

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences 1 (2009) 1215–1225

Procedia
Social and Behavioral Sciences

World Conference on Educational Sciences 2009

The effect of classroom management skills of elementary school teachers on undesirable discipline behaviour of students

Kemal Kayıkçı*

Akdeniz University, Faculty of Education/ Antalya -Turkey

Received October 23, 2008; revised December 25, 2008; accepted January 6, 2009

Abstract

A majority of disciplinary incidents that take place in the classroom originate from the insufficiency of teachers' classroom management skills. The aim of this study is to assess the effect of elementary school teachers' classroom management skills on the discipline behaviour of students.

The research was conducted as a survey with 450 teachers commissioned in the city of Antalya. Data were analysed employing t-test with regards to the significance of regression coefficients. A significant relation between the dimensions regarding classroom management skills of the teachers and disciplinary behaviour of the students was observed. It was seen that there was a positive relation between all the dimensions of students' disciplinary behaviour and teachers' first, second, third, fourth and sixth dimensions regarding classroom management; and a negative one with the fifth dimension. It is observed that the dimensions regarding teachers' classroom management skills are important predictors in students' disciplinary behaviour.

© 2009 Elsevier Ltd. Open access under [CC BY-NC-ND license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Keywords: Classroom management; disciplinary behaviour; class rules; class order; motivation; misbehaviour.

1. Introduction

A teacher's most important activity in a typical class environment is the one related to classroom management. Learning and teaching cannot take place in a mismanaged classroom (Marzano, 2003). In limited terms, classroom management is the management of the class by educational motives. Contemporary understanding of classroom management approach calls for conceiving class as a system (Aydm, 2005). Class in educational system is a subsystem of educational management and at the same time a formal organisation. Within this framework, classroom management could be defined as the process of arranging the classroom environment and its physical structure under the laws in order to satisfy the expectations of the educational system, the curriculum (of the lesson), the school, the lesson, the teacher and of the students; constituting the rules, relation patterns and administration of class order; planning, presenting and evaluating educational activities; recognizing students' assets; providing student motivation; arranging classroom communication pattern; attaining classroom discipline; and of effective and productive employment of time, human and material resources in order to prevent students' undesired behaviour.

* Kemal Kayıkçı. Tel.: +90 5052381052; fax: +90 2422261953.

E-mail address: kemalkayikci@akdeniz.edu.tr

The human resources mentioned here do not only imply teachers and students but instead they address all the people indirectly contributing to the learning and teaching process (administrators, other teachers, janitors, officers, parents etc.). Material resources are physical structure of classrooms, laboratories and other educational spaces, educational tools and equipment, education technology, graphics, panels, posters, pictures, maps etc. The most striking dimension of classroom management is its direct effect on learning. From this perspective, classroom management can be defined as the organisation of learning (Sabancı, 2008).

On the other hand, discipline has two meanings with regard to behaviour. The first one refers to undesired behaviour. For example, we say “The discipline of this classroom is poor”. The second is the procedure in which the teacher seeks to discover the acceptable student behaviour (Charles, 2005). In this research, the concept of “students’ disciplinary behaviour” refers to the students’ undesired behaviour, as stated by Charles in the first definition, in other words, the undesired disciplinary behaviour of the student in the classroom.

Classroom management consists of many interrelated and complicated dimensions arising from class and environment. The teacher, as the class manager, is expected to lead the class environment, as stated by Lemlech (1988) considering these dimensions as an orchestra. Another important aspect of classroom management is to create a proper learning environment and to prepare the physical conditions of the class. Not only are the already-present things pedagogically affective, so are their arrangement and (aesthetical) appearance (Becher, 1993; Başar, 1999: 29). A well-prepared physical environment and order eases the learning and teaching process and can enhance the class participation of students. On the contrary, a dull, unaired, noisy and ill-prepared classroom environment negatively effects participation in activities and learning. Environment also affects the quality of teacher-student relations (Grubaugh and Houston 1990; Eccles and others, 1991, Başar, 1999: 29). The teacher has to make different physical arrangements in the classroom according to the educational method and content (Evertson, Emer, Clements, Worsham, 1997, Celep, 2002: 27).

In crowded classrooms the desks are lined up one after the other, while in others different arrangements can be preferred. The preferred lining up in collaborative learning and group works should be in accordance with this (Başar, 1999: 29). A well-arranged classroom order motivates students, enhances learning and assists the recalling of what is learnt (Fry, 1985). The future high-tech learning environment necessitates that the physical structure be supported with these devices (Tracy, 1993). Just like the classroom order, lining up of the students enables or hinders classroom management and pedagogic efforts (Jacobsen et al. 1985; Haris, 1991; Celep, 2002: 31). One of the main concerns in settling the lining up of the students is enabling everyone to see and hear and avoiding one hindering the other (Harris, 1991). Classroom order should be suitable for the subject and the method, which ease learning, facilitate the achievement of resources and the relation between teachers and students, assist the traffic flow, and smooth the process of student participation (Hull, 1990; Harris, 1991 Başar, 1999: 36, Celep, 2002: 33).

