DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 302 528 SP 030 792

AUTHOR Evertson, Carolyn M.
TITLE Improving Elementary Classroom Management: A School-Based Training Program for Beginning the Year.
PUB DATE Sep 88
NOTE 29p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Techniques; Elementary Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; Instructional Improvement; *Professional Development; Student Behavior; Teacher Effectiveness; *Training Methods; *Workshops

ABSTRACT

This study was one of a series of field experiments designed to accomplish three purposes: (1) to validate research-based principles of classroom organization and management found in correlational research to be related to instructional and managerial effectiveness in elementary classrooms (grades 1-6); (2) to determine if school district personnel and other teachers could conduct management workshops and collect data on teachers' use of the principles; and (3) to assess whether professional development workshops in classroom management could provide additional skills to teachers already trained in the state's instructional skills program. Results showed that workshops and classroom observations could be accomplished by personnel, and the experimental group exceeded the control group in use of key management principles, had better student task engagement, and had less inappropriate behavior. This study supports similar findings in secondary classrooms. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED302528

Improving elementary classroom management:

A school-based training program for beginning the year

Carolyn M. Evertson

Peabody College

Vanderbilt University

September, 1988

SP030792

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. M. Evertson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

U S DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Abstract

This study was one of a series of field experiments designed to accomplish three purposes: (a) to validate research-based principles of classroom organization and management found in correlational research to be related to instructional and managerial effectiveness in elementary classrooms (grades 1-6); (b) to determine if school district personnel and other teachers could conduct management workshops and collect data on teachers' use of the principles; and (c) to assess whether professional development workshops in classroom management could provide additional skills to teachers already trained in the state's instructional skills program. Results showed that workshops and classroom observations could be accomplished by personnel, and the experimental group exceeded the control group in use of key management principles, had better student task engagement, and had less in inappropriate behavior. This study supports similar findings in secondary classrooms (Evertson, 1985).

Improving elementary classroom management:
A school-based training program for beginning the year

Carolyn M. Evertson
Peabody College, Vanderbilt University

Practitioners, researchers, and lay persons alike agree about the importance of managerial and organizational skills in effective teaching. Indeed, managing and organizing the classroom is an enduring concern of both beginning and experienced teachers. Not only are these skills important to the general climate of classrooms and schools, they are also necessary ingredients in pupil achievement (Good, 1979; Medley, 1977).

Studies in primary and secondary grades (Anderson, Evertson & Brophy, 1979; Brophy & Evertson, 1976; Evertson, Anderson, Anderson, & Brophy, 1980) show that more academically effective teachers generally had better-organized classrooms and fewer behavior problems. Research also indicates that the key to managing classrooms effectively begins with advance preparation and planning from the first day of school (Emmer, Evertson, & Anderson, 1980; Evertson & Emmer, 1982). Even though research has supported the importance of classroom management as a necessary condition for effe ive teaching, the problem of translating research to practice still remains. Interest from practitioners in using these research results for preservice teacher preparation and for inservice professional development has prompted investigators to explore models for educating teachers in these research-based principles. In many instances, this interest has been both statewide and nationwide through various divisions of state education agencies, district and regional agencies, and teachers' organizations. Some experimental studies have shown that teachers can benefit from systematic exposure to principles of classroom organization and management through specially designed workshops and professional development experiences (Borg & Ascione, 1982; Emmer, Sanford, Clements, & Martin,

1983; Evertson, Emmer, Sanford & Clements, 1983; Evertson, 1985).

Some of these professional development experiences provide teachers with research-based principles of good organization and management, individual and group activities aimed at helping them examine their teaching practices, opportunities to plan and discuss their teaching practice with their peers, and opportunities to receive feedback. Teachers taking part in experiences such as these have helped students improve task engagement, reduced inappropriate behavior, and planned and implemented smoother instructional activities when compared to control groups without such experiences.

The following report describes a field experiment undertaken in two of six Arkansas school districts involved in developing and testing a statewide model for improvement of classroom management and instruction using the findings from classroom research. Findings from a similar study conducted in secondary classrooms are reported elsewhere (Evertson, 1985). The research that formed the basis of the Arkansas classroom management model took place in a large metropolitan school district in Texas and encompassed both elementary and secondary schools.

Several reasons existed for conducting the series of studies in a variety of Arkansas schools rather than simply adopting the results of the Texas studies.

1. The field experiments conducted in Texas suggested that brief (1/2 day) workshops and teacher manuals were enough to produce positive changes in teachers' management practices; however, much more information about effective workshop materials and activities was needed to support the development of a consistent and exportable statewide model with recommendations and guidelines for use.

