

The Effect of Class Management Types (Authoritative, Democratic, Laissez-faire) on Teacher Professional Development among Iranian EFL Teachers

Afsaneh Mostofi *

M.A student, Department of English Language Teaching, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Southern Branch, Iran

Ahmad Mohseni

Associate Professor, Department of English Language Teaching, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Southern Branch, Iran

Abstract

In general, professional development (PD) is the development of an individual in his/her professional role (Villegas-Reimers, 2003). On the other hand, classroom management can be demarcated as series of tools or procedures that an instructor used in his class to provide an organized class for learning, as Smith and Laslett, (2002, p. 3). Regarding the importance of these two concepts, the present study sought to find out whether there is any relationship between these two concepts among Iranian English language teachers. In this study, 60 English language teachers from different language schools in Tehran, Iran were selected as the participants. The Professional Development Questionnaire (Varies, Jansen & Grift, 2013) was used as the instrument in this study. After sampling the participants, they were divided randomly into four groups: three as experimental groups and one as control group. In the three experimental groups, each group consisting of 15 teachers were asked to adopt one of the class management styles (authoritative, democratic, laissez faire). After data collection, the data were analyzed in the software SPSS and ANOVA was run. The results showed that a significant difference was observed between all three experimental groups and the control group. Besides, each classroom management style had a significant effect on teachers' PD. In other words, the null hypothesis of the study is rejected and it can be said that different types of class management styles had a significant effect on teachers' PD. The present study could add some valuable results to the related literature on WTC and class management styles. Thus, English language teachers and teacher educators are addressed by the results of the present study to put much focus on class management style.

Keywords: class management types (authoritative, democratic, laissez-faire), teacher professional development, Iranian EFL teachers

INTRODUCTION

Teachers are asked to teach a classroom full of students with a wide range of learning abilities, as well as a varied range of learning disabilities. Students come to the

classroom from stable, traditional, supportive home environments and from unstable, broken and homeless situations. Some students are ready to learn while others are highly resistant (Ryan, 2007). Obviously, classroom management is one of the most important issues in educational settings (Yilmaz & Cavas, 2008).

The research works on Professional Development (PD) can be classified under three wide areas: a) why PD is a novel primacy; b) what creates effective PD; and c) teaching as part of the PD and identity of new professors (Moss, 2008). Teacher PD has become a national primacy in Australia because of the great attrition degree of beginning tutors as recognized by the Committee for the Review of Teaching and Teacher Education. The federal government in reaction to this national worry has claimed that teacher registration becomes dependent upon ongoing PD (Al-bidawi, 2015). The connection between registration and ongoing PD will create resistance undoubtedly, since it embodies yet another “professional attack and obligation on teachers’ truth and professional identity” (Moss, 2008, p. 351). It is acknowledged that while PD is measured properly, experts and researchers are not convinced regarding its measurement (Borko, 2004) and does not essentially cause acknowledgement of superiority teaching or professional identity in school assemblies. If PD is made as part of being and/or becoming a teacher, this might change teacher insights of PD from something to be tolerated, to quality professional regeneration, integral to professional identity (Jensen, 2010).

Regarding two concepts of Teacher Professional Development (TPD) and classroom management types discussed above, working on the relationship between these two concepts in the field of ELT can be of great importance; literature review also indicated that the relationship between these two variables was not investigated in previous research studies. Therefore, the current study sought to find out whether there is any relationship between these two concepts among Iranian English language teachers.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Here first theoretical foundations of teacher professional development and class management styles and then empirical studies done on teacher professional development and class management styles are presented respectively.

Teacher Professional Development

In general, professional development (PD) is the development of an individual in his/her professional role (Villegas-Reimers, 2003). As said by Villegas-Reimers, the notion of PD is related to two parallel but narrower concepts: job development, as the maturity educators achieve over their professional career, and staff development, as the in-service programs intended to support the development of tutors.

For Richards and Farrell (2005), PD is one of the two opinions resulting from two general objectives in teacher education: training and development. Training includes the initial or pre-teaching teacher education, in a BA program, for example; development denotes the in-service and long-term development of teachers. For the writers, teacher training typically creates short-term goals related to the educators’

current or immediate requirements. Teacher training naturally includes comprehending theory, and then using it to teaching till skills in representing the values and practice are improved and perceived. In sequence, teacher development is planned for long-term periods whose aim is to enable teachers' self-understanding and to comprise a deep section as a foundation of the program. PD expands the performance of educators, learners, and the school itself which Richards and Farrell consider a bottom-up process.

Additionally, Edge (1989) (as cited in Wallace, 1991) about the distinction between teacher training or education and teacher development declares that: "the distinction is that training or education is something that can be offered or achieved by others; but development is something that can be done only by and for oneself" (p. 3). Wallace (1991) argues two former models of professional education: craft and applied science, and proposes his own, reflective. The craft model is centered on experiential PD; in it, expertise is revealed by a master practitioner and imitated or experienced by the young learner. This imitative practice is thought to cause professional competence. Wallace assessed this model as simple, static, imitative, and ignoring the development of important scientific knowledge. Schön's (1987) assumed science model analyzed teaching problems by scientific knowledge to attain vibrant objectives, emphasizing theory and considering practice as instrumental. Wallace criticized this model since it splits theory (research) and practice.