In a class where rules and order are of dominating character, an environment of good learning and teaching emerges (Marzano, 2003). The complicated nature of classroom relations necessitate their regulation through establishment of rules (Brophy, 1988). It is observed that in the classroom environments where there are no rules, teachers fail to control the class and to manage time, and as a result of this mismanagement an unproductive learning environment emerges (Teyfur and Çelikten, 2008). Classroom management is based upon the formulation and development of behavioural standards (class rules) devoted at creating a safe learning environment as an organisation with the student groups (Jones, 1988; Celep, 2002; Brophy and Good, 1986). The principle problem in laying down classroom rules is convincing the students about the need for these rules (Wragg, 2001). Rules define the confines of the behaviour in the classroom. Rules formalize the expectations regarding what students can and cannot do in the classroom (Smith and Laslet, 1993).

Recognising the various characteristics and determining the needs of the students enable the teacher to pursue an effective classroom management. Teachers should first understand students’ needs and the relationship of behaviour related to these needs. Afterwards they should provide a good classroom management in order to answer the personal needs of the students in the classroom (Jones, 1988; Celep, 2002). One of the most important duties of the teacher is to employ the proper methods and techniques in the class in order to develop potential powers of the students. The teacher should take care of early-late, easy-hard learners and able-disabled students separately. There is a multifaceted and complicated network of relations present in the classroom. Behaviour of students affects one other. As the characteristics of the classes and students change, so should the managerial implementations (Brophy, 1988).

The quality of teacher-student relationship is an essential determining factor in the quality of classroom management. In order to obtain a good relation and communication between the student and the teacher, it is required that the relationship between the teacher and the student be open, transparent, direct and be based on trust and mutual appreciation; the teacher and the student carry the feeling of dependency; the particular assets, interests and skills of the students and their differences be taken into account; and the needs of the teachers and students be satisfied reciprocally (Gordon, 1974). In accordance with the personal development of the students, classroom management alters; in the primary years the children are more in need of rules and customs in the classroom. In the following years with commence of adolescence, the problems of obeying the order increase. Students develop anger and take a stand against adult authority. Teachers should be sensitive especially in this period. Orientation towards desiderative statements instead of imperative narratives, bargaining for touchiness and diffidence of the students differentiate the verbal and silent reactions that the teacher receives (Brophy, 1988).

Another important aspect of classroom management is to ensure the motivation of the students and keep their attention focused on educational activities throughout the course. What students complain generally is not the difficulty of the course, but the dullness of it. It is evident that the dullness of the course is related to teachers' skills regarding classroom management. We can state that dullness emerges from the rupture between what is expected from us and what we apply in life (Okutan, 2006). Emphasising not to be anxious about failing and encouraging may motivate especially timid students. The fact that everyone can make mistakes and that the important thing is to learn from our failures applies to the teachers as well. Students should be freed from worries of being embarrassed, diffidence related to failure, criticisms, being ridiculous, humiliation and punishment and an environment free of these worries should be created in the classroom (Martin, 1983: 77).

According to the studies on classroom management, teacher's undesired attitude may be the reason for student's undesired behaviour (Cummings, 2000). For example, a threatening and frowning environment hinders effective learning process since hormone excretion as a consequence of stress affects the learning process negatively (Cummings, 2000). Teachers and administrators intermediate for disciplinary problems under these conditions: a) forcing students to learn meaningless subjects; b) being insufficient in managing the development of independent thinking patterns; c) applying strict control over the students, failing to create an environment in which the students feel autonomous and d) using discipline procedures that give prominence to wrong behaviour (Edwards, 1997; Celep, 2002: 171).

Every teacher confronts problematic attitude during their tutorage. In general, teachers without sufficient knowledge and skills regarding classroom management and new starters find no way out and some teachers use their authority obtained from their classroom status in order to employ the easiest and most dangerous way, namely constraint, violence and even threatening. Such classroom management strategies do not serve for solving problems; instead they cause the classroom environment to corrupt and new profound problems to emerge. Focussing excessively on undesired behaviour spoils the natural course of the class (Çelik, 2005).

There may be conditions under which the most undesired tool should be used in classroom management. Punishment is one of these. Punishment here refers to teacher's making the student confront with an unwanted and unfavourable situation. Punishment may be used in order to prevent adverse behaviour and to establish order (Rich, 1991; Başar, 1999: 142). Physical punishment is against the law and human honour; its long-term effects are destructive and make people aggressive (Cangelosi, 1988; Rich, 1991; Başar, 1999: 143). The behaviour seen as the negative impacts of punishment can be listed as: hindering learning, spoiling relations, alienating from school, enhancing feelings of guilt and fear, rendering teacher as a negative model in the eyes of the children, skipping school, excessive anxiety and vandalism (Brown, 1982; Hull, 1990; Rich, 1991; Başar, 1999). In brief, punishment resembles medicine; when not given on time, to the right dimension and when necessary, punishment, just like medicine, has side effects (damage), which are more than its benefits, and make classroom management more difficult. For a teacher, who often gives punishment, the worst consequence of punishment is (once more like consistently used medicines) that its effect fade away in time.

Most of the people regard the word 'discipline' as physical punishment. Discipline is not punishment; instead it is the act of teaching students self-control (Cummings, 2000). Other people view discipline as the strict control and autocratic administration of rules and regulations. Individuals who are subject to disciplinary procedures tend to overlook the process of establishment of these rules and do not take their implication into account (Dreikurs, 1988; Babaoğlu, 2008). Discipline is regarded as solely control at schools (Włodkowski, 1982; Teyfur ve Celikten, 2008).

Classroom management decisions should be towards provision of quality and continuity of the education, rather than control (Brophy, 1988).

