

The Role of Socio-demographic Factors of Teachers' Disciplines Styles and Classroom Management Approaches: A Case Study of Teachers in Zeytinburnu-Istanbul

Engin Erşen¹, Serkan Kan²

¹Istanbul Aydın University, Faculty of Sports Sciences, Turkey

²Istanbul Aydın University, Institute of Social Sciences, Turkey

Correspondence: Engin ERŞEN, İstanbul Aydın University, Faculty of Sports Sciences, Turkey.

Received: July 18, 2019

Accepted: August 7, 2019

Online Published: August 13, 2019

doi:10.11114/jets.v7i10S.4454

URL: <https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v7i10S.4454>

Abstract

The aim of the study was to find the role of socio-demographic factors of teachers' discipline styles and classroom management approaches. The study was designed in relational survey method. The universe of the study was composed of teachers serving in high schools in Zeytinburnu district. Using convenience sampling method, 317 teachers accepted to participate in the study.

To collect data, a demographic information form, the Teacher Discipline Styles Inventory and the Classroom Management Approaches Scale were used. The data were analyzed via the SPSS 21.0 program. T-test and ANOVA were used for the groups with normal distribution. In addition, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation analysis was performed to determine the relationship between the variables and the scale. Significance level was taken as $p < .05$.

As a result of the study, it was found that the teachers used conciliatory style at the highest rate, followed by supportive style, and they used abdicative style at the lowest rate. In addition, it was found that the teachers adopted democratic approach at the highest rate in classroom management, followed by laissez-faire and autocratic approaches. Also, there was a significant positive relationship between supportive style and abdicative, conciliatory, coercive, negotiator styles. However, there was no significant relationship between supportive style and autocratic and laissez-faire classroom management approaches. Finally, a significant positive relationship was found between supportive style and democratic approach.

Keywords: discipline, discipline styles, classroom management, classroom management approaches

1. Introduction

Teachers are the ones who plan the teaching process, provide the necessary environment for students, and monitor and evaluate them. In this context, teachers constitute an important element of the teaching process (Yaşar, Sözer & Gültekin, 2000: 458). The teacher is responsible for maintaining the order. It is expected that a teacher will prepare and manage the activities that will enable students to become active by providing subject integrity and also have the ability to maintain effective classroom management (Celep, 2004: 118-119). Any kind of physical environment and student attitudes that will disrupt the course setting are an obstacle to classroom management, which may be solved by the teacher's leadership behaviors. Otherwise, even if the most intelligent students are taught with the greatest curriculum, it is not possible to achieve educational goals (Şimşek, 2008: 74). Physical arrangements include organizing the classroom in a way that allows students to be healthy and comfortable, the suitability of the space, the suitability of the number of students, specifying the educational tools, meeting the essential needs (heat-light-noiseless-color-cleaning-aesthetic), and the layout and order. The purpose of all of these is to provide an environment to achieve predetermined educational objectives (Başar, 2008: 4).

Managing a classroom requires the implementation of the principles related to the functions in which communication and evaluation are performed by using necessary tools in line with systematic planning (Türkmen, 2011). Since classroom management refers to human management, it brings some difficulties (Taş, 2005). Classroom management requires an understanding of the individual characteristics of students. Recognition of students facilitates communication with them, which is the first step in the use of teaching methods and techniques for their individual characteristics (Başar, 2008: 6).

The aim of implementing classroom management strategies is to improve social behaviors of students and increase their academic participation. (Emmer & Sabornie, 2015; Everston & Weinstein, 2006).

The concept of classroom management draws attention to both the role of teaching and the role of management of the teacher. The teacher who manages the classroom closely follows the students' works for the success of the school and students by using different educational techniques (Ilgar, 2005: 161). Teachers' behaviors towards students in the classroom are critical for student achievement. Likewise, students' behaviors in the classroom affect their achievement (Hoşgörür, 2005: 120-121).

