

The Impact of Conscious Discipline on Teacher Efficacy and Burnout: Perspectives for Elementary Teachers

Lori A. Cooper, *Wilkes University*

Abstract

This study examined the impact of Conscious Discipline® on Michigan elementary teachers' perceptions of their self-efficacy and burnout levels. Teachers completed a survey of the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and Maslach's Burnout Inventory (MBI) and were observed using a fidelity instrument (Rain, 2014) by the researcher five months after the adoption of Conscious Discipline® school-wide in the treatment group ($n = 12$). The control group ($n = 15$) was matched with similar student population demographics, and the same surveys and fidelity instrument (Rain, 2014) were used. Results from this study found no statistical significance in the TSES or MBI scores between those in treatment and control groups. Additionally, no statistical significance was found in the observed implementation level of Conscious Discipline® and efficacy or burnout scores.

Keywords: Classroom management; Emotional intelligence; Efficacy; Burnout; Conscious Discipline®

Introduction

Classroom management and discipline can be a challenge for teachers; they have the potential to either help a teacher to manage daily practices with ease, or they can cause a teacher to flee the profession due to insurmountable challenge. As service professionals, teachers are likely to experience burnout and leave the field (Farmer, 2017; Vandenberghe & Huberman, 1999), and those who feel they are less effective

Lori A. Cooper. (2019). The Impact of Conscious Discipline on Teacher Efficacy and Burnout: Perspectives for Elementary Teachers. *International Journal of Education Policy & Leadership* 15(14). URL: <http://journals.sfu.ca/ijepl/index.php/ijepl/article/view/882> doi: 10.22230/ijepl.2019v15n14a882

IJEPL is a joint publication of PDK International, the Faculty of Education at Simon Fraser University, the College of Education and Human Development at George Mason University, and the University of Delaware. By virtue of their appearance in this open access journal, articles are free to use, with proper attribution, in educational and other non-commercial settings 90 days after initial publication. Copyright for articles published in IJEPL is retained by the authors. More information is available on the IJEPL website: <http://www.ijepl.org>



at teaching are at increased risk of burning out. Because the management of classroom daily activities, functions, procedures, and student discipline can affect the flow of the day, it can significantly influence the amount of time spent in quality learning experiences for students and impact teacher efficacy. Problems with student discipline (one component of classroom management) are the most taxing aspect of the work environment for teachers (Kuzsman & Schnall, 1987). Classroom management is paramount because it is so closely linked to student academic outcomes and teacher efficacy (Wong, Wong, Jondahl, Ferguson, Allred, Barlak, Candler, Gulle, Rogers, & Seroyer, 2014).

Problem statement

Teachers often encounter challenges with classroom management issues and varying levels of emotional intelligence in students. Teachers who struggle with classroom management and emotional intelligence challenges may experience low levels of self-efficacy and a high tendency toward burnout. These problems can lead to teachers leaving the profession. Teacher attrition is disruptive and can be costly to schools and students (Ronfeldt, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2012; Sutchter, Darling-Hammond, & Carver-Thomas, 2016). Teacher attrition is especially significant in large urban areas (Jurist Levy, Joy, Ellis, Jablonski, & Karelitz, 2012).

The problem is that some teachers experience burnout and low self-efficacy (Brown, 2012). There is a significant need in the education community for tools that help teachers to perform more effectively in the classroom. One such tool, Conscious Discipline[®] is a classroom management, emotional intelligence program that can assist teachers not only effectively manage problem behaviors but also manage their own emotions and teach students methods of effective problem-solving and empathy (Bailey, 2001).

Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study was to examine the impact of the Conscious Discipline[®] emotional intelligence and classroom management program on teachers' efficacy and burnout scores for elementary teachers. Since behaviors in the classroom can impact teachers' feelings of their own efficacy (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001), the study sought to discover whether implementing this particular emotional intelligence and classroom management system specific to teachers, Conscious Discipline for Educators, impacted teachers' perception of their own effectiveness in the classroom. Also, since teacher efficacy is linked to burnout in a negative correlation (Brown, 2012), this study sought to find out the impact of Conscious Discipline for Educators, developed by Dr. Becky Bailey (2001), on burnout scores.

Significance of the study

While the subject area of teacher self-efficacy has been studied regarding various aspects of teaching, foundational authors in the field, Sherri Gibson and Myron Dembo (1984), suggested that further research is needed to relate efficacy specifically with classroom management. Additionally, classroom management has been lauded as a critical component of effective teaching (Brophy, 1988), and there is a positive cor-

relation between teacher self-efficacy and effective methods for dealing with students that exhibit behavior issues (Almog & Shechtman, 2004). This research study examined this relationship with a specific focus on the program Conscious Discipline® and also related efficacy scores with the implementation of Conscious Discipline® and burnout.

This study is significant because although studies have been done on the effectiveness of the Conscious Discipline® program in schools and classrooms around the nation, past studies focused on the impact of Conscious Discipline® on student achievement scores (Rain & Brehm, 2012), social validity (Caldarella, Page, & Gunter, 2012), and discipline referrals (Zastrow & Simonis, 2005). No studies have been published thus far on the effect of Conscious Discipline® on teachers' sense of self-efficacy or their tendency toward burnout. "Teachers' efficacy beliefs have a profound effect on the educational process" (Knoblauch & Hoy, 2008, p. 166), increases student achievement (Schunk, 1991), and reduces teacher burnout (Lee, Patterson, & Vega, 2011). In addition, efficacious teachers are of higher quality than those who are not (Knoblauch & Hoy, 2008). Since these conclusions have been made, an investigation regarding how this program impacts teacher efficacy and/or teacher sense of burnout could contribute to the field of literature and ultimately empower teachers. In order to pursue the study of the influence of Conscious Discipline for Educators on teacher self-efficacy and burnout levels, a comprehensive review of the literature was completed.

