Seven decades of research have documented the central importance of classroom management in providing quality instruction (see Brophy, 2006; Brophy & Evertson, 1978; Emmer, Evertson, & Anderson, 1980; Fuller, 1969; Gilbert & Lignugaris-Kraft, 1997; Kounin & Gump, 1958). Teacher educators (e.g., Doyle & Carter, 1996; Emmer & Stough, 2001; Evertson & Weinstein, 2006) have repeatedly argued that classroom management is a critical pedagogical skill that teachers must master in order to maximize classroom instruction. Studies have also demonstrated that when teachers are effective classroom managers, their students achieve at a higher level (Freiberg, Stein, & Huang, 1995; Omoteso & Semudara, 2011; Stronge, Ward, & Grant, 2011; Stronge, Ward, Tucker, & Hindman, 2008) and display more interest in the subject matter of the class (Kunter, Baumert, & Köller, 2007). Plainly, teachers must learn to competently manage instruction and behavior if they are to become effective instructors.

Several chapters in the earlier editions of this book (Brophy, 2006; Jones, 2006; Stough, 2006) provided in-depth reviews of research on the necessity of training in classroom management. In this current chapter, we provide an update on that research, noting where more recent findings intersect with those established previously. First, we discuss recent research on the different ways in which classroom management is integrated into preservice training. Second, we discuss research on in-service professional development and present several effective models of classroom management that have been used in school settings. In our last section, we summarize the current status of research on training teachers to be classroom managers.

PRESERVICE PROGRAMS AND CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

Teacher educators have repeatedly identified the importance of classroom management, while simultaneously lamenting that teachers receive limited classroom training during their preservice education (see Brophy, 2006; Brownell, Ross, Colón, &
McCallum, 2005; Jones, 2006). In the previous edition of this handbook, the first author suggested that the root of this divide is that state certification and professional accreditation standards seldom identify classroom management as a required competency (Stough, 2006). Given the national emphasis on content area preparation for teaching, coursework in general pedagogy, such as classroom management, has been deemphasized over the last several decades (Imig & Imig, 2008). This change in focus has not, however, changed the view of most academics that classroom management is an essential element of teacher preparation.

**Traditional Routes to Preservice Training**

In the early part of the 20th century, preservice teachers were commonly prepared at normal schools or teacher’s colleges, rather than at universities, and coursework was focused on preparing the student for the educational profession (Labaree, 2008). During the last half of the century, most teachers’ colleges were incorporated into public universities, and the first several years of teacher preparation became equivalent to that required of all undergraduates (Labaree, 2008). Currently, 79 percent of those seeking certification receive their training through higher education–based preparation programs (U.S. Department of Education [DOE], 2011). Preservice teachers typically enter undergraduate degree programs soon after graduating from high school. These traditionally prepared teachers then spend four to five years completing their coursework conjointly with their teacher certification requirements.

Along with general coursework, teachers prepared through the traditional undergraduate route complete subject-specific coursework. For example, aspiring math teachers take additional coursework in mathematics, along with related pedagogical coursework, such as math for elementary school teachers. Education support courses, such as in child development or inclusive education, are also part of the typical teacher preparation curriculum. Pedagogical coursework that focuses on instructional design and delivery or classroom management then rounds out the coursework requirements. Reforms since the passing of No Child Left Behind have tended to shift the balance in this coursework and increased the amount of content matter required, while the amount of general pedagogy coursework has decreased (Brownell, Ross, Colón, & McCallum, 2005; Stough, 2006). In addition to coursework, supervised field practica are typically embedded within or accompany the coursework (Brownell, Ross, Colón, & McCallum, 2005). The curriculum is usually concluded with a student teaching experience during the final year of teacher preparation. The Department of Education (2011) reports that traditionally trained teachers receive an average of 177 hours of supervised classroom practica offered alongside their coursework, followed by an additional average of 514 hours in the classroom as part of the student teaching experience.

