



TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT ORIENTATIONS IN TURKISH AND LATVIA CONTEXTS: A COMPARATIVE STUDY

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Yusuf Cerit
Abant İzzet Baysal University
Faculty of Education
14280 Bolu- TURKEY
cerit_y@ibu.edu.tr

Saadet Yüksel
Abant İzzet Baysal University
Faculty of Education
14280 Bolu- TURKEY
saadetyuksel_90@hotmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to explore teachers' classroom management orientations in the Turkey and Latvia. The data in the study was collected through 294 Turkish teachers and 44 Latvian teachers. Data in this study were collected using the attitudes and beliefs on classroom control ideology (ABCC) developed by Martin et al. (1998). Mean, standard deviation, and Mann Whitney U- test were used in analysis of the data. In this study, it was found that there was no significant differences between Turkish and Latvian teachers' instructional management, whereas significant differences between Turkish and Latvian teachers' people management and behavior management.

Key Words: Classroom management, classroom management orientation, teacher, Turkey, Latvia.

INTRODUCTION

Researchers argued that teachers' classroom management skills have an effect on the success of students and the quality of teaching (Yılmaz & Çavaş, 2008). Classroom management is defined as the range of teacher efforts to oversee classroom activities, including learning, social interaction, and student behavior (Iverson, 2003). According to Tal (2010), "classroom management is perceived as a cyclical process that includes advanced planning, implementation, assessment during implementation, and final evaluation that takes into account factors related to children and their environment, intended to bring about progress in the activities carried out for the learning and emotional well-being of the children in the class" (p.144). Classroom management is defined as the formation and implementation of classroom routines, and procedures for participation in teaching activities, shaping cooperative learning teams, accomplishing class work (Sterling, 2009). As can be seen this definitions, it is suggested that classroom management is a factor directly affecting the quality of education because it is the concept including a broad teachers' actions from are required to perform teaching to managing students' behaviors. Eventually, studies examining factors affecting students' learning revealed that classroom management is an important factor for students' learning (Shin & Koh, 2007). However, teachers report that one of the most widespread challenges in the classroom is classroom management (Goyette, Dore, & Dion, 2000). This may indicate that classroom management is an important factor to ensure the quality of education.

One of the factors shaping teachers' actions related to classroom management is classroom management orientations. Although teachers may choose different classroom management orientations to make teaching activities, they tend to be widely adopted only style. Therefore, teachers adopting classroom management



orientations may have had an important effect on determining their reactions toward students' behaviors and teaching activities. Classroom management strategies are a crucial part of teacher's success in creating a safe and effective learning environment for student's quality education (Osakwe, 2014). Thus, in order to determine teacher using classroom management orientations, it may contribute to appropriate or desired teaching activities in class. In this respect, it is important examining teachers' adopting classroom management orientations.

Glickman and Tamashiro (1980) conceptualized teacher's classroom management orientations which commonly used in the literature. They classified beliefs toward discipline on a continuum of control that reflects the extent to which teachers want to exercise control over students. The continuum ranges from interventionists at one extreme to non-interventionists at the other, with interactionalists midway between them (Martin et al. 1998). This conceptualization has been used to some studies examining teachers' classroom management orientations (Chambers, 2003; Martin, Yin & Baldwin, 1998a). This study utilized the classroom management framework conceptualized by Glickman and Tamashiro to explore teachers' classroom management orientations.

