Primary School Teachers' Views on Constructive Classroom Management

Ercan ARI *
Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Turkey

Berfu KIZILASLAN TUNÇER
Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Turkey

Mehmet Kaan DEMİR
Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Turkey

Abstract

Behavioural teaching programmes that had long been used in Turkey began changing in 2005. In a significant development, new programmes based on constructivism have come to the fore. The adaptation of teachers in this transitional process and their internalization of this new approach have been of utmost importance for the success of the programme. Difficulties faced by experienced primary school teachers in particular have become a serious matter that should be qualitatively addressed. This study aimed to reveal the views of experienced primary school teachers (175) about constructive classroom management. Interviews were employed to do so. The study revealed that a large majority of the interviewed teachers considered themselves to be successful at classroom management (thanks to factors like experience, close contact with students, their affection for students, etc.), while almost half of the teachers thought that classroom management had been much easier in pre-2005 teaching programmes. The results also exposed disturbing behaviours, among them students fighting, the use of improper language, disrupting in-class teaching processes and irrelevant talking among students. The coping techniques adopted for these behaviours were warnings, punishment and more enjoyable teaching that incorporated a range of different activities.

Keywords: Constructivism, Behaviourism, Classroom teacher, Classroom management.

Introduction

In the Turkish education system, different approaches and theories have been adopted at different periods to produce teaching programmes, and these approaches and theories have been taken into account when setting educational goals. Constructivism, initially referred to as a learning theory, is today considered as a teaching theory, an education theory, a theory of the origin of ideas, and a theory of both personal knowledge and

---
* ✉ Ercan Arı, Faculty of Education, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Çanakkale, Turkey. Phone: +90 286 2171303/3571, E-mail: ercanari@hotmail.com

scientific knowledge and a curriculum design theory (Matthews, 2002). Constructivism has been favoured in developed countries since 1980 and came to prominence in Turkey in 2005, when primary school programmes were developed on the basis of constructivism. While teaching programmes became permeated with constructivist ideas from 2005, researching –questioning educational philosophy as a different implication of constructivism – was only included in some programmes in 2013.

Constructivism focuses on individuals and relies on the idea that learners are actively involved in the learning process, and responsible for their own learning (Dağdelen & Kösterelioğlu, 2015; Glasersfeld, 1995; Hand & Treagust, 1995; Henson, 2015; Schneider, Krajcik, Marx & Soloway, 2002; Shiland, 1999; Staver, 1998; Zarotiadou & Tsaparlis, 2000; Wedin, 2015). According to this theory, an individual associates their prior knowledge with new knowledge that they have obtained by interacting with their surrounding environment (Driver, 1995; Hand & Treagust, 1995; Hewson, 1992; Karahan & Roehrig, 2015; Kelly, 1997; Leow & Neo, 2014; Niaz, 1995; Osborne, 1996; Shiland, 1999).

Constructivism aims to develop individuals who have multiple viewpoints and advanced problem-solving skills, and who are able to defend their thoughts and rights and organize. In constructive settings, the person taking responsibility is expected to have skills such as initiative-taking, self-expression, communication, critical thinking, planning and practicing what they have learned in real-life settings (Marlowe & Page, 1998). This requires the emergence of a brand new type of classroom management. Constructivism affects not only the reconstruction of knowledge, but also practices such as school management and classroom discipline. As a result, the roles of teachers and students are different from those in traditional education systems. In particular, the use of strategies based on hands-on and experiential learning in science education, central to fundamental education, is one of the most established aspects of science education. Experiments form the basis of laboratory management, which is undoubtedly essential to science education. Experiments are particularly employed in science education to account for correlations between natural phenomena and to explain the laws concerning these correlations. Some studies suggest that problems concerning classroom management may arise during individual and group experiments (Akgün, 1995; Alpagut, 1993; Ekici, 1996; Öztürk-Akar, 2006).

Classroom management consists of practices that help to create an efficient setting for maintaining the order required for in-class learning (Celep, 1997; Hoglund, Klingle & Hosan, 2015). 'Order' here refers to the high-quality and acceptable student behaviour to ensure the success of in-class activities. Classroom management is the process of creating and preserving/sustaining order and reinstating it when disrupted (Arens, Morin & Watermann, 2015; Burden, 1995). Classroom management models have been categorized by some researchers as reactional, preventive, developmental and holistic (Balay, 2003; Başar, 2005; Demirtaş, 2006), while others have classified them into five types, namely traditional, reactional, preventive, developmental and holistic (Erdoğan, 2003; Kaya, 2003; Yaka, 2006).