Opposed to those models, Wallace (1991) suggested the reflective model that balances both experience and scientific bases of teaching carrying out professional development over a mixture of "received" and "experiential" knowledge; the first one contains the disciplinary theory that preserves language, teaching, and learning, while the second one is associated to the educators' constant experience and expertise. Figure 2 summarizes this model. PD on the whole has moved from an initial emphasis on training to modern sights that comprise the educators' personal and professional dimensions, knowledge, experience, working conditions, and agendas (Cárdenas Beltrán& Nieto Cruz, 2010). The training viewpoint has been measured a "deficit model," opposed to the second one, realized as a cooperative-process view (Richardson & Anders as cited in Cárdenas Beltrán& Nieto Cruz, 2010). The previous purposes at fixing teaching practice believed out-of-date or somehow imperfect; it is concentrated on the academic knowledge to be conveyed by the educators and its methodology search for the educators use that in their settings the knowledge well-educated in the training courses. The cooperative-process perspective follows the association between theory and practice, giving prominence to reflection and constructing educators' analytical and critical awareness.

Precisely, educators' PD is "the professional growth a teacher reaches on account of achieving improved experience and inspecting his or her teaching systematically" (Villegas-Reimers, 2003, p. 11), includes formal (e.g., attendance of workshops) and informal experiences (e.g., reading professional publications), and it is essential to study the experiences, processes, and the settings wherein educators' PD happens. Latest tendencies in PD are centered on constructivism instead of transmission-oriented models (Villegas-Reimers, 2003). It means that, educators in PDPs are energetic

learners. Similarly, a PDP for Darling-Hammond (1998) is connected to the everyday actions of educators and students and it must be based on schools. Professional development can merely prosper in settings, or contexts, that preserve it. Perhaps the most critical part of that maintenance must originate from administrators (McLaughlin & Marsh, 1978). The result of every professional development initiative finally will be contingent on whether its administrators consider it significant. Hence, buy-in on the part of administrators (whether state directors, superintendents, or principals) is vital to success.

Another feature of settings that reinforce professional development is that they are conducive to the variations that the professional development is intended to cause. Before happening change, there need to be a mutual feeling of necessity for change—the more powerfully and extensively felt the better. For instance, simply telling teachers that scores on standardized assessments must develop is not enough to make the sense of urgency that institutional change needs (Kennedy, 2008). They must sense the urgency themselves. If the professionals in an assumed setting approve problems and solutions, institutional change is probable, even likely. When they disagree, the possibility of change is restricted. Whether an assumed setting is conducive to change will be contingent on the degree to which the belief systems of its teaching professionals approve. Change is far more likely in settings wherein there is agreement on the answers to definite basic questions:

- Is learning a conscious act including memorization of facts, or is it a growing of consciousness that results from exploration?
- Is the educator's work to assist as a facilitator or to offer information to passive contributors?
- Is learning a private experience or does it develop over social interaction? (Cely, 2009).

Educators' opinions about the answers to these and other fundamental questions play an important role in teaching efficacy (Wolfolk & Hoy, 1990). Simultaneously, they can be the hardest obstacles for professional development to overcome, as in many cases they have changed over years of teaching experience. This is why professional development frequently can't create its proposed results: When the information and/or strategies offered through professional development oppose to the contributing educators' opinions, the educators commonly go right back to what they had been doing all along (Wallace, 1991).

Investigation on professional development for professors has changed in the last decade from distributing and assessing professional-development packages to concentrating more on reliable teacher learning and the situations that support it (Webster & Wright, 2009). Professional learning communities (PLCs) or networks (PLNs) are assemblies of tutors that share and critically probe their practices in an ongoing, reflective, collaborative, inclusive, learning-oriented, and development encouraging way to equally improve teacher and student learning (Stoll, Bolam, McMahon, Wallace, & Thomas, 2006). PLCs go a step further than professional development by providing educators

with not just abilities and knowledge to develop their teaching practices but as well an ongoing community that enhances each teacher's experiences in their own classrooms and uses those practices to direct teaching rehearses and develop student teaching (Vescio, Ross & Adams, 2008). Study displays that when professional learning communities prove four key features, they can advance teaching practice and student achievement in reading, writing, math, science, and social studies subject tests: fruitful teamwork, emphasis on student learning, nonstop teacher learning, and teacher right to make decisions concerning curriculum, the procedures of their own learning, and features of school governance. Numerous practices of professional learning societies have established consistent support: Video based images, lesson study, mentoring programs, and grade-level teams (Vescio et al., 2008).

