CHAPTER II

Literature Review

2.1. Introduction

In this chapter, research drawn from classroom management literature, self efficacy and teacher efficacy literature, and five factor model of personality in teaching context. In this chapter the related literature on research variables is reviewed. Information organized around the following questions: (a) what is classroom management and what influence does teachers’ beliefs on classroom management? (b) What is self-efficacy and what do we know about teacher efficacy? And (c) What do we know about five factor model of personality and how does it help to find out teachers’ personality profiles? Information related to question (c) is not exhaustive, but rather is limited to findings that are relevant to the objectives of this thesis. Specifically, information pertaining to classroom management (with an emphasis on teacher characteristics), information pertaining to teacher efficacy as a predictor of instructional outcomes (with an emphasis on its relation to classroom management style and teacher characteristics), and information pertaining to five factor model of personality as a predictor of classroom management style and teacher efficacy is reviewed.

A) **What is classroom management and what influence does teachers’ beliefs on classroom management?**

2.2. Classroom Management

2.2.1. Classroom and Management

The dictionary meaning of class is member or body of persons with common characteristics, or in like circumstances, or with a common purpose, etc. In education, a class is a group of students under one teacher, or pursuing a study together. A classroom is a room
in a school in which classes meet. It is a meeting place of a group of students for instruction and learning. In the present time, management is taken as a serious applied social science. In that light, it is defined as the process of working with and through individuals and groups to accomplish organizational goals. Or it is the process of optimizing the use of four or five resources namely, persons, money, material, information and time for achieving some predetermined goals of an organization. Based on certain general consideration, all managers in their stations of work perform the same main functions such as forecast, plan, organize, direct and control. Thus, be it a factory chief, military general, housewife, school principal or a teacher, all are managing. With some added specifics skills for educational management, a school principal does institutional management and a teacher, classroom management (Khetarpal, 2005).

2.2.2. Classroom management: What it is about?

Translating instructional goals into learning experiences is what classroom management is all about. In all classrooms the teacher is in charge of organizing the environment, managing the learning process and student behavior as well as establishing the framework for a spirit of enquiry. In the ultimate analysis, good classroom management is when ‘my students really want to come to my class and the responsible parents are eager to send them there after watching their day to day progress on some hard indicators’. Practicing the art or applied social science for achieving such results has always been a challenge for those who deliver a curriculum in the classroom. Highly successful teachers may be finding very different as persons and as professionals. They will be found utilizing different teaching strategies and will express different ideas about maintaining student discipline. Contrast the
classrooms of these teaching superstars, and you will find major differences in how they structure learning environment for their students and manage their classroom.

Seven indicators, although not exhaustive, of such structuring reveal much about the depth in the concept of classroom management (Khetarpal, 2005). These are listed below and described thereafter.

1. *Classroom climate,* as a set of characteristics that describe a classroom, distinguish it from other classrooms and influence the behavior of teachers and students in it, relatively enduring over a period of time.

2. *Classroom communication,* the process by which someone who has a purpose to accomplish, say a teacher, tries to convey something to get someone else, say a student, to act for the achievement of the purpose. Communication involves both exchanging information and transmitting meaning.

3. *Classroom management of student learning to belong,* which is about focusing on culture which can help shape attitudes, dispositions, and behaviors and a strong sense of belongingness of those in the school, all of which work in pursuit of the technical part of school. The culture produces a strong sense of community for the school and a feeling of belonging to that community on the part of teachers and students and parents. Teachers creating learning experiences for their students by knowing about their background knowledge of skills, interests outside school, cultural heritage and special needs through various methods.

4. *Management of student behavior in the classroom (Discipline),* refers to approaches to managing students' behavior till learning occur in an effective environment. Managing
discipline in the classroom is an important component of classroom management. Learning will not meet in an environment where student behavior is out of control.

5. Teaching strategies; means selecting best method for teaching once teacher become aware of what the class needs in terms of learning experiences; teaching the whole class, teaching groups, or individual work.

6. Managing the new generation classroom; is shifting classroom management to computer lab management. Obviously, classroom management for the new generation will need to be different, far different.

In some other point of views classroom management is the organization of a classroom as a learning environment; the management of student discipline, order and care; the grouping of student for different tasks and patterns of interaction; the individualization of students learning (Stensimo, 1995, Emmer, Everston, Clements, & Worsham, 1994, Jones and Jones, 1990 as cited in Martin & Shoho, 2000, and Smith, 1991). The task of classroom management is also defined as follows (Truly et al 1992).

Figure 3: Task of Classroom Management
Drawing from the works of Martin and Baldwin (1998), although often used interchangeably, the terms classroom management and discipline are not synonymous. The term discipline typically refers to the structures and rules describing the expected behavior of students and the effort to ensure that students comply with those rules. However, classroom management is defined as a multi-faceted construct and umbrella term that includes three broad dimensions describing teacher efforts to oversee the activities of the classroom: Dimension one, instructional management, includes aspects such as monitoring seatwork, structuring daily routines, and allocating materials; Dimension two people management pertains to what teachers believe about students as persons and what teachers do to develop the teacher – student relationship. A large body of literature indicates that academic achievement and productive behavior are influenced by the quality of teacher-student relationship (Burden, 1995; Weinstein, 1996, Martin & Baldwin, 1998); the third dimension, behavior management, is similar to, but different than, discipline in that it focuses on pre- planed means of preventing misbehavior rather than the teacher’s reaction to it. Specifically, this facet includes setting rules, establishing a reward structure, and providing opportunities for student input.

Froyens and Iverson, (1999) have considered three major components for classroom management:

(a) Content management – occurs when the teachers manage the space, materials, equipments, movement of the people, and lessons that are part of a curriculum or program of studies.

(b) Conduct management: is centered on one’s beliefs about the nature of people. By integrating knowledge about human diversity (and individually at the same time) into a
particular instructional philosophy, teacher could manage their classroom in a better and more effective way;

(c) Convenient management: stresses the classroom as a social system. Teacher and student roles and expectations shape the classroom into an environment conducive to learning.

Definitions of classroom management vary, but usually include action taken by the teacher to establish order, engage students, or elicit their cooperation (Emmer & Stought, 2001). Doyle (1986) summarized it as “The action and strategies teachers use to solve the problem of order in classroom”. Jackson’s (as cited in Emmer & Stought, 2001) analysis of classroom life noted that management’s complexity is a result of several properties of classroom teaching, including:

- Multidimensionality- varied events and persons,
- Simultaneity- many thing happen at once,
- Immediacy – the rapid ace of events limits reflection,
- Unpredictability- of events and outcomes,
- Publicness- events are often witnessed by many or all students, and
- History – actions and events have pasts and futures.

Jones (1996) underlined the comprehensive nature of classroom management by identifying five main features:

1. An understanding of current research and theory in classroom management and students’ psychological and learning needs.
2. The certain of positive teacher-student and peer relationships.
3. The use of instructional methods that facilitates optimal learning by responding to the academic needs of individual students and classroom groups.
4. The use of organizational and group management methods that maximize on-task behavior.

5. The ability to use a range of counseling and behavioral methods to assist students who demonstrate persistent or serious behavior problem.

This overview of classroom management includes: establishing and maintaining order, designing effective instruction, dealing with students as a group, responding to individual student needs, handling discipline problems, and helping students adjust to the school environment.

2.2.3. Theories of Classroom Management

Levin, Nolan, Kerr, & Elliot (2005) describe three main theories of classroom management as student-directed, collaborative, and teacher directed. The student-directed theory believes that students have the primary responsibility for controlling their behavior. Collaborative management is based on the belief that the control of student behavior is the joint responsibility of student and teacher. In the teacher-directed method, the teacher assumes primary responsibility of managing student behavior. Students become effective decision-makers by internalizing rules and guidelines for behavior. Levin et al. (2005) describe the models as three points on a continuum that move from student-directed toward teacher-directed practices. The points may be thought of as the beliefs that teachers hold to subscribe to a particular method, or a combination of methods. The theories outlined in the following figure.
There are two ways of viewing the issue of classroom management or classroom control. One way is to consider the issue from the standpoint of reducing discipline problems or dealing with misbehavior. The other is to examine the interaction pattern that exists in the classroom and to note the extent and the means of teacher’s control and direction of all the activity in the classroom.

Withall, (1951, as cited in Kasinath, 2001) developed one of the teacher instruments for assessing the classroom interaction. Based on the seven categories in the Withall’s climate index one is able to consider evidence of two types of classroom control (management), learner- centeredness and teacher- centeredness. Withall found that different teachers produced a different climate with the same group of students. The categories are:

1. Learner-supportive statements,
2. Acceptant or clarifying statements (teacher’s intent to help pupil gain insight into his problem),
3. Problem- structuring (teacher’s intent to elucidate the problem and to facilitate the learner’s problem solving effort),
4. Neutral statements with no

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Student-Directed</th>
<th>Collaborative</th>
<th>Teacher Directed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary responsibility for management</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Joint</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal of management</td>
<td>Caring community focus and self-direction</td>
<td>Respectful relationships, academic focus</td>
<td>Well-organized, efficient, academic focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent on management</td>
<td>Valuable and productive</td>
<td>Valuable for individual but not for group</td>
<td>Wasted time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships within management system</td>
<td>Caring personal relationships</td>
<td>Respect for each other</td>
<td>Non-interference with each other’s rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher power bases</td>
<td>Referent, expert</td>
<td>Expert, legitimate</td>
<td>Reward! coercive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
supportive intent, 5. Directive statements (teacher’s intent to have the student adopts the teacher’s point of view and pursues the course of action advocated), 6. Reproving, disapproving or disparaging statements (teacher’s main intent to admonish the student for unacceptable behavior or to emphasize that he has not met standards of acceptable achievement), and 7. Teacher- supportive statements (teacher’s intent to assert his position in the classroom and to defend or justify his actions).

Another classic study on classroom management is that of Lippitt and White (1958, as cited in Kasinath, 2001) who examined the leadership styles of youth leaders, highlighting a threefold typology: Authoritarian, laissez-faire, and Democratic. The chief characteristics of these three leadership styles are presented in figure (5).

Figure 5: Threefold Typology of Classroom Management (Lippitt & White, 1958)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authoritarian</th>
<th>Democratic</th>
<th>Laissez-faire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. All determination of policy by leader.</td>
<td>1. All policies a matter of group discussion and decision encourage and assist by leader.</td>
<td>1. Complete freedom of group or individual decision, with a minimum of leader participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Techniques and activity steps dictate by the authority, one at a time, so that future steps are always uncertain to a large degree.</td>
<td>2. Activity perspective gain during discussion period. General steps to group goal sketch, and, where technical advice is needed, the leader suggests two or more alternative procedures from which choice could be made.</td>
<td>2. Various material supplies by the leader, who make it clear that he could supply information when asked. Leader takes no other part in work discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The leader usually dictates the particular task and work companion of each member.</td>
<td>3. The members are free to work with whomever they chose, and the division of task is left up to the group.</td>
<td>3. Complete non participation of the leader.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. The dominator tends to be personal in his praise and criticism of the work of each member, remaining aloof from active group participation except when demonstrating.