Classroom management models can be summarized as follows. Teaching and learning activities are centred on the teacher in the traditional classroom management model. Here, teachers are active, while students remain passive during the course of in-class activities. The reactional model refers to a model where undesirable behaviours are addressed by using rewarding or punitive activities. The preventive model is intended to create a classroom setting that is able to foresee and prevent any possibly disruptive behaviour. It can also be regarded as a model for taking precautionary measures against probable classroom problems. The developmental model takes into consideration the developmental characteristics of students that are deemed essential to classroom

management. In-class activities should be designed in accordance with the physical, mental and affective developmental steps of the learners. Finally, the holistic model not only prioritizes the preventive model, but also allows teachers to adopt any action from other models to eliminate undesirable behaviours and situations (Başar, 2005; Şentürk, 2006). In today's schools, teachers face problems posed by a shortage of classroom management models and methods for dealing with ever-changing student profiles. As such, further research is needed to determine the best classroom management model for both teachers and students in state schools (Roadhouse, 2007), particularly in light of the fact that the transition from behaviourism to constructivism can be labelled as a radical change in context of Turkish schools.

For Glasersfeld (1995), the principle underlying constructivism in education is that knowledge is not passively received, either through the senses or by way of communication, but it is actively built up by cognitive understanding of the subject. Learning settings where students are active participants may also pose problems pertaining to classroom management and student behaviour. A review of related studies on classroom management and unwanted student behaviours showed that studies on undesirable student behaviours primarily focus on primary schools, and adopt quantitative research methods (Aksu, 1999; Aydın, 2001; Civelek, 2001; Demiroğlu, 2001; Girmen et al., 2006; Sadık, 2006; Sayın, 2001; Terzi, 2001). According to the results of these studies, the most often encountered undesirable student behaviours include indifference to the teacher and the subject, talking to friends, complaining about friends and dealing with subjects irrelevant to the class. These studies also reveal that in return, teachers warn or slap students, threaten to give them low grades, ignore misbehaviour, send misbehaving students to school administrators, remind them of classroom rules and talk to their parents, amongst others.

In research on strategies for coping with unwanted student behaviours, Tümüklü and Yıldız (2002) found that teachers use strategies such as eye contact with a student that misbehaves, talk to them about their behaviour, remind them of classroom rules, call out their name and motivate them to participate. According to results found by Kazu (2007), in the case of a minor disciplinary issue, teachers tend to ignore it, spend the rest of the class advising the student to take care of the problem, warn the student using body language and/or relocate the student. In the case of a serious issue, teachers consult the school administration (which corresponds to "medium frequency" in Kazu's study).

In a study by Clunies-Ross et al. (2008), there is a strong correlation between the use of reactive classroom management and showing a negative reaction to the unwanted behaviour of the student. Moreover, the study shows that there is no significant relationship between preventive management strategies and increased student on-task behaviour. Additionally, the study also found a significant relationship between teachers' positive reactions and students' high level of on-task behaviours. In another study on the views of trainee teachers about classroom management strategies, Çakmak, Kayabaşı and Ercan (2008) found that trainee teachers thought that the prerequisite for successful classroom management was a good command of classroom management strategies.

According to Gömleksiz (2007), the views of teachers on the new primary school programme being considered and its various variables, there is no significant relationship between teachers' educational setting and internalization and practice of the programme. The study also suggests that the success of an educational programme greatly depends on teachers' internalization of the programme and the implementation of the program in line with its predetermined goals. This result verifies the feedback from teachers regarding changes as being among the important factors for ensuring that changes emerging in the educational system achieve predetermined goals. In the study "Teachers' Views about

Effects of Constructivist Approach on Classroom Management", Çandar and Şahin (2013) aimed to identify the probable effects of primary school teachers' constructive approaches on their classes and classroom management. The study concludes that constructivism, compared to the traditional approach, requires that teachers assume new roles and responsibilities in classroom management and that the relevant activities change in accordance with the constructive approach.

The long-used behavioural teaching programmes began to change in Turkey in 2005. The new programmes based on constructivism have come to the fore as a significant development. Teachers' adaptation in this transitional process and their internalization of this new approach has been of the utmost importance for the success of the program. Difficulties faced by experienced primary school teachers in particular have become a serious matter that should be qualitatively addressed. It can be proposed that classroom management models and approaches used by teachers in traditional classroom settings will fall short of the needed classroom management where constructivism is adopted ad hoc. In the case of constructivism, learning settings are as essential as the teacher. Building on the views of the participating teachers, the aim of this study is to determine the characteristics of a classroom where constructive classroom management is practiced and how this differs from those where the traditional approach is adopted.

Method

A phenomenological research design (a qualitative research method) was employed in this study. A phenomenological research design focuses on the phenomena that we are aware of, but of which we do not have a detailed and exhaustive grasp of. Phenomenology provides the proper basis for studies intended to research the phenomena that we are familiar with but cannot thoroughly understand (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2006, p.72). Classroom management as a concept is frequently used in relation to the education process, yet has changed due to the constructive practices put into effect in primary school programmes as of 2005. Therefore, a phenomenological research design provides suitable conditions for the analysis of classroom management based on a constructivist approach.