Standards six and seven of the National Professional Standards for Teachers (NPIS), (Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership, 2011), relevant to this research, are devoted to defining how teachers at several steps in their occupations can involve in professional learning and reproduction and likewise donate to their relevant schools and professional groups. Obviously, standards without help do not confirm encouragement of teacher learning (Jensen, 2010). Where professional standards have been adopted generatively and contextually as an instrument to support teachers' and students' restricted requirements, though, they were perceived to be effective (Mayer, Mitchell, MacDonald, & Bell, 2005).

Al-bidawi (2015) examined the opinions and recommendations that English as foreign language (EFL) faculty members at Al Jouf University have about their professional development. Two tools were adopted for data collection: a questionnaire and interviews were completed with 46 participants. The results of present work displayed that the faculty members' most common belief concentrated on making a novel role for EFL faculty members, changing from transmitters of knowledge to makers of knowledge. In contrast, the most common recommendation considered planning programs that concentrated on EFL language educators' professional development.

Chaves¹ and Guapacha (2015) described a mixed-method research project intended to develop the practices of public sector English teachers in Cali (Colombia) over a professional development program. At the diagnostic stage surveys, documentary analysis, and a focus group generated the educators' outline and qualified requirements. The action phase dignified the program's effect through surveys, evaluation formats, a focus group, researchers' journal, and documentary analysis. Results discovered that an eclectic approach tailored to the contributors' necessities and goods and a practice-reflection-theory cycle developed the educators' quality.

Class Management Styles

Classroom management can be demarcated as series of tools or procedures that an instructor used in his class to provide an organized class for learning, as Smith and Laslett, (2002, p. 3) revealed "The set of strategies that teachers and students use to ensure a productive, harmonious learning environment to prevent disruptions in the learning process". As stated by Tak and Shing (2008, p. 23) classroom management "in

general it refers to teachers' actions which lead to the creation of a learning environment where positive interpersonal interaction is promoted and effective learning is facilitated", it means in what way the class works, how the instructor and students collaborate, and how teaching and learning occur. Similarly they measured the term of classroom management as a design used by an instructor to make and unify the entire class, they say that "a classroom management plan consists of a series of practices and procedures that a teacher uses to maintain an effective environment in which instruction and learning can occur. Allen (2010) believed that classroom management is a complex set of skills that includes much more than being able to influence and control student behavior. According to Wrench, Richmond and Gorham (2009, p. 119), a well-managed classroom is one where productive interaction is encouraged, students grant power to the teacher, immediacy and affect are high, and discipline is rarely needed".

These days, classroom management is a major concern in schools. As stated by Martin and Sass (2010, p. 225), classroom management involves an "umbrella of definitions that include learning interactions, learning, and the behavior of students". Also Walker (2009, p. 122) specified that "The best teachers don't simply teach content, they teach people". Marzano (2003) mentioned that to successfully teach their pupils, teachers should use effective behavior management strategies, implement effective instructional strategies, and grow a strong curriculum. Along with managing the instruction in the classroom, a teacher's most noteworthy challenge is also managing the behavior of students in the classroom due to how it may influence instruction, learning, and achievement. As the mandated connected with the federal law NCLB (No Child Left Behind), the CCRPI (College and Career Ready Performance Index), and achievement based programs, such as Race to the Top; teachers are worried about penalizing pupils in ways that will eliminate them from the regular classroom setting. However, once they decide to talk about the discipline issue, students are removed from their instructional part of proficiency to a probably feeble and undertrained skill of classroom management, like ISS (Etheridge, 2001). Educators should constantly decide whether they should behave disorderly over penalizing actions or continue to try to teach those pupils (Etheridge, 2010).

Teachers cannot fulfill the needs of these mandated plans without effective classroom management strategies in their classrooms. On the word of Froyen (1988), student achievement has grieved in schools anywhere punishing discipline and behavioral issues have not been sufficiently described. There's not a teacher alive who hasn't felt the frustration of trying to manage a classroom with at least one student who repeatedly pulls other students off-task with annoying, disorderly behavior. Once pupils with behavior issues are not controlled appropriately, study has displayed they can negatively impact the learning environment by encouraging other to join them, which makes teacher effectiveness to be examined, and also an increased pressure for the teacher (Etheridge, 2010). The influence of classroom disruptions, mainly the noncompliant behaviors, ascribed to 2% to 5% of students, is a concern. These noncompliant behaviors constrain the teacher's skill to work successfully by overriding an unequal extent of the teacher's time and energy. Moreover, it has been recommended

that finding effective and efficient strategies for refining behavior should be involved in educational reform before a deep impact on schools is observed.

Another subject related to classroom management is recognizing which approach/method is the most suitable for elementary school students. Is there a one size fits all approach to classroom management? Investigation displays the first years of a teacher's profession are found to be the hardest years of their profession, mostly regarding the classroom management and discipline strategies. As stated by Etheridge (2010), these tough years are revealed in estimation representing approximately 30% of teachers quit the profession after three years and closely 50% of teachers resign within the first five years of ingoing a teaching career. Because of the modifications in teaching and learning, schools are conferring and observing more discipline and classroom management issues.

