Choice of Behaviour Management Techniques amongst Primary School Teachers: Implications for Counselling and Teacher Preparation

[1]Obidoa, Mabel A. PhD, [2]Onuigbo, Liziana N. Ph.D, [3]Odo, Kenneth O, [4]Ezeke, John I.
Department of Educational Foundations, University of Nigeria, Nsukka Enugu Staten Nigeria
[1]maobidoa@yahoo.com, +234-0896013030
[2]onuigbosamlizzy@yahoo.com, +234-08066956428

Abstract:
The study investigated the choice of behaviour management techniques amongst primary school teachers. Three research questions and three null hypotheses guided the study. A structured questionnaire was developed and used to elicit information from 163 primary school teachers in the Obollo-Afor Education zone of Enugu State. Mean and standard deviation were used to answer the research questions. t-test statistics was used to test the first hypothesis while Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to analyse the second and third hypotheses. Findings of the study revealed the behaviour management techniques used by practicing teachers in the zone and showed that there is a significant difference in the teacher's choice of these techniques due to teachers gender, educational qualification and age. Based on the findings, recommendations, conclusions and counselling implications were highlighted.
Key words: Behaviour, Management, Techniques, Teachers, Primary School, Counselling

1.1. Introduction

Teachers are constantly faced with the challenges of managing the behaviour problems of school children in addition to the arduous task of teaching the various schools subjects. With the increase in the use of information and technology devices the behaviour problems of children seem to increase thereby increasing the responsibility of the teacher. Sometimes while the teacher is teaching in the class, children will be busy playing games or fighting or pinching one another. These behaviours cause a lot of worry not only to the teachers but also to parents and society especially as its persistence could affect the children's academic performance (Okere & Onyechi, 2006).

School children exhibit a wide range of problematic behaviours which could be mild but persistent , intense and very challenging. American Federation of Teachers (2010) and Codding & Smith, (2008) enumerated certain behaviour problems of primary school children to include disrupting the work of others, bullying, aggression, calling or shouting out at others, leaving the seats and walking about, noise making, pilfering, truancy, pinching others, lateness to school, cheating in examinations, gossiping, fighting, crying, physical aggression, refusal to do home-works and verbal abuse among others. Researchers have noted that the management of these behaviours can be stressful and frustrating to the teacher (Clunies-Ross, Little and Keinhuis, 2008),.

Teachers play a critical role in the management of children's behaviour problems. Behaviour management according to Shea & Bauer as cited by Walker and Shea (1991) are defined as those actions (conscious and unconscious) teachers and parents engage in to enhance the probability that children individually and in groups will develop effective behaviour that are personally fulfilling and socially acceptable. Behaviour management techniques are therefore, interventions which are used to reshape the behaviour problems of students.

Teachers respond to students behaviour problems in various ways. Some teachers respond to behaviour problems in a negative and aversive manner while others adopt positive behaviour management techniques. Traditionally teachers manage behaviour problems by increasing the frequency and intensity of punitive disciplinary measures (Sungai & Horner, 2002; Utley, kozleski, Smith & Draper, 2002). Teachers especially in the rural areas apply such techniques as the use of corporal punishment by flogging the child, kneeling the child down, asking the child to cut grasses while the lessons are going on, washing the school toilet, suspending the child or expelling him/her. These techniques have been considered as aversive as they could affect the psychology of the child. It could place the child at risk of dropping out of school or playing truancy (Harrell, Leavell, van Tassel & McKee,2004). Studies indicate that the use of corporal punishment was not an acceptable behaviour management technique as they may result in an increase of the challenging behaviour problems rather than decrease it (Lassen, Steele & Sailor, 2006).

 There has been a growing research on the use of proactive behaviour management techniques in managing behaviour problems (Aber, Brown & Jones, 2003). Researchers in this area have focussed on behavioural monitoring and reinforcement (Catalano, Arthur, Hawkins, Berglund & Olson, 1998). They recommend behaviour modification techniques which include the use of reinforcement (positive and negative reinforcers) extinction, reprimands, token economy, timeout, over correction, contingency contracting, self management and

self monitoring. They recommend that punishment should be used as the last resort when other strategies have failed and to them it merely affects immediate response and generally produces many negative effects (Zanzibar Ministry of education and vocational training (2006). Some teachers neither apply corporal punishment nor the proactive behaviour management strategies. They are so care- free that they stare at children when they misbehave, and they allow them to go scot free (The American Federation of Teachers (2010).