Literature review

The review of the literature focused on the subjects of teacher efficacy and burnout, emotional intelligence, and Conscious Discipline® (Bailey, 2012; 2015) to give a full-spectrum view of the various components leading to the research study.

Teacher efficacy and burnout

Albert Bandura (1986) defined self-efficacy to be "people's judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances" (p. 391). To feel competent at their job, teachers need to feel as if they are making a difference in the lives of their students and their school (Bandura, 1997). When teachers feel defeated by the roadblocks in their way of success, no matter the cause, they tend to go on the defensive and blame others for their lack of success, instead of working to form a solution to the root of problems (Knight, 2010).

Bandura (1977) established and refined efficacy theory as a predictor of behavioral change and mastery of content. Additionally, Bandura (1977) proposed that the activities in which individuals choose to engage are related to their feelings of efficacy regarding the task. For example, a teacher who feels incompetent at engaging in the scientific process may avoid implementing science experiments in the classroom when possible. Teacher efficacy revolves around the ability to engage students, maintain effective classroom management, and implement effective instructional strategies (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). Teachers' abilities to effectively manage classrooms and perceive themselves as efficacious are imperative to constructing a quality educational system (Smitta Dibapile, 2012).

Efficacy, according to Bandura (1997), is more than merely a function that is only evident within the classroom. Isaac Friedman and Efrat Kass (2002) asserted that Bandura's efficacy theory has evolved to include other functions of teaching, such as decision-making, student discipline, family involvement, and school climate. When these elements are added to the definition of efficacy, one can deduce that the measure of efficacy goes beyond mere classroom instruction to relationships between teachers and all stakeholders around them, such as students, administrators, parents, and the community (Friedman & Kass, 2002). The perception of the effectiveness of teachers goes deeper than what is communicated to them from colleagues, families, and administrators. Teachers' self-efficacy is their perception of their own effectiveness in various aspects of teaching. Bandura (1986) defined self-efficacy as "people's judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances" (p. 391). For teachers, the perception of their own effectiveness can not only impact their feelings about their role in the field of education, it can also impact their pedagogical methods, their relationships with peers, parents, and students, and can alter their abilities to become effective role models for sound decision-making (Babaoglan & Korkut, 2010).

Efficacy related to teacher burnout

While high self-efficacy can bring positive influences, low self-efficacy can lead to frustration for teachers. This frustration can lead to feelings of incompetence, resulting in burnout (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000; Friedman & Farber, 1992; Ozdemir, 2007). Burnout is comprised of three components: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). There is a statistically significant negative correlational relationship between teacher efficacy and teacher burnout (Brown, 2012); therefore, teachers are headed down a path of enormous challenge if they perceive themselves as lacking in efficaciousness. Since teachers leave the profession at alarming rates (Aloe & Amo, 2013; Lynch, 2012; Sutchter, Darling-Hammond, & Carver-Thomas, 2016), improving teachers' self-efficacy is imperative to keeping teachers in the profession, as well as helping students to enjoy positive classroom experiences.

Efficacy was also shown to predict attrition and retention rates positively (Lee, Patterson, & Vega, 2011). The perception of efficacy can empower teachers to be able to stay in the field, as teacher effectiveness was a predictor of job satisfaction (Viel-Ruma, Houchins, Jolivette, & Benson, 2011). Teachers who consider themselves to be effective are more likely to be satisfied with their jobs (Viel-Ruma et al., 2011). Teachers who feel effective in the classroom will feel more satisfied in their profession and not only stay in the field longer but could bring more energy, innovation, and creativity to their classrooms because of their job satisfaction. Refining the process of educating working teachers in a meaningful way can help them to be more successful in classroom settings and experience less burnout (Viel-Ruma et al., 2011).

Conscious Discipline®

Many social/emotional curricula have been studied for their effectiveness and have been linked to social/emotional and academic gains (Powell & Dunlap, 2009).

Programs with an affective approach, as compared to a cognitive approach, have seen favorable results concerning student behavior (Shechtman & Leichtentritt, 2004). A primary focus of Conscious Discipline[®], as opposed to other social/emotional curricula, is to help children to take ownership of their own feelings and use conflict as a means of developing this control. A major component of this model is that interaction with others sets the stage for problem-solving (Bailey, 2001, 2015).

Conflict is no longer perceived as a hindrance in the classroom, but rather an opportunity to teach social skills (Bailey, 2001, 2015). Conflict is perceived as an avenue for generating motivation for students to want to solve problems and/or let go of previous misconceptions of ineffective problem-solving (Bailey, 2001, 2015). Moving from impulsivity in the lower centers of the brain, where reaction takes place, to conscious decision-making in executive function, is a primary goal of the Conscious Discipline[®] program (Zastrow & Simonis, 2005). It is in this higher center of the brain where true problem-solving capabilities lie (Bailey, 2001, 2012; 2015). While the focus is on classrooms for teachers and home environments for parents, the principles embedded within Conscious Discipline[®] are applicable to all types of human interactions and relationships (Bailey, 2001, 2015).

Because of the issues many teachers face with regard to managing classroom behaviors and because Conscious Discipline[®] has been identified as having positive effects on social validity (Caldarella, Page, & Gunter, 2012), student discipline referrals (Zastrow & Simonis, 2005), and student academic outcomes (Rain & Brehm, 2012), a gap in the literature of how Conscious Discipline[®] affects classroom teachers was pursued. This model of classroom management and the teaching of emotional intelligence and self-regulation was studied to determine if this program has any impact on the scores of teachers' self-efficacy or tendency toward burnout.