Interventionists emphasize the external environment and what this does to the human organism to cause it to develop in its particular way (Unal & Uludag, 2008). Interventionists believe that students learn appropriate behaviors primarily when their behaviors are reinforced by teacher-generated rewards and punishments, and they assert that teachers should exercise a high degree of control over classroom activities (Martin et al., 1998). The goal of the interventionist orientation is to maintain an orderly and efficient classroom that promotes quality of education (Osakwe, 2014). Teachers who approve the interventionist orientation may tend to take control of the situation by implementing immediate disciplinary strategies to control their students' behaviors (Witcher, Onwuegbuzie, Collins, Witcher, Minor & James, 2002). According to the interventionist orientation, the teacher's role in the classroom is to conduct rules and procedures, convey these to students and implement appropriate rewards and punishment for compliance or non-compliance respectively (Osakwe, 2014). "At the other extreme, non-interventionists believe that students have an inner drive that needs to find its expression in the real world" (Martin et al. 1998, p. 6). To accomplish this, the teacher's role should create close, strong, trusting relationship with children and helping them develop their problem solving abilities (Osakwe, 2014). Non-interventionists suggest that students should be allowed to exert significant influence in the classroom and that teachers should be less involved in modifying student behaviors (Martin et al. 1998a). Teachers who endorse to the non-interventionist approach may tend to student-oriented and favor to employ strategies using minimal teacher power (Witcher et al. 2002). Non-interventionist teacher's goal is to demonstrate empathy toward students and to find a compromise in an effort to provide opportunities for students to self-correct the inappropriate behaviors and learn to manage their own behaviors (Unal & Uludag, 2008). The goal of the non-interventionist approach is to increase the personal growth and autonomy of the student in the teaching-learning process (Osakwe, 2014). "Midway between these two extremes, interactionalists focus on what the individual does to modify the external environment, as well as what the environment does to shape the individual" (Martin et al., 1998, p.7). Interactionalists believe that students learn desired behaviors as a result of encountering the outside world of people and objects (Martin et al. 1998). Interactionalists suggest that students and teachers should share responsibility for classroom management (Martin et al., 1998). Interactionalists endeavor to find solutions satisfactory to both teacher and students, adopting some of the same strategies as interventionists and non-interventionists. Interactionalist teachers may use both directive and non-directive strategies (Unal & Uludag, 2008). The interactionist teacher's role is to understand student's behavior and to help students understand their own behavior and its consequences (Osakwe, 2014). The emphasis of this orientation is how the established rules and regulations can be obeyed by the students concerned (Osakwe, 2014).

Because of the importance of classroom management, it is important to know factors influencing teachers' classroom management orientations. In literature, it is suggested that culture has an important effect on teachers' attitudes and behaviors. Cultural values may shape teachers' perceptions toward students, teaching and learning (Osborn, 1999). Cultural values play a crucial role to evaluation and interpretation classroom management, classroom environment and teacher-student relationships (Holmes, 2005; Mceachron, Baker, & Bracken, 2003; Romi, Lewis & Katz, 2009; Zhang, 2007). In Eastern culture, teachers are authorities and



knowledge transmitter (Zhang, 2007). The level of interaction between teachers and students is low, and students' silence is an statement of respect to the teacher (Holmes, 2005). Eastern education prefers a more authoritarian, antisocial, and dialectic approach, which is often test-oriented, information-packed, verbatim, and conformity (Holmes, 2005; Zhang, 2006). In Western culture, teacher's roles are facilitator, mentor, and organizer (Zhang, 2007). Western education tends to a more humanistic, prosocial, and dialogic approach, which is often experiential, inquiry-based, problem-solving, and critical thinking (Holmes, 2005). People from collectivistic cultures favored more dispositional strategies to maintain interpersonal relationship conformity, whereas people from individualistic cultures favored more contingency strategies to promote freedom (Lee, Levine, & Cambra, 1997; Zhang, Zhang & Castellucci, 2011). The results of the study examining teachers' behavior alteration techniques in U.S. and China with different cultural values revealed that U.S. teachers generally focus on student autonomy and teacher-student equality so that they use reward-based, prosocial, compliance-gaining strategies, while Chinese teachers emphasize authority and inequality so that they tend to punishment-based and antisocial techniques (Lu, 1997). Hence, differences between West and East cultures play an important role shaping teachers' pedagogical beliefs and practices including classroom management styles (Zhou & Li, 2015). The results of study examining students' responsibility in Australia, China and Israel with different cultural characteristics indicated that Chinese students have levels of responsibility in class than those in Australia and Israel, and that Australian and Chinese teachers conceive more their students' responsibility than Israeli teachers (Romi et al., 2009).

