

CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT INTO LEARNING: USING
PHENOMENOGRAPHY TO ANALYSE STUDENT TEACHERS' CONCEPTIONS
OF CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

DA GESTÃO DA SALA DE AULA À APRENDIZAGEM: O USO DA
FENOMENOGRAFIA NA ANÁLISE DAS CONCEÇÕES DE GESTÃO DE SALA
DE AULA DOS FORMANDOS

Ana Maria Correia¹

Abstract

Classroom management is a critical area in the curriculum of teacher education programs. Student teachers' conceptions of the role of the teacher as a class leader are frequently backed by their intuition and experience as students and socio-cultural context rather than evidence-based. This paper examines the conceptions of classroom management held by a multicultural group of forty-four student teachers attending a teacher education program at a higher education institute in Macao. The study aims at understanding the patterns of variation expressed by student teachers regarding the purpose and relevance of the object of learning. It compares a) the patterns of variation in students' views of classroom management, and b) the students' learning progress based on the pre- and post-test. The phenomenographic approach was adopted as the conceptual framework. Participants handwritten transcripts from student teachers at the first and last sessions of the course are the primary type of data collection. The findings show that changes in student teachers' understanding of the conceptions of

¹ University of Saint Joseph, School of Education, Estrada Marginal da Ilha Verde, 16, Macau SAR, China. Corresponding Author: ana.correia@usj.edu.mo.

classroom management occurred during the course. The initial preferences for disciplinary approaches to classroom leadership have given way to conceptions of promoting the integration of classroom management into learning. The participants expressed increasing adherence to classroom management systems targeting and providing behavioural and academic supports and interventions to children and adolescents with and without special needs.

Keywords: Classroom management; Teacher education; Phenomenography.

Resumo

A gestão de sala de aula é uma área central no *curriculum* dos programas de formação de professores. As concepções dos formandos sobre o papel do professor enquanto líder são mais vezes fundadas em experiências e intuições pessoais e influenciadas pelo contexto cultural do que cientificamente fundamentadas.

Este estudo examina as concepções de gestão da sala de aula de um grupo multicultural de 44 formandos inscritos num programa de formação profissional em contexto universitário. O estudo visa compreender os padrões de variância em relação ao objetivo e à relevância do objeto em estudo. Compara a) os padrões de variância relativamente às conceptualizações dos aprendentes sobre a gestão de sala de aula e b) as mudanças ocorridas após a frequência do curso. A investigação adotou como enquadramento conceptual uma abordagem fenomenográfica. A principal fonte de recolha de dados é constituída por textos redigidos pelos participantes no início e no final do curso. Os resultados evidenciam mudanças na compreensão das concepções de gestão da sala de aula ocorridas entre o início e o final do curso. As preferências iniciais por modelos disciplinares deram lugar a concepções promotoras da gestão da sala de aula como parte integrante do processo de aprendizagem. Os participantes expressaram um apoio crescente a sistemas de gestão da sala de aula inclusivos, contemplando apoios e intervenções de natureza comportamental, social e académica.

Palavras-chave: Gestão de sala de aula; Formação de professores; Fenomenografia.

Introduction

Classroom management (CM) poses a particularly difficult challenge to teachers and school administrators concerned with the amount of learning that takes place in a classroom. Pre-service teachers in particular, struggle with uneasy classroom situations in which the learning process is negatively affected (Borman & Dowling, 2008; Rhoades, 2013; Solarte, 2019). Novice teachers consistently rank classroom management as one of their main concerns in teaching (Lewis, Romi, Qui, & Katz 2005; Macías, 2018; Marzano & Marzano, 2003; Quintero & Ramírez, 2011; Pineda & Frodden, 2008; Sieberer-Nagler, 2016). The lack of knowledge and skills in managing a classroom results more often than not in teachers' replicating of disciplinarian practices of behaviour control perceived as an unavoidable necessity given structural constraints such as large class size and the rigidity of centralized curricular mandates. Yet, we have long known that a restrictive disciplinarian approach to CM leads to superficial learning and discourages the development of self-regulated and lifelong learning habits (Brophy, 1985; Evans, Evans, Gable, & Kehlhem, 1991; Watson & Crockenberg, 1982). More important, such an approach has become doubly untenable as the student population, especially in urban schools, has become increasingly diverse. Current research has shown that what teachers believe and do has a substantial impact on the quality of student learning (Darling-Hammond, 2000). It is therefore essential to more systematically investigate the prevalent conceptions held by student teachers during their university-based teacher training to identify the patterns and variations in their awareness and understanding of CM before they start their teaching practice. This study examines the perceptions of CM held by a multicultural group of forty-four student teachers attending a teacher education program at an institute of higher education in Macau.