4. The leader is objective or fact minded in his praise and criticism and try to be a regular group member in spirit without doing too much of the work.

4. Infrequent spontaneous comments on member activities unless questioned and no attempt to appraise or regulate the course of events.

Perhaps the best known literature on classroom management is McGregor’s (1960, as cited in Tassall, 2004) distinction between Theory X and Theory Y. Theory X suggests that managers assume that those with whom they work dislike it so that they have to be controlled. Coerced and directed in order to achieve the desired outcomes, whereas Theory Y concentrates on the way that managers focus on the human side of their employees and endeavor to develop them as people.

Wolfgang and Glickman (1980) conceptualized a framework to explain teachers’ beliefs toward discipline. Their continuum was based on a combination of psychological interpretations to illustrate three approaches to classroom interactions:

1. Non- Interventionist
2. Interventionist
3. Interactionalist

The non-interventionists classroom management style is based on philosophical and psychological belief system that is commonly referred to as humanistic or student-centered or non directive teaching (Akbaba & Arif, 1998; Joyce & Weil, 1996). This theory is based on the work of Carl Rogers and suggests that the child (student) develops from an inner unfolding of potential. In other word, the non-interventionist presupposes the child (student) has an inner drive that needs to find it expression in the real world. So, the teacher’s role is to facilitator. In this role the teacher helps students explore new ideas about their lives, their
school work and their relation with others. The model creates an environment where students and teachers are partners in learning share ideas openly and communicate honestly with one another Rogers believed that:

“The hard part of figuring out how to teach is learning when to keep your mouth closed, which is most of the time (Joyce & Weil, 1996).

At the opposite end of the continuum are interventionists: those who emphasize what the outer environment (or people and objects) does to the human organism to cause it to develop in its particular way. This model base on behaviorist approach, suggests that children (students) develop as result of external environmental conditions, such as reinforcement and punishment. The teacher’s role in the classroom is to establish rules and procedures communicate these clearly to student and implement appropriate rewards and punishments for compliance of noncompliance. The major goal of the interventionist approach is to maintain an orderly and productive classroom. According to this model the teacher is a orchestrator, that is the classroom management or teaching style is teacher-centered. In this model focus on short-term goals in teaching-learning process but in non-interventionist model focus on long-term goals in teaching-learning process (Levin & Nolan, 1991). Midway between these two extremes is interactionalist. Proponents of this model (Alfred Adler, Rudolf Dreikurs, and William Glasser) views child’s developments as he interaction of inner and outer forces. This approach is known to confronting- contracting model, also. William Glasser, best known for his book schools without failure “emphasizes that “students have a responsibility to learn at school, but with the teacher’s help. A classroom with non-interventionist managing is student-centered, with interventionist managing is teacher-centered, and classroom with interactionalist managing is teacher – student centered. The
assumption is that teachers believe and act according to all three models of classroom management. But one usually predominates in beliefs and actions. (Martin et al., 1995).

Following political pendulum shows a historical perspective toward classroom management since 1900.

**Figure 6: Historical Perspective Classroom Management Theory**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>Pragmatic</th>
<th>Progressive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discipline/Classroom Management</td>
<td>Control/Authoritarian</td>
<td>Assertive/Teacher-Centered</td>
<td>Supportive/Student-Centered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**2.2.4. Teacher Beliefs**

Teacher beliefs have been discussed here because it makes possible a rich and robust understanding of classroom management styles which are used by teachers.

**Defining Teacher Beliefs**

According to Richardson (1996), beliefs may be thought of as psychologically held understanding, premises, or proposition about the world that are felt to be true. Richardson explains that beliefs and attitudes are subsets of a group of constructs that name, define, and
describe the structure and content that derive a person’s actions. In the realm of education teachers’ beliefs will ultimately affect what they teach and how they teach.

*Origins of Teacher Beliefs*

Teachers’ beliefs may come from a variety of sources. Three categories of experience influence the development of beliefs about teaching – personal experience, experience with schooling and instruction, and experience with formal knowledge (Richardson, 1996). Studies have shown that the influence of the quality of pre-service classroom experience and the opportunity for reflection on the pre-service experience has an effect on a teacher’s beliefs (Brousseau, Book, & Byers, 1998; Bean & Zulich, 1992; Cherland, 1989; Richardson, Grip, & Thompson, 1987, as cited in Fang, 1996).

Personal experience includes the aspects of life that go into the formation of the world view- the intellectual and moral dispositions, beliefs about self in relation to others, understanding the relationship of schooling to society, and other form of personal, familial, and cultural understanding. Clandinin (1986) suggests that personal experience is encoded in images that affect practice; these images have moral, emotional, personal, and private dimensions.

Regarding schooling and instruction experience, research has shown students arrive in their pre-service education year with inherent beliefs about the nature of teaching based on their own experiences. When combined with the real world of teaching practice, students’ established beliefs create conditions that can make it difficult for pre-service teacher education to have an impact (Richardson, 1996). For example, Knowel’s (1992) life history study reported that family influences and previous teachers had influenced the pre-service
teachers’ conceptions of teacher’s role. Personal experiences of learning in classroom and observing teaching models, coupled with parental involvement, may contribute to the perception of the teacher role. Examples of experience with formal knowledge of students entering school are found in school subjects, outside readings, and television. When learning to teach, examples of formal knowledge are exhibited in knowledge of subject matter, and conceptions about the nature of subject matter and how students learn it (Richardson, 1996).

Studies of the origins of teachers’ beliefs show that a variety of life experiences will contribute to the formation of strong and enduring beliefs about teaching and learning. Furthermore, the studies suggest that teachers’ beliefs should be surfaced and acknowledged during teacher education programs to make a difference in the deep structure of knowledge and beliefs held by pre-service teachers (Richardson, 1996).

Uses and Functions of Beliefs in Teaching

While beliefs affect all areas of teaching, they are important to note in several ways. Nespor (1997) stated that they are useful in task definition in the cognitive realm because they function as framing or defining the teaching task. Beliefs help in facilitating memory processing by aiding recall, and the constructive and reconstructive processes. Nespor sums up the uses of beliefs in the following quotation: “The effect and emotional components of beliefs can influence the ways events and elements in memory are indexed and retrieved and how they are reconstructed during recall. Emotion and effect thus have important implications for how teachers learn and use what they learn”.

Considering teachers, this quotation refers to how the intricacies of belief system influence emotions and how learning experiences are perceived. For example, a teacher may find themselves in a particular situation which requires a specific action; recalling a similar
situation and their corresponding beliefs may connect them to how they felt and how they acted in order to respond appropriately to the present situation. Nespor (1997) argues that the contexts and environments within which teachers work, along with the problems they encounter, are ill-defined and deeply entwined, and that they peculiarly suit beliefs for making sense of those contexts. Implications for understanding beliefs suggest that, if the great interest is in why teachers organize and manage classrooms as they do, then consequently, more attention must be made to the goals they pursue and to their subjective interpretations of classroom processes.

Studies have shown that teachers’ expectations can significantly influence student behavior and academic performance (Good, 1987). Subsequently teachers may behave differently towards students, and their actions may convey behavioral and performance expectations (Good, 1987). Teachers’ implicit theory about the nature of knowledge acquisition can also affect the behaviors they use in the classroom, and ultimately, how the students learn from the behaviors. Teachers’ beliefs and philosophies about their teaching style will ultimately affect teaching and learning (Good, 1987; Anders & Evans, 1994; Stoddert, 1994, as cited in Fang, 1996). A teacher’s particular approach to an issue may have an impact on what the student is learning based on the teacher’s beliefs and how they convey them through their actions.

*Relationship between Beliefs and Actions*

The need for a better understanding of teaching effectiveness is of concern in the teaching realm; researchers acknowledge that teaching is complex, demanding, and uniquely human (Clark & Peterson, 1986). Studies indicate that teacher beliefs can make or break the learning process, and researchers are paying closer attention to teacher attitudes and beliefs
on students and on the quality of school life (Ange, Greenwood & Miller, 1994). Where personal beliefs are concerned, if the purpose is to define what makes a good teacher, it is necessary to investigate the beliefs of teachers (Ange, Greenwood & Miller, 1994). For example, good teaching may include being a good classroom manager; being conscious of beliefs may open up the possibility for a greater range of possible choices and responses to classroom situations and individual student behavior. (Larrivee, 2005).

Studies have been done to conduct research that leads to understanding the complexities of teaching contexts and of teaching processes and actions within those contexts. Richardson (1996) states that an understanding of a teacher’s practices is enhanced by research attention to both beliefs and actions through interviews and observations. Moreover, this attention may contribute to change in beliefs and practices if the research conducted is done collaboratively. Richardson (1996) also asserts that beliefs are thought to drive actions, with experience and reflection on action possibly leading to change in, or additions to, beliefs.

Levin et al. (2005) states that beliefs strongly affect one’s behavior; however, experience and reflection on action may lead to changes or amendments to beliefs. Changes in beliefs are beneficial because having a strong, positive belief system will benefit both the teacher and his or her students. Being aware of the type of beliefs that are positive as opposed to those that need work will help teachers become more effective educators. For example, in terms of producing constructive results in the classroom, a belief in the importance reflection on the success of a lesson may produce a more positive effect on teaching strategies than a belief which does not include reflection practices. Researchers say that significant change in teachers can occur if they are engaged in personal exploration, experimentation, and reflection upon their thoughts and actions (Richardson, 1996).
2.2.5. Linking Teachers’ Beliefs and Classroom Management

Several studies have been done that look into the beliefs regarding classroom management style and comparing them with particular demographics; the next section further describes findings.

Teacher Demographics and Classroom Management Styles

Several studies done by Martin, Baldwin, Sohoho, and Yin (1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, 1997, and 2000) have investigated differences in classroom management perceptions and beliefs in terms of the following demographics: teacher of different training and age, novice and experienced teachers, teacher personality characteristics, grade level taught, gender, and geography of teachers. For example, Martin and Baldwin (1992) found that novice teachers differ from and are influenced by those more experienced, regarding their beliefs on discipline. Beginning teachers appeared to be patient, share responsibility, and interact with students (Martin and Baldwin, 1992), while more experienced teachers tended to react in a manner that insists on appropriate behavior, using time-out procedures, and punishing students (Martin and Baldwin, 1992). Thus this finding illustrates how teachers’ attitudes become pessimistic and controlling overtime.