In literature, conducted studies related to classroom management revealed that teachers in countries with different cultural values favored different classroom management orientations (Shin & Koh, 2007). Shin and Koh (2007) found that there were significant differences in perceives of West (America) and Asia (Korea) teachers regarding their classroom management strategies, and American teachers tend to favor more interventionist orientation on people management and behavior management than Korean teachers. Asian teachers preferred to use more behavioral strategies (Cheng, 2014). Cultural values such as valuing collective interest over individualism and the hierarchical nature of teacher-student relationships play a important role in shaping Chinese teachers' classroom management orientations (Zhou & Li, 2015). Also, the hierarchical teacher-student relationships had effect on Chinese teachers' classroom management orientations (Hofstede, 1986).

This study explored whether a difference in classroom management orientation of Turkish and Latvian teachers who have different cultural values. Turkey is a collectivist, high power distance, and high uncertainty avoidance society, whereas Latvian is an individualistic, low power distance and low uncertainty avoidance society (Aycan & Kanungo, 2000; Huettinger, 2008). Turkish teachers more spend their time maintaining order in the class than Latvian teachers (OECD, 2009, 2014). In terms of the teacher-student relationship including having mutual respect, empathy, and social skills, in Turkey, positive teacher-student relationships scores lower than Latvia (OECD, 2009, 2014). Latvian teachers believe that the teacher-student relationships are developed, students' thoughts are valued, and students should be allowed to think of solutions to problems (OECD, 2014). In light of this knowledge, it is suggested that Latvian teachers may tend to noninterventionist or interactionist classroom management orientations.

Turkey is a collectivist, high power distance, and paternalistic society. Individuals in a high power distance value one's status, title, and position (Aycan & Kanungo, 2000), accept centralized power, and rely on manager for direction (Rodrigues, 1988). In such societies, teachers are expected to transmit knowledge for students (Kırlıdoğ & Ağaoğlu, 2004). In collectivistic societies students are usually expected to respect and obey their teachers (Zhou & Li, 2015). In paternalistic countries manager's duty is protection, direction, and guidance, employees unquestioning obedience as a means of reciprocation (Aycan & Kanungo, 2000). According to this, in societies with such a culture such as Turkey, teachers may believe that they should make decisions relating what teaching activities to do and how student act in classroom. Considering teachers' role in interventionist classroom management is that their determined rules transmit students, and give reward or punishment whether students comply with rules, teachers may favored interventionist classroom management orientation allowing them to be authority and dominant in the class.



Conversely, individuals in low power distance societies do not endure centralized power, and expect to get their opinions about decisions and participate in the decision-making process (Rodrigues, 1988; Aycan & Kanungo, 2000), students can easily say their ideas and criticize their teachers (Erdoğan, Yaman, Şentürk & Kalyoncu, 2008). According to this, in societies with such a culture such as Latvia, Teachers value students' thoughts about in-class activities, make decisions together, and share responsibilities. Non-interventionist Teachers allow students to be active and freedom, and help students to solve problems. Interactionalist teachers share responsibilities. Based on this knowledge, it is suggested that Latvian teachers may favored non-interventionist or interactionist classroom management orientations.

Although studies were conducted exploring teachers' classroom management orientations in the a single country, studies comparing teachers' classroom management orientations between countries are very few, specially comparative studies of classroom management orientations in countries with different cultural values. Consequently, very little is known about classroom management orientations in different cultural contexts. According to Zhau & Li (2015) there is a need understanding classroom management practices in different cultures. It may contribute to extend knowledge regarding this topic in order to examine teachers' classroom management orientations in Turkey and Latvia with different culturel values. Therefore, it was the intent of this study to explore Turkish and Latvian teachers' classroom management orientations.