Classroom management models

CM does not lend itself easily to neat schematization. Its meaning goes from conceiving it as a set of rules to control students within the classroom to a school-wide structure that serves to build and sustain a school culture that minimizes behavioural issues and

maximizes learning. CM plans are interwoven with school environments, teachers' personal experiences, and cultural contexts. Similarly teaching circumstances may be perceived as challenging in one place but not in another (Brown, 2007; Macías, 2018). Students' behaviour is subjectively and culturally defined. For instance, novice teachers from Confucius heritage countries or regions such as Macau, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Singapore, Japan and South Korea, tend to have a robust and pre-established expectation of orderly classrooms with quiet learners, while their counterparts from European societies tend to be more accepting of a certain level of noise and more expecting to meet unruly youngsters. As Solarte says, different cultural contexts have

[...] diverging expectations on classroom dynamics, on how explicit teachers are in the provision of feedback, error correction, and how they are supposed to handle instruction and assessment. These expectations might affect how teachers are perceived and how students relate to them. In one context, a teacher might be perceived as authoritarian or rude, while in a different context, the teacher is perceived as strict. (2019, p. 186)

A wide array of perspectives about what constitutes effective CM is echoed in the literature developed mainly in Europe and North America during the last fifty years. Some of these approaches or models were integrated into the course Classroom Management and Leadership taught by the researcher. Among the CM approaches included in the course, four of them were selected for this study. They differ from each other in nature, scope, and objectives.

The four distinctive CM models are the *Assertive discipline model*, coined after Canter's book *Assertive Discipline* (Canter 2010), published in 1976, the *Dignity model*, referring to Curwin and Mendler's book *Discipline with Dignity* (1988), the *Child-driven Model*, based on Alfie Kohn's ideas developed in his book *Beyond discipline: from compliance to community* (1996), and the *Multi-tiered Support Systems (MTSS)*, an approach used in applied behaviour analysis and adopted by the general education system in the US in the 1990s.

Assertive discipline is a classroom behaviour management system developed in the 1970s by Lee Canter, a training program to teach teachers how to control students and sustain an orderly classroom through the use of rewards and punishers. It entails a set of classroom techniques and behaviour rules created and enforced by teachers on students to ensure they can teach smoothly and control students' behaviour. Many of its elements are resonating "early attempts to introduce operant procedures to educational settings" (Evans, Evans, Gabbie & Kehlhem, 1991, p. 14) in line with the prevalent views of classroom management in the 1970s and 1980s. Canter's assertive discipline was widely accepted across countries and remains popular in present-day schools. The program was created for regular education settings, though students with behaviour disorders in inclusive schools have been exposed to it since the 1970s.

Canter's assertive discipline model of classroom management is based on the following key ideas:

- The teacher is responsible for maintaining control within the classroom;
- Discipline prepares the road for instruction;
- Inappropriate behaviour is necessarily to be followed by a set of consequences;
- Rewards and punishments are components of an effective classroom management plan.

Assertive discipline. Known in the eighties as the 'names on the board and marbles in a jar' programme (Canter, 1989), assertive discipline attracted criticisms from the supporters of humanist approaches (Glasser, 1985; Curwin & Mendler, 1988; Render, Padilla, & Krank, 1989; Watson & Crockenberg, 1982) to whom students are seen as potentially cooperative rather than predisposed to misbehaviour.

Assertive discipline focuses on individual students' misbehaviour and uses aversive procedures, such as writing the student's name on the board to address infractions to classroom rules. In this sense, Canter's model produces a classroom climate that is

embarrassing to the students whose names are often on the board, and may even escalate the behaviour problems of these students, resulting in more severe consequences. Research about the effects of assertive discipline on students with disabilities has been scant, as reported by Evans, Gable, and Kehlhem as early as 1991.

Dignity model. In the 1980s, the connection between CM and behaviour control through a set of technical devices and motivational tricks was challenged by a broader and more systematic view that emphasizes preventing, rather than reacting to, misbehaviour. Curwin and Mendler's book (1988), *Discipline with dignity*, is particularly significant in this line of thought. The authors added humanistic and democratic dimensions to the mostly mechanistic approach used at schools across countries in that epoch. They encouraged teachers to reject the 'one size fits all' approaches and replace them with one that gives ownership to the students and treats everybody, children and adults, regardless of age or position, with respect. They invited teachers to reflect on their relationships with students to examine their possible role and complicity in triggering discipline problems. While Curwin and Mendler (1988) thus partially transferred the locus of discipline problems from the students to the teachers and curriculum planning, their primary argument is that classroom management is not the responsibility of cloistered groups but should be grounded in a schoolwide value system that serves the needs of both students and teachers. Students have some control over classroom events in the sense that they are given choices and the opportunity to participate in the decision-making process. Curwin and Mendler's *dignity model* intends not only to reduce incidents of misbehaviour but ensure that classroom management strategies do not also lead to lowered students' motivation and learning. In emphasizing the prevention of rather than the reaction to disruptions, the model does not dismiss the need for consequences for rule infraction. However, to the authors, the purpose of the consequences is to reinforce the value system consensus to encourage the students to become more responsible and to learn to make better choices (Curwin & Mendler, 1988). Curwin and Mendler's model aimed at providing class management strategies and tools to teachers teaching typically developing students. Although they acknowledge the diversity of students in the classroom and the need to