Several studies have been conducted on teachers management of children's behaviour problems. Oliver & Reschley, (2007) found that teacher preparation and professional development could determine if a teacher will experience difficulty in the management of children's behaviour problems. To them, if the professional development is inadequate, the teacher may encounter problems in managing student's behaviour problems. Formica (1962) found that teachers with shorter preparation time reported more problems than those with four – year degree. Levin and Nolan (2007) noted that highly qualified teachers use a collection of best practices that influence students learning achievement and behaviour.

Research has also shown that there is a relationship between teacher gender and students behaviour management techniques. Chudgar, Sankar, (2008) found that male and female teachers differ in terms of their classroom management practices. Krieg, (2005) found that students taught by women perform better than those taught by men but Driessen (2007) found that teacher gender has no influence on student achievement, attitudes or behaviour irrespective of student gender, ethnic background, or socio economic status. Stone and Ayers cited in Hicks, (2012) found that male teachers perceive fewer problems than their female counterparts in terms of classroom management.

The age of the teacher is another factor that could influence children's behaviour management. Ayers (1972) found that age was not an important factor in classroom management of teachers. They also found that teachers between the age range of 24 – 35 years perceived fewer problems than teachers older than 35 or younger than 24.

Despite the studies on children's behaviour management, very few studies have examined how these teacher variables; age, gender, years of experience and teaching qualification, influence their choice of behaviour management techniques. This study therefore, set out to find how teacher gender, educational qualification and age influence teachers choice of behaviour management techniques. The findings of this study will help to assess the training and retraining needs of teachers at various teacher education institutions and it will also add to existing literature on behaviour management techniques

To guide this study, three research questions and three null hypotheses were formulated.

1.2. Research Questions:

1. What are the behaviour management techniques adopted by male and female teachers?

2. Are teachers choice of behaviour management techniques related to their educational qualifications?

3. Is the choice of behaviour management techniques of teachers dependent on their chronological age?

1.3. Hypotheses

Ho_1. The choice of behaviour management techniques of female teachers do not differ from those of male teachers

Ho_2. There is no significant difference in the behaviour management techniques of primary school teachers due to their educational qualification

Ho_3. There is no significant difference in the choice of behaviour management techniques of primary school teachers due to their age.

2.1. Method

A descriptive survey design was used in this study. The design was used as it is concerned with describing situations as they occur. The   study was delimited to the traditional behaviour management techniques of teachers in the rural schools utilize. The population of the study consisted of all the one thousand one hundred and sixty three (1163) primary school teachers in Obollo Afor education zone of Enugu State. 163 primary school teachers in the 26 rural schools in the zone were randomly sampled for the study.

2.2. Instrument for Data collection:

Two instruments were used for the study. The first was an open-ended questionnaire distributed to all the teachers. In Section A, the questionnaire required them to list all the problem behaviours exhibited by their pupils and in Section B, they were required to list all the methods they use to manage these problematic behaviours. From their responses, a list of problematic behaviours and their management techniques were compiled for the second instrument. The second instrument which was used for the second phase of the study also had two sections. Section A was used to elicit information on the personal data of the teachers which include information on the educational qualifications, gender and age of the teachers. Section B listed the

behaviour modification techniques compiled from the first instrument. Teachers were required to indicate for each problematic behaviour, their most frequently used technique.

Face validation of the instrument was done by two professors in Guidance and Counselling and one expert in Special Education. The experts examined the instrument in terms of the relevance and the clarity of the items. The instrument was also administered to twenty teachers in equivalent schools in Nsukka Local Government. Cronbach Alpha was used to determine the reliability of the instrument and it yielded a reliability estimate of 0.89

Data collection was done in two stages. First an initial pilot was done to find out the major behaviour problems exhibited by children in schools as seen by the teachers and the most popular ways of handling these behaviours. A list of 18 behaviour problems were compiled from respondents with a list of 15 behaviour management techniques. The data collected from Section B of the questionnaire was collated on a frequency table that indicated the number of times the teachers chose a particular technique for each of the problem behaviours. This was correlated to the ages, gender and qualification of the teachers. The data was run on an SPSS programme and used to test the hypotheses that guided the study. Mean and standard deviation was used to answer the research questions. t test statistics was used to analyze hypothesis one while Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to analyze the hypotheses two and three at 0.05 level of significance.

3.1. Results

Gender differences in the choice of behaviour management techniques of teachers

Research Question 1 and Ho$_1$ address this subject

Research question1: What are the behaviour management techniques adopted by male and female teachers?