2. The role that classroom observations could play in encouraging teachers to adopt and use the desired practices needed to be explored further.

3. Further questions remained about the applicability of the findings from the

field studies in Texas to schools in Arkansas where different local and state contexts, goals, and purposes applied. In Texas the participating school district was familiar with the research and used it in its own inservice programs; in Arkansas the material was new, but there had been extensive statewide training in instructional skills through the statewide Program for Effective Teaching (PET) program. The critical question became whether classroom management training could add anything new to teachers' knowledge and skills after they had been trained in the PET program.

4. In the Texas studies, the workshops and the classroom observations were conducted by members of the research team. Developing an exportable model would require that school personnel be taught how to provide the workshops, follow-up observations, and conferences for their teachers. Hence, guidelines for the workshops and for conducting observations would have to be developed. This required that a key element in the studies be a training phase that included careful outlining and specification of the content and activities used in the teacher workshops.

To gain answers to some of these questions, a series of studies was conducted in six school districts.

Method

Participating in the studies were 102 teachers from six Arkansas school districts: 70 in grades K-6, with 35 assigned to experimental treatment groups and 35 to control groups; and 32 teachers in junior high and high school, 16 experimental and 16 control. In most cases the classes of these teachers were composed of typical, average ability students. However, there were some exceptions. In the specific study to be reported here, elementary classrooms were grouped homogenously ranging from high to low in students' entering achievement.

Because the intent of the studies was to explore both the content and the processes involved in developing a model for classroom management training which school districts could use, personnel from within each school district had to learn to carry out the research.

The workshop content for all of the studies was drawn from two manuals (Emmer, et al, 1982; Evertson, et al, 1981). An outline of this material is described in Figure 1. Procedures and activities were developed in three one-day meetings with the principal investigator and workshop presenters. Presenters familiarized themselves with manuals and used this material to develop procedures and training activities to convey the content to teachers in the workshops. Presenters spent an additional week to ten days developing the presentations and activities for the workshops to be given just before the opening of school.

Study design

Teachers who volunteered in each school were randomly assigned to experimental treatment and control groups. Both experimental and control group teachers were assigned within the same school to avoid confounding school effects. Prior to randomization, a step was taken to prevent an imbalance across groups on teaching experience, ability level of classes, and grade level. Teachers were blocked into matched pairs on these demographic variables; then members of each pair were assigned randomly to either experimental or control groups. Table 1 shows the demographic characteristics of the teachers in each group.

Insert Table 1 about here.

One requirement for participation in the studies was that all teachers in both groups were to have had previous training in instructional skills through the

state's PET program. This qualification was necessary in order to hold constant a key background variable related to teachers' previous experience with and instruction in teaching practices.

Experimental group teachers participated in a one-day, before-school workshop in their respective school districts and were given copies of the manuals that had been produced in the Texas studies. Presenters used procedures developed in the three one-day meetings to develop workshop agenda. In mid- to late October a follow-up workshop was conducted with all experimental group teachers to reemphasize management principles, to focus on maintaining a good management system already in place, and to discuss any new or persistent problems and possible interventions.

In the summer prior to the beginning of school, administrative staff members (some of whom were also classroom teachers in their districts) from each of the six districts met with the principal investigator for a three-day training session. One requirement for being designated as a trainer was that the staff member also be certified as an instructor in the state's PET program. The reason for this qualification was to capitalize on talent already available in each of the districts, to conserve time and resources, and, more importantly, to supply a common orientation and background for the training procedures. Content for the teacher workshops is outlined in Figure 1.

Insert Figure 1 about here.

Description of data sources

Observers from each district were trained to use a variety of data collection procedures. These included narrative descriptions of classroom events,

ratings of student task engagement, classroom rating scales, and summary ratings of each teacher's classroom. Observers were given manuals describing each of the procedures and how they were to be used. They participated in a one-day intensive training workshop using both written scripts of classroom situations and videotapes. Reliability was measured by comparing observers' use of the measures with a master videotape. By the end of training all observers had reached a criterion agreement of 80-90%.

Narrative records. During each observation observers recorded descriptions of class activities and teacher and student behaviors. These notes included time information which allowed estimates of the length of activities and transitions. Observers were asked to preserve the correct sequence of events and to record as much class dialogue as possible. Information from the narrative records provided an important classroom context and aided in interpreting the meanings of other measures.