Data Collection and Analysis

Standardized open-ended interviews were used for the purpose of this study. This interview type comprises a series of meticulously written and ordered open-ended questions and each interviewee is asked the same question in the same order (Patton, 1987, as cited in Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2006, p.123). To achieve reliability, the interview form was scrutinized by three experts in education science and revised in line with their feedback. The study was administered among 175 primary school teachers working at public schools in Çanakkale. The criterion that participant teachers had begun working as teachers prior to 2000 was essential for the purpose of the study. There were four open-ended questions in the standardized open-ended interview form. The questions in the form were:

1) Do you think you are successful at classroom management? If yes, how; if no, why.

2) Can you compare and contrast your classroom management practices to the previous and present classroom management programmes? What are the differences?

3) What are the most disturbing student behaviours in your classroom management?

4) What solutions do you adopt for addressing the most disturbing student behaviours?

Descriptive data analysis was performed to analyse the data. In descriptive analysis, data can be ordered according to the themes revealed by the research questions, but also can be presented by considering the interview questions. In a descriptive analysis, quotes are typically used to effectively reflect the views of the interviewees (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2006, p. 224). Moreover, to be able to increase reliability, the qualitative data were presented in the form of numbers, frequencies and percentages when calculating the interviewees' views.

Results

In this part of the study, the data obtained using the open-ended interview were descriptively analysed and presented and explained in tables. The findings were analysed according to four categories.

1) The reasons for why teachers considered themselves successful or unsuccessful at classroom management

Table 1 presents the frequencies and percentages concerning whether teachers considered themselves successful (or not) at classroom management.

Table 1. *Do teachers consider themselves successful at classroom management?*

	f	%
I am successful at classroom management	106	89.8
I am not successful at classroom management	12	10.2
Total	**118**	**100.00**

It is clear from Table 1 that 89.8% of teachers interviewed considered themselves successful at classroom management, while 10.2% did not. The reasons why teachers considered themselves successful at classroom management are provided in Table 2.

Table 2. *The reasons why teachers considered themselves successful at classroom management.*

Reasons why teachers considered themselves successful (n=106).	*f*	*%*
Being experienced	21	8.57
Close relationships with students	21	8.57
Caring about children	16	6.53
Having knowledge about children	12	4.90
Maintaining discipline	11	4.49
Mutual love	11	4.49
Speaking at students' level	10	4.08
Providing interesting in-class activities	9	3.67
Establishing rules with students	9	3.67
Self-improvement/keeping up-to-date	8	3.27
Being a graduate of primary school education	8	3.27
Implementing rules consistently	7	2.86
Creating a democratic classroom	7	2.86
Sympathizing	6	2.45
Gaining students' trust	6	2.45
Getting students involved in the class	6	2.45
Having preferred teaching as a job	5	2.04
Mutual respect	5	2.04

Table 2 (Cont.)*. The reasons why teachers considered themselves successful at classroom management*

Reasons why teachers considered themselves successful (n=106).	f	%
Motivating students in the class	5	2.04
Being witty	5	2.04
Being tolerant	4	1.63
Enjoying your job	4	1.63
Students being able to express their thoughts freely	4	1.63
Accepting students as individuals	4	1.63
Using technology	4	1.63
Treating students equally	3	1.22
Being consistent	3	1.22
Making eye contact with students	3	1.22
Giving turns in activities	3	1.22
Providing activities when students are distracted	3	1.22
Views below 1%	22	9.02
Total	**245**	**100.00**

Table 2 shows that interviewees associated their success in classroom management with being very experienced (f= 21), close relationships with students (f= 21), caring about children (f= 16), mutual love (f= 11), having knowledge about children (f= 12), maintaining discipline (f= 11), speaking at students'' level (f= 10), establishing the rules with students (f= 9) and self-improvement (f= 8).

T34 explained the importance of enjoying classroom management in terms of human relations: "It starts with loving students. *As long as students understand that you love them, you will have no classroom management problems".*

T42 stated, "I owe my success to being experienced, knowing…my students, self-improvement [and being aware of students'] interests and needs."

T60 expressed the importance of establishing rules together with students as follows: "I set the rules of my class(room) together with my students. By giving examples, I explain [to] them [that anyone] can get upset sometimes if they disobey these rules. *If a student who has started their primary education in the last month can understand and manage to [follow] the rules, no problems show up later on."*

The reasons with the lowest frequency of success pertaining to teachers' classroom management accounted for less than 1% and referred to reasons such as imposing authority, giving responsibility, talking about the rationale behind the rules, leaving thoughts irrelevant to school outside the classroom, being a role model, empathizing with students, being a leader, being patient, being cheerful, being persuasive, not causing fear, praising the behaviour not the student, cooperating with the teachers, teaching through play, helping students internalize the rules, setting applicable rules and uncrowded classes.

The reasons why teachers considered themselves unsuccessful at classroom management are presented in Table 3.

Table 3 reveals that teachers considered themselves unsuccessful at classroom management primarily due to overcrowded classes (f= 5), not being authoritarian (f= 3) and overly active students (f= 2).

