RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEACHER SELF-EFFICACY AND CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT STYLES IN BASIC EDUCATION HIGH SCHOOLS

Soe Khant Lin[1], Khin Mar Ni[2] and Mai Lein Htung[3]

Abstract

The research aimed to study the levels of teacher self-efficacy, the variations of the levels of teacher self-efficacy grouped by age, teaching service, academic qualification, position, teaching subjects, marital status and school, to study the classroom management styles that the teacher mostly used and the relationship between the teacher self-efficacy and classroom management styles. From the selected seven Basic Education High Schools in Mingalardon Township, 82 senior teachers, 102 junior teachers and 48 primary teachers participated in this study by using proportional stratified sampling method. The study was based on two dimensions of self-efficacy (personal teaching efficacy and general teaching efficacy) and three types of classroom management styles (noninterventionist, interactionist and interventionist). In this study, the levels of teacher self-efficacy and classroom management styles were determined by the mean values responses to the questionnaire items. The reliability coefficients (Cronbach's alpha) of the instrument were 0.73 for self-efficacy and 0.77 for classroom management styles. For qualitative methodology, open-ended questions and partially structured interview were conducted. Descriptive statistics, Independent Samples *t*-Test, One-way ANOVA, Tukey post-hoc mean comparison and Pearson correlation were used to analyze the data. According to findings, the levels of teachers' overall self-efficacy were moderately high and among two dimensions, personal teaching efficacy had higher mean values than general teaching efficacy. There were no significant differences in overall self-efficacy of teachers grouped by age, teaching service, educational qualification, teaching subject and marital status. There were significant differences in overall self-efficacy of teachers grouped by position (between junior and senior teachers) and school (between school C and E). The type of classroom management style that was mostly used by teachers was noninterventionist style. There were no significant differences in classroom management styles grouped by age but there were significant differences in interventionist style grouped by service. Married teachers used interactionist style more than single teachers and there were significant differences between School E and School A, C in this style. There were also significant differences in classroom management styles grouped by educational qualification and position. There was positively weak correlation between teachers' overall self-efficacy and all styles of classroom management.

Keywords: teacher self-efficacy, classroom management

Introduction

Schools are second homes for young children. The teachers are the most important people in nurturing them in the classroom. Classroom management is one of the important areas in schools. It is not just one isolated action, or one particular skill. Classroom management is an essential part of teaching for creating an effective environment where teaching and learning can occur proficiently (Martin et al.,1998). Some teachers have faith in that they must take major responsibility for everything in the classroom. In order to get cooperation, students' participation and interesting, some teachers assumed that they must share responsibility with students Others

[1] U, Senior Teacher, BEHS Sarbudaung, Hlegu Township, Yangon Region
[2] Dr, Associate Professor, Department of Educational Theory, Yangon University of Education
[3] Daw, Associate Professor, Department of Educational Theory, Yangon University of Education

agree that children have innate potential to learn. And they permit students to take major responsibility for everything and they assist as a facilitator or guide.

The methods the teachers use to manage their classroom also rest on their efficacy belief. Therefore, efficacy plays an important aspect in the classroom management. Their styles of classroom management are influenced by their belief and their actions. Teacher self-efficacy is related to teacher practices as greater persistence with students who are struggling (Allinder, 1995). Self-Efficacy base on the belief that people attempt to exercise control over the events in their life (Bandura, 1977). It does not relate to the skills people have, but it is their beliefs about what they can perform in different situations.

Teacher self-efficacy in relation to classroom management becomes well-known. Teachers' ways of managing classrooms are affected by beliefs in their efficacy- especially in dealing with students' misbehavior (Armor, 1976). In order to be used better management approaches in the classroom, this study become essential.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study are as follows:

1. To study the levels of teachers' self-efficacy in the basic education high schools in Mingalardon Township

2. To study the variations of the levels of teachers' self-efficacy in terms of demographic data.

3. To study the classroom management styles that the teachers mostly use in basic education high schools in Mingalardon Township.

4. To study the variations of teachers' classroom management styles in terms of demographic data.

5. To investigate the relationship between the teachers' self-efficacy and their classroom management styles.

Research Questions

1. What are the levels of teachers' self-efficacy in the basic education high schools in Mingalardon Township?

2. What are the variations of the levels of teachers' self-efficacy in terms of demographic data?

3. What styles do the teachers mostly use to manage the classroom in Mingalardon Township?

4. What are the variations of teachers' classroom management styles in terms of demographic data?

5. Is there any relationship between teachers' self-efficacy and their classroom management styles?

Theoretical Framework

(a)Teacher Self-Efficacy

A teacher belief in his/her ability to achieve goals is called teacher self-efficacy. Teachers' self-efficacy model was developed based on a widespread review of the literature by

Tschannen-Moran et al. (1998). Four major sources that have major influences on efficacy beliefs are included and each contribute to both the investigation of the teaching task and to self-perceptions of teaching competence.