Beginning-of-school ratings. This set of ratings included six items that observers were to use during the first week of school to assess (a) the extent to which the teacher presented and discussed rules and procedures, (b) the clarity with which these were explained, (c) the extent of teacher monitoring of the whole class, and (d) the use of rehearsal and feedback in developing the rules and procedures with students.

Student engagement. At a randomly determined time during the first 10 minutes of the observation period, observers suspended notetaking, scanned the room, and categorized each student in one of three categories of task engagement: (a) definitely on-task: the student is obviously engaged in the task at hand as defined by the teacher; (b) probably on-task: student appears to be engaged but there is some question; and (c) definitely off-task: student is clearly not engaged in the

assigned task. Observers were instructed to count students on- or off-task only if there was no question about this; otherwise students were categorized as "probably on-task."

Classroom rating scales. Observers filled out a set of classroom rating scales after each observation. The scales assessed teacher variables related to instructional management, appropriate rules and procedures, meeting student concerns, managing student behavior, and classroom climate. These five-point scales were defined during training and descriptions and were included in manuals provided.

Summary ratings. At the conclusion of the observations in November, a set of summary ratings of each teacher was completed by the observer who saw a given teacher at least twice. In most instances, two sets of ratings were obtained because at least two observers saw a given teacher. These rating were designed to assess variables that were more global in nature and that could only be accurately assessed after several visits to the classroom. These items included overall time students spent waiting for assignments, decreases or increases in attention from the first of the year, smoothness of transitions, and students' methods of getting help. Observers were instructed to do these ratings independently and not to discuss them with one another. Observer agreement tended to be 85% or above on most items.

Data collection. All observations lasted from 30 - 50 minutes and began on either the first or second day of the school year. In elementary classrooms they were scheduled to include the beginnings of lessons and to begin at natural breaks in the school day. Observations in these classrooms covered language arts, reading, or math lessons. In secondary classrooms observations were for an entire class period. Observers were not told the identity of the teachers who

participated in the workshops, and observers saw both experimental and control teachers an equal number of times. Experimental group teachers were told the design of the study and asked not to share materials or other information until after the last observation in November. Control group teachers were told the general nature of the study, and they were scheduled for workshops conducted in the spring or the following summer.

Observations were planned so that observers saw all teachers four times after the first workshop and twice after the second workshop given in mid-October. The observations conducted after the second workshop were used to assess the effects of a second workshop in helping teachers maintain their management skills.

Results

Group Differences

The findings reported here are from 29 elementary classrooms (grades 1 - 6) in two rural school districts that participated in the studies. The classroom rating scales, student engagement rates, and summary observer ratings were analyzed using two-way analyses of variance with group membership (experimental or control) as a between groups factor and time of workshop (after the first or after the second workshop) as a within groups factor.

For none of the measures did the means for the control group exceed those of the experimental group. Of the 40 classroom rating scales items used to assess teachers' management practices, 21 (52%) were significant at $p \leq .05$. Means and standard deviations for group differences after the first workshop and after the second workshop are shown in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 about here.

Instructional management. Five of the 12 ratings assessing teachers' skills in organizing and conducting lessons were significant for the experimental group. Three of these measures had to do with clarity in describing lesson objectives, providing explanations, and giving directions for assignments. This cluster of measures assessed the degree to which teachers explained the purpose of the lessons by either writing objectives on the board or summarizing them in introductions to the lessons to give students an indication of what they were supposed to learn from the lesson. Clear explanations and presentations were indicated by the teacher's presenting lesson content in a coherent sequence, providing adequate examples, and demonstrating concepts where needed. Clear directions for assignments were indicated by teachers' providing step-by-step instructions either by giving them verbally, having students repeat them, or by otherwise modeling the steps to be accomplished in an assignment. Other indirect evidence of lesson clarity was the ease with which students began work and the relative absence of student signs of confusion about what they were to do.

Appropriate pacing of the lesson and monitoring student understanding of the lesson content were two other measures that showed significant differences between experimental and control teachers. Appropriate pacing was indicated by teachers' orchestrating lessons that flowed smoothly from beginning to end, with the basic skills needed for the lesson presented early before more advanced content was taught. Once students were engaged in the assignment, they were not interrupted frequently by the teacher's trying to explain something else. Monitoring student understanding was indicated by the teacher's actively seeking information about how well students were comprehending lesson concepts, directions, or seatwork activities. This could be assessed by frequent questioning during class presentations, quick drills, show of hands with correct answers, patterned-

turns, or the teacher's circulating widely during seatwork to check students' understanding of the material.