Classroom management is called all activities aiming at the planning, organization, cooperation, communication and evaluation necessary for the realization of the predetermined objectives, the conscious implementation of the concepts, theories and techniques necessary for the realization of the learning and the creation of an environment conducive to learning (Erdoğan, 2004: 12).

The aim of implementing classroom management strategies is to improve social behavior and increase student academic participation (Emmer and Sabornie, 2015; Everston and Weinstein, 2006). Classroom management can also be defined as using resources systematically, organizing students' progress and following up their works, and finding solutions to the problems experienced by students (Terzi, 2002: 1). A teacher needs to have some managerial skills to perform classroom management effectively (Celep, 2004: 118-119). Effective classroom management principles apply to almost all subject areas and grade levels (Brophy, 2006; Lewis, et al., 2015).

The way individuals choose for learning differs according to their experiences, social life and the possibilities of the environment (Kaya, 2011: 14). Teachers who want to replace authoritarian practices with democratic ones will focus on achieving long-term results. When teachers believe in students, classroom achievement increases as students' self-confidence increases. Positive discipline methods will be effective when teachers agree to cooperate with their students.

If an environment where children can express their thoughts freely is created, and the students are given the chance to choose instead of forcing them, the classroom environment becomes a field of mutual love and respect (Nelsen, Lott & Glenn, 2003). Democracy in the classroom begins with the way assignments are delivered, the way students express their opinions in the classroom, the way the teacher teaches the lesson, and the choice of election method for the classroom elections (Ilgar, 2005: 180-181).

School administrators, teachers and other staff should not have contradictory views and practices regarding school rules and behavior towards students. The diverse voices should not be disruptive to the general policies of the school and the practices should not contradict the students. The school should be an environment in which students will not be forced beyond their ability as forcing or preventing students may push them to negative behaviors. (Başar, 2008: 140).

A teacher may share authority, power, responsibility and effort with students. Teachers adopting effective classroom management strategies set expectations and rules for behaviors for the first few days of the class. A clear explanation of expectations is a fundamental element of preventive discipline. The aim of the preventive discipline is to clearly explain to students which behaviors are (not) appropriate. (Başar, 2008: 150).

2. Method

The groups representing the universe and chosen from the universe constitute the sample (Karasar, 2006). The neutrality of the sample is considered important for the reliability of the study (Kaptan, 1998). Probability sampling is used to determine a sample where every individual in the universe has an equal chance of being selected (Yazıcıoğlu and Erdoğan, 2004). Sample selection provides convenience in terms of time and cost (Gökçe, 1988). It is necessary to generalize the obtained data to reach the correct information (Arıkan, 2004). Generalizable studies lead to more accurate results (Karasar, 2006). The universe of the study was composed of teachers serving in high schools in Zeytinburnu. 317 volunteers (35% of all high school teachers in the mentioned district) within the universe constituted the sample of the study.

Table 1. Frequency and Percentage Values of Participants' Demographic Information

Parameters		N	%
Gender	Male	144	45.4
	Female	173	54.6
Marital Status	Married	181	57.1
	Single	136	42.9
Age	25 years and younger	32	10.1
	26-30 years	103	32.5
	31-40 years	82	25.9
	41 years and older	100	31.5
Seniority	0-5 years	127	40.1
	6-10 years	81	25.6
	11-20 years	46	14.5
	21 years and over	63	19.9
Graduation	Bachelor's	259	81.7
	Master's	58	18.3
Faculty	Faculty of Education	162	51.1
	Other	155	48.9
Classroom Size	30 students and under	56	17.7
	31 students of over	261	82.3
Total		317	100.0

A demographic information form, the Teacher Discipline Styles Inventory (TDSI) (Cronbach Alpha coefficient: 0.83), which was developed by Tomal (1998, 2001) and adapted to Turkish by Sađnak (2008a), and the Classroom Management Approaches Scale (CMAS) developed by Terzi (2001) were used to collect the data.

The obtained data were analyzed by using frequency, descriptive statistics, t-test, one-way ANOVA and Pearson correlation tests via SPSS 21.0 program.