The researchers believed the reason for this difference is perhaps experienced teachers are more interventionist because they perceive outside pressure from administrators, parents, and faculty. This causes them to take an active and controlling approach to classroom situations (Martin and Baldwin, 1992). Regarding locus of control, experienced teachers were found to score more internally than pre-service teachers. It appears that years of
experience my influence teachers’ perceptions of classroom management style while the locus of control may be secondary factor (Martin & Baldwin, 1993).

Martin and Baldwin (1994) suggest that their results may imply that novice teachers’ own experiences as students may influence their perceptions of classroom management more than their experiences in pre-service training programs. More experienced teachers may have modified their practices and beliefs to correspond to particular teaching realities and skill learned on the job.

Beliefs regarding classroom management vary among teachers. When they studied particular teacher personality characteristics in relation to classroom management style, Martin, Baldwin, and Yin (1995) found that teachers scoring more interventionist or controlling on classroom management-style inventory were often less venturesome and inhibited, more practical, and more astute and aware of social conventions. Significant relationships between personality characteristics and classroom management style were positive and negative in direction on the scales used, and consistent with expected patterns based on past research (Martin, Baldwin, & Yin, 1997). Sharma (1980) in his study showed that each teacher differs from the other in respect of the development of type of leadership. Some teachers influenced their pupils through democratic strategies while others did so by giving freedom to their pupils to a degree that they act in any way they choose. She referred to these two leadership style as personality differences.

In contrary with, Henson, Bennett, Sienty, & Chambers (2002) examined the personality types of emergency certification teachers as predictors of classroom management and self-efficacy beliefs. Data analysis indicated that there was a limited relationship between personality and classroom management and efficacy beliefs.
Regarding gender, Martin, Yin, Baldwin (1997) reported that no significant differences were found between male and female teachers regarding their attitudes and beliefs on classroom control. The teaching setting (rural or urban) was evidently more of a factor than gender in determining beliefs regarding classroom management style at the high school level researched, yielding more of a difference (Martin, Yin, Baldwin, 1997).

When researching age, Martin and Sohoho (2000) hypothesized that age could account for differences in beliefs concerning classroom management style. They found that traditionally certified teachers and additional certification program participants scored more interventionist than student teachers on both subscales used. Martin and Sohoho found that as teachers age, their beliefs and attitudes toward classroom management become more controlling; they assume that most of the older subjects were also likely to be parents. They speculate whether or not it is teaching experience or life experience that causes this difference in the teachers’ attitude. Martin and Sohoho also wonder if teachers who are parents approach their classrooms differently from those who are not parents.

They conclude that over the past several years a change in people has occurred who enter teacher preparation programs; they may be older and more diverse. Because the non-traditional student teacher is likely to have the benefit of richer experiences, teacher preparation program should respond accordingly by tailoring their approach to their student body and abandoning a one-size-fits-all approach (Martin &Sohoho, 2000). They found that practical classroom experiences make a difference in teachers’ perceptions and beliefs. More richly developed field training will be more beneficial to alleviate the beginning teachers’ idealism with realism, thus educating about the differences between what teachers believe they know and what actually occurs in existing classrooms. This may include providing more
experiences in challenging classrooms so beginning teachers will have the opportunity to manage diverse situations not often discussed in teacher preparation programs.

Martin and Baldwin (1996) extended their research to investigate the differences between the classroom management style of elementary and secondary level educators and their beliefs regarding the nature of appropriate and inappropriate student behaviors. The findings indicated that elementary teachers scored significantly less interventionist than their secondary level counterparts.

Laut (1999) conducted a study on beliefs of pre service teachers and classroom teacher concerning classroom management styles. It was hypothesized that greater experience in teaching would be associated with less interventionist management styles. Findings suggested that there were no differences on the classroom management style. Pre service teachers- those with the least teaching experience – were more non-interventionist than other group. Interns with the middle level of teaching experience were more interventionist than experienced teachers. The experienced teachers, also reacting in a non-interventionist manner, same to the practicum pre service – students. According to results of this study, as mentioned, for intern teachers (Middle level of teaching experience) is easier to interact with the students from an interventionist position than create opportunities for students to communicate with the teacher. There is greater security for the teacher with specific rules and procedures are stabilized and management restricted to use of; direction statement, modeling behavior, reinforcement, intervention and isolation. There can be little doubt that beliefs regarding experiences and the manner in that teachers approach them, to create a unique and individual styles of classroom management. Of great importance is that efficient
lesson planning and effective classroom management are both necessary in order for learning to take place.

Gholami (1999) at his study” the relationships between classroom management styles and academic achievement of primary school students of Khoramabad city in Iran reported that:

1. There was a significant difference between teachers in terms of management styles.
2. The majority of teachers were student -oriented.
3. There was a significant relationship between classroom management styles and academic achievement of the students.
4. The academic achievements of the students with student oriented teacher ( non – directive / humanistic / non – interventionist) was more than students with task -oriented teachers ( directive / hard/ interventionist).
5. There was a significant relationship between gender and classroom management styles, that is, women more use of student -oriented styles than men.
6. Experience of teaching had a role importance to select classroom management styles. For example, the beginner teachers have shown less flexibility at the classroom. The researcher has shown that they are very often task- oriented.
7. In this study that was used “PCL inventory” for the collection data, most of the teachers were completely agreed with 22nd item inventory: The teaching must be vivacious, and teacher must be lively also.

Akbaba (1998) in his study examined 14 sixth grade teachers’ opinions about classroom management, gathering information from on online discussion group. It was found that nine teachers (64, 21) were using the interventionist classroom management approach, three teachers (21.4%) were using the interactionalist classroom management approach, and
only one teacher (7%) was using both the interactionalist and the interventionist. Based on the data analysis, the interventionist classroom management approach is the most frequently used one by the teachers. It seems that teachers still determine the rules (instructional Behavioral) by themselves and like to run the classroom with these rules. They also support or prevent behaviors with reinforcements. It is also found interesting that none of 14 teachers was using the non-interventionist approach, although the importance of humanities approach is mentioned in many educational environments there might be some reasons for teachers such as that humanistic approach or non-interventionist approach takes time to apply perfectly in the classroom. In addition, they do not find it appropriate situations. Classroom management depends on many things such as class size, the place where school is located, socio-economics status of students and their aspiration for education and students personal characteristics. More over, to being awarded of all theories that they provide basis for classroom management models, is necessary, too.

Stensmo (1995) conducted a study on classroom management styles in context- two grades 5 Swedish teacher-in terms of five management tasks: planning, control, motivation, grouping, and individualization. He in his study reported that Mrs. A reflected a production oriented style, focusing on subject matter and tight management of classroom activities towards teacher defined goals. Mr. B exhibited a more relation oriented style, focusing on individual students, and a soft management of classroom activities according to expressed students needs and feelings. Mrs. A. and Mr. B work in the same school context with parallel classes. This means that they have common conditions; common goals and curricula. But the school context also permits them to work differently in their classrooms. Mrs. A and Mr. B have different kinds of philosophies of Education Mrs. A stands for a philosophy of
adjustment and Mr. B. stands for a philosophy of change. Mrs. A. class is a teacher-centered (interventionist), following Mrs. A: agenda through the curriculum. Mr. B. class is a student–centered (non-interventionist), following individuals (student) agenda.

B) What is self-efficacy and what do we know about teacher efficacy?

2.3. Teacher Efficacy

2.3.1. Self efficacy

Harter (1986, as cited in Bong, 1999) acknowledge that different forms of self beliefs, especially those that explored the notion of perceived competence, have received attention in recent publications of human learning and motivation research. Investigations on these self-constructs attested to the importance of one’s “perceived” self as opposed to the “actual” self in successful functioning and adaptation across different domains (Bandura, 1995).

Studies involving personal beliefs (Bong, 1999) suggested that individuals with positive views of themselves strive to succeed and overcome obstacles in their lives. People with weak or negative self-concept may fail to reach their fullest potential and fall short of their expected performance based on their potential capacity. Researchers (Bandura & Markus; Nurius as cited in Bong, 1999) affirmed that constructs of self-belief, are not more reflection of one’s past performances but are active procedures of human attainments. Pajares (2002) noted that Bandura (1986) advanced a view of human functioning that accorded a central role to cognitive, vicarious, self-regulatory, and self-reflective processes in human adaptation and change. Individuals possess a self-esteem that enables them to exercise a measure of control over their thoughts, feelings, and actions. Pajares (1996) asserted that this self-system accommodated one’s cognitive and affective structures and included abilities needed to:
symbolize, learn from others, plan alternative strategies, regulate one’s behavior, and engage in self-reflection.

According to Pajares (2000):

“Bandura advanced a view of human functioning that accords a central role to cognitive, vicarious, self-regulatory, and self-reflective processes in human adaptation and change. People are viewed as self-organizing, proactive, self reflecting and self-regulating rather than as reactive organisms shaped and shepherded by environmental forces or driven by concealed inner impulses. From this theoretical perspective, human functioning is viewed as the product of a dynamic interplay of personal, behavioral, and environmental influences”.

Bandura (as cited in Pajares, 1996) described human behavior and motivation in terms of beliefs that people have about themselves as key elements in the exercise of control and personal agency. They interpretation of their performance attainments by individuals can inform and alter their environments and their self-beliefs, which, in turn, can inform and alter their subsequent performances. According to Bandura’s (as cited in Pajares, 1996) social cognitive theory, self-referent thought can be a mediator between knowledge and action. Knowledge, skill, and prior attainments are often poor predictors of subsequent attainments because beliefs that individuals hold about their abilities and the outcome of their efforts can influence their behavior. Many theorists (e.g., Abelson, Dewey, James, Mead, Nisbett & Ross, Rokeach as cited in Pajares, 1996) shared the view that the potent nature of beliefs can create a filter through which new phenomena are interpreted and subsequent behavior mediated. Bandura (1986) considered self-reflection the most distinctively human
characteristic and human capability, because people evaluate and alter their thinking and behaviors using this form of self-referent thought. These self-evaluations include perceived self-efficacy, which has been defined as "people's judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required attaining designated types of performances" (Bandura, 1986). Bandura (1984) stated that:

“People are not simply reactors to their immediate environment or steered by past stimulus inputs. Most of their behavior, except for patterns that eventually become routinized, is partly guided by the exercise of forethought. Among the forms of forethought that affect action none is more central or pervasive than people's judgments of their capabilities to deal with different realities. In their daily lives they continuously have to make decisions about what course of action to pursue, how much effort to invest in them, and how long to continue those they have undertaken. Because action on misjudgments of personal capabilities can produce detrimental consequences, proper appraisal of one's own efficacy has considerable functional value”.