Implications for teachers

Teachers who experienced low efficacy indicated behaviors that were more controlling of their students' behaviors (Tschannen-Moran, Hoy, & Hoy, 1998). These teachers were more likely to be pessimistic about student motivation and enforce strict punishments and extrinsic rewards (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). These behaviors are contrary to those elucidated in Conscious Discipline[®]. The link between teacher efficacy and a classroom management program that is contrary to behaviorist methods such as extrinsic rewards and punishments is a connection that could be an interesting one. In addition, because educators typically enter the profession of teaching to help students to develop and grow in positive ways, a lack of personal accomplishment in student development contributes to educator burnout (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 2010).

Because Conscious Discipline[®] has a focus on conflict resolution and problem-solving, it is imperative that teachers cultivate relationships with every student. Students will not feel motivated internally if they do not feel a connection with others around them (Bailey, 2001). Motivation for change and academic success stems from positive relationships between teachers and students (Hinton & Fischer, 2010). Additionally, optimal learning can only occur for children when students and teachers

have strong relationships surrounding learning (White, 2007); therefore, teachers need to strive toward helping students make connections with each other and their teachers.

Method

Due to the challenges of classroom management variations on teachers, a study was conducted of elementary (kindergarten through Grade 5) teachers in Michigan to see how implementing a classroom management and emotional intelligence program, Conscious Discipline for Educators, would influence teacher efficacy and burnout. Previous studies conducted on Conscious Discipline® focused on student achievement (Rain & Brehm, 2012) and student discipline referrals (Hoffman, Hutchinson, & Reiss, 2005; Zastrow & Simonis, 2005). No previous studies were published regarding the impact of Conscious Discipline® on teachers. The following research questions were posed for this investigation:

RQ1: What is the difference in the survey scores of teacher efficacy between elementary teachers who are implementing the Conscious Discipline® classroom management/emotional intelligence program and those who are not?

RQ2: What is the difference in the survey teacher ratings of teacher burnout between elementary teachers who are implementing the Conscious Discipline® classroom management/emotional intelligence program and those who are not?

RQ3: What is the difference in the survey scores of teacher efficacy for teachers, and high scores versus low scores on the fidelity measure of the implementation of content learned through Conscious Discipline for Educators training?

RQ4: What is the difference in the survey scores of teacher burnout for teachers, and high versus low scores on the fidelity measure of the implementation of content learned through Conscious Discipline for Educators training?

In order to seek answers to the research questions, two charter schools in the greater Detroit area agreed to participate in this study. The schools were matched according to geographic location, English-language learners, those requiring special-needs services, and the number of students receiving free and reduced lunch offerings due to income.

Ensuring the level of implementation of Conscious Discipline® was needed for internal validity. A fidelity observational instrument was used. The principal investigator visited all the classrooms of teachers that participated in the research study ($n = 27$) and used a fidelity measure (Rain, 2014). This rubric was used to assess all participants on Conscious Discipline® implementation five months after teachers in the treatment group ($n = 12$) attended a two-day training of Conscious Discipline for Educators. In addition, all participants completed a survey via SurveyMonkey that included the long-form Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES; See Appendix A) (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, n.d) and the Maslach's Burnout Inventory (MBI-ES; See Appendix B) (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 2010) shortly after the fidelity observation was conducted.

The independent variable in the study was the level of implementation of Conscious Discipline® based on the fidelity score. There was no issue of inter-rater reliability since the researcher was the only individual conducting the fidelity observations. The dependent variables for this study included scores on the TSES and the MBI-ES.

Setting

The setting for this study took place in charter schools in the greater Detroit, Michigan, region. The treatment and control schools were located approximately 15 miles apart and served at-risk populations of students and families. This particular location was chosen because three schools nationwide were implementing Conscious Discipline® school-wide, and this location was both a large enough sample and agreed to participate in the study.

The treatment school has been in existence for ten years and serves children from kindergarten through Grade 12. The school is split between three campuses, but only two campuses were observed for the study. Kindergarten is in a separate campus approximately five miles away from the elementary campus, which houses the remaining grades observed in the study. The third campus houses the middle and high school. At the elementary campus, the majority of classrooms are in the main building, but two additional modular buildings with several classrooms are located outside the main building.

Teachers in the treatment school were chosen by their administrators to attend the Conscious Discipline for Educators training and implement the structures in their classrooms due to the school-wide implementation of the program. Since the school in the treatment group decided to implement Conscious Discipline® school-wide, monthly training in the form of a book chapter review, support, and coaching were provided for teachers throughout the academic year.

The control school was also located just outside Detroit, Michigan; it serves approximately 800 children in kindergarten through Grade 8 and has been in operation since 1999. All grades observed in the study, kindergarten through Grade 5, were housed in one building, with an addition being built to accommodate the growing school. Teachers in the control school did not attend Conscious Discipline for Educators training, but instead were trained in their school-wide discipline system. All teachers participated in training in their school-wide discipline system through in-service training and webinars.

The grade bands studied in the treatment school were in multiple buildings, which affected the ability of the administrator to lead effectively. Faculty and staff in these buildings were not consistently aware of where the administrator was located each day, and did not know how to locate her with ease when needs arose. In addition, the climate in this school seemed somewhat strained; responsiveness was lacking in warmth and leadership was disjointed.

The control group school was housed in one location and had multiple administrators within the building, allowing multiple layers of leaders to be readily available to faculty. Each wing of the school had an administrative mentor who was a resource to educators in their wing, as well as a building-level principal. The climate in this school was extremely welcoming, with responsiveness warm and leadership consistently evident.

Participants

The participants in the study consisted of a convenience sample of certified elementary teachers in Michigan ($n = 27$) who taught in classrooms of children in kindergarten through Grade 5 in two charter schools in the greater Detroit metropolitan

area. The treatment group consisted of early childhood teachers who experienced some Conscious Discipline® training, implemented the program in their classrooms at varying levels, and received support in the implementation methods of Conscious Discipline® through book and/or video studies. The control group members were elementary teachers who did not have any Conscious Discipline® training and are not implementing the program in their classroom. The control group was comprised of teachers in matched schools with similar student populations of similar geographic location, socioeconomic backgrounds, race, and disability proportions as per state-level data reporting (Michigan Department of Education, 2019).