Mastery Experiences, one of the most powerful sources, can be occurred when people challenge to do something and are successful. People believe more that they will be able to do something new if it is similar to something they have already done well. So, they are the most efficient way to increase self-efficacy. The second factor influencing self-efficacy is **Modeling and Vicarious Experiences**. Observation of the successes and failures of other people who are like to one's self affects self-perceptions of efficacy through two processes. First, it gives knowledge. Second, people partly evaluate their proficiencies using social comparisons. We often talk people into believing that they have the capacity to achieve what they want to accomplish. It is **Verbal Persuasion**. It may involve a pep talk or detailed performance comment from a supervisor or a colleague (Bandura, 1994). **Physiological and Emotional Cues:** The degree of emotional and physiological arousal that a person experiences in a teaching situation (either of anxiety or excitement) adds to self-perceptions of teaching competences. Self-efficacy is self-perception of competence. It is not actual level of competence (Bandura, 1977, cited in Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998).

The model has two dimensions (analyzing the teaching task and its context, and self-perceptions of teaching competence) that are consistent with two factors of general teaching efficacy (GTE) and personal teaching efficacy (PTE). Teacher efficacy is context-specific. The factors such as; the assessment of students' abilities, instructional strategies, resources provided by school, and physical condition of teaching environment are included in the analyzing of teaching task. Principal support, collegial support, and school climate are contextual factors. In addition, Bandura's (1994) four sources affect these two dimensions.

(b)Classroom Management Styles

The teachers' ability to cooperatively manage time, space, resources, students' roles and behaviors to provides a climate that encourages learning is classroom management (Alberto and Troutman, 1986). There are a large number of management styles that teachers reveal. In this study, the classroom management style was based on three types of noninterventionist, interactionist and interventionist by Wolfgang and Glickman (1980).

Wolfgang and Glickman (1980) took various psychological interpretations of child development and categorized them into three basic beliefs:

1. An inner unfolding of potential make the child develop
2. A result of external conditions make the child develop
3. The interaction of inner and outer forces make the child develop.

According to Wolfgang and Glickman (1980), the first one points out that the child has an inner potential that need to look for its appearance in real world to develop. Any such inner potential is rejected to admit by the second one. It just emphasizes the development of the human organisms as the cause of the outer environment in its unusual way. Third item highlights that the interaction of inner potential of an individual and external forces of the environment shapes the child.

Using these descriptions of social learning, three schools of psychological thought (the Noninterventionist, the Interventionist, and the Interactionist) were defined by Wolfgang and Glickman (1980). The Noninterventionist classroom management model is commonly referred to as humanistic or student-centered and it is based on a philosophical and psychological belief system. The Interactionalist models of classroom management are based on both behavior and feelings. The Interventionist systems of classroom management are based on the basic tenets of behavioral psychology (Levin and Nolan, 1991).

Definition of Key Terms
Teacher Self-Efficacy

Teacher self-efficacy is the teacher's belief in his or her ability to bring about desired outcomes in students. Teacher self-efficacy consists of two concepts: personal teaching efficacy and general teaching efficacy. Personal teaching efficacy is defined as self-evaluation of one's ability to successfully bring about positive changes in students' behaviour in the classroom. General teaching efficacy is defined as teacher's belief in his or her ability to manage the classroom and to create teaching-learning process effectively regardless of external factors such as home environment and family background. In this study, it will be determined by the mean values of teachers' response to self-efficacy items in the questionnaire.

Classroom management Style

Classroom management style is defined as the styles that the teachers use to effectively support and facilitate academic, behavioural, social-emotional, and motivational outcomes of students. In this study, the most common type of teachers' classroom management style will be determined by the mean values of the selected teacher responses to the items of classroom management style (noninterventionist, interactionist and interventionist).

Methodology

Research Design

In this study, quantitative and qualitative methods were used to study the relationship between teacher self-efficacy and classroom management styles in Basic Education High Schools in Mingalardon Township, Yangon Region.

Sample

There are 7 Basic Education High Schools in Mingalardon Township, Yangon Region. All schools were chosen as a sample and selected teachers (total of 232) were participated in this study. Proportional stratified sampling method was used. The demographic information about the teachers who participated in this study was shown in table.

