

The Philosophical Foundations of Classroom Discipline: Exploring the Predictive Effect of Educational Orientations on Pupil Control Ideology

Sinan Dağ^{1 2}

Atıf/Reference: Dağ, S. (2026). The Philosophical Foundations of Classroom Discipline: Exploring the Predictive Effect of Educational Orientations on Pupil Control Ideology. *Yönetim ve Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 5(2), 204-218.

Abstract

This study investigated the relationship between teachers' educational philosophy orientations and their pupil control ideologies, exploring whether underlying pedagogical beliefs serve as significant predictors of classroom authority styles. Drawing on a relational survey design, data were collected from 660 public high school teachers in Türkiye using the Educational Beliefs Scale and the Pupil Control Ideology Scale. The findings revealed that the participating teachers predominantly endorsed student-centered philosophies, specifically existentialism and progressivism, while essentialism received the lowest level of agreement. Multiple linear regression analysis demonstrated that educational philosophy orientations collectively explained 23% of the total variance in pupil control ideology. Specifically, essentialism emerged as the most potent positive predictor, indicating that teacher-centered traditionalism reinforces custodial control tendencies. Conversely, existentialism was a significant negative predictor, suggesting that a focus on individual autonomy and freedom fosters more humanistic management approaches. Notably, progressivism, perennialism, and reconstructionism did not emerge as significant predictors within the regression model. These results suggest that pupil control ideology is not merely a technical classroom management preference but is deeply rooted in teachers' broader philosophical frameworks. The study emphasizes the necessity of incorporating critical philosophical reflection into teacher education and professional development programs to foster more reflective and democratic classroom environments.

Keywords: Educational philosophy, Teacher beliefs, Classroom management, Pupil control ideology, Classroom authority

Sınıf Disiplininin Felsefi Temelleri: Eğitim Felsefesi Yönelimlerinin Öğrenci Kontrol İdeolojisi Üzerindeki Yordayıcı Etkisinin İncelenmesi

Özet

Bu çalışma, öğretmenlerin eğitim felsefesi yönelimleri ile öğrenci kontrol ideolojileri arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemekte ve temel pedagojik inançların sınıf içi otorite stillerinin anlamlı yordayıcıları olup olmadığını araştırmaktadır. İlişkisel tarama modeline dayanan araştırmanın verileri, Türkiye'deki resmi liselerde görev yapan 660 öğretmenden, Eğitim İnançları Ölçeği ve Öğrenci Kontrol İdeolojisi Ölçeği kullanılarak toplanmıştır. Araştırma bulguları, katılımcı öğretmenlerin ağırlıklı olarak varoluşçuluk ve ilerlemecilik gibi öğrenci merkezli felsefeleri benimsediklerini, esasiciliğin ise en düşük düzeyde kabul gördüğünü ortaya koymuştur. Çoklu doğrusal regresyon analizi, eğitim felsefesi yönelimlerinin öğrenci kontrol ideolojisindeki toplam varyansın %23'ünü topluca açıkladığını göstermiştir. Spesifik olarak esasicilik, en güçlü pozitif yordayıcı olarak öne çıkmış;

¹ PhD.; Ministry of National Education, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6687-5219>; sinandag66@hotmail.com;

² This study is based on the author's doctoral thesis, which was completed at the Department of Educational Management, Institute of Educational Sciences, Gazi University.

bu durum öğretmen merkezli gelenekselciliğin gözetimci kontrol eğilimlerini pekiştirdiğine işaret etmiştir. Aksine, varoluşçuluk anlamlı bir negatif yordayıcı olarak saptanmış; bu da bireysel özerklik ve özgürlük odağının daha insancıl yönetim yaklaşımlarını desteklediğini düşündürmüştür. Dikkat çekici bir bulgu olarak; ilerlemecilik, daimicilik ve yeniden kurmacılık regresyon modelinde anlamlı birer yordayıcı olarak ortaya çıkmamıştır. Bu sonuçlar, öğrenci kontrol ideolojisinin yalnızca teknik bir sınıf yönetimi tercihi olmadığını, öğretmenlerin geniş felsefi çerçevelerine derinlemesine kök saldıgını göstermektedir. Çalışma, daha yansıtıcı ve demokratik sınıf ortamları oluşturmak amacıyla, öğretmen eğitimi ve mesleki gelişim programlarına eleştirel felsefi sorgulamaların dahil edilmesinin gerekliliğini vurgulamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Eğitim felsefesi, öğretmen inançları, sınıf yönetimi, öğrenci kontrol ideolojisi, sınıf otoritesi.