It is significant to discriminate between instructional management (IM) and Behavioral management (BM). Instructional management is when the teacher keeps control within their classroom with the precision of the lesson. Froyen (1988) said, "Discipline is a subcategory of classroom management, and classroom management is a subcategory of instructional management" (p. 20). Instructional management is established on planning effective lessons in the classroom where the pupils keep on joining and doing tasks. Apprentices are very vulnerable and need educators who have the knowledge of how to make the best result for everybody in the learning environment.

Behavioral management (noninterventionist, interventionist, and interactionalist) is associated with the opportunities an educator holds for their students. White and Reid (2008, p. 1) inscribed, "It's not enough to expect students to keep their hands to themselves or to raise their hands to speak, though those are great starts. Students also need to understand how you expect them to walk around the classroom, to handle sharpening pencils and turning in papers and how you want them to sit at their desks. They need to know how to get your attention appropriately and what voice levels to use at what times". Santiago (2012, p. 1) mentioned five areas an teacher must make their focal point as they wish to keep people management: "communications, fairness, listen, empower, and change". The current study discovers the probable link between student outcomes and approaches to instructional and behavioral classroom management.

The term 'classroom management' is used by some other terms in the language teaching arena interchangeably. 'Classroom control' and 'classroom discipline' are the most frequently used notions to denote to what we call the management of the classroom through teaching. The term 'classroom management' has its origins from the notion that the words 'control' and 'discipline' may upset educators as they smack of an controlling rule which contradict students' any rights and respect (Tak & Shing, 2008). In its elementary form, CM is demarcated as including the decisions teachers make about their use of space and time: where teachers stand and who they look at; how they ask questions and check understanding; the way they use their voice (Poulou, 2009). Thus, the aim of effective CM is to offer a positive climate that improves learning (Tuncay, 2010). The successful result of a well-prepared physical environment enables the

learning and teaching procedure and promotes the class participation of students. In contrast, a gloomy, noisy and ill-prepared classroom environment has negative effects on learners' learning and participating in activities, which sequentially, intensifies CM problems (Kayıkçı, 2009).

First consideration connected to CM problems is the bases to be unsuccessful in handling the classroom. As stated by Matus (1999), CM problems come from individual factors such as family problems, home factors, feelings of inadequacy, and financial factors. Similarly, Santiago (2012) itemized four key factors which hinder classroom management: time, socio cultural differences, lack of student motivation, and large size classroom. Educators' eagerness for teaching is also a key factor for managing the class well or not. Johnson (1994) identifies the issues associated with CM as students' always asking out to the toilet, too-high noise level, being incapable to classify the offender of an fault when all reject guilt, a playground dispute which lasts in the classroom, a learner who just rejects to do what he is said, swearing in the classroom, over-familiarity, students who strike others, a class which arrives the room or area in an over-excited way and is hard to calm down, learners who run about madly out of their seats, persistent disruption of a lesson by a pupil or pupils, and a physical fight in the classroom.

Classroom management is an organizational task wherein tasks are done in a diversity of backgrounds. This typically causes the inculcation of knowledge, application of knowledge, as well as definite social values, such as, individual integrity, human respect, self-confidence, direction and decision making and unity (Johnson, 1994).

The teacher has different responsibilities associated to her/ his job of spreading knowledge. The teacher makes the infrastructure for conductive education which contains the time duration for contacts, space in the classroom, infrastructure resource and finally, the learning material. The methods of instruction play a vibrant role in enabling the student and making the teacher successful as well. So, classroom management has an extensive spectrum of responsibilities and doings involving, the teacher, the student and the support factors.

There are a amount of management kinds that teachers' show. Classroom management styles of teachers can be considered along two dimensions (Baumrind, 1971): Type of control exercised over students and degree of involvement of teachers with students. The excesses of these two dimensions let teacher management of students to be eagerly recognized. The classroom management styles of teachers have been recognized on the basis of the changes and mishmashes of the grade of control and the level of involvement. The chart given below obviously reveals the probable combinations. Baumrind (1971) has defined the four probable combinations of classroom management styles as follows:

Authoritative: The authoritative teacher places limits and controls on the students but simultaneously encourages independence. This teacher often explains the reasons behind the rules and decisions. If a student is disruptive, the teacher offers a polite, but

firm, reprimand. This teacher sometimes metes out discipline, but only after careful consideration of the circumstances.

Democratic: The democratic teacher places few demand or controls on the students. "Do your own thing," describes this classroom. This teacher accepts the student's impulses and actions and is less likely to monitor their behavior.