The evaluation of the studies conducted with 11.000 statistical findings, 28 factors within a time period covering 50 years shows that when cognitive processes are compared to home environment, family support, school culture, programme pattern and demographic structure of the school, classroom management is considered as the most important factor (Cummings, 2000). Brophy and Everston state that, whether students' learning level or their grades be taken as an indicator of success, in almost all studies classroom management has seen to be of primary importance in determining teachers' ability to teach. In a study held between 1980 and 1982, Emmer, Evertson and Anderson showed the necessity of consulting theoretical and implicational knowledge in order to attain effective classroom management as soon as the school year starts. However, there is strong evidence that teachers indicate the insufficiency of their training prior to employment in terms of classroom management (Reed, 1989; Rickman, Hollowell, 1981; Vocke, 1992; Celep, 2002).

Jere Brophy conducted valuable research on classroom management strategies during the second half of the 1990s. In his research he found out that effective class managers were the ones that employed different strategies in accordance with different characteristics of students, whereas those ineffective made use of same strategies without paying attention to the varying characteristics of students. According to Brophy, teachers need to develop their personal and professional skills in order to respond to the varying student needs. In a study held by Margaret Wang, Geneva Haertel and Herbert Wallberg, it is observed that among 228 factors "classroom management" factor is the most important one as a determinant of student achievement (Marzano, 2003). Studies show that true beginners tend to cooperate more with the students while, as teachers get experienced, they prefer authoritarian relations that negatively affect students (Morzano, 2003).

According to a study held in England, the following are determined as the features of a successfully-managed classroom:

Classroom environment is appropriate for teacher's activities. Tools and equipment allocation is considered important.

Different methods are used in accordance with the learning needs of the students and the size of the group. The ones with endowments are placed in groups where it is possible to demonstrate these skills.

Teaching method: Teaching manner is appropriately chosen in line with the subject and the student needs.

Evaluation, duty and identification formation: Most of the evaluation is informal and is based on discussion and observation (Farell, 1999).

It was requested from the teachers not to award the students for a couple of weeks in a classroom with students who demonstrate successful and desired behaviour and after this period it was observed that the students tended to perform unsuccessful and unwanted behaviour (Becker, Engelmann, and Thomas, 1975; Celep, 2002: 131). Another research has proved that teachers giving punishment whenever it is obligatory are effective (Brophy, 1988). According to Okutan's research (2006), teachers try to prevent undesirable behaviour mostly by "posing questions" and "eye-contact". "Absolute obedience" occupies an important position in teachers' understanding of discipline. According to Başar's study (1999) on classroom management, teachers ranked medium in building up interest, praising and relocating the student when necessary; and ranked high in listening to the students.

The purpose of the study was to determine the effect of elementary school teachers' skills in different aspects of classroom management on students' disciplinary behaviour. In this way, the scope is to increase the sensitiveness of the teachers regarding their skills in various aspects of classroom management, to motivate the teachers and encourage them to undergo training in classroom management and thus reduce the discipline problems in classrooms and at schools. In line with this aim the following questions are to be answered:

Is there a significant relationship between teachers' skills in classroom management and students' undesirable disciplinary behaviour?

Are the dimensions of teachers' skills in classroom management effective on students' disciplinary behaviour intended for "spoiling educational process"?

Are the dimensions of teachers' skills in classroom management effective on students' misbehaviours towards "each other"?

Are the dimensions of teachers' skills in classroom management effective on students' unwanted disciplinary behaviour towards "the teacher"?

Are the dimensions of teachers' skills in classroom management effective on students' disciplinary behaviour intended for "violating disciplinary rules"?

2. Methodology

This research was conducted as a survey.

Population and Sample: The population of this research consists of the elementary schools in the city of Antalya central district, Konyaalti, Muratpaşa, Kepez, Manavgat, Alanya and Kumluca districts. The random sample comprises of elementary school teachers employed in 40 elementary schools in total. The research data were provided from two scales, each replied by 450 teachers.

Data Gathering instrument and Data Gathering: The research consists of two scales that were developed by validation and reliability confidence analyses and according to 5-point Likert scale. "Teachers' Classroom management Skills" scale consists of 58 items and six dimensions. The Cronbach Alpha values for these dimensions are respectively: 1) 17-item-"Teacher-student relationship and communication": .92; 2) 10-item-"Recognition of student characteristics and needs": .90; 3) 11-item-"Application of teaching process and motivation": .90; 4) 8-item-"Setting up class rules and application": .83; 5) 7-item-"Management of undesirable behaviour": .76; 6) 5-item-"Arrangement of classroom environment and physical structure": .74. In this scale, items with factor load value bigger than .450 were evaluated. The KMO measure of sampling adequacy for this analysis was .930; The Bartlett test of sphericity was significant ($P < .05$). 50 % of the variance was accounted for by the factors.

The scale named "Disciplinary Behaviour of Students" consists of 46 items and 4 dimensions. The Cronbach Alpha values of these dimensions are respectively: 1) 18-item-"Towards spoiling teaching process": .96; 2) 15-item-"Students towards each other": .96; 3) 9-item-"Towards the teacher": .92; 4) 4-item-"Towards violation of disciplinary rules": .79. In this scale, items with factor load value bigger than .450 were evaluated. The KMO measure of sampling adequacy for this analysis was .971 ; The Bartlett test of sphericity was significant ($P < .05$). 64 % of the variance was accounted for by the factors. The data were provided by analysing 450 questionnaires from every scale by SPSS package programme. In the analysis of the data Pearson correlation coefficient and multiple linear regression analysis were used.