respond to individual differences, there is no specific provision for classroom management of inclusive classrooms.

Child-driven model. The approach to CM presented by Alfie Kohn in the book *Beyond discipline*, first published in 1996, is distinctive from previous ones. Kohn rejects all behavioural approaches that accept handling behavioural problems through the use of coercion and rewards. Punishments, rewards, and praises are, according to him, short-term fixes that may seem adequate in apparently changing behaviour but have no lasting impact on the person.

Kohn maintains that all discipline programs are easy-to-follow recipes intended to manipulate and control students rather than help them grow into caring and responsible adults. He is especially critical of Rudolf Dreikurs (2004), whose theories and techniques have been assimilated by many CM programmes. One example is Dreikurs' support for the use of *logical consequences*, which, according to Kohn (2006), is predicated on the assumption that students need to feel pain before they cease the *bad* behaviour.

Aligned with critical pedagogy and theorists such as Paulo Freire, Henry Giroux and Michael Apple, Kohn maintains that behind most approaches to classroom management is a dark view of human nature that ascribes children's equivocal actions "to a diabolic desire to make trouble" (Kohn, 2006, p. 10). Instead, he suggests:

Children may act in troubling ways because they are wanting for the sort of warm, caring relationships that enable and incline people to act more compassionately. They may have learned to rely on power rather than reason, to exhibit aggression rather than compassion, because this is what they have seen adults do – and perhaps what has been done to them. (Kohn, 2006, p. 9)

Kohn sees children who have trouble treating others with care and respect as needing help, just as children who have difficulty solving math problems also need help. He

challenges teachers to provide an engaging curriculum and caring environment where students feel trusted, respected, and empowered. He presents a range of good practices concerning the development of intrinsic motivation, curiosity, and critical thinking of children and adolescents, and underlies the importance of positive school-family relations and a climate of high expectations. Criticisms of Kohn's conceptualization of CM argue that a warm and caring environment needs to be supplemented by active efforts and structured plans to put values and beliefs into practice.

Despite not providing teachers with strategies to support students who exhibit behavioural challenges, Kohn is nowadays one of the most influential voices in the field of education. His overt antagonism towards most of contemporary educators and researchers and his recurrent criticisms of schoolteachers fuelled numerous controversies over the past decade.

Multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS). Although referred under different names (positive behaviour supports, positive behaviour interventions and supports, response to intervention, multi-tiered behaviour frameworks) MTSS targets enhancement in academic and behavioural outcomes for students with and without special needs (Hunter, Maheady, Jasper, Williamson, Murley & Stratton, 2015). It has become the major reference for schoolwide frameworks emphasizing a continuum of evidence-based practices and interventions across countries and has been adopted as a framework in education reforms attempting to reduce the number of special education schools and provide regular schools with differentiated instruction and supports to meet the needs of all students (Ziomiek-Daigle, Goodman-Scott, Cavin & Donohue, 2016).

The three-tiered model began in the USA in the 1990s as a broad, schoolwide approach to build school capacity. With roots in behavioural sciences in the USA, the model is supported by a time-honoured and sound empirical research. It developed as a framework for organizing effective supports and interventions in schools committed to responding to the social, emotional, and academic challenges of students. It comprises 3 tiers, namely (1) primary prevention (tier 1), focusing on universal or whole-school approaches and practices through the use of principles of universal

design for learning and schoolwide discipline programs, (2) secondary prevention (tier 2), focusing on more specialized interventions (reading programmes, self-management support guides) designed for students with an IEP or groups of students who display behavioural or academic challenges (5% to 15%) requiring adult mentors and tutors; and (3) tertiary prevention (tier 3), focusing on the small number of students to whom desired results were not met by tiers 1 and 2. Students who need more specialized, intensive and individualized supports or the provision of curriculum accommodations fall into this category, which is approximately 1% to 5% of the school population (Janney & Snell, 2013).