Teachers in the treatment group ($n = 12$) were both observed and completed the online survey of the combined TSES and MBI instruments, as well as questions pertaining to their level of training in Conscious Discipline®. In the control group ($n = 15$), teachers completed the identical online survey and were observed using the same fidelity measure during the same time frame as the treatment group.

In addition to the TSES and MBI, participants were asked several questions in the online survey. One preliminary question asked if the participants were certified to teach the grade level assigned to them in the current school year. All participants responded that they were certified to teach in their current grade level in the state of Michigan.

Table 1 summarizes data that pertains to the group’s participation in Conscious Discipline for Educators training and the level of self-study in DVD and/or book form. Of those in the treatment group who attended the training offered by the school, two of the treatment group participants also attended the Conscious Discipline® Summer Institute. The y-axis names the amount of self-study for participants, and the x-axis notes the type of self-described DVD and/or Book study each participant had taken.

Table 1: Amount of self-study participants engaged in

Self-study	DVD		Book	
	Frequency	(percent)	Frequency	(percent)
No self-study	15	55.6	15	55.6
Minimal self-study	7	25.9	5	18.5
Some self-study	5	18.5	6	22.2
Lots of self-study	0	0.00	1	0.04
Total	27	100.0	27	96.34

Instrumentation

Teacher sense of efficacy scale

The Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and Maslach’s Burnout Inventory (MBI) were used for participants to electronically complete as the survey in this study. The TSES uses a nine-point Likert scale, with one denoting that nothing can be done by teachers to affect the situation, to nine signifying that a great deal can be done by teachers to influence the situation (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, n.d.). The authors of the instrument performed factor analysis to determine respondent trends and found the following to be correlated: efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in instructional practices, and efficacy in classroom management (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, n.d.). The long-form of the TSES was used for enhanced precision in the identification of trends.

The TSES scale has been studied with regard to reliability and validity (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001) with additional factor analysis and reliability analysis performed by Megan Tschannen-Moran and Anita Hoy (2007). The TSES is a valid and reliable tool for measuring teacher efficacy by implementing three separate studies using the instrument with a reliability score of 0.94 (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). Additionally, the Cronbach score for reliability was 0.93 in a separate study by Helenrose Fives and Michelle Buehl (2010). The TSES was also found to have construct validity with previous measures (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). The addition of questions regarding a wider variety of teaching tasks allowed for a greater application in a variety of settings (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001).

Maslach Burnout Inventory-Educators Survey

The Maslach Burnout Inventory-Educators Survey (MBI-ES) was used to measure the level of burnout each teacher is experiencing. This scale was developed specifically for teachers after the development of the original Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) for those in human service professions (Maslach et al., 2010). The MBI is available in various editions for various professions and is the most commonly used tool in the assessment of burnout (Leithwood, Menzies, Janzti, and Leithwood as cited in Vandenberghe & Huberman, 1999). Additionally, extensive research has been conducted on the use of the MBI for over 25 years (Maslach et al., 2013). The three subscales of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment are identified and factored in the survey (Maslach et al., 2013). This seven-point Likert scale can be coded as low, average, or high by using cut-off points listed on the scoring key (Maslach et al., 2013). While the MBI-ES is not a clinical diagnostic tool, it can give a clear indication to school administrators of where potential problems may lie and help support teachers who need it most (Maslach et al., 2010). The MBI-ES can also help teachers to self-assess and gain a clearer awareness of what areas are contributing to the most satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction in their work so remediation or other steps in career management can be taken (Maslach et al., 2010).

The MBI has been tested for reliability ($\alpha = 0.91$) with each subscale of the instrument demonstrating average reliability of emotional exhaustion (EE) ($\alpha = 0.88$, $SD = 0.05$), depersonalization (DP) ($\alpha = 0.71$, $SD = 0.09$), and personal accomplishment (PA) ($\alpha = 0.78$, $SD = 0.08$) (Aguayo, Vargas, de la Fuente, & Lozano, 2011). Thirty-eight studies were represented in the regression subsample of the meta-analysis using the English version of the scale. Their reliability alpha ranged from 0.72 to 0.95, with $M = 0.88$ and $SD = 0.04$ (Aguayo et al., 2011). Descriptive statistics from the full sample were similar to those from the regression subsample. In addition, studies done on the English version of fifty-three studies of the EE subscale and coefficient alpha estimates ranged from 0.72 to 0.95, with $M = 88$ and $SD = 0.04$, 95% $CI = 87, 0.89$ (Aguayo et al., 2011).

Fidelity instrument

The Fidelity Checklist provided by Loving Guidance, Inc., the parent company for Conscious Discipline®, was never used to produce an overall score in previous studies. Because of this, no validity or reliability information could be obtained for an

overall score. The Fidelity Checklist was previously used in observing and rating the four subscales. These four subscales are Structures, Rituals, and Routines-Observer (SRRO); Social Emotional Personal Development (SEPD); Teaching Style Rating Scale (TSRS-O); and the Classroom Social Emotional Behavior (CSEB). The TSRS-O contains three subscales: Positive Discipline (PD); Classroom Management (CM); and Positive Emotional Climate (PEC). Table 2 shows the reliability alpha scores for each of the Fidelity Checklist subscales as reported by the author of the instrument (Rain, 2014). The x-axis names the various subscales of the Fidelity rubric and the y-axis lists the reliability scores for each.