4. Results and Discussion

The findings obtained in this study are presented below in the form of tables.

Table 2. Total Scores of the Teacher Disciplinary Styles Inventory and Arithmetic Mean and Standard Deviation Values of All Sub-dimensions

Sub-dimension	N	$\bar{X} \pm Ss$
Supportive	317	16.52±2.73
Abdicative	317	12.15±3.04
Conciliatory	317	14.67±2.51
Coercive	317	14.41±3.19
Negotiator	317	17.75±3.26

Table 3. Results of T-Test for the Teacher Discipline Styles Inventory by the Gender Variable

Parameter		N	Mean± Ss	T Value	Sd	Significance Level
Supportive	Male	144	16.56±2.768	0.208	315	P=0.835>0.05
	Female	173	16.49±2.712			
Abdicative	Male	144	12.22±3.069	0.411	315	P=0.681>0.05
	Female	173	12.08±3.028			
Conciliatory	Male	144	14.72±2.960	0.365	315	P=0.716>0.05
	Female	173	14.62±2.087			
Coercive	Male	144	14.81±3.552	2.042	315	P=0.042<0.05*
	Female	173	14.08±2.827			
Negotiator	Male	144	17.67±3.492	-0.368	315	P=0.713>0.05
	Female	173	17.81±3.075			

*Significant difference at the level of 0.05

Table 4. Results of ANOVA for the Teacher Discipline Styles Inventory by the Age Variable

Parameter		N	Mean± Ss	Sd	F Value	Significance Level
Supportive	25 years and younger	32	16.88±1.809	3	0.633	P=0.594>0.05
	26-30 years	103	16.33±3.075			
	31-40 years	82	16.77±2.421			
	41 years and older	100	16.40±2.853			
	Total	317	16.52±2.733			
Abdicative	25 years and younger	32	11.75±1.918	3	1.856	P=0.137>0.05
	26-30 years	103	12.70±3.093			
	31-40 years	82	11.74±3.265			
	41 years and older	100	12.03±3.050			
	Total	317	12.15±3.043			
Conciliatory	25 years and younger	32	14.69±1.615	3	1.395	P=0.244>0.05
	26-30 years	103	15.05±2.290			
	31-40 years	82	14.32±2.779			
	41 years and older	100	14.55±2.724			
	Total	317	14.67±2.517			
Coercive	25 years and younger	32	14.00±2.436	3	0.522	P=0.668>0.05
	26-30 years	103	14.21±3.207			
	31-40 years	82	14.63±3.226			
	41 years and older	100	14.57±3.376			
	Total	317	14.41±3.193			
Negotiator	25 years and younger	32	18.13±2.904	3	0.877	P=0.453>0.05
	26-30 years	103	18.08±3.155			
	31-40 years	82	17.56±3.389			
	41 years and older	100	17.44±3.388			
	Total	317	17.75±3.267			

Table 5. Results of ANOVA for the Teacher Discipline Styles Inventory by the Seniority Variable

Parameter		N	Mean± Ss	Sd	F Value	Significance Level
Supportive	0-5 years	127	16.89±2.655	3	5.566	P=0.001<0.01*
	6-10 years	81	15.68±2.687			
	11-20 years	46	16.00±2.996			
	21 years and over	63	17.24±2.448			
	Total	317	16.52±2.733			
Abdicative	0-5 years	127	12.15±2.688	3	0.693	P=0.557>0.05
	6-10 years	81	12.51±4.032			
	11-20 years	46	11.96±2.011			
	21 years and over	63	11.81±2.878			
	Total	317	12.15±3.043			
Conciliatory	0-5 years	127	14.80±2.051	3	0.486	P=0.692>0.05
	6-10 years	81	14.73±2.898			
	11-20 years	46	14.30±2.624			
	21 years and over	63	14.57±2.787			
	Total	317	14.67±2.517			
Coercive	0-5 years	127	13.98±2.874	3	1.963	P=0.120>0.05
	6-10 years	81	14.57±3.532			
	11-20 years	46	15.26±3.073			
	21 years and over	63	14.48±3.355			
	Total	317	14.41±3.193			
Negotiator	0-5 years	127	18.12±3.171	3	1.663	P=0.175>0.05
	6-10 years	81	17.15±3.264			
	11-20 years	46	18.04±3.340			
	21 years and over	63	17.56±3.354			
	Total	317	17.75±3.267			