Table 3. *The reasons why teachers considered themselves unsuccessful at classroom management.*

Reasons why teachers considered themselves unsuccessful (n=12).	f	%
Overcrowded classes	5	33.33
Teacher not being authoritarian	3	20.00
Overly active students	2	13.33
Teacher being unable to impose the rules	1	6.67
Disobedient students	1	6.67
Class being used/attached to a previous teacher	1	6.67
Programme inappropriate for students' level	1	6.67
Spoiled students	1	6.67
Families incapable of providing proper education	1	6.67
Total	**15**	**100.00**

T85 stated, "I am not very successful [at classroom management largely due to] overcrowded classes and the fact that it is [difficult] to implement the new system in crowded classes, due to [spoiled] students and the fact that we are unable to impose the rules."

T120 stated, "I don't think I am successful [at classroom management]. *The reasons [for this] is my crowded class of 50 students. It is very difficult to implement the programme and thus to be successful."*

2) Teachers' comparisons between the old and new programmes in terms of classroom management

Table 4 shows the frequencies and percentages of the interviewees' answers to the question, "Can you compare and contrast your classroom management to the old and new education programmes and give reasons for your comparison?"

Table 4. *Teachers' comparisons between the old and new programme in terms of classroom management.*

	f	%
Classroom management was easier in the previous programme	36	45.56
Classroom management is easier in the new programme	28	35.44
Both programmes are the same in terms of classroom management	11	13.92
I cannot properly implement the new programme	4	5.06
Total	**79**	**100**

Among the interviewees, 45.57% (f= 36) of the teachers expressed that classroom management had been easier in the previous programme. The percentage of interviewees who thought classroom management was easier in the new programme (2005 primary school programme) was 35.44% (f= 28), while those who thought there was no difference between the two programmes accounted for 13.92% (f= 11); those who were unable to properly implement the new programme accounted for 5.06% (f= 4).

The views of the teachers who thought that classroom management had been easier in the previous programme are presented in Table 5.

Among the interviewees, 45.56% of teachers stressed that classroom management was more difficult in the new programme. They noted the primary reason for this difficulty (f= 16) being the fact that students are active and teachers passive in the new programme.

Table 5. *The reasons why classroom management was viewed as easier in the previous programme.*

Teacher views	Reasons	*f*	%
Classroom management was easier in the previous programme (*n*=36)	Because students are active and the teacher is passive in the new programme	16	35.56
	Because it is difficult to complete the activities of the new programme in crowded classes	8	17.78
	Because the previous programme was teacher-centred and the new one is student-centred	7	15.56
	Because there are too many activities in the new programme	7	15.56
	Because it (the new programme) has a different sense of discipline	2	4.44
	Because the new programme requires collaboration with parents	2	4.44
	Because whatever the teacher says was considered acceptable in the previous programme	1	2.22
	Because communication skills are highlighted in the new programme	2	4.44
	Total	**45**	**100.00**

Other reasons included the difficulty of completing the activities of the new programme in crowded classes (*f*= 8), the student-centred nature of the new programme (*f*= 7) and the excessive amount of activities in the new programme (*f*= 7). Among the other reasons why teachers considered classroom management difficult to achieve in the new programme was its different sense of discipline (*f*= 2), the necessity for collaborating with parents (*f*= 2), communication skills being highlighted in the new programme (*f*= 2), the fact that any statement made by teachers had been considered acceptable beyond question in the previous programme (*f*= 1).

T7 explained the difficulty of classroom management in the new programme as follows: "*Classroom management was easier in the previous programme. Everything was done by the teacher. I used to teach the class and tell them 'write, draw and listen', which made it easier. Now students are more active. While managing [students] doing the activity, I have to check [on the students observing] them. One needs to be more careful...*"

The reasons given by teachers who thought that classroom management was easier in the new programme are presented in Table 6.

Among the interviewees, 35.44% of teachers expressed that classroom management was much easier in the new programme. Table 6 shows that teachers were of the opinion that students being active thanks to the new programme as the primary reason for why students were not bored (*f*= 13). As clearly indicated by Table 6, the interviewees thought that classroom management was easier in the new programme because it is student-centred (*f*= 5), classrooms are equipped with technological devices (*f*= 3), students are given responsibilities (*f*=3), it creates a more democratic environment (*f*= 3), teachers guide the students (*f*= 2), teacher-student communication is very strong (*f*= 2) and classes are taught using activities and play (*f*= 1).

