

## The Relationship Between the Self - Efficacy of Physical Education Teachers and Styles of Physical Education Classroom Management

<sup>1</sup>Rahim Ramezaninejad, <sup>2</sup>Mehrali Hemmatinejad and <sup>3</sup>Mohammad Hemmatinejad

<sup>1</sup>Associate Professor, Gilan University, Gilan, Iran.

<sup>2</sup>Associate Professor, Gilan University, Gilan, Iran.

<sup>3</sup>MSc in Physical Education, Gilan University, Gilan, Iran.

---

**Abstract:** The present research studies the relationship between the self-efficacy of physical education teachers and their styles of classroom management. 148 male and female physical education teachers of intermediate and secondary schools of Rasht City (82% of the population) participated in the present research from a total number of 178 physical education teachers (107 female and 71 male teachers). The questionnaire of Jeffrey (2003) with 16 questions and in 4 dimensions - student, space, time, and organization - and Physical Education Classroom Management Questionnaire (McCormack 1997) with 20 questions and 3 sections were used in the research. Using Cronbach's alpha, the internal consistencies of the questionnaires were reported as 0.86 and 0.80 respectively. Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, Pearson's correlation coefficient, Spearman's tests, t-test for independent samples, and Mann - Whitney U test were used for data analysis at the  $P \leq 0.05$  significance level. The results showed that there is a significant negative relationship between the self - efficacy of teachers and their preventive management, and that there is no significant relationship between the self - efficacy of teachers and supportive management as well as corrective management. Moreover, a positive significant relationship was observed between the dimension of *behavior of students* in self - efficacy and the preventive, supportive and corrective management style of teachers, while no significant relationship was observed between the *space* dimension and the corrective and preventive management styles of teachers. The results of the research showed that there is a significant negative relationship between the *space* dimension and supportive management style of teachers, between all management styles and the *time* dimension, and between the *organization* dimension and preventive management style, while no significant relationship was observed between the *space* dimension and other management styles. Finally, the findings revealed that there is no significant difference between the dimensions of self - efficacy of physical education teachers (behavior of students, time, space and organization) and their physical education classroom management styles (corrective, preventive and supportive management styles) in the intermediate and secondary stages.

**Key words:** Self - Efficacy, Physical Education Teachers, Classroom Management Styles.

---

### INTRODUCTION

The most important factor in achieving organizational goals is manpower and without doubt, the success and progress of any organization depends on its human resources (Mojallal, H., 1975). Among these organizations, there is the Education Ministry where most of the human resources are hardworking and committed individuals and providing that the working and motivational conditions are favorable, they will employ their talents and skills in the service of that organization (Mehdizadeh Tehrani, R., 1997). Achieving the goals of general education through physical activities as well as health and hygiene of students is a difficult responsibility and physical education teachers must be favored with favorable, proper conditions and educational facilities for achieving these goals (Ghayoumi, M., 2003). According to Bandura's social cognitive theory, the main determinants of teachers' success are their judgments regarding their self-efficacy, for teachers base their self-efficacy judgments on cognitive development and problem-solving skills which are essential for efficient performance in adulthood. Research on physical education, exercise science, and sports sciences have shown that awareness of self-efficacy plays an important role both in the beginning of training and during athletic performance (Bandura, A., 1997). On the other hand, proper classroom management is the most important prerequisite of effective education. This issue gains more importance in physical education classrooms and programs, for these classes have different conditions as compared to other educational activities. The open class environment and space, the tendency of students toward a high level of movement and activity, and the strong dependence of the curriculum to special educational tools and facilities lead to specific conditions for physical education teachers. Thus, physical education teachers must be well equipped with classroom management methods and teaching styles (Ramezaninejad, R., 2003). Meticulous planning and natural, methodic handling of classroom affairs prevents the waste of time and energy of teachers. Successful teachers are those who make the best use of every single hour of the physical education and sports course in accordance

---

**Corresponding Author:** Rahim Ramezaninejad, Associate Professor, Gilan University, Gilan, Iran.

with the criteria proposed by physical education specialists and education officials for achieving favorable results (Javadi, B.M., 1997).

