of significant difference reported between the elementary level beginning teacher pre-test and administrative responses. Further observation of Table III shows that there was no significant difference between the elementary level beginning teacher post-test and experienced teacher responses to section B. Change was noted between the elementary level beginning teacher post-test and administrative responses, to all three sections of the questionnaire. This suggested that the elementary level beginning teachers' perceptions of the questionnaire situations did change during

TABLE III

COMPUTED T-TEST COMPARISONS BY EDUCATIONAL
LEVEL OF RESPONDENTS ON A QUESTIONNAIRE
RELATED TO CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

Group identification			Group identification		Questionnaire section	T-Test results
Elementary level						
Group 1	with	Group 2			A	-.400
Group 1	with	Group 2			B	.381
Group 1	with	Group 2			C	1.212
Group 1	with	Group 3			A	-1.227
Group 1	with	Group 3			B	2.173*
Group 1	with	Group 3			C	1.364
Group 1	with	Group 4			A	-1.844*
Group 1	with	Group 4			B	1.960*
Group 1	with	Group 4			C	1.831*
Group 2	with	Group 3			A	-.804
Group 2	with	Group 3			B	1.591
Group 2	with	Group 3			C	-.370
Group 2	with	Group 4			A	-1.436
Group 2	with	Group 4			B	1.492
Group 2	with	Group 4			C	.592
Group 3	with	Group 4			A	-.682
Group 3	with	Group 4			B	.124
Group 3	with	Group 4			C	1.057
Junior high level						
Group 1	with	Group 2			A	-.173
Group 1	with	Group 2			B	1.100
Group 1	with	Group 2			C	-.546
Group 1	with	Group 3			A	-1.140
Group 1	with	Group 3			B	.740
Group 1	with	Group 3			C	-.901

(* Indicates significant difference at .05 level.)

TABLE III (continued)

Group 1	with	Group 4	A	-1.280
Group 1	with	Group 4	B	1.556
Group 1	with	Group 4	C	-1.200
Group 2	with	Group 3	A	-1.368
Group 2	with	Group 3	B	-.336
Group 2	with	Group 3	C	-.353
Group 2	with	Group 4	A	-1.516
Group 2	with	Group 4	B	.692
Group 2	with	Group 4	C	-.741
Group 3	with	Group 4	A	-.142
Group 3	with	Group 4	B	.874
Group 3	with	Group 4	C	-.501

Senior high level

Group 1	with	Group 2	A	.845
Group 1	with	Group 2	B	-.122
Group 1	with	Group 2	C	.713
Group 1	with	Group 3	A	.388
Group 1	with	Group 3	B	.671
Group 1	with	Group 3	C	1.141
Group 1	with	Group 4	A	-.712
Group 1	with	Group 4	B	-.111
Group 1	with	Group 4	C	-.373
Group 2	with	Group 3	A	-.190
Group 2	with	Group 3	B	.824
Group 2	with	Group 3	C	.253
Group 2	with	Group 4	A	-1.548
Group 2	with	Group 4	B	-.031
Group 2	with	Group 4	C	-.965
Group 3	with	Group 4	A	-.946
Group 3	with	Group 4	B	-.701
Group 3	with	Group 4	C	-1.420

the seven months of experience to more closely coincide with the reported perceptions of the elementary level experienced teachers and administrators.

Computations were made to reveal significant difference between the four total sampling group mean scores. It was assumed that since significant differences did occur between four of the elementary level comparisons, they may occur in the comparison of the total sampling groups. The results of that computation are presented in Table IV.

The assumption that significant differences may exist between the total sampling group mean scores was supported by the computation. Four comparisons produced significant differences. There was a significant difference reported between the beginning teacher pre-test and experienced teacher responses to section B of the questionnaire. There was, however, no significant difference reported between beginning teacher post-test and experienced teacher responses to section B. This indicated that the beginning teachers' perceptions of the importance of disciplinary action related to the questionnaire situations did change during the seven month period of experience to more closely coincide with the experienced teacher responses to section B.