1. Introduction

Education is not merely a technical process of knowledge transmission but is, inherently, a value-laden and philosophically grounded practice. Educational practices are inevitably informed by the philosophical assumptions, beliefs, and epistemological orientations of educators (Livingston et al., 1995; Rideout, 2006; Sabarwal et al., 2022). These underlying orientations dictate how teachers conceptualize the nature of knowledge, learning, and authority, as well as the agency of students within the pedagogical process (Pajares, 1992; Witter & Hattie, 2026). In this sense, teachers' philosophical perspectives toward education serve as the primary bedrock upon which classroom practices and pedagogical decisions are constructed.

Educational philosophy provides a conceptual framework that guides pedagogical objectives, instructional methodologies, and the interpersonal dynamics established within the classroom (Kilpatrick, 1951). Diverse philosophical traditions—namely perennialism, essentialism, progressivism, existentialism, and reconstructionism—offer distinct assumptions regarding the nature of epistemology, the teacher's authority, and the learner's position within the educational process (Gutek, 2006). While certain orientations prioritize teacher-centered authority, the direct transmission of knowledge, and highly structured learning environments, others emphasize student autonomy, inquiry-based discovery, and democratic participation in learning (Öztürk, 1992). Given this diversity, these philosophical orientations inherently underpin teachers' subjective beliefs regarding the fundamental nature of teaching and learning processes.

A burgeoning body of literature suggests that teachers' belief systems and philosophical orientations are pivotal in modulating their instructional practices and classroom management frameworks (Akyürek, 2021; Altinkurt et al., 2012; Aytaç, 2021; Doğanay, 2011; Duman & Ulubey, 2008; Karadağ et al., 2009; Mardiha & Alibakhshi, 2020). Specifically, teachers' epistemological beliefs function as cognitive filters that influence their conceptions of pedagogy, the selection of instructional strategies, and the nature of student-teacher interactions. For instance, educators who align with traditional, teacher-centered philosophical orientations tend to prioritize direct knowledge transmission, formal authority, and stringent control within the learning environment (Öztürk, 1992). Conversely, those who subscribe to student-centered philosophies are more predisposed to fostering autonomy, reciprocal dialogue, and participatory learning contexts (Gutek, 2006). Empirical evidence further corroborates that these philosophical foundations substantially dictate educational objectives, classroom dynamics, and overarching approaches to discipline and authority. However, while the influence of these beliefs on instructional methods is well-documented, the specific mechanism by which philosophical leanings translate into distinct ideologies of behavioral regulation remains a critical area of inquiry.

A seminal construct that encapsulates teachers' approaches to classroom authority and disciplinary frameworks is pupil control ideology (Willover, Eidell & Hoy, 1967). This concept pertains to the internalized belief systems teachers maintain regarding the management and regulation of student behavior within educational environments. Theoretically, pupil control ideology is conceptualized along a multidimensional continuum, bifurcating into custodial and humanistic orientations (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1990). Within custodial orientations, the emphasis is placed on rigid discipline, the maintenance of hierarchical authority, and the stringent regulation of student conduct to ensure organizational order (Lunenburg & Mankowsky, 2000). Conversely, humanistic orientations prioritize the cultivation of student autonomy, the establishment of mutual respect, and the promotion of self-regulatory capacities among learners (Samfira & Sava, 2021). These divergent orientations are not merely pedagogical preferences; rather, they serve as outward manifestations of deeper philosophical assumptions concerning human nature, the essence of learning, and the socio-ethical role of authority in education.

Extant research on pupil control ideology has demonstrated that teachers' beliefs regarding student management are multifaceted and correlate with various psychological, pedagogical, and organizational

determinants (Hoy & Forsyth, 1986; Kottkamp & Mulhern, 1987). Specifically, prior investigations have explored pupil control ideology in relation to variables such as teacher burnout (Baş, 2013; Cadavid & Lunenburg, 1991), classroom climate (Lunenburg, et. al., 1999), leadership practices (Yılmaz, 2007), and teacher self-efficacy (Rideout & Morton, 2010; Samfira & Sava, 2021). However, despite the profound conceptual intersection between educational philosophy and control ideology, the philosophical foundations underpinning teachers' regulatory approaches have received disproportionately limited scholarly attention. In other words, while classroom authority is frequently debated within the realms of pedagogical strategy or organizational climate, the deep-seated philosophical orientations that inherently shape these practices remain largely underexplored in the current literature.

From a theoretical standpoint, philosophical orientations toward education offer a robust explanatory framework for elucidating how educators conceptualize the interplay between authority, discipline, and student agency (Pajares, 1992; Sabarwal et. al., 2022). It is theoretically posited that educational philosophies emphasizing structured knowledge transmission and formal teacher authority are inherently aligned with more custodial control tendencies. Conversely, philosophical traditions that prioritize student autonomy, critical inquiry, and democratic engagement are expected to correlate with more humanistic approaches to student behavior management. Unraveling these complex interrelationships is essential for gaining a more nuanced understanding of how teachers' foundational philosophical perspectives fundamentally dictate classroom dynamics and the enactment of disciplinary practices.

