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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine relationship between each level of teacher efficacy and different components of classroom management style (instructional management, people management and behavior management). This study investigated whether or not teachers are differing in classroom management styles and level of efficacy with reference to their gender. One hundred and fifty teachers completed a standard teacher efficacy scale developed by Anita and Hoy (1990) and Attitude and Belief on Classroom control Inventory (ABCC) developed by Martin, Yin and Bardwin.(1997). The results of the study revealed that the whole teacher efficacy had direct influence over classroom management, where as the teacher efficacy increased, Classroom management also increased linearly and significantly. It has been also found that male teachers were found to have higher levels on management than female teachers except for behavioral management and finally, most of the gender differences existed in the low teacher efficacy levels on management scores.
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1. Introduction

The teacher plays a vital role in the progress and welfare of society. He plays his role towards society in two ways: Inside the school by preparing students to become effective citizens and outside the school by assuming the role of social worker and agent of social change. Saxena N.R and al.(1997).

It has been found that in different countries, there is considerable scrutiny of the professional skills of teachers. Today, teachers are expected to manifest a high degree of professional competence, and therefore to be able to manage their classes in the way that students derive the maximum benefit from their
schooling. Indeed, mastery of classroom management appear to be a necessary component of effective teaching ad learning, thus, teacher are often evaluated based on their management of the classroom.

Based on the teacher survey classroom management, one can say that effective teacher also means effective manager of the classroom. (Laut, 1999). In the past few decades, educators found that educational effectiveness (external/internal) depends to a large extent on teacher effectiveness. (Anderson, 2004). The majority of the countries in the world have emphasized the impact of teacher effectiveness (performance/competence) in bringing quality improvement in school education for two reasons. First, allocate the great part of educational budgets to teacher’s salaries. Today, teachers’ salaries absorb around 75 to 95 percent of the educational budgets in developing countries. Second, teachers have been known as absolute power to veto innovations and new teaching methods. (Anderson, 2004). It is completely clear that teacher, probably, is most important factor in qualitative programming for education. Brouwers and Tomic (2000) noted that people who doubted their abilities in particular domain of activity were quick to consider such activities as threats, which they preferred to avoid. Teacher who distrusted their ability to maintain classroom order could not avoid this key factor. Teachers who lacked confidence in their classroom management abilities were confronted by their incompetence every day. At the same time, they understood the importance if they were to perform and help their students achieve their educational goals. (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000). This internal conflict could cause stress and impact instructional and behavioral strategies that teachers use to establish and maintain their order in their classroom.

2. Objectives of the study

2.1. General objective:

To determine the relationship between teacher efficacy and classroom management among secondary school teachers of Kigali city.

2.2. Specific Objectives:

1. To identify relationship between teacher efficacy and instructional management among secondary school teachers of Kigali city with respect to their gender.
2. To determine relationship between teacher efficacy and people management among secondary school teachers of Kigali city with respect to their gender.
3. To identify relationship between teacher efficacy and behavior management among secondary school teachers of Kigali city with respect to their gender.
4. To identify relationship between teacher efficacy and total classroom management among secondary school teachers of Kigali city with respect to their gender.

3. Hypothesizes

1. There is no significant relationship between teacher efficacy and instructional management among secondary schools teachers of Kigali city in with respect to their gender.
2. There is no significant relationship between teacher efficacy and people management among secondary school teachers of Kigali city with respect to their gender.
3. There is no significant relationship between teacher efficacy and behavior management among secondary school teachers of Kigali city with respect to their gender.
4. There is no significant relationship between teacher efficacy and total classroom management among secondary school teachers of Kigali city with respect to their gender.
4. Methods

4.1. Participants

Participants in the present study were 150 secondary teachers working in Kigali city of Rwanda. One hundred and twenty one of the participants were male teachers (80.6 percent) and 29 were female teachers (19.4 per cent).

4.2. Instrumentation and Measurement

Teacher Efficacy Scale. Teachers’ sense of efficacy was measured through the Woolfolk and Hoy (1990) standard teacher-efficacy scale whereby participants responded to 22 six-point agree/disagree statements. Ten statements (items: 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 13, 15, 17, 20, 21) dealt with general teaching efficacy and the remaining items (1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18, 19, 22) to obtain a score. That score was then divided by the number of items on the subscale to obtain a mean score that reflected the original unit of measurement. This procedure allowed the researcher to make comparisons between the subscales using the same scale. According to the protocols of the instrument’ authors, possible scores for both the subscales could range from 1.00 to 6.00, with higher scores indicating more efficacious in each subscale. The validity and reliability of the instrument was initially established by the authors, which makes these unnecessary in the Rwandan context.

Attitudes and Beliefs on Classroom management Control Inventory (ABCC), was used to assess various aspect of teachers’ beliefs toward classroom management. The ABCC includes 25 items with a 4 point Linkert scale format. Within the inventory, the classroom management was defined a multi-faced construct that includes three board dimensions: instructional management (14 items: 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 13, 17, 20, 21, 23, 25, 26) which includes aspects such as monitoring seatwork, structuring daily routines, and allocating materials", People management (8 items: 3, 4, 9, 11, 14, 16, 22, 24) “Pertains to what teachers believe about student as persons an what teachers do to develop the teacher-student relationship”, and Behavior Management(4 items: 12, 15, 18, 19) which includes setting rules, establishing a reward structure, and providing opportunities for student input.” The purpose of using mean scores is to allow direct comparison among the three dimensions measured on the ABCC and provide scores that reflect the original scale of measurement. Possible score could range from 1.00 to 4.00 on each dimension with high scores representing a stronger interventionist perspective.