There were no differences with regard to use, variety, or readiness of instructional materials, nor for different assignments for different students. The key to understanding this set of variables is that teachers in neither group used a wide variety of instructional materials. What was used tended to be a minimum set of materials such as basal readers, group seatwork assignments to be copied from the overhead projector, ditto sheets, or workbooks. Having materials ready was not a particularly difficult or complex task under these conditions. The degree to which teachers waited for student attention was not significantly different between groups, nor was encouraging analyses, reflection, and higher order thinking in questions to students. Rather, questioning tended to elicit convergent, single answer, or right-wrong answers as opposed to being divergent or process oriented. Means for the workshop group were higher for both of these variables, indicating that the workshop teachers tended to break this pattern somewhat, but these did not reach significance.

Room arrangement. Two items assessed the degree to which the arrangement of the desks, chairs, tables and other furniture in the room did or did not contribute to congestion, good traffic flow, or helped or hindered students in seeing the instructional displays, charts, or other information needed for instruction. Neither variable was significant. This is probably due to the fact that most classes were not crowded and had enough room for students to move about and to see instructional displays.

Rules and procedures. All ratings dealing with the development and implementation of appropriate rules and procedures were significant for the workshop group. Ratings included in this section were of two kinds. First, those

used during the first week of school assessed the extent of teachers' introduction of rules and procedures and the monitoring of those procedures (see the first three ratings in this section). Second, those used throughout the first three months assessed the effectiveness of the implemented procedures. A large portion of workshop time was devoted to helping teachers plan and outline necessary rules and procedures for the start of school, and these findings show that the teachers were able to utilize this to get their classes off to smoother starts at the beginning of the year.

The workshop group not only began the year with discussions and clearer presentations of the rules and procedures, they also implemented more efficient routines for handling paperwork, keeping records, checking attendance, etc. such that instructional time was preserved. General procedures that included bathroom use, lining up, coming and going from the room, using materials and supplies were also rated as more efficient in the workshop teachers' classes. These teachers also established efficient means of moving students to and from group areas, handling students who came up for help, minimizing interruptions to group activities, and establishing ways for students not in the group with the teacher to get help. Workshop teachers were also rated has having suitable routines for assigning, checking, and collecting student academic work. They not only gave clearer assignments as was noted in previous ratings, they had developed efficient procedures for keeping records of assignments including make up work for absent students and for collecting, marking, and returning papers.

Meeting student concerns. Teachers who participated in the workshops showed more awareness of students' attention levels. They instituted change of pace activities rather than letting activities go on too long or leaving students with nothing to do. This is also supported elsewhere by the item in the summary ratings

completed at the end of the study that showed more down time in control teachers' classrooms. Consideration of student attention spans was the only one of the four variables that yielded a significant difference between the two groups. There was little or no student aggressive behavior in classes of either group of teachers. Also, levels of student success seemed to be similar in both groups. However, observers generally reported difficulty in making this rating. Evidence of students' success was not easy to find. Most students were quite able to complete assignments and engage in the activities planned by teachers in both groups as far as that went. The issue was not whether the students were able to do the tasks assigned, but whether they chose to engage in them. The degree to which these activities were quality learning experiences for students or just busy work was not evident to observers.

Managing student behavior. All four variables composing observers' assessments of teachers' behavior management strategies were significant in favor of the workshop teachers. Workshop teachers were seen as rewarding appropriate performance by frequently using praise and encouragement, displaying student work, and/or allowing privileges more frequently. They also used signals to cue correct behavior such as a bell to begin an activity, and alerted students as to what was expected of them before beginning an activity. Workshop teachers also were seen as more consistent and predictable in managing student behavior, i.e., they seldom allowed a behavior on one occasion only to disapprove of it on another occasion. These teachers also monitored more frequently and were more aware of what was occurring in class. They avoided becoming so engrossed in helping a particular student that they lost sight of the group as a whole.

Student misbehavior. Student misbehavior was distinguished in two ways: (1) as <u>disruptive</u>, meaning that a student's behavior was distracting to others and

interfered with class activities or (2) as inappropriate, meaning that, although the student did not disturb others, he/she was not engaged in the assigned task. Inappropriate behavior could be manifested as inattention, uncooperativeness, wandering around the room, quiet socializing, etc. Amounts of student disruptive behavior were quite low for both groups. Average ratings were near 1.00, meaning "none." Although disruptive behavior was practically nonexistent, inappropriate behavior did occur in greater amounts in the control group. To the degree that it occurred in the experimental group classes, it was stopped quickly. Also, inappropriate behavior did diminish in time in the control teachers' classrooms, suggesting that these teachers were beginning to solve the problem of order and inattention as they were well into the second month of the school year. The workshop teachers had low amounts of inappropriate behavior from the beginning of the year.