Table 1 Demographic Information about the Respondents

Variables	Group	Number	Percentage (%)
Age	21-30 years	21	9%
	31-40 years	60	26%
	41-50 years	51	22%
	51 years and above	100	43%
Academic Qualification	B.A, B.Sc., DTEd, DTEC	135	58%
	B.Ed.	76	33%
	M.A, M.Sc., M.Ed.	21	9%
Position	Senior Teachers	82	35%
	Junior Teachers	102	44%
	Primary Teachers	48	21%
Service	≤ 3 years	4	2%
	4-6 years	9	4%
	7-18 years	93	40%
	19-30 years	71	31%
	31-40 years	55	24%
Teaching Subject	Art	107	46%
	Science	107	46%
	All subjects	18	8%
Marital Status	Single	104	45%
	Marriage	128	55%
Total		**232**	**100%**

Instrumentation

The questionnaire consists of two parts. First part included (21) items related to teacher self-efficacy levels (general teaching efficacy and personal teaching efficacy). These items were rated on four-point Likert scales ranging from 1-strongly disagree to 4-strongly agree. The second part included (21) items related to classroom management styles (non-interventionist style, interactionist style and interventionist style) that the teachers used in Basic Education High Schools. These items were rated on four-point Likert scales ranging from 1-never,2-sometimes, 3-often and 4-always. Open-ended questions and interview questions for teacher self-efficacy and classroom management styles were also used as part of this study for data triangulation.

Procedure

Firstly, the relevant literature concerning the research was explored. The instrument was constructed under the guidance of the supervisor to find out the required data. For the expert validity of the questionnaire, the advice and guidance were taken from twelve teacher educators who had sound knowledge and experiences in the field of study. After that, necessary changes were made under the guidance of supervisor. Pilot test was conducted with (40) teachers on the 3th week of September, 2018. The reliability of coefficient for teacher self-efficacy was 0.73 and for classroom management styles was 0.77. After making the necessary changes, the questionnaires were distributed to teachers on the 1st week of November, 2018 and the response rate was 100%. Interview was conducted on the 4th week of November for data triangulation.

3.5 Data Analysis

The data obtained from questionnaires were analyzed by using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Science) software version 25. Descriptive analysis techniques, One-way ANOVA, Tukey post-hoc mean comparison, Independent Sample *t*-Test and Pearson correlation was used. Answers of open-ended and interview questions were analyzed by using knowledge from review of related literature.

Findings

Quantitative Research Findings
Finding for Research Question (1)

Table 2 Mean Values and Standard Deviations of Teachers' Self-Efficacy   (N=232)

Teachers' Self-Efficacy	Mean	SD	Level
General Teaching Efficacy	2.73	0.38	Moderately High
Personal Teaching Efficacy	3.06	0.31	Moderately High
Overall self-efficacy	2.89	0.24	Moderately High

Scoring Direction:

1.00-1.75=Low   1.76-2.50=Moderately Low   2.51-3.25=Moderately High   3.26-4.00=High

Finding for Research Question (2)
Table 3 Mean Values and Standard Deviations of Teachers' Self-Efficacy grouped by their Age   (N=232)

Variables	Age	n	Mean	SD	Remark
Overall Self-Efficacy	21-30	21	2.88	0.20	Moderately High
	31-40	60	2.89	0.23	Moderately High
	41-50	51	2.86	0.24	Moderately High
	51years and above	100	2.90	0.25	Moderately High

Scoring Direction:

1.00-1.75=Low   1.76-2.50=Moderately Low   2.51-3.25=Moderately High   3.26-4.00=High

Table 4 Mean Values and Standard Deviations of Teachers' Self-Efficacy grouped by their Educational Qualification   (N=232)

Variables	Qualification	n	Mean	SD	Remark
Overall Self-Efficacy	B.A, B.Sc., DTEd, DTEC	135	2.91	0.27	Moderately High
	B.Ed.	76	2.84	0.20	Moderately High
	M.A, M.Sc., M.Ed.	21	2.89	0.17	Moderately High

Scoring Direction:

1.00-1.75=Low   1.76-2.50=Moderately Low   2.51-3.25=Moderately High   3.26-4.00=High

Table 5 Mean values and Standard Deviations of Teachers' Self-Efficacy grouped by their Positions   (N=232)

Variables	Position	n	Mean	SD	Remark
Overall Self-Efficacy	Senior Teachers	82	2.84	0.19	Moderately High
	Junior Teachers	101	2.94	0.27	Moderately High
	Primary Teachers	48	2.85	0.22	Moderately High

Scoring Direction:

1.00-1.75=Low   1.76-2.50=Moderately Low   2.51-3.25=Moderately High   3.26-4.00=High

Table 6 ANOVA Results of Teachers' Self-Efficacy grouped by their Position (N=232)

Variable		Sum of squares	df	Mean Squares	F	p
Overall Self-Efficacy	Between Groups	.502	2	.251	4.453	.013*
	Within Groups	12.904	229	.056		
	Total	13.406	231			

*p< .05, **p< .01, ***p<.001 ns=no significance*

Table 7 Tukey HSD of Teachers' self-efficacy grouped by their Position   (N=232)

