



Aslan, S. (2022). An analysis of the primary school teachers' classroom management styles in terms of some variables. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET)*, 9(2). 955-970.

Received : 07.01.2022
Revised version received : 20. 03.2022
Accepted : 25.03.2022

AN ANALYSIS OF THE PRIMARY SCHOOL TEACHERS' CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT STYLES IN TERMS OF SOME VARIABLES

Research article

Serkan Aslan 

Suleyman Demirel University

serkanaslan@sdu.edu.tr

Biodata:

Serkan Aslan has received his MA and PH degree from the field of Educational Sciences, Curriculum and Instruction. His research interests are curriculum, curriculum development, digital literacy, flipped classroom model, multicultural education, values education, program evaluation and qualitative research.

Copyright © 2014 by International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET). ISSN: 2148-225X.

Material published and so copyrighted may not be published elsewhere without written permission of IOJET.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE PRIMARY SCHOOL TEACHERS' CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT STYLES IN TERMS OF SOME VARIABLES

Serkan Aslan

serkanaslan@sdu.edu.tr

Abstract

This study aims at analyzing primary school teachers' classroom management styles in terms of some variables. The cross-sectional survey model, one of the survey types, was used in the current study. The target population of the study consisted of the primary school teachers working in Isparta. The sampling held a total of 515 primary school teachers who were selected by the stratified sampling method. This study deployed Classroom Management Styles Scale as a data collection tool. Descriptive statistics and multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) were used during data analysis. The findings indicated that primary school teachers had a high level of participation in authoritative and laissez free classroom management styles, and a medium level of participation in authoritarian and indifferent classroom management styles. The findings also revealed a significant difference across primary school teachers' authoritarian classroom management style in favor of male teachers and across authoritative style in favor of females. No significant difference was identified across teachers' classroom management styles in terms of their grade level to teach, seniority, school type, graduation faculty and educational status.

Keywords: Classroom, classroom management, classroom management styles, primary school teachers

1. Introduction

The classroom is considered as a common living space where teachers and students come together, services for education are produced, teaching is carried out and learning is made (Aydın, 2017: 246). Teachers perform activities in their classes to have students acquire various learning outcomes. While implementing these activities, teachers are expected to remark various issues such as time management, designing the teaching-learning process taking into account individual differences, using variables such as clues, feedback and corrections appropriate for the level, arranging the physical conditions of the classroom environment, preventing undesirable behaviors, using teaching materials appropriately, and ensuring student motivation. (Aslan, 2021). To achieve this, teachers need to handle a qualified classroom management.

Classroom management is the process of determining the classroom rules, providing a satisfactory classroom arrangement for education and effective time management as well as creating a positive classroom climate for the student (Çelik, 2012: 3). In another definition, classroom management is the term for all the processes that contribute to planning before the education, organizing the materials that will help students learn in the classroom, creating a positive learning environment by controlling the student behaviors in the classroom order with the rules, and dealing with improper teaching pacing (Aydın, 2017; Celep, 2020; Evertson & Weinstein, 2011; Robinson, 2020). Good and Brophy (2007) highlighted that classroom management is the process of creating and maintaining a suitable learning environment. Classroom management focuses on a teacher's ability to learn to learn in order to attract students' attention (Wolff, Jarodzka & Boshuizen, 2017). The main purpose of classroom management is not to control students; in contrast, an effective classroom management is to urge students to do activities individually and to manage themselves

through learning (Bailey, Jones, Jacob, Madden & Phillips 2012). In this vein, it is most likely to stress that the role of teachers is of great importance in classroom management. Teachers' effective classroom management will also make a great contribution to the acquisition of learning outcomes in the learning environment. Classroom management styles adopted by teachers also have an impact on creating an effective classroom environment as teachers design the teaching environment in accordance with their classroom management styles, which affects students' learning.

Classroom management styles are considered as teachers' communication with students and their behaviors in the classroom (Aktan & Sezer, 2018). The management style that the teacher, who plays an active role in classroom management, will implement in classroom management has an effect on student-teacher communication. Shindler pointed out that classroom management style preference is based upon attitude and pedagogical choices (cited in Sünbül & Teke, 2016). As teachers gain experience, they differ across the management styles they prefer, yet there may also be style differences when dealing with a certain subject (Bosworth, 1997). Bosworth (1997) grouped teachers' classroom management profiles into four categories. These are: Authoritarian class management style: Authoritative class management style: Laissez-faire class management style: Indifferent class management style:

The authoritarian classroom management style includes controls and limits of the teacher on the students (Bosworth, 1997). The teacher places certain rules for students. The teacher prefers strong discipline and expects obedience from the students. All power is in the hands of the teacher (Erdoğan, 2017). The student who does not obey the rules is sent to the disciplinary committee. The desks are usually in straight rows.