METHOD

Participants

The study was carried out in elementary schools in Turkey. The participants for this study consisted of 294 Turkish teachers and Latvian teachers. Teachers in the Turkish sample were 62.58 % female, and 37.41 % male, teachers in the Latvian sample were 84% female, and 15.9 % male. Turkish teachers had from 4 to 25 years teaching experiences, Latvian teachers had from 10 to 30. 18.70 % of Turkish teachers had completed a 2-year program with higher schools of education, 61.56 % of teachers had completed a 4-year program with college degree, and 19.72 % of teachers had a master's degree. % 52.2 of Latvian teachers had bachelor's degree, and 47.7 % teachers had a master's degree.

Instrument

To measure teachers' interventionist, non-interventionist, and interactionalist orientations, Martin et.al. (1998) developed the Attitudes and Beliefs on Classroom Control (ABCC) Inventory. The ABCC is extensively used to measure teachers' classroom management orientations (e.g. Henson & Chambers, 2005; Martin, Yin, & Mayall, 2006; Shin and Koh, 2007). This instrument measures teachers' beliefs and attitudes toward classroom management in three broad dimensions, instructional management (14 items), people management (8 items), and behavior management (4 items). Instructional Management includes activities such as establishing daily procedures, allocating materials, and monitoring students' independent work. People management pertains to teachers' beliefs about students as persons and what teachers do to enable them to develop. Behavior Management is any pre-planned intervention aimed to prevent student misbehavior. On a continuum of control each subscale assessed the degree of teacher power over students (Martin et al. 1998) ranging from interventonist to interactionalist to non-intervantionist. The ABCC is a four-point Likert scale which is scored as follows: Four points "describes me very well", three points "describes me usually", two points "describes me somewhat", and one point "describes me not at all". High scores on three subscales of the ABCC inventory reflect more interventionist management beliefs while low scores reflect less interventionist management beliefs.

As ABCC was adapted in Turkish Language, to confirm the construct validity of 26 items and the three factors structure of ABCC, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) performed on data for the Turkish sample of this study. To assess the model fit, it was used that multiple fit statistics including Chi-square, root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), googness of fit index (GFI), adjusted goodness of fit index (AGFI) and the comparative fit index (CFI). The results of CFA showed that fit index of the 26 items and the three factors structure of ABCC indicated a acceptable fit to the data ($\chi^2= 324.889$ $df=83$, $\chi^2/df= 3.91$, $RMSEA=.07$, $AGFI= .91$ $CFI=.88$, $GFI=.94$). In addition, load values of the items of the instructional management factor ranged from .65 to .91, that of

people management factor from .70 to .84, that of behavior management factor from .63 to .81. Consequently, it is revealed that three factors structure of ABCC is a valid structure.

The adaptation process of the ABCC inventory to Lettish included a validity and reliability study. ABCC was translated in Lettish by two translators. In this study, explanatory factor analysis was made for Lettish teachers by the use of principal components with varimax rotations in ABCC. The compliance of the data with the factor analysis was ascertained with KMO and Barlett Sphericity test. KMO was .793 and Barlett Sphericity test (X^2 : 369.744; $p = 0.000$) was found to be meaningful. These results indicated that factor analysis was suitable for the sample. Factor analysis was performed to confirm underlying dimensions of the ABCC. The factor analysis revealed three factors of ABCC. Three factors of ABCC accounted for 77.84 % of the variance in the respondents' scores. In addition, load values of the items of the instructional management factor ranged from .65 to .83, that of people management factor from .48 to .80, that of behavior management factor from .57 to .88. In addition, CFA performed on data for the Latvia sample of this study. The results of CFA showed that fit index of the 26 items and the three factors structure of ABCC indicated a good fit to the data ($X^2 = 144.832$ $df=74$, $X^2/df= 1.95$, $RMSEA=.04$, $AGFI= .92$ $CFI=.96$, $GFI=.95$).Consequently, it is revealed that three factors structure of ABCC is a valid structure for Latvian teachers.