Dependent Variables	(I) ST,JT,PT	(J) ST,JT,PT	Mean Difference (I-J)	p
Overall Self-Efficacy	Junior Teacher	Senior Teacher	.09559*	.019*
		Primary Teacher	.09029	ns

*p< .05, **p< .01, ***p<.001 ns=no significance*

Table 8 Mean values and Standard Deviations of Teachers' Self-Efficacy grouped by their Teaching Service   (N=232)

Variables	Teaching Service	n	Mean	SD	Remark
Overall Self-Efficacy	≤3years	4	2.80	0.17	Moderately High
	4-6 years	9	2.80	0.29	Moderately High
	7-18 years	93	2.89	0.21	Moderately High
	19-30 years	71	2.89	0.27	Moderately High
	31years and above	55	2.89	0.25	Moderately High

Scoring Direction:
    1.00-1.75=Low   1.76-2.50=Moderately Low   2.51-3.25=Moderately High   3.26-4.00=High

Table 9 Mean values and Standard Deviations of Teachers' Self-Efficacy grouped by their Teaching Subject   (N=232)

Variables	Teaching Subject	n	Mean	SD	Remark
Overall Self-Efficacy	Art	107	2.87	0.26	Moderately High
	Science	107	2.91	0.22	Moderately High
	All subjects	18	2.82	0.25	Moderately High

Scoring Direction:
        1.00-1.75=Low   1.76-2.50=Moderately Low   2.51-3.25=Moderately High   3.26-4.00=High

Table 10 Mean values and Standard Deviations of Teachers' Self-Efficacy grouped by their Marital Status   (N=232)

Variables	Marital Status	n	Mean	SD	Remark
Overall Self-Efficacy	Single	104	2.86	0.25	Moderately High
	Marriage	128	2.91	0.23	Moderately High

Scoring Direction:
        1.00-1.75=Low   1.76-2.50=Moderately Low   2.51-3.25=Moderately High   3.26-4.00=High

Table 11 Mean values and Standard Deviations of Teachers' Self-Efficacy grouped by their School (N=232)

Variables	School	n	Mean	SD	Remark
Overall Self-Efficacy	**School A**	33	2.88	0.22	Moderately High
	School B	35	2.87	0.17	Moderately High
	School C	39	3.02	0.31	Moderately High
	School D	25	2.84	0.18	Moderately High
	School E	51	2.84	0.24	Moderately High
	School F	21	2.84	0.23	Moderately High
	School G	28	2.88	0.25	Moderately High

Scoring Direction:
1.00-1.75=Low   1.76-2.50=Moderately Low   2.51-3.25=Moderately High   3.26-4.00=High

Table 12 ANOVA Results of Teachers' Self-Efficacy grouped by their School (N=232)

Variable		Sum of squares	*df*	Mean Squares	*F*	*p*
Overall Self-Efficacy	Between Groups	.893	6	.149	2.676	.016*
	Within Groups	12.514	225	.056		
	Total	13.406	231			

*p< .05, **p< .01, ***p<.001 ns=no significance

Table 13 Tukey HSD of Teachers' self-efficacy grouped by their schools (N=232)

Dependent Variable	(I) School of teacher	(J) School of teacher	Mean Difference (I-J)	*P*
Overall Self-Efficacy	School C	School E	.17596*	.010**

*p< .05, **p< .01, ***p<.001 ns=no significance

Findings for Research Question (3)

Table 14 Mean Values and Standard Deviations of Teachers' Classroom Management Styles (N=232)

Variables	Mean	SD	Performance
Noninterventionist style	3.35	0.37	Always
Interactionist style	3.13	0.49	Often
Interventionist style	2.45	0.47	Sometimes

Scoring Direction:
1.00–1.75=never   1.76-2.50=sometimes   2.51-3.25=often   3.26-4.00=always

Findings for Research Question (4)

Table 15 Mean values and Standard Deviations of Teachers' Classroom Management Styles grouped by their Age (N=232)

Age	Noninterventionist Style		Interactionist Style		Interventionist Style	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
21-30	3.33	0.36	3.29	0.37	2.38	0.41
31-40	3.29	0.43	3.12	0.50	2.35	0.44
41-50	3.34	0.39	3.08	0.54	2.41	0.50
51years and above	3.41	0.33	3.13	0.48	2.55	0.46

Scoring Direction:
1.00–1.75=never   1.76-2.50=sometimes   2.51-3.25=often   3.26-4.00=always

Table 16 Mean values and Standard Deviations of Teachers' Classroom Management Styles grouped by their Educational Qualification   (N=232)

Educational Qualification	Noninterventionist Style		Interactionist Style		Interventionist Style	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
B.A, B.Sc., DTEd, DTEC	3.43	0.34	3.21	0.46	2.52	0.47
B.Ed.	3.26	0.37	2.99	0.51	2.40	0.43
M.A, M.Sc., M.Ed.	3.20	0.46	3.03	0.50	2.21	0.46