* Significant difference at the level of 0.01

Table 6. Results of T-Test for the Teacher Discipline Styles Inventory by the Graduation Variable

Parameter		N	Mean± Ss	T Value	Sd	Significance Level
Supportive	Bachelor's	259	16.64±2.644	1.608	315	P=0.109>0.05
	Master's	58	16.00±3.072			
Abdicative	Bachelor's	259	12.34±3.115	2.377	315	P=0.018<0.05*
	Master's	58	11.29±2.548			
Conciliatory	Bachelor's	259	14.87±2.651	3.136	315	P=0.002<0.01**
	Master's	58	13.74±1.505			
Coercive	Bachelor's	259	14.33±3.191	-1.002	315	P=0.317>0.05
	Master's	58	14.79±3.200			
Negotiator	Bachelor's	259	17.86±3.332	1.352	315	P=0.177>0.05
	Master's	58	17.22±2.926			

* Significant difference at the level of 0.05 ** Significant difference at the level of 0.01

Table 7. Results of T-Test for the Teacher Discipline Styles Inventory by the Type of Faculty Variable

Parameter		N	Mean± Ss	T Value	Sd	Significance Level
Supportive	Faculty of Education	162	16.74±2.912	1.469	315	P=0.143>0.05
	Other	155	16.29±2.523			
Abdicative	Faculty of Education	162	12.01±2.689	-.794	315	P=0.428>0.05
	Other	155	12.28±3.376			
Conciliatory	Faculty of Education	162	14.52±2.362	-1.064	315	P=0.288>0.05
	Other	155	14.82±2.669			
Coercive	Faculty of Education	162	14.39±3.295	-.139	315	P=0.890>0.05
	Other	155	14.44±3.092			
Negotiator	Faculty of Education	162	17.80±3.428	.305	315	P=0.760>0.05
	Other	155	17.69±3.099			

Table 8. Total Scores of the Classroom Management Approaches Scale and Arithmetic Mean and Standard Deviation Values of All Sub-dimensions

Sub-dimension	N	X ±SS
Autocratic	317	35.05±5.17
Democratic	317	44.87±5.93
Laissez-faire	317	24.47±5.48

Table 9. Results of T-Test for the Classroom Management Approaches Scale by the Gender Variable

Parameter		N	Mean± Ss	T Value	Sd	Significance Level
Autocratic	Male	144	34.10±5.657	-3.046	315	P=0.003<0.01*
	Female	173	35.85±4.586			
Democratic	Male	144	44.60±6.495	-0.730	315	P=0.466>0.05
	Female	173	45.09±5.419			
Laissez-faire	Male	144	25.49±5.904	3.053	315	P=0.002<0.01*
	Female	173	23.62±4.955			

* Significant difference at the level of 0.01

Table 10. Results of T-Test for the Classroom Management Approaches Scale by the Marital Status Variable

Parameter		N	Mean± Ss	T Value	Sd	Significance Level
Autocratic	Married	181	34.46±5.273	-2.361	315	P=0.019<0.05*
	Single	136	35.84±4.932			
Democratic	Married	181	44.70±5.901	-0.604	315	P=0.546>0.05
	Single	136	45.10±5.976			
Laissez-faire	Married	181	24.36±5.825	-0.395	315	P=0.693>0.05
	Single	136	24.61±4.994			

* Significant difference at the level of 0.05

Table 11. Results of ANOVA for the Classroom Management Approaches Scale by the Age Variable