The goal of education is to teach and cultivate human beings and considering the tools at its disposal, education tries to bring about favorable transformations in individuals, foster their talents, and help them achieve perfection. Considering the worthy role of physical education in providing general and mental health and well-being for the people of the society, it seems imperative to review physical education programs in schools (Shiyar, J., 1992). Research studies have shown that the more the level of efficacy is, the broader will be the range of job opportunities and more interests will be toward them. Low self-efficacy may restrain the range of job choices a person considers and may contribute to uncertainties regarding the few choices that are regarded as efficient (Bores-Rangel E., 1990). Thus, the self-efficacy of physical education teachers is of utmost importance in teaching the course of physical education. The quality of education, both at the national and international level, is an important issue and the education system of any society aims to pursue this requirement with purposeful teaching styles and observations in order to improve the educational quality and properly train the teachers. Many studies have focused on the effective teaching styles for behavioral aspects of teaching which highlight class management as one of the most important elements of good teaching (McCormack, Ann., 1997).

Ross (1994) reviewed 88 studies on the effect of teacher efficacy in pre-university stages and found a possible relationship between efficacy of teachers and their behavior (Ross, J.A., 1994). Gibson and Dembo (1994), in a research on teacher efficacy, came to the conclusion that teachers with a high degree of self-efficacy create more advantages for successful performance of students using their teaching abilities (Gibson, S., and Dembo, M.H., 1984). Zimmerman (1995) showed in his research that self-efficacy in students has positive motivational outcomes such as effort and persistence. He also concluded that the more the teacher self-efficacy, the more will be the student self-efficacy; since students' evaluation of themselves depends on the actions of their teachers (Zimmerman, B.J., 1995). From the perspective of Jeffrey Martin (2003), teacher self-efficacy has been divided into four dimensions:

- Student: students' attitudes toward physical education differ. One of the factors for assessing self-efficacy by the teacher is to manage the students that do not enjoy physical activities and are not interested in it.
- Space: schools are different in terms of their facilities and space for the course of physical education. The space factor can be an evaluation tool at the hand of teachers in situations where there are problems in education due to lack of sufficient space for physical activity.
- Time: it is possible that at times, due to the lack of proper planning or due to planning under special conditions, the time allotted to the physical education course is insufficient.
- Organization (school): the organization factor involves the manager, assistant manager, and the teachers of a school. The viewpoint of an organization and the way it treats the concept of activity and physical education may differ (Jeffrey, JM. and Hodges Kulinna, P., 2003).

McCormack, (1997) divided physical education classroom management styles in the following three categories:

- Preventive Style: these methods are measures taken by physical education teachers in order to prevent future abnormal behavior of students - monitoring the classroom, controlling and supervising students, short-term and long-term punishment, and/or ignoring some of the behaviors of students.
- Supportive Style: applying these methods depends on making use of effective verbal communication and positive social relations with the students. Thus, the students are led to believe that they are under social-emotional support of teachers - support and encouragement of students, developing special regulations, and/or temporary contracts such as nominating a leader
- Corrective Style: sometimes physical education teachers prefer to clearly and explicitly provide the necessary guidance for clarifying their expectations of students. This strategy entails having effective verbal communication with students for improving or correcting their beliefs about what they have so far believed in (McCormack, Ann., 1997).

Stevens (1994) showed in a research that exchanging thought between teachers and their cooperation as well as new learning techniques play a significant role in promoting an effective classroom environment; and finally, vulnerable students benefit to a large extent from teachers who pay attention to them and are willing and determined to bring about real changes in the learning environment (Stone, L., 1994). Maleki (2002) found in a research that among different classroom management styles, the method of positive social-emotional relations and supervising and controlling the classroom are mainly applied by teachers. Comparing three class management dimensions between different characteristics of teachers did not reveal a significant difference and only female teachers used the method of more supervision and control (Salmani, E., 2006).