The key features of the MTSS models are (1) a data-based decision system, including universal screening and systematic monitoring; (2) practices supported by empirical evidence, taking into account the student needs and environmental factors; (3) an implementation fidelity supported by strong team-based coordination, action planning and progress focused practices.

While *Assertive discipline model* emphasizes the role of the teacher in planning and implementing a structured CM system based on the use of consequences to misbehaviour, the *Dignity model* agrees with the former stating that teachers' role is to control the class, however departs from it in stating that rules and consequences should be devised to prevent decreasing students' motivation and learning. Although the teacher retains a central role in Curvin and Mendler's model of classroom management, students are addressed with respect and to a certain extent encouraged to participate in decision-making processes. The third model included in this study holds a romanticized view of childhood anticipated by and echoing Rousseau's philosophy of education, and maintains that when students are given love and freedom to expand their natural curiosity, the teacher's role is of a discreet facilitator and the implementation of a structured CM plan is dispensable. According to Kohn (2006), a CM plan, including any rewards, punishment, consequences, or praise is detrimental to students' development of autonomy and independence.

MTSS is the only approach to CM that is schoolwide, addresses the needs of all students, including students with special needs is supported by sound research

evidence in each tier and approaches students' behavioural and academically-based needs. The approach fosters universally designed learning experiences and uses the least intrusive interventions and supports to meet individual students' needs. MTSS requires teamwork, a schoolwide shared leadership, and strong partnerships with families. The model earned its popularity from schools that implemented it and afterward reported that time spent in academic activities had increased (Hardin, 2014). Figure 1 (by the author) compares the four models concerning the continuum of structure to culture and behavior issues to learning and motivation.

Figure 1. Classroom management models

Emphasis on classroom/school culture	Dignity model	Child-driven model
Emphasis on classroom/school structure	Assertive discipline model	Multiple-Tiered Support Systems model
	Emphasis on behaviour	Emphasis on learning

Conceptual framework

Phenomenography was inspired by the historical movement of phenomenology launched in the first half of the 20th century by the German philosopher Edmund Husserl. Phenomenology studies the structure of human experience of the world as it is presented to the conscience through particular concepts, ideas, or images – as a first-person experience of or about something distinct from what it presents or means. Phenomenography came into its own in 1981 when Ference Marton imported some of the key concepts from phenomenology to the field of education studies to develop a new approach to the study of the process of learning and teaching. Whereas constructivism's focus is on the teaching methods, phenomenography is centred on what and how learners learn (Assan, 2009; Marton, 2015). The approach emphasizes a second-order or from-the-inside perspective (participants' view) rather than direct observation (researchers' view), to describe the world as the learner experiences it

(Marton, 2015). Instead of expecting all learners to come to the same understanding, phenomenography looks for variations in the experience of learning and the patterns of these variations. In Marton's words, phenomenography is "about the different meanings of the same things (or about ways of seeing, experiencing and conceptualizing them), where 'things' refers to anything that might have different meanings. We can learn about meanings by reading, by solving problems, by seeing, by hearing, by feeling, by moving and so forth" (Marton, 2015, p. 123).

The findings of phenomenographic research are presented as an outcome space, usually through a diagram or a visual map showing the variety of conceptions found in the data and the relationships between them. As stated by Marton (2015, p. 117), the different "ways of seeing (or conceptions) are logically related to each other in a hierarchically organized outcome space, relative to the specific object of learning and the specific group of learners participating in the study." The typology of the different conceptions held by the participants, which is grounded in their oral or written reports, is however "interpreted by researchers in such a way as to provide what may possibly be a clearer and more articulate account of student conceptions than students would themselves generate" (Ashworth & Lucas, 1998, p. 417). The outcome space not only casts new light on the phenomenon under study but also turns the researcher into a learner within the process.

Methodology

This research examines the conceptions of CM held by a multicultural group of forty-four student teachers attending a teacher education program at an institute of higher education in Macau. During the course period, students were exposed to the four approaches of CM described in section 2 and were given opportunities to compare and contrast them. Besides, a whole class debate took place to discuss the pros and cons of each of the approaches, taking into account environmental factors such as the school culture and the Macau educational system.

The study follows the phenomenographic paradigm to identify and analyse the patterns of variation in the student teachers' views of CM. It examines the variation of

conceptions of CM held by student teachers before and after they completed the course as part of their professional training. The principles of the phenomenographic approach were considered adequate to investigate variations in how student teachers perceive educational phenomena such as CM. The researcher adopted an interpretive approach toward the statements made by the participants.

Data collection and analysis

In phenomenographic research, data collection is typically obtained by semi-structured, individual interviews, together with other sources of information such as observations, written responses, and historical documents, considered to have similar evidential significance as oral accounts (Richardson, 1999).