Significant difference was reported between the beginning teacher pre-test and administrator responses to section B of the questionnaire. This significant difference

TABLE IV

COMPUTED T-TEST COMPARISONS OF TOTAL SAMPLING GROUPS
ON A QUESTIONNAIRE RELATED TO CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

Group identification		Group identification	Questionnaire section	T-Test results
Group 1	with	Group 2	A	-.026
Group 1	with	Group 2	B	.967
Group 1	with	Group 2	C	1.143
Group 1	with	Group 3	A	-1.181
Group 1	with	Group 3	B	2.150*
Group 1	with	Group 3	C	1.094
Group 1	with	Group 4	A	-2.242*
Group 1	with	Group 4	B	2.223*
Group 1	with	Group 4	C	1.096
Group 2	with	Group 3	A	-1.243
Group 2	with	Group 3	B	1.340
Group 2	with	Group 3	C	-.357
Group 2	with	Group 4	A	-2.372*
Group 2	with	Group 4	B	1.471
Group 2	with	Group 4	C	.081
Group 3	with	Group 4	A	-1.040
Group 3	with	Group 4	B	.213
Group 3	with	Group 4	C	.408

(* Indicates significant difference at .05 level.)

was not reported between the beginning teacher post-test and administrator responses to section B. Statistically, this indicated that the total group of beginning teachers did change their perception of the importance of disciplinary action to more closely coincide with the administrator responses to questionnaire section B.

A significant difference was noted between the beginning teacher pre-test and administrator responses to questionnaire section A. A similar difference was reported between the beginning teacher post-test and administrator responses to section A. This comparison indicated that the difference that existed between the beginning teacher pretest and administrator responses did not change during the beginning teachers' first seven months of experience.

Conclusions. Statistical computations indicated that beginning teachers' perceptions of the questionnaire situations did undergo a discernable change during initial teaching experience. The evidence of change, however, is more prominently noted at the elementary level than at the junior or senior high school levels. Noteworthy in this comparison is the fact that fifty-one per cent of the study participants were from the elementary level. This larger sampling number would provide a better basis for comparison. Analysis of sections A and C offered limited evidence of beginning teacher change. The only recorded change for

these two sections was reported by the elementary level.
Change was reported in section B in both the elementary
level and the total group comparisons. This indicated that
the beginning teachers' perception of the importance of
disciplinary action, in situations listed in the question-
naire, did change during the first seven months of experi-
ence.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to compile data rel-
evant to beginning teachers' perceptions of classroom
management and to analyze compiled data in an attempt to
determine any perceptual change that occurred during initial
teaching experience.

Procedures used to examine the stated hypotheses
included a review of limited related literature, interviews
with educators, and circulation of a questionnaire designed
to measure teachers' perceptions of classroom management.
The questionnaire was completed by beginning teachers prior
to first teaching and again after seven months of professional
experience. During this interval, the questionnaire was com-
pleted by groups of experienced teachers and administrators.
The questionnaire data was examined statistically to deter-
mine whether any perceptual change had occurred during
beginning teaching experience. Experienced teacher and admin-
istrative group mean scores were important to the analysis
in that they established a measurable base revealing
recorded differences between the beginning teacher pre-test
and post-test mean scores.

II. CONCLUSIONS

Results of the study indicated that beginning teachers' perceptions of classroom management did not substantially change during initial professional experience. If a change did occur, it was so minimal that statistical treatment of the data did not reveal significant difference at the five per cent level. The data did, however, reveal incidents of significant difference between beginning and experienced teachers' perceptions of classroom management. Similar incidents of significant difference were reported between beginning teachers' and administrators' perceptions of classroom management.

Results of the study also indicated that elementary level respondents perceived more teacher responsibility for classroom management than did secondary educators.