3. Findings and Comments

Table 1. The Results of Correlation Analysis of Relationship Between Teachers' Classroom Management Skills and Students' Disciplinary Behaviour

Classroom management Dimension/ Discipline Dimension		1. Dimension: Towards spoiling teaching process	2. Dimension: Students towards each other	3. Dimension: Towards the teacher	4. Dimension: Towards violation of disciplinary rules
1. Dimension: Teacher-student relation and communication	Pearson Correlation	-.204	-.240	-.293	-.257
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
2. Dimension: Recognition of student characteristics and needs	Pearson Correlation	-.296	-.258	-.297	-.312
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
3. Dimension: Application of teaching process and motivation	Pearson Correlation	-.265	-.248	-.278	-.259
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
4. Dimension: Setting up class rules and application	Pearson Correlation	-.189	-.227	-.309	-.237
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
5. Dimension: Management of undesirable behaviour	Pearson Correlation	.063	.082	.066	.126
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.183	.083	.162	.008
6. Dimension: Arrangement of classroom environment and physical structure	Pearson Correlation	-.178	-.162	-.212	-.205
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.001	.000	.000

Table 1 shows the results of correlation analysis of the relation between teachers' classroom management skills and students' discipline behaviour. According to this, a significant and negative relation was observed between 1. Dimension (Teacher-student relation and communication), 2. Dimension (Recognition of student characteristics and needs) 3. Dimension (Application of teaching process and motivation), 4. Dimension (Setting up class rules and application), and 6. Dimension (Arrangement of classroom environment and physical structure) of teachers' classroom management and all dimensions of students' disciplinary behaviour (Towards spoiling teaching process, Students towards each other, Towards the teacher, Towards violation of disciplinary rules).

There is a significant relation between the 5. Dimension (Management of undesirable behaviour) of teachers' classroom management and the 4. Dimension (Towards spoiling teaching process) of students' disciplinary behaviour. However, there is no observable significant relation between the 5. Dimension (Management of undesirable behaviour) of teachers' classroom management and other dimensions of students' disciplinary behaviour (Students towards each other, Towards the teacher, Towards violation of disciplinary rules).

Table 2. The Results of Multiple Regression Analysis of the Relation Between Six Dimensions of Teachers' Classroom Management Skills and the First Disciplinary Dimension (Towards Spoiling Teaching Process)

Variable	B	Std. Error β	B	T	P	Zero-order r	Partial r
Fixed	4.621	.398		11.611	.000		
1. Dimension	.030	.123	.017	.244	.807	-.204	.012
2. Dimension	-.287	.077	-.211	-3.701	.000	-.296	-.173
3. Dimension	-.217	.120	-.127	-1.801	.072	-.265	-.085
4. Dimension	-.106	.091	-.066	-1.167	.244	-.189	-.055
5. Dimension	.197	.055	.167	3.566	.000	.063	.167
6. Dimension	-.096	.057	-.082	-1.682	.093	-.178	-.080
R= .361	R ² = .130						
F _(6, 443) = 11.069	p= .000						

The results of the regression analysis regarding the first dimension of discipline (Towards spoiling teaching process) according to classroom management dimensions are given in Table 2.

In order to ensure the validation of the model D-W coefficient was found as 2,056. In this case, it can be said that there is no auto correlation. Since the correlation coefficients are smaller than .80, there is no problem of multi collinearity.

When bivariate and partial correlations between predictor variables and dependent variables (the first disciplinary dimension of "Towards spoiling teaching process") are observed, it is seen that there is a negative and low-level relation ($r=-,204$) between the first dimension of disciplinary behaviour (Towards spoiling teaching process) and the first dimension of classroom management. However, when the other variables are checked, it is observed that the correlation between the two variables is calculated as ($r=,012$). It is seen that there is a negative and low-level relation ($r=-,296$) between the first dimension of disciplinary behaviour (Towards spoiling teaching process) and the second dimension of classroom management, whereas when the other variables are checked, it is observed that the correlation between the two variables is calculated as ($r=-,173$). It is observed that there is a negative and low-level relation ($r=-,265$) between the first dimension of disciplinary behaviour (Towards spoiling teaching process) and the third dimension of classroom management, while when the other variables are checked, it is shown that the correlation between the two variables is calculated as ($r=-,085$). It is observed that there is a negative and low-level relation ($r=-,265$) between the first dimension of disciplinary behaviour (Towards spoiling teaching process) and the third dimension of classroom management, while when the other variables are checked, it is shown that the correlation between the two variables is calculated as ($r=-,085$). It is further seen that there is a negative and low-level relation ($r=-,189$) between the first dimension of disciplinary behaviour (Towards spoiling teaching process) and the fourth dimension of classroom management, when the other variables are checked, it is shown that the correlation between the two variables is calculated as ($r=-,055$). There is no significant relation observed between the fifth dimension of classroom management and the first dimension of disciplinary behaviour (Towards spoiling teaching process). It is seen that there is a negative and low-level relation ($r=-,178$) between the first dimension of disciplinary behaviour (Towards spoiling teaching process) and the sixth dimension of classroom

management; whereas from the other variables it is shown that the correlation between the two variables is calculated as ($r=-,080$).