Laissez-faire: The laissez-faire teacher is not very involved in the classroom. This teacher places few demands, if any, on the students and appears generally uninterested. The laissez-faire teacher just doesn't want to impose on the students. As such, he/she often feels that class preparation is not worth the effort. Things like field trips and special projects are out of the question. This teacher simply won't take the necessary preparation time. Sometimes, he/she will use the same materials, year after year. Also, classroom discipline is lacking. This teacher may lack the skills, confidence, or courage to discipline students.

The prominence of classroom management has been confirmed by empirical research. The expansion of the Attitudes and Beliefs on Classroom Control (ABCC) by Martin, Yin, and Baldwin in 1998 certified academics to directly emphasize on classroom control from interventionist, noninterventionist, and interactionalist viewpoints. Nevertheless, the ABCC and the revised ABCC-R (Martin, Mayall & Yin, 2006) had undesirable overlap in inter-item correlation and consequently required discriminant validity. For these causes the Behavior and Instructional Management Scale (BIMS) (Martin & Sass, 2010) was intended to offer a psychometrically sound measuring instrument for defining interventionist, noninterventionist, and interactionalist approaches to instructional and behavioral classroom management. Essential to realizing the background of the proposed study, interventionist, noninterventionist, and interactionalist management styles at this time can be reliably distinguished using the Behavioral and Instructional Management Scale (BIMS) (Brannon, 2010; Martin & Sass, 2010). "The most essential findings that are behind this study are from Martin and Sass (2010). Classroom management is "multi-faceted contracts that includes two independent constructs: Behavior Management and Instructional Management" (Martin & Sass, 2010, p. 1126).

Martin and Sass (2010) made three studies on the Behavior and Instructional Management Scale (BIMS). These studies comprised 550 K-12 certified teachers from the southwestern United States. In the initial study, Martin and Sass (2010) measured a shortened form of the 24-item BIMS by an exploratory factor analysis. The factor analysis presented a reliability of .85, respectively. As for the second study, the validity and reliability was examined by a confirmatory factor analysis in another shortened version of the survey. Both factors, behavioral and instructional management showed a good internal consistency ($\alpha = .77$). After the prior studies, Martin & Sass (2010) thought discriminate and convergent validity would be undertaken on the BIMS. This encouraged the last study to be done. Martin and Sass (2010) compared the BIMS and a short version of the Ohio State Teacher Efficacy Scale (p.1126). A worthy overall model fit was discovered. The results of these studies confirmed the Behavior and Instructional Management Scale effectively measures educators' views of their practices

in the parts of behavior and instructional management. Along with the confirmation of the BIMS, Martin and Sass propose the 24-item BIMS for use in upcoming researches to unite a relationship through gender, grade levels, and content areas.

Extra research studies have parallel outcomes to Martin and Sass's (2010) results. Brannon (2010) studied the association between student academic success and classroom management beliefs on fifth grade English language arts and math scores. Brannon used the Attitudes and Beliefs on Classroom Control (ABCC) Inventory-R to identify teachers as interventionist, noninterventionist, and interactionalist, with the aim of "the lower survey score results in a less controlling (noninterventionist) ideology, and the higher survey score results in a more controlling (interventionist) ideology" (p. 48). ELA and math achievement were measured by the California Standards Test (CST) database. For the forty-one fifth grade educators who contributed, Brannon found that ELA and math scores were did significantly vary from group for 4th grade students, but notified, "It is important to note that the means are higher for ELA for noninterventionist, teachers with a less controlling ideology, while for Math, there was a higher mean for Interactionalist teachers that mix both controlling and non-controlling ideologies."

Though the absence of significant differences between interventionist, noninterventionist, and interactionalist educators in student achievement recommends that classroom management styles could not be essential in student achievement, Brannon's (2010) research was affected by weaknesses that should be spoken before finishing that classroom management and student achievement are independent of each other. First of all, Brannon (2010) involved just four (4) noninterventionist teachers; That is to say, since statistical power is a role of sample size (Creswell, 2003), Brannon's (2010) work might have required the statistical power to display significant differences. Additionally, Brannon used the ABCC-R, which has questionable psychometric properties (Martin & Sass, 2010) in comparison to the more new BIMS scale. Moreover, Brannon combined ABCC-R people management with instructional management into one general classification that could not show behavioral and instructional classroom management. Moreover, though Brannon (2010) considered standardized scores on statewide tests (which can be useful), compliance with AYP guidelines are on the basis of percent pupils passing core studies. Brannon (2010) finally measured the relationship between demographic variables and teacher instructional style, however was unsuccessful to contain the covariates in realizing the relationship between instructional style and student outcomes. This is vital, for demographic variables can influence relationships.

This short review of the literature revealed that few studies have been done on the effect of class management styles on teacher professional development. Thus, the present study seeks to fill this gap and focus on this topic. As a result, the research question is as follows:

- Do class management styles have any significant effect on teacher professional development?

METHOD

In this part, participants, instrument, and procedure are presented.

Participants

In this study, 60 English language teachers from different language schools in Tehran, Iran were selected as the participants. They were all female and from 23 to 40 years old with job experience from 2 to 10 years.