Scoring Direction:
        1.00–1.75=never   1.76-2.50=sometimes   2.51-3.25=often   3.26-4.00=always

Table 17 ANOVA Results of Teachers' Classroom Management Styles grouped by Educational Qualification   (N=232)

Variable		Sum of squares	df	Mean Squares	F	P
Noninterventionist Classroom Management Style	Between Groups	2.018	2	1.009	7.632	.001***
	Within Groups	30.142	228	.132		
	Total	32.161	230			
Interactionist Classroom Management Style	Between Groups	2.602	2	1.301	5.724	.004**
	Within Groups	51.835	228	.227		
	Total	54.437	230			
Interventionist Classroom Management Style	Between Groups	1.980	2	.990	4.700	.010**
	Within Groups	48.027	228	.211		
	Total	50.007	230			

*p< .05, **p< .01, ***p<.0.001*, ns=no significance

Table 18 Tukey HSD of Teachers' classroom management styles grouped by their Educational Qualification   (N=232)

Dependent Variables	(I) Educational Qualification	(J) Educational Qualification	Mean Difference (I-J)	P
Noninterventionist classroom management style	B.A, B.Sc., DTEd, DTEC	B.Ed.	.17644*	.003**
		M.A, M.Sc., M.Ed.	.22759*	.022*
Interactionist classroom management style	B.A, B.Sc., DTEd, DTEC	B.Ed.	.22325*	.004**
		M.A, M.Sc., M.Ed.	.18198	ns
Interventionist classroom management style	B.A, B.Sc., DTEd, DTEC	B.Ed.	.11531	ns
		M.A, M.Sc., M.Ed.	.30601*	.013*

*p< .05, **p< .01, ***p<.001 ns=no significance

Table 19 Mean values and Standard Deviations of Teachers' Classroom Management Styles grouped by their Position   (N=232)

Position	Noninterventionist Style		Interactionist Style		Interventionist Style	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Senior Teachers	3.22	0.40	2.98	0.51	2.34	0.43
Junior Teachers	3.44	0.35	3.19	0.46	2.56	0.49
Primary Teachers	3.40	0.34	3.24	0.46	2.40	0.43

Scoring Direction:
        1.00–1.75=never   1.76-2.50=sometimes   2.51-3.25=often   3.26-4.00=always

Table 20 ANOVA Results of Teachers' Classroom Management Styles grouped by their Position   (N=232)

Variable		Sum of squares	df	Mean Squares	F	P
Noninterventionist classroom management style	Between Groups	2.151	2	1.076	8.173	.000***
	Within Groups	30.009	228	.132		
	Total	32.161	230			
Interactionist calssroom management style	Between Groups	2.786	2	1.393	6.150	.003**
	Within Groups	51.651	228	.227		
	Total	54.437	230			
Interventionist classroom management style	Between Groups	2.360	2	1.180	5.646	.004**
	Within Groups	47.647	228	.209		
	Total	50.007	230			

*p< .05, **p< .01, ***p<.0.001*, ns=no significance

Table 21 Tukey HSD of Teachers' classroom management styles grouped by their Position   (N=232)

Dependent Variables	(I) ST,JT,PT	(J) ST,JT,PT	Mean Difference (I-J)	P
Noninterventionist style	Senior Teacher	Junior Teacher	-.21081*	.000***
		Primary Teacher	-.17705*	.021*
Interactionist style	Senior Teacher	Junior Teacher	-.21173*	.009**
		Primary Teacher	-.25799*	.009**
Interventionist style	Senior Teacher	Junior Teacher	-.22063*	.004**

*p< .05, **p< .01, ***p<.001* ns=no significance

Table 22 Mean values and Standard Deviations of Teachers' Classroom Management Styles grouped by their Teaching Service   (N=232)

Teaching Service	Noninterventionist Style		Interactionist Style		Interventionist Style	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
≤ 3years	3.36	0.27	3.11	0.18	2.29	0.49
4-6 years	3.30	0.31	2.93	0.66	2.48	0.30
7-18 years	3.29	0.41	3.12	0.50	2.34	0.44
19-30 years	3.42	0.34	3.15	0.48	2.49	0.48
31years and above	3.38	0.36	3.13	0.46	2.60	0.47

Scoring Direction:

    1.00–1.75=never   1.76-2.50=sometimes   2.51-3.25=often   3.26-4.00=always

Table 23 ANOVA Results of Teachers' Classroom Management Styles grouped by their Teaching Service   (N=232)

Variable		Sum of squares	df	Mean Squares	F	p
Interventionist classroom management style	Between Groups	2.581	4	.645	3.075	.017*
	Within Groups	47.425	226	.210		
	Total	50.007	230			