In order to assess the internal consistency of the ABCC inventory for Turkey and Latvia, Cronbach's coefficient was utilized. Alpha coefficient for the instructional management was .83, and .79 for Turkey and Latvia, respectively. Alpha coefficient for the people management was .80, and .76 for Turkey and Latvia, respectively. Alpha coefficient for the behavioral management was .68, and .61 for Turkey and Latvia, respectively.

Data Analysis

The respondents' scores on the ABCC scale were analyzed by utilizing mean and standard deviation. Mann Whitney U-test was conducted to determine differences between Turkish teachers and Latvian teachers' classroom management orientations.

RESULTS

Mean and standard deviation values of Turkish and Latvian teachers' classroom management orientations on instructional management, people management, and behavior management subscales of the ABCC are presented in Table 1. The mean score of Turkish teachers in instructional management was midpoint on the rating scale. This result revealed that Turkish teachers favored interactionist classroom management orientation on the instructional management. Mean scores of Turkish teachers in people management, and behavior management was above the midpoint. These findings showed that Turkish teachers were oriented interventionist classroom management style on people management, and behavior management.

Table 1: Distribution of Mean Scores on ABCC's Subscale

	Turkish Teachers		Latvian teachers		Total Score
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	
Instructional management	32.78	4.86	29.88	4.19	56
People management	24.78	2.94	17.56	2.12	32
Behavior management	11.59	1.78	9.34	1.84	16

As shown in Table 1,the mean score of Latvian teachers in instructional management was the midpoint. This result indicated that Latvian teachers favored interactionist classroom management orientation on the instructional management. Mean scores of Latvian teachers in people management, and behavior management was above the midpoint. These findings showed that Latvian teachers were oriented interventionist classroom management approach on people management, and behavior management.

Table 2: The results of Mann Whitney U- Test

		Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	P
Instructional Management	Turkish Teachers	194.19	66023.50	6906.500	.407
	Latvian Teacher	179.47	7896.50		
People Management	Turkish Teachers	212.24	72162.50	767.500	.000
	Latvian Teacher	39.94	1757.50		
Behavior Management	Turkish Teachers	209.07	71083.00	1847.00	.000
	Latvian Teacher	64.48	2837.00		

Mann-Whitney U was conducted to determine differences between Turkish and Latvian teachers about classroom management orientations. The results of Mann-Whitney U revealed no statistically significant differences between Turkish and Latvian teachers' instructional management, whereas significant differences between Turkish and Latvian teachers' people management and behavior management. Turkish teachers' attitudes toward the people management and behavior management had significantly higher scores than Latvian teachers. Turkish teachers tended to favor more interventionist orientation on people management and behavior management. Turkish teachers are able more a strict, control and directive approach in teacher-students relationship, giving directions, and commenting on behavior than Latvian teachers.

DISCUSSION

In this study, it was founded that there is no difference between Turkish and Latvian teachers' classroom management on instructional management. Turkish and Latvian teachers tended to interactionist orientation on instructional management. Based on this result, it is said that Turkish and Latvian teachers have a tendency to act together with their students to determine behaviors toward performing teaching such as monitoring students' work, establishing class procedures, and allocating teaching materials. This result may seem surprising, considering the two countries' national cultural values. It can expected that teachers in Latvia with low power distance and uncertainty avoidance favore non-interventionist or interactionist classroom management orientations, whereas it can expected that teachers in Turkey with collectivist, high power distance and uncertainty avoidance tend to interventionist orientation. However, the result of this study revealed that teachers in both countries adopted interactionist classroom management orientation. This finding may result from curriculum reforms which have been in Turkey in 2005, and in Latvia since 1990s. Educational reforms in Latvia have stipulated to move democratic and learning-centred approach, and it based on constructivist model since 2006 (Zagla, Cernova & Kalnina, 2011). Curriculum reform in 2005 in Turkey such as Latvia are to move from behaviorist and teacher-centred approach to constructivist and student-centred approach. Turkish and Latvian teachers may have a similar thought because of these reforms in both countries which based on the same approach.