Instrument

The following questionnaire was used as the instrument:

Professional Development Questionnaire (Varies, Jansen & Grift, 2013)

Teacher professional development was developed by Varies, Jansen, and Grift (2013). The questionnaire included 45 items which were classified under three scales: updating, reflective and collaborative. This questionnaire was of Likert type and the participants chose one choice from among four options: never, rarely, regularly and very often. The items referred to the activities that a teacher may do in his or her everyday job at school or out of school and the participants were asked to answer how often they did them. As this questionnaire was in English and the participants of the present study were Iranian EFL teachers whose mother tongue was not English, it was decided to translate the questionnaire so that the participants could understand the items very well. This questionnaire was translated by the researcher. To check its validity, it was reviewed by three experts in ELT. Since some items of the questionnaire were not compatible with the Iranian context, after consultation with three experts in the field of applied linguistics and also some English teachers, five items were added and some items were revised. Then the Persian version was piloted among 15 teachers. To check its reliability, a pilot study was run. The data collected from the pilot study were analyzed in SPSS through Cronbach Alpha. The coefficient was .85 which is considered as an acceptable figure. Thus, the translated version of this questionnaire benefited from good and acceptable amount of reliability.

Procedure

After sampling the participants, they were divided randomly into four groups: three as experimental groups and one as control group. In the three experimental groups, each group consisting of 15 teachers were asked to adopt one of the class management styles (authoritative, democratic, laissez faire). Thus, the experimental groups included one authoritative group, one democratic and one laissez faire group. In the control group, teachers were asked to adopt their own personal class management style. Before starting teaching with these class management styles, they were given the teacher professional development questionnaire and then they started teaching for 6 months

with the given class management styles. After finishing the 6-month period, they were given the teacher professional development again.

RESULTS

In this part, the results of the statistical procedures are reported. First the results of data normality are reported.

Checking Data Normality

First of all to check the normality of the data on WTC pre-test and post-test for all four groups, K-S and Shapiro Wilk tests of normality were carried out. Table 1 presents the results obtained from the analysis of these two tests outputs in SPSS. As it is clear from the table 1, the data obtained from TPD pre-test and post-test are normal as the p values in K-S test and Shapiro Will test are greater than .05. Since the data are normal, parametric statistical analysis was used to find the difference between these four groups. In this regard, ANOVA test was conducted.

Table 1. Tests of Data Normality

Group	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro Wilk		
	Statistic	df	sig.	Statistic	df	sig.
TPD pre test Data	.287	59	.07	.920	44	.10
TPD post test	.157	59	.30*	.960	44	.31

ANOVA for TPD Pre-test

As mentioned earlier, there are four groups in this study. Before giving treatment to these groups, a TPD pre-test was given to them to see whether they differ in TPD level. To answer this question or to find out whether these four groups were different in TPD level, an ANOVA was run since the data were parametric. The table 2 shows the descriptive statistics of ANOVA.

Table 2. The Descriptive Statistics of ANOVA for Pre-test

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Lower Bound		
					60.21			
					68.47			
auth	15	64	2.241	.674	57.25		39	87
democ	15	60	1.985	.341	63.20		47	85
lassez	15	62	2.740	.789	59.87		36	83
contr	15	62	2.354	.544	65.40		42	85
					60.23			
					65.35			
Total	60	62	2.342	.477	59.32	65.32	41	85

As seen in Table 2, the means of these four groups are not that much different which can show that the participants were nearly at the same level of TPD. However, to prove it statistically that there is no difference between these four groups, the result of ANOVA should be presented. The table 3 shows the results of ANOVA.

Table 3. The Results of ANOVA for Pre-test

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	112.57	3	106.34	3.582	.08
Within Groups	1375.52	33	28.653		
Total	1488.09	35			

If p value is bigger than the sig level, then it can be said that there is no significant difference between the groups. According to Table 3, there is no statistically significant difference between these four groups ($F(3,33) = 3.58$, $p \leq .05$). Thus, it can be said that the four groups were nearly the same in terms of TPD before the treatment.

ANOVA for TPD Post-test

After the treatment, again the participants were given the TPD test to find out their level of TPD. To find whether there was a difference between three groups in terms of TPD, an ANOVA was run. Table 4 shows the descriptive statistics of ANOVA for the post-test.

Table 4. The Descriptive Statistics of ANOVA for Post-test

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
autho	15	74	4.582	.654	68.31	82.67	48	88
democ	15	66	2.541	.412	58.47	70.20	46	86
laissez	15	69	3.470	.740	59.98	71.90	43	84
contr	15	62	3.412	.584	61.63	73.05	45	86
Total	60	68	3.332	.566	62.2	72.3	44	85

As seen in Table 4, the means of these four groups are different which can show that the participants were not at the same level of TPD in different groups. However, to prove it statistically that there is a significant difference between these four groups, the result of ANOVA should be presented. The table 5 shows the results of ANOVA.