*p< .05, **p< .01, ***p<.0.001*, ns=no significance

Table 24 Tukey HSD of Teachers' Classroom Management Styles grouped by their Teaching Service   (N=232)

Dependent Variables	(I) Service of Teachers	(J) Service of Teachers	Mean Difference(I-J)	p
Interventionist Style	31years and above	7-18 years	.26153*	.009**

*p< .05, **p< .01, ***p<.0.001, ns=no significance

Table 25 Mean values and Standard Deviations of Teachers' Classroom Management Styles grouped by their Marital Status   (N=232)

Marital Status	Noninterventionist Style		Interactionist Style		Interventionist Style	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Single	3.36	0.40	3.05	0.52	2.43	0.44
Marriage	3.35	0.35	3.19	0.45	2.47	0.49

Scoring Direction:
    1.00–1.75=never   1.76-2.50=sometimes   2.51-3.25=often   3.26-4.00=always

Table 26 The Result of Independent Samples *t*-Test of Teachers' Classroom Management Styles grouped by their Marital Status   (N=232)

Dimension	*t* Test for Equality of Means			
	t	df	Mean Difference	p
Interactionist Style	-2.16	203.738	-0.14	0.03*

*p< .05, ns=no significance

Table 27 Mean values and Standard Deviations of Teachers' Classroom Management Styles grouped by their School   (N=232)

School	Noninterventionist Style		Interactionist Style		Interventionist Style	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
School A	3.42	0.41	3.29	0.49	2.56	0.35
School B	3.31	0.33	3.20	0.52	2.47	0.59
School C	3.40	0.43	3.30	0.44	2.56	0.40
School D	3.37	0.27	3.00	0.36	2.28	0.49
School E	3.32	0.40	2.93	0.47	2.46	0.46
School F	3.23	0.27	3.15	0.53	2.42	0.47
School G	3.40	0.39	3.04	0.46	2.31	0.46

Scoring Direction:
    1.00–1.75=never   1.76-2.50=sometimes   2.51-3.25=often   3.26-4.00=always

Table 28 ANOVA Results of Teachers' Classroom Management Styles grouped by their School   (N=232)

Variable		Sum of squares	df	Mean Squares	F	p
Interactionist calssroom management style	Between Groups	4.975	6	.829	3.755	.001***
	Within Groups	49.462	224	.221		
	Total	54.437	230			

*p< .05, **p< .01, ***p<.0.001, ns=no significance

Table 29 Tukey HSD of Teachers' Classroom Management Styles grouped by their School
(N=232)

Dependent Variable	(I) School of teacher	(J) School of teacher	Mean Difference (I-J)	*p*
Interactionist Style	School E	School A	-.36482*	.011*
		School C	-.37409*	.004**

*p< .05, **p< .01, ***p<.0.001, ns=no significance

Findings for Research Question (5)
Table 30 The Relationship Between Teachers' Self-Efficacy and Classroom Management
Styles   (N=232)

Variables	Noninterventionist Style	Interactionist Style	Interventionist Style
Genaral Teaching Efficacy	0.072	0.178**	0.064
Personal Teaching Efficacy	0.340**	0.206**	0.173**
Overall Self-Efficacy	0.271**	0.274**	0.158**

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2 tailed)

Quantative Research Finding
Findings from Open-ended Questions

Five Open-ended questions were used in this study. Vairous response for open-ended questions are described as follows.

For the question **"Describe your strategies of handling students who are influenced by bad habits from their home environment."** The 31% (n=73) of teachers discussed the problems with the students and gave them love, warmth, and more time. The 3% (n=6) of teachers treated students according to school discipline. For the question **"Do you believe you can help students get more qualities? Describe your strategies."** The 31% (n=71) of teachers made competition between students, allowed them to participate, provided exact guidance and asked questions to students. The 6% (n=14) of teachers used reward and punishment system to get more quality of students.

For the question **"Who develop classroom rules and regulations to follow in the classroom? (Teacher or Teacher and students or Students). How?"** The 34% (n=80) of teachers developed rules themselves in the class. The 52% (n=121) of teachers developed rules by discussing them with the students and used their input. The 4% (n=10) of teachers allowed students to develop their classroom rules.

For the question **"How do you treat to students who do not obey rules?"** The 42% (n=98) of teachers privately discuss with the students, gave them examples and exact gudiances. The 3% (n=6) of teachers gave warning to the students who did not obey the rules. For the question **"you believe the students have individual differences? How do you treat them?"** The 38% (n=76) of teachers treated students according to their mind, feeling and differences. The 2% (n=5) of teachers did not believe that the students have individual differences.