Ho$_1$. The choice of behaviour management techniques of female teachers do not differ from those of male teachers

Table 1: Mean Rating and Standard Deviation of Choice of Behaviour Management Techniques by Gender

S/No	Item		X	SD	T	Df	Sig(2-tailed)	Dec
1	Staring at offender	Male	2.26	1.45	-945	112	0.48	NS
		Female	3.15	2.13				
2	Cautioning offender	Male	2.76	3.39	-1.711	118	0.090	NS
		Female	3.70	2.71				
3	Kneeling offender down	Male	2.93	2.02	-1.915	111	0.058	NS
		Female	3.82	2.63				
4	Private discussion	Male	2.14	1.65	-.991	92	.324	NS
		Female	2.58	2.25				
5	Scolding offender	Male	2.82	1.40	-.937	110	.351	NS
		Female	3.24	2.77				
6	Flogging offender	Male	2.18	1.43	-2.169	110	.351	S
		Female	2.94	2.01				
7	Manual labour	Male	1.94	1.05	-2.210	105	.029	S
		Female	2.72	2.03				
8	Standing child up	Male	2.82	1.22	-.404	117	.687	NS
		Female	2.94	1.75				
9	Putting offender in charge of class	Male	1.91	0.94	-.085	110	.933	NS
		Female	1.93	1.14				
10	Reasons for misbehaviour	Male	3.44	1.11	-1.018	117	.311	NS
		Female	3.79	2.154				
11	Standing behind offender	Male	1.31	0.51	-1.613	108	.110	NS
		Female	1.57	0.98				
12	Denial of privilege	Male	1.39	0.63	-.833	104	.407	NS
		Female	1.51	0.75				
13	Detention	Male	1.61	0.75	-.214	103	.831	NS
		Female	1.64	0.88				
14	Suspension	Male	1.79	0.77	.103	112	.919	NS
		Female	1.77	0.83				
15	Expulsion	Male	1.00	0.00				NS
		Female	1.00	0.00				

Table 1 presents data relating to the choice of behaviour management techniques for males and female teachers which indicate that for cautioning offenders males have a mean score of 2.76 with a standard deviation of 3.39 while females have a mean score of 3.70 with a standard deviation of 2.71. A t-test analysis of the item show that there is no significant difference between male and female teachers on the item. This is shown by the calculated t of -1.711 which is significant at 0.09 but not significant at 0.05 level of significance. With regards to kneeling offenders down males have a mean score of 2.93 with a standard deviation of 2.22 while females have a mean score of 3.82 with a standard deviation of 2.63. The t –test statistics show that there is no significant difference between male and females in kneeling offender down. Data on asking the child the reason for the misbehaviour indicate that males have a mean score of 3.44 with a standard deviation of 1.11 while females have a mean score of 3.79 with a standard deviation of 2.15. A t-test analysis indicate that there is no significant difference between males and females in the use of the technique. This is shown in the calculated t of -1.018 which is significant at .311 but not significant at 0.05 level of significance.

The result on Table 1 shows that on two items, flogging offender and manual labour, the gender of the teacher significantly influenced their choice of the behaviour management techniques. Data on flogging offender indicate that males have a mean score of 2.18 with a standard deviation of 1.43 while females have a mean score of 2.94 with a standard deviation of 2.01. A t- test analysis shows a significant difference between male and female teachers on flogging offender. This is shown by the calculated t of -2.169 which is not significant at .351 but significant at 0.05 level of significance. Data on manual labour also indicate that males have a mean score of 1.94 with a standard deviation of 1.05 while females have a mean score of 2.72 with a standard deviation of 2.03. A test of difference using t- test indicates that there is a significant difference between male and female teachers in the use of manual labour. This is shown by the calculated t of -2.210 which is not significant at .029 but significant at 0.05 level of significance. The higher mean score for females on the two items indicates that female teachers choose flogging offenders and manual labour as behaviour management techniques more than males.

On item by item analysis, the results on Table 1 above indicates that13 out of the 15 behaviour management techniques listed on the Table are not significantly different based on teachers gender. Items 1, 2, 3, 4 7, 8, 9, 10,11,12,13,14,15 which have the calculated t of -1.711, -1.915, -.991, -.937, -.404, -.085,-1.018, -1.613, -.833, -.214 and .103 respectively is significant at 0.90, 0.58, 0.32, .351, .687, .933, .311, .110, .407 .831 and .919 and not significant at 0.05 level of significance.

On the other hand, items relating to flogging offender and manual labour have calculated t value of -2.16 and -2.210 which is not significant at .351 and .029 but significant at 0.05 level of significance. So there is a significant difference in the male and female teachers choice of flogging and manual labour as behaviour management techniques. The female teachers have a mean rating of 2.94 and 2.72 on flogging offender and manual labour respectively whereas male teachers have a mean rating of 2.18 and 1.95 respectively on the items. This indicates that female teachers choose flogging offender and manual labour as behaviour management techniques more than their male counterparts.