In conclusion, the study supported the stated hypothesis that there are no significant differences between beginning teachers' perceptions of classroom management prior to, and after seven months' experience. The second and third hypotheses; that there are no significant differences between beginning and experienced teachers' perceptions of classroom management, and that there are no significant differences between beginning teachers' and administrators' perceptions of classroom management, must be rejected.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

The conclusions presented in the preceeding pages
must be treated with certain qualifications. The writer is
fully aware of the limitations and inadequacies inherent in
the study questionnaire. Some improvements could be made to
correct these inadequacies and create a more valid instru-
ment. The instrument had not been tested; therefore, it was
impossible to establish right and wrong responses to the
situations offered. The most important inadequacy, however,
is that both positive and negative changes occurred between
the beginning teachers' pre-test and post-test mean scores
(positive indicating a higher mean score, negative indicating
a lower mean score on the post-test as compared to the pre-
test). The study revealed that twenty-one beginning teachers
took the option to sign both their pre- and post-test ques-
tionnaires. This presented the opportunity to make an item
and mean score comparison of twenty-one sets of question-
naires. Mean score comparisons presented in the thesis text
indicated that the beginning teachers' pre-test and post-
test mean scores of questionnaire section A did not change.
However, a comparison of the twenty-one sets of known
respondents indicated a mean change of thirty-five one-
hundredths. Statistically, if the negative mean changes
were subtracted from the positive mean changes only seven-

hundredths mean change is indicated. Similar conflicts appear in a comparison of computed mean scores and mean change of known respondents' scores in questionnaire sections B and C. It is possible, and borne out by known respondent sets of questionnaires, that individual change did take place. The individual mean score change of known respondents is presented in Appendix D, Table IX.

It is therefore recommended that the study questionnaire should be revised before valid conclusions can be drawn from the data secured through its application.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Addicott, Irwin O., <u>Constructive Classroom Control</u>, San Francisco: Howard Chandler, 1958. 46 pp.

2. Andrews, Lloyd J., <u>State Manual of Washington</u>, Olympia: Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1958: 192-202.

3. Bagley, William Chandler, <u>School Discipline</u>, New York: The MacMillan Company, 1914. 259 pp.

4. Bany, Mary A. and Johnson, Lois V., <u>Classroom Group Behavior</u>, New York: The MacMillan Company, 1964. 412 pp.

5. Blix, Trygve I., <u>Interview</u>, Assistant Superintendent, Personnel; Tacoma Public Schools, 1965.

6. Blommers, Paul and Lindquist, E. F., <u>Elementary Statistical Methods</u>, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1960. 528 pp.

7. Brain, Walter Russell, <u>The Nature of Experience</u>, London: Oxford University Press, 1959. 73 pp.

8. Buell, Clayton E., <u>Discipline in the Junior High School</u>, Philadelphia: Philadelphia Public Schools, 1962. 33 pp.

9. Compton, F. E., <u>Encyclopedia</u>, Chicago: William Benton, 1965. Volume 13, page 109.

10. Dember, William N., <u>The Psychology of Perception</u>, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963. 390 pp.

11. Doob, Leonard W., <u>Social Psychology</u>, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1956. 583 pp.

12. Francke, Donald C., "Personal Variables Related to Perceptions of Decision-Making," <u>The Journal of Educational Research</u>, 61:166-68, December, 1967.

13. Gage, N. L., <u>Handbook of Research on Teaching</u>, Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1963. 1217 pp.

14. Garrison, Jesse, Self Concept and Teaching; and Exploration, Monmouth: Oregon College of Education, Unpublished. 10 pp.

15. Harris, Chester W., Encyclopedia of Educational Research, New York: The MacMillan Company, 1960. 941-945.

16. Jones, Archie, Devices and Concepts of Discipline Procedure and Class Control, Laramie: The Bureau of Educational Research and Service, 1951. 13 pp.

17. Krech, David, Crutchfield, Richard S. and Ballachey, Egerton L., Individual In Society, San Francisco: McGraw-Hill Book Company Inc., 1962. Chapters 2, 5, 6 and 7.

18. Laing, R. D., Phillipson, H. and Lee, A. R., Interpersonal Perception, New York: Springer Publishing Company, 1966. 180 pp.

19. Larson, Knute G. and Karpas, Melvin R., Effective Secondary School Discipline, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963. 200 pp.