In the authoritative classroom management style, students are given autonomy within the framework of certain rules (Bosworth, 1997). Teachers place limits and rules on the students, but defend the student's autonomy. They explain the reasons behind the rules. They try to develop students' self-confidence by sharing responsibilities. When the student makes a mistake, they are politely warned. It is avoided to humiliate the student (Erdogan, 2017).

In the laissez-faire classroom management style, the relationship between the teacher and the student is at the forefront. Teachers place quite few demands and controls on students. The phrase "do your own thing" best describes this classroom. Teachers make an effort so as not to hurt the student's feelings. It is burdensome for the teacher to say "no" to the student and to apply the rules (Ekici, 2004).

In the indifferent classroom management style, teachers are not very involved in the classroom. They place certain demands on students and they are generally indifferent to their students. They don't want to force them. They often think that class preparation is not worth the effort. Trips and projects are out of question. They do not make the necessary preparation for the lesson. They can use the same course material year after year. Classroom discipline is lacking. They do not possess the necessary self-confidence and courage to discipline students (Aktan & Sezer, 2018).

As stated above, the classroom management styles adopted by teachers is a significant issue in the organization of the learning environment. The classroom management style adopted by the teachers affects their teaching method, technique, model and teaching materials, classroom arrangements, communication with the students, etc. in the teaching-learning process. Therefore, determining teachers' classroom management styles is a hot issue, so such a study is expected to fill the gap. It is of great importance to examine the classroom management styles adopted by primary school teachers, who have an effect on the students' entire educational life. Because primary school teachers are potential role models

for primary school students who are just starting school. Primary school teachers' communication with students and their behaviors towards them affect primary school students' learning, namely, their academic achievement. Various variables such as teachers' seniority, gender, grade level to teach, educational status, and the faculties they graduated from are known to have an impact on their classroom management styles. Upon analyzing the relevant literature, these variables were found to be effective on classroom management styles (Baysal & Altun, 2019; Canöz, Ünlü Uzunkol, 2019; Güneş & Buluç, 2018; Yalçın, 2020). Therefore, this study attempts to identify whether teachers' classroom management styles varied across these variables. Besides, a limited number of studies were conducted on this topic (Dönmez, 2015; Ünlü, 2020). This was considered as a shortcoming, and thus this study was carried out. The study is expected to be a feedback for primary school teachers, teacher training programs and other relevant institutions. The results of the study will also contribute to the primary school teachers in terms of making the students' learning permanent in the classroom and creating a positive classroom climate. This study will provide clues for the instructors working at teacher training institutions regarding the pre-service teachers' development of democratic classroom management styles. In addition, it will shed light upon the Ministry of National Education in terms of ensuring in-service training to improve primary school teachers' classroom management styles. This study aims to examine primary school teachers' classroom management styles in terms of several variables. In service of this aim, answers to the following questions were sought.

1. What are the primary school teachers' participation levels regarding their classroom management styles?

2. Do primary school teachers' classroom management styles significantly vary across their gender, seniority, grade level to teach, school type, graduation school and educational status?

2. Method

2.1. Model of the Research

This study employed a cross-sectional survey model, which is one of the survey types. Cross-sectional surveys are used to gather information about individuals' current attitudes, views, practices or beliefs. Data are collected from a sample drawn from a pre-specified population at one time only, although the time required is from one day to several weeks or more (Scott & Morrison, 2006). The present study used a cross-sectional survey model since the data on primary school teachers' classroom management styles were collected at a sitting.

2.2. Participants

The target population of the study consisted of the primary school teachers working in Isparta. The sample was chosen by the stratified sampling method. It is a sampling method in which subgroups are initially determined and then these subgroups are represented in the sample with their ratios in the population size (Büyüköztürk, Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz & Demirel, 2013). Within the scope of this study, public and private primary schools in Isparta were determined as a layer. 1603 primary school teachers work in Isparta. 64 of these teachers work in private primary schools and 1539 of them work in public primary schools. This study was conducted with 515 primary school teachers. All primary school teachers working at private schools were contacted, while 451 teachers working at official primary schools were reached. In this regard, it may be wise to mention that the layers reflect the population. Johnson and Christensen (2014) emphasized that if the population is 1,000,000, the sample will be 384 at the 95% confidence interval. Thus, the sample can be said to represent the population. Incompletely filled data collection tools were excluded from the

study before performing data analysis. Table 1 depicts demographic information regarding the participants.