Classroom climate. Experimental group teachers were judged to have a more task-oriented focus in their classrooms. This difference is supported elsewhere by the the low incidence of inappropriate behavior and off-task behavior.

Student engagement. Experimental group teachers had fewer students off task during the first weeks of school and had correspondingly more students on task, although the on-task differenc[illegible] not significant. Off-task behavior in the control group reached 12.[illegible] m[illegible] three to four students in an average class of 26 students were [illegible]ged at any one observational point in time; while in the workshop group classes, one student might be off-task during alternate observations. This difference does not suggest that the classrooms of the control group were chaotic. Still, if these conditions persist across the year, it does represent nagging student attentional problems for the teacher which will eventually take its toll on class climate.

Differences across time

The purpose of examining these differences, as previously stated, was to determine whether or not the classroom management skills that the teachers learned and implemented during the first weeks of school would sustain from the first of the year to November and to see if the second workshop was effective in helping to sustain them. Only three of the ratings showed differences across time for the two groups, one at $p \leq .07$ and two at $p \leq .06$. Control group teachers improved their procedures for moving students in and out of small groups as the year progressed, and inappropriate behavior decreased in the control group. Additionally, percentage of students off task decreased in the control teachers' classrooms. On the other hand, the workshop teachers started out with less off-task and inappropriate behavior and maintained this. By mid-October and early November, the control teachers tended to improve and workshop group teachers tended to stay the same or drop slightly on some of the measures. What these findings say is that at least one advantage of the before-school workshop was that the experimental group teachers achieved an "edge in getting routines and expectations established and socializing students into the needed procedures. In some areas control group teachers with the worst problems were able to get their classes under control, but this was at the expense of two and a half months of the school year.

There were two interactions between group membership and time. These were for amount of inappropriate behavior and for percentage of student off-task behavior. The control group means began higher than the experimental group, but decreased after the time of the second workshop. There was large variability in the control group for off-task behavior; this variability decreased after the second workshop, but remained relatively unchanged in the workshop teachers' classrooms from the beginning of school. A t-test for the difference in control

group means for the times of post workshop 1 and post workshop 2 indicated a significant difference ($t = 2.28$; $p \leq .04$). Mean scores ranged from 5% to 58% for control group teachers, and means for the workshop group ranged from 0% to 9%. The improvement in the control group from the first to second data collection period was chiefly in the classes with the highest off-task rates. For example, the teacher whose class had a mean of 58% reduced this to 20% by the end of data collection.

The improvement in the control group bears some discussion. In final interviews with the observers, it became apparent that the control teachers were interacting with the workshop teachers in their schools, looking at their classroom displays (e.g., posted rules), and borrowing techniques to use in their own classrooms. For example, charts and materials that were in the workshop teachers' classrooms began to appear in the control teachers' classrooms also. Since these were rural schools, the teachers knew one another; and even though the workshop teachers indicated that they did not share the information directly, some of the new techniques were observable by the other teachers and became part of the talk in the hallways and the teachers' lounge. It also became apparent to control group teachers that inappropriate and off-task behavior were two of the key areas that observers were looking for in class observations. Some control group teachers reported that they told their students to be on their good behavior when the observer was in the room.

Summary observer ratings

Summary ratings were filled out after observers had completed all observations in each classroom. Of the 27 rating categories, 14% (four) were significant at $p \leq .05$ and 14% (four) were significant at $p \leq .10$. (See Table 3.) Based on the ratings, both experimental group teachers themselves and their

classrooms were viewed as being more prepared for the start of school. Teachers who participated in the workshops were seen as managing instructional activities more effectively by planning enough work for students, minimizing down time, orchestrating more efficient transitions, and helping students become accountable for academic work. Observers also rated experimental group teachers as more confident and more enthusiastic, probably because they had more cooperative student behavior and they were better prepared.

Insert Table 3 about here.