Considering the mentioned issues, it seems that in people with higher self-efficacy, management strategies are affected by their perception of their self-efficacy. In a study carried out by Staples (1999) on 376 employees,

it was mentioned that a strong relationship was observed between self-efficacy and career record, performance improvement, and use of special management strategies in employees who had managerial experience in their organization (Staples, D., 1999). Since teachers form their self-efficacy beliefs based on their evaluation of their performance, their self-efficacy in class management decreases due to the decline of performance (Brouwers, A. and Tomic, W., 2000). Friedman and Farber (1992) found that teachers who consider themselves unable to manage the classroom and create order (having lower self-efficacy) benefit less from methods such as logical behavior and effective verbal communication for classroom management than those of their peers that have higher self-efficacy (Friedman, IA. and Farber, BA., 1992). Further, Hipp (1995), in a study on the relationship between teachers and school managers' efficacy and their management styles, came to the conclusion that using a specific method of management and leadership in the classroom and the school has direct relationship with the level of individual efficacy of the teacher and school manager (Nir, AE., 2006). Also Brouwers and Tomic (1998) concluded in their study on teacher efficacy in classroom management that the high level of abnormal behavior of the student decreases teacher's efficacy in managing the classroom and this issue forces the teacher to implement treatments such as short-term and long-term punishment and deprivation in dealing with the student (Aali, A., 2008).

In addition to assessing the level of self-efficacy of physical education teachers, the present research studies their common classroom management styles. Despite the studies carried out on teacher efficacy and physical education classroom management styles independently, and considering the importance of these two issues with respect to classroom management, there has not yet been any research studying the relationship between these two subjects; thus, the researcher aimed to study the relationship between self-efficacy of physical education teachers and their classroom management styles. The necessity of carrying out this research and similar studies is to enable one to obtain the necessary information from the population of interest and explain the obtained data so as to classify some of the insufficiencies in education and issues related to teachers of physical education and sports.

#### **Research Methodology:**

The population of the research consists of all the male and female physical education teachers of intermediate and secondary schools of Rasht City; the total number of physical education teachers were 178 of which 107 were male (55 intermediate school teachers and 52 secondary school teachers) and 71 males (37 intermediate school teachers and 34 secondary school teachers). The population and sample of the present research were equal. Of 178 questionnaires that were distributed, 147 ones (82%) were collected. Two questionnaires were used in the research. The first one was the questionnaire of Jeffry (2003) with 16 questions and 4 dimensions - student, space, time, and organization - having internal consistencies of 0.86, 0.75, 0.78, and 0.73 respectively. Each of the dimensions of this questionnaire involved 4 questions. The first 4 questions of the questionnaire were related to the *student* dimension, questions 5-8 were related to the *space* dimension, questions 9-12 were related to the dimension of time, and questions 13-16 were related to the *organization* (or *school*) dimension. By the way, Salmani, (2006) again obtained the internal consistency of the questionnaire for his research and reported it as 0.86. The other questionnaire was the Physical Education Classroom Management Questionnaire from an article with the same subject written by McCormack, (1997). This questionnaire contains 20 questions and 3 sections. Reliability and validity of the questionnaire was reported by McCormack as 0.70 and 0.87 respectively. Maleki, (2002) reported the internal consistency of this instrument as 0.80 in his research.

After obtaining letters of introduction from the Faculty of Physical Education and Sports Sciences of Gilan University, the researcher personally went to the Education Organization of Gilan Province to obtain information about the teachers and afterwards, he distributed the questionnaires in on-the-job training classes of PE teachers. Descriptive and inferential statistical methods have been used in reporting research findings. To report the personal information and characteristics of the subjects in the form of tables and diagrams, descriptive statistics were applied by determining the simple frequencies and percentages as well as calculating means and standard deviations of the characteristics of interest. Moreover, in examining research hypotheses, first descriptive statistical methods were used in the form of tables by determining the frequency of each of the options and calculating the mean scores for each option, and then to test research hypotheses, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to examine data distribution due to the fact that the questionnaire scales were Likert - type. Pearson's test was applied to test the hypotheses related to correlation in cases where data distribution was normal, and Spearman's rank correlation coefficient test was applied when the distribution of data was non-normal. T - test for independent samples was applied to the hypotheses related to comparing groups in cases with normal distribution. Further, the results of the Levine's test for examining the homogeneity of group variances have been taken into account in using the t-test and Mann-Whitney U test was used in cases with non-normal distribution.

