5th World Conference on Educational Sciences - WCES 2013

Investigating classroom management profiles of pre-service teachers (Cukurova University sample)

Semra Sadik[a*], Fatma Sadik[b]

[a] *Çukurova University International Office, Adana, TURKEY*
[b] *Çukurova University Faculty of Education Curriculum & Instruction, Adana, TURKEY*

Abstract

The main purpose of this research is to detect classroom management profiles of pre-service teachers and investigate whether these profiles show significant differences in terms of some variables. Classroom Management Profile (CMP) by Santrock (1996) was used to collect data. The data was gained from 1238 pre-service teachers from different departments of Faculty of Education during 2012-2013 year. At the end of the study, it was found that pre-service teachers have high Authoritative and Laissez-faire classroom management profile. There was no significant difference among Laissez-faire, Indifferent and Authoritarian classroom management profiles, however, female pre-service teachers have higher profile in Authoritative dimension.

Keywords: Classroom management, pre-service teacher, classroom management profile, teacher training

1. Introduction

One of the most important professional qualifications for teachers that must be gained during pre-service education is classroom management. The reason is that education becomes difficult, attention is distracted, academic success decreases and education time is wasted in a disordered classroom environment (Doyle, 1986; Marzano & Marzano, 2003). However, according to related research, classroom management skills are being neglected during professional education (Kaliska, 2002) and teachers state that they have problems in maintaining order in classrooms, managing student behaviors and overcoming undesired circumstances and that they need training (Johansen et al. 2011; Kaufman & Moss, 2010; Putman, 2009). According to Kagan (1992), teachers' classroom management behaviors are largely based on their understanding of classroom management and dynamics and on their perceptions and opinions on student behaviors and student-teacher interaction. The research in related literature has shown that teachers who perceive students as irresponsible individuals behave more strictly in their classrooms, teachers who believe in the capability of their students give more importance to cooperation with students and teachers who believe that the cause of behavioral problems is the family seek the solution out of the school (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1990; Johansen et al., 2011; Miller, 2003; Sadık et al., 2007). Therefore, it is necessary to reveal teachers' profile about classroom management in the first place in order for trainings aiming at developing teachers' classroom and behavioral management skills to become more effective. Four basic profiles related to teachers'

---

* Corresponding name:Semra SADIK, Tel.: +90-5334325626
E-mail address: semrasadik@gmail.com

behaviors in the classroom have been mentioned in the literature (Brophy, 1998; Dreikurs et al., 1982; Good & Brophy, 2007; Little, 1982; Merret & Jones, 1994; Santrock, 1996).

Authoritarian Profile: There is excessive pressure and discipline on students. Wishes and expectations of students are not taken into consideration. Communication is insufficient and quite harsh. Students are required to obey the rules and do what the teacher wants. Punishment, accusation, dispraise, embarrassing etc. are classroom management behaviors of authoritarian profile.

Authoritative Profile: The purpose of classroom management is not to prohibit, to punish but to present learning opportunities, help and support. Teachers always try to explain the reasons lying behind their rules and expectations to their students, they are interested in how their students learn and they are open to communication. Students are encouraged to express their opinions. Students' interests and needs are taken into consideration and their learning efforts are realized.

Laissez-faire Profile: Students' feelings are more important than their academic behaviors and performances. Teachers do not apply strict rules in their classes. Although they provide students with required materials and homework, they do not check whether students fulfill their responsibilities or show any effort. Since classroom management principles are not regarded, problems can occur and remain unresolved.

Indifferent Profile: These teachers are uninterested in the class and students, inattentive in the matter of preparation for the lesson. They teach the lesson in the same way and use the same materials for years. Expectations and rules are not clear, even negative behaviors of students are kept away from discipline. Rules are rarely applied. In such classes, discipline problems emerge rather than educational problems.

In this research, first of all, classroom management profiles of pre-service teachers were determined, then, comparisons were made per gender, branch, grade and taking/not taking classroom management lessons.