Other theorists have developed similar definitions of self-efficacy. According to Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy & Hoy (1998):

“Self-efficacy has to do with self-perception of competence rather than actual level of competence. This is an important distinction, because people regularly overestimate or underestimate their actual abilities, and these estimations may have consequences for the courses of action they choose to pursue or the effort they exert in those pursuits. Over or underestimating capabilities may also influence how well people use the skills they possess.”
Bandura (as cited in Pajares, 1997) introduced the construct of self-efficacy with the publication of "Self-efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioral Change." In 1986, Bandura (as cited in Pajares, 1997) positioned the self-efficacy construct in the social cognitive theory of human behavior. This theory was a departure from established theories of cognitivism that placed cognitive development under the influence of social influences. In 1997, Bandura published "Self-efficacy: The Exercise of Control" in which he further placed self-efficacy in a theory of personal and collective agency that operated jointly with other socio cognitive factors to regulate human well-being and attainment. The power of this theory was the integration of origins or sources of efficacy beliefs, their structures and functions, the processes through which they produced diverse effects, and the possibilities for change into one conceptual framework (Bandura, 1997). Self-efficacy beliefs could be strong determinants and predictors of the level of accomplishment that individuals could attain (Pajares, 1996). For these reasons, Bandura (1997) argued, "beliefs of personal efficacy constitute the key factor of human agency".

Brouwers and Tomic (2000) cited Bandura and Maddux in suggesting that self-efficacy beliefs varied along three dimensions:

1. **Magnitude**, which referred to the level a person believes he/she capable of performing,
2. **Generality**, which referred to the extent to which changes in self-efficacy beliefs extend to other behaviors and situations, and
3. **Strength**, which referred to the resoluteness of people's convictions that he/she could perform a behavior in question.

Self-efficacy beliefs could influence human functioning through mediating processes (Bandura and Maddux as cited in Brouwers & Tomic, 2000) including:
1. Influence goals that people set for themselves and strategies that people envision for attaining these goals,

2. Influence the motivation of people to persist in the face of obstacles,

3. Influence how people feel about themselves when they attempt to reach their goals,

4. Influence situations that people select in terms of their challenge.

Efficacy beliefs could help determine how much effort people could be expected to expend on a task, how long they could persevere when confronting obstacles, and how resilient they could be in the face adverse situations. Pajares (1996) indicated that people, who had higher levels of the sense of efficacy, were more likely to put forth greater effort, persistence, and resilience. Bandura(1994) stated that people with high assurance in their capabilities set challenging goals and maintained strong commitment to them. These individuals exhibited resilience by heightening and sustaining their efforts in the face of failure and quickly recovering their sense of efficacy after failures and setbacks. They attributed failure to insufficient effort or deficient knowledge and skills, which were acquirable, and considered themselves as highly efficacious (Bandura & Cervone, 1983, 1984; Schunk, 1981). However, high self-efficacy in one domain does not necessarily guarantee high efficacy in another. One’s perceived sense of efficacy appeared to be situational. Bandura (1997) argued that self-efficacy beliefs “may vary across realms of activity, different levels of task demands within a given activity domain, and under different situational circumstances”. Raudenbush, Rowan, and Cheong (1992) noted that self-efficacy was not a global disposition. Instead, they asserted, certain types of situations and activities may require different skills and greater diligence or may be at risk for negative penalties. As result, Bandura inferred that an individual’s sense of efficacy could vary from situation to
situation. This insight has important implications for research on teacher’s self-efficacy (Raudenbush et al. 1992).

Efficacy beliefs also can influence individuals’ thought patterns and emotional reactions. Individuals with low self-efficacy, who regard themselves as inefficacious, may avoid difficult tasks, believing that things are more difficult than they really are. This pessimistic belief can foster stress, depression, and a narrow vision of how best to solve problems. They generally have low aspirations and weak goal commitment. When faced with difficult tasks, they dwell on personal deficiencies, obstacles they may encounter, and other adverse outcomes rather than concentrating on how to perform successfully (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000). As a result of these decisions, effort typically decreases and individuals with low self-efficacy tend to give up quickly when facing difficulties. Many are slow to recover their sense of efficacy following failure or setbacks and are more likely to fall victim to stress and depression (Bandura, 1994; Pajares, 1996).

2.3.2. Source of Self-Efficacy

Bandura’s study (as cited in Teschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998) described four sources of self-efficacy. One factor, performance accomplishment, refers to the successful completion of a behavior. Teschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy (1998) addressed the concept of mastery experiences. Efficacy beliefs are strengthened with the successful completion of a difficult task with little assistance early in the learning cycle; however, not all successful learning experiences develop efficacy. If learning is achieved through extensive assistance, late in the learning cycle, and on an easy task, efficacy belief is not raised. Mastery experiences are the most important source of self-efficacy. The theory is that once people complete a task successfully, their confidence to repeat it again is increased.
(Weber and Omotani, 1994). Teschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy (1998) stated that self-perception of teaching competence is affected by all four of the areas, but is most influenced by mastery experiences.

The second factor is vicarious experience, or watching others perform. If the task being viewed is familiar to the viewer, this has an even bigger effect on the observer. Through vicarious experience one begins to decide who can learn, how much can be learned, who is responsible for the learning, and whether teachers can really make a difference (Teschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998).

Verbal persuasion is the third and least effective factor that influences self-efficacy. An example of verbal persuasion is coursework and professional development workshops. These experiences provide information about teaching by providing strategies and methods. These experiences may have little impact on the perception of teaching confidence until they are actually used in successful teaching – learning situations.

The fourth source of self-efficacy information is psychological and emotional cues. Bandura (1996) stated that moderate levels of arousal can improve performance, while high levels of arousal can impair or interfere with effective use of skills and abilities. The level of emotional and psychological arousal a person experiences in a teaching situation adds to self-perceptions of teaching competence (Teschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998).

Bandura (1986) suggested that relevant information used for judging personal capabilities becomes instructive only through cognitive appraisal. Much of the appraisal depends on how an individual interprets the given information. In addition, Bandura concluded that:
“... in forming efficacy judgment, people have to deal not only with different configurations of efficacy-relevant information conveyed by a given modality, but they also have to weigh and integrate efficacy information from these diverse sources. The weights assigned to different types of efficacy information may vary across different domains of activity”.

The self-efficacy mechanism is a central determinant of a person's ability to exert power, action, and influence and is the outcome of a complex process of self-persuasion, resulting from the processing of efficacy information conveyed enactively, vicariously, socially, and physiologically (Chester & Beaudin, 1996). People's perceptions of their efficacy affect all of their positive and negative interactions and environments. Bandura (1986, 1989) explained that self-efficacy beliefs regulate human functioning and influence selection of activities and environments. As such, these beliefs can be key factors in the self-regulation of motivation. The motivation to pursue a task or challenge (i.e., teaching in an urban middle school) can result from individuals' internalized goals, needs, and aspirations that are dependent on the self-efficacy mechanism (Bandura, 1977, 1986; Gagne, 1985).

Bandura (as cited in Chester & Beaudin, 1996) suggested that self-efficacy should be defined within the context of behaviors that are being studied. Thus, when investigating teacher beliefs, perceived self-efficacy should include "beliefs about confidence to affect students' performance and about confidence to perform specifics tasks" (Pajares, 1992, p. 316), as well as beliefs about causes of teachers' or students' performances.

2.3.3. Teacher’s Efficacy
Researchers have been linked the construct of teacher efficacy to Bandura’s (1997) theory of self-efficacy. Teacher efficacy is viewed as a specific type of self-efficacy (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk-Hoy, & Hoy, 1998). These beliefs are influenced by the degree of effort that individuals put forth, the length of time they persist when confronted with obstacles, their resilience in coping with demanding situations (Bandura, 1997).

The conceptualization of teacher efficacy in the literature focused on teachers’ perception of their teaching competence and their abilities to shape students’ knowledge, values, and behavior (Ashton & Webb, 1986; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk-Hoy, 2001). According to Bandura (as cited in Ghaith & Shaaban, 1999), two types of expectations determine human behavior: (a) an expectation that a certain behavior can lead to a certain outcome, and (b) an expectation that one can perform the required behavior needed to bring about the desired outcome. Within the context of teaching, Coladaria and Bretton (1997) explained beliefs that a normative teacher or an abstract collective of teachers; are capable of delivering skillful instruction that can overcome the negative effects of an impoverished home environment constitutes a sense of ‘general efficacy’. Personal efficacy refers to a teacher’s personal confidence that she/he is capable of delivering skillful instruction. These researchers further emphasized that understanding the distinction between these two types of efficacy (personal and general) is important. This distinction is important because teachers may have a high sense of general efficacy, but many have serious doubts about their personal ability to perform the necessary activities that can produce desired outcomes (Ghaith & Shaaban, 1999). In the context of a study reported Ghaith & Shaaban (1999), personal and general efficacy is viewed as two separated variables that were defined by Anderson, Greene, and Loewen (1998):
1. **Personal efficacy** is the teachers’ own expectations that they will be able to perform the actions that lead to student learning,

2. **General efficacy** is the belief that the teacher population’s ability to perform this action is not limited by factors beyond school control.

Teacher efficacy researchers proposed similar conceptualizations to those of Anderson et al. using different labels, such as: Teaching efficacy and personal teaching efficacy (Ashton & webb, 1986; Gibson & Dembo, 1984) and general teaching efficacy and personal teaching efficacy (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1990). Other researchers, Evans and Tribble, Guskey, Greenwood (as cited in Ghaith & Shaaban, 1999) concurred that the construct of teacher efficacy was a uni-dimensional construct. While Ashton and Webb (1986) stressed that teacher behavior is best predicted by personal efficacy and teaching efficacy, these independent constructs should be considered as parts of a single latent variable, teacher efficacy. Bandura and Jourdan (1991) maintained that self-efficacy is a situation – specific determinant of behavior instead of a global personal trait.

Tschannen-Moran, Wolfolk Hoy, and Hoy, (as cited in Brouwers & Tomic, 2000) proposed an integrated model, reflecting the cyclical nature of teacher efficacy. They inferred that:

> “Within this model, teachers’ efficacy judgments resulted from the interaction between personal appraisal of the relative importance of factors that make teaching difficult and an assessment of self-perceptions of personal teaching capabilities. To make these assessments, teachers draw information from four sources: enactive mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and psychological arousal. The consequences of teacher efficacy, the goals teachers set for themselves, the effort they put into reaching these goals and their persistence when facing difficulties, influence teachers’
performance levels, which in turn serve as new sources of efficacy information”.

The cycle nature of teacher efficacy implies that lower levels of efficacy lead to lower levels of effort and persistence, which lead to a deterioration in performance, which in turn lead to decreased efficacy (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000). Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy and Hoy (1998) presented a model of the cyclical nature of teacher efficacy. Figure 7 presents the graphical representation of this model.