Within the specific context of Türkiye, empirical inquiries into educational philosophy have predominantly concentrated on delineating teachers' philosophical preferences or exploring their correlations with instructional beliefs and pedagogical approaches (e.g., Altinkurt et. al., 2012; Doğanay & Sarı, 2003; Duman & Ulubey, 2008; Ekiz, 2007; Karadağ et. al., 2009; Kozikoğlu & Uygun, 2018). Parallel to this, national research on pupil control ideology has primarily investigated teachers' disciplinary orientations in conjunction with classroom management strategies or individual teacher characteristics (e.g., Baş & Beyhan, 2013; Celep, 1997; Oğuz & Kalkan, 2011; Yılmaz, 2007). This inquiry is particularly timely given the recent paradigm shifts in the Turkish National Curriculum, which increasingly emphasize a transition from traditional instruction to more holistic and value-based models (MEB, 2024; Demirel, 2024). Furthermore, the evolving structure of teacher education programs in Türkiye-where the weight of philosophical foundation courses has been subject to ongoing debate and restructuring (Çetin et. al., 2021)-underscores the urgent need to empirically validate how these theoretical orientations manifest in classroom management and behavioral control. Notwithstanding these efforts, scholarly work that directly examines the nexus between teachers' overarching philosophical orientations and their specific tendencies to regulate student behavior remains remarkably scarce. Addressing this empirical gap is essential, as it may offer profound insights into the foundational philosophical underpinnings that inform classroom management practices in the Turkish educational landscape.

The present study offers several significant contributions to the existing body of literature. First, whereas previous inquiries into pupil control ideology have predominantly emphasized organizational and psychological determinants-such as school climate, leadership dynamics, or teacher burnout-the philosophical underpinnings of behavioral regulation have remained largely marginalized. By positioning educational philosophy orientations as key predictors of control ideology, this research illuminates the critical role that foundational beliefs play in the social construction of classroom authority and discipline. Second, this study synthesizes disparate strands of literature by establishing a conceptual bridge between philosophical traditions and student management approaches, thereby offering a more holistic understanding of teacher cognition. Finally, by focusing on public secondary school teachers within the Turkish educational system, the study provides robust empirical evidence from a specific cultural and institutional context where the philosophical dimensions of classroom management remain significantly under-researched.

Conceptually, this study is predicated on the assumption that teachers' philosophical orientations fundamentally dictate their conceptualizations of authority, discipline, and student autonomy, which subsequently govern their behavioral control tendencies. Consequently, the primary objective of this research is to analyze the predictive relationship between teachers' educational philosophy orientations and their ideologies regarding student control. By positioning philosophical leanings as a salient predictor of student control ideology, the study endeavors to enrich the existing discourse by elucidating the foundational philosophical dimensions that underpin contemporary classroom management practices.

2. Literature Review

Educational Philosophy Orientations

Educational philosophy constitutes a foundational meta-theoretical framework through which educators interpret the teleological aims, curricular content, and pedagogical processes of schooling (Apps, 1973). As a branch of applied philosophy, it interrogates the multifaceted assumptions underlying educational praxis, including ontological and epistemological inquiries regarding the nature of knowledge, the mechanisms of learning, and the socio-ethical dimensions of authority within instructional settings (Ertürk, 2016; Kilpatrick, 1951; Ülken, 2013). Philosophical inquiry serves to delineate the latent premises that shape educational theories, facilitating a critical evaluation of these assumptions in relation to broader socio-political and epistemological paradigms.

In the academic discourse, several overarching philosophical orientations are recognized for their influence in modulating educational practices (Apps, 1973). The most prominent among these—perennialism, essentialism, progressivism, and reconstructionism—postulate distinct assumptions regarding the nature of objective knowledge, the structure of the curriculum, and the hierarchical roles of teachers and students (Gutek, 2006). These orientations are broadly categorized into teacher-centered (traditional) and learner-centered (contemporary) traditions. Teacher-centered philosophies, such as perennialism and essentialism, prioritize the transmission of canonical knowledge and the preservation of magisterial authority, whereas learner-centered philosophies, including progressivism and existentialism, advocate for experiential learning, idiosyncratic development, and learner autonomy.

Traditional philosophical orientations typically operate on the premise that knowledge comprises enduring, universal truths that must be disseminated via structured and disciplined curricula (Ertürk, 2016). For instance, perennialism underscores the significance of timeless ideas, positioning the educator as an intellectual vanguard responsible for directing students toward rational enlightenment. Similarly, essentialism emphasizes the mastery of core competencies and fundamental knowledge essential for societal integration. In stark contrast, modern paradigms such as progressivism accentuate the importance of heuristic problem-solving and experiential inquiry, encouraging students to actively construct meaning through sustained interaction with their environment.

These divergent philosophical leanings have profound implications for the micro-politics of classroom