Teachers choice of behaviour management techniques and their educational qualifications

Research questions 2 and Ho_2 address this topic

Research Question 2: Are teachers choice of behaviour management techniques related to their educational qualifications?

Table 2: Mean rating and Standard Deviation of Teachers on the Choice of Behaviour Management Techniques based on Educational Qualifications

S/No	Behaviour Management Techniques	Without Degree		Degree With Education		Degree Without Education	
		X	SD	X	SD	X	SD
1	Staring at Offender	2.49	2.18	5.66	2.08	2.75	1.66
2	Cautioning offender	13.44	2.95	14.00	3.0	11.63	2.72
3	Kneeling offender down	3.44	2.42	5.33	3.78	3.37	2.38
4	Private discussion	2.37	2.02	4.33	3.51	2.14	1.46
5	Scolding offender	3.14	2.41	2.33	1.52	2.50	0.54
6	Flogging offender	2.60	1.87	3.33	2.31	2.88	1,25
7	Manual labour	2.40	1.55	5.33	1.15	1.71	0.95
8	Standing child up	2.85	1.59	3.67	1.53	3.25	1.03
9	Putting offender in charge of class	1.87	.96	3.67	2.51	1.88	1.12
10	Asking reasons for misbehaviour	3.62	1.58	7.00	6.24	2.87	1.25
11	Standing behind offender	1.44	0.81	11.66	1.15	1.62	1.06
12	Denial of privilege	1.46	0.72	1.33	0.57	1.57	0.53
13	Detention	1.59	0.77	2.67	2.08	11.80	0.84
14	Suspension	1.76	0.78	1.67	1.13	2.14	1.07
15	Expulsion	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00

Results on Table 2 on the choice of behaviour management techniques based on teachers educational qualifications indicate that mean ratings of teachers without degree, teachers with degree in education and teachers who hold degree though not in education on items 1-15 range between 1.44-13.44, 1.33- 14.00 and 1.57-11.63. The result indicates that teachers who hold degrees with educational qualifications chose eleven out of the fifteen listed behaviour management techniques which is more than those teachers without degree and those who hold degree without educational qualification. This is shown by their mean rating on items1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 13.

Ho$_2$. There is no significant difference in the choice of behaviour management techniques of primary school teachers due to their educational qualifications

Table: 3: Summary of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on in the choice of behaviour management techniques of primary school teachers due to their educational qualifications

S/No	Item		Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig	Dec
1	Staring at offender	Between group	29.496	2	14.743	3.20	0.04	S
		Within groups	429.914	107	4.607			
		Total	522.400	109				
2	Cautioning offender	Between group	26.144	2	13.012	1.510	0.23	NS
		Within groups	1012.847	117	8.657			
		Total	1038.992	119				
3	Kneeling offender down	Between group	10.541	2	5.271	.876	0.42	NS
		Within groups	661.669	110	6.015			
		Total	672.230	112				
4	Private discussion	Between group	11.736	2	5.868	1.409	0.25	NS
		Within groups	379.083	91	4.166			
		Total	390.819	93				
5	Scolding offender	Between group	4.702	2	2.351	.435	0.65	NS
		Within groups	588.726	109	5.401			
		Total	593.429	111				
6	Flogging offender	Between group	2.014	2	1.007	.294	0.75	NS
		Within groups	373.700	109	3.428			
		Total	375.714	111				
7	Manual labour	Between group	28,940	2	14.470	4.960	0.01	S
		Within groups	303.415	104	2.917			
		Total	332.355	106				
8	Standing child up	Between group	2.994	2	1.497	.612	0.54	NS
		Within groups	283.796	116	2.447			
		Total	286.790	118				
9	Putting offender in charge of class	Between group	9.408	2	4.704	4.464	0.01	S
		Within groups	114.868	109	1.054			
		Total	124.277	111				
10	Reasons for misbehaviour	Between group	38.494	2	19.247	6.235	.003	S
		Within groups	358.060	116	3.087			
		Total	396.555	118				
11	Standing behind offender	Between group	.368	2	.184	.263	0.77	NS
		Within groups	74.986	107	.701			
		Total	75.355	109				
12	Denial of privilege	Between group	.135	2	.067	.133	0.88	NS
		Within groups	52.214	103	.507			
		Total	52.349	105				
13	Detention	Between group	3.542	2	1.771	2.619	0.08	NS
		Within groups	68.972	102	.676			
		Total	72.514	104				
14	Suspension	Between group	1.003	2	.502	.768	0.47	NS
		Within groups	72.514	111	.653			
		Total	73.518	113				
15	Expulsion	Between group	.000	2	.000			
		Within groups	.000	7	.000			
		Total	.000	9				

Data on Table 3 relates to difference in the choice of behaviour management techniques of primary school teachers due to their educational qualifications. The ANOVA statistics show that there is a significant difference in the choice of four out of the fifteen behaviour management techniques of primary school teachers due to their qualification. This is shown on items such as staring at offender, manual labour, putting offender in charge of class, and asking the child the reason for the misbehaviour. These items have significant f values of 0.04, 0.01, 0.01, and 0.03 respectively. The significance level of the items are below 0.05 and therefore, teachers educational qualifications influence the choice of the behaviour management techniques.