Participants' handwritten transcripts are the primary type of collected data in this study. The written transcripts were collected during the first and the last sessions of the course, after the student teachers have been invited to write a statement about the object of learning. In both cases, permission was obtained to include the student teachers' written responses as the major data source in the research.

The pre-test was an entry point for the research and was prompted by the question:

- What does classroom management mean to you?

The post-test took place in the last session and was prompted by the following question:

- Of the approaches to classroom leadership and management studied during this course, which one/s do you consider worthwhile to apply in your practice as a teacher? Why?

The post-test results were compared with the results of the pre-test to reveal student teachers' understandings of their concepts of CM after completion of the course. The phenomenographic analysis aimed at identifying the range of conceptions held by the participants and at determining the qualitative change in learning outcome. In phenomenographic studies, the findings are presented as an outcome space to facilitate understanding the variation in participants' conceptions, or perceptions, of the phenomenon.

Participants

The current study presents data from student teachers enrolled in the Post-Graduate Diploma in Education (PGDE) program taught for the 2016-2017 academic year at a higher education institute in Macau SAR. The University runs the PGDE is a one-year intensive program in both English and Chinese medium of instruction, and at the time of the research had an average yearly intake of 120 students. The forty-four student teachers from the English medium class were invited to participate in this research. Of the participants, 18 (40.9%) were prospective teachers, and 26 (59%) were in-service currently teaching at local schools. The teaching experience of the in-service teachers ranged from 1 to 15 years. The participants were between 23 to 52 years old, of which 30 (68.1%) are female, and 14 (31.8%), male (Table 1).

Table 1. Demographics

Students' origin		Total	Gender		Total	Status		Total
Macau & Asia region	Europe, Americas & Africa		Female	Male		Pre-service	In-service	
N (%)	N (%)							
30 (68.1)	14	44	30	14	44	18	26	44
68.1	31.8	100%	68.1	31.8	100%	40.9	59	100%

Of the participants, 30 (68.1%) were born in Macau or in the nearby region and are of Chinese/Asian origin, and 14 (31.8%) are overseas students of European, American or African origins. All participants were enrolled in the 'Classroom Management and Leadership' course taught by the researcher.

Findings and discussion

The research is empirically grounded in the students' learning experiences during the month and a half of the Classroom Management and Leadership course. The data reveal four qualitatively different ways in which the participants conceptualize CM. A two-dimensional outcome space is presented graphically in Table 2 to describe the various CM conceptions held by the participants. The presented typology is grounded in the students' conceptions of CM, and the subsequent understanding of the relationships between learning and CM. The first dimension, "classroom management models", depicts the conceptions of CM derived from the data, progressing in the following manner: 1) Assertive discipline model, 2) Dignity model, 3) Child-driven model, and 4) Multiple-Tiered Support Systems model. The second dimension presents a progression from a perspective in which CM's role is to prepare the road for instruction and learning to a perspective in which classroom management is embedded in and supports learning and motivation. In learning and CM relations type 1, CM is seen as a set of techniques, rules, and regulations to be in place before learning can occur. In type 2, CM is focused on establishing classroom contracts based on principles and procedures, preferably discussed and agreed by students and conducive to learning and motivation. In type 3, CM is as discreet and embedded in learning and motivation. Finally, in type 4, CM emerges as a schoolwide support plan driven to provide the most effective learning experience for every student, including those with and without exceptionalities. This highly structured multi-layered model targets academic and behavioral problems before reactive procedures are put in place, and implements differentiated instruction to tier 2 and tier 3 students.

Table 2. The two-dimensional outcome space for the conceptions of classroom management and the perceived position of classroom management in the learning process

Classroom management models	Focus	Role of classroom management in learning			
		Separated	Aligned	Discreet	Integrated
Assertive discipline	Teacher centred Rules & regulations Rewards & punishments Typically developing students	Type 1			
Responsibility	Individual differences Shared decision making Stepped consequences Typically developing students		Type 2		
Child-driven	Autonomy Freedom Higher-order thinking Typically developing students			Type 3	
Multiple-tiered support systems	Schoolwide support plan Three-tier approach Focused on prevention Typically and non-typically developing students				Type 4

Type 1. Learning and CM are viewed as separated from each other. The potential for learning to occur is subject to the prior establishment of a set of technical devices, rules, and regulations. The teacher is responsible for defining which procedures best fit the group of students according to factors such as age group, subject, and class dynamics. One participant (T6) who is an in-service teacher (IS) describes her teaching style as follows:

