

*Full Length Research Paper*

# An investigation of the class management profiles of students of physical education and sports teaching departments

Hacer Özge Baydar<sup>1\*</sup>, Muhsin Hazar<sup>1</sup>, Ozer Yildiz<sup>2</sup>, Mehtap Yildiz<sup>2</sup>, Emre Ozan Tingaz<sup>1</sup> and Belgin Gökyürek<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Sports Sciences Faculty, Gazi University, Turkey.

<sup>2</sup>Physical Education and Sports Department, Mustafa Kemal University Turkey.

Received 25 April, 2016; Accepted 19 October, 2016

The objective of this research is to examine and analyze the class management profiles of 3rd and 4th grade students of Physical Education and Sports Teaching Departments of universities in Turkey based on gender, grade level and university. The research population comprised 375 students (170 females and 205 males) of Physical Education and Sports Teaching departments in Gazi University, Abant İzzet Baysal University, Kocaeli University, Sakarya University, and Anadolu University. The “Class Management Profile Scale (CMPS)”, which was developed by Kris (1996) and adapted into Turkish by Ekici, was used as the data collection tool. In the data analysis, the T test and One-Way analysis of variance were performed on the independent groups for determining whether or not the scale in general and its sub-dimensions showed any significant difference according to gender, class level, and the university. According to the results of the research, it was determined that the average of the idle class management profiles of the male students proved to be significantly higher than those of the female students, and that 3rd grade students had a more authoritative class management profile than 4th grade students.

**Key words:** Class management, Class management profile, physical education and Sports Teaching.

## INTRODUCTION

The investment made on information as well as acquiring it is one of the prerequisites for the transition to a knowledge-based society. For this reason, in order for nations to be able to turn into knowledge-based (information) societies, they need to make investments on information and human resources and to improve particularly educational institutions as soon as possible.

The success of education will only be assessed by the power of being able to raise the individuals that are capable of competing in the international arena. Hence, to raise individuals who fit into the worldly standards and who are capable of existing within the global arena can be possible with the development of all the educational institutions, starting from primary school to higher

\*Corresponding author. E-mail: ozgebydr@hotmail.com.

education level (Ercoşkun, 2011). In this context, it is of great importance to make school environments appropriate for today's conditions.

One of the most important factors that affect education within the school environment is the class management profile of the teacher. The teacher, along with the class management profiles he/she exhibits and practices within the classroom, wishes to create behavioral changes in his/her students and tries to provide an adequate level of motivation in them, as well. The behavioral patterns exhibited by teachers in the process of communication shape their class management profiles (Aluçdibi and Ekici, 2012). Class management involves educational program and planning, creating a suitable atmosphere for learning in the classroom, physical arrangements, the flow of the teaching and educational process as well as time management, organizing relationships within the classroom environment within the framework of certain rules, providing an effective coordination between the instructor and the student, and ensuring students' motivation (Saritaş, 2003). In other words, class management ensures the participation of all the students for an effective teaching and education as well as allowing the learning process to take place on a high-quality level and creating environments that promote the learning process (Weinstein, 1996). Since it is the teacher him/herself who is responsible for organizing and conducting the educational processes necessary for an effective class management, the most strategic variable, in this case, is the teacher. Therefore, a teacher is supposed to provide the physical and psychological environment and atmosphere necessary for class education (Aydın, 2004).

Since the objective of all learning activities carried out within classroom environment is to enable students to learn effectively, the teacher should have a positive influence on the students with the behaviors he/she exhibits within the classroom. Leaving positive impressions on the students will be possible through a positive communicative process established between the teacher and his/her students (Ekici, 2004). An effective communication is important for the development of a mutual respect in class management. The more the students have a harmonious communication with their teachers within the classroom, the more they will get motivated during the learning process (Brown, 2005). Within this context, today's teachers must have the skills to be able to exhibit a good management so as to become successful in class management (Glasser, 1999). In this research, the class management profiles of the students were dealt in four dimensions: Authoritative, Appreciated, Idle, and Unconcerned Profiles. According to Kris (1996), in the Authoritative Class Management Profile, the teacher's control and restrictions over the students become prominent, through which the teacher's authority over the classroom is clearly observed. In the

Appreciated Class Management Profile, the teacher's control and restrictions over the students are based on sensible reasons, and the student is encouraged independently and by him/herself. In the Idle Class Management Profile; however, the teacher fails to have control over the students and prefers to stay as a viewer/watcher. On the other hand, in the Unconcerned Class Management Profile, the teacher acts rather insensitively towards the students and never engages in the class (Ekici, 2004).