Figure 7: The Cyclical Nature of Teacher Efficacy (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy & Hoy, 1998)

Efficacy is a function of a teacher’s source of efficacy information, cognitive processing, analysis of the teaching task, assessment of personal teaching competence, goals, effort, persistence, and influence teachers’ cognitive processing they become more confident in their abilities to analyze the teaching task and assess their personal teaching competency, the teacher efficacy can be either increased or decreased. Their perceptions then have an effect on the consequences of teacher efficacy which then influence their performance, which provides new sources of efficacy information and being the cycle new.
Attributions play a role in teacher efficacy. If teachers attribute success to internal or controllable causes, such as effort, then self-efficacy is enhanced. But if success is attributed to luck or intervention of others, then self-efficacy may not be strengthened (Bandura, 1993; Pintrich & Schunk, 1996). Bandura (1997) observed that low self-efficacy leads teachers to avoid situations for which they perceive they cannot succeed. Efficacy research predicts that when tasks, challenges, or changes are perceived as being unattainable, too costly, or demanding, low efficacy teachers tend to either resist or ignore such options. Teachers who have low self-efficacy are more likely to attribute failure to lack of ability. They may avoid challenges, complexities, and uncontrolled outcomes (Ashton & Webb, 1986; Bandura, 1997). Ashton and Webb (1986) in their study constructing high and low self-efficacy teachers, found that low efficacy teachers were more likely to; demean students, threaten students’ self-esteem, believe student could not be reached, fail to support low achieving students, emphasize control when maintaining discipline, use positional authority, lack emphasis on instruction, and were unwilling to monitor academic work. Gibson and Dembo (1984) found that teachers with low teacher efficacy spent more time on nonacademic activities, gave up if they did not get results, and criticized students for failure. Denscombe (1985) also found that teachers with low efficacy who perceived that students were lazy, noisy, or troublemakers gave up trying gradually came to regard classroom disruption as normal. Low efficacy teachers were able to preserve and protect their egos by allowing classroom disruptions to continue. They believed they could not do anything about student behavior problems and absolved themselves of responsibility for classroom control. Hence, low efficacy teachers tended to be more punitive, critical, demeaning to students that resulted
in substantial in students’ misbehavior (Ashton&webb, 1986; Denscombe, 1985; Rosenholtz, 1989).

Researchers (Ashton&Webb, 1986; Bandura, 1977, 1997; Berman & McLaughlin, 1977; Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990) found that teachers with high self-efficacy:

- Were willing to take risk
- Sought challenges
- Were open to staff development and other change efforts
- Raised academic performance levels of student successfully
- Felt less threatened by student behavior
- Extended more effort
- were willing to support students’ intrinsic interests and academic self-directedness
- rejected more humanistically during interaction with students, and
- rejected custodial methods to control the class

Ashton and Webb (1986) asserted that high efficacy teachers believed that most low performing students could be reached academically and were worth the time and effort
required to reach them. These teachers were likely to sustain efforts in reaching students and tended to persevere during tough times.

Ashton and Webb (1986) applied Bandura’s social learning theory to the study of teacher efficacy. They employed a measure of teacher efficacy developed by the Rand Corporation (Berman & McLaughlin, 1997) to assess two dimensions of teacher efficacy. The first, which they believed correspond to Bandura’s outcome expectations, was labeled teaching efficacy. Teachers’ level of agreement was assessed with the statement; when it comes right down to it, a teacher really can’t do much because most of a student’s motivation and performance depends on his or her home environment. The second dimension, which was consistent with Bandura’s efficacy expectations, was labeled personal efficacy. The level of agreement with the statement: If I try really hard, I can get through to even the most difficult or unmotivated students” assessed this dimension. Results of research employing these two items as a measure of teacher efficacy supported the independence of the two different efficacy dimensions (Ashton & Webb, 1986).

Over time, several instruments were developed to measure teacher efficacy in the Rotter tradition, including Teacher Locus of Control (Rose & Medway, 1981) and Responsibility for Student Achievement (Guskey, 1981). Several measures grew out of Bandura’s social cognitive theory and his construct of self-efficacy (as cited in Brouwers & Tomic, 2000), the Teacher Efficacy Scale (Gibson & Dembo, 1984), the Science Teaching Efficacy Belief instrument (Riggs & Enochs, 1990), the Ashton Vignettes (Ashton, Buhr & Crocker, 1984), and the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (Bandura, 1990).

Friedman and Kass (2002) expressed their discontent with the narrowness of the definition of teacher efficacy, especially with the two–factor model originating from the
RAND – Rotter and the Gibson and Dembo (1984) conceptualization. The major rationale for this sense of discontent rested on the assumption that teachers’ role were much more complex than represented in existing conceptualizations (Friedman & Kass, 2002). In this regard, Bandura (as cited in Fridman & Kass, 2000) argued that teachers’ perceptions of efficacy depended on than their ability to teach subject matter. Woolfolk, Rosoff, & Hoy (1990) argued that teacher’s effectiveness is determined in part, by their efficacy beliefs in maintaining classroom discipline that establishes an environment of learning, using appropriate resources, and supporting parental efforts to help their children learn. Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk-Hoy (2001) suggested that measures of teacher efficacy need to be useful and generalizable if they are going to examine teacher self assessments of their competence across the wide range of activities and tasks that they are expected to perform.

2.3.4. Predictors of Teacher efficacy

A number of studies have been performed to determine the elements that predict teacher efficacy. Research suggests that teacher characteristics such as gender, years of teaching experience, and educational background, as well as the grade level to which teachers are assigned may predict between-teacher differences in teachers’ sense of efficacy.

Gender. There is empirical evidence to suggests that, on average, female teachers have higher self-efficacy beliefs than do male teachers (Brandon, 2000; Ross, Cousins, & Gadalla, 1996; Anderson et al., 1998; Kalaian & Freeman, 1994; Raudenbush et al. 1992; Haydal, 1997; Wittmann, 1992; Anderson, Greene & Loewen, 1998; Lee, Buck & Midgley, 1992; Riggs, 1991). These researches indicated that female reported higher efficacy in elementary school settings, in higher school, and in special education. While males showed high efficacy when asked about their confidence in teaching subject, for example, in science subject which tends
to be more of a male-dominated subject. However, gender differences in task or domain specific measures of teacher efficacy are not always found.

_Teaching Experience and Age._ The effect of years of teaching experience on teachers’ efficacy also varies depending on the measure of teacher efficacy used in the study. Dembo and Gibson (1985) found that preservice teachers had the highest teaching efficacy (teachers can make difference), and that teaching efficacy declined slightly with experience. In a study by Hoy and Woolfolk (1993), teachers declined slightly in teaching efficacy as they became more experienced. On the other hand, teachers increased in personal teaching efficacy (I can get through to even the most difficult students) with experience. Campbell (1996) reported that experience proved to be related to the development of teacher efficacy. Higher teacher efficacy scores also linked with higher age, although teacher who changed schools or experienced disruptive events tended to decrease efficacy (Huguenard, 1992; Coladarci and Breton, 1991; Taimalu and Ōim, 2005).

Previous research indicates that years of teaching experience is positively correlated with measures that assess a teacher’s belief that he or she is capable of carrying out teaching tasks and producing student learning (e.g., Dembo & Gibson, 1984; Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993), but negatively associated with measures that assess efficacy beliefs related to the capability of the teachers to overcome environmental impediments to learning (Hebert, Lee, Williamson, 1998). Research also suggests that the influence of teaching experience on teachers’ efficacy may vary by domain, with experienced teachers feeling more efficacious than novice teachers in the areas of instruction and classroom management, but not necessarily in terms of efficacy related to supporting student engagement (Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk-Hoy, 2002). Ross (1998) offers an exploration for some of these differences in his review of the
literature on teacher efficacy. Specifically, he posits that experience provides opportunities for the development of mastery, which may not only provide teachers with evidence that they are able to produce student learning, but also alerts them to the complexities of teaching and the difficulty of reaching all students. Some studies examining teacher age and self-efficacy did not distinguish “age” and teachers “experience”. In these studies being older in age is generally associated with having more teaching experience but it wasn’t explicit as to how many participants might have been older “new”.

*Educational Background.* Compared to investigations involving gender and teaching experience, there are relatively fewer studies that examine the influence of teachers’ educational background on teachers’ sense of efficacy. However, limited research suggests that teachers who hold a graduate degree may be more likely to have a higher sense of teaching efficacy than those who do not hold advanced degrees (e.g., Hoy & Woolfolk, 1990; 1993). At Ross, et. al’s study (1996) teachers with Master’s degree as opposed to bachelor’s degree felt fewer efficacies for being successful but more efficacies for engaging students. Finding by Hoy and Woolfolk (1993) indicated that educational level predicted personal teaching efficacy, but not general teaching efficacy. In a study by Taimalu and Õim (2005) revealed teacher efficacy beliefs depend on teacher’s age along with other teachers characteristics like educational background. Brissie, (1987, cited in Edward, 1996) found a slight positive correlation between teacher efficacy and higher degrees.

*Grade level taught.* Teacher efficacy has also been found to be lower for teachers at higher grade levels. Researchers have found this association when comparing the efficacy of teachers in differing school levels (i.e., elementary, middle, and high school) as well as when looking at grade level differences within a single school type (e.g., teachers of high school,
There is evidence in the literature suggesting that elementary teachers report higher scores in self-efficacy for teaching than do secondary teachers (Ross, Cousins, & Gadalla, 1996; Woolfolk-Hoy & Spero, 2005). The relationship between teacher efficacy and grade level does not appear to be dependent on the type of efficacy assessed (general and personal), as there was substantial variability in the efficacy measures employed in the previously mentioned studies.

2.3.5. Teacher Efficacy and Classroom Management

Woolfolk, Rosoff, and Hoy (1990) proposed that teachers’ sense of efficacy (i.e. the belief that they can have a positive effect on student learning) appeared to be related to teacher approaches to classroom management. Brauwers and Tomic (2000) defined teacher perceived self-efficacy in classroom management as teachers’ beliefs in their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to maintain classroom order. Research of Emmer and Hickman (1991) suggested that teacher efficacy for classroom management and discipline was distinct from the personal teaching efficacy and general teaching efficacy dimensions identified by Gibson and Dembo (1984). They reported that high efficacy in this area predicted preferences for certain teacher strategies to manage situations, such as: encouraging students to expand more effort, providing praise and helping students develop goals to become successful. Emmer and Hickman (1991) extended teacher efficacy research and defined a third factor called classroom management and discipline. He added this third the Gibson and Dembo instrument.
Research on prospective teachers reported by Woolfolk and Hoy (1990) argued that prospective teachers’ beliefs about student control could impact how they managed their classrooms. Teachers’ beliefs could have an impact on their management strategies, and perceptions of attaining and maintaining a comfortable classroom environment.