Discussion

One of the original purposes of this study was to determine whether training in classroom management practices could add new skills to teachers' repertoires over and above their training in the state's instructional skills program (PET). The answer to this questions appears to be 'yes.' The results support the usefulness of the classroom management workshops for teachers prior to the beginning of school, and these workshop experiences enhance teachers' skills in instructional areas as well as in managing student behavior. When compared to control teachers, teachers who participated in the workshops were able to plan and initiate more efficient routines, were clearer in their explanations and directions and in framing the objectives of class lessons, rewarded student performance more consistently, monitored their students more effectively, and were more consistent in managing student behavior. Their lessons flowed more smoothly, and they were also able to minimize inappropriate and off-task behavior in their classes more effectively.

The efficacy of the workshops most likely lay in two areas. First, none of

the suggestions or principles was new to teachers. Most of the concepts were already familiar to them. However, opportunities to examine their own practices, to apply labels to these practices, and to become aware of aspects of their own teaching appeared to serve as a catalyst for change. Second, once teachers could see the need for critical examination and problem solving, having the opportunity to get suggestions from peers seemed to be particularly useful in helping teachers structure activities and routines. Teachers also reported that these experiences helped them to see their teaching in a new way. On more than one occasion, trainers reported that workshop teachers commented that they had used many of the techniques and suggestions in the workshops at one time or another. However, this use was not systematic, i.e., they would try one technique and then another without understanding how it fit into a total organizational framework. The content of the workshops, however, provided them with rationales and a framework that could serve as guides in setting goals and making the moment-to-moment decisions necessary in the daily tasks of teaching.

This study also suggests that school personnel can design and carry out professional development experiences such as these. It is also likely that having colleagues who are on-site and available to consult as well as to provide training can increase the likelihood that skills are maintained. More importantly, building the capacity for teacher assistance within schools can contribute to ongoing professional development.

The patterns of these findings are similar in many respects to those obtained in the secondary classrooms participating in the statewide studies (Evertson, 1985). In that study, workshop teachers also had lower off-task rates, less inappropriate behavior, and were able to plan and carry out routines that helped the year get off to a smoother start.

This study supports the proposition that giving teachers opportunities to plan and develop academic and administrative routines that keep students productively engaged and keep inappropriate behavior to a minimum results in preserving instructional time. Thus, solving managerial and organizational problems is an essential beginning in laying the groundwork for quality learning opportunities for students.

References

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

Borg, W., & Ascione, R. (1982). Classroom management in elementary mainstreaming classrooms, Journal of Educational Research, 74, 85-95.

Brophy, J. (1982). Supplemental group management techniques. In D. Duke (Ed.) Helping teachers manage classrooms. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

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

Emmer, E., Evertson, C., Sanford, J., Clements, B., & Worsham, M. (1981). Organizing and managing the junior high classroom, (Rept. 6150), Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas.

Emmer, E., Sanford, J., Clements, B., & Martin, J. (1983, March). Improving junior high classroom management. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal.

Evertson, C. & Emmer, E. (1982). Effective management at the beginning of the school year in junior high classes. Journal of Educational Psychology, 74, 485-498.

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

Evertson, C., Anderson, C., Anderson, L., & Brophy, J. (1980). Relationships between classroom behaviors and student outcomes in junior high mathematics and English classes. American Educational Research Journal, 17, 43-60.

Evertson, C., Emmer, E., Clements, B., Sanford, J., & Worsham, M. (1981). Organizing and managing the elementary school classroom. Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas.

Evertson, C., Emmer, E., Sanford, J., & Clements, B. (1983). Improving classroom management: An experiment in elementary school classrooms. Elementary School Journal, 84, 173-188.

Good, T. (1979). Teacher effectiveness in the elementary school. Journal of Teacher Education, 30, 52-64.

Medley, D. (1977). Teacher competence and teacher effectiveness: A review of process-product research. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Figure 1. Outline of workshop content for experimental group

1. Planning (before school starts)
   A. Use of space (readying the classroom)
   B. Rules for general behavior
   C. Rules and procedures for specific areas
      1. Student use of classroom space and facilities
      2. Student use of out-of-class areas
      3. Student participation during whole class activities/seatwork
      4. Student participation in daily routines
      5. Student participation during small-group activities
   D. Consequences and incentives for appropriate/inappropriate behavior
   E. Activities for the first day of school

2. Implementing rules, procedures, and expectations (beginning of school)
   A. Teaching rules and procedures using
      1. Explanation
      2. Rehearsal
      3. Feedback
      4. Reteaching, if necessary
   B. Teaching academic content
   C. Communicating concepts and directions clearly

3. Maintaining the system (throughout the year)
   A. Monitoring for behavioral and academic compliance
   B. Acknowledging appropriate behavior
   C. Stopping inappropriate behavior
   D. Consistent use of consequences/incentives
   E. Adjusting instruction for individual students/groups
   F. Helping students become accountable for academic work
   G. Coping with special problems

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of experimental and control group teachers.