The goals of classroom management are to create positive teacher–student relationships, manage student groups to sustain on-task behavior, and use psychological strategies to aid students who present persistent psychosocial problems (Emmer
& Stough, 2001). Classroom management content, however, does not fit neatly into the curriculum because its focus is primarily pedagogic, and it does not correspond to a specific content area (Stough, 2006). Studies affirm that classroom management content is minimal within most teacher training programs. Only a minority of teacher preparation programs in the United States includes classroom management as a stand-alone course (Brophy, 2006; Stough, 2006), and Wesley and Vocke (1992) found that only 39% of teacher preparation programs included classroom management as a stand-alone course. More recent studies show that this trajectory has continued. In a study of preparation programs in the top 50 U.S. schools of education, Stough, Williams, & Montague (2004) found only 44 percent of the top 50 colleges of education in the United States listed a stand-alone course in classroom management. In an examination of 26 special education programs in Florida, Oliver and Reschly (2010) similarly found that only 27% had a course devoted to classroom management. An Australian study of 35 teacher preparation programs (O’Neill and Stephenson, 2011) also found only 30% of teacher preparation programs included stand-alone classroom management content. However, O’Neill and Stephenson (2011) did find, after additional analysis, at least some management content embedded within 30 of the 35 programs they reviewed. In these embedded units, however, the mean number of hours spent on the topic of classroom management hours was 2.3 compared to 25.5 mean hours covering the content in the stand-alone coursework. In the United States, classroom management content is often embedded in introductory courses in educational psychology; however, given the range of topics in this subject, its inclusion in these courses is probably limited to several lectures at best (Jones, 2006).

Preservice programs differ not only in the extent to which classroom management content is taught but also in the type of classroom management content taught (Stough, Williams-Diehm, & Montague, 2004). This difference is highlighted when the content of special education programs is compared to the content of general education programs. Preservice training for general education teachers typically focuses on content and group instruction, whereas training for special education preservice teachers tends to focus on modifications and individual instruction (Brownell, Ross, Colon, & McCallem, 2005; Gilberts & Lignugaris-Kraft, 1997). While early in their college careers, general and special education preservice teachers typically take most of the same courses, their training paths diverge about the third year of training (Stough, Williams, & Montague, 2004). In examining course syllabi (Stough, Montague, Williams-Diehm, & Landmark, 2006), we have found that classroom management is taught with two primary emphases: either a whole-class/generalist approach or an individual/behaviorist approach. The first of these two approaches has its roots in the seminal work of the educational psychologist Kounin (1970), while the second aligns with the theoretical work of B. F. Skinner. As a result, when classroom management appears as part of a general education program, the pedagogical emphasis tends to be on management and procedures for the whole class, while special education coursework emphasizes individual interventions for students, rather than whole-group instruction (Stough, Williams, & Montague, 2004).
Fieldwork and Student Teaching during Preservice Training

Much less is known about classroom management knowledge acquired during student teaching or other fieldwork experiences. Although teachers report that they learn the most about classroom management through experience in the field (Stough, Montague, Williams-Diehm, & Landmark, 2006) it cannot be assumed, and indeed there is no evidence, that new teachers acquire classroom management skills simply with time and experience (Oliver & Reschly, 2007). With respect to learning management skills as part of practica, Jones (2006) suggests that related field experiences should be of high quality and sufficient duration. Further, he advocates (as would most teacher educators) that there should be congruence between the university coursework content and the field experiences. Oliver and Reschly (2007) point out that teachers need ample opportunity and feedback in order to learn how to implement behavior management strategies. Brownell and colleagues (2005), in a review of 64 preservice special education programs, found that effective field experiences were those that were carefully supervised and tied to practices acquired in coursework.