There is no significant difference in the choice of other behaviour management techniques such as cautioning offender, kneeling offender down, having private discussion with the offender, scolding offender, flogging offender, standing child up putting offender in charge of class, asking reasons for misbehaviour, standing behind offender, denial of privilege and detention and suspension as a result of teachers educational qualifications. The significance f value of the items range between 0.08 - 0.88 on Table 3. Since the significance levels of the items are above 0.05 significance level, there is therefore, no significant difference in the choice of eleven behaviour management techniques due to teachers educational qualifications.

Choice of behaviour management techniques and age of teachers

This is addressed by research Question 3 and Ho_3

Research question 3:Is the choice of behaviour management techniques of teachers dependent on their chronological age?

Table 4: Mean rating and Standard Deviation of Teachers on the Choice of Behaviour Management Techniques based on Age of Teachers

S/No	Behaviour Management Techniques	Teachers Age 20-30years		Teachers Age 31-40years		Teachers Age Over 41years	
		X	SD	X	SD	X	SD
1	Staring at Offender	3.94	4.06	2.41	1.44	2.28	2.05
2	Cautioning offender	13.44	3.28	13.50	2.94	12.81	2.83
3	Kneeling offender down	5.69	3.68	3.08	1.85	3.25	2.38
4	Private discussion	3.43	3.09	2.25	1.78	2.08	1.56
5	Scolding offender	4.85	5.30	2.71	1.31	3.19	1.81
6	Flogging offender	3.43	2.56	2.69	1.70	2.00	1.50
7	Manual labour	2.53	2.67	2.39	1.42	2.55	2.14
8	Standing child up	4.18	2.81	2.64	1.15	1.88	1.21
9	Putting offender in charge of class	2.07	1.22	1.92	1.06	1.84	0.99
10	Asking reasons for misbehaviour	4.50	3.24	3.49	1.58	3.65	1.19
11	Standing behind offender	1.47	0.83	1.45	0.91	1.500	0.59
12	Denial of privilege	1.29	0.61	1.52	0.76	1.39	0.58
13	Detention	1.80	1.08	1.62	0.81	1.52	0.75
14	Suspension	1.88	0.88	1.78	0.83	1.72	0.68
15	Expulsion	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00

Results on Table 4 on the choice of behaviour management techniques based on teachers age, indicate that mean ratings of teachers whose ages are between 20-30 years, 31 years – 40years and 41 years and above on items 1-15 range between 1.28-13.44, 1.45- 13.50 and 1.39-12.81. Data on the Table reveal that teachers whose ages are between 20- 30 years seem to choose many of the behaviour management techniques listed in this study more than those who ages range between 31-40 years and 41 years and above. Their mean rating is highest in eleven out of the fifteen the behaviour management techniques listed in this study.

Ho_3. There is no significant difference in the behaviour management of primary school teachers due to their age

Table5: Summary of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on Mean Ratings On The Behaviour Management Of Primary School Teachers Due To Their Age