20. McCallon, Earl and Dumas, Wayne, "A Factorial Comparison of Three Teacher Interpersonal Perception Traits," The Journal of Educational Research, 61:19-21, September, 1967.

21. McCandless, Boyd R., Children and Adolescents, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1961. 485 pp.

22. Tagiuri, Renato and Petrullo, Luigi, Person Perception and Interpersonal Behavior, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1962. 390 pp.

23. Van Dalen, Deobold B., Understanding Educational Research, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962. 419 pp.

24. Vernon, M. D., A Further Study of Visual Perception, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1952. 263 pp.

APPENDIX A

Purpose

The purpose of this is to determine how the beginning teacher perceives classroom disturbances. What steps does he, a beginning teacher, take to curb disturbances, and what does he believe constitutes a classroom or school disturbance?

Procedure

In answering this questionnaire, you are asked to relate only to the information contained in the question or situation. Previous knowledge and circumstances surrounding a situation would condition your response. For the sake of reasonable validity in the study it is important that you accept circumstances given as factual situations which could confront you in initial experiences in teacher-pupil relationships.

Conclusion

A retest will be made at the end of the school year and you will be asked to complete a similar questionnaire to try to determine whether or not any significant changes have occurred. Upon completion of the study, each of you will receive a copy of the conclusions reached.

Personal Information

Please circle your correct response: Sex;   male   female

Teaching level;   K-3   4-6   7-9   10-12   Experience;   0   1-5   6-10   11-

Name _____   School_____
                    (name and school information is optional)

                              Thank you for your cooperation,

                              Edward A. Anderson

APPENDIX B

How would you react to the following classroom situations? Please indicate by circling the number which you consider would be your response. Number explanations are as follows:

1. <u>Immediate</u> action should be taken by the <u>teacher</u>.
2. <u>Deferred</u> action should be taken by the <u>teacher</u> at a more appropriate time.
3. <u>No</u> action should be taken by <u>anyone</u>.
4. <u>Deferred</u> action should be taken by the <u>principal</u>, <u>counselor</u>, or <u>parent</u> at an appropriate time.
5. <u>Immediate</u> action should be taken by the <u>principal</u>.

Example: A probable classroom disturbance.............. 1 2 (3) 4 5

1. A student confronts you, the teacher, with severe profanity.. 1 2 3 4 5
2. A student shoots a spit-wad and hits a fellow student... 1 2 3 4 5
3. A girl does not practice moral, (lady-like) behavior in the presence of boys............................. 1 2 3 4 5
4. A student intentionally drops his books on the floor.. 1 2 3 4 5
5. A student lies about observed activities............ 1 2 3 4 5
6. A student continually disturbs the class with loud talking.. 1 2 3 4 5
7. A student is looking out the window................ 1 2 3 4 5
8. A student throws his work paper on the teacher's desk and stomps back to his seat.................... 1 2 3 4 5
9. One of your boy students is being a bully on the playfield... 1 2 3 4 5
10. A student who is not in your class is insubordinate in the hall to you................................. 1 2 3 4 5
11. A student did not report after school as directed. What would you do the following day?............... 1 2 3 4 5
12. An angry student refuses to respond to your question.. 1 2 3 4 5
13. A student has failed to prepare today's assignment.. 1 2 3 4 5
14. The class was very rude to your substitute while you were ill.. 1 2 3 4 5
15. A student is filthy in both body and attire: the smell disturbs his classmates...................... 1 2 3 4 5
16. You catch a student in the act of stealing......... 1 2 3 4 5
17. Two students start fighting in your room........... 1 2 3 4 5
18. Two boys knock other students down during the exit of your class in a fire drill...................... 1 2 3 4 5

How important is disciplinary action related to the following situations? Circle the number of your choice.

1. UNIMPORTANT
2. SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT
3. MODERATELY IMPORTANT
4. VERY IMPORTANT
5. EXTREMELY IMPORTANT

Caution: the number relationships have changed from Questionnaire A.