Research has shown that collaboration with cooperating or mentor teachers has successful outcomes for novice, beginning, and preservice teachers (Brownell, Ross, Colón, & McCallum, 2005; Krull, Oras, and Sisask, 2007). Jones (2006) recommends that cooperating teachers be selected who appropriately demonstrate classroom management strategies that are taught in university coursework. In addition, Jones recommends that teachers-in-training have numerous visits from university supervisors who can provide frequent and ongoing feedback on how to create learning environments that promote positive student behavior. Brownell and colleagues (2005) state that preservice field experiences that accompany classroom management coursework should include diverse students and collaboration between preservice and in-service teachers.

Oliver and Reschly (2007) point out that most preservice teachers begin their field experiences after the commencement of the school year and are placed in classrooms that already have established management routines and procedures. However, new teachers will need to know how to establish routines and procedures once they are in charge of their own classrooms. Oliver and Reschly (2007) suggest that professional development school models are an ideal environment in which preservice teachers might practice and receive supportive feedback on their classroom management skills. Professional development schools established in partnership with teacher education programs and providing teacher candidates with intensive preservice classroom experiences have demonstrated their potential to increase new teachers’ classroom and behavior management skills (Emmer & Stough, 2001; Siebert, 2005). In addition, instructional components such as journal writing, reflective activities, and portfolios enhance field-based management competencies by providing additional opportunities for reflection on classroom practice. There is also evidence that video of classroom situations may provide a useful medium for analysis and discussion of appropriate classroom management strategy use in fieldwork settings (Stough, 2001). Also recommended are experiences
in multiple classroom contexts as a strategy to strengthen classroom management skills (Emmer & Stough, 2001; Soodak, 2003).

It is important to note that most of the published work on fieldwork and classroom management gives recommendations rather than providing empirical results on the effect that fieldwork has on developing classroom management skills. Much more work is needed to test the veracity of many of these claims, commonsensical as they may appear.

*Alternative Routes to Preservice Training*

An increasing number of teachers in the United States complete their teacher certification requirements through alternative certification programs (Schonfeld and Feinman, 2012; U.S. Department of Education, 2011). Alternative certification programs serve teacher candidates who are acting as teacher of record in a classroom while simultaneously participating in training (U.S. Department of Education, 2011). Alternative preparation programs may be based either within, or independently from, a college or university. Of the over 230,000 teachers who complete their teaching requirements each year, approximately 9 percent do so through an alternative certification program associated with an institution of higher education, while 11 percent complete nonassociated alternative routes to certification (U.S. Department of Education, 2011).

Alternative routes to certification are reported to vary widely with respect to the time required to complete the program and the content of these programs. Some research has indicated that teachers who complete alternative preparation programs are less skilled in classroom management than those who complete traditionally trained programs (e.g., Darling-Hammond, 2001; Good et al., 2006; Schonfeld & Feinman, 2012). Other studies suggest that alternative certified teachers have different attitudes toward classroom management in their first years of teaching (e.g. Ritter & Hancock, 2007; Schonfeld & Feinman, 2012; Sokal, Smith, & Mowat, 2003). Given the variability in alternative programs, however, it is difficult to make general assumptions about the classroom management skills of teachers prepared through alternative programs. Given the shorter length of time of preservice training usually required in alternative preparation programs (U.S. Department of Education, 2011), a more appropriate analysis may be of the number of instructional hours devoted to learning classroom management skills in alternative programs vs. those hours spent in traditional programs.

Several studies have examined classroom management as an element within alternative teacher training. Tricario & Yendol-Hoppey (2012) found that 15 teachers-in-training in a university-affiliated alternative training program exhibited significant challenges in monitoring student learning and providing differential instruction due to their struggles with classroom management. Schonfeld and Feinman (2012) studied 252 beginning teachers in New York public schools. They found those teachers who were alternatively certified were significantly more likely to experience classroom management problems than were their colleagues. These studies suggest that the amount of time spent in preservice training is an important variable in developing
skill in the area of classroom management. Because teachers usually spend less time receiving preservice training in alternative certification programs (U.S. Department of Education, 2011), it is logical to assume that the number of hours that they spend receiving classroom management training is also reduced.

**PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT**

Professional development (previously termed in-service training) refers to the additional education that teachers receive after receiving certification and while they are employed. Professional development can benefit teachers in a number of ways: filling gaps of knowledge, keeping teachers up-to-date with changing theories and legal mandates, and allowing teachers to reflect on their educational practices and beliefs (Charland, 2006). For teachers in the field, professional development training can serve as a critical bridge from learning about research on evidence-based practices to implementing such practices in their classrooms (Kretlow, Cooke, & Wood, 2011).

Research has identified a number of components that, when implemented within a professional development program, have positive impacts on teacher strategy use and confidence. Effective professional development programs are typically provided by experts in the field, conducted in a way that allows for application, aligned to school goals, and practical in meeting current classroom needs (Hough, 2011a). The majority of teachers report a preference for in-district workshops in which teams of teachers participate (Coalition for Psychology in Schools and Education, 2006).

Recent studies emphasize the need for professional development that is provided in a continuous manner (Oliver & Reschly, 2007), rather than provided piecemeal through workshops. A program evaluation of a professional development training program found that training must be sustained for at least two years and implemented in the classroom for at least 1.5 years by 75% of the participating teachers in order for positive teaching and student outcomes to result (Hough, 2011a, 2011b). Similarly, a national survey of over 1000 in-service teachers revealed that length of time and number of hours of professional development had a substantial positive influence on active learning by teachers. Researchers reported that professional development is more effective and of higher quality if it is sustained over time and engages teachers for a substantial number of hours (Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001).

Numerous studies have emphasized teachers’ ongoing need for classroom management as part of their professional development (e.g. Baker, 2005; Coalition for Psychology in Schools and Education, 2006; Nahal, 2010; Stough, Montague, Williams-Diehm, & Landmark, 2006), and even highly effective classroom managers benefit from professional development on classroom management (Montague, 2009). A national sample of over 2,000 teachers identified the most frequent need was to “ensure that students’ negative behaviors are not an ongoing distraction to you (the teacher) and your classroom” (Coalition for Psychology in Schools and Education, 2006, p. 93). Further areas of need identified by teachers in the study included physical safety, time management, and active student participation.
Effective classroom management professional development emphasizes the use of positive, preventive, and proactive strategies to both prevent student behavior problems (Boulden, 2010; Carlson, Tirtet, Bender, & Benson, 2011; Sugai & Horner, 2002) and to decrease teacher stress (Clunies-Ross, Little, and Kienhuis, 2008). Also, training in classroom management has been found to increase teacher use of positive strategies and lessen teacher negative emotional effects (Alvarez, 2007). Conversely, reactive management approaches tend to increase student off-task behaviors (Clunies-Ross, Little, and Kienhuis, 2008). The use of proactive or preventive classroom management as a more effective practice has been frequently supported in the literature (e.g., Emmer & Stough, 2001; Oliver & Reschly, 2007) and is considered best practice when used as part of professional development. In addition, Hough (2011a) found that sustained professional development resulted in teachers implementing a number of effective classroom management practices at high levels of proficiency.

Teachers receive professional training in classroom management skills through a variety of methods. In the United States, professional development workshops are often used as a medium through which to improve the classroom management skills of in-service teachers. Teachers participate in training sessions either within their school districts or through universities, conferences, or regional workshops (Coalition for Psychology in Schools and Education, 2006). Examples of professional development training programs teachers report receiving frequently include Applied Behavior Analysis, Boys Town, Capturing Kids’ Hearts, and Love and Logic (Stough, Montague, Williams-Diehm, & Landmark, 2006). Professional development programs such as the Good Behavior Game (GBG), The First Days of School, Classroom Organization and Management Program (COMP), Assertive Discipline, Teacher Effectiveness Training, and Conflict Resolution Education in Teacher Education (CRETE) are referenced widely in the literature (see Jones, 2006; van Lier, Muthén, van der Sar, & Crijnen, 2004; Webster-Stratton, 2000). Jones (2006), in the first edition of this *Handbook*, provides additional detail about the COMP and Consistency Management and Cooperative Discipline programs. Two additional programs that have professional development components and that have become increasingly popular over the last several decades are detailed in the following sections.