Table 5. The Results of ANOVA for Post-test

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	123.21	3	111.52	4.87	.002
Within Groups	1462.42	33	31.441		
Total	1685.63	35			

If p value is smaller than the sig level, then it can be said that there is a significant difference between the groups. According to Table 5, there is a significant difference between these four groups ($F(3,33) = 4.87$, $p \leq .05$). Thus, it can be said that the three groups were not the same in terms of TPD after the treatment.

To find out where this difference is and what two groups are different with each other, the post hoc test was run. Table 6 shows the results of post hoc test of ANOVA.

Table 6. The Post hoc Test Results

Group (J)	Group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
autho	demo	-4.56*	3.21	.007	-5.77	-2.10
	lais	-2.63*	1.24	.08	.96	2.36
	Contr	9.65	2.22	.001	.65	2.55
demo	autho	4.56*	3.21	.007	-2.10	-5.77
	lais	2.41	.665	.23	.66	1.34
	Cont	6.33	2.99	.03	-.29	1.39
Lais	autho	-2.63*	1.24	.08	-.96	2.36
	demo	-2.41	.665	.23	.66	1.34
	Cont	8.33	0.221	.009	-.55	1.44

As seen in Table 6, in four comparisons, there is a significant difference:

- A) Between authoritative and control ($.001 \leq .05$)
- B) Between democratic and control ($.03 \leq .05$)
- C) Between laissez-faire and control ($.009 \leq .05$)
- D) Between authoritative and democratic ($.007 \leq .05$)

As a significant difference was observed between all three experimental groups and the control group, each classroom management style had a significant effect on teachers' PD. In other words, the null hypothesis of the study is rejected and it can be said that different types of class management styles had a significant effect on teachers' PD.

DISCUSSION

This part is dealt with discussing previous and related studies to contrast and compare them with the present study. As this study was done on two concepts of TPD and class management styles, some similar studies are discussed here.

The first study to be discussed belongs to Walker (2009) who showed that authoritative style of management in the class lets teachers train superiority in prompting the students' academic and social dimensions. He establishes that the students in an authoritative classroom were generally great in their achievement. Likewise they specified that such teachers can even decrease the percentage of failures. The present study achieved the same findings to some extent since it proved that authoritative style of class management style had a significant effect on teachers' PD. Although Walker (2009) proved the positive effect of authoritative on academic achievement, TPD has been proved to lead to academic achievement of the learners. Thus, these two studies are in line with each other. Likewise, another study aimed to explore the effect of class management on student achievement. According to Shindler et al, (2009), high quality classroom management powerfully connected with student achievement. The sample

revealed a various range of student population. The work was elegant and the socio-economic status of the student was also measured.

This study was done on the effect of class management style on teachers' PD. In another study done by Poulou (2009), it was shown that classroom management will be simplified by teacher-student interpersonal and intrapersonal relations, for example, joint respect, stimulating attention and commitment. Teacher-student relation is closely related to TPD. Thus, these two studies are considered to be in line with each other.

CONCLUSION

ELT has recently witnessed an overriding interest in doing research on the newly-inserted terms from psychology including TPD. The present study has followed, in actuality, this trend and attempted to add some valuable contributions to the literature and cast more light on the unknown aspects of TPD. Besides, class management is an area which has not been approached as deserved since without class management, the way is paved for pedagogical principles and methods to be done. As a result, this study has felt this necessity and focused on the effect of class management styles on TPD. The findings, as mentioned earlier, showed that all three class management styles (authoritative, democratic, laissez-fair) had a significant effect on teachers' DP. This study emphasized on the significance of class management style and its effect on different aspects of learning and teaching including teachers' PD.

The results of this study proved the fact that if teacher can hold a successful class management, he or she can help learners learn and achieve much more than what they could have achieved in a class with poor class management. Thus, teachers are strongly recommended that they adopt a successful class management style so that they can make learning happen more successfully. According to this study, authoritative class management style worked the best in improving teachers' PD; however, it cannot be recommended that this style is necessarily expected to work better than other styles in every aspect and for all teachers. What can be concluded is that authoritative style could improve teachers' PD more than the other two class management styles: democratic and laissez-fair leading to the implication that to move on their career more successfully, teacher can adopt authoritative class management style. All in all, the present study could add some valuable results to the related literature on WTC and class management styles. Thus, English language teachers and teacher educators are addressed by the results of the present study to put much focus on class management style.

REFERENCES

- Al-bidawi, S. (2015). EFL faculty members' professional development: beliefs and suggestions. *Journal of Modern Education Review*, 5(10), 970-977.
- Allen, K. P. (2010). Classroom management, bullying and teacher practices. *The Professional Educator*, 34(1), 101-124.
- Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership. (2011). *National Professional Standards for Teachers*. Melbourne: MCEECDYA.