1. John is tardy to class.............................. 1 2 3 4 5
2. Susan's hair is not combed......................... 1 2 3 4 5
3. Bill does not have his arithmetic finished......... 1 2 3 4 5
4. Nancy continually talks to her neighbor............ 1 2 3 4 5
5. Mary is rude to you, her teacher................... 1 2 3 4 5
6. Sam and Bill are smiling at each other............. 1 2 3 4 5
7. Fred is reading a comic book instead of his
    social studies assignment.......................... 1 2 3 4 5
8. Frank throws a pencil to Tom....................... 1 2 3 4 5
9. Don and Bill are fighting.......................... 1 2 3 4 5
10. Don and Bill are pushing each other during
    recess... 1 2 3 4 5
11. Karla sharpens her pencil during class without
    permission... 1 2 3 4 5
12. Steve continues to finish his art project during
    English class...................................... 1 2 3 4 5
13. Connie returns noisily from a special class........ 1 2 3 4 5
14. Mark sneers at your homework assignment............ 1 2 3 4 5
15. You return to class and find Joe drawing a picture
    on the blackboard under which is the word
    "Teacher."... 1 2 3 4 5

How important are the following factors relating to teachers on classroom management? Please use the above assigned values in relation to the numbers.

1. Teacher's physical appearance...................... 1 2 3 4 5
2. Teacher's attire................................... 1 2 3 4 5
3. Teacher's personality.............................. 1 2 3 4 5
4. Teacher's knowledge of subject matter.............. 1 2 3 4 5
5. Teacher's understanding of child psychology........ 1 2 3 4 5
6. Teacher's attitude toward her students............. 1 2 3 4 5
7. Teacher's consistency of approach.................. 1 2 3 4 5
8. Teacher's classroom conduct........................ 1 2 3 4 5

APPENDIX C

TABLE V

INDIVIDUAL MEAN SCORES OF BEGINNING TEACHER PRE-TEST ON
A QUESTIONNAIRE RELATED TO CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

Teacher number	Sex	Section A mean score	Section B mean score	Section C mean score
Elementary (kindergarten through sixth) grade level.				
1.	F	1.50	3.93	4.75
2.	F	2.11	3.53	5.00
3.	F	1.78	3.00	5.00
4.	F	1.56	3.93	4.50
5.	F	2.44	2.93	4.38
6.	F	1.72	3.33	4.63
7.	F	2.11	2.67	3.88
8.	F	2.17	2.13	4.50
9.	F	2.17	3.00	3.88
10.	F	2.17	2.67	4.88
11.	F	2.44	2.40	5.00
12.	F	2.11	3.13	4.38
13.	F	1.50	2.67	4.25
14.	F	2.11	3.00	4.25
15.	F	1.83	3.33	5.00
16.	M	1.44	3.27	4.75
17.	M	2.00	2.80	4.50
18.	M	2.83	2.87	4.38
19.	M	2.33	3.00	4.00
20.	M	1.89	3.20	4.63
21.	F	1.72	3.40	4.12
22.	M	2.00	3.27	4.38
Junior high (seventh through ninth) grade level.				
23.	M	2.50	3.07	4.00
24.	M	2.67	2.80	4.38
25.	F	1.89	3.27	5.00
26.	F	2.06	3.33	4.00
27.	M	2.44	3.13	4.25
28.	F	2.56	2.07	4.25
29.	F	1.83	3.93	3.63
30.	F	2.33	3.67	4.63

TABLE V (continued)

31.	F	2.17	3.00	4.00
32.	F	1.89	3.53	4.50
33.	F	2.78	3.53	4.25
34.	F	1.83	2.80	4.25
35.	M	2.06	2.67	4.00

Senior high (tenth through twelfth) grade level.