2. Method

2.1. The research model

This research is a descriptive study practicing scanning model conducted in order to examine the classroom management profiles of pre-service teachers in terms of some variables.

2.2. Population and sample

The population of the research consists of pre-service teachers who are enrolled at eight different departments of Çukurova University, Faculty of Education. The participants of the study were students of single-group departments and students of a randomly chosen group of a multi-group departments on voluntary basis. The descriptive statistics related to pre-service teachers are given in Table1.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics related to pre-service teachers

Department	f	%	Gender	f	%
Primary School Teaching	143	11.6	Female	762	61.6
Science and Technology	130	10.5	Male	476	38.4
Social Sciences	166	13.4	Total	1238	100.0
Turkish Language	135	10.9			
Computer Teaching	125	10.1	**Class Year**		
Religious Culture	146	11.8	1st Year	333	29.9
Philosophy	110	8.9	2nd Year	295	23.8
Foreign Language	283	22.9	3rd Year	336	27.1
Total	1238	100.0	4th Year	274	22.1
They have taken the "classroom management" course or not			Total	1238	100.0
Have not taken	750	60.6			
Have taken	488	39.4			
Total	1238	100.0			

2.3. Data collection tools

In the collection of data, adaptation of Classroom Management Profile (CMP) survey by Santrock (1996) to Turkish by Gürsel & Sünbül (2000) was used. The 5 point type scale survey consists of four dimensions and 12 items. The possible lowest score from each dimension of classroom management profile is 3 and the highest is 15.

Cronbach Alfa reliability coefficient was calculated as .72 in Authoritarian dimension; .68 in Authoritative dimension; .52 in Laissez-faire dimension and .65 in Indifferent dimension.

2.4. Data analysis

The mean and standard deviation of scores that pre-service teachers got from CMP were calculated to determine their classroom management profiles. The means received were divided by number of items in each dimension and values between 1 and 5 were acquired and were interpreted according to interval they were suitable with the 5 point rating scale. Mann Whitney U and Kruskall-Wallis tests were used to find out whether there was significant difference in pre-service teachers' classroom management profiles in terms of discussed variables. The significance level was accepted as .05.

3. Findings

The mean and standard deviation values of scores that pre-service teachers got from CMP are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Pre-service teachers' classroom management profiles

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Laissez-faire	1238	12.00	1.97
Indifferent	1238	7.13	1.94
Authoritarian	1238	8.49	2.08
Authoritative	1238	12.09	1.80

When Table 2 is analyzed, it is observed that pre-service teachers got the highest means in "Authoritative" (12.09) and "Laissez-faire" (12.00) profiles and the lowest in "Indifferent" profile (7.13) in general. When these values are taken into account on the basis of 5 point rating scale, pre-service teachers generally replied ''agree'' to the items in "Authoritative'' and "Laissez-faire" profiles and replied ''disagree'' to the items in ''Indifferent" and "Authoritarian" profiles.

Table 3 shows Mann Whitney U test results performed to reveal whether there is a significant difference per in pre-service teachers' classroom management profiles according to gender.

Table 3. Differences in pre-service teachers' classroom management profile according to gender

	Gender	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	p
Laissez-faire	Female	762	627.37	478057.00		
	Male	476	606.90	288884.00	175358.000	,321
	Total	1238				
Indifferent	Female	762	609.54	464468.00		
	Male	476	635.45	302473.00	173765.000	.209
	Total	1238				
Authoritarian	Female	762	606.00	461771.00		
	Male	476	641.11	305170.00	171068.000	.089
	Total	1238				
Authoritative	Female	762	637.80	486006.50		
	Male	476	590.20	280934.50	167408.500	.021[*]
	Total	1238				

As it is seen in Table 3, the difference between the scores of the two groups is significant in favor of female pre-service teachers' in "Authoritative" profile and in terms of mean rank.