Table 1. *Demographic information regarding the participants*

Gender	<i>f</i>	%
Female	261	51
Male	248	49
Grade Level to Teach		
1st grade	131	26
2nd grade	136	27
3rd grade	120	23
4th grade	122	24
Seniority		
Between 0-5 years	14	3
Between 6-10 years	42	8
Between 11-15 years	84	17
Between 16-20 years	59	12
21 years and over	310	60
School Type		
Public School	445	87
Private School	64	13
Graduation Faculty		
Faculty of Education	406	80
Other Faculties	103	20
Educational Status		
2+2 Undergraduate Degree Completion	94	19
Undergraduate	390	76
Postgraduate	25	5
Total	509	100

Considering the distribution of the teachers' demographic characteristics, 51% are female and 49% are male participants. Table 1 also show that primary school teachers are mostly second grade teachers (27%) whose seniority is 21 years or over (60%), who work in public schools (87%), who graduated from education faculty (80%) and who have a bachelor's degree (76%).

2.3. Data Collection Tools

This study deployed the classroom management styles scale developed by Bosworth (1997), the Turkish adaptation of which was done by Aktan and Sezer (2018). The scale was administered to 306 teachers and adapted to Turkish. The linguistic validity of the tool was checked with 55 senior English teaching pre-service teachers. The analysis results revealed that the linguistic validity correlation coefficient ranged between .68 and .91 (Aktan & Sezer, 2018). Exploratory factor analysis was performed during adaptation process. The analysis results suggested that the scale was grouped under four factors and consisted of 12 items. The explained variance of the scale was determined to be 66.68%, and the factor loads of the tool varied between .69 and .84 (Aktan & Sezer, 2018). The dimensions can be exemplified with such items: for the authoritarian " If a student is disruptive during class, I assign him or her to detention without further discussion.", for the authoritative " I am concerned about both what my students learn and how they learn.", and for the laissez faire " The emotional well-being of my students is more important than classroom control." and for the indifference " If a student turns in a late homework assignment, it is not my problem.". The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficients of the scale's factors differed between .68 and .86 (Aktan & Sezer, 2018). The researchers also examined confirmatory factor analysis while adapting the scale. As a result of the confirmatory factor analysis, the scale was found to have satisfactory fit indices. This study also analyzed the internal consistency coefficient regarding the factors. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient for the authoritarian factor was .89, the authoritative factor was .87, the laissez faire factor was .79, and the indifferent factor was .77. These results indicate that the obtained scores are reliable (Can, 2019). The responses were on the five-point Likert scale: "strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree and strongly agree"

2.4. Data Analysis

At first, the study examined univariate and multivariate normality. In this context, the extreme values were removed from the study and normality was guaranteed (Can, 2019). Descriptive statistics and multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) were used during data analysis. Some basic assumptions must be tested to use MANOVA. Univariate and multivariate normality must be ensured, the data must be at least in the interval scale, there must be no problem of multiple correlations between them, there must be no significant difference between the covariances of the dependent variables, the error variances of the dependent variables must be homogeneous, and each data should be independent from the other (Can, 2019; Green & Salkind, 2013; Pallant, 2005; Sezer, 2015). All these assumptions were met in this regard. The participation levels can be expressed as "low between 0.00 and 1.66", "medium between 1.67 and 3.32", and "high between 3.33 and 5.00".

2.5. Ethical Considerations

Quantative data was collected electronically and the lack of demographic information collection allowed for anonymity. The interview instrument and consent information were hosted on the researchers' personel computer and safeguarded by a password. Study's participation resulted in minimal risks to respondents. In this study, all rules stated to be followed within the scope of "Higher Education Institutions Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Directive" were followed. None of the actions stated under the title "Actions Against Scientific Research and Publication Ethics", which is the second part of the directive, were not taken. (Date: 13/02/2020, Number: 874329561050.991/87.4)

3.Results

The findings of the study were presented based on the research questions. At first, primary school teachers' classroom management styles levels were examined. The findings regarding whether the dimensions of primary school teachers' classroom management styles significantly differed across their gender, seniority, grade level to teach, graduation faculty and educational status are depicted in the relevant tables.

Table 2 displays the primary school teachers' participation levels regarding the dimensions of classroom management styles.