- Baumrind, D. (1971). Current Patterns of Parental Authority. *Developmental Psychology Monographs*, 4(1), 89-99.
- Borko, H. (2004). Professional development and teacher learning. *Educational researcher*, 33(8), 3-15.
- Brannon, T. S. (2010). *The Effects of Classroom Management Beliefs/Ideologies on Student Academic Success*. Dissertation completed at California State University. 1-97.
- Cárdenas Beltrán, M. L., & Nieto Cruz, M. C. (2010). *El trabajo en red de docentes de inglés* [Teachers of English and their network]. Bogotá, CO: Universidad Nacional de Colombia.
- Cely, R. M. (2009). *Perfil del docente de inglés* [The profile of a teacher of English]. Lecture given at the First National Congress on Bilingualism, Armenia, Colombia.
- Chaves, O., & Guapacha, M. (2015). An Eclectic Professional Development Proposal for English Language Teachers. *PROFILE Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 18(1), 71-96.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Etheridge, T. (2010). *Assertive discipline and its impact on disruptive behavior* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (Publication No. AAT 3409180)
- Froyen, L. A. (1988). *Classroom Management: Empowering Teacher-Leaders*, McGraw-hill, Delhi.
- Jensen, B. (2010). *What teachers Want: Better teacher management*. Melbourne: Grattan Institute.
- Johnson, V. (1994). Student teachers' conceptions of classroom control. *Journal of Educational Research*, 88(2), 109-117.
- Kayıkçı, K. (2009). The effect of classroom management skills of elementary school teachers on undesirable discipline behavior of students. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1(2), 1215-1225.
- Kennedy, M. (2008). Sorting out teacher quality. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 90(1), 59-63.
- Martin, N. K., & Sass, D. A. (2010). Construct validation of the behavior and instructional management scale. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(10), 1124-1135.
- Marzano, R. J. (2003). *What works in schools. Translating research into action*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).
- Martin, N.K., Mayall, H. & Yin, Z. (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 Southwest Educational Research Association*. Austin, TX.
- Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey & D. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: implications for educators* (pp. 3-31). New York: Basic Books.
- Matus, D. E. (1999). Humanism and effective urban secondary classroom management. *The Clearing House*, 11(1), 305-307.

- McLaughlin, M., & Marsh, D. (1978). Staff development and school change. *Teachers College Record*, 80(1), 70–94.
- Moss, J. (2008). Leading Professional learning in an Australian secondary school through school university partnerships. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(4), 345-357.
- Poulou, M.S. (2009). Classroom Interactions: Teachers' and Students' Perceptions. *Research in Education*, 82(3), 103-106.
- Richards, J. C., & Farrell, T. S. C. (2005). *Professional development for language teachers: Strategies for teacher learning*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Ryan, H. (2007). *An examination of the relationship between teacher efficacy and teachers' perceptions of their principals' leadership behaviors'*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas.
- Santiago, D. (2012). *A Study of the Relationship between Middle School and High School Teachers Instructional and Behavior Management Practices and Demographic Variables*. Liberty University. Retrieved from: Digital Commons at Liberty University.
- Schön, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Shindler, J., Jones, A., Williams, A., Taylor, C & Cadenas, H. (2009). Exploring below the Surface: School Climate Assessment and Improvement as the Key to Bridging the Achievement Gap, A Paper Presented at *the Annual Meeting of the Washington State Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction*, Seattle WA.
- Smith, C.J., & Laslett, R. (2002). *Effective classroom management: A teacher's guide*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.
- Stoll, L., Bolam, R., McMahon, A., Wallace, M., & Thomas, S. (2006). Professional Learning Communities: A Review of the Literature. *Journal of Educational Change*, 7(4), 221-258.
- Tak, H.M., & shing, L .W (2008). *Classroom managements: creating a positive learning environment*. Hong Kong: Color Print Production Co. Ltd.
- Tuncay, H. (2010). *Class management in ELT: Who is the boss?* Retrieved from <http://hidayettuncay.com/makaleler/CLASS-MANAGEMENT-NT-IN-ELT.pdf>
- Vescio, V., Ross, D., & Adams, A. (2008). A Review of Research on the Impact of Professional Learning Communities on Teaching Practice and Student Learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24(1), 80-91.
- Villegas-Reimers, E. (2003). *Teacher professional development: An international review of the literature*. Paris, FR: UNESCO, International Institute for Educational Planning.
- Wallace, M. J. (1991). *Training foreign language teachers: A reflective approach*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Walker, J.M. (2009). Authoritative Classroom Management: How Control and Nurturance Work Together. *Theory into Practice*, 48(3), 122-129.
- Webster-Wright, A. (2009). Reframing Professional Development through Understanding Authentic Professional Learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 79(2), 702-739.

- Woolfolk, A., & Hoy, W. (1990). Prospective teachers' sense of efficacy and beliefs about control. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82(1), 81–91.
- Wrench, J.S., Richmond, V.P., & Gorham, J. (2009). *Communication, Affect, & Learning in the Classroom*. 3rd ed. United States.
- Yilmaz, H., & Cavas, P. (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.