**Positive Behavior Support**

An increasingly popular program is Positive Behavior Support (PBS). PBS is a school-wide approach in which systematic educational and systems change methods are used to redesign the school environment (Carr et al., 2002; Sugai & Horner, 2002). Preventive strategies rather than punishment are used to enhance quality of life and minimize problem behavior. As such, school-wide PBS provides a “framework for prevention and the foundation for effective classroom organization and management” (Oliver & Reschly, 2007) and has been shown to effectively reduce disruptive student behaviors (Horner & Sugai, 2000; Sugai & Horner, 2002). Although Positive Behavior Support (PBS) is not a stand-alone professional development program, part of the PBS systems change includes in-service teacher training. PBS also provides the same type of training to both special educators and general educators.
The National Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports provides a “blueprint” for states, regional centers, districts, and/or campus-level teams to utilize in building professional development training in PBS (Lewis, Barrett, Sugai, & Horner, 2010). Teams are provided with strategies to implement PBS through each of the blueprint phases, including exploration, installation, initial implementation, full implementation, and sustainability. Teams are provided with information on Tier I, II, and III interventions and given campus evaluation questions that are needed to begin and continue the process of school-wide PBS implementation (Lewis, Barrett, Sugai, & Horner, 2010).

Although school-wide PBS does not specifically target individual teacher classroom management strategies, it does provide a school-wide behavioral plan that transcends classrooms, as well as a tertiary model of behavioral support. Within the classroom, the PBS model relies on teachers to directly teach routines and expectations, actively supervise students, prompt desired behaviors, and organize the classroom in effective ways (Sugai & Horner, 2002). However, Jones (2006) pointed out that most of the data from the PBS approach have been either based on individual student cases or aggregated by school rather than examining the management practice of individual teachers.

The Incredible Years Teacher Classroom Management Program

The Incredible Years Teacher Classroom Management Program for children is an evidence-based model that includes professional development in the area of classroom management. Developed by Webster-Stratton, the Incredible Years Training Series contains a number of research-validated components, including parent training, teacher training, and child training (see Carlson, Tiret, Bender, & Benson, 2011; Shernoff & Kratochwill, 2007; Webster-Stratton & Reid, 1999a, 1999b). As is the case with PBS, it is not designed solely as a teacher development program, but teachers often receive Incredible Years training as part of their professional development. The teacher professional development program emphasizes decreasing problem behavior and preventing behavior problems through proactive teaching strategies, providing effective praise, motivating students and building positive relationships with students, and outreach to families. A key component of the training is the use of video modeling, whereby teachers model effective management of challenging classroom behaviors. Video narration, teacher manuals, and readings accompany the video modeling (Shernoff & Kratochwill, 2007). Research validating the effectiveness of the teacher training component was first published in the literature in 1999. Results show that students in classes with teachers trained in the program demonstrate higher levels of social competence, higher levels of engagement in the class, and lower rates of noncompliance and aggression (Webster-Stratton & Reid, 1999a, 1999b, Webster-Stratton, Reid, & Hammond, 2004). Further, studies have shown that teachers trained in the program utilize higher rates of praise and lower rates of criticism than do control groups of teachers (Webster-Stratton & Reid, 1999a, 1999b; Webster-Stratton, Reid, & Hammond, 2001, 2004). Researchers have also assessed the effectiveness of specific components of the Incredible Years Teacher Training
Program. Shernoff and Kratochwill (2007) compared teachers trained using video modeling and those using video modeling with added consultation and found students in both groups showed decreased problem behaviors. The additional use of consultation following the teachers’ self-directed video modeling produced even greater positive effects on teacher confidence. It should be noted that a large number of the studies that have found the Incredible Years program effective have been conducted by the developer or her colleagues.