Table 2. Teachers' participation levels regarding classroom management styles

Variables	n	M	sd	Max	Min	Skewness	Kurtosis	Level
Authoritarian	509	2.96	.80	5.00	1.00	.140	.250	Medium
Authoritative	509	4.25	.60	5.00	2.33	-.544	-.274	High
Laissez-faire	509	3.35	.70	5.00	1.67	.248	-.009	High
Indifferent	509	2.43	.80	5.00	1.00	.796	1.098	Medium

Upon analyzing Table 2, primary school teachers were identified to have a "high" participation level regarding the authoritative ($M=4.25$) and laissez-faire ($M=3.35$) dimensions of the classroom management styles, while a "medium" participation level related to authoritarian ($M=3.28$) and indifferent ($M=2.43$) dimensions. Primary school teachers were found to mostly have authoritative classroom management style.

Table 3 presents one-factor MANOVA results related to whether the dimensions of primary school teachers' classroom management styles significantly varied across their gender.

Table 3. One-factor MANOVA results concerning gender

Dependent Variables	Gender	n	M	sd	df	F	p	η^2
Authoritarian	Female	261	2.87	.76	1-507	7.32	.00*	.01
	Male	248	3.06	.84				
Authoritative	Female	261	4.32	.57	1-507	6.86	.00*	.01
	Male	248	4.18	.63				
Laissez-faire	Female	261	3.33	.68	1-507	.53	.46	.00
	Male	248	3.37	.72				
Indifferent	Female	261	2.37	.78	1-507	2.76	.09	.00
	Male	248	2.49	.81				

*p<.05

MANOVA was conducted to determine whether the dimensions of the primary school teachers' classroom management styles significantly varied across their gender. There were no violations regarding the assumptions of the MANOVA analysis. One of the basic assumptions of MANOVA analysis is the homogeneity of the diffusion matrix according to Box's M statistics. The analysis result suggested that this assumption was met ($F_{10-1221649,794}=1.059$, $p=.391$). A statistically significant difference was determined across the dimensions of the classroom management styles in terms of gender (Wilk's $\Lambda=.966$, $F_{(1, 507)}=4.38$, $p<.05$, partial eta square $=.034$). As is observed in Table 3, a significant difference was identified across the dimension of authoritarian style in favor of male teachers ($F_{1-507}=7.32$, $p<.05$) and across the dimension of authoritative style in favor of female teachers ($F_{1-507}=6.86$, $p<.05$); whereas no significant difference was identified across the dimensions of laissez-faire ($F_{1-507}=.53$, $p<.05$) and indifferent ($F_{1-507}=2.76$, $p<.05$) in terms of gender. In addition, a low-level interaction was found between gender and the dimensions of the classroom management styles scale (Green & Salkind, 2013).

One-factor MANOVA results regarding whether the dimensions of primary school teachers' classroom management styles significantly varied across their seniority were demonstrated in Table 4.

Table 4. *One-factor MANOVA results concerning seniority*

Dependent Variables	Seniority	n	M	sd	df	F	p	η^2
Authoritarian	Btw. 0-5 years	14	2.97	.96	4-504	2.15	.07	.01
	Btw. 6-10 years	42	2.73	.64				
	Btw. 11-15 years	84	3.00	.72				
	Btw. 16-20 years	59	2.77	.86				
	21 years and over	310	3.02	.82				
Authoritative	Btw. 0-5 years	14	4.26	.66	4-504	.07	.98	.00
	Btw. 6-10 years	42	4.28	.56				
	Btw. 11-15 years	84	4.26	.61				
	Btw. 16-20 years	59	4.28	.62				
	21 years and over	310	4.24	.60				
Laissez-faire	Btw. 0-5 years	14	3.35	1.13	4-504	.23	.92	.00
	Btw. 6-10 years	42	3.25	.61				
	Btw. 11-15 years	84	3.36	.69				
	Btw. 16-20 years	59	3.36	.64				
	21 years	310	3.36	.71				

Indifferent	and over							
	Btw. 0-5 years	14	2.40	.88				
	Btw. 6-10 years	42	2.41	.78				
	Btw. 11-15 years	84	2.48	.83	4-504	.16	.95	.00
	Btw. 16-20 years	59	2.37	.71				
	21 years and over	310	2.43	.80				

MANOVA was used to confirm whether the dimensions of the classroom management styles scale, which is the dependent variable, significantly differed across primary school teachers' seniority. No violations were encountered regarding the assumptions of the MANOVA analysis. One of the basic assumptions of MANOVA analysis is the homogeneity of the diffusion matrix according to Box's M statistics. The analysis result suggested that this assumption was unmet ($F_{40-14054,459}=1.407$, $p=.046$). Akbulut (2011) suggests that if this assumption is unmet, the results of the Pillai's Trace test must be examined. Since this assumption was not met, the result of the Pillai's Trace test was examined in the present study. The MANOVA analysis results revealed that the dimensions of primary school teachers' classroom management styles were free from a significant difference in terms of their seniority (Pillai's Trace=.022, $F_{(4, 504)}=7.02$, $p>.05$, partial eta square =.006).