4.3. Procedure of data collection

The stratified random sampling in selection of schools of Kigali city and teachers in each school was used.

4.4. Sample and population

One hundred fifty secondary teachers/educators were selected as sample among 847 comprised total number of all teachers of Kigali city referred to the report of Kigali city council in charge of education (2010). The sample of 21 schools was used from 67 secondary schools of Kigali city.

5. Analysis and Interpretation of results

In the present study, descriptive statistics were used to measure components of teacher efficacy namely General and Personal efficacy and some background variables are tested to identify its influence on teacher efficacy.

5.1. Results

Teacher efficacy, gender and Instructional management: A significant difference was observed in the mean scores of teachers with different levels of teacher efficacy on institutional management scores
(F=3.345; P=.038). From the mean table it is clear that as the teacher efficacy increased, scores on instructional management are also increased. The mean scores for teachers with high, medium and low levels of teacher efficacy are 38.64, 38.40 and 35.14 respectively. Further male teachers (mean 38.21; P=.022) had significantly higher scores than female teachers (mean 35.79). Lastly, the interaction effect between teacher efficacy levels and gender was found to be non-significant (F=1.86; P=.175).

**Teacher efficacy, gender and people management:** In people management also teachers with different levels of teacher efficacy differed significantly as the observed F value of 4.636 was found to be significant at .011 level. From the mean table it is clear that as the teacher efficacy increased, scores on people management also increased. The mean scores for teachers with high, medium and low levels of teacher efficacy are 22.82, 22.78 and 20.73 respectively. Further male teachers (mean 22.64) had significantly (F=3.877; P=.050) higher scores than female teachers (mean 21.83). Lastly, the interaction effect between teacher efficacy levels and gender was also found to be significant (F=4.322; P=.039) where we find that in medium efficacy category female teachers had higher management scores, where as in lower efficacy level male teacher had high scores.

**Teacher efficacy, gender and Behavior management:** A non-significant difference was observed in the mean scores of teachers with different levels of teacher efficacy on behavior management scores (F=1.012; P=.366). Gender-wise comparison (F=2.592; P=.110) as well as the interaction between efficacy level and gender was found to be non-significant (F=3.021; P=.084).

**Teacher efficacy, gender and total classroom management:** In total classroom management, teachers with different levels of teacher efficacy differed significantly as the observed F value of 4.386 was found to be significant at .014 level. From the mean table it is clear that as the teacher efficacy increased, scores on people management also increased. The mean scores for teachers with high, medium and low levels of teacher efficacy are 69.45, 69.01 and 63.77 respectively. Further male teachers (mean 68.98) had significantly (F=6.102; P=.015) higher scores than female teachers (mean 65.48). Lastly, the interaction effect between teacher efficacy levels and gender was also found to be significant (F=3.912; P=.050) where we find that in medium efficacy category we do not find much difference between male and female teachers, however, in low efficacy category female teachers had significantly lesser scores on classroom management.

### 6. Main findings

1. On the whole teacher efficacy had direct influence over classroom management, where as the teacher efficacy increased, Classroom management also increased linearly and significantly.
2. Male teachers were found to have higher levels on management than female teachers except for behavioral management.
3. Most of the gender differences existed in the low teacher efficacy levels on management scores.

### 7. Discussion of results.

The present study examined the relationship between secondary school teacher’s efficacy and classroom management styles in Rwanda especially in Kigali city. In order to confirm or reject the hypotheses formulated, we have tried to compare our results with similar studies done in the same area. In the study conducted by Martin & Baldwin(1992) aimed to investigate difference in classroom management perceptions and beliefs in terms of the relevant demographics characteristics, it has been found that novice teachers differ from experienced teachers regarding their beliefs on discipline. Beginning teachers appeared to be patient, share responsibility, and interact with students, while more experience teachers tended to react in a manner that insisting on appropriate behavior, using time-out procedures and punishing students. In their study, Martin, Yin and Baldwin (1997) reported that no significant differences were found between male and female teachers regarding their attitudes and beliefs on classroom control. Here, the present study revealed male teachers were found to have higher levels on management than female teachers except for behavioral management. The above reports also confirm the main findings of the present study.
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8. Conclusion

The present study aimed to determine relationship between teacher efficacy and classroom management in secondary school teachers. It has been observed that, in the process of teaching learning two said variables are interrelated. This study revealed that there is influence of gender on classroom management with reference to different components of classroom management. The further studies are welcomed to establish the relationship between teacher efficacy and classroom management styles with respect to different demographic informations and areas.
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Tables

Table: Mean scores of male and female secondary teachers with different levels of teacher efficacy on instructional people, behavioral and total classroom management and results of MANOVA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher efficacy</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Components of classroom management</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional management</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>People management</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Behavior management</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total classroom management</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38.64</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.82</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38.64</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.82</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38.41</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.76</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.87</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38.10</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.78</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36.63</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.81</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>31.17</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.83</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35.14</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.73</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38.21</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.64</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35.79</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.83</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37.75</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.49</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (Teacher efficacy)</td>
<td>F=3.345; 19; P=.038</td>
<td>F=4.6636; P=.011</td>
<td>F=1.012; P=.366</td>
<td>F=4.386; P=.014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (Gender)</td>
<td>F=5.353; P=.022</td>
<td>F=3.877; P=.050</td>
<td>F=2.592; P=.110</td>
<td>F=6.102; P=.015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (Interaction)</td>
<td>F=1.860; P=.175</td>
<td>F=4.332; P=.039</td>
<td>F=3.021; P=.084</td>
<td>F=3.912; P=.050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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