**Results:**

The results of Pearson correlation coefficient test revealed that there is a negative significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy and preventive management style and that it has no relationship with supportive management, while using Spearman's coefficient correlation revealed that there is no significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy and corrective management style (table 1).

**Table 1:** The relationship between teacher self-efficacy and classroom management styles.

	Classroom management Styles	Preventive	Supportive	Corrective
Self-Efficacy	Correlation Coefficient	-0.23**	-0.146	-0.08
	Significance Level	0.005	0.078	0.32

Notes: \*  $P \leq 0.05$

The results of Spearman correlation test showed that there is a significant positive relationship between the students' behavior dimension in self-efficacy and preventive, supportive, and corrective management styles of teachers. The results of Spearman's correlation test revealed that there is no significant relationship between the space dimension and corrective and preventive management styles of teachers, while there is a significant negative relationship between the space dimension and the corrective management style of teachers and between the time dimension and all the management styles. Moreover, the results of Spearman's correlation test revealed that there is a significant negative relationship between the dimension of organization and the preventive management style and that it has no significant relationship with other management styles (table 2).

**Table 2:** The relationship between teacher self-efficacy and classroom management styles.

	Classroom Management Styles	Preventive		Supportive		Corrective	
		Correlation Coefficient	Significance Level	Correlation Coefficient	Significance Level	Correlation Coefficient	Significance Level
Dimensions of Self-Efficacy	Students	0.212*	0.010	0.334*	0.001	0.169*	0.041
	Space	-0.11	0.19	-0.16*	0.052	-0.06	0.467
	Time	-0.387*	0.001	-0.373**	0.001	-0.22	0.007
	Organization	-0.6*	0.052	0.04	0.631	-0.016	0.847

Notes: \*  $P \leq 0.05$  \*\* $P \leq 0.01$

The results of Mann-Whitney U test for comparing two dimensions of teacher self-efficacy - i.e. students' behavior and time - in the intermediate and secondary school stages revealed that there is no significant difference between the two educational stages in these two dimensions (table 3). Moreover, the results of independent t-test showed that there is no significant difference between intermediate and secondary school stages in the other two teacher self - efficacy dimensions (table 4).

**Table 3:** A Comparison of the self-efficacy of PE teachers in student and time dimensions across different educational stages.

	Stage	Mean Rank	Z	Significance Level
Students	Secondary School	72.25	-0.51	0.60
	Intermediate	68.79		
Time	Secondary School	77.61	-1.06	0.28
	Intermediate	70.24		

Notes: \*  $P \leq 0.05$

**Table 4:** A Comparison of the self-efficacy of PE teachers in space and organization dimensions across different educational stages.

	Stage	Mean	t	Significance Level
Students	Secondary School	10.09	0.432	0.666
	Intermediate	9.86		
Time	Secondary School	11.48	-0.011	0.99
	Intermediate	11.49		

Notes: \*  $P \leq 0.05$

**Table 5:** A Comparison of the corrective management style of physical education teachers in different educational stages.

	Stage	Mean Rank	Z	Significance Level
Corrective Behavior	Secondary School	68.79	-1.52	0.12
	Intermediate	79.42		

Notes: \*  $P \leq 0.05$

The results of Mann-Whitney U test for comparing the use of corrective management styles by teachers in the secondary and intermediate stages showed that there are no significant differences between these two stages (table5).

And finally, the results of t-test for independent samples showed that there is no significant difference between secondary and intermediate stages in the use of preventive and supportive management styles (table 6).