Table 2: Reliability scores for fidelity checklist subscales

	SRRO	SEPD	TSRS-O	CSEB
α	0.85	0.91	PD 0.89 CM 0.78 PEC 0.94	0.92

According to the author of the Fidelity Checklist, all subscale measures are content valid (Rain, 2014). Additionally, all subscale measures have demonstrated criterion-related validity through correlations with similar measures, with the exception of the structures and skills rubrics. Since there were no like measures for the structures and skills rubrics, they have been validated only against earlier versions of themselves (Rain, 2014). The mean score on the Fidelity Checklist for the treatment group ($n = 12$) was 98.25 ($sd = 23.33$). The control group ($n = 15$) mean score was 76.53 ($sd = 20.04$).

Procedures

The survey used was the TSES long-form and MBI combined with questions regarding Michigan certification, level of education, attendance at training, and participants’ level of education in Conscious Discipline®. Directions for completion were sent to teachers via email with a link to an electronic completion webpage included. Consent for participation in the study was obtained before the email was sent to the administrators in both the treatment and control groups to be forwarded to participants in the study.

The surveys were completed electronically with accuracy of question wording to ensure the validity and reliability of both instruments, and were sent to teachers in both the treatment and control groups in an email with a link to SurveyMonkey. Both schools served children of the same age group and similar school demographics.

Treatment

The treatment for this study is implementing a new program of Conscious Discipline® in elementary classrooms after receiving training about Conscious Discipline for Educators. The measurement of the implementation of the program was done through the fidelity measure developed by Dr. Jeffrey Rain (2012), named the Conscious Discipline® Fidelity Rubric. The principal investigator was responsible for implementing the fidelity measure approximately five months after the teachers attended the initial training.

Instruments

Three instruments were used in the study: a fidelity instrument to measure the implementation level of Conscious Discipline® (Rain & Brehm, 2012), the TSES (Tschannen-Moran & Woodfolk Hoy, n.d.), and the MBI-ES (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 2010). The fidelity instrument was composed of 28 items with scores ranging from little to no evidence (score of one) to full implementation (score of four). The highest possible score on the fidelity instrument is 112 with moderate fidelity scores of approximately 56 (Rain & Brehm, 2012). The TSES long-form that was used in this study had 24 questions, with each question measuring how much can be done from nothing (score of one) to a great deal (score of nine) regarding teacher perception on what they are able to do in their classrooms (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, n.d.). The highest possible score on the TSES long-form is 216, with moderate efficacy scores of approximately 108 (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, n.d.). The MBI-ES was composed of 22 statements regarding educators’ perception of feelings related to their role as teachers, with scores ranging from never (score of 0) to every day (score of 6) (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 2010). The inventory includes three subscales, with overall moderate burnout scores between 62 and 70 points (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 2010).

Outcomes

After a descriptive analysis of the sample and instrument results (see Table 3), an analysis was conducted between a treatment and control group in this post-test-only design using SPSS 20.0 software. An independent *t*-test was used to compare means for each research question at the recommendation of Meredith Gall, Joyce Gall, and Walter Borg (2007). The y-axis names the various instruments used in the study, and the x-axis denote the descriptive statistics regarding each instrument for the control and treatment groups.

Table 3: Descriptive statistics of instrument results by group

	Group control (<i>n</i> = 15) treatment (<i>n</i> = 12)	<i>m</i>	<i>sd</i>	Max	Min
Fidelity	Control treatment	76.53 98.25	20.04 23.33	113.00 140.00	46.00 71.00
TSES	Control treatment	184.47 170.08	23.69 18.70	216.00 199.00	129.00 135.00
MBI-ES	Control treatment	61.13 67.42	11.99 13.21	81.00 89.00	44.00 45.00

Note: Despite the small sample size, assumptions were met for normality using both the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007).

The findings of this analysis from the *t*-test analysis resulted in no significant difference in all four research questions at the 95 percent confidence interval. Given the low sample size, the results from RQ1 regarding teacher self-efficacy and attending Conscious Discipline for Educators training prompt a need for further exploration with a larger sample ($t(25) = 1.76, p = .098$). For this reason, investigating the impact of Conscious Discipline for Educators training on teacher self-efficacy

should be considered for future research. While the ability to find an effect in a small sample is difficult, a recommendation for future research would be to replicate this study with a larger sample size to determine the potential effect with greater confidence. Additionally, the study should be replicated with schools that have implemented Conscious Discipline® for longer periods of time than five months.

Discussion

There are some possible explanations for the results of the study. There are factors that were notably different between the schools that could affect study results that were not possible to measure before arrival on site. Insignificant results make sense in the results of this study due to the following possible reasons.

Purpose of the program

Because Conscious Discipline® was designed to help adults and students to manage emotions and handle conflict through problem-solving (Bailey, 2001), and the largest correlative factor of burnout has been found to be student misbehavior (Burke, Greenglass, & Schwarzer, 1996), the link between the implementation of this discipline program and teacher self-efficacy and burnout could potentially be strong. Since the program had been shown to improve academic outcomes and discipline referrals for students, it was postulated that the program could also be supportive of teacher efficacy. Because Conscious Discipline® was not designed specifically to increase teacher efficacy or burnout, however, the lack of statistical significance between the variables is logical and meaningful to the field. Any classroom management program has the potential to help teachers in how they see themselves with regard to their effectiveness and willingness to remain in the field of education; since the treatment and control group schools implemented classroom management programs, they both had similar outcomes with regard to efficacy and burnout.

Implementation time

One possibility is that teachers have not yet had enough time to implement the new skills learned to have a significant effect on efficacy and/or burnout. Since the majority of teachers in the treatment school attended the two-day Conscious Discipline for Educators training in August, measuring efficacy and burnout five months later is not an ideal implementation time due to teachers having recently begun their DVD and book self-studies.