When the studies conducted as to how an efficient educational process should be reviewed, it was ascertained that an effective class management skill was the most important factor that determined the educational success (Erden, 2001). In line with the targets and acquisitions determined as parts of the educational system, the teachers who take the responsibility for creating the desired behaviors in individuals have quite significant tasks. The elements regarding the increase or decrease in students' academic success, which stem from teachers in particular, are among the major issues mentioned in the studies carried out in the field of teaching and education. Within this context, determining what sort of class management profiles the teacher candidates have should not be ignored, either. Thus, this research is thought to make a contribution to this field. The objective of this study is to determine the class management profiles of the students of the department of physical education and sports teaching based on variables such as gender, class level and the university they attend.

## METHODS

Survey Research Method was used in this study. The Survey Research Method aims to determine the certain traits/characteristics of a given group (Büyükoztürk et al., 2013).

### Research population

The research population consisted of a total of 375 participants in the Departments of Physical Education and Sports Teaching Departments of Abant İzzet Baysal University (n = 43; 11.5%), Anadolu University (n=50; 13.3%), Gazi University (n=102; 27.2%), Kocaeli University (n =73; 19.5%), and Sakarya University (n = 107; 28.5%) in 2015 to 2016 academic year. 54.7% of the students who participated in the study were males (n= 205), whereas 45.3% of them were females (n =170). When the distribution of the participants according to classes was examined, 41.6% of them were in 3rd Grade, while 54.7% of them were in 4th Grade. On the other hand, when the distribution of their ages was examined, it was observed that 48.3% (n = 181) of the individuals were aged between 20 to 22, while 33.6% of them (n = 126) were aged between 23 to 25, and 18.1% of them (n = 68) were over 24.

### Data collection tools

In the research, a personal information form consisting of 4 items,

which aimed to determine the personal information of the students in question, and also the "Class Management Profile Scale (CMPS)", which was developed by Kris (1996) and adapted into Turkish by Ekici (2004), were used. The data were collected directly from students after an interview. Personal information form included data on the age, gender, grade level and university name. The scale arranged in a total of 12 items for four types of class management profiles allows for a personal evaluation. There are a total of 3 items each for class management profile. The participants can mark each item by rating them between 1 and 5. Accordingly, the highest score that the participants can get from each class management profile group is 15, while the lowest score to be obtained is 3. Since CMPS in general consists of 12 items, the highest score to be obtained is 60, whereas the lowest score can be 12. The scale has 4 different class management profiles. Authoritative Class Management Profile, Appreciated Class Management Profile, Idle Class Management Profile and Unconcerned Class Management Profile.

In the scale arranged as a five-point Likert scale, the items are graded as "I absolutely agree" (5 points), "I agree" (4 points), "I amhesitant" (3 points), "I disagree" (2 points), and "I absolutely disagree" (1 point). While the Cronbach's Alpha reliability value of CMPS in general was calculated as 0.87, it was calculated as 0.82 for the Authoritative Class Management Profile (1st, 3rd, 9th items), 0.80 for the Appreciated Class Management Profile (4th, 8th, 11th items), .84, for the Idle Class Management Profile (6th, 10th, 12th items); and 0.78 for the Unconcerned Class Management Profile (2nd, 5th, 7th items). To determine the reliability level of the class management scale used in the research, the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was calculated as 79.4%.

#### Data analysis

For the purpose of determining whether or not CMPS in general and its sub-dimensions showed any significant difference according to gender, class level and the universities attended, the SPSS program was used, and the T-test and One-Way Analysis of Variance were performed in independent groups.

## FINDINGS

The distribution of the answers given to the questions in each item of CMPS is given in Table 1. When Table 2 is examined; for all of the participants, the mean of Authoritative Class Management Profile is  $x=10.54$ ; the mean of Appreciated Class Management Profile is  $x=11.73$ ; whereas the mean of Idle Class Management Profile is  $x=10.62$ ; and the mean of Unconcerned Class Management Profile is 9.35. The mean CMPS General Score, on the other hand, is  $x=42.24$ .