All dimensions related to teachers' classroom management skills and points of students' behaviour towards spoiling teaching process provide a medium-level significant relation ($R = ,361$; $R^2=.130$; $F = 11,069$; $p<.01$). Teachers' classroom management skills explain 13% of the total variant. According to the standardised regression coefficient (β), the order of relative importance of predictor variables on the first factor is: 2. dimension; 5. dimension; 3. dimension; 6. dimension; 4. dimension; and 1. dimension. When results of the t-test regarding the significance of regression coefficients are observed, it is seen that the second dimension and the fifth dimension are important (significant) predictor. The regression equation for the prediction of the organisational first factor according to the results of the regression analysis is given as:

FIRST FACTOR = $4,6214 + .030$ First Dimension $-,287$ Second Dimension $-,217$ Third Dimension $-,106$ Fourth Dimension, $+197$ Fifth Dimension $-,096$ Sixth Dimension

Table 3. The Results of Multiple Regression Analysis of the Prediction of the Relation between the Six Dimensions of Teachers' Classroom management Skills and the Disciplinary Dimension of "Towards each other"

Variable	B	Std. Error β	B	T	P	Zero-order r	Partial r
Sabit	4.689	.378	-	12.392	.000	-	-
1. Dimension	-.139	.117	-.082	-1.187	.236	-.240	-.056
2. Dimension	-.206	.074	-.160	-2.803	.005	-.258	-.132
3. Dimension	-.085	.114	-.053	-.744	.457	-.248	-.035
4. Dimension	-.187	.086	-.123	-2.168	.031	-.227	-.102
5. Dimension	.219	.052	.196	4.173	.000	.082	.194
6. Dimension	-.064	.054	-.058	-1.181	.238	-.162	-.056
R=0 .357	R ² =0.127						
F _(6, 443) = 10.769	p= .000						

The results of the regression analysis of prediction of the second dimension of the disciplinary behaviour according to the 1., 2., 3., 4., 5. and 6. dimension variables are given in Table 3.

When bivariate and partial correlations between predictor variables and dependent variables (predicted, measure) are observed, it is seen that there is a negative and low-level relation ($r=-0,24$) between the first dimension of classroom management and the second dimension of disciplinary behaviour (Towards each other). However, when the other variables are checked, it is observed that the correlation between the two variables is calculated as $r=-0,06$. It is seen that there is a negative and low-level relation ($r=-0,26$) between the second dimension of classroom management and the second dimension of disciplinary behaviour (Towards each other), whereas when the other variables are checked, it is observed that the correlation between the two variables is calculated as $r=-0,13$. It is observed that there is a negative and low-level relation ($r=-0,25$) between the third dimension of classroom management and the second dimension of disciplinary behaviour (Towards each other), while when the other variables are checked, it is shown that the correlation between the two variables is calculated as $r=-0,04$. It is observed that there is a negative and low-level relation ($r=-0,23$) between the fourth dimension of classroom management and the second dimension of disciplinary behaviour (Towards each other), while the other variables show that the correlation between the two variables is calculated as $r=-0,10$. There is no significant relation observed between the fifth dimension of classroom management and the second dimension of disciplinary behaviour (Towards each other). It is seen that there is a negative and low-level relation ($r=-0,16$) between the sixth dimension of classroom management and the second dimension of disciplinary behaviour (Towards each other); whereas from the other variables it is shown that the correlation between the two variables is calculated as $r=-0,06$.

1., 2, 3., 4., 5. and 6. dimension variables and points of students' behaviour towards spoiling teaching process provide a medium-level significant relation ($R= 0,357$, $R^2=0,13$, $P<.01$). Teachers' classroom management skills explain 13% of the total variant of the students' disciplinary behaviour. According to the standardized regression coefficient (β), the order of relative importance of predictor variables on students' disciplinary behaviour is: 5, 2, 4,

1, 6 and 3. When results of the t-test regarding the significance of regression coefficients are observed, it is seen that the second, fourth and the fifth dimensions are important (significant) predictors of students' disciplinary behaviour.

The regression equation (mathematical model) for the prediction of the students' disciplinary behaviour according to the results of the regression analysis is given as:

THE LEVEL OF STUDENTS' DISCIPLINARY BEHAVIOUR = 4.69-0.139 First Dimension -0.206 Second Dimension - 0,085 Third Dimension -0,187 Fourth Dimension +0,219 Fifth Dimension -0,064 Sixth Dimension

Table 4. The Results of Multiple Regression Analysis for Predicting the Relation Between Six Dimensions of Teachers' Classroom Management Skills and the Disciplinary Dimension (Towards the Teacher)

Variable	B	Standard Error _B	B	T	P	Bivariate r	Partial r
Fixed	4.567	.357	-	12.790	.000	-	-
1. Dimension	-.175	.110	-.106	-1.583	.114	-.293	-.075
2. Dimension	-.220	.069	-.176	-3.172	.002	-.297	-.149
3. Dimension	-.009	.108	-.006	-.081	.936	-.278	-.004
4. Dimension	-.303	.082	-.204	-3.717	.000	-.309	-.174
5. Dimension	.225	.050	.206	4.534	.000	.066	.211
6. Dimension	-.093	.051	-.086	-1.813	.070	-.212	-.086
R=0.424	R ² =0.180						
F _(6, 443) = 16.183	p= .000						

The results of the regression analysis of prediction of the third dimension of the disciplinary behaviour according to the 1., 2., 3., 4., 5. and 6. dimension variables are given in Table 4.