Table 4 shows Kruskall Wallis test results performed to reveal whether there is a significant difference in terms of departments they are enrolled among pre-service teachers' classroom management profiles.

Table 4. Differences in pre-service teachers' classroom management profile according to department

	Department	N	Mean Rank	df	X^2	p	Asymp. Sig.		Department	N	Mean Rank	df	X^2	p	Asymp. Sig.
Laissez-faire	Primary School Teaching	143	321.37				PST, TL and P > CT TL, P and FL > ST FL > CT and RC	Authoritarian	Primary School Teaching	143	630.29				ST and SS > RC, P, FL PST and T L > P CT > RC, P, FL
	Science and Technology	130	554.44						Science and Technology	130	673.41				
	Social Sciences	166	614.56						Social Sciences	166	693.69				
	Turkish Language	135	659.45		25.193	.001*			Turkish Language	135	636.34		31.256	.000*	
	Computer Teaching	125	530.04	7					Computer Teaching	125	678.64	7			
	Religious Culture	146	578.53						Religious Culture	146	569.31				
	Philosophy	110	660.73						Philosophy	110	509.81				
	Foreign Language	283	676.90						Foreign Language	283	580.14				
	Total	1238							Total	1238					
Indifferent	Primary School Teaching	143	583.90				ST, SS, CT, RC, P, FL > TL	Authoritative	Primary School Teaching	143	619.53				FL> ST, SS, CT and RC TL > ST
	Science and Technology	130	644.17						Science and Technology	130	561.80				
	Social Sciences	166	627.11						Social Sciences	166	571.59				
	Turkish Language	135	524.06		14.382	.045*			Turkish Language	135	646.94		18.470	.010*	
	Computer	125	640.23	7					Computer	125	604.25	7			
	Religious Culture	146	635.24						Religious Culture	146	583.98				
	Philosophy	110	650.78						Philosophy	110	626.34				
	Foreign Language	283	637.78						Foreign Language	283	683.41				
	Total	1238							Total	1238					

PST- Primary School Teaching, ST- Science and Technology, SS- Social Sciences, TL- Turkish Language, CT- Computer Teaching, RC-Religious Culture, P- Philosophy, FL- Foreign Language

As it is seen in Table 4, pre-service teachers' classroom management profile levels are becoming significantly different in all four dimensions. According to Mann Whitney U tests results, generally pre-service teachers at Foreign Language and Turkish Language Departments present a higher "Authoritative" and lower "Indifferent" behavioural profile than those enrolled at other departments. Pre-service teachers at Science and Technology, Computer Teaching and Religious Culture Departments reflect a lower "Laissez-faire" profile whereas pre-service teachers at Social Science, Computer Teaching, Science and Technology and Primary School Teaching Departments present a higher "Authoritarian" behaviour level.

Table 5 shows Kruskall Wallis test results performed to reveal whether there is a significant difference with regards to class year in pre-service teachers.

Table 5. Differences in pre-service teachers' classroom management profile according to class year

	Year	N	Mean Rank	df	X^2	p	Asymp. Sig.		Year	N	Mean Rank	df	X^2	p	Asymp. Sig.
Laissez-faire	1st	333	652.59				1st and 2nd >4th	Authoritarian	1st	333	708.16				1st >2nd, 3rd and 4th 2nd >4th
	2nd	295	637.88						2nd	295	632.03				
	3rd	336	606.78	3	8.518	.037*			3rd	336	584.40	3	37.965	.000*	
	4th	274	575.09						4th	274	541.31				
	Total	1238							Total	1238					
Indifferent	1st	333	641.24					Authoritative	1st	333	647.47				
	2nd	295	603.37						2nd	295	613.51				
	3rd	336	628.04	3	2.913	.405			3rd	336	605.83	3	2.950	.399	
	4th	274	599.98						4th	274	608.72				
	Total	1238							Total	1238					

When Table 5 is examined, it is observed that the differences in "Laissez-faire" and "Authoritarian" classroom management profiles are significant. According to Mann Whitney U test results, 1st and 2nd year participants present a more "Laissez-faire" profile than those of 4th year; 1st year students present a more "Authoritarian" profile compared to 2nd, 3rd and 4th year participants and 2nd year students were found more "Authoritarian" than those of 4th year.