Findings from Interview
Teachers' ways of developing classroom rules and procedure in their calssroom and solving the classroom problems

The teachers of all schools set classroom rules and procedures from the beginning of the year by themselves. If the students broke the classroom rules or misbehaved in the classroom, teachers called out their names, asked them questions about lesson, changed seat or sent them near teacher's seat. If students quarrelled, teachers called and discussed about the problem with their parents and board of school discipline Most teachers answered (n=9) that they bit the students who broke the rules occassionally.

Teachers' strategies to get their students' trust

The teachers said that they tried to imporve their teaching skills to get trust from their students. Some of their students' lesson had already learned in their tution and so they did not care what teachers said. In this situation, teachers asked question about subjects, ask them concepts of lessons to get their attention. Some teachers gave good care of their students' health, education, feeling and thought to get their trust.

The ways of handling students form dysfunctional families and problem makers

The teachers said that they had trouble makers form dysfuntional families in ther classroom. The teachers studied their environment, their family background, their feeling and thoughts and gave better care. Some teachers gave leader positions to the problem makers and allowed them to participate in the school activities.

The teachers' ways to become expert in their subjects and to help students get better understanding.

The teachers said that they tried to become experts in their subjects by buying books and studied them and prepared for the coming years. They studied from online. They discussed the subject with old and experienced teachers. Teachers firstly studied their students' conditions, their levels of knowledge before teaching. Some teachers connected current lessons with their knowledge of previous academic years.

Discussion

According to finding, the levels of teachers overall self-efficacy were moderately high but personal teaching efficacy had higher mean value than general teaching efficacy. In the study of teachers' self-efficacy grouped by their age, all groups were moderately high but teachers (51 years and above) got the highest mean value in overall self-efficacy. And in the study of teachers' self-efficacy grouped by their teaching service, all groups were moderately high but teachers at the stages of 7-18 years, 19-30 years and 31 years and above got the highest mean values. These may be because the older the teachers, the more experiences they got. According to Huguenard (1992), higher teacher efficacy scores also linked with higher age.

In the study of teachers' self-efficacy grouped by their educational qualification and their position, all groups were in the same level in both comparisons. But there were significant differences between junior and senior teachers in overall self-efficacy. These may be because of age differences of students. Junior teacher had to contact only with younger children than senior teachers. For senior teachers and master degree holders the students they had to teach were older, than the other teachers'. This result is the same with previous research conducted by Ross,

Cousins & Gadalla (1996). They found that elementary teachers got higher scores in self-efficacy than secondary teacher.

In the study of teachers' self-efficacy grouped by teaching subject, all groups were in the same level (moderately high) and there were no significant differences between two groups. In the study of teachers' self-efficacy according to marital status, both groups were moderately high but married teachers got the higher mean value than single teachers. The result was similar to finding by Islahi and Nasreen (2013), Schoenbon (2004). However, it was contrary to the finding of Wafula (2010), Njoka (2007) and NgiNah (2012). The reason may be that the married teachers were seen as emotionally stable and having children makes them more tolerant and they are more sympathize with the students.

In the study of teachers' self-efficacy according to school, all groups were moderately high but School C got significantly higher mean value than School E in overall self-efficacy as said by ANOVA and Tukey result. The reason may be that there are more experienced teachers there. The result of interview found that they have the opportunities for collaboration with other teachers. The school teachers are like a family. Everyone can take part in decision making process. Most students are clever and good.

According to finding, teachers always used noninterventionist classroom management style, often used interactionist classroom management style and sometimes used interventionist styles. The result of previous research conducted by Bibi et.al. (2017) showed that interactionist style was used by the teachers at high school level more than noninterventionist style. So the outcomes of this research did not support the result of previous research. The cause of situation may be diverse situation in high schools. The second reason may be that the study was grounded on self-reported data of teachers.

In the study of teachers' classroom management styles grouped by their age and teaching services, teachers in all groups got the highest mean values in noninterventionist classroom management styles and there were significant differences between teachers (≥31 years) and teachers (7-18 years) of teaching service in interventionist style.

In comparing the mean values of teachers' classroom management styles grouped by teachers' educational qualification and their position, all groups gets the highest mean values in noninterventionist classroom management style. But among them, mean values of senior teachers was the lowest in all styles. This may be because of our school system. The result of interview showed that most senior teachers were very busy. They had to try to finish their course in time and they had to teach so many classes in a day and there are so many students in each class. These may be the reason why they got the lowest mean score in all style among three groups.

In teachers' marital status, all groups got the highest mean values in noninterventionist styles but there were significant differences in interactionist style, the married teachers got higher values. This could be concluded that married teacher had to interact with their own children and that helped them to interact with their students and to understand them. They are more sympathetic to children and understand more about their feeling and mind.

In comparing the mean values of classroom management styles grouped by school, all schools got the highest mean values in noninterventionist classroom management style. One-way ANOVA results showed that there were significant differences between School E and both School A and C in interactionist style. According to interview, the demographic structure and

facilities of school are difference between these schools. And teachers in school A and C are older and more experienced than teacher in school E. The classroom, infrastructure of school E and most students in the school come from dysfunctional families and live in orphanage. This may be the reason why school E got lower value.