T23 claimed that "*classroom management was more difficult [when] implementing the new programme. The students who had to listen to...what I told [them] (as passive receivers) used to get bored. They used to easily get distracted and accordingly, it used to [be more difficult] to manage the classroom...*"

Table 6. *The reasons why classroom management was thought to have been easier in the new programme.*

		f	%
Classroom management is easier in the new programme (*n*=28)	Students do not get bored because they are active thanks to the new programme	13	40.63
	Because the new programme is student-centred	5	15.63
	Because classes are given using technological equipment in the new programme	3	9.38
	Because students are given responsibilities in the new programme	3	9.38
	Because there is a more democratic environment in the new programme	3	9.38
	Because teachers guide the students in the new programme	2	6.25
	Because the new programme improves teacher-student communication	2	6.25
	Because classes are taught using activities and play	1	3.13
	Total	**32**	**100.00**

T44 stated that "*because I guide them, [students] are in the foreground now. Because they are supposed to actively participate in the class in the new programme, this…made my job very easy…*" T44 here refers to the fact that active participation is of great importance for classroom management.

3) Student behaviours that disturb teachers the most while managing the classroom

The frequencies and percentages pertaining to teachers' answers to the question "which student behaviours disturb you the most?" are provided in Table 7.

According to Table 7, the most disturbing behaviour for teachers are students fighting with one another and using inappropriate language (*f*= 31), behaving in a way that disturbs the class (*f*= 30), talking to one another during class (*f*= 28), not paying attention in class (*f*= 26), doing irrelevant things (*f*= 21) and talking without taking turns (*f*= 16). Other disturbing behaviours include students displaying disrespectful behaviours (*f*= 13), telling lies (*f*= 6) and disobeying the rules (*f*= 5).

T106 expressed *"[students] talking without taking turns and being disrespectful to one another"* to be disturbing.

T192 described disturbing behaviours as, *"disrupting the class, bothering [a] friend [and] playing with tool, such as[a] pencil [etc.]."*

T64 stated that families have an impact on students' behaviour and claimed that *"Parents are overprotective. Teachers have no authority over students. This makes children spoiled."*

Table 7. *Student behaviours that disturb teachers the most while managing the classroom.*

Student behaviours	*f*	%
Fighting with one another and saying bad words	31	13.90
Behaving in a way that disturbs the class	30	13.45
Talking to one another during class	28	12.56
Not paying attention in class	26	11.66
Doing irrelevant things in class	21	9.42
Talking without taking turns	16	7.17

Table 7. (Cont.) *Student behaviours that disturb teachers the most while managing the classroom.*

Students not doing their homework and not fulfilling responsibilities	13	5.83
Displaying disrespectful behaviour	13	5.83
Being indifferent to the class	9	4.04
Telling lies	6	2.69
Being unprepared for class	5	2.24
Disobeying the rules	5	2.24
Not being active	4	1.79
Being careless	3	1.35
Frequently leaving the class to go to the restroom	3	1.35
Being late for class	2	0.90
Making fun of/belittling the teacher	2	0.90
Being spoiled	2	0.90
Trying to solve class-related problems with the family	2	0.90
Unhelpful families	1	0.45
Being a misfit	1	0.45
Total	**223**	**100.00**

T122 explained disturbing behaviours as follows: *"Students speaking [during] the course of the class and doing irrelevant things, which frustrates [teachers, including myself]."*

T195 described upsetting behaviours as follows: *"Students hurting [one another] is very sad. Of course, I [get] annoyed when they do not do their homework [or] fulfil their responsibilities..."*

4) Solutions to student behaviours that disturb teachers the most while managing the classroom

The frequencies and percentages concerning teachers' answers to the question "what are your solutions to the most disturbing behaviours while managing the classroom?" are presented in Table 8.

Table 8. *Solutions to student behaviours that disturb teachers the most while managing the classroom*

Solutions	*f*	%
I warn the student	37	18.78
I punish the student	21	10.66
I make the class more enjoyable by using various activities	20	10.15
I talk to the students' parents	19	9.64
I talk to the student in person	17	8.63
I explain what the consequences of misbehaving will be	14	7.11
I give students a turn/responsibility	14	7.11
I try to find the causes of misbehaving	9	4.57
I consult the school counsellor	8	4.06
I ask how the student would feel if the same was done to him/her	8	4.06
I make eye contact with the student	6	3.05
I wait quietly for the student to understand what they have done	6	3.05
I raise my voice when teaching	5	2.54
I give students turns in activities	4	2.03
I reward desirable behaviour	4	2.03
I relocate them to another desk	3	1.52
I encourage students to apologize when/if they misbehave	2	1.02
Total	**197**	**100.00**

The analysis of the solutions that teachers preferred in order to cope with undesirable behaviours revealed that the most preferred solutions were warning students (*f*= 37), punishment (*f*= 21), making the class more fun by using various activities (*f*=20), talking to students parents (*f*= 19) and talking to the student in person (*f*= 17).