	Parameter	N	Mean± Ss	Sd	F Value	Significance Level
Autocratic	25 years and younger	32	37.34±5.178	3	6.010	P=0.001<0.01*
	26-30 years	103	35.35±4.972			
	31-40 years	82	35.71±5.783			
	41 years and older	100	33.48±4.398			
	Total	317	35.05±5.167			
Democratic	25 years and younger	32	43.94±4.642	3	1.428	P=0.235>0.05
	26-30 years	103	45.39±5.872			
	31-40 years	82	45.52±6.229			
	41 years and older	100	44.10±6.051			
	Total	317	44.87±5.927			
Laissez-faire	25 years and younger	32	26.28±5.854	3	4.099	P=0.007<0.01*
	26-30 years	103	25.35±4.742			
	31-40 years	82	23.06±6.625			
	41 years and older	100	24.14±4.725			
	Total	317	24.47±5.477			

* Significant difference at the level of 0.01

Table 12. Results of ANOVA for the Classroom Management Approaches Scale by the Age Variable

	Parameter	N	Mean± Ss	Sd	F Value	Significance Level
Autocratic	0-5 years	127	35.72±5.191	3	7.839	P=0.000<0.01*
	6-10 years	81	36.06±5.512			
	11-20 years	46	35.09±4.961			
	21 years and over	63	32.38±3.837			
	Total	317	35.05±5.167			
Democratic	0-5 years	127	45.98±5.156	3	3.838	P=0.010<0.01*
	6-10 years	81	44.02±6.753			
	11-20 years	46	45.48±5.399			
	21 years and over	63	43.27±6.220			
	Total	317	44.87±5.927			
Laissez-faire	0-5 years	127	24.04±5.285	3	7.787	P=0.000<0.01*
	6-10 years	81	26.53±6.177			
	11-20 years	46	21.96±3.657			
	21 years and over	63	24.52±5.155			
	Total	317	24.47±5.477			

* Significant difference at the level of 0.01

Table 13. Results of T-Test for the Classroom Management Approaches Scale by the Type of Faculty Variable

Parameter		N	Mean± Ss	T Value	Sd	Significance Level
Autocratic	Faculty of Education	162	33.86±4.990	-4.305	315	P=0.000<0.01*
	Other	155	36.30±5.070			
Democratic	Faculty of Education	162	44.57±5.715	-0.930	315	P=0.353>0.05
	Other	155	45.19±6.144			
Laissez-faire	Faculty of Education	162	24.41±5.463	-0.208	315	P=0.836>0.05
	Other	155	24.54±5.508			

* Significant difference at the level of 0.01

Table 14. Results of T-Test for the Classroom Management Approaches Scale by the Classroom Size Variable

Parameter		N	Mean± Ss	T Value	Sd	Significance Level
Autocratic	30 students and under	56	33.79±4.842	-2.034	315	P=0.043<0.05*
	31-40 students	261	35.33±5.203			
Democratic	30 students and under	56	46.11±5.463	1.726	315	P=0.085>0.05
	31-40 students	261	44.61±5.999			
Laissez-faire	30 students and under	56	23.18±3.805	-1.953	315	P=0.052<0.05*
	31-40 students	261	24.75±5.741			

* Significant difference at the level of 0.01

As a result of the study, it was found that the teachers used conciliatory style at the highest rate, followed by supportive style, and they used abdicative style at the lowest rate.

When the participants' scores in the TDSI were evaluated according to the gender variable, there was a significant difference in favor of men in coercive style, but no significant difference was found in other sub-dimensions. It was observed that males had higher scores than females in coercive style.

Regarding the participants' scores in the TDSI according to the seniority variable, there was a significant difference between the arithmetic means of the groups in supportive style, but no significant difference was found in the other sub-dimensions. The difference was found between the ones with 6-10 years of seniority and the group with 0-5 years and 21 years and over of seniority. While those with 6-10 years of seniority had the lowest score, those with 21 years and over of seniority had the highest score. In the supportive style sub-dimension, it was seen that the teachers with 1-5 years and 6-10 years of seniority have a higher level of support compared to the ones with 11-15 years and 21 years and over of seniority.