#### The Comparison between the class management profile scale and Its Sub-Dimensions according to gender

The T test results are given in Table 3 in the independent groups, performed to determine the averages of CMPS and its sub-dimensions according to gender and also to find out whether the difference between these averages

was significant or not. According to the results in Table 3, the average of the male individuals for the sub-dimension of the Authoritative Class Management Profile is  $x=10.58$ , whereas the average for the female ones is  $x=10.49$ . There is no significant difference between male and female students in terms of the Authoritative Class Management Profile ( $t(372)=0.435$ ;  $p<0.05$ ). The average of the male individuals for the sub-dimension of the Appreciated Class Management Profile is  $x=11.87$ , whereas the average for the female ones is  $x=11.56$ . There is no significant difference between male and female students in terms of the Appreciated Class Management Profile ( $t(372)=1.43$ ;  $p<0.05$ ). On the other hand, the average of the male individuals for the sub-dimension of the Idle Class Management Profile is  $x=10.81$ ; whereas the average for the female ones is  $x=10.38$ . There is a significant difference between male and female students in terms of Idle Class Management Profile ( $t(372)=1.979$ ;  $p<0.05$ ). The mean of Idle Class Management Profile of the male students is significantly higher than that of the female ones ( $p<0.05$ ). The average of the male individuals for the sub-dimension of the Unconcerned Class Management Profile; however, is  $x=9.30$ ; whereas the average for the female ones is  $x=9.40$ . There is no significant difference between male and female students in terms of the Unconcerned Class Management Profile ( $t(372)=0.427$ ;  $p<0.05$ ). When CMPS general score is examined, the average of the male students is  $x=42.55$ ; whereas the average of the female students is  $x=41.83$ . There is no significant difference between male and female students in terms of the general score of the Class Management Profile Inventory ( $t(372)=1.22$ ;  $p<0.05$ ).

#### The comparison between the class management profile scale and its sub-dimensions according to class level

The T test results are given in Table 4 for the independent groups. The tests were performed to determine the averages of CMPS and its sub-dimensions according to class level and also to find out whether the difference between these averages was significant or not. According to the results in Table 4, the average of the 3rd Grade students for the sub-dimension of the Authoritative Class Management Profile is  $x=10.90$ ; whereas the average of the 4th Grade students is  $x=10.25$ . There is a significant difference ( $p<0.05$ ) between 3rd Grade and 4th Grade students in terms of the mean value of Authoritative Class Management Profiles. The mean value of Authoritative Class Management Profile of the 3rd Grade students is significantly higher than that of 4th Grade students ( $t(372)=3.390$ ;  $p<0.05$ ). While the average of the 3rd Grade students for the sub-dimension of the Appreciated Class Management Profile is  $x=11.86$ ; the average of 4th Grade students is  $x=11.63$ . There is

**Table 1.** The Distribution of the Answers Given to the Questions in the Items of the Class Management Profile Scale.

Parameter	I absolutely disagree		I disagree		I am hesitant		I agree		I absolutely agree	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1. If a student ruins the class order, I unquestionably stand in his/her way	8	2.1	24	6.4	42	11.2	146	39.0	154	41.2
2. I do not want to impose the rules upon my students	8	2.2	45	12.1	56	15.1	155	41.7	108	29.0
3. The classroom must be silent to allow my students to learn	3	0.8	21	5.7	35	9.5	156	42.2	155	41.9
4. I am interested in both the subject the students learn and how they learn it	4	1.1	9	2.4	33	8.9	142	38.2	184	49.5
5. If a student brings his/her homework late, it is not my problem.	39	10.6	102	27.6	95	25.7	85	23.0	48	13.0
6. I do not want to scold the student, because I may hurt his/her feelings.	5	1.4	29	7.9	71	19.3	131	35.6	132	35.9
7. Class preparations are not worthwhile for teaching activities.	122	32.9	85	22.9	58	15.6	61	16.4	45	12.1
8. I always try to explain the reasons for my decisions and principles to my students.	10	2.7	25	6.9	40	11.0	153	42.0	136	37.4
9. I do not accept the "excuses or apologies" of a student who is late for class.	123	33.1	121	32.5	59	15.9	47	12.6	22	5.9
10. The good emotional state of the student is more important to me than the class control.	14	3.9	40	11.1	119	33.0	117	32.4	71	19.7
11. My students, if they have any questions about the subject, have already understood the fact that they can ask their questions by interrupting my presentation.	27	7.3	63	17.1	87	23.6	116	31.5	75	20.4
12. If a student asks for permission, I always give permission.	23	6.2	94	25.3	107	28.8	93	25.1	54	14.6