Brouwers and Tomic (2000) noted that people who doubted their abilities in particular domain of activity were quick to consider such activities as threats, which they preferred to avoid. Teachers who distrusted their ability to maintain classroom order could not avoid this key factor. Teachers who lacked confidence in their classroom management abilities were confronted by their incompetence every day. At the same time, they understood the importance of competence if they were going to perform well and help their students achieve their educational goals (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000). This internal conflict could cause distress and impact instructional and behavioral strategies that teachers use to establish and maintain order in their classrooms.

Woolfolk, Rosoff and Hoy (1990) conducted a study to determine if a relationship existed between teachers’ sense of efficacy and their general beliefs about how to manage their classrooms, control, and motivate students. Results from the target population found that:

“... the greater the teacher's sense of personal efficacy, the more humanistic the teacher's pupil control orientation. The stronger the teacher's belief that teaching can be successful, even with difficult and unmotivated students (general teaching efficacy), the more humanistic the teacher's pupil control orientation and the more the teacher supported student autonomy in solving classroom problems. Teachers who believed that students must be controlled and cannot be trusted were also more likely to believe that extrinsic rewards
are necessary to motivate the students”.

Researchers (Anderson, 1980; Kounin, 1970, as cited in Chambers, Henson, and Sienty, 2001) found that a very important variable, teacher management behavior, could influence student engagement. Other researchers (Anderson, Everston & Brophy, 1979) found a correlation between management and student achievement.
C)

What do we know about five factor model of personality and how does it help to find out teachers’ personality profiles?

2.4. Personality

2.4.1. Definition of Personality

'Personality is that pattern of characteristic thoughts, feelings, and behaviors that distinguishes one person from another and that persists over time and situation' (Phares, 1991). It is the sum of biologically based and learnt behavior which forms the person's unique responses to environmental stimuli (Ryckman, 1982).

The concept of personality must be hypothetically understood (Ryckman, 1982). No clear neurological ground can be found for it, although attempts have been made to describe the basis of personality in terms of neurophysiology (Rowe, 1989). Probably no other word in the English language is more loosely and freely used than the word” personality”. Some definitions include:

1. One’s personality is the sum total of all of his habits—physical, mental, moral, spiritual, civic, and emotional (Brown and Phelps, 1961).

2. The characteristic patterns of behavior through which the individual adjusts himself to his environment, especially his social environment (Brown and Phelps, 1961).


4. The quality or fact of being a person (Mckechnie, 1983).
5. Habitual patterns and qualities of behavior of any individual as expressed by physical and mental activities and attitudes; distinctive individual qualities of a person (McKechnie, 1983).

The personality structure is fairly stable and predictable throughout different situations and time (Phares, 1991). There are personality traits of different depth and significance. The innermost layer is the basis, while the outermost layer is situation-bound and influenced by, for example, tiredness. A tired person might accordingly behave in a way that is not like his/her true self (Cattell, 1950). Dependent on the situation, personality traits may be more or less visible and personality may also develop over time (Phares, 1991). The changes which reflect events and feelings during the lifespan only affect the surface and not the core character. Profound changes in personality are usually consequences of major life changes or deliberate effort (Costa & McCrae, 1992).

It is important that the individuals adapt to their circumstances in life at the same time as they retain the feeling of a solid inner core. Some adaptations seem to be general and follow a certain pattern. Sensation seeking is one example of characteristics which diminish over time from adolescence to middle age in all cultures (Costa & McCrae, 1980). Neuroticism and openness to experience tend to decrease over time, while self-esteem, conscientiousness and agreeableness tend to increase (Neyer, 2000). The expressions of personality are moreover dependent on age and maturity. The same activity level may thus enhance an interest for football at a young age and gardening in later days (Costa & McCrae, 1980).

2.4.2. Research on Teacher personality

This review of research on teacher personality points to a series of findings and suggestive observations. There may be no specific statements concerning the big five
personality factor focused in the present study. However, this section has examined teacher personality in terms of its role in various efficacy and classroom orientations.

The word personality, as previously illustrated, has broad and varied definitions. An educator’s personality has been cited as the greatest factor in a teacher’s success or failure in teaching. According to Brown and Phelps (1961), there is no other field in which the personality of the individual is more significant factor of success than it is in teaching. Personality traits influence the form of discipline teachers use, how they handle and react to problems, and how they organize their classroom. Personality traits also significantly affect daily routines and interactions and responses to other people. Perceptions and attention are influenced by personality and determine how people respond to others at work, at home, and socially.

Ornstein (1990) points out that teachers need to examine their personalities and how they relate to their systems of discipline. A teacher’s personality, philosophy, and teaching style will directly affect his or her classroom style of discipline and the approaches used in disciplining students. Edwards (1997), in support of Ornstein (1990), believes that the approach teachers use to discipline and their reaction to the students produce different results. In choosing a discipline approach or method, teachers must be aware and objective about their personalities and the beliefs of discipline and examine what is they are trying to accomplish when disciplining students. Ornstein adds by stating, teachers need to assess their strengths and weaknesses and identify their personality, values, and beliefs. Because teachers are different and have their own unique personalities, according to Mosier and Park, cited in Duke (1982), there is danger in a school or an administrator adopting an established model of discipline because each teacher is unique. There needs to be allowances for each teacher’s
unique intelligence and personality. For a discipline plan to be effective, the teacher must be able to embrace the system and implement it with sincerity.

Emmer (1991) states there is strong evidence that teacher thinking, philosophy, and behavior regarding student discipline and behavior management are all strongly influenced by the teacher’s personality and emotional reactions to experiences in the classroom. Emotional states have effects on teachers’ daily routines and interactions with other people and how they respond to students and adults. Emmer believes that teacher emotions and the effect they have on the classroom and students have received little attention from educational researchers. Teachers’ emotional reactions to student behavior and classroom management and the reasons teachers behave as they do deserve the attention of current educational researchers. Emmer states that of all the areas in which teachers must act, classroom management and discipline present emotionally charged situations.

According to Brown and Phelps (1961) a teacher can minimize problems by his or her actions and personality. Classroom discipline tends to be effective or ineffective depending on the impact of the teacher’s personality. A student’s learning is rooted in the teacher’s personality and the interrelationship between the student and teacher.

Teachers’ personality traits and behavior in the classroom have been the focus of many research studies. Reynaud and Murray (1996) studied university psychology professors to determine an association between personality traits and teaching effectiveness. The study found extroversion, leadership, supportiveness, and intelligence to be among the traits related to teaching effectiveness. The study supported previous studies that concluded teaching effectiveness is closely related to the personality traits of the teacher. Human relationships are always the interaction of personalities. The impact of the teacher’s personality on a
student will show in the student’s behavior. According to Brown and Phelps (1961), a teacher who lacks basic courtesy in their personality by being sarcastic, inconsistent, playing favorites and ignoring students will create students who react with resentment, fearfulness, unhappiness, and disobedience.

The personality traits of teachers that have the most significant influence on others include cheerfulness, friendliness, and congeniality of interests. Bush (1985) in a study on teacher personality, pupil control behavior, and pupil control attitudes concluded that teachers with a more humanistic personality were more effective than teachers with an authoritarian personality. Teachers with a humanistic personality are more flexible, adaptable, and handle stress and frustration without fatigue. They are secure and have a strong positive self-concept and respect students as individuals. The authoritarian personality is rigid, punitive, of low tolerance, critical, and doubtful of its own worth. The authoritarian’s approach to classroom management and discipline is based on absolute authority and compliance.

Long (1991) believes that optimism, positive regards for others, and a hardy disposition are positive teacher attributes that lead to desired students outcomes. A study conducted by Scheier and Carver (1985, as cited in Long, 1991) found that optimists generally expect good things to happen and pessimists behave differently and others react very differently to them. In a follow-up study, Scheier et al., (1986, as cited in Long, 1991) concluded that people enjoy interacting with optimistic individuals and tend to shun pessimists. Teachers with a gloomy and pessimistic outlook were more likely to turn students off to school than teachers who were optimistic and were hopeful about the future.
A study of hardiness on teachers was conducted by McEnany (1986). The researcher interviewed teachers with twenty-five years or more experience and who have maintained successful careers. The findings noted that these hardy teachers were actively involved in helping students succeed and were responsible for making good things happen in their classroom. The personality of hardy teachers was also studied by Harris, Halpin, and Halpin (1985). The authors concluded that teachers who perceive themselves as directly affecting the classroom activities work hard to produce desired outcomes.

Kourilsky, Esfahani, and Wittrock (1996) studied generative teaching and personality characteristics of student teachers. The purpose of the study was to determine the association between a student teacher’s social maturity, receptivity to criticism, and the ability to use suggestions about their performances and generative teaching. There was a positive relationship between those personality characteristics and effective generative teaching.

Smith (1981, 1984) studied the relationship between classroom management styles and certain teacher personality variables. In Classroom Management Styles and Personality Variables of Teachers and Education Majors, Smith (1981) employed, among other instruments, Rotter's Internal–External Locus of Control test. The results were reported for 313 respondents-158 experienced teachers with a range of teaching experience from 1 to 52 years, a mean of 10.4 years of teaching experience, and a mean age of 36.5 years; and 155 education majors, just beginning professional education training, with a mean age of 21.5 years. As stated by Smith (1981), Locus of Control refers to the degree to which individuals attribute reinforcement to their own behavior or to circumstances beyond their control. Smith (1981) observed that for the sample of education majors, there was a statistically significant relationship between the inductive classroom management style and an internal locus of
control. For the sample of experienced teachers, Smith observed a trend associating the inductive classroom management style and an internal locus of control. Although Smith (1981) termed this observed finding among the experienced teachers, as compared with education majors, somewhat confusing, the overall findings were indicative of a significant correlation between the inductive-integrative teaching style and internalized locus of control. Such a correspondence is also consistent with the assumptions of ego psychology which postulates that a greater degree of self-control parallels a clearer delineation of self from object. Ego theory suggests that an individual with greater self-definition should be able to permit more autonomous functioning in others. The ability to allow greater student autonomy is observed in the classroom management styles of the inductive – integrative teachers. These teachers view the students as an individual and are more encouraging of the student’s open expression of ideas, concerns and feelings. Flander’s (1965, as cited in Chambers et al., 2001) found that this pattern of teacher behavior worked better with students whose goals were less clear. Flander’s thought this was due to these students’ needs to achieve a greater degree of independence from the teacher in order to engage in the cognitive process of problem solving.

Smith (1981) also investigated the factors of Dogmatism, Machievellianism and Anxiety. He found no significant differences, in terms of these three factors and classroom management styles, between experienced teachers and education majors. He did, however, find significance in the males use more sensitizing /punitive techniques than females. This was especially true in the approach of the experienced male this teachers and male education majors to boys. Smith (1981) theorizes that these findings may relate to a cultural tendency to
socialize males in amore sensitizing manner and that therefore male teacher’s pass on their own socializing experiences to their students in the classroom.