Table 5 shows one-factor MANOVA results related to whether the dimensions of primary school teachers' classroom management styles significantly varied across their grade level to teach.

Table 5. *One-factor MANOVA results concerning grade level to teach*

Dependent Variables	Grade Level	n	M	sd	df	F	p	η^2
Authoritarian	1st grade	131	2.96	.83	3-505	.82	.47	.00
	2nd grade	136	2.92	.76				
	3rd grade	120	2.92	.80				
	4th grade	122	3.06	.83				
Authoritative	1st grade	131	4.25	.63	3-505	.34	.79	.00
	2nd grade	136	4.29	.60				
	3rd grade	120	4.21	.59				
	4th grade	122	4.25	.60				
Laissez-faire	1st grade	131	3.31	.72	3-505	.43	.73	.00
	2nd grade	136	3.32	.68				
	3rd grade	120	3.38	.70				
	4th grade	122	3.39	.70				
Indifferent	1st grade	131	2.40	.86	3-505	.34	.79	.00
	2nd grade	136	2.39	.73				
	3rd grade	120	2.49	.78				
	4th grade	122	2.43	.81				

MANOVA was used to identify if the dimensions of primary school teachers' classroom management styles significantly differed across their grade level. No violations were encountered regarding the assumptions of the MANOVA analysis. One of the basic assumptions of MANOVA analysis is the homogeneity of the diffusion matrix according to Box's M statistics. The analysis result showed that this assumption was met ($F_{30-688234,279}=1.223$, $p=.187$). As a result of MANOVA, no significant difference was found across the dimensions of primary school teachers' classroom management styles in terms of the grade level to teach (Wilk's $\Lambda=.987$, $F_{(3, 505)}=.556$, $p>.05$, partial eta square $=.004$).

One-factor MANOVA results regarding whether the dimensions of primary school teachers' classroom management styles significantly differed across their school type were demonstrated in Table 6.

Table 6. *One-factor MANOVA results concerning school type*

Dependent Variables	School Type	n	M	sd	df	F	p	η^2
Authoritarian	Public School	445	2.96	.81	1-507	.10	.75	.00
	Private School	64	3.00	.73				
Authoritative	Public School	445	4.25	.59	1-507	.57	.44	.00
	Private School	64	4.31	.71				
Laissez-faire	Public School	445	3.36	.70	1-507	1.29	.25	.00
	Private School	64	3.26	.70				
Indifferent	Public School	445	2.45	.82	1-507	1.96	.16	.00
	Private School	64	2.30	.61				

MANOVA was used to identify whether the dimensions of the classroom management styles scale, which is the dependent variable, significantly differed across primary school teachers' school type. No violations were encountered regarding the assumptions of the MANOVA analysis. One of the basic assumptions of MANOVA analysis is the homogeneity of the diffusion matrix according to Box's M statistics. The analysis result suggested that this assumption was unmet ($F_{10-53722,926}=2.306$, $p=.011$). Therefore, the results of the Pillai's Trace test was examined. The MANOVA analysis results revealed that the dimensions of primary school teachers' classroom management styles significantly differed in terms of their school type (Pillai's Trace $=.009$, $F_{(1, 507)}=1.08$, $p>.05$, partial eta square $=.009$).

Table 7 displays one-factor MANOVA results related to whether the dimensions of primary school teachers' classroom management styles significantly varied across their graduation faculty.