T158 attempted to address behavioural problems by *"warning [students], explaining [that] what [they had done] was wrong. If [the student still...misbehaves], I talk to [their] parents."*

T183 stated, *"I try to solve such problems by warning [students]. But if [they are] persistent, I make [them] wait outside [the classroom] as a punishment."*

Conclusion, Discussion and Suggestions

In consideration of the results of this study, which was aimed at describing the views of primary school teachers on constructive classroom management, it is concluded that 89.8% of the teachers interviewed considered themselves successful at classroom management, while the remaining 10.2% believed themselves to be unsuccessful. The major reasons for participant teachers to consider themselves successful included being experienced, having good communication with the students, caring about children, mutual love, having knowledge about children, maintaining discipline, speaking at students' level, setting the rules together with students and self-improvement. Among the reasons why teachers believed themselves to be unsuccessful at classroom management were overcrowded classes, teachers not being authoritarian enough and students being active.

The comparisons by participant teachers between the previous and the new programme showed that 45.56% of the teachers believed classroom management to have been easier in the pre-2005 programme, while 35.44% believed it to be easier according to the 2005 primary school programme. Furthermore, 13.92% expressed that there was no difference between the two programmes and 5.06% claimed that the new programme has not yet been properly executed. Teachers supporting the notion that classroom management had been easier in the previous programme listed the reasons for saying so by asserting that students are active in the new programme, whereas teachers are passive; they stated that it was difficult to complete the activities of the new programme in a crowded class, that the programme is student-centred and that the presence of activities in the new programme renders classroom management more demanding. Çelik-Şen and Şahin-Taşkın (2010) suggest that the number of in-class activities have increased with the advent of the new programme, affecting classroom organization. This overlaps with the present study's result that classroom management has become more difficult due to problems posed by crowded classes. In the study "The Effects of Class Size on 2005 Elementary School Curriculums' Success" conducted by Alaçam and Demir (2013), it was found that teachers with a class size of 41 or more students stated that class sizes have more negative effects on the success of 2005 primary school curricula when compared to teachers with a class size of 25-40. According to Bedir (2015)'s research, primary and secondary school teachers feel the most efficient on classroom management in constructivist approach.

The interviewees believed that classroom management was easier in the new programme because students are more active in the new programme, the program is student-centred, classrooms are equipped with technological devices, students are given responsibilities, the programme creates a more democratic environment, teachers guide the students, teacher-student communication is very strong and classes are taught using activities and play. It is inferred from research by Çandar and Şahin (2013) that undesirable behaviours such as irrelevant talking, disrespectful behaviours in informal classroom settings, uncontrollable behaviours due to the leniency of the teacher – as well

as behaviours that need to be handled correctly in order to reinstate classroom order – are being observed more often than in the past. This indicates that teachers who base their classes on constructivism need to develop advanced competencies for creating, preserving, sustaining and restoring order within the classroom environment.

According to the results of the current study, the most disturbing student behaviours are: fighting between students, using bad words, misbehaving in such a way as to disrupt the class, talking to one another, being indifferent to the class, doing irrelevant things in class, talking without taking a turn, disrespectful behaviours, telling lies and disobeying rules. The literature review revealed that the findings of the present research are partially consistent with those of other studies. The study by Çankaya (2011) shows that indifference to the class, cheating, physical and verbal abuse, disrespect the teacher, not taking responsibility, disrupting the class and student cliques are frequently encountered as problematic and undesirable behaviours. Siyez (2009) discovered that the undesirable behaviours most frequently encountered by teachers are: not paying attention in class, failure to fulfil class-related responsibilities, talking without taking a turn and disrupting the class.

The analysis of the solutions that teachers preferred to use in order to cope with undesirable behaviours revealed that the most preferred solutions were giving students a warning, punishment, making the class more fun by using various activities, talking to parents and talking to the student in person. Interestingly, consulting the school counselling office about students displaying undesirable behaviours was a less often mentioned solution. According to Çankaya (2011), the solutions teachers prefer in order to cope with unwanted behaviours include short- and long-term solutions such as guiding/counselling students, making them face up to what they have done, helping them take responsibility, punishment, rewards and social support. Siyez (2009) states that teachers who encounter unwanted student behaviours adopt appropriate approaches such as trying to understand the cause(s) of the misbehaviour, talking to the student in person, warning them about their misbehaviour, as well as inappropriate reactions such as shouting, punishment and opting to send the student to the counsellor's office. The findings of the present research overlap with these findings.

The present study revealed that further research is required to investigate phenomena such as codes of conduct and undesirable behaviours and related strategies. In particular, it is suggested that the class environment can be observed in social studies, science and technology classes. The 2005 primary school curriculum based on constructivism has changed the teacher's role in terms of classroom management. Therefore, more functional in-service training should be offered in order for teachers to broaden their knowledge about activity-based constructive classroom management. This study included primary school teachers as a research sample. Similar studies carried out involving secondary and subject-matter teachers are expected to contribute to the field.

• • •

References

Akgün, Ö. E. (2005). Uygulayanların deneyim ve görüşleriyle yapıcı yaklaşım ve yapıcı yaklaşımların uygulanması öncesinde yapılması önerilen araştırmalar, *Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 2*(2), 1-18.

Aksu, Ü. (1999). *Sınıf Öğretmenlerinin Disiplin Problemlerine Yönelik Sınıf Yönetimi Yöntemleri İle Stresle Başa Çıkma Tutumları Arasındaki İlişki*. Unpublished MA Thesis, Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Trabzon.