Being an assertive teacher myself, I need to know my wants and needs. I need to be very clear about my rules with the students. [...] Teachers need

to set positive consequences for good behavior and negative consequences for bad behavior. These rules must be explicitly conveyed and written from day one. Teachers must be firm with directions. My P2 students are ready to understand and follow the rules, and I should be firm – but not hostile – when they do not comply with the rules. (T6-IS)

This participant is echoing a teacher-centred approach based on conventional methods of discipline as control. She is not prepared to give up her power over the students or to understand what their needs and interests are. Instead, she is keen on CM models that assist her in getting the children to do what she wants. Within this view, setting up detailed rules and regulations concerning all aspects of class actions and interactions is paramount, and is treated as a prerequisite to learning. Another in-service teacher stresses the need to instruct students on the established rules and the consequences inflicted in case of disobedience: “At the beginning of the year, students are instructed on the school rules, their purpose, and the consequences of not complying with the rules. Then we have a basis from where to work smoothly and build a friendly environment” (T10-IS).

Type 2. Learning and CM are viewed as preferentially aligned with learning and motivation. Curvin and Mendler imported several of the features of Canter’s model, such as controlling students’ behaviour through rewards and consequences; however, they are clearly against attacking the dignity of the students and in favour of giving some of the teacher’s power to students. Effective discipline is more than the quick mastery of techniques; it “comes from the heart and soul of the teacher” (Curvin, Mendler & Mendler, 2008, p. 41). Building relationships, giving students opportunities to participate in the decision-making processes, and caring for individual students is central to the type 2 model. The following in-service teacher illustrates this perspective:

My school accepts students expelled from other schools. They have their own background and unhappy story. We need to understand their basic needs first. They have to meet the need for belongingness so they can study effectively, and their self-esteem has to be strengthened (T29-IS).

There is a genuine interest in helping children overcome their personal troubles, but this is achieved against a backdrop of untrustworthiness on the capacity of children to successfully change their behaviour if a framework of coercion and compliance has not been secured. The focus is on both preventing and responding to discipline problems as seen in the following excerpt from a pre-service (PS) teacher:

The teacher is the chief conductor. His role is to ensure that all musicians are playing and well-tuned. An excellent chief conductor gives room for them to grow their talents and creativity, even if they go out of tune and to ask for help if they are lost (T9-PS).

Type 3. The teacher is a facilitator who uses her authority with maximum discretion and encourages students to take the lead in learning and developing life skills such as autonomy, responsibility, self-regulation, and contribution. Type 3 requires deep cognitive and social changes, which will affect personal thinking, attitudes, and character. One example of this type can be found in the transcript of an in-service drama teacher who clearly shows awareness of Alfie Kohn's approach:

Children as individuals should be treated respectfully and should be guided to their own decisions/moral viewpoints/motivation; not controlled, judged, and punished. In my own classes, I first try to build up a trusting relationship. This takes time, but it is incredibly important. I also allow them to be real. Express their emotions, talk about their lives, and share in their proud moments. Establishing the classroom routines in drama helps

to build up trust. It is difficult sometimes because compared with other teachers, I am very relaxed; they are not used to this, and sometimes it takes a while to settle. This, in my opinion, is partly due to the fact that I do not bribe them for co-operation, or put them in teams to make points, or give them 'minus points' if they forget their materials. They have to self-regulate in my lesson, I will not do it for them, and this takes time for them to get used to and patience on my part while I wait for them and encourage them to get there. I very much agree with the idea that the classroom should be a community, that wherever possible students should have choices in their learning and that behavior should not be bargained for. (T38-IS)

For this teacher, rules and regulations are not front-stage elements of her teaching. Although she is aware that her choice of removing all kinds of discipline plans from the classroom dynamics takes time and patience, she is quite sure that in the long run, the outcomes are worthwhile.

Type 4. Type 4 was not known from the students before it was introduced during the course, as local schools have not implemented it. This highly structured school-wide approach designed to identify and solve students' needs through increasingly more intensive levels (tiers) of supports and interventions was preferred by a few student-teachers, as illustrated in the following excerpt:

MTSS focuses on the prevention of problems from occurring but also monitors the progress of the student, hence is more consistent and likely more effective than other programs. Because it is a whole-school approach, it assists new teachers in dealing with behavioral problems. When a new teacher encounters a problem in her classroom, she does not need to recreate the wheel, right? The whole school supports her and gives her directions on how to address the problem. Is good for all students and also

for teachers. Maybe with this new model, teachers will stop basing their decisions on personal opinion. Many times personal opinions are just wrong. I hope one day I'll be working in a school that has implemented MTSS. (T17-PS)

Comparison between pre-test and post-test of participants' conceptions of classroom management

The written responses completed in the first session of the course (the pre-test) were coded according to the four types of classroom management approaches laid out in the post-test (Table 3), namely, types 1, 2, 3 and 4 as explained above. The student teachers' answers are shorter and with less complexity comparative to the post-test answers. The analysis reveals significant differences in the concepts of CM held by the students who participated in the study at the course beginning and completion dates.