S/No	Item		Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig	Dec
1	Staring at offender	Between group	33.785	2	16.892	3.69	0.03	S
		Within groups	488.615	107	4.566			
		Total	522.400	109				
2	Cautioning offender	Between group	9.516	2	4.758	.54	0.58	NS
		Within groups	1029.476	117	8.799			
		Total	1038.992	119				
3	Kneeling offender down	Between group	90.786	2	45.393	8.59	0.00	S
		Within groups	581.444	110	5.286			
		Total	672.230	112				
4	Private discussion	Between group	20.619	2	10.310	2.53	0.09	NS
		Within groups	370.200	91	4.068			
		Total	390.819	93				
5	Scolding offender	Between group	50.739	2	25.369	5.09	0.01	S
		Within groups	542.690	109	4.979			
		Total	593.429	111				
6	Flogging offender	Between group	20.594	2	10.297	3.16	0.04	S
		Within groups	355.121	109	3.258			
		Total	375.714	111				
7	Manual labour	Between group	.561	2	.280	.088	0.92	NS
		Within groups	331.794	104	3.190			
		Total	332.355	106				
8	Standing child up	Between group	31.880	2	15.940	7.25	0.01	S
		Within groups	254.910	116	2.196			
		Total	286.790	118				
9	Putting offender in charge of class	Between group	.483	2	.242	.213	0.81	NS
		Within groups	123.793	109	1.136			
		Total	124.277	111				
10	Reasons for misbehaviour	Between group	13.423	2	6.712	2.03	0.14	NS
		Within groups	383.131	116	3.303			
		Total	396.555	118				
11	Standing behind offender	Between group	.044	2	.022	.031	0.97	NS
		Within groups	75.311	107	.704			
		Total	75.355	109				
12	Denial of privilege	Between group	.796	2	.398	.79	0.45	NS
		Within groups	51.553	103	.501			
		Total	52.349	105				
13	Detention	Between group	.673	2	.337	.48	0.62	NS
		Within groups	71.841	102	.704			
		Total	72.514	104				
14	Suspension	Between group	.234	2	.117	.18	0.84	NS
		Within groups	73.283	111	.660			
		Total	73.518	113				
15	Expulsion	Between group	.000	2	.000			
		Within groups	.000	7	.000			
		Total	.000	9				

The summary of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) presented in Table 5 shows that items relating to staring at offender, kneeling offender down, scolding offender, flogging offender and standing the offender up is significant at P<0.05. The table indicates that the significance f value of 0.03, 0.00, 0.01, 0.04 and 0.01 on the items respectively are below 0.05. There is therefore, a significant difference in the behaviour management of primary school teachers due to their age with regards to staring at offender, kneeling offender down, scolding offender, flogging offender and standing the child up. The ANOVA further show that items as cautioning offender, having private discussion with the offender, manual labour, putting offender in charge of class, asking

reasons for misbehaviour, standing behind offender, denial of privilege, detention and suspension are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. From the Table above the significance of f for the items which range from 0.09- 0.97 is above the 0.05 level of significance.   Teachers between the ages of 20 and 30 use kneeling offender down, scolding offender, standing child up and asking reasons for misbehaviour, having private discussion with the offender and flogging offender more frequently. Teachers between age 31-40 ask offender reasons for misbehaviour and kneel offender down more frequently while teachers above 41 years offender reasons for misbehaviour and kneel offender down and scold offender more frequently. This implies that there is no significant difference the behaviour management techniques of teachers such as cautioning offender, having private discussion with the offender, manual labour, putting offender in charge of class, asking reasons for misbehaviour, standing behind offender, denial of privilege and detention as a result of their age.

4.1. Discussion of Findings

This study shows that primary school teachers still adopt the traditional behaviour management strategies such as flogging the child, kneeling the child down, manual labour and scolding the child among other behaviour management techniques irrespective of their gender, educational qualifications and age. This finding supports earlier studies by Sungai and Horner, (2002) Utley, kozleski, Smith and Draper (2002) which shows that teachers traditionally manage behaviour problems using disciplinary measures as corporal punishment.

 Data on Table 1 show that there is a significant difference between male and female teachers in their choice of some behaviour management techniques. Result on the Table indicates that there is a significant difference in the male and female teachers choice of behaviour management techniques such as flogging offender and manual labour. The higher mean rating of the female teachers over the male teachers in the choice of flogging and manual labour   where there is a significant difference indicates that more female teachers choose those techniques than males. The implication is that female teachers may perceive many behaviour problems as deserving flogging and manual labour than the male teachers. This finding could be supported by the findings of Ayers cited in Hicks (2012) who found that male teachers perceive fewer problems than their female counterparts in terms of classroom management.

The Table also indicates that there is no significant difference in the male and female teachers choice of behaviour techniques such as cautioning offender, kneeling offender down, having private discussion with the offender, scolding offender, standing the child up, asking the child the reason for the misbehaviour, detention of the child, suspension and expulsion of the child. This finding negates Chudgar and Sanker (2008) who found that male and female teachers differ in their classroom management techniques. The findings further indicate that the commonest behaviour management technique chosen by teachers is cautioning offender. This is used by majority of the teachers irrespective of their gender, age and educational qualification. This item has the highest mean rating in each case. Expulsion on the other hand, was rarely chosen as a behaviour management technique irrespective of the teachers gender, age or educational qualification. This indicates that at the primary school level, expulsion of children is not utilized as a behaviour management technique .