	Experimental	Control
Years of teaching experience:		
1 - 5	3	3
6 - 10	3	4
11 - 15	4	4
16 - 20	2	2
20 or more	2	2
	14	15
Grade level:		
1	1	0
2	1	2
3	5	2
4	1	4
5	2	5
6	4	2
	14	15
Achievement level of classes taught:		
High	5	7
Middle	3	4
Low	6	4
	14	15

Table 2. Means for classroom rating scales for elementary classrooms: Experimental and control groups and time of workshop

	Post-Workshop 1				Post-Workshop 2						
	Exp. n=14		Cont. n=15		Exp. n=14		Cont. n=15		Main Effects		Interaction
	$\bar{X}$	sd	$\bar{X}$	sd	$\bar{X}$	sd	$\bar{X}$	sd	Grp.	Time	GXT
Instructional Management											
Describes objectives clearly	3.99	1.25	2.94	1.22	4.02	1.13	3.03	1.09	≤.02		
Variety of materials	2.05	1.17	1.74	.78	2.03	1.03	1.60	.76			
Materials are ready	4.63	.49	4.20	1.09	4.50	.65	4.30	.73			
Clear directions for assignments	4.42	.63	3.90	.93	4.25	.73	3.93	.62	≤.04		
Waits for attention	4.32	.63	3.96	.37	4.42	.49	4.00	.29			
Encourages analysis	3.24	1.05	2.51	1.21	3.11	1.02	2.87	1.25			
Assignments for different sts.	1.48	1.07	1.35	.36	1.64	.93	1.60	.85			
Appropriate pacing of the lesson	4.31	.62	3.32	1.05	4.07	.87	3.67	.62	≤.006		
Clear explanations	4.51	.47	3.76	.79	4.25	.78	3.97	.64	≤.02		
Monitors student understanding	4.36	.65	3.58	1.07	4.18	.70	3.97	.72	≤.03		
Clear standards for academic work	4.09	.88	3.81	1.05	4.13	.79	3.69	.80			
Consistently enforces academic work standards	4.09	.90	3.62	1.01	4.07	.81	3.80	.80			
Room Arrangement											
Suitable traffic patterns	4.30	.69	4.33	.64	4.04	.87	4.20	.62			
Good visibility	4.38	80	4.31	.63	4.29	.87	4.11	.81			
Rules and Procedures											
Teacher presents & discusses * rules and procedures (first week of school)	4.11	1.05	2.38	1.51	—		—		≤.02		
Clear presentations of rules, procedures and expectations (first week of school)	4.56	.86	3.00	1.58	—		—		≤.04		
Teacher stays in charge of whole class (first week of school)	5.00	.00	4.72	.47	—		—		≤.05		
Efficient routines	4.55	.52	3.57	.92	4.45	.57	3.60	.76	≤.001		
Appropriate general procedures	4.41	.56	3.68	.72	4.45	.52	3.57	.90	≤.001		
Efficient small group procedures	4.04	1.07	2.63	1.06	4.50	.76	3.50	1.04	≤.008	≤.07	
Suitable routines for assigning and checking academic work	4.20	.57	3.63	.80	4.21	.51	3.97	.58	≤.05		
Meeting student concerns											
Level of student aggression	1.02	.08	1.03	.13	1.00	.00	1.10	.28			
High degree of student success	3.82	.45	3.56	.64	3.86	.82	3.57	.75			
Attention spans considered	4.15	.59	3.43	.73	3.96	.72	3.63	.77	≤.01		

Table 2. (cont'd)