When the participants' scores in the TDSI were evaluated in terms of the graduation variable, it was found that while there was a significant difference between the arithmetic means of the groups in favor of the ones with bachelor's degree in abdicative and conciliatory styles, there were no significant differences in other sub-dimensions. It was observed that the ones with bachelor's degree had higher scores in abdicative and conciliatory styles compared to the ones with master's degree.

In addition, it was found that the teachers adopted democratic approach at the highest rate in classroom management, followed by laissez-faire and autocratic approaches.

When the participants' scores in the CMAS were evaluated according to the gender variable, there was a significant difference between the arithmetic means of the groups in favor of females in the autocratic approach sub-dimension and in the favor of males in the laissez-faire approach sub-dimension.

It was found that females had higher scores in autocratic approach and males had higher scores in laissez-faire approach.

Regarding the teachers' scores in the CMAS in terms of the marital status variable, it was concluded that while there was a significant difference between the arithmetic means of the groups in favor of singles in the autocratic approach

sub-dimension, no significant difference was found in the democratic and laissez-faire approach sub-dimensions. It was observed that singles had higher autocratic approach scores than married ones.

In terms of the age variable, while there was a significant difference between the arithmetic means of the groups in the autocratic and laissez-faire approach sub-dimensions, there was no significant difference in the democratic sub-dimension. As a result of the Scheffe test to determine which groups differed regarding the autocratic and laissez-faire approach sub-dimensions by the age variable, there was a significant difference between the group with 41 years and older and the groups with 25 and younger and 31-40 years. It was observed that those in the group with 41 years or older had the lowest score in autocratic approach. Moreover, it was detected that there was a significant difference between the group with 31-40 years and the group with 30 years and younger in the laissez-faire approach sub-dimension, and those in the group with 31-40 years had the lowest score in the laissez-faire approach sub-dimension.

According to the seniority variable, a significant difference was found between the arithmetic means of the groups in the autocratic, democratic and laissez-faire approach sub-dimensions. As a result of the Scheffe test conducted to determine which groups differed regarding their scores in the autocratic, democratic and laissez-faire sub-dimensions by the seniority variable, it was found that there was a significant difference between those with 21 years and over of seniority and other groups in the autocratic approach sub-dimension and those with 21 years and over of seniority had the lowest score in the autocratic approach sub-dimension. In the democratic approach sub-dimension, it was concluded that there was a significant difference between those with 21 years and over of seniority and those with 0-5 years of seniority, and those with 21 years and over of seniority had the lowest score in the democratic approach sub-dimension. In the laissez-faire approach sub-dimension, it was found that there was a significant difference between those with seniority of 6-10 years and those with 0-5 years and 11-20 years of seniority. Those with 6-10 years of seniority had the lowest score in the laissez-faire approach sub-dimension.

In terms of the type of faculty variable, while there was a significant difference between the arithmetic means of the groups in favor of the graduates of other faculties, there was no significant difference in the democratic and laissez-faire approach sub-dimensions. Graduates of other faculties had higher scores in the autocratic approach sub-dimension.

Regarding the classroom size variable, it was observed that there were higher autocratic and laissez-faire approach scores in the classes with 31-40 students. There was no significant difference in the democratic approach sub-dimension.

A correlation analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between the participants' scores in the TDSI and the CMAS. Therefore, it was seen that supportive style had a positive significant relationship with abdicative, conciliatory, coercive and negotiator styles; no significant relationship with autocratic and laissez-faire management approaches; and a positive significant relationship with democratic approach. It was observed that abdicative style had a positive significant relationship with conciliatory, coercive, negotiator styles and laissez-faire approach; and no relationship with autocratic and democratic approaches. Besides, it was found that conciliatory style had a positive significant relationship with coercive and negotiator styles and democratic and laissez-faire approaches; and no significant relationship with autocratic approach. Finally, it was discovered that there was a positive significant relationship between autocratic approach and democratic and laissez-faire approaches, and there was a positive significant relationship between democratic approach and laissez-faire approach.