Table 7. *One-factor MANOVA results concerning graduation faculty*

Dependent Variables	Faculty	n	M	sd	df	F	p	η^2
Authoritarian	Faculty of Education	406	2.99	.81	1-507	1.26	.26	.00
	Other Faculties	103	2.89	.79				
Authoritative	Faculty of Education	406	4.25	.61	1-507	.00	.95	.00
	Other Faculties	103	4.25	.57				
Laissez-faire	Faculty of Education	406	3.36	.71	1-507	.73	.39	.00
	Other Faculties	103	3.30	.66				
Indifferent	Faculty of Education	406	2.46	.83	1-507	3.02	.08	.00
	Other Faculties	103	2.31	.63				

MANOVA was used to confirm whether the dimensions of the classroom management styles scale, which is the dependent variable, significantly varied across primary school teachers' graduation faculty. No violations were encountered regarding the assumptions of the MANOVA analysis. One of the basic assumptions of MANOVA analysis is the homogeneity of the diffusion matrix according to Box's M statistics. The analysis result suggested that this assumption was met ($F_{10-155874.112}=1.689$, $p=.077$). As a result of MANOVA, no significant difference was determined across the dimensions of primary school teachers' classroom management styles in terms of their graduation faculty (Wilk's $\Lambda=.993$, $F_{(1, 507)}=.866$, $p>.05$, partial eta square =.007).

One-factor MANOVA results regarding whether the dimensions of primary school teachers' classroom management styles significantly varied across their educational status were presented in Table 8.

Table 8 . *One-factor MANOVA results concerning educational status*

Dependent Variables	Educational Status	n	M	sd	df	F	p	η^2
Authoritarian	2+2 Undergraduate Degree Completion	94	2.94	.79	2-506	.84	.42	.00
	Undergraduate	390	2.96	.80				
	Postgraduate	25	3.17	.86				
Authoritative	2+2 Undergraduate Degree Completion	94	4.28	.61	2-506	.47	.62	.00
	Undergraduate	390	4.24	.61				
	Postgraduate	25	4.36	.52				
Laissez-faire	2+2 Undergraduate Degree Completion	94	3.35	.67	2-506	.61	.54	.00
	Undergraduate	390	3.34	.71				
	Postgraduate	25	3.50	.66				
Indifferent	2+2 Undergraduate Degree Completion	94	2.43	.79	2-506	1.58	.20	.00
	Undergraduate	390	2.41	.81				
	Postgraduate	25	2.70	.60				

MANOVA was used to verify whether the dimensions of the classroom management styles scale, which is the dependent variable, significantly differed across primary school teachers' educational status. No violations were encountered regarding the assumptions of the MANOVA analysis. One of the basic assumptions of MANOVA analysis is the homogeneity of the diffusion matrix according to Box's M statistics. The analysis result suggested that this assumption was met ($F_{20-16440.385}=.781$, $p=.740$). As a result of MANOVA, no significant difference was identified across the dimensions of primary school teachers' classroom management styles in terms of their educational status (Wilk's $\Lambda=.991$, $F_{(2, 506)}=.60$, $p>.05$, partial eta square =.005).

5. Discussion and Conclusions

The results suggested that primary school teachers had a high level of participation in authoritative and laissez-faire classroom management styles, while their participation was at a medium level regarding in authoritarian and indifferent classroom management styles. This paved the way for the fact that primary school teachers mostly adopted more authoritative and laissez-faire classroom management styles. The classroom management styles adopted by the teachers were authoritative, laissez-faire, authoritarian and indifferent, respectively. That the authoritative classroom management style was adopted more by the teachers, particularly in the first place, is a significant result of the study as curricula have been developed based upon the constructivist approach since the 2005 academic year in Turkey. While organizing the classroom environment with this approach, it is remarkable that teachers be laissez-faire in the classroom environment (Teyfur, 2014). Therefore, that teachers adopted more laissez-faire classroom management styles was an expected result. However, this study revealed the opposite of this expected situation. The fact that primary school teachers adopted a more authoritative classroom management style is an indication that they guide students in the teaching-learning process, they provide them with necessary feedback in the learning environment and autonomy within the framework of the rules, and they avoid humiliating them (Aktan & Sezer, 2018; Bosworth, 1997; Ekici, 2004; Erdoğan, 2017). Ünlü (2020) concluded that teachers mostly adopted the authoritative classroom management style, which is consistent with that of this study.