	Post-Workshop 1				Post-Workshop 2				Main Effects		Interaction
	Exp. n=14		Cont. n=15		Exp. n=14		Cont. n=15		Grp.	Time	GXT
	$\bar{X}$	sd	$\bar{X}$	sd	$\bar{X}$	sd	$\bar{X}$	sd			
Activities related to students' backgrounds and interests	3.51	.72	2.96	.88	3.29	1.10	2.97	1.22			
Managing Student Behavior											
Rewards appropriate performance	3.66	.97	3.66	.97	3.75	.96	3.07	1.21			
Signals correct behavior	3.58	1.12	2.74	1.21	3.75	1.03	2.73	1.10	≤.004		
Consistency in managing student behavior	4.40	.58	3.51	1.05	4.50	.34	3.73	.68	≤.001		
Monitors student behavior	4.35	.64	3.64	1.13	4.25	.47	3.77	.82	≤.02		
Student Misbehavior											
Amount of disruptive behavior	1.13	.29	1.32	.46	1.00	.00	1.07	.26			
Amount of inappropriate behavior	1.69	.58	2.49	1.03	1.71	.61	1.90	.60	≤.04	≤.05	≤.04
Stops inappropriate behavior quickly	3.76	.87	2.85	1.00	3.89	1.38	3.00	1.39	≤.02		
Ignores inappropriate behavior	2.19	1.03	2.74	.91	2.18	1.40	2.43	1.14			
Classroom Climate											
Task-oriented focus	4.42	.56	3.83	.95	4.32	.61	4.03	.79	≤.02		
Relaxed, pleasant atmosphere	4.46	.53	4.12	.69	4.25	.83	3.97	1.01			
Teacher uses good listening skills	4.26	.63	3.82	.68	3.96	.80	3.80	.94			
Expresses feelings	2.81	1.18	2.61	.49	2.54	.46	2.57	.77			
Student Engagement											
% of students off-task	3.10	2.83	12.21	14.56	3.36	4.68	6.80	7.26	≤.05	≤.06	≤.04
% of students probably on-task	3.71	7.68	5.10	8.61	1.64	4.53	3.00	5.44			
% of students on-task	93.20	9.13	82.70	22.66	95.00	8.60	90.20	10.92			

Note. Means for component ratings are based on 5-point scales: 1 = none, low occurrence, or least characteristic; 5 = high occurrence or most characteristic.

* Items 1, 2, & 3 under **Rules and Procedures** were analyzed using a one-tailed t-test.

Table 3. Experimental and control group comparisons for summary observer ratings of elementary classrooms.

	Experimental N=14		Control N=15		
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	p ≤
Teacher Behavior					
Organizing Activities & Physical Space					
Good use of classroom space	4.38	.77	4.13	.92	
Teacher is prepared for school	4.84	.38	4.33	.72	.02
Classroom is prepared for school	4.54	.88	4.07	.88	.09
Handling Student Problems during Seatwork					
Teacher ignores "come-ups"	1.42	.79	1.60	.91	
Teacher sends "come-ups" back to seats	2.08	1.31	2.00	1.20	
Teacher answers "come-ups" questions	4.83	.39	4.60	.74	
Managing Instructional Activities					
Teacher plans enough work for students	5.00	.00	4.53	.64	.01
Teacher allows activities to go on too long; students are bored	1.92	.95	2.13	.92	
Assignments are too hard	1.69	1.11	1.73	.96	
Assignments are too short and easy	1.08	.28	1.20	.41	
Minimum of down time waiting for next assignment	4.38	.96	3.73	.96	.05
Efficient transitions	4.58	.86	4.00	1.07	.07
Dealing with Misbehavior					
Teacher stops disruptive behavior quickly	4.84	.38	4.60	.74	
Monitoring & Maintaining Accountability					
Teacher checks for understanding	4.54	.52	4.20	.86	
Teacher keeps students responsible for academic work	4.62	.65	3.86	1.07	.05
Teacher leaves room often	1.08	.28	1.07	.26	
Personal Characteristics					
Teacher is confident	4.54	.78	4.00	1.20	.10
Teacher is warm and pleasant	4.38	.77	4.07	1.10	
Teacher is enthusiastic	4.38	.65	3.87	1.06	.07
Student Behavior					
Engagement in Tasks					
Students wander around the room	1.85	1.07	2.33	1.23	
Students talk during seatwork	3.00	.71	3.27	.88	
Class gets out of hand	1.54	1.13	1.93	1.28	
High noise level	1.92	1.12	2.00	1.07	

Table 3. (cont'd)

Obtaining Help on Assignments				
Students come up for help frequently	2.00	1.00	2.47	1.25
Students leave desks to get help	2.00	.91	2.07	.80
Students raise hands to get help	4.46	.66	4.33	.72
Students call out for help	2.08	.86	1.87	.92

Note. These items were based on 5-point scales: 1 = low occurrence or least characteristic; 5 = high occurrence or most characteristic.
p levels - one-tailed tests

Note

This study was sponsored in part by the Arkansas Dept. of General Education, Little Rock, AR and by National Institute of Education Grant Number (NIE-G-83-0063). The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of those agencies nor should any official endorsement be inferred.

Address correspondence to Carolyn M. Evertson, Box 330, Peabody College, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN 37203.