When bivariate and partial correlations between predictor variables and dependent variables (predicted, measure) are observed, it is seen that there is a negative and low-level relation ($r=-0,29$) between the first dimension of classroom management and the third dimension of disciplinary behaviour (Towards the teacher). However, when the other variables are checked, it is observed that the correlation between the two variables is calculated as $r=-0,08$. It is seen that there is a negative and medium-level relation ($r=-0,30$) between the second dimension of classroom management and the third dimension of disciplinary behaviour (Towards the teacher), whereas when the other variables are checked, it is observed that the correlation between the two variables is calculated as $r=-0,15$. It is observed that there is a negative and low-level relation ($r=-0,28$) between the third dimension of classroom management and the third dimension of disciplinary behaviour (Towards the teacher), while when the other variables are checked, it is shown that the correlation between the two variables is calculated as $r=-0,00$. It is observed that there is a negative and medium-level relation ($r=-0,31$) between the fourth dimension of classroom management and the third dimension of disciplinary behaviour (Towards the teacher), while the other variables show that the correlation between the two variables is calculated as $r=-0,17$. There is no significant relation observed between the fifth dimension of classroom management and the third dimension of disciplinary behaviour (Towards the teacher). It is seen that there is a negative and low-level relation ($r=-0,21$) between the sixth dimension of classroom management and the second dimension of disciplinary behaviour (Towards each other); whereas from the other variables it is shown that the correlation between the two variables is calculated as $r=-0,09$. 1., 2., 3., 4., 5. and 6. Dimensions together with the points of students' behaviour "Towards the teacher" provide a medium-level significant relation ($R=0,424$, $R^2=0,18$, $P<0,01$). Six dimensions mentioned above explain 18% of the total variant of students' disciplinary behaviour.

According to the standardised regression coefficient (β), the order of relative importance of predictor variables on students' disciplinary behaviour is: 5, 4, 2, 1, 6 and 3. When results of the t-test regarding the significance of regression coefficients are observed, it is seen that the second, fourth and the fifth dimension are important (significant) predictors of students' disciplinary behaviour. The first, third and the sixth dimensions do not have a significant effect. The regression equation (mathematical model) for the prediction of the students' disciplinary behaviour according to the results of the regression analysis is given as:

THE LEVEL OF STUDENTS' DISCIPLINARY BEHAVIOUR =4.57-0.175 First Dimension -0.220 Second Dimension - 0,009 Third Dimension -0,303 Fourth Dimension +0,225 Fifth Dimension -0,093 Sixth Dimension

Table 5. The Results Of Multiple Regression Analysis Of The Prediction Of The Relation Between The Six Dimensions Of Teachers' Classroom Management Skills And The Fourth Disciplinary Dimension Of "Towards Violation Of Disciplinary Rules"

Variable	B	Standard Error _B	B	T	P	Bivariate r	Partial r
Fixed	4.050	.366		11.071	.000		
1. Dimension	-.156	.113	-.092	-1.383	.167	-.257	-.066
2. Dimension	-.300	.071	-.233	-4.214	.000	-.312	-.196
3. Dimension	-.024	.111	-.015	-.214	.831	-.259	-.010
4. Dimension	-.188	.084	-.123	-2.245	.025	-.237	-.106
5. Dimension	.287	.051	.257	5.653	.000	.126	.259
6. Dimension	-.104	.052	-.094	-1.992	.047	-.205	-.094
R=0.426	R ² =0.181						
F _(6, 443) =16.350	p=.000						

The results of the regression analysis of prediction of the fourth dimension of the disciplinary behaviour (Towards violation of disciplinary rules) according to the 1., 2., 3., 4., 5. and 6. dimension variables are given in Table 5.

When bivariate and partial correlations between predictor variables and dependent variables (predicted, measure) are observed, it is seen that there is a negative and low-level relation ($r = -0,26$) between the first dimension of classroom management and the fourth dimension of disciplinary behaviour (Towards violation of disciplinary rules). However, when the other variables are checked, it is observed that the correlation between the two variables is calculated as $r = -0,07$. It is seen that there is a negative and medium-level relation ($r = -0,31$) between the second dimension of classroom management and the fourth dimension of disciplinary behaviour (Towards violation of disciplinary rules), whereas when the other variables are checked, it is observed that the correlation between the two variables is calculated as $r = -0,20$. It is observed that there is a negative and low-level relation ($r = -0,26$) between the third dimension of classroom management and the fourth dimension of disciplinary behaviour (Towards violation of disciplinary rules), while when the other variables are checked, it is shown that the correlation between the two variables is calculated as $r = -0,01$. It is observed that there is a negative and low-level relation ($r = -0,24$) between the fourth dimension of classroom management and the fourth dimension of disciplinary behaviour (Towards violation of disciplinary rules), while the other variables show that the correlation between the two variables is calculated as $r = -0,11$. It is observed that there is a positive and low-level relation ($r = 0,3$) between the fifth dimension of classroom management and the fourth dimension of disciplinary behaviour (Towards violation of disciplinary rules), while the other variables show that the correlation between the two variables is calculated as $r = 0,26$. It is seen that there is a negative and low-level relation ($r = -0,21$) between the sixth dimension of classroom management and the fourth dimension of disciplinary behaviour (Towards violation of disciplinary rules); whereas from the other variables it is shown that the correlation between the two variables is calculated as $r = -0,09$. 1., 2., 3., 4., 5. and 6. Dimensions together with the points of students' behaviour "Towards violation of disciplinary rules" provide a medium-level significant relation ($R = 0,426$, $R^2 = 0,18$, $P < .01$). Above mentioned six dimensions explain 18% of the total variant of students' disciplinary behaviour.