The results of this study revealed that there was a difference between Turkish and Latvian teachers' classroom management on people management. Turkish tended to interventionist classroom management orientation on people management, whereas Latvian teachers favored interactionist orientation. The results of studies conducting countries with Western and Eastern cultural values are inconsistent. Consistent with this result, studies in Jordan and Iran which have similar cultural values, and Turkey have found that teachers adopted interventionist orientation on people management (Abu-Tineh, Khasawneh & Khalaileh, 2011; Rahimi & Asadollahi, 2012; Yılmaz & Çavaş, 2008). This result is inconsistent with the findings of the study conducting Western cultural context such as Latvia. American teachers tend to more interventionist orientation than Korean teachers (Shin & Koh, 2007). In this study, Turkish teachers tend to be dominant to shape teacher-student relationships, while Latvian teachers show tendencies to shape teacher-student relationships with their students. The study conducted by OECD founded that most Latvian teachers are interested in their students' thoughts, and believed that teacher-student relationships are good (OECD, 2014). In Turkey with collectivism, high power distance, and paternalism, teacher-students relationships are characterized by teachers' authority and hierarchical relationship. Thus Turkish teachers may tend to interventionist orientation to classroom management. Conversely, the teacher-student relationships in the West such as Latvia tend to be more



professional so that in Latvia, teacher-student relationship are characterized by equality and freedom (Zhang, 2006). Therefore, Latvian teachers may favored to interactionist classroom management style.

The result of this study revealed that there was a difference between Turkish and Latvian teachers' classroom management on behavior management. Turkish tended to interventionist classroom management orientation on behavior management, whereas Latvian teachers favored interactionist orientation. Contrary to this result, the study comparing of teachers' classroom management practices in U.S. with Western culture such as Latvia and Greece with Eastern culture such as Turkey revealed that American and Greek teachers believed that the class rules should be established by themselves (Akin-Little et al., 2007). Turkish teachers want to have control on behavior management including acts toward preventing of students' undesirable behaviors through determining class rules. They do not tend to pay attention to students' thoughts. Rules should be determined by the teacher and students must comply with it. This results corroborate the result of the study conducting Latvia indicated that teachers do not establish any rules for classroom discipline, and believe that students are allowed much freedom (Daniela & Nimante, 2011). As in the collectivistic classroom, discipline and order are valued (Sun, 2015), collectivist teachers believe that students' behaviors should be controlled, and strictness in setting up classroom rules for managing their behaviors. Thus Turkish teachers may favored to interventionist classroom management approach. Contrary, because in individualist classroom, teachers may provide students with opportunities to make choices and be responsible for their own behaviors, individualist teachers believe that students are allowed to express their thoughts freely, and have responsibility of establishing their own rules. Thus Latvian teachers tend to interactionist classroom management orientation.

IMPLICATIONS

The results of this study suggest some important implications for classroom management orientation. It is important to know factors affecting classroom management orientations because successfully managing a classroom is crucial to the success of students and the quality of instruction, and teachers' classroom management orientations had effect on their classroom practices. In this study, it is revealed that teachers' classroom management orientations vary in countries with different cultural values. Based on the results of this study, it is suggested that national culture is to be a factor considering to provide teachers manage their classrooms according to contemporary classroom management orientations. In addition, teachers in countries where were adopted constructivist and student-centred approach in instruction such as Turkey and Latvia should manage their classroom consistent with this approach. In order to shape teachers' classroom management orientations policy makers and principals need to be aware of how teachers' classroom management orientations has been affected by their cultural values.