**Table 2.** Mean Scores of the Class Management Profile Scale.

Parameter	$\bar{X}$	S	Min.	Max.
Authoritative class management profile	10.54	1.86	5.00	15.00
Appreciated class management profile	11.73	2.10	4.00	15.00
Idle class management profile	10.62	2.07	3.00	15.00
Unconcerned class management profile	9.35	2.36	3.00	15.00
CMPS general score	42.24	5.62	18.00	57.00

no significant difference between 3rd Grade and 4th Grade students in terms of the mean value of Appreciated Class Management Profiles

( $t(372)=1.056$ ;  $p<0.05$ ). The average of 3rd Grade students for the sub-dimension of the Idle Class Management Profile is  $x=10.78$ ; whereas the

average of 4th Grade students is  $x=10.50$ . There is no significant difference between 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade and 4<sup>th</sup> Grade students in terms of the

**Table 3.** Comparison between the Class Management Profile Scale and Its Sub-Dimensions According to Gender.

Parameter		N	$\bar{x}$	S	t	p
Authoritative class management profile	Male	205	10.58	1.83	0.435	0.664
	Female	169	10.49	1.91		
Appreciated class management profile	Male	205	11.87	2.16	1.430	0.154
	Female	169	11.56	2.02		
Idle class management profile	Male	205	10.81	1.98	1.979	0.049*
	Female	169	10.38	2.17		
Unconcerned class management profile	Male	205	9.30	2.39	0.427	0.670
	Female	169	9.40	2.33		
CMPS general score	Male	205	42.55	5.22	1.228	0.220
	Female	169	41.83	6.07		

\*p<0.05.

**Table 4.** Comparison between the Class Management Profile Scale and Its Sub-Dimensions According to Class Level.

Parameter		N	$\bar{x}$	S	t	p
Authoritative Class Management Profile	3rd Grade	164	10.90	1.66	3.390	0.001*
	4th Grade	210	10.25	1.96		
Appreciated Class Management Profile	3rd Grade	164	11.86	1.82	1.056	0.292
	4th Grade	210	11.63	2.30		
Idle Class Management Profile	3rd Grade	164	10.78	1.71	1.276	0.203
	4th Grade	210	10.50	2.32		
Unconcerned Class Management Profile	3rd Grade	164	9.52	2.47	1.279	0.202
	4th Grade	210	9.20	2.26		
CMPS General Score	3rd Grade	164	43.05	5.04	2.524	0.012*
	4th Grade	210	41.59	5.98		

\*p<0.05

mean value of Idle Class Management Profiles ( $t(372)=1.276$ ;  $p<0.05$ ). On the other hand, the average of 3rd Grade students for the sub-dimension of the Unconcerned Class Management Profile is  $x=9.52$ ; whereas the average of 4th Grade students is  $x=9.20$ . There is no significant difference between 3rd Grade and 4th Grade students in terms of the mean value of Unconcerned Class Management Profiles ( $t(372)=1.279$ ;  $p<0.05$ ). As for CMPS General Score, the average of 3rd Grade students is  $x=43.05$ ; while the average of 4th Grade students is  $x=41.59$ . There is a significant difference ( $p<0,05$ ) between 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade and 4<sup>th</sup> Grade

students in terms of the mean value of CMPS General Scores. The mean of CMPS General Score of 3rd Grade students is significantly higher than that of 4th Grade students ( $t(372)=2.524$ ;  $p<0.05$ ).

**The comparison between the class management profile scale and its sub-dimensions according to the universities attended**

The results of One-Way Analysis of Variance (One Way ANOVA) are given in Table 5. The test was performed to

**Table 5.** Comparison between the Class Management Profile Scale and Its Sub-Dimensions According to the Universities Attended.