36.	F	1.94	2.33	4.38
37.	M	2.28	3.07	4.88
38.	M	3.28	3.27	4.25
39.	F	2.50	2.73	4.63
40.	F	2.56	2.67	4.12
41.	F	2.17	3.67	4.75

TABLE VI

INDIVIDUAL MEAN SCORES OF BEGINNING TEACHER POST-TEST
ON A QUESTIONNAIRE RELATED TO CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

Teacher number	Sex	Section A mean scores	Section B mean scores	Section C mean scores
Elementary (kindergarten through sixth) grade level.				
1.	F	1.78	2.33	4.88
2.	M	2.11	3.13	3.88
3.	F	2.33	3.80	3.88
4.	F	1.89	2.93	4.50
5.	M	2.33	2.87	5.00
6.	M	1.83	3.60	4.38
7.	F	2.78	2.00	4.63
8.	M	2.17	3.40	4.12
9.	F	1.39	3.87	4.63
10.	F	1.94	3.00	4.25
11.	F	2.22	3.13	5.00
12.	F	2.11	3.00	4.63
13.	F	2.56	3.00	4.00
14.	F	2.28	3.13	4.50
15.	F	1.89	2.73	4.38
16.	M	2.28	2.80	4.50
17.	M	1.11	3.40	4.63
18.	M	2.00	3.07	3.50
19.	F	2.11	2.33	4.25
20.	F	1.94	3.80	5.00
21.	F	1.56	2.27	1.00
22.	M	2.28	2.67	4.38
Junior high (seventh through ninth) grade level.				
23.	M	2.22	3.07	4.63
24.	F	2.22	2.87	3.88
25.	M	2.33	2.47	3.75
26.	F	1.72	3.47	4.38
27.	F	2.72	2.40	3.75
28.	F	2.17	3.00	4.75
29.	M	2.67	3.20	5.00
30.	M	2.00	2.67	4.63

TABLE VI   (continued)

31.	M	2.22	2.47	4.50
32.	F	2.11	2.60	3.88
33.	F	2.33	3.00	4.63
34.	F	2.22	3.47	4.50
35.	M	2.06	2.80	4.00
36.	M	2.22	3.60	4.00
37	F	2.56	3.20	4.50
38.	F	1.68	2.73	4.12

Senior high (tenth through twelfth) grade level.

39.	F	1.61	3.07	3.50
40.	M	2.39	2.93	4.38
41.	F	2.56	3.00	4.75
42.	M	2.00	2.73	4.25
43.	M	2.67	3.27	5.00
44.	F	2.17	2.87	3.33
45.	F	2.50	3.47	4.88
46.	F	2.22	2.53	4.50

TABLE VII

INDIVIDUAL MEAN SCORES OF EXPERIENCED TEACHERS ON A
QUESTIONNAIRE RELATED TO CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

Teacher number	Sex	Section A mean score	Section B mean score	Section C mean score
Elementary (kindergarten through sixth) grade level.				
1.	M	2.50	3.20	5.00
2.	M	1.56	2.87	3.63
3.	M	2.00	2.67	4.50
4.	F	2.56	3.07	4.12
5.	F	2.56	3.33	4.25
6.	F	1.61	3.27	4.63
7.	F	2.44	2.67	4.63
8.	F	2.44	2.40	3.75
9.	F	2.56	3.00	4.63
10.	F	1.83	2.87	4.75
11.	F	1.50	2.07	4.12
12.	F	1.94	3.07	5.00
13.	F	2.17	2.93	4.50
14.	F	2.11	2.27	4.38
15.	F	1.94	3.27	4.38
16.	F	1.56	3.00	4.50
17.	F	2.78	1.80	3.75
18.	F	2.06	2.53	4.50
19.	F	2.33	3.07	4.88
20.	F	2.00	2.67	3.88
21.	F	2.00	2.80	3.75
22.	F	2.44	2.60	4.00
Junior high (seventh through ninth) grade level.				
23.	M	2.22	2.60	4.50
24.	M	2.78	2.93	4.38
25.	M	2.06	3.33	4.25
26.	M	2.78	3.20	4.12
27.	M	2.50	2.47	4.25
28.	M	2.56	2.40	3.88
29.	M	1.61	3.20	4.50
30.	M	2.89	2.27	4.00

TABLE VII   (continued)

31.	M	2.06	3.47	4.38
32.	F	3.06	3.40	5.00
33.	F	2.11	3.73	4.25
34.	F	1.94	2.60	4.50
35.	F	2.28	2.53	4.38
36.	F	2.72	3.80	4.50

Senior high (tenth through twelfth) grade level.