**Table 6:** A Comparison of supportive and preventive management styles of PE teachers in different educational stages.

	Stage	Mean	t	Significance Level
Preventive Behavior	Secondary	3.82	-0.531	0.596
	Intermediate	3.87		
Supportive Behavior	Secondary	3.72	-0.339	0.735
	Intermediate	3.75		

Notes: \*  $P \leq 0.05$

**Discussion and Conclusion:**

The results of the present research showed that the self-efficacy of the physical education teachers of Rash City is at a mediocre level. Although 64% of the subjects were graduate and postgraduate students and 55% of them had a career record of 10 years and above, the teachers were expected to feel a higher level of self-efficacy.

It is a disappointing issue that teachers appear in physical education classes with average feeling and understanding of self-efficacy. Specially, since there is more consistency in the research studies carried out on the positive relationship between teacher self-efficacy and educational degree and/or career record or experience (Aali, A., 2008; Heppner, MJ., 1994). Of course, among the dimensions of self-efficacy, physical education teachers had a greater feeling of efficacy, dominance, and authority over the student and space dimensions. However, the time and organization (school) dimensions were the next preferences. This issue seems evident, since time and organization are not under the control of physical education teachers, while they can assert their efficacy and authority over students as well as space and educational facilities of the school.

Regarding classroom management styles, the physical education teachers of Rasht City applied the preventive, supportive, and corrective management styles respectively. The preventive method is mainly a proactive behavior which by active anticipation of any disturbing, detrimental accidents and events before they occur, the teacher tries to exert more supervision on the classroom. While in the supportive method, effective verbal communication, positive social relations, and setting temporary regulations are underlined; finally, using the corrective method, the teacher tries to react after the occurrence of any problem or disturbance in the classroom and assert their views, orders, and guidance immediately. According to this interpretation, it appears that supportive and preventive management methods can be more effective for classroom management and physical education teachers have made greater use of these methods.

Before any discussion and analysis of the research findings, it is important to note that there are very few research studies on self-efficacy in sports (Feltz, DL., 2008) and most studies have focused on the relationship between well-being, performance, educational progress, and hygiene (Salmani, E. 2006). First, the self-efficacy of non-PE teachers have been accounted for and it has been analyzed during various stages of employment; as well its relationship with burnout and the educational performance of students has been examined (Brouwers, A. and Tomic, W., 2000; Erel, D., 2005).

Analysis of research results showed that there is a negative significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy and the preventive management style, but no significant relationship was observed between teacher self-efficacy and supportive and corrective management styles. Regarding the relationship between teacher self-efficacy and classroom management styles, the research results showed that there is a significant positive relationship between *student* and preventive, supportive, and corrective management styles, while a significant negative relationship was observed between *space* and supportive management style and between *time* and all management styles of teachers. Finally, it was revealed that there is a significant negative relationship between organization and the preventive management style, while it had no significant relationship with other management styles of teachers.

Although teacher self-efficacy only had a negative significant relationship with their preventive management, other research studies do confirm the positive relationship between self-efficacy and management styles (Staples, D. 1999; Brouwers, A. and Tomic, W., 2000). On the other hand, Zimmerman, (1995) too found a positive relationship between teacher self-efficacy and their attitude and persistence in the classroom. Moreover, the cognitive competence of a teacher or their academic ability (part of teacher self-efficacy) has a positive relationship with the quality of controlling and managing the classroom (Tschannen-Morana, M. and Hoy, AW., 2001) and teachers with high self-efficacy pursue the active, greater participation of students (Onofre, M., 2001). Thus, because the physical education teachers of Rasht City enjoyed a reasonable self-efficacy, they rarely used the preventive management method. Considering the definition and explanation of this

type of management, physical education teachers can emphasize less on close observation of students, short-term punishment, etc. if we take preventive management as a direct, interventional method, this findings is consistent with the results of Seyyed Abasszadeh, for he found a positive relationship between indirect monitoring of students and the career record of teachers (Seyyed Abbaszadeh, MM., 1992).

Considering the four activity levels of a physical education teacher in the classroom (Mosayyebi, F., 2001), creating order and control is the first and foremost activity of a teacher in the school which is considered as a non-educational and managerial activity. Therefore, the physical education teachers of Rasht City were less involved in this level of activity and they probably mainly focus on other classroom activities. However, the important point is why there is no significant relationship between the self-efficacy of these teachers and the supportive style of management (positive interaction and relation), while it appeared that these teachers would turn to the interactive style (Aali, A., 2008).