Empirical evidence on classroom management orientations has been more confined to only the western world or only eastern world. This study extends this line of inquiry by examining teachers' classroom management orientations in different cultural setting by taking Turkey and Latvia. This study adds to existing knowledge about teachers' classroom management orientations across cultures. However, it is suggested that more research in the farklı kültürel değerlere sahip ülkelerde is needed in order to further confirm the results of this study.

REFERENCES

- Abu-Tineh, A., Khasawneh, S.A. & Khalaileh, H.A. (2011). Teachers self-efficacy and classroom management styles in Jordanian schools. *Management in Education*, 25(4), 175-181.
- Akin-Little, K.A., Little, S.G. & Laniti, M. (2007). Teachers' use of classroom management procedures in the United States and Greece. *School Psychology International*, 28(1), 53-62.
- Rahimi, M. & Asadollahia, F. (2012). EFL teachers' classroom management orientations: Investigating the role of individual differences and contextual variables. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 31, 43-48.



Aycan, Z., & Kanungo, R.N., (2000). Impact of culture on human resource management practice and organisational culture. In Z. Aycan (Ed.), *Management, leadership, and human resources application in Turkey* (pp. 25-47). Ankara: Turkish Psychologists Association.

Chambers, S.M. (2003). *The impact of length of students teaching on the self-efficacy and classroom orientation of pre-service teachers*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association (San Antonio). ED 477 509.

Cheng, Y. (2014). What are students' attitudes towards different management strategies: A cross-regional study. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 141, 188-194.

Daniela, . L. & Nimante, D. (2011). Teachers' perception of discipline problems. *International Forum for Education*, Eds: Nowosad, I. & Milkowska, I., pp. 181-202. Torun: Adam Marszalek.

Erdogan, Y., Yaman, E., Sentürk, O. & Kalyoncu, E. (2008). Power Distance in Web-Based Education: The Case of Bilgi University. *Journal of Values Education*, 6(15), 115-137.

Glickman, C. D. & Tamashiro, R.T. (1980). Clarifying teachers' beliefs about discipline. *Educational Leadership*, 37, 459-464.

Goyette, R., Dore, R., & Dion, E. (2000). Pupils' misbehaviors and the reactions and causal attributions of physical education student teachers: A sequential analysis. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 20, 3 – 14.

Henson, R.K. & Chambers, S.M. (2005). Personality type as a predictor of teaching efficacy and classroom control in emergency certification teachers. *Education*, 124 (2), 261-8.

Hofstede, G. (1986). Cultural differences in teaching and learning. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 10 (3), 301-320.

Holmes, P. (2005). Ethnic Chinese students' communication with cultural others in a New Zealand university. *Communication Education*, 54, 289-311.

Huettinger, M. (2008). Cultural dimensions in business life: Hofstede's indices for Latvia and Lithuania. *Baltic Journal of Management*, 3(3), 359-376.

Iverson, A.M. (2003). *Building competence in classroom management and discipline*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice-Hall.

Kirildog, M. & Agaoglu, M. (2004). Can e-Learning Help for Student-Based Learning? First International Conference on Innovations in Learning for the Future, Istanbul.

Lee, C. R., Levine, T. R., & Cambra, R. (1997). Resisting compliance in the multicultural classroom. *Communication Education*, 46, 29-43.

Lu, S. (1997). Culture and compliance gaining in the classroom: A preliminary investigation of Chinese college teachers' use of behavior alteration techniques. *Communication Education*, 46, 10-28.

Martin, N. K., Yin, Z., & Baldwin, B. (1998). Construct validation of the attitudes and beliefs on classroom control inventory. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 33 (2), 6-15.

Martin, N. K., Yin, Z., & Baldwin, B. (1998a). *Classroom management training, class size and graduate study: Do these variables impact teachers' beliefs regarding classroom management style?* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Associations (San Diego), ED 420671.