37.	M	1.50	3.47	4.63
38.	M	1.44	1.80	3.63
39.	M	2.94	1.67	3.88
40.	F	2.89	3.27	4.50
41.	F	2.39	3.33	4.75
42.	M	2.78	2.67	4.12

TABLE VIII

INDIVIDUAL MEAN SCORES OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS ON A
QUESTIONNAIRE RELATED TO CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

Principal number	Sex	Section A mean score	Section B mean score	Section C mean score
Elementary (kindergarten through sixth) grade level.				
1.	M	2.05	2.40	4.25
2.	M	2.72	2.60	4.62
3.	M	2.61	3.60	4.25
4.	M	2.94	3.27	3.75
5.	M	2.44	2.01	3.63
6.	M	2.39	3.40	4.88
7.	M	2.61	2.33	3.25
8.	M	1.78	2.27	1.00
9.	M	2.44	2.40	4.38
10.	M	2.00	2.67	4.25
11.	M	1.87	2.13	3.88
12.	M	2.56	2.80	4.50
13.	M	2.11	1.67	5.00
14.	M	2.22	2.40	4.38
15.	M	3.17	3.00	4.25
16.	M	2.44	3.07	1.25
17.	M	2.00	3.53	4.88
18.	M	1.44	2.93	4.25
19.	M	1.94	2.87	4.88
20.	M	2.22	2.27	4.12
21.	M	1.50	3.00	4.63
22.	M	1.33	3.87	4.63
23.	M	1.78	2.33	4.50
24.	M	2.22	2.67	4.38
25.	M	2.56	3.87	5.00
Junior high (seventh through ninth) grade level.				
26.	M	2.89	2.87	4.12
27.	M	1.89	3.13	5.00
28.	M	2.61	2.80	3.90
29.	M	2.72	2.27	3.63
30.	M	2.83	3.00	4.38

TABLE VIII (continued)

31.	M	2.83	3.13	4.00
32.	M	2.11	1.73	4.38
33.	M	3.06	3.40	4.88
34.	M	2.56	2.53	4.38
35.	M	2.28	4.33	5.00
36.	M	2.28	2.53	4.50
37.	M	2.00	2.40	4.50
38.	M	1.61	2.73	4.63
39.	M	2.22	2.47	4.50

Senior high (tenth through twelfth) grade level.

40.	M	2.61	2.53	4.50
41.	M	3.11	2.33	4.50
42.	M	1.94	2.47	4.13
43.	M	2.67	3.20	4.90
44.	M	1.83	4.07	5.00
45.	M	3.89	4.00	5.00
46.	M	2.67	3.07	4.38
47.	M	2.61	2.27	4.13

APPENDIX D

TABLE IX

MEAN SCORE CHANGE BETWEEN PRE- AND POST-TEST RESULTS
FOR TWENTY-ONE IDENTIFIABLE RESPONDENTS

(+ indicates higher post-test mean score)
(- indicates lower post-test mean score)

Respondent	Section A	Section B	Section C
Elementary level			
1	-.15	-.06	+.13
2	-.33	+.07	+.25
3	+.17	-.40	-.13
4	+.61	-.13	+.13
5	-.66	-.07	-.12
6	+.78	+.46	+.25
7	-.33	+.13	-.12
8	+.39	-.40	-.13
9	+.17	-.67	+.26
10	-.17	+.33	.00
Junior high level			
11	+.28	-.27	-.25
12	+.16	+.33	-.50
13	-.11	-1.20	+.49
14	+.23	-.47	-.13
15	-.45	-.53	+.38
16	+.39	+.07	-.37
17	+.16	+.93	.00
Senior high level			
18	+.28	+.20	+.12
19	+.39	+.20	+.12
20	-.72	-.27	+.50
21	+.33	-.20	+.13
Total positive change	+4.34	+2.72	+2.76
Total negative change	-2.92	-4.67	-1.75
Total mean change	7.26	7.39	4.51
Mean change	.345	.351	.214