Alaçam-Çakır, S. & Demir, M. K. (2013). Sınıf mevcudunun 2005 öğretim programlarının başarısına etkisi, *International Journal of Social Science, 6*(2), 313-328.

Alpagut, O. (1993). Fen Öğretiminin Verimli ve İşlevsel Hale Getirilmesi. Ortaöğretim kurumlarında fen öğretimi ve sorunları sempozyumu. Ankara: TED 12-13 Haziran 1993.

Arens, A. K., Morin, A. J.S. & Watermann, R. (2015). Relations between classroom disciplinary problems and student motivation: Achievement as a potential mediator? *Learning and Instruction, 39*, 184-193.

Aydın, B. (2001). *İlköğretim okullarında sınıf disiplinin sağlanması*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Bolu.

Balay, R. (2003). *2000'li yıllarda sınıf yönetimi*. Ankara: Pegem Yayınları.

Başar, H. (2005). *Sınıf yönetimi*. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Bedir, G. (2015). Perception of teaching efficacy by primary and secondary school teachers. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education, 8*(1), 41-54.

Burden, P. R. (1995). Classroom management and discipline: Methods to facilitate cooperation and instruction. NY: Longman Publishers.

Civelek, K. (2001). *İlköğretimde sınıf öğretmenlerinin sınıf içi disiplini sağlamada kullandıkları yöntemler*. Unpublished MA Thesis, Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Celep, C. (1997). Öğretmenlik yeterlik duygusu. *Yaşadıkça Eğitim Dergisi, 50*, 27-32.

Clunies-Ross, P., Little, E. & Kienhuis, M. (2008). Self-reported and actual use of proactive and reactive classroom management strategies and their relationship with teacher stress and student behaviour. *Educational Psychology, 28*(6), 693-710.

Çakmak, M., Kayabaşı, Y. & Ercan, L. (2008). Öğretmen adaylarının sınıf yönetimi stratejilerine yönelik görüşleri. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 35*, 53-64.

Çandar, H. & Şahin, A. E. (2013). Yapılandırmacı yaklaşımın sınıf yönetimine etkilerine ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. *H. U. Journal of Education, 44*, 109-119.

Çankaya, İ. (2011). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin karşılaştıkları istenmeyen öğrenci davranışları ve bu davranışlarla başa çıkma yolları, *Turkish Studies, 6*(2), 307-316.

Çelik-Şen, Y. & Şahin-Taşkın, Ç. (2010). Yeni ilköğretim programının getirdiği değişiklikler: Sınıf öğretmenlerinin düşünceleri, *Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 7*(2), 26-51.

Dağdelen, O. & Kösterelioğlu, İ. (2015). Effect of conceptual change texts for overcoming misconceptions in "people and management" unit. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education, 8*(1), 99-112.

Demiroğlu, A. (2001). *İlköğretim okulları birinci kademede sınıf düzeninin sağlanmasında öğretmen özelliklerinin etkisi*. Unpublished MA Thesis, Marmara Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

Demirtaş, H. (2006). Sınıf yönetiminin temelleri. In H. Kıran (Ed.). *Etkili sınıf yönetimi* (1-34). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Driver, R. (1995). Constructivist Approaches to Science Teaching. In Steffe & Gale (Eds.), *Constructivism in Education*. 385-400. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ekici, G. (1996). *Biyoloji Öğretmenlerinin Öğretimde Kullandıkları Yöntemler ve Karşılaştıkları Sorunlar*. Unpublished MA Thesis, Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Erdoğan, İ. (2003). *Sınıf yönetimi*. İstanbul: Sistem Yayıncılık.

Girmen, P., Anılan, H., Şentürk, İ. & Öztürk, A. (2006). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin istenmeyen öğrenci davranışlarına gösterdikleri tepkiler. *Manas Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 15*, 235-244.

Glasersfeld E. Von. (1995). A constructivist approach to teaching. In: Steffe L. P. & Gale J. (eds.) *Constructivism in education*, 3-15, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gömleksiz, M. N. (2007). Yeni ilköğretim programına ilişkin öğretmen görüşlerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından değerlendirilmesi. *Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi, 27*, 69-82.

Hand, B. & Treagust, D. F. (1991) Student achievement and science curriculum development using a constructive framework. *School Science and Mathematics, 91*(4), 172-176.

Henson, K. T. (2015). *Curriculum planning: Integrating multiculturalism, constructivism, and education reform* (5th edition). USA: Waveland Press, Inc.

Hewson, P. W. (1992). Conceptual Change in Science Teaching and Teacher Education. Paper presented at a meeting on "Research and Curriculum Development in Science Teaching," Under the auspices of the National Center for Educational Research, Documentation and Assessment, Ministry for Education and Science, Madrid, Spain, June 1992.