According to the standardised regression coefficient (β), the order of relative importance of predictor variables on students' disciplinary behaviour is: 2, 5, 4, 1, 3 and 6. When results of the t-test regarding the significance of regression coefficients are observed, it is seen that the second, fourth and the fifth dimension are important (significant) predictors of students' disciplinary behaviour. The first and the third dimensions do not have a significant effect.

The regression equation (mathematical model) for the prediction of the students' disciplinary behaviour according to the results of the regression analysis is given as:

THE LEVEL OF STUDENTS' DISCIPLINARY BEHAVIOUR = 4.10-0.156 First Dimension -0.300 Second Dimension - 0,024 Third Dimension -0,188 Fourth Dimension +0,287 Fifth Dimension -0,104 Sixth Dimension

4. Conclusion and Recommendations

A negative and significant relation was observed between the teachers' classroom management dimensions of "Teacher-student relation and communication", "Recognition of student characteristics and needs", "Application of teaching process and motivation", "Setting up class rules and application" and "Arrangement of classroom environment and physical structure" and all dimensions (Towards spoiling teaching process, Students towards each other, Towards the teacher, Towards violation of disciplinary rules) related to the students' disciplinary behaviour. There is a positive and significant relation between teachers' classroom management dimension regarding "Management of undesirable behaviour" and students' disciplinary behaviour dimension of "Towards violation of disciplinary rules". The reason for this result is that as the frequency of violation of disciplinary rules increases in the Likert scale, which expresses frequency, so does the class manager teachers' behaviour towards preventing this undesirable behaviour. Since other dimensions related to classroom management skills aim at preventing the possible disciplinary behaviour, as this preventive behaviour increases, the frequency of students' disciplinary behaviour decreases. As stated by Erdoğan (2000), an unsuccessful classroom management in general brings about undesirable behaviour.

Teachers' classroom management skills of "Recognition of student characteristics and needs" and "Management of undesirable behaviour" were seen to be effective in preventing students' disciplinary behaviour of "Towards spoiling teaching process". Students within the same class embody different characteristics. Needs, attention, expectation and skills differ from one student to another. Therefore, students behave according to these characteristics in the classroom. Teachers should deal separately with forward-backward, easy-hard learning and able-disabled students (Brophy, 1988). In this case, teachers should manage the class in line with students' characteristics and needs. The way to overcome undesirable student behaviour is to analyse the reasons of their unwanted behaviour. Teachers should primarily understand these needs and the behaviour related to these needs (Jones, 1988; Celep, 2002). It is difficult to overcome behaviour without identifying its reason. The most important duty of a class manager is to search for the reasons of undesirable behaviour and then to eliminate this reason. Students who are oriented to activities with their needs and interests taken considered tend to perform their activities with pleasure and thus the teaching-learning process would become effective and problematic behaviour would decrease.

It is observed that classroom management skills of teachers regarding "Recognition of student characteristics and needs", "Setting up class rules and application" and "Management of undesirable behaviour" are effective on preventing students' unwanted disciplinary behaviour "Towards each other". An effective class manager could enable the success of teaching-learning activities by recognising the needs and characteristics of the students and by promoting collective working and collaboration among students with similar interests and skills. Similarly, teachers facilitate involvement of students to activities and to work groups by preventing the conflicts among students that do not get along well with each other for some reasons. Teachers may cause the deterioration of students' relationships and disciplinary problems with their wrong attitude in classroom management, such as comparing students, making students compete with each other, being unfair in awarding and punishing the students or promoting complaints regarding students. The complexity of classroom relations necessitate their regulation through rules (Brophy, 1988). Establishing rules that students comprehend and participate would contribute to students' relations both to the teacher and among each other.

It is further demonstrated that teachers' classroom management skills regarding "Recognition of student characteristics and needs", "Setting up class rules and application" and "Management of undesirable behaviour" are significantly effective on preventing students' unwanted disciplinary behaviour "Towards the teacher". Classroom management is related to the presence of positive teacher-student relations and supportive conditions in the classroom. The quality of the relationship between teacher and student affects academic achievement and student behaviour (Jones, 1988; Celep, 2002). Students' acceptance of disciplinary rules and their tendency to apply them are dependent to the teacher's ability to establish good relations with the students. In this way, when students violate the rules, they admit the sanctions more easily (Marzano, 2003).

Lastly, it is confirmed that teachers' ability regarding "Recognition of student characteristics and needs", "Setting up class rules and application", "Management of undesirable behaviour" and "Arrangement of classroom environment and physical structure" are effective in preventing students' disciplinary behaviour "Towards violation of disciplinary rules". Desks, tables, distance between teacher and student in the classroom constitute a ground for psychological obstacles. These as well change communication and interaction (Barker, 1982: 29). In general, when rules are established without getting students' opinion and when students do not see the good account of these rules,

they do not show obedience easily. This situation causes disciplinary problems like violation of the rules. The rules that are difficult or impossible to be implemented are the easiest to be violated.