Parameter		N	$\bar{x}$	S	F	p
Authoritative class management profile	Abant Izzet Baysal University	43	10.40	1.55	2.048	0.087
	Anadolu University	50	10.56	1.20		
	Gazi University	102	10.30	1.80		
	Kocaeli University	73	10.33	1.88		
	Sakarya University	107	10.95	2.21		
	Total	375	10.54	1.86		
Appreciated class management profile	Abant Izzet Baysal University	43	11.47	1.92	6.515	0.000*
	Anadolu University	50	11.00	1.60		
	Gazi University	102	12.38	1.71		
	Kocaeli University	73	12.14	2,03		
	Sakarya University	107	11.26	2.51		
	Total	375	11.73	2.10		
Idle class management profile	Abant Izzet Baysal University	43	10.30	2.02	3.600	0.007*
	Anadolu University	50	9.84	1.15		
	Gazi University	102	10.75	1.83		
	Kocaeli University	73	11.19	2.32		
	Sakarya University	107	10.61	2.35		
	Total	375	10.62	2.07		
Unconcerned class management profile	Abant Izzet Baysal University	43	8.98	2.50	9.272	0.000*
	Anadolu University	50	8.90	1.98		
	Gazi University	102	8.49	1.88		
	Kocaeli University	73	9.81	2.17		
	Sakarya University	107	10.23	2.66		
	Total	375	9.35	2.36		
CMPS general score	Abant Izzet Baysal University	43	41.14	4.09	3.506	0.008*
	Anadolu University	50	40.30	2.87		
	Gazi University	102	43.92	4.05		
	Kocaeli University	73	43.47	4.82		
	Sakarya University	107	41.36	8.10		
	Total	375	42.24	5.62		

\*p<0.05.

determine the averages of CMPS and its sub-dimensions according to the universities attended and also to find out whether the difference between these averages was significant or not.

According to the results in Table 5, the sub-dimension of the Authoritative Class Management Profile does not show any significant difference according to the universities attended, whereas the Appreciated Class Management Profile, Idle Class Management Profile, Unconcerned Class Management Profile and the general CMPS score show significant difference according to the universities attended. According to the results of Tukey's

HSD (Honest Significant Difference) test, performed to determine which group that difference stemmed from; the average of the students of Gazi University ( $\bar{x}$ =12.38) proved to be significantly different from and higher ( $p<0.05$ ) than that of the students of Abant Izzet Baysal University ( $\bar{x}$ =11.47), Sakarya University ( $\bar{x}$ =11.26) and Anadolu University ( $\bar{x}$ =11.00) in terms of the sub-dimension of the Appreciated Class Management Profile; whereas, there is no significant difference as far as the average of Kocaeli University ( $\bar{x}$ =12.14) is concerned ( $p<0.05$ ).

The average of the students of Anadolu University

( $x=9.84$ ) proved to be significantly different from and lower ( $p<0.05$ ) than that of the students of Gazi University ( $x=10.75$ ), Kocaeli University ( $x=11.19$ ) and Sakarya University ( $x=10.61$ ) in terms of the sub-dimension of the Idle Class Management Profile; whereas, there is no significant difference when compared with the students of Abant İzzet Baysal University ( $x=10.30$ ) ( $p<0.05$ ). The average of the students of Sakarya University ( $x=10.23$ ) proved to be significantly different from and higher ( $p<0.05$ ) than that of the students of Abant İzzet Baysal University ( $x=8.98$ ), Anadolu University ( $x=8.90$ ) and Gazi University ( $x=8.49$ ) in terms of the sub-dimension of the Unconcerned Class Management Profile; whereas, there is no significant difference when compared with the average of the students of Kocaeli University ( $x=9.81$ ) ( $p<0.05$ ). On the other hand, as for the CMPS in general, the averages of the students of Gazi University ( $x=43.92$ ) and Kocaeli University ( $x=43.47$ ) were determined to be significantly different from and higher than the average of the students of Sakarya University ( $x=41.36$ ), and also, the average of the students of Sakarya University ( $x=41.36$ ) proved to be significantly different from and higher than the average of the students of Abant İzzet Baysal University ( $x=41.14$ ) and Anadolu University ( $x=40.30$ ) ( $p<0.05$ ).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