Mentoring as a Form of Professional Development Training

Mentoring is another well researched method for training teachers in effective classroom management strategies (e.g. Evertson & Smithey, 2000). Mentoring provides in-service teachers with the opportunity to provide collegial support, examine their own methods, and support their peers (Jones, 2006). Mentors provide support by assisting the teacher to consider new educational practices (Knight, 2004). Numerous studies support the efficacy of coaching novice teachers in classroom management skill development (Certo, 2005a, 2005b; Edwards, 2011; Hough, 2011a). Baker (2005) found that teachers typically report high self-efficacy and willingness to ask and consult with colleagues for advice and assistance. Consultation with colleagues can provide guidance and external validation for the mentee teachers and lead to increased confidence and competence. Research has also shown that collaboration with mentor teachers has successful outcomes for novice teachers (Certo, 2005a, 2005b; Krull, Oras, and Sisask, 2007).

Mentoring is implemented in a number of ways. Mentoring is often provided as a component of teacher induction where new teachers are welcomed, trained, and valued. Mentoring is also a way to build relationships and provide needed support. Coaching, which is a form of mentoring, is also a frequently cited method for assisting novice teachers (Edwards, 2011; Shernoff et al., 2011). Coaching usually is directed at supporting the teacher in carrying out specific classroom functions. Hough (2011a) found that classroom-based coaching, as part of a classroom management professional development program with more than 2,300 teachers across 25 states, resulted in enhanced professional development training and improved student outcomes in terms of behavior, attendance, and achievement. Coaching, paired with pre- and post-conferences, as well as teacher support groups, has been demonstrated as an effective approach for professional development in classroom management (Edwards, 2011; Shernoff et al., 2011).

A Model of Effective Mentoring and Coaching

A recently developed promising practice for professional development in classroom management is the Teachers Supporting Teachers in Urban Schools (TST) model. Within this model, teachers who are socially connected and influential on the campus are labeled Key Opinion Leaders (KOLs) (Atkins et al., 2008). These KOLs serve as mentors and are matched with novice teachers (Shernoff et al., 2011). KOL mentors receive training and promote effective classroom management strategies (Neal
et al., 2008). A second group of teachers, KOL Coaches, then provide evidence-based classroom management and motivation support through preconferences, classroom visits, and postconferences.

KOLs mentors lead group seminars twice a month for novice teachers where classroom management and motivational strategies are shared. Coaches are invited to attend these group seminars. Further, KOL mentors lead Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) monthly for all teachers in which reflection, shared responsibility, and collaboration are central components (Shernoff et al., 2011). Together, the mentors and coaches serve in complementary roles that center on addressing persistent problems and promoting teacher effectiveness. The mentor model of using learning communities has been highlighted in other research as well (Edwards, 2011).

FUTURE DIRECTIONS IN CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

In reflecting on the studies reviewed in this chapter, we confirm the critical need for classroom management training while simultaneously agreeing with the National Research Council’s (2010) statement: “There is currently little definitive evidence that particular approaches to teacher preparation yield teachers whose students are more successful than others.” Reports from novice and experienced teachers alike strongly point to the need for more training in the area of classroom management, but the number of efficacy studies continue to be few and have limited generalizability. While several models, such as PBS and the Incredible Years, have established effectiveness, classroom management training is only part of larger intervention and takes place during professional development. In the first edition of this Handbook, Stough (2006) asserted that classroom management should be integrated as a fundamental part of all preservice teacher training programs. Several models for how to integrate classroom management into preservice training exist, and research suggests that more intensive instruction in this area is more effective. Research, too, is abundant on the use of mentoring to help teachers develop effective classroom management practices. However, as was the case in the first edition of the Handbook, we actually know little about how these different types of teacher training ultimately affect classroom management practice, student achievement, and student behavior (see Jones, 2006). Most recently, the National Research Council (2010) ranked classroom management training as one of the three highest-priority research areas in teacher preparation. For the most part, however, contemporary educational researchers have yet to take up this charge.

REFERENCES