A significant difference was identified across the primary school teachers' classroom management styles in terms of their gender. The analysis results outlined a significant difference in terms of authoritarian classroom management style in favor of male teachers, and in favor of female teachers in terms of authoritative classroom management style. It is mostly likely that male teachers exert pressure on students by acting more authoritatively in the classroom environment and have a strict understanding of discipline (Bosworth, 1997). On the other, female teachers give students autonomy in the classroom environment and provide the opportunity to act within the framework of certain rules (Erdoğan, 2017). The adoption of an authoritative classroom management style by female teachers is a predictable situation since women act with maternal instinct. Likewise, Dönmez (2015) noted that female teachers mostly adopted an authoritative classroom management style because they act with the sense of motherhood. During my teaching years, I personally observed that female teachers had an authoritative classroom management style in the classroom environment. The relevant literature includes research results that are parallel or opposite to the result of this study. In the studies conducted by Ekici (2004), Çiftçi, (2015) and Dönmez (2015), a significant difference was found in terms of authoritative classroom management style in favor of female teachers. These results are consistent with those of this study. On the contrary, in the studies conducted by Sezer, Aktan, Tezci, and Erdener, (2017), Ünlü (2020), and Yılmaz (2011), no significant difference was found between the teachers' classroom management styles in terms of their gender. These results were in contrary to that of the present study. This may be due to the fact that the study was conducted in a different city and the data were collected with different data collection tools.

The results depicted no significant difference across the primary school teachers' classroom management styles in terms of their grade level to teach, seniority, school type, graduation faculty and educational status, meaning that teachers' classroom management styles are similar in terms of their grade level to teach, seniority, school type, graduation faculty, and educational status. This is a pivotal result of our study. It was thought that there would be a significant difference between teachers' classroom management styles, especially in terms of their seniority, school type, graduation faculty and educational status. Because it

is widely known that teachers adopt the essentialist education philosophy as their seniority increases (Aslan, 2017). Teachers who adopt the essentialist education philosophy have a strict understanding of discipline in the teaching environment (Sönmez, 2019). Therefore, it was expected that a significant difference across authoritarian classroom management style would be obtained in favor of teachers with high years of seniority. It was also expected that there would be a significant difference across the teachers' laissez-faire and authoritative classroom management styles in favor of those working at private schools. Teachers working at private schools mostly work on a contract basis. School administrators have the authority to terminate teachers' employment contracts. Therefore, these teachers organize the classroom environment in a more democratic way in order to satisfy students and their parents. In this regard, it was expected that laissez-faire and authoritative classroom management styles would significantly differ. Likewise, it was also predicted that there would be a significant difference in terms of laissez-faire classroom management style in favor of teachers who graduated from the faculty of education and those having postgraduate degree. Because it was thought that teachers who were graduates of education faculties and postgraduate education were more knowledgeable about classroom management styles and organized a laissez-faire classroom environment based upon the constructivist approach. The opposite results were obtained in this study. In the studies conducted by Ünlü (2020) and Çiftçi (2015), no significant difference was identified across the teachers' classroom management styles in terms of the graduation faculty and their seniority. These results are in line with that of this study. Ekici (2004), Çiftçi (2015) and Dönmez (2015) found a significant difference between teachers' seniority and their classroom management styles.

6. Suggestions

Based upon the findings, various recommendations were provided.

1. The results revealed that the primary school teachers mostly adopted the authoritative classroom management style. In Turkey, curricula have been developed based upon the constructivist approach. There must be a democratic classroom environment in order for these curricula to be implemented effectively. Therefore, it would be beneficial to provide teachers with in-service training on classroom management styles.
2. It is recommended to conduct studies through using different data collection tools such as interviews and observations, and different models and patterns such as case studies, mixed research, and phenomenological studies with a view to determining primary school teachers' classroom management styles.
3. Studies may be conducted to compare the classroom management styles of primary school teachers and those from different branches.