Hoglund, W. L. G., Klingle, K. E. & Hosan, N. E. (2015). Classroom risks and resources: Teacher burnout, classroom quality and children's adjustment in high needs elementary schools. *Journal of School Psychology, 53*(5), 337-357.

Karahan, E. & Roehrig, G. (2015). Constructing media artifacts in a social constructivist environment to enhance students' environmental awareness and activism. *Journal of Science Education and Technology, 24*(1): 103-118.

Kaya, A. (2007). Edimsel (Operant) Koşullanma. A. Kaya (Ed.), *Eğitim psikolojisi* (357-409). Ankara: PegemA Yayıncılık.

Kazu, H. (2007). Öğretmenlerin sınıfta istenmeyen davranışlarının önlenmesi ve değiştirilmesine yönelik stratejileri uygulama durumları. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi, 36*(175), 57-66.

Kelly, G. J. (1997). Research Traditions in Comparative Context: A Philosophical Challenge to Radical Constructivism. *Science Education, 81*, 355-375.

Leow, F. T. & Neo, M. (2014). Redesigning the classroom environment to enhance students' collaborative learning activities. In Huang, R., Kinshuk, Jemni, M., Chen, N.-S., Spector, J.M. (Eds). *Lecture notes in educational technology* (pp. 267-274). Springer.

Matthews, M. R. (2002). Constructivism and science education: A further appraisal. *Journal of Science Education and Technology, 11*(2), 121-134.

Marlowe, B. & Page, M. L. (1998). *Creating and sustaining the constructivist classroom*. London: Corwin Press.

Niaz, M. (1995). A Lakatosian Conceptual Change Teaching Strategy Based on Student Ability to Build Models with Varying Degrees of Conceptual Understanding of Chemical Equilibrium. Paper presented at the 68 Annual Conference of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching (NARST) San Francisco, April, 1995.

Osborne, J. F. (1996). Beyond Constructivism. *Science Education, 81*(1), 53-82.

Öztürk-Akar, E. (2006). Farklı türde okullarda çalışan biyoloji öğretmenlerinin mesleki gelişim deneyim ve ihtiyaçları. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 30*, 174-183.

Roadhouse, M. A. (2007). *Effective models and methods of classroom management: An action research study*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Walden University, USA.

Sadık, F. (2006). *Öğrencilerin istenmeyen davranışları ve bu davranışlarla başedilme stratejilerinin öğretmen, öğrenci ve veli görüşlerine göre incelenmesi ve güvengen disiplin modeli temele alınarak uygulanan eğitim programının öğretmenlerin başetme stratejilerine etkisi*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Çukurova Üniversitesi, Adana.

Sayın, N. (2001). *Sınıf öğretmenlerinin karşılaştıkları istenmeyen öğrenci davranışları ve bu davranışların nedenlerine ilişkin görüşleri ile istenmeyen davranışları önleme yöntemleri*. Unpublished MA Thesis, Anadolu Üniversitesi, Eskişehir.

Schneider, R. M., Krajcik, J., Marx, R. W. & Soloway, E. (2002). Performance of students in project-based science classrooms on a national measure of science achievement. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 39*(5), 410-422.

Shiland, T. W. (1999). Constructivism: The implications for laboratory work. *Journal of Chemical Education, 76*(1), 107-108.

Siyez, D. M. (2009). Liselerde görev yapan öğretmenlerin istenmeyen öğrenci davranışlarına yönelik algıları ve tepkileri, *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 1*(25), 67-80.

Staver, J. R. (1998). Constructivism: Sound theory for explicating the practice of science and science teaching. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 35*(5), 501-520.

Şentürk, H. (2006). Öğretmen adaylarının uygulama liselerindeki rehber öğretmenlerin kullandıkları sınıf yönetimi modellerine ilişkin algıları. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 48*, 585-603.

Terzi, Ç. (2001). *Öğretmenlerin sınıf yönetim anlayışlarına ilişkin görüşlerinin belirlenmesi.* Unpublished MA Thesis, Anadolu Üniversitesi, Eskişehir.

Türnüklü, A. & Yıldız, V. (2002). Öğretmenlerin öğrencilerin istenmeyen davranışlarıyla başa çıkma stratejileri. *Çağdaş Eğitim, 284*, 22-27.

Wedin, A. (2015). Non-challenging education and teacher control as factors for marginalization of students in diverse settings. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education, 7*(2), 169-188.

Yaka, A. (2006). Sınıf yönetimi modelleri (yaklaşımları). In M. Yılman (Ed.). *Sınıf yönetimi* (37-44). Ankara: Nobel.

Yıldırım, A. & Şimşek, H. (2006). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayınevi.

Zarotiadou, E. & Tsaparlis, G. (2000). Teaching lower-secondary chemistry with a piagetian constructivist and an ausbellian meaningful-receptive method: a longitudinal comparison. *Chemistry Education: Research and Practice in Europe, 1*(1), 37-50.

www.iejee.com

This page is intentionally left blank