There have not been too many studies like the present research that comprehensively studies different dimensions of teacher self-efficacy and classroom management styles. However, Ross (1994) showed that there is a possible relationship between the self-efficacy of teachers and their behavior, suggesting that teachers with higher self-efficacy will learn new educational approaches and strategies and will teach them, will use management techniques for increasing the autonomy of students, will specially help the students with less progress, increase students' understanding of their academic skills, set achievable goals, and finally will resist in face of failure of students (Ross, JA., 1994).

Moreover, Hipp (1995) came to the conclusion that using a specific management and leadership method in the classroom and school has a direct relationship with the level of individual self-efficacy of the teacher and school manager (Nir, AE., 2006). Brouwers and Tomic, (1998) came to the conclusion that the high abnormal behavior of students decreases teacher self-efficacy in managing the classroom and this issue forces the teacher to use treatments such as punishment as well as short-term and long-term deprivations (Brouwers, A. and Tomic, W., 2000). Friedman and Farber, (1992) found that teachers with lower self-efficacy benefit less from classroom management methods such as logical confrontation and effective verbal communication as compared to their peers with an advantage in self-efficacy (Friedman, IA. and Farber, BA., 1992). All these studies indicate a general relationship between teacher self-efficacy and the behavior of teachers in the classroom.

The highest dimension of teacher self-efficacy was that of the student which had a significant positive relationship with all the three classroom management styles. In the present research, teachers with greater ability in managing students' behaviors made use of all the three management styles. This issue is noteworthy, since according to the findings of Maleki, disorder and behavioral disturbances of students were referred to as one of the most important problems of physical education classes in Rasht City (Maleki, R., 1997) and teacher efficacy in this regard has made them apply all the three management styles.

Relationships and correlations between different dimensions of self-efficacy and classroom management styles are highly varied and unstable. For instance, the significant negative relationship between self-efficacy in the dimension of educational space and facilities of the school (second preference among the dimensions of teacher self-efficacy) and supportive management or between organization and the preventive management style, as well as some insignificant relationships indicates that no proper explanation and final conclusion can be provided in this regard, since according to theoretical bases, teachers with high self-efficacy are more inclined toward supportive and preventive management styles and high self-efficacy in the dimensions of student and space (as the two dimensions which are mainly managed and controlled by the teacher) must show stable relationships with different management styles.

Analysis of research findings revealed that there is no significant difference between intermediate and secondary stages in the dimensions of self-efficacy of physical education teachers (students' behavior and time, space and organization). Salmani, (2006) showed that there is no significant relationship between the self-efficacy of physical education teachers and the educational stage, which is consistent with the results of the present research (Salmani, 2006). He results of the research showed that there is no significant difference between intermediate and secondary stages in classroom management styles implemented by teachers (corrective, preventive, and supportive management styles). Seyyed Abbaszadeh, (1992) reported that there is a significant relationship between the teachers of elementary, intermediate, and secondary schools in the method of controlling the classroom and this difference suggests indirectness of classroom controlling method in elementary schools with respect to elementary and secondary schools which is inconsistent with the results of the present research (Seyyed Abbaszadeh, MM., 1992). Since physical education teachers in Secondary schools were mostly graduates and considering the findings of Aali and Yazdi which suggest that graduate physical education teachers tend to use the interactive style (Aali, A., 2008), it was expected that they would turn to the supportive management. Thus, considering the characteristics of students in these three educational stages, it seems imperative to implement different management methods. Indeed this issue can be attributed to the nature of physical education classes and regardless of the educational stage and characteristics of students, similar management methods must be implemented.

It may be possible to justify these findings with regards to the specific quality and nature of physical education classes, for it appears different classroom management styles must be implemented in various activities in physical education classes. On the other hand, these relationships are at a low level and very weak and one cannot make any immediate, conclusive remark on how teacher self-efficacy can be associated with classroom management styles.