The result on Table 2 indicates that teachers who hold degrees with educational qualifications chose eleven out of the fifteen listed behaviour management techniques more than those without degree and those who hold degree without educational qualification. The ANOVA Table indicates that out of the fifteen items listed,there are four items where a significant difference exists in the choice of behaviour management technique due to educational qualifications. The items where educational qualifications has a significant difference include staring at offender, manual labour, putting offender in charge of class and asking the child the reasons for their misbehaviour. In each of the four items, teachers with degree in education had higher mean ratings of 5.66, 5.33, 3.67 and 7.00, compared to teachers who do not have degree with mean ratings of 2.49, 2.46, 1.87 and 3.62 respectively and teachers who hold degree without teaching qualification with mean ratings of 2.75, 1.71, 1.88 and 2.88 respectively.

On the contrary, there is no significant difference in the teachers choice of behaviour management techniques mentioned below due to their educational qualifications. The behaviour management techniques include cautioning offender, kneeling offender down, having private discussion with the offender, scolding offender, flogging offender, standing child up, standing behind offender, denial of privilege, detention and suspension. Their significance levels are above 0.05, and there is therefore, no significant difference in the mean rating of the teachers on the choice of the behaviour management techniques due to their level of educational qualifications. This finding negates Oliver & Reschley, (2007) who found that   teacher preparation and professional development could determine if a teacher will experience difficulty in the management of children's behaviour problems. They noted that teachers may experience some difficulties in the management of behaviour problems if their professional development is inadequate. This finding does not agree with Levin and Nolan (2007) who noted that highly qualified teachers use a collection of best practices that influence students learning achievement and behaviour

Data on Table 4 reveal that teachers whose age is between 20- 30 years seem to choose many of the behaviour management techniques listed in this study more than those whose age range between 31-40 years and 41 years and above. Their mean rating is highest in eleven out of the fifteen the behaviour management techniques listed in this study compared to those between 31-40 years and 41 years and above. They tend to choose staring at offender, kneeling offender down, having private discussion with the offender, scolding offender, flogging offender, manual labour, standing child up, putting offender in charge of class, asking the child the reasons for the misbehaviour, detention and suspension more than teachers between 31-40 years and 41 years and above. The more frequent use of the behaviour management behaviour techniques by teachers within the age bracket of 20- 30 years could be as a result of their age and lack of experience. Teachers who are young and inexperienced could easily be provoked by the children's behaviour problems.   They may not be conversant with other behaviour management techniques apart from the use of the punitive measures.

The result of the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) presented on Table 5 indicate a significant difference in the choice of some behaviour management techniques of primary school teachers due to their age. The data indicate that a significant difference due to age exists in teachers choice of behaviour management techniques with respect to staring at offender, kneeling offender down, standing offender up and scolding offender. These items have significance f value of 0.03, 0.00, 0.01 and 0.01respectively. The significance f values are below 0.05 level of significance and these items are therefore said to be significant. Data on Table 4 indicate that on the items where there is a significant difference in the choice of some behaviour management techniques of primary school teachers due to their age, teacher between the ages of 20- 30 years have the highest mean scores compared to those between the age range of 30- 40 years and 40 years and above on such items. (Teachers within the age range of 20- 30 years have mean ratings of 3.94, 5.69, 4.19 and 4.85 respectively while teachers within the age range of 31-40 years and 40 years and above have mean rating of 2.41, 3.08, 2.63, 2.71 and 2.28,3.25.2.88.and 3.19 respectively on such items.)

Teacher's choice of behaviour management techniques such as cautioning offender, having private discussion with the offender, manual labour, putting offender in charge of class, asking the child reasons for misbehaviour, standing behind offender, denial of privilege, detention and suspension are not significant due to teachers age. This finding which has significant f value ranging between 0.14- 0.97 is higher than the 0.05 level of significance. The result indicates that no significant difference was found in the mean responses on the choice of these strategies due to their age. This present finding contradicts the earlier studies by Ayers (1972) which found that age was not an important factor in classroom management.

5.1 Conclusion and Recommendations:
The result of this study has shown that teachers' gender, educational qualifications and age influence teachers choice of behaviour management techniques. Based on the findings of the study, it is recommended that:

Educational institutions charged with the responsibility of training teachers should de-emphasize the use of corporal punishment as a behaviour management technique. They should rather emphasize the proactive behaviour modification strategies.

Teachers who are young and inexperienced on the job should be properly supervised by their head teachers who are usually older and more experienced.

In-service training should be organised for teachers especially those in the rural areas on alternative behaviour management strategies irrespective of their gender, educational qualifications and age,

School guidance counsellors should be utilized to help teachers especially the less experienced ones manage behaviour problems of pupils in less traditional, more acceptable and efficient ways

References
Aber, J.L., Brown, J L., & Jones, S.M. (2003). Developmental trajectories toward violence in middle childhood: Course, demographic differences and response to school-based intervention. *Developmental Psychology*, 39, 324–348.