References

- Akbulut, Y. (2011). *Sosyal bilimlerde SPSS uygulamaları*. İdeal Yayıncılık.
- Aktan, S., & Sezer, F. (2018). Sınıf yönetimi stilleri ölçeği'nin psikometrik özelliklerinin incelenmesi. *Kastamonu Education Journal*, 26(2), 439-449. <https://doi.org/10.24106/kefdergi.389803>
- Aslan, S. (2017). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin eğitim inançlarının çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 25(4), 1453-1468.
- Aslan, S. (2021). Sınıf içi disiplin modelleri. S. Karabatak, M. Alanoglu & S. Atik (Ed.). *Yeni nesil sınıflar ve yönetimi*. Anı Yayıncılık.
- Baysal, A., & Altun, H. (2019). Öğretmenlerin sınıf yönetim stilleri ile sınıf kontrol düzeylerinin bazı değişkenlere göre incelenmesi. *Turkish International Journal of Special Education and Guidance & Counseling*, 8(1), 28-45.
- Aydın, A. (2017). *Sınıf yönetimi*. Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Bailey, R., Jones, S.M., Jacob, R., Madden, N., & Phillips, D. (2012). *Social, emotional, and cognitive understanding and regulation in education (SECURE): Preschool program manual and curricula*. Harvard University.
- Bosworth, B. (1997). What is your classroom management profile? *Teacher Talk-A Publication for Secondary Education Teachers*, 1(2). Retrieved Date: 15.05.2021. <http://protectiveschools.org/drugstats/tt/v1i2/table.html>.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E. K., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2013). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Can, A. (2019). *SPSS ile nicel veri analizi*. Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Canöz, T., Ünlü, İ., & Uzunkol, E. (2019). İlkokul öğretmenlerinin mesleki motivasyon düzeyleri ve sınıf yönetimi stillerinin incelenmesi. *Temel Eğitim Dergisi*, 1(2), 40-56.
- Celep, C. (2020). *Sınıf yönetiminde kuram ve uygulama*. Nobel Yayıncılık.
- Çelik, V. (2012). *Sınıf yönetimi*. Nobel Yayıncılık.
- Çiftçi, A.S. (2015). *İlkokul öğretmenlerinin sınıf yönetim tarzları ve demokratik değerlere ilişkin görüşleri arasındaki ilişki*. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Çanakkale.
- Dönmez, T. (2015). *İlkokul sınıf öğretmenlerinin sınıf yönetimi profilleri ile çocuk haklarına yönelik tutumları arasındaki ilişki*. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Gazi University, Ankara.
- Ekici, G. (2004). İlköğretim 1. kademe öğretmenlerinin sınıf yönetimi profillerinin değerlendirilmesi. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 131(29), 50-60.
- Erdoğan, İ. (2017). *Sınıf yönetimi*. Alfa Basım Yayım Dağıtım.
- Evertson, C.M., & Weinstein, C.S. (2011). *Handbook of classroom management research, practice and contemporary issues*. Taylor & Francis.
- Good, T. L., & Brophy, J. E. (2007). *Looking in classrooms*. Pearson.
- Green, S.B., & Salkind, N.J. (2013). *Using spss for windows and macintosh: analyzing and understanding data*. Pearson.

- Güneş, A.M., & Buluç, B. (2018). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin sınıf yönetim becerileri ve teknoloji kullanımları arasındaki ilişki. *Necatibey Eğitim Fakültesi Elektronik Fen ve Matematik Eğitimi Dergisi*, 12(2), 739-771. <https://doi.org/10.17522/balikesirnef.506518>
- Johnson, B.R., & Christensen, L.B. (2014). *Educational research: quantitative, qualitative and mixed approaches*. SAGE.
- Pallant, J. (2005). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using spss for windows*. Australian Copyright.
- Robinson, T. (2020). Improving classroom management issues by building connections with families. *General Music Today*, 33(3), 36 –39. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1048371319880877>
- Scott, D., & Morrison, M. (2006). *Key ideas in educational research*. Continuum.
- Seçer, İ. (2015). *SPSS ve Lisrel ile pratik veri analizi: Analiz ve raporlaştırma*. Anı Yayıncılık.
- Sezer, F., Aktan, S., Tezci, E., & Erdener, M. A. (2017). Öğretmenlerin yaşam stilleri ve sınıf yönetim profillerinin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Turkish Studies*, 12(33), 167-184. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.12680>
- Sönmez, V. (2019). *Eğitim felsefesi*. Anı Yayıncılık.
- Sünbül, M., & Teke, A. (2016). Sınıf yönetimine yaklaşımların sınıflandırılması ve öğretim stilleri sürecinin yükseltilmesi. A. Arı (Ed.). *Dönüştürücü sınıf yönetimi* içinde (ss. 149-171). Eğitim Yayınevi.
- Teyfur, M. (2014). Yapılandırmacı sınıf yönetiminde okul-aile işbirliği. M. Çelikten & M. Teyfur (Ed.). *Yapılandırmacı yaklaşıma göre sınıf yönetimi* içinde (ss. 25-44). Anı Yayıncılık.
- Ünlü, İ. (2020). *Sınıf öğretmenlerinin düşünme stilleri ile sınıf yönetim stilleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Sakarya University, Sakarya.
- Wolff, C.E., Jarodzka, H., & Boshuizen, H.P. (2017). See and tell: Difference between expert and novice teachers' interpretations of problematic classroom management events. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 66, 295-308. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.04.015>
- Yalçın, B.Y. (2020). *Sınıf öğretmenlerinin benimsedikleri sınıf yönetimi stilleri ile olumlu sınıf iklimi oluşturma yeterlikleri arasındaki ilişki*. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Sabahattin Zaim University, İstanbul.