According to the results of the research, the mean value of Idle Class Management Profile of the male students is significantly higher than that of the female students. In accordance with this result, it can be stated that male physical education teacher candidates are less prescriptive and strict than the female candidates in terms of class management due to the fact that women are more principled and tolerant in life. Ünlü (2008) conducted a study on physical education teachers, and Ayar and Arslan (2008), Taflan (2007), and Kars (2007) conducted a study on other teachers, and determined a significant difference in favor of women in terms of class management according to gender. Çelik (2014) conducted a study and determined that female physical education teachers had more positive behaviors than the males in class management. It shows that these results support our findings. But Yaşar (2008) and Tortu (2012) conducted a study and found that there was no significant difference in class management according to the gender variable. Ekici et al. (2012) conducted a study and discovered that female teachers had preferred to apply the Appreciated Class Management Profile at most, while the male teachers had preferred to use the Authoritative Class Management Profile at most. Çiftçi (2015) conducted a study and reported that female teachers had exhibited a more authoritative class management profile when compared with the males, and that gender was not

a prominent factor in Idle, Unconcerned and Appreciated class management styles. In the research carried out by Aluçdibi (2010), it was determined that female teachers had demonstrated Appreciated, Idle and Unconcerned teacher attitudes more than male teachers did, whereas, male teachers had shown an Authoritative class management profile more than female teachers did. In a research conducted by Kaya (2013), on the other hand, it was found that female teachers had exhibited more democratic behaviors in class management than the males. There are different results about class management for teacher candidates. These differences occur due to different population.

When the comparison of CMPS and its sub-dimensions according to class level was examined, there was a significant difference between 3rd and 4th Grade students in terms of the mean value of authoritative class management profiles, and the mean value of authoritative class management profile of 3rd Grade students proved to be significantly higher than that of 4th Grade students. This shows that 3rd Grade physical education teacher candidates prefer a more authoritative class management. In accordance with this result, it can be stated that 4th Grade students may have more experiences than 3rd Grade students. Yılmaz (2013) conducted a study on physical education teacher candidates, and Döşyılmaz and Karşit (2005) conducted a study on physical education teachers, and determined that the participants had preferred the authoritative class management profile. Kurt (2013), Terzi (2001), and Kapusuzoğlu (2004) conducted a study and found out that teachers had applied the authoritative class management profile at most. Grasha (1994) and McGowan (2008) conducted a study and determined that instructors had applied the authoritative learning styles. In the literature, other results in contrast with the results of this study were found. Inan and Dervent (2013) conducted a study and ascertained that physical education teacher candidates had exhibited democratic tendencies, while Özçakır (2007) and Güven (2004) found that physical education teachers had exhibited democratic tendencies in class management. Lewis et al. (2005) conducted a study in which they examined class-discipline strategies that were being performed in Australia, China and Israel, and determined that the cause of the false behaviors of students was associated with the increasing strict discipline strategies of teachers.

As for CMPS general score, the mean of CMPS general score of 3rd Grade students is significantly higher than that of 4th Grade students. This shows that 3rd Grade physical education teacher candidates behave more inconsistently/precariously than 4th Grade candidates in terms of class management profiles. When the comparison of CMPS and its sub-dimensions according to the universities attended was examined, the average of the students of Gazi University was found to

be significantly different from and higher than that of the students of Abant İzzet Baysal University, Sakarya University, and Anadolu University in terms of the appreciated class management profile. Aluçdibi and Ekici (2012) as well as Ekici et al. (2012) conducted a study and determined that teachers had preferred the Appreciated Class Management Profile on quite high levels. The average of the students of Anadolu University was found to be significantly different from and lower than that of the students of Gazi University, Kocaeli University, and Sakarya University in terms of the Idle Class Management Profile. The average of the students of Sakarya University was found to be significantly different from and higher than that of the students of Abant İzzet Baysal University, Anadolu University, and Gazi University in terms of the Unconcerned Class Management Profile. In his research, Aluçdibi (2010) found that teachers had exhibited Authoritative, Idle, and Unconcerned Class Management Profiles on a moderate level.