References

- Arıkan, R. (2004). *Research methods and report preparation*. Ankara: Asil Publishing.
- Aydoğdu, A. (2015). *Classroom Management Skills of Teaching Staff*. Master's Thesis, Harran University Graduate School of Social Sciences, Şanlıurfa.
- Başar, H. (2008). *Education and Classroom Management*. *Classroom Management* (Edt.: Ağağlu, E.) Eskişehir: Anadolu University.
- Brophy, J. (2006). History of research on classroom management. In C. M. Evertson & C. S. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues*, 17-43. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Celep, C. (2004). *Classroom Management and Discipline* (3rd edition). Ankara: Anı Publishing.
- Çerç, H. Y. (2009). *Discipline approaches of teachers serving in public schools*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Maltepe University Graduate School of Social Sciences, İstanbul.
- Emmer, E. T., & Sabornie, E. J. (Eds.) (2015). *Handbook of classroom management* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203074114>

- Erdoğan, İ. (2004). *Classroom Management*, 8th Edition, Sistem Publishing, İstanbul.
- Evertson, C. M., & Weinstein, C. S. (2006). Classroom management as a field of inquiry. In C. M. Evertson & C. S. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues*, 3-16. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gökçe, B. (1988). *Research in Social Sciences*. Ankara: Savaş Publishing.
- Hoşgörür, V. (2005). *Communication". Classroom Management*. (Edt. Z. Kaya). Ankara: PegemA Publishing.
- Ilgar, L. (2005). *Educational Administration School Management Classroom Management*. (3rd Edition). İstanbul: Beta Publishing.
- Kaptan, S. (1998). *Scientific Research Techniques and Statistical Methods*. 11th Edition, Ankara: Tekışık Web Ofset.
- Karasar, N. (2006). *Scientific Research Method*. Ankara: Nobel.
- Kaya, Z. (2011). *Creating a Positive Learning Environment. Classroom Management* (12th Edition) Ankara: PegemA Publishing.
- Lewis, T. J., Mitchell, B. S., Trussell, R., & Newcommer, L. (2015). In E. T. Emmer & E. J. Sabornie (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management* (2nd Ed.), 40-59. New York: Taylor and Francis Group.
- Marsh, H. W., & Roche, L. A. (2000). Effects of grading leniency and low workload on students' evaluation of teaching: Popular myth, bias, validity, or innocent bystanders? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 92, 202-228. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-0663.92.1.202>
- Nelsen, J., Lott, L., & Glenn, S. (2003). *Positive Discipline in Classroom* (Miyasa Koyuncu, Trans.) İstanbul: Hayat Publishing.
- Şimşek, Y. (2008). *"Teacher as Class and Group Leader" Classroom Management* (Edt: Ağaoğlu, E.) Eskişehir: Anadolu University Publishing.
- Taş, A. (2005). *Factors Affecting Classroom Management*. Effective Classroom Management. (Edt.: Hüseyin Kıran.) Ankara: Anı Publishing.
- Terzi, A. R. (2002). Effective Teacher Behaviors in terms of Classroom Management. Ankara: *National Education*. (155-156), 162-169.
- Terzi, Ç. (2001). *Identifying Teachers' Views on Classroom Management*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Anadolu University Graduate School of Educational Sciences, Eskişehir.
- Tomal, D. (1998). *A Five-Styles Teacher Discipline Model Reports-Research; Speeches/Meeting Papers* Chicago, Illinois.
- Türkmen, Ş. (2011). *Management Activities in Schools*, Ankara: Asil Publishing.
- Uğurlu, B. (2012). *Analysis of Public School Teachers' Personality Traits According to Demographic Variables*, Master's Thesis, Marmara University Graduate School of Educational Sciences Department of Educational Administration and Supervision.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the [Creative Commons Attribution license](#) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.