Allen, K. P. (2010). Classroom management, bullying, and teacher practices. *Professional Educator,* 34(1), 1-15.

Ayers, J. B. (1972). Elementary school teachers' attitudes toward instructional television. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, *41*(1), 1-4.

Browers , 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

Catalano, R.F., Arthur, M.W., Hawkins, J.D., Berglund, L., & Olson, J.J. (1998). Comprehensive community- and school based interventions to prevent antisocial behaviour. In R. Loeber & D.P. Farrington (Eds.),

Serious and violent juvenile offenders: Risk factors and successful interventions (pp. 248–283). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Chudgar, A & Sankar, V. (2008). The relationship between teacher gender and student achievement: evidence from five Indian states. *Compare* 38 (5), 627-642

Clotfelter, C. T., Ladd, H. F., Vigdor, J. L., & Wheeler, J. (2007). *High-poverty schools and the distribution of teachers and principals* (Working paper). Washington, DC: national Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Educational Research. Retrieved November, 20, 2009, from http://www..caldercenter.org/PDF/1001057_High_Poverty.pdf

Clunies-Ross, P., Little, E., & Keinhuis, M. (2008). Self-reported and actual use of proactive and reactive classroom management strategies and their relationship with teacher stress and student behavior. *Educational Psychology*, 28(6), 693-710.

Codding, R., & Smyth, C. (2008). Using performance feedback to decrease classroom transition time and examine collateral effects on academic engagement. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation,*18, 325-345.

Driessen, G. 2007. The feminization of primary education: Effects of teachers' sex on pupil achievement, attitudes and behaviour. *International Review of Education* 53, no. 2: 183–203.

Formica, F. A. (1962). Teaching difficulties encountered by beginning elementary teachers. (Doctoral Dissertation) Retreived 20/10/2011 from ProQuest database.

Harrell, P. Leavell, A, Van Tassel, F. & McKee, K. (2004). No teacher left behind: Results of a five-year study of teacher attrition. *Action in Teacher Education*, 26, 47-59

Ingersoll, R. M. & Smith. T. M. (2003). The wrong solution to the teacher shortage. *Educational Leadership*, 60 (8), 30-33

Krieg, J.M. 2005. Student gender and teacher gender: What is the impact on high stakes test scores?Current Issues in Education [Online], 8, no. 9. ttp://cie.ed.asu.edu/volume8/number9/.

Lassen, S.R., Steele, M. M. & Sailor, W. (2006). The relationship of school-wide positive behaviour support to academic achievement in an urban middle school. *Psychology in the school,* 43 (6), 701-712

Levin, J., and Nolan, J.F., (2007). *Principles of Classroom Management: A Professional Decision- Making Model*, Pearson, Boston, MA

Marzano, R., Marzano, J., & Pickering, D. (2003). *Classroom management that works: Research-based strategies for every teacher*. Moorabbin: Hawker-Brownlow Education.

Peske, H. G. & Haycock, K. 2006. Teacher inequality: How poor and minority students are shortchanged on teacher quality. Washington, DC: The Education Trust. Retrieved November 20, 2009 from http://www2.edtrust.org/NR/rdonlyres/010DBD9F-CED8-4D2B-9EOD-91B446747ED3/0/TQReportJune2006.pdf

Sugai, G., & Horner, R. (2002). The evolution of discipline practices: School-wide positive behavior supports. *Child and Family Behaviour Therapy,* 24, 23–50.

Utley, C.A., Kozleski, E., Smith, A., & Draper, I.L. (2002). Positive behaviour support: A proactive strategy for minimizing behaviour problems in urban multicultural youth. *Journal of Positive Behaviour Interventions*, 4, 196–207.

Walker, B, & Shea, M. (1991). Behaviour Management a practical approach to Educators. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company

This academic article was published by The International Institute for Science, Technology and Education (IISTE). The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open Access Publishing service based in the U.S. and Europe. The aim of the institute is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the publisher can be found in the IISTE's homepage: http://www.iiste.org

CALL FOR JOURNAL PAPERS

The IISTE is currently hosting more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals and collaborating with academic institutions around the world. There's no deadline for submission. **Prospective authors of IISTE journals can find the submission instruction on the following page:** http://www.iiste.org/journals/ The IISTE editorial team promises to the review and publish all the qualified submissions in a **fast** manner. All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Printed version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

MORE RESOURCES

Book publication information: http://www.iiste.org/book/

Recent conferences: http://www.iiste.org/conference/

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digtial Library , NewJour, Google Scholar