Kaplan (1960) was interested in teacher competency as related to teacher personality traits. Kaplan’s (1960) goal was to establish that teacher competency was not related factors in a teacher’s personality. He divided his teacher sample into subject-orientation and pupil-orientation by means of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory. He found that, on the Rorschach Test, subject –oriented teachers in contrast to the pupil –oriented teachers, took less time on the test, gave less original responses and gave fewer sex responses.

There were other differences between the two teacher groups but they did not prove statistically significant. For example, he found that the pupil – oriented teacher was more responsive to affect and individually than the subject- oriented teacher. In addition, the pupil-oriented teacher views structure as something to be altered rather than preserved, and that he prefers not to be regarded as a spokesman for tradition. Kaplan (1960) found that the subject-oriented teacher displayed attitudes of a sharp distinction between adult and child, little tolerance for play amid the serious business of education and a greater restraint on instinctual expression in the classroom. In some contrast to this, the pupil – oriented teacher group took the view that the teachers ‘identification with the child facilitates the teachers’ role and that the students’ good manners are not always essential. The author concluded that the Rorschach results showed that the pupil-oriented group of teachers expressed playfulness, regression, and affect and that the subject- oriented group of teachers showed restraint, renunciation and intellection.

The work of investigators such as Blos (1941), Ackerly (1960), Bernard(1958), Caplan(1963) and Smith(1981) underscores the importance of the teacher’s personality as a
major factor in teacher responses to students and in the transactions between teachers and students. These authors support the importance of the teachers’ experiences and personality factors that affect, often negatively, the teacher’s relationship with students in their classrooms.

With reference to the issue of classroom control Symond (1955) stated that the “superior teacher” does not “…fear…one’s own aggression “and can therefore be more “assertive” and exercise greater “firmness” in dealing with students. In this regard, it is interesting to compare the self-assuredness observed by Symond’s (1955), in what he termed the more effective, child-centered teacher, and Smith’s (1981) finding of a greater internal locus of control on the part of teachers with an inductive classroom management style, i.e., greater reliance on self as an agent of control, in one case, and greater self-confidence, in the other. In both cases these qualities are also associated with a more effective psychologically – oriented classroom management style as seen through the lens of psychoanalytic ego psychology and cognitive – behavioral theory.

According to Edwards (1997), Dreikurs has identified three types of teachers: autocratic, permissive, and democratic. An autocratic teacher is one who forces his or her will on the students and takes strict control. They do not tolerate deviation from the rules of the classroom and use force to motivate students. The autocratic teacher does not use humor or show any warmth in class and enforces his or her power and authority over students. Students are not receptive to the autocratic teacher and may respond with hostility to the demands and commands. The permissive teacher is also ineffective when working with students because rules are not important in the classroom and the teacher does not follow through on consequences. The teacher allows the students to behave as student learning self-discipline
hey wish and is not concerned about the students learning self-discipline. The result of a permissive teacher is a chaotic learning environment. The democratic teacher sets firm guidelines but does not instill rebellion. Students are encouraged to participate in decision making and learning responsibility. Freedom is allowed with the students assuming responsibility for their behavior. The result of a democratic teacher is that students feel a sense of belonging and community and students increase their personal responsibilities as they are free to explore and discover. Dreikurs’ approach to discipline is democratic and a democratic environment procedures students who behave out of a desire to be accepted socially.

A study was conducted to support Dreikurs’ Theories. Appleton and Stanwyck (1996) studied 115 graduate students employed as classroom teachers for the purpose of determining a relationship among personality, pupil control ideology, and leadership style. The basic Adlerian Scales for Interpersonal Success-Adult (BASIS-A) form was used to assess teacher personality. The finding indicated that teachers who were less democratic and more custodial in their classroom management were likely to score high on “Taking Charge” and Striving for Perfection”. A teacher with the Taking Charge personality style will need to be aware and understand that power struggles with students may become an issue. Appleton and Stanwyck that assessed teachers’ personality traits may be helpful in the teacher understanding the strengths and weakness of the traits and the teachers’ approach to life.

Teacher personality was the number one factor of teacher effectiveness according to a study conducted by Ganser (1996). Ganser studied preservice and inservice teachers using a survey of ten factors associated with the overall effectiveness of a teacher. The study revealed that teacher factors of personality, intelligence, and background as compared to the
same pupil factors have more influence in teacher effectiveness. Both preservice and inservice teachers reported that the single most important factor of teacher effectiveness was teacher personality.

“What a teacher know is not as important as how the teacher acts in managing classroom behavior. It is teacher action, not teacher knowledge, which influences the way the referent students feel, learn, and behave” (Englander, 1986). The literature has shown that personality is probably the greatest factor in teacher’s effectiveness or ineffectiveness in teaching. Student misbehavior can be reduced or accelerated by the teacher’s reaction to the student’s inappropriate behavior. How discipline problems are viewed and managed depends to a large degree on the teacher’s personality.

According to many of the researchers (Brown and Phelps 1961; Ornestein 1990; Emmer 1991), teachers need to be aware that their personality will directly affect their managerial and disciplinary approach. Teacher need to be flexible and examine their choice of discipline models in relationship to their own ideals, values, and personality. To be more effective in managing student behavior, teachers must be objective about their personalities and understand their strengths and weaknesses.

2.4.3. The Five Factor Model (FFM) of Personality Structure

Throughout the centuries, personality has been described and measured by a range of theories and models. Some theories (such as those of Freud and Jung) seek to explain the dynamics of personality as a whole. One of the basic concepts of Freud's theories is the notion of different levels of consciousness. We are aware of the phenomena on the conscious level, able to reach the phenomena on the preconscious level but unaware of the issues on the unconscious level. Our personality and reactions are influenced by all these three levels. Jung
extended the unconscious concept to include the collective unconscious and the study of archetypes. We inherit in our brains the collective unconscious, which is a latent memory base of our ancestors. Archetypes are themes which have been part of human life throughout all time and cultures. The persona, anima and animus and the self are some of the archetypes described by Jung. The persona represents the mask and the different roles we play in our lives. Each man has a feminine side, anima, while each woman has a male side, animus. The self is depicted as our true potential and aim of self-actualization. All these aspects influence our behavior and form the basis of our character.

Besides the psychodynamic theories of personality there are the descriptive ones. The dispositional personality perspective depicts personality as made up by physiologically based traits, which guide behavior. Traits can be described as tendencies to behave and react in a specific way (Phares, 1991). Personality states, on the other hand, are the results of the combination of traits and situation. Persons with high emotional instability are, for instance, more likely than calm and stable persons to feel anxiety in a threatening evaluation situation. Traits can thus be described as dispositions to states (Humphreys & Revelle, 1984). Trait theory has in recent years become more and more popular. The base of personality in this tradition is related to genetics and neurological processes. Research based on studies of twins raised apart has shown that 50% of the central personality traits can be related to genes. Experiences in childhood are another ground for the formation of personality. As experiences are self-selected to a large degree, they can also be guided by genetic disposition. Although genetics seem to influence personality, neither genetic disposition nor environmental influences are deterministic. The individual is unique in his/her character and part of a
complex system which makes it impossible to predict reactions with certainty (Bouchard, 1997).

After 50 years of personality research there is a common agreement in the field that there are five basic dimensions that can be used to describe differences in cognitive, affective and social behavior. This is the base for the five-factor model of personality (Revelle & Loftus, 1992). Goldberg (1981) termed elements of the model “Big Five,” in order to describe the personality factors we commonly refer today as Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness (Costa & McCrae, 1992). According to Goldberg, the choice of the description “Big Five” was “…a title chosen not to reflect their intrinsic greatness but to emphasize that each of these factors is extremely broad” (John & Sruivastava, 1999). The dimensions are stable across a lifespan and seem to have a physiological base (Revelle & Loftus, 1992).

The five-factor model discussion evolved from an analysis of the terms which are used to describe personality. The lexical hypothesis states that there is enough information in natural language to describe differences in personality, as natural basic characteristics are reflected into language (Goldberg, 1990). Besides the lexical analysis, additional support for the five-factor model was found in the analysis of personality questionnaires. Almost all of the personality tests existing today measure one or more of the five factors (McCrae & John, 1992).

Existence of a five–dimensional personality structure is supported by early research using rating, self-report, and linguistic analyses (Borgatta, 1964; Fiske, 1949; Norman, 1963; Smith, 1967; Tupes & Christal, 1961). Additional recent research further supports the concept that personality can be represented by five super-ordinate constructs (Birenbaum &
Descriptors used by various researchers are consistent with the theory of five robust personality dimensions. Eysenck (1947) delineated the “Big Two”: Extraversion/Introversion and Neuroticism/Emotional Stability. A third dimension, generally interpreted as “agreeableness”, involves such characteristics as altruism, nurturance, and caring at one end of the dimension, and hostility, self-centeredness, spitefulness, and jealousy at the other end (Digman, 1990). A fourth dimension, characterized as “conscientiousness” by some researches (Costa & McCrae, 1985; Norman, 1963), has been termed by others as “will” (Digman, 1988), “superego strength” (Cattell, 1957), “self-control” (Lorr, 1986), and “dependability” (Tupes & Christal, 1961). A fifth dimension has been variously interpreted as “intellect” (Digman & Inouye, 1986; Goldberg, 1981; Hogan, 1983), “Intelligence” (Borgatta, 1964), and “openness” (Costa & McCrae, 1985). Supportive evidence for the presence of the five factor model has been found within the realm of personality inventories. Among these are the Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI; Eysenck & Eysenck, 1964; McCrae & Costa, 1985), the Jackson Personality Research Form (PRF; Costa & McCrae, 1988; Jackson, 1974), the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI; McCrae & Costa, 1989; Meyers & McCauley, 1985), and the California Set (Block, 1961; McCrae, Costa, and Bush, 1986). Support for four of the factors was found in the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI; Costa & et al., 1986; Hathaway & McKinley, 1951). The one dimension absent from MMPI was “conscientiousness”.

2.4.4. The Five Factor Model and Proficiency
One important weakness of existing personality research in education, as with research in other occupations (Barick & Mount, 1991), is the absence of a consistent taxonomy of personality traits for use from study to study. Attempts to compare the results of research studies, therefore, may be largely futile, because it is often difficult to determine whether the variables used are similar from one study to another. When possible recurrent factors are found, differences in the nature of the variable identifying these factors are such as to make nearly impossible any but subjective judgments as to their possible similarities (Tupes & Christal, 1961). The five factor model (FFM) of personality structure addresses this deficiency by providing as parsimonious model that captures the five principal dimensions that are recurrent within much of personality theory research: Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, and “conscientiousness”.