## REFERENCES

- Aali, A., 2008. The effect of teacher characteristics on the classroom management style. *Journal of Education and Training*, No. 24.
- Bandura, A., 1997. *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Brouwers, A. and W. Tomic, 2000. A longitudinal study of teacher burnout and perceived self-efficacy in classroom management, 16(2): 239-253.
- Erel, D., 2005. The concept of self-efficacy and self-efficacy-performance relationship. *Ankara University SBF.*, pp: 4-55.
- Feltz, D.L., S.E. Short and P.J. Sullivan, 2008. *Self-efficacy in sport*. Human Kinetics Press.
- Friedman, I.A. and B.A. Farber, 1992. Professional Self-concept as a Predictor of Teacher Burnout. *Journal of Educational Research*, 86: 28-35.
- Ghayoumi, M., 2003. Analysis and comparison of the results of the scientific, cultural, and sports test of male physical education teachers of the whole country in 2000, 2001, and 2002. *Research and Development Office, Physical Education Department, Niroom-va-Neshat Journal*, 10(1): 25-33.
- Gibson, S. and M.H. Dembo, 1984. Teacher Efficacy: A Construct Validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76: 569-582.
- Heppner, M.J., 1994. An empirical investigation of the effects of a teaching practicum on prospective faculty. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 72: 500-509.
- Javadi, B.M., 1997. *Physical education and sports in schools*. First edition, Iran University Press, Tehran.
- Jeffrey, J.M. and P. Hodges Kulinna, 2003. The development of a physical education teachers' physical activity self-efficacy instrument. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education.*, 22: 219-232.
- Maleki, R., 1997. A study of the problems of physical education class from the perspective of teachers. *MSc thesis, Gilan University*.
- McCormack, Ann., 1997. Classroom Management Problems, Strategies and Influences in Physical Education. *European Physical Education Review.*, 3(2).
- Mehdizadeh Tehrani, R., 1997. Description of the views of physical education teachers of schools in Isfahan City regarding some of the driving factors that increase their efficiency. *Tarbiat Moallem University, Tehran*.
- Mojallal, H., 1975. A research on the efficacy of education. *MSc thesis, University of Tehran*.
- Mosayyebi, F., 2001. Four levels of physical education class management. *Physical Education Monthly*, 6: 2.
- Nir, A.E., 2006. School Principals Leadership Style and Teachers Self-efficacy. *Planning and Changing*, 2.
- Onofre, M., 2001. Practical knowledge, self-efficacy and quality of teaching: A multicase study in PE teachers. *Paper presented at AIESEP International Congress, Madrid*.
- Ramezanejad, R., 2003. *Physical education in schools*. First edition, SAMT Publications, pp: 245.
- Ross, J.A., 1994. Beliefs that make a difference: The origins and impacts of teacher efficacy. *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*.
- Salmani, E., 2006. A study of the relationship between on-the-job training and efficacy of physical education teachers. *MSc Thesis, Gilan University*.
- Seyyed Abbaszadeh, M.M., 1992. Teachers and class control methods. *Science-Research Journal, Faculty of Education, University of Tehran*, 15(1):2.
- Shiyar, J., 1992. A study of the views of physical education teachers of Amol City regarding on-the-job training classes. *MSc thesis, Tarbiat Moallem University, Tehran*. 8. Bores-Rangel E; Church AT; Szendre D; Reeves C.1990. Self-efficacy in relation to occupational consideration and academic performance in high school equivalency students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 37: 407-418.
- Staples, D., 1999. A Self-efficacy Theory Explanation for the Management of Remote Workers in Virtual Organizations. *Organization science*, 10(6): 758-776.
- Stone, L., 1994. An investigation of classroom management and how it promotes a positive learning environment. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 31: 224-238.
- Tschannen-Morana, M. and A.W. Hoy, 2001. Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17: 738-805.
- Zimmerman, B.J., 1995. Self-efficacy and Educational Development. In *Self-efficacy in Changing Societies* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, pp: 202-231