There was positively low correlation between teachers' overall self-efficacy and all styles of classroom management. Woolfolk, Rosoff and Hoy (1990) reported that the greater the teachers personal teaching efficacy, the more humanistic the teachers' pupil control orientation. The stronger the teachers' belief in general teaching efficacy as teaching can be successful, even with difficult and unmotivated students, the more humanistic the teachers' pupil control orientation and more teachers supported student autonomy in solving problems.

Recommendation

To improve teachers' self-efficacy; Every principal should support collaboration among teachers, foster peer coaching, allow them to take part in decision making process and encourage them to visit other schools and observe classrooms to improve modeling and vicarious experiences. All stakeholders and township officer should be aware of programs for improving self-efficacy, not only sharing knowledge about subject matter skill but also sharing the ways to overcome classroom problems. For preservice teachers, they should be given more opportunities to interact with students and solve classroom problems in real situation by teacher training colleges and universities. For in-service novice teachers, the up-to-date professional development and refresher course should be given with major emphasis for improving their self-efficacy.

In practicing teachers' classroom management styles; Old and experienced teachers who are familiar with teacher-centered approach should be given refresher courses to be able to create classroom environment leading to self-governing society. All teachers should have positive relationships with students through mutual understanding and good communication. All teachers should pay attention and promote self-esteem of students and to transform into life-long learners. All teachers should read books, magazines and journals related with classroom management to have sound knowledge.

Need for Further Study

The research focused on the relationship between teachers' self-efficacy and their classroom management styles in Basic Education High School, Mingalardon. Thus, further researches should be conducted to investigate the relationship between the teachers' self-efficacy and student achievement, to investigate the effects of teachers' classroom management styles on student achievement, to investigate teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction and students' perception of teachers' classroom management styles.

Acknowledgements

References

Alberto, P.A. & Troutman, A.C. (1986). *Applied Behavior Analysis for Teachers.* Columbus, OH: Charles Merrill.

Allinder, R. M. (1995). An examination of the relationship between teacher efficacy and curriculum-based measurement and student achievement. *Remedial and Special Education*, *16*(4).

Armor, D. (1976). Analysis of the school preferred reading program in selected Los Angeles minority schools. Retrieved January 10, 2019 from

https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED130243.pdf

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological review*, *84*(2).

Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. *Encyclopedia of human behavior*, *4*(1). Retrieved August 15, 2018 from

https://www.unitar.org/hiroshima/sites/unitar.org.hiroshima/files/18.AF_2010_WS2-3_Self-Efficacy.pdf

Huguenard, T. (1992). *The relationship between teacher efficacy, certification, and student achievement* (Doctoral dissertation, Baylor University).

Islahi, F. & Nasreen, D. (2013). Who make effective teachers, men or women? An Indian perspective. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 1(4).

Levin, J., & Nolan, J. F. (1991). *Principles of classroom management: A hierarchical approach*. Prentice Hall.

Martin, N. K., Yin, Z., & Baldwin, B. (1998). Construct validation of the attitudes & beliefs on classroom control inventory. *The Journal of Classroom Interaction*.

Nginah, M. N. (2012). *Influence of work-family conflicts on secondary school teachers' level of job satisfaction in Machakos District, Kenya*. Unpublished Thesis. Department of Educational Administration, University of Nairobi.

Njoka, E. (2007). *Guiding and Counselling Pupils in Kenyan Public Primary Schools: Head Teachers and Teacher Counsellors Role Perceptions and Experiences.* Published Doctoral Thesis. Durham University.

Ross, J., Cousins, J. B., & Gadalla, T. (1996). Within-teacher predictors of teacher efficacy. Teaching and Teacher Education, 12(4).

Schoenborn, C. A. (2004). *Marital status and health: United States, 1999–2002. Advance Data from Vital and Health Statistics*, *Number 351*. Hyattsville, Maryland: National Center for Health Statistics.

Tschannen-Moran, M., Hoy, A. W., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of educational research*, *68*(2).

Wafula, A. N. (2010). *Work-family conflict among women from a collectivistic culture*. Department of Industrial Psychology, University of the Western Cape.

Wolfgang, C. H., & Glickman, C. D. (1980). *Solving Discipline Problems: Strategies for Classroom Teachers*. Allyn and Bacon, Inc., Longwood Division, College and Professional Publications, 470 Atlantic Avenue, Boston, MA 02210.

Woolfolk, A. E., Rosoff, B., & Hoy, W. K. (1990). Teachers' sense of efficacy and their beliefs about managing students. *Teaching and teacher Education*, *6*(2).