Leadership

Another reason why it makes sense for the results to be insignificant could be attributed to the difference in leadership in the schools. The treatment group school was split up into two different campuses in the elementary level, one with multiple portable buildings. During observations, administrators were absent from one campus or another due to issues at the other building. One administrator was on a medical leave of absence for several weeks. The lack of daily support from school administration can contribute to teacher burnout (Burke, 2014). The leadership at the control group school was different in that each wing had an administrator who

was available to coach, mentor, evaluate, support, and answer questions on a daily basis. There was also a principal who oversaw this process for further accountability. Since the mere presence of administration and the perception of support and availability were so strong, this could contribute to the lack of burnout in the control group school.

In addition to increased numbers of administrators, the building in the control group housed all classrooms in the kindergarten through Grade 5, which encompassed the study participants. Because leadership style was not measured in the current study, formal conclusions could not be made, but the fact remains that the possibility exists that this could contribute to affecting the study results. For instance, not providing support for teachers has been noted as the largest factor in contributing to burnout, and ultimately, teachers leaving the profession (Burke, 2014).

School climate

Finally, the climate of each school was also varied between the treatment and control group schools. Even though both schools were charter schools, the environments were different. School climate was not formally assessed in the current study, but differences were evident. The treatment school personnel demonstrated challenges with using welcoming language with visitors, the knowledge of programs used was low, and there was a lack of administrator availability and consistently warm interactions. Due to multiple buildings and the absence of an administrator at times, support for teachers could be lacking. When daily support of teachers by administrators is lacking, this can contribute to teacher perceptions that are not efficacious (Burke, 2014).

The control school personnel, on the other hand, served visitors promptly with knowledgeable responses to help direct people to the services needed. Administrators were available regularly as there were more of them, and administrative assistants were privy to administrator availability to help visitors and families reach the proper person.

Although Conscious Discipline® has been shown to impact school climate (Hoffman, Hutchinson, & Reiss, 2009), this was not evident yet in the treatment school. Perhaps, as noted above, implementation with fidelity would increase over time and improve school climate in the long run. Additionally, due to the recent adoption of the program, teachers may have resisted the change or become overwhelmed at the thought of additional work. If teachers do not have confidence in a new program, the likelihood of success is drastically diminished (Rutherford, 2007). This confidence in the program is essential for success in the adoption of reform (Rutherford, 2007). If teachers were not included in the decision-making for the implementation of Conscious Discipline®, or they were not given clear justification for the adoption of the program, their resistance could influence overall school climate (Friedman & Kass, 2002).

Since the climate in the control school was so positive, this could impact teachers feeling more efficacious and less likely to experience burnout. School climate can be a huge determining factor in the success of teachers (Collie, Shapka, & Perry, 2012). If teachers are successful in their endeavors in the classroom, their outcomes for their own work will be perceived as efficacious. Therefore, the climate of the school affects teacher perceptions of efficacy.

Recommendations for further research

In order to investigate this subject matter further, more studies are needed regarding the use of classroom management programs on teacher efficacy and burnout. Teacher shortages have been noted nationwide and throughout the world with no limit to stage of career (Aloe & Amo, 2013). High attrition rates greatly exacerbate the problem of not having enough educators to supply the field (Sutcher, Darling-Hammond, & Carver-Thomas, 2016).

In addition, studies of Conscious Discipline® relative to teachers are needed. Previous studies have been published regarding the impact of the program on student achievement and student discipline referrals, but teachers were not a focus previous to this study.

In order to see if the results of this study were lacking significance due to the recent school-wide implementation of the Conscious Discipline® program, further study of schools that have implemented the program over several years would be a logical next step. Bailey (2015) has recently suggested that three to four years are needed, at minimum, to see full implementation. Keeping this time frame in mind would be helpful in replicating the study with schools that have implemented the program for at least three years. Furthermore, other classroom management or emotional intelligence programs could be studied to see if they had an impact on teacher efficacy and burnout rates.

Certainly, the need for supports for classroom teachers is clear. A lack of professional support drives teachers out of the profession and prohibits stable learning environments for students (Burke, 2014). Teachers leave the field at high rates, with beginning teachers leaving the field at the highest rate of all populations (National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 2010) and those who remain in the field can eventually be harmful to student success and well-being if they are feeling ineffective and burning out. Continuing to search for possible ways to support teachers so they can be efficacious and satisfied with their jobs would benefit the profession as well as the children they serve.

References

- Aguayo, R., Vargas, C., de la Fuente, E.I., Lozano, L. M. (2011). A meta-analytic reliability generalization study of the Maslach Burnout Inventory. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology, 11*(2), 343–361. Retrieved November 12, 2012, from <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/337/33716996009.pdf>
- Almog, O., & Shechtman, Z. (2007). Teachers' democratic and efficacy beliefs and styles of coping with behavioural problems of pupils with special needs. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 22*(2), 115–29.
- Aloe, A.M., Amo, L.C., & Shanahan, M.E. (2014). Classroom management self-efficacy and burnout: A multivariate meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review, 26*(1), 101–126. doi:10.1007/s10648-013-9244-0
- Babaoglan, E., & Korkut, K. (2010). The correlation between level of classroom teachers' self-efficacy beliefs and classroom management ability perceptions. *Inonu University Journal of the Faculty of Education, 11*(1), 1–19.
- Bailey, B. (2001). *Conscious Discipline®: 7 brain smart skills for brain smart classroom management*. Oviedo, FL: Loving Guidance, Inc.
- Bailey, B. (2012). *Conscious Discipline® brain state model*. Loving Guidance. Retrieved June 2, 2013, from http://consciousdiscipline.com/about/brain_state_model.asp.