- Martin, N.K., Yin, Z., & Mayall, H. (2006). Classroom management training, teaching experience and gender: Do these variables impact teachers' attitudes and beliefs toward classroom management style? Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Southwest Educational Research Association, Austin, TX.
- Mceachron, G., Baker, C. & Bracken, B.A. (2003). What classroom environments tell about the pedagogical aspects of subject matter: A cross-cultural comparison. *School Psychology International*, 24(4): 462–476.
- OECD (2009). Creating effective teaching and learning environments: First results from TALIS. www.OECD.org.
- OECD (2014). *TALIS 2013 results*. www.OECD.org.
- Osakwe, R.N. (2014). Classroom management: A tool for achieving quality secondary school education in Nigeria. *International Journal of Education*, 6(2), 58-68.
- Osborn, M. (1999). National context, educational goals and pupil experience of schooling and learning in three european countries. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 29(3), 287-301.
- Rodrigues, C.A. (1998). Cultural classifications of societies and how they affect cross-cultural management. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, 5(3), 31-41.
- Romi, S., Lewis, R. & Katz, Y.J. (2009). Student responsibility and classroom discipline in Australia, China, and Israel. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 39 (4), 439-453.
- Shin, S. & Koh, M.S. (2007). A cross-cultural study of teachers' beliefs and strategies on classroom behavior management in urban American and Korean school systems. *Education and Urban Society*, 39(2), 286-309.
- Sterling, D. (2009). Classroom management: Setting up the classroom for learning. *Science Scope*, 32(9), 29-33.
- Sun, R.C.F. (2015). Teachers' experiences of effective strategies for managing classroom misbehavior in Hong Kong. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 46, 94-103.
- Tal, C. (2010). Case studies to deepen understanding and enhance classroom management skills in preschool teacher training. *Early Childhood Edu Journal*, 38, 143-152.
- Unal, Z. & Uludağ, A. (2008). Comparing Beginning and Experienced Teachers' Perceptions of Classroom Management Beliefs and Practices in Elementary Schools in Turkey. Retrieved January 5, 2008 from [www.zunal.com/zportfolio/uploads/classroompaper\(3\).doc](http://www.zunal.com/zportfolio/uploads/classroompaper(3).doc).
- Witcher, L.A., Onwuegbuzie, A.J., Collins, K., Witcher, A.E., Minor, L., & James, T.L. (2002). Relationship between teacher efficacy and beliefs about education among preservice teachers, Paper presented of the annual meeting of the mid-south educational research association (29th, Chattanooga, TN, November 6-8, 2002), ED 474 899.
- Yılmaz, H. & Çavaş, P.H. (2008). The effect of the teaching practice on pre-service elementary teachers' science teaching efficacy and classroom management beliefs. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science & Technology Education*, 4(1), 45-54.
- Zagla, I., Cernova, E. & Kalnina, D. (2011). Schools of Latvia for Learners: System and its managements. *International Forum for Education*, Eds: Nowosad, I. & Milkowska, I., pp. 44-63. Torun: Adam Marszalek.
- Zhang, Q. (2006). Immediacy and out-of-class communication: A cross-cultural comparison. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 30, 33-50.



Zhang, Q. (2007). Teacher misbehaviors as learning demotivators in college classrooms: A cross-cultural investigation in China, Germany, Japan and the United States. *Communication Education*, 56(2), 209-227.

Zhang, Q., Zhang, J. & Castellucci, A.A. (2011). A cross-cultural investigation of student resistance in college classrooms: The effects of teacher misbehaviors and credibility. *Communication Quarterly*, 59(4), 450-464.

Zhou, W. & Li, G. (2015). Chinese language teachers' expectations and perceptions of American students' behavior: Exploring the nexus of cultural differences and classroom management. *System*, 49, 17-27.