Table 6 shows Mann Whitney U test results performed to reveal whether there is a significant difference in pre-service teachers' classroom management profile according to the situation whether they have taken the Classroom Management (CM) Course or not.

Table 6. Differences in pre-service teachers' classroom management profile according to the situation whether they have taken the "Classroom Management "course or not

	Have a taken CM Course	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	p
Laissez-faire	Have not taken	750	633.07	474803.00	172822.000	.093
	Have taken	488	598.64	292138.00		
	Total	1238				
Indifferent	Have not taken	750	623.56	467673.50	179951.500	.615
	Have taken	488	613.25	299267.50		
	Total	1238				
Authoritarian	Have not taken	750	659.44	494582.00	153043.000	.000*
	Have taken	488	558.11	272359.00		
	Total	1238				
Authoritative	Have not taken	750	623.41	467558.50	180066.500	.628
	Have taken	488	613.49	299382.50		
	Total	1238				

As it can be seen in Table 6, the difference between the scores of two groups is significant in favour of pre-service teachers who have not taken CM Course, in "Authoritarian" profile and in terms of mean rank.

4. Discussion and conclusion

In this research it was shown that pre-service teachers present a high level of "Authoritative" and "Laissez-faire" and a low level of "Authoritarian" and "Indifferent" classroom management profiles. Accordingly, it can be concluded that pre-service teachers provide students with learning opportunities that could develop their academic behaviours and performances besides classroom management behaviours that give importance to their emotional development. Classroom management includes numerous managerial and educational behaviors like planning the education and practicing it, explaining rules and expectations, creating a positive emotional atmosphere, preventing problematic behaviors and etc. (Marzano & Marzano, 2003; Snowman et al., 2009). The purpose of classroom management lesson is to enable pre-service teachers to understand these dynamics and to gain a preventive attitude in classroom management. Therefore, the reason why 1st and 2nd year pre-service teachers' present higher "Authoritarian" and "Laissez-faire" behaviors may be because of their being at the beginning of their professional education. The fact that "Authoritarian" level of 3rd and 4th year pre-service teachers who have taken classroom management lesson were found low supports this idea and shows that the course has theoretically reached its objectives. In the study, it was observed that female pre-service teachers in general and Foreign Language and Turkish Language Department pre-service teachers of both gender are generally more "Authoritative". The reason to this may be that more than half of the female pre-service teachers who participated in the research were enrolled at Foreign Language and Turkish Language Teaching Departments and that objectives and contents of the lessons vary together with education methods. As it is also emphasized in the current studies (Güneş, 2011), achieving four basic language skills that are listening, speaking, reading and writing requires students' being more active and encouraged to participate. The reason of Science and Technology and Computer Teaching Departments pre-service teachers' presenting a more "Authoritarian" profile may be their aim to provide safety in their classes since lessons are taught in laboratory environment. Additionally, in these lessons where methods like experiments, observation, hands-on-activities are used more, the insufficiency of educational tools (Tekbıyık &Akdeniz, 2008) and crowded classes make it difficult to perform the activities (Yapıcı & Demirdelen, 2007). The age of students is another important criterion in teachers' classroom management behaviors. Therefore, the reason of Primary School Teachers' presenting a more "Authoritarian" profile may be because of their encountering students of younger age groups (ages 5-10) compared to pre-service teachers in other departments. It is more difficult to manage the classroom in younger age groups because the first years of primary school are years when children learn how to behave in the classroom environment and achieve habits of living and working together (Burden, 2003; Doyle, 1986).