- Bailey, B. (2015). *Conscious Discipline: Building resilient classrooms expanded & updated Edition*. Oviedo, FL: Loving Guidance, Inc.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191–215. doi:10.1037/0033-295x.84.2.191
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: Freeman.
- Brophy, J.E. (1988). Educating teachers about managing classrooms and students. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 4(1), 1–18. doi:10.1016/0742-051X(88)90020-0
- Brouwers, A., & Tomic, W. (2000). A longitudinal study of teacher burnout and perceived self-efficacy in classroom management. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16(2), 239–253.
- Brown, C.G. (2012). A systematic review of the relationship between efficacy and burnout in teachers. *Educational & Child Psychology*, 29(4), 47–63. Retrieved November 2, 2018, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285928343_A_systematic_review_of_the_relationship_between_self-efficacy_and_burnout_in_teachers.
- Burke, R.J., Greenglass, E.R., & Schwarzer, R. (1996). Predicting teacher burnout over time: Effects of work stress, social support, and self-doubts on burnout and its consequences. *Anxiety, Stress, and Coping: An International Journal*, 9(3), 261–275.
- Burke, K. (2014, April 2). *Replacing “sink or swim” with “structure and support” for beginning teachers*. Oxford, OH: Learning Forward. Retrieved November 2, 2018, <http://nctaf.org/featured-home/replacing-sink-swim-structure-support-beginning-teacher>.
- Caldarella, P. Page, N.W., & Gunter, L. (2012). Early childhood teachers’ perceptions of *Conscious Discipline*. *Education*, 132(3), 589–599. Retrieved August 13, 2018, from <https://consciousdiscipline.com/early-childhood-educators-perceptions-of-conscious-discipline/>.
- Collie, R.J., Shapka, J.D., & Perry, N.E. (2012). School climate and social–emotional learning: Predicting teacher stress, job satisfaction, and teaching efficacy. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 104(4), 1189–2104. doi:10.1037/a0029356
- Farmer, L. (2017). How to beat teacher burnout: With more education. *The Education Digest*, 83(2), 13–16. Retrieved November 2, 2018, from <https://ezproxy.wilkes.edu/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.wilkes.edu/docview/1932117564?accountid=62703>.
- Fives, H., & Buehl, M.M. (2009). Examining the Factor Structure of the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 11(1), 118–134. doi:10.1080/00220970903224461
- Friedman, I.A., & Farber, B.A. (1992). Professional self-concept as a predictor of teacher burnout. *Journal of Educational Research*, 86(1), 28–35.
- Friedman, I.A., & Kass, E. (2002). Teacher self-efficacy: A classroom-organization conceptualization. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18(6), 675–686. doi: 10.1016/S0742-051X(02)00027-6.
- Gall, M.D., Gall, J.P., & Borg, W.R. (2007). *Educational research: An introduction* (8th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. H. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76(4), 569–582. doi 10.1037/0022-063.76.4.569
- Hinton, C., & Fischer, K. W. (2010). Learning from the developmental and biological perspective. In H. Dumont, D. Istance & F. Benavides (Eds.), *The nature of learning. Using research to inspire practice*. Paris: OECD.
- Hoffman, L.L., Hutchinson, C.J., & Reiss, E. (2005). Evidence of positive effects on the behavior of difficult children. *Strate Journal*, 14(1), 36–43.
- Hoffman, L.L., Hutchinson, C.J., & Reiss, E. (2009). On improving school climate: Reducing reliance on rewards and punishment. *International Journal of Whole Schooling*, 5(1), 13–24. Retrieved February 12, 2012, from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ834298.pdf>.
- Jurist Levy, A., Joy, L., Ellis, P., Jablonski, E., & Karelitz, T. M. (2012). Estimating teacher turnover costs: A case study. *Journal of Education Finance*, 38(2) 102–129. doi: 10.1353/jef.2012.0019

- Knight, J. (2010). *Unmistakable impact: A partnership approach for dramatically improving instruction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press
- Knoblauch, D., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2008). "Maybe I can teach those kids." The influence of contextual factors on student teachers' efficacy beliefs. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24(1), 166–179. doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2007.05.005
- Kuzsman, J.F., & Schnall, H. (1987). Managing teachers' stress: Improving discipline. *The Canadian School Executive*, 6, 3–10
- Lee, Y., Patterson, P., & Vega, L. (2011). Perils to efficacy perceptions and teacher-preparation quality among special education intern teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 38(2), 61–76. Retrieved February 12, 2012, from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ926860.pdf>.
- Lynch, M. (2012). Recruiting, retaining, and fairly compensating our teachers. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 8(2), 121–135. Retrieved November 20, 2018, from <http://www.inased.org/ijjepi.htm>.
- Maslach, C., Jackson, S.E. & Leiter, M.P. (2010). *Maslach burnout inventory manual* (3rd ed.). Mountain View, CA: Mind Garden, Inc.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W.B., & Leiter, M.P. (2001). Job burnout. Annual review. *Psychology*, 52(1), 397–422. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.397
- Michigan Department of Education. (2019). *MI school data: Schools at a glance*. Retrieved on October 12, 2019, from <https://www.mischooldata.org/Legislative2/LegislativeDashboard4.aspx>.
- National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (2010, January). *Who will teach? Experience matters*. Retrieved February 12, 2012, from <http://nctaf.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/NCTAF-Who-Will-Teach-Experience-Matters-2010-Report.pdf>.
- Ozdemir, Y. (2007). The role of classroom management efficacy in predicting teacher burnout. *International Journal of Social, Behavioral, Educational, Economic, Business and Industrial Engineering*, 1(11), 751–757. Retrieved February 13, 2012, from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/5fcd/ca057a8d4a5648063f46af54fa65dd21b184.pdf>.
- Powell, D., & Dunlap, G. (2009). *Evidence-based social-emotional curricula and intervention packages for children 0-5 years and their families: Roadmap to effective intervention practices*. Tampa, FL: University of South Florida, Technical Assistance Center on Social Emotional Intervention for Young Children. Retrieved February 12, 2012, from www.challengingbehavior.org.
- Rain, J. (2014). *Conscious Discipline fidelity rubric*. Retrieved June 1, 2014, from http://consciousdiscipline.com/downloads/resources/progress_assessment_structures_rubric_final-1.pdf.
- Rain, J.S., & Brehm Consulting. (2012). *Safe schools/healthy students, grant initiative*. Unpublished study. Washington, DC: U.S. Departments of Education, Health and Human Services, and Justice.
- Ronfeldt, M., Loeb, S., Wyckoff, J. (2013). How teacher turnover harms student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 50(1), 4–36
- Rutherford, C. (2007). Planning to change: Strategic planning and comprehensive school reform. *Educational Planning* 18(1), 1–10. Retrieved February 12, 2012, from http://isep.info/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/18-1_1PlanningtoChange.pdf
- Schunk, D. H. (1991). Efficacy and academic motivation. *Educational Psychologist*, 26(3/4), 207–231. Retrieved August 1, 2012, from https://libres.uncg.edu/ir/uncg/f/D_Schunk_Self_1991.pdf
- Shechtman, Z., & Leichtenritt, J. (2004). Affective teaching: A method to enhance classroom management. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 27(3), 323–333. doi:10.1080/0261976042000290822
- Smitta Dibapile, W.T. (2012). A review of literature on teacher efficacy and classroom management. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning*, 9(2), 79–92. Retrieved May 25, 2014, from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1418715985?accountid=12085>.
- Sutcher, L., Darling-Hammond, L., & Carver-Thomas, D. (2016). *A coming crisis in teaching? Teacher supply, demand, and shortages in the U.S.* Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute. Retrieved April 2, 2019, from <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/coming-crisis-teaching>.