As for the CMPS in general, the averages of the students of Gazi University and Kocaeli University were found to be significantly different from and higher than those of the students of Sakarya University, while the averages of the students of Sakarya University were found to be significantly different from and higher than those of the students of Abant İzzet Baysal University and Anadolu University. Yüksel (2013) conducted a study and came to the conclusion that there was no significant difference between teachers according to the universities they graduated from. On the other hand, Stoughton (2007) conducted a study and concluded that the majority of teacher candidates had developed different perspectives in line with the courses they had taken in their universities, and that they had also internalized, in wide-ranging learning environments, the ideas developed in teacher training such as maintaining social justice and treating all children equally. In Foxworthy's (2006) research, teachers stated that their in-class experiences had shaped their beliefs as well as the strategies they applied in the classrooms, and they also added that their beliefs and strategies regarding class management had begun to change from the moment they started their teaching profession. Rockey (2008) conducted a study on candidate teachers, and came to the conclusion that the rules and principles established by students in terms of class management as well as the studies and tasks performed by them had to be focused on. Little et al. (2007), on the other hand, stated in their research that teachers had applied positive class management profiles. It is recommended that further studies should be conducted by applying qualitative research techniques.

### Conflict of Interests

The authors have not declared any conflict of interests.

### REFERENCES

- Aluçdibi F (2010). Ortaöğretim Öğrencilerinin Biyoloji Dersi Motivasyon Düzeylerine Biyoloji Öğretmenlerinin Sınıf Yönetimi Profillerinin Etkisinin Değerlendirilmesi. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Aluçdibi F, Ekici G (2012). Ortaöğretim Öğrencilerinin Biyoloji Dersi Motivasyon Düzeylerine Biyoloji Öğretmenlerinin Sınıf Yönetimi Profillerinin Etkisi. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (H. U. Journal of Education), 43:25-36.
- Ayar AR, Arslan R (2008). İlköğretim okullarında görev yapan sınıf öğretmenlerinin sınıf yönetimi performansının araştırılması. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 16(2):335-344.
- Aydın A (2004). *Sınıf Yönetimi*. Ankara: Tekebaş Eylül Yayıncılık.
- Brown DF (2005). The Significance of Congruent Communication in Effective Classroom Management, The Clearing House, 79(1):12-15.
- Büyükoztürk Ş, Çakmak E, Akgün ÖE, Karadeniz Ş, Demirel F (2013). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri*. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.
- Çelik OB (2014). Farklı Liderlik Stillere Sahip Olan Beden Eğitimi Öğretmenlerinin Sınıf Yönetimi Davranışlarının İncelenmesi. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Çiftçi AS (2015). İlkokul Öğretmenlerinin Sınıf Yönetim Tarzları ve Demokratik Değerlere İlişkin Görüşleri Arasındaki İlişki. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Çanakkale.
- Döşyılmaz E, Karşıt V (2005). Beden Eğitimi Öğretmenlerinin Sınıf İçi Davranışları ve Etkili Öğretmen Tiplerinin İncelenmesi. 4. Ulusal Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Öğretmenliği Sempozyumu, (10-11 Haziran), Bursa.
- Ekici G (2004). İlköğretim I. Kademe Öğretmenlerinin Sınıf Yönetimi Profillerinin Değerlendirilmesi. Eğitim ve Bilim, 29(131):50-60.
- Assessment of Teachers' Classroom Management Profiles in First-Level Elementary Education
- Ekici G, Aluçdibi F, Öztürk N (2012). Biyoloji Öğretmenlerinin Sınıf Yönetimi Profillerinin Cinsiyet ve Kıdem Değişkenleri Açısından İncelenmesi. Dicle Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 8:13-30.
- Ercoşkun MH (2011). Etkili Sınıf Yönetimi Oluşturmada Sınıf Öğretmenlerinin Yeni Rollerinin İncelenmesi, Doktora Tezi, Atatürk Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Erzurum.
- Erden M (2001). Sınıf Yönetimi. İstanbul: Alkım Yayınları.
- Foxworthy JE (2006). *Teachers' beliefs about classroom management*. Master Thesis, Lakehead University, Canada.
- Glasser W (1999). Okulda Kaliteli Eğitim. (Çeviren: Ulaş Kaplan), İstanbul: Beyaz Yayınları.
- Grasha AF (1994). A Special Section: Discovering Your Best Teaching Styles. *College Teaching*, 42(4):122-123.
- Güven B (2004). *Beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin sınıf yönetiminin öğretmen davranışı boyutuna ilişkin görüşleri*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- İnan M, Dervent F (2013). Investigation of the Relevance Between Democratic Tendencies and Classroom Management Perceptions of Preservice Physical Education and Classroom Teachers. *Pegem Eğitim ve Öğretim Dergisi*, 3(1):27-34.
- Kapusoğlu Ş (2004). *İlköğretim Düzeyinde Sınıf Yönetimi Uygulamalarının Öğrenci-Öğretmen Görüşleri ve Sınıf Yönetimi Profilleri Açısından Değerlendirilmesi*. XIII. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kurultayı, (6-9 Temmuz). Malatya.
- Kars YE (2007). *Din kültürü ve ahlak bilgisi öğretmenlerinin kendi algılarına dayalı sınıf yönetimi yeterlikleri (Konak ilçesi örneği)*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İzmir.
- Kaya C (2013). Sınıf Öğretmenlerinin Sınıf Yönetimindeki Demokratik Tutumlarının İncelenmesi. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Atatürk Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Erzurum.
- Kurt H (2013). Biyoloji Öğretmenlerinin Öğrenci Başarısından Sorumluluk Algılarının Sınıf Yönetimi Profillerine Göre Analizi. *Türk. Stud.* 8(6):473-490.