As stated in table 3, the vast majority (89.2%) of the students attending the course in the first session advocated a view of CM as an array of technical devices necessary to keep trouble making students quiet and on track. Several participants, both in-service and prospective teachers, associated classroom management with "control," a term that often emerges in the transcripts such as the following: "[classroom management] is about managing things within the classroom. For example, the layout of the classroom, handling different situations in class and control the students" (T4-IS). Another participant referred to the "need to control the classroom as to stay ordered, not chaotic. Hence provide a good learning environment for students. I think we will be trained on how to be a good teacher, to make the students listen to us and be obedient" (T41-PS).

Table 3. Comparison from the pre-test and the post-test regarding the different understandings of classroom management

Participants' conceptions of CM	Pre-test (43 participants)		Post-test (44 participants)	
	Frequency of coded references	%	Frequency of coded references	%
Type 1	42	89.2	16	29.6
Type 2	5	10.6	8	14.8
Type 3	-	-	13	24
Type 4	-	-	17	31.4
Total	47	100	54	100

The findings from the pre-test show that 89 percent of the participants were inclined to favour assertive discipline before taking the course, which indicates a preference for disciplinarian practices. The lack of knowledge and skills about CM might have influenced the initial responses, which were likely informed by past experiences, cultural factors, and concerns about one's capacity to handle large classes.

There was an accentuated reduction in the number of students who remained favourable to assertive discipline after taking the course, as demonstrated by the percentage of coded references within this category. However, 29.6 percent of the participants remained acolytes of Canter's model at the completion date. The adherence to a CM model that emphasizes students' compliance might derive from cultural factors, namely the expectation of orderly classrooms with noiseless and submissive learners, common in Asian cultures of Confucian heritage.

In contrast, the percentage of students favouring the child-driven model based on Alfie Kohn's libertarian philosophy rose from 0% to 31.4%. The participants expressing a preference for the child-driven model during the post-test were mostly from the group of overseas participants. One of those participants coded in the pre-test as type 1 moved to type 3 in the post-test. His statement illustrates the response coded as type 3 in the post-test:

When I did some research on Alfie Kohn I was a little bit upset about his unrealistic ideas. But now makes more sense to me after more research and discussions with group members. I still have some questions, but overall I like his ideas, and I would use it to create a learning environment with my students. As a teacher, I am tempted to use my superpower to drag down the students to the direction of my own good. I have sacrificed to build up a learning community over better grades and full control over my students. Alfie Kohn's student-centered view helped me and reminded me to stand on a student-centered approach. (T₃₂-IS)

Of all the models, type 4 (Multiple-Tiered Support Systems) was screened more often by the participants during the post-test (31.4 percent) followed by type 1 (assertive discipline) chosen by 29.6 percent of the participants, type 3 (child-driven model) chosen by 24 percent of the participants, and type 2 (dignity model) selected by 14.8 percent of the participants.

With more and more schools moving into an inclusive delivery model, participants' increased interest for and support of MTSS over the course period shows the critical role of teacher education programs in changing teachers' conceptualizations of classroom management. An effective system of supports and interventions based on data collected and fidelity implementation is essential to support children and adolescents with and without disabilities.

Conclusion

Given its influence on student achievement, instruction on CM should be more relevant in teacher education programs to avoid leaving teachers to their own devices when they start teaching. Broomfield (2006), Ingersoll and Strong (2011), Weiner (2003) and Solarte (2019) have pointed out that many beginning teachers are provided insufficient knowledge, skills, and support to perform at various aspects of teaching and leading, including providing effective solutions to students' challenges according

to their individual needs. This study corroborates their findings, showing that student teachers lack high-level knowledge of and training in CM, although the latter figures so critically and substantially in their success as teaching professionals. The study also shows that student teachers respond well to even limited exposure to theories and models of CM. The comparative analysis and evaluation of models of CM not only has a measurable effect on not only the students teachers' thinking and understanding of CM but also leads to more comprehensive, integrative and holistic reflections on the part of the student teachers about the cultural values that underpin their perceptions of effective classroom dynamics. The increasing support of MTSS evidences their awareness regarding the educational environment and their role in it and regarding the urgency to move away from disciplinary and exclusionary conceptualizations of CM towards more inclusive and responsive approaches.