- Tschannen-Moran, M., Hoy, A.W., & Hoy, K.W. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. Review. *Educational Research*, 68(2), 202–248. Retrieved November 12, 2012, from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/214114604?accountid=12085>.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woodfolk Hoy, A. (n.d.). *Teacher sense of efficacy scale (long form)*. Retrieved February 17, 2012, from <http://people.ehe.osu.edu/ahoy/files/2009/02/tses.pdf>.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(7), 783–805. Retrieved February 17, 2012, from http://wps.ablongman.com/wps/media/objects/2347/2404137/Megan_Anita.pdf.
- Vandenberghe, R., & Huberman, M.A. (1999). *Understanding and preventing teacher burnout*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press
- Vesely, A.K., Saklofske, D.H., & Leschied, A.D.W. (2013). Teachers-the vital resource: The contribution of emotional intelligence to teacher efficacy and well-being. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology*, 28(1), 71–89. Retrieved May 26, 2017, from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1449795456?accountid=12085>.
- Viel-Ruma Aguayo, R., Vargas, C., de la Fuente, E. I., & Lozano, L. M. (2011). A meta-analytic reliability generalization study of the Maslach Burnout Inventory. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, 11(2), 343–361.
- White, J. C. (2007). Learner-centered teacher-student relationships are effective: A meta-analysis. Review. *Educational Research*, 77(1), 113–143.
- Wong, H.K., Wong R.T., Jondahl, S.F., Ferguson, O.F., Allred, S.L., Barlak, R., Candler, L., Gulle, J. Rogers, K., & Seroyer, C. (2014). *The classroom management book*. San Francisco, CA: Wong Publications, Inc.
- Zastrow, K., & Simonis, P. (2005). *Enhanced learning with Conscious Discipline®*. Institute for Learning Partnership Final Grant Report. Green Bay, WI: University of Wisconsin-Green Bay.

Appendix A

Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)

Teacher Beliefs		How much can you do?													
		Nothing	Very Little	Some Influence	Quite A Bit	A Great Deal									
1.	How much can you do to get through to the most difficult students?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)					
2.	How much can you do to help your students think critically?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)					
3.	How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)					
4.	How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in school work?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)					
5.	To what extent can you make your expectations clear about student behavior?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)					
6.	How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in school work?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)					
7.	How well can you respond to difficult questions from your students ?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)					
8.	How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)					
9.	How much can you do to help your students value learning?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)					
10.	How much can you gauge student comprehension of what you have taught?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)					
11.	To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)					
12.	How much can you do to foster student creativity?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)					
13.	How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)					
14.	How much can you do to improve the understanding of a student who is failing?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)					
15.	How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)					
16.	How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)					
17.	How much can you do to adjust your lessons to the proper level for individual students?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)					
18.	How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)					
19.	How well can you keep a few problem students from ruining an entire lesson?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)					
20.	To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)					
21.	How well can you respond to defiant students?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)					
22.	How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)					
23.	How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)					
24.	How well can you provide appropriate challenges for very capable students?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)					

Note: For use by Lori Cooper only. Received from Mind Garden, Inc. on March 11, 2013.

Appendix B

IJEPL 15(14) 2019

Cooper

Teacher Efficacy
and Burnout

Maslach Burnout Inventory Educator Survey (MBI-ES) Example Questions

Christina Maslach, Susan E. Jackson & Richard L. Schwab

*The purpose of this survey is to discover how educators view their job
and the people with whom they work closely.*

Instructions: On the following pages are 22 statements of job-related feelings. Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about *your* job. If you have *never* had this feeling, write the number "0" (zero) in the space before the statement. If you have had this feeling, indicate *how often* you feel it by writing the number (from 1 to 6) that best describes how frequently you feel that way. An example is shown below.

How often:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Never	A few times a year or less	Once a month or less	A few times a month	Once a week	A few times a week	Every day

Note: For use by Lori Cooper only. Received from Mind Garden, Inc. on March 11, 2013.

Example Questions:

How Often:

_____ I feel I'm positively influencing other people's lives through my work.

_____ I feel like I'm at the end of my rope.

_____ I worry that this job is hardening me emotionally.