In this research, classroom management profiles of pre-service teachers were detected. As for the future research, behaviors of pre-service teachers in practical classes can be observed and their classroom management profiles and behaviors can be compared. In the research, pre-service teachers were asked whether they have taken classroom management courses but their opinions were not received on the matters of content of the lessons and lessons' efficiency to prepare then for their future job. In the future research, pre-service teachers' opinions about classroom management lesson can be studied in detail.

References

Brophy, J. E. (1988). Educating teachers about managing classrooms and students. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, (1), 1-18.

Burden, P.R. (2003). *Classroom management: Creating a successful learning community.* (2th ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Doyle, W. (1986). Classroom organization and management. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (3th ed., pp. 392-431)*.* New York: Mc. Millan.

Dreikurs, R., Grunwald, B., & Pepper, E. (1982). *Maintaining sanity in the classroom*. New York: Harper & Row.

Good, T. L., & Brophy, J. (2007). *Looking in classrooms* (10th ed.). Boston: Allen & Bacon.

Güneş, F. (2011). Language teaching approaches and their applications in teaching Turkish. *Mustafa Kemal University Journal of Sciences Institute*, 8 (15), 123-148.

Gürsel, M., & Sünbül, A. M. (2000). Öğretmen ve okul yöneticilerinin sınıf yönetim profillerinin incelenmesi. *Konya Selçuk Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, Özel Sayı*, 92-100.

Hoy, W. K., & Woolfolk, A. E. (1990). Socialization of student teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 27, 279-300.

Johansen, A., Little, S. G., & Akin-Little, A. (2011). An examination of New Zealand teachers' attributions and perceptions of behavior, classroom management, and the level of formal teacher training received in behavior management. *KAIRARANGA,* 12 (2), 3-12.

Kagan, D. M. (1992). Implications of research on teacher belief. *Educational Psychologist*, 27, 65-90.

Kaliska, P. (2002). *A comprehensive study identifying the most effective classroom management techniques and practices*. (Unpublished master theses). The Graduate School University of Wisconsin, USA.

Kaufman, D., & Moss, D. M. (2010). A new look at preservice teachers' conceptions of classroom management and organization: Uncovering complexity and dissonance. *The Teacher Educator*, 45, 118-136.

Little, J. M. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. *American Educational Research Journal*, 19, 325-340.

Marzano, R. J., & Marzano, J. S. (2003). The key to classroom management. *Educational Leadership*, 61 (1), 6-13.

Merrett, F., & Jones, L. (1994). Rules, sanctions and rewards in primary school. *Educational Studies*, 20 (3), 345–356.

Miller, A. (2003). *Teachers, parents and classroom behavior-A psychosocial approach*. London: Open University Press.

Sadık, F., Kaf Hasırcı, Ö., & Sadık, S. (2007). Pre-service teachers' and classroom discipline. Proceeding of Affective Education in Action 9th International Conference of EAEN, 28-30 June 2007 (pp. 262-269).

Santrock, J. T. (1996). *What is your classroom management profile*?. Retrieved from http://education.indiana.edu/cas/tt/v1i2/what.html

Snowman, J., Dobozy, E., Scevak, J., Beyer, F., Baartlett, B.,& Biehler, R. (2009). *Psychology: Applied to teaching*. Milton, Qld: John Wiley & Sons.

Putman, S. M. (2009). Grappling with classroom management: The orientations of preservice teachers and impact of student teaching. *The Teacher Educator*, 44 (4), 232-247.

Tekbıyık, A., & Akdeniz, A. R. (2008). İlköğretim fen ve teknoloji dersi öğretim programını kabullenme ve uygulamaya yönelik öğretmen görüşleri. *Necatibey Eğitim Fakültesi, Eloktronik Fen ve Matematik Eğitimi Dergisi*, 2 (2), 23-37.

Yapıcı, M., & Demirdelen, C. (2007). İlköğretim 4.sınıf sosyal bilgiler öğretim programına ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. *Gazi Üniversitesi Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 43 (3), 261-274.