- Lewis R, Romi S, Qui X, Katz YJ (2005). Teachers' classroom discipline and student misbehavior in Australia, China and Israel. *Teach. Teacher Educ.* 21(6):729-741.
- Little KA, Little SG, Laniti M (2007). Teachers' use of classroom management procedures in the United States and Greece: A Cross-Cultural Comparison. *School Psychol. Int.* 28(1):53-62.
- McGowan SR (2008). Teaching Styles of Technical College Core and Occupational Faculty: Their Relationship to Student Achievement. *Doctoral Dissertation*, Capella University, United States.
- Özçakır, S. (2007). *Beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin sınıf yönetimi anlayışları: Düzce ili örneği*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Bolu.
- Rockey RD (2008). *An Observational Study of Pre-Service Teachers' Classroom Management Strategies*. Doctoral dissertation. Indiana University, USA.
- Sarıtaş M (2003). Sınıf Yönetimi ve Disiplinle İlgili Kurallar Geliştirme. Sınıf Yönetiminde Yeni Yaklaşımlar. L. Küçükahmet, (Ed.). Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Stoughton EH (2007). How will I get them to behave?: Pre service teachers reflect on classroom management. *Teach. Teacher Educ.* 23(7):1024-1037.
- Taflan A (2007). *Öğretmen görüşleri ve öğrenci algısıyla sınıf yönetimi stratejilerinin değerlendirilmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Yeditepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Terzi Ç (2001). *Öğretmenlerin sınıf yönetimi anlayışlarına ilişkin görüşlerinin belirlenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Anadolu Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Eskişehir.
- Tortu E (2012). İlköğretim Öğrencilerinin Beden Eğitimi Dersinde Sınıf Yönetimine Ait Görüşlerinin İncelenmesi. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Kırıkkale Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Kırıkkale.
- Ünlü H (2008). Beden Eğitimi Öğretmenlerinin Yeterlikleri ve Sınıf Yönetimi Davranışları. Doktora Tezi. Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Weinstein CS (1996). *Secondary Classroom Management: Lessons From Research and Practice*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Yaşar S (2008). Classroom Management Approaches of Primary School Teachers. Master Thesis. Middle East Technical University, The Department of Educational Sciences. Ankara.
- Yılmaz İ (2013). Pre-service physicaleducation teachers' preference for class management profiles and teacher's self-efficacy beliefs. *Educ. Res. Rev.* 8(9):539-545.
- Yüksel A (2013). Sınıf Öğretmenlerinin Sınıf Yönetimi Becerilerinin Değerlendirilmesi (Afyonkarahisar İli Örneği). Doktora Tezi. Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.