References

- Aydın, A. (2005). *Sınıf Yönetimi*. Altıncı Baskı Tekağaç Yayınları:47. Dizi No:8 Ankara.
- Barker, L. L. (1982). *Communication in the Classroom*. Prentice Hall Inc. Englewoods Cliffs.
- Başar, H. (1999). *Sınıf Yönetimi*. Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları Öğretmen Kitapları Dizisi: 200. Ankara.
- Başar, H. (2001). *Sınıf Yönetimi*. Beşinci Baskı Pegem A Yayınevi Tic. Ltd. Şti. Ankara.
- Becher, R. (1993). "The Aesthetic Classroom Environment and Student Attitude Toward School". Dissertation Abstracts International. Vol.53. No.9. p. 37-41.
- Brophy, J. & Good, T. (1986). *Teacher Behavior and Student Achievement*. In M. Wittrock (Ed.) Handbook ar Research on Teaching (3rd ed). Macm.
- Brophy, J. (1988). "Educating Teachers About Managing Classroom and Students". Teaching and Teacher Education. Vol 4. No 1. (pp.1-18).
- Brooks, J. G. M. G. Brooks (1999). *In Search of Understanding The Case for Constructivist Classrooms*. Alexandria, VA, USA. Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.
<http://site.ebrary.com/lib/akdeniz/Doc>.
- Brown, L. (1982). "Evaluating and Managing Classroom Behavior". *Teaching Children with Learning and Behavior Problems*". Ed. D. D. Hammil and N. R. Bartel. Third Ed. Allyn and Bacon Inc. Boston.
- Certo, S. C. (2000). *Modern Managemet*. (8th Ed.) Prentice-Hall Inc. New Jersey.
- Charles,C.M. (2005). *Building Classroom Discipline*. Collaboration by Gail W Senter. Emeritus San Diego state university. Eight edition.
- Cummings, C. (2001). *Strategies for Classroom Management. Teaching, inc.* Virginia, USA
- Çelik, V. (2005). *Sınıf Yönetimi*. 3. Basım. Nobel Yayın Dağıtım. Nobel Yayın No: 356. Ankara.
- Doyle, W. (1986). "Classroom Organisation and Management". Handbook of Research on Teaching. Ed. Merlin C. Wittrock, Third Ed. Macmillan Pub. Comp. New York.
- Dreikurs, R. (1968). *Psychology in the Classroom*. New York: Harper and Row (2nd Edition).
- Eccles, J. & Others. (1991). "What Are We Doing to Early Adolescents? The Impact of Educational Context on Early Adolescents". American Journal of Education. Vol. 99. No.4. p. 521-539.
- Edwards, C. H. (2000). *Classroom Discipline and Management*. 3rd. Ed. John Wiley& Sons, Inc. New York.
- Evertson, C.M., Emmer, E.T., Clements, B.S., Worsham, M.E. (1997). *Classroom Management for Elementary Teacher (4th ed.)*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Farrell, M. (1999). *Key Issues for Primary Schools*. Routledge. New York. <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/akdeniz/Doc>.
- Fry, D. (1985). "helping Students Remember". Teaching as Though Students Mattered. Jossey-Bass Inc. San Fransisco.
- Gordon, T. (1974). *Teacher Effectiveness Training*. NewYork: Wyden.
- Grubaugh, S.& Huston R. (1990). "Establishing a Classroom Environment That Promotes Interaction and Improved Student Behavior". The Clearing House. Vol.63. (pp. 375-378).
- Harris, A. H. (1991). "proactive classroom Management: Several Ounces of Prevention". Contemporary Education. Vol.62. No.3.(pp. 156-160).
- Hull, J. (1990). *Classroom Skills. A Teacher Guide*. David Fulton Pub. London.
- Jocobsen, D. & Others. (1985). *Methods for Teaching. A Skills Approach*. Second Ed. Charles and Merrill Pub. Comp. Columbus.
- Jones, V.F. & Jones, L.S. (1997). *Responsible Classroom Discipline : Creating Positive Learning Environments and Solving Problems*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Jones V.F.& L.S. Jones. (2001). *Comprehensive Classroom Management: Creating Communities of Support and Solving Problems*. Allyn&Bacon. Boston.
- Lemlech, J. K. (1988). *Classroom Management*. Longman Inc. Second Ed. New York.
- Marzano, R. J. (2003). *Classroom Management that Works: Research-Based Strategies for Every Teacher*. Alexandria, VA, USA. Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development. <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/akdeniz/Doc>.
- Okutan, M. (2006). *Sınıf Yönetiminde Örnek Olaylar*. Pegema Yayıncılık. Ankara.
- Reed, D. (1989). *Student teacher problems with classroom discipline: Implication for program development*. Action in Education. Vol.11 No.3. 59-65.
- Rich, J. M. (1991). "Should Student Be Pnushed?". Contemporary Education. Vol. 62. No.3.(pp.180-184)
- Rickman, L. & Hollowell, J. (1981): *some causes of student teacher failure*. Improving college and university Teaching. Vol.29. No. 4. (pp. 176-179).
- Sabancı, A. (2008). *Yapılandırıcı Yaklaşım Göre Sınıf Yönetimi*. Ed. M. Çelikten. Anı Yayıncılık. Ankara.
- Smith, C. J. & R. Laslett (1993). *Effective Clasroom Management: A Teacher's Guide*. Second Edition. Routledge. New York.
<http://site.ebrary.com/lib/akdeniz/Doc>.
- Teyfur M. and Çelikten M. (2008). *Yapılandırıcı Yaklaşım Göre Sınıf Yönetimi*. Ed. M. Çelikten. Anı Yayıncılık. Ankara.
- Wlodkowski, R. J. (1982). *Discipline: The great false hope*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Wisconsin- Milwaukee. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 224 782.).
- Wragg, E. C. (2001). *Class Management in The Primary School*. London, GBR: Routledge. <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/akdeniz/Doc>.