References

- Ashworth, P. & Lucas, U. (1998). What is the 'world' of phenomenography? *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 42(4), 415-431.
- Assan, T. E. B. (2009). Educators' classroom experiences with variation of learning theory. *Problems of Education in the 21st Century*, 18, 8-19.
- Borman, G., & Dowling, N. M. (2008). Teacher attrition and retention: A meta-analytic and narrative review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(3), 367-405.
- Bromfield, C. (2006). PGCE secondary trainee teachers and effective behavior management: An evaluation and commentary. *Support for Learning*, 21(4), 188-193.
- Brophy, J. (1985). Classroom management as instruction: Socializing self-guidance in students. *Theory into Practice*, 24(4), 233-240.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Teaching by Principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. White Plains, N Y: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Canter, L. (1989). Assertive discipline: more than names on the board and marbles in a jar. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 71(1), 57-61.
- Canter, L. (2010). *Assertive Discipline: Positive behavior management for today's classroom* (4th ed.). Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

- Curwin, R. L., & Mendler, A. N. (2001). *Discipline with Dignity*. University of California: Merrill. (1st ed. 1988).
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement. In *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, v. 8, 1. ISSN 1068-2341.
- Dreikurs, R., Cassel, P., & Ferguson, E. D. (2004). *Discipline without Tears. How to reduce conflict and establish cooperation. Revised edition*. Canada: Wiley.
- Evans, W. E., Evans, S. S., Gable, R. A., & Kehlhem, M. A. (1991). Assertive discipline and behavioral disorders: Is this a marriage made in heaven? *Beyond Behavior*, 2(2), 13-16.
- Glasser, W. (1985). Discipline has never been a problem and isn't the problem now. *Theory into Practice*, 24(4), 241-246. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00405848509543181>.
- Hardin, C. J. (2014). *Effective Classroom Management. Models and strategies*. Harlow: Pearson.
- Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Culture and Organizations. Software of the mind*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hunter, W. C., Maheady, L., Jasper, A. D., Williamson, R. L., Murley, R. C., & Stratton, E. (2015). Numbered heads together as a Tier 1 instructional strategy in multitiered systems of support. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 38(3), 345-362.
- Ingersoll, R. M., & Strong, M. (2011). The impact of induction and mentoring programs for beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(2), 201-233.
- Janney, R., & Snell, M. (2013). *Modifying School Work. Teachers' guides to inclusive practices*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing.
- Jones, F. (1987). *Positive Classroom Discipline*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Kohn, A. (2006). *Beyond Discipline: From compliance to community*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (1st ed. 1996).
- Lewis, R., Romi, S., Qui, X., & Katz, Y. J. (2005). Teachers' classroom discipline and student misbehaviour in Australia, China, and Israel. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21, 729-741.
- Macías, D. F. (2018). Classroom management in foreign language education: An exploratory review. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 20(1), 153-166.
- Marton, F. (2015). *Necessary Conditions of Learning*. New York: Routledge.
- Marzano, R. J., & Marzano, J. S. (2003). The key to classroom management. *Educational Leadership*, 61(1), 6-13.

- Pineda, D., & Frodden, C. (2008). The development of a novice teacher's autonomy in the context of EFL in Colombia. *Profile: Issues in Teachers Professional Development*, (9), 143-162.
- Quintero Corzo, J., & Ramírez Contreras, O. (2011). Understanding and facing discipline-related challenges in the English as a foreign language classroom at public schools. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 13(2), 59-72.
- Render, G. F., Padilla, J. N. M., & Krank, H. M. (1989). What research really shows about assertive discipline. *Educational Leadership*, 46(6), 72-75. Retrieved from <http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/392/515> .
- Rhoades, G. (2013). Minimizing the chaos through cooperative classroom management. *English Teaching Forum*, 4, 28-34.
- Richardson, J. T. E. (1999). The concepts and methods of phenomenographic research. *Review of Educational Research*, 69(53), 53-82. Retrieved from <http://rer.sagepub.com/content/69/1/53>.
- Sieberer-Nagler, K. (2016). Effective classroom management & positive thinking. *English Language Teaching*, 9(1), 163-172.
- Solarte, A. C. S. (2019). Classroom management and novice language teachers: friend or foe? *How*, 26(1), 177-199.
- Watson, M., & Crockenberg, V. (1982). Assertive discipline: a dissent. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 9, 59-74.
- Weiner, L. (2003). Why is classroom management so vexing to urban teachers? *Theory into Practice*, 42(4), 305-312.
- Ziomek-Daigle, J., Goodman-Scott, E., Cavin, J., & Donohue, P. (2016). Integrating a multi-tiered system of supports with comprehensive school counselling programs. *The Professional Counselor*, 6(3), 220-232.