The value of the FFM lies in three arenas (McCrae & John, 1992): (a) Its integration of a wide array of personality constructs facilitates communication among researchers of many different orientations; (b) Its comprehensiveness provides a basis for systematic exploration of the relations between personality and other phenomena, and (c) Its efficiency provides at least a global description of personality with as few as five scores. McCrae and John (1992) pointed out: “Of these, comprehensiveness is perhaps the most crucial. Without a comprehensiveness model, studies using personality traits as predictors are inconclusive, because the most relevant traits may have been overlooked”.

Studies, using established instruments such as the 16 Personality Factor Inventory and California Personality Inventory, have demonstrated support for the viability of the FFM to predict student teacher success (Guddemi, Swick & Brown, 1987). In their qualitative analysis of seven studies utilizing teacher scores on the 16PF and two studies utilizing
teacher scores on the CPI as correlates of Success, Guddemi et al., (1987) concluded that successful student teachers demonstrated emotional stability, enthusiasm, conscientiousness, and venturesomeness. Other characteristics of successful student teachers, as shown by scores on the CPI, are friendliness, control, and ego strength. High performing student teachers were found to be warm, kind, systematic, stimulating, and creative.

Given the complexity of the job of teaching, it is not surprising that Guddemi, Swick & Brown (1987) concluded that no single personality characteristic emerges as indicative of successful pre-service teacher-education students. They identified five characteristics as most often recognized as positive attributes of teachers that show strong resemblance to the dimensions of the FFM: outgoing/assertive (Extraversion, spontaneous/imaginative (Openness), self-image (Emotional stability), conscientiousness (Conscientiousness), and control (Agreeableness). Guddemi, Swick & Brown (1987) emphasized the value of these characteristics for helping teacher educators identify “at-risk” prospective teachers for possible remedial action or de-selection from teacher training. School administrators have a similar opportunity to use these characteristics to identify from among their applicant pool those prospective teachers who have the greatest potential for success. In their meta-analysis involving 117 studies of personality attributes for selection purposes, Barrick and Mount (1991) found that Conscientiousness showed consistent, positive relationships with all job performance criteria for all occupational groups studied (professional, police, manager, sales, and skilled/semi-skilled occupations). Support was found for Extraversion as a valid predictor for managers and sales personnel. Support for Openness as a valid predictor of performance across job categories was found based on one of three criterion categories: training proficiency, but not for job proficiency or personal data. With obvious implications
for teacher performance prediction, Barrick and Mount suggested as a possible explanation of
these findings that individuals who score high on these dimensions (e.g., intelligent, curious, broad-minded, and cultured) are more likely than others to have positive attitudes toward learning experiences in general. However, it must be noted that the correlations reported were very small in size with very limited practical significance.

2.4.5. Dimension of the Five Factor Model and Implications for Predicting Teacher performance

Factor I: Conscientiousness

The relationships measured in Barrick and Mount’s (1991) meta-analysis between certain personality dimensions and job performance has implication for the prediction of success among education professionals. Just as the dimension of Conscientiousness has been found to be related generally to job success in business and industry (Barrick and Mount, 1991), it may be expected to be predictive of success among teachers. This dimension entails the element of self-control, including an active process of planning, organizing, and carrying out tasks (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Preparation and planning are major determinants of what is successfully taught in school (Clark & Lampert, 1986).

Experienced elementary teachers have reported that they spend between ten and twenty hours per week in planning activities, and much of that time occurs during non-school hours (Clark and Yinger, 1979). Such activities require a level of commitment and dedication that are related to the dimension of Conscientiousness. Pittman (1985) observed that effective teachers were differentiated from ineffective teachers along a dimension of organization, as well as dimensions of creativity and warmth. Conscientiousness has been shown to be related
to teaching success using other measures such as the 16 Personality Factor Inventory (Barr, 1961; Warburton, Butcher & Fros, 1963; McClain, 1968).
Factor II: Extraversion

Extraversion has been found to be a valid predictor of job containing a high interpersonal component, such as managers and sales agents (Barrick & Mount, 1991). More than sociability, the dimension of Extraversion includes assertiveness, talkativeness, and high energy (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Extroverts tend to like excitement and stimulation and to be cheerful in disposition. Similar to those of managers and sales agents, the job of teaching also has a substantial interpersonal component with which the teacher must be comfortable. In a study of 41 second-grade and 54 fifth-grade teachers, Ekstrom (1976) found that the ability to express oneself accurately seems to be related to communication and to instructional proficiency, and verbal fluency was found to show a positive relationship with the quality of teaching methodology. An ability and willingness to express oneself orally, to be upbeat, and to be optimistic are considered to be elements of extraversion (Barrick & Mount, 1991) and also seem to be components of successful teaching.

Factor III: Openness

Barrick and Mount (1991) found that Openness demonstrated a positive relationship with training proficiency perhaps due to positive attitudes toward learning experience. The dimension of Openness incorporates several personality elements into a coherent domain. These include an active imagination, esthetic sensitivity, attentiveness to inner feeling, preference for variety, intellectual curiosity, and independence of judgment (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Openness is especially related to aspects of intelligence that contribute to creativity, such as divergent thinking. Creativity has been found to be associated with
superior performance among elementary and secondary student teachers (Bond, 1959). Individuals who score high on this dimension are intelligent, curious, broad-minded, and cultured. This dimension also had the highest correlation of any of the personality dimensions with measures of cognitive ability. Openness may measure the ability to learn as well as motivation to learn (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Based on her interviews of twenty-tour elementary teachers who had been identified by their peers as outstanding teachers, Easterly (1985) concluded that pathfinder teachers are those who demonstrate a willingness to take risks and to have a capacity for loving and a sense of well being.

Factor IV: Neuroticism

In contrast with Extraversion and Openness, Barrick & Mount (1991) found relatively small relationships between measure of job performance and Neuroticism in their meta-analysis of 117 studies of personality and selection. Neuroticism entails a general tendency to experience negative affects such as fear, sadness, embarrassment, anger, guilt, and disgust (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Barrick and Mount,(1991) suggested that such low relationships may occur for a number of reasons, including range restriction and a selecting –out process, that personality have applicability to teacher occupational research. Individuals may have self selected out based on their own interests or perceptions of their own emotional stability. Another explanation is the possible absence of a linear relationship between emotional stability and job performance beyond a critically unstable range. That is, as long as an individual possesses sufficient emotional stability to execute the basic functions of their position, the predictive value of any differences is minimized (Barrick and Mount, 1991). This may be true of teachers as well of people in business occupations.
Certain scales of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory seem to be related to favorable teacher performance (Bowers and Soar, 1962; Flanagan, 1961). Skillful interaction with students requires a personality profile consisting of a sense of responsibility and ability to establish affective relationships. A teacher must be sufficiently well adjusted that much of his or her energy is not drained off dealing with intrapersonal tensions. A teacher must have a clear perception of self and must be able to represent himself/herself honestly in communication with others. Using supervisor ratings as a criterion measure, Flannagan(1961) found evidence to indicate that teachers rated as outstanding demonstrated positive social adjustment, low anxiety, low depression, and social extraversion.

Factor V: Agreeableness

In their meta-analysis of 117 studies of personality and selection, Barrick and Mont (1991) found that the results for Agreeableness suggested it was not an important predictor of performance for all the job categories examined. However, they concluded that Agreeableness is a better predictor for jobs with a leadership component than for the other groups studied such as professional, sales, skilled, and semi/skilled. Like Extraversion, Agreeableness is primarily a dimension of interpersonal tendencies. The agreeable person is sympathetic to other and eager to help them (Costa & McCrae, 1992). In contrast, the disagreeable person is egocentric, skeptical of other’s intentions, and competitive rather than cooperative.

The results of the Barrick and Mount(1991) research with regard to Agreeableness are in contrast to those of the other socially – based personality dimension, Extraversion, which predicted performance of managers and sales persons. It appears that being courteous,
trusting, straight forward, and soft-hearted (i.e., elements of Agreeableness) may have a smaller impact on such occupational categories as professionals and sales than being talkative, active, and assertive. To the extent that agreeableness captures affective dimensions, such as live and the concern for the well being of students, the variable of agreeableness should predict teacher effectiveness.

While existing research in the field of teacher education has demonstrated the importance of relationships between certain personality characteristics of teachers and teacher performance, few studies have been undertaken utilizing a parsimonious, yet comprehensive, model of personality. At the same time, parsimony in the extreme may be detrimental too its predictive value. The notion that only the use of a very few factors may be counterproductive to the prediction of behavior is supported among a number of personality theorists (e.g., Mershon & Gorsuch, 1988). Not all personality researchers are presented that the five –factor model provides the optimal number of factors for the prediction of behavior. Some researchers have argued foe models containing more than five to eight factors (e.g., Briggs, 1988). Such researchers maintain that those personality systems using a small number of factors operate at a higher-order level and, in so doing, lose valuable predictive information.

From a factor –analytic perspective, the rule of parsimony dictates that, when given two models of personality that explain the construct equally well, the more parsimonious of the two models is superior(Gorsuch,1983). In an applied setting, use of a model consisting only of higher-order factors, while validly explicating the construct, may be too general to provide information upon which to predict behavior accurately(Mershon&Gorsuch,1988). In other words, predictive value of real-world behavior may be increased as the number of factors is
increased (Mershon & Gorsuch, 1988; Briggs, 1988). In the context of parallel goals of gaining a better understanding of the major dimensions of teacher personality and of predictive efficiency, a hierarchical model that validly delineates both primary and second-order factors is likely to be of greater value than one not providing information at both levels (John, 1988).

Existing research in the field of teacher education points to the importance of relationships between the personality characteristics of teachers and teaching performance. Nevertheless, the finding is inconsistent. Improved evaluation of the relationships between teaching performance and the personality characteristics of teachers may be facilitated with the use of a comprehensive model for measuring teacher personality. Research evidence suggests that there are positive relationships between measures of teacher success and factors corresponding to major personality dimensions such as “conscientiousness”, “neuroticism”, “extraversion”, “openness”, and “agreeableness” (e.g., Barr, 1961; Warbuton et al., 1963; McClain, 1968; Henjam, 1966; Davis & Satterly, 1969; Swick & Ross, 1972; Mundel-Atherstone, 1980). A review of the literature, however, finds no studies that have been undertaken utilizing a personality model that is based on parsimonious, yet comprehensive framework that provides information at both trait and dimension levels.

The use of the Five Factor Model (McCrae & John, 1992) for teacher personality research may enable education researchers to distinguish the relative importance of major personality dimensions as well as the significance of traits within the major dimensions. An understanding of the importance of these traits, in the context of the larger dimension to which they pertain, may increase our ability to predict success. The goal of this study was to
examine the relationship between personality traits and the performance of in service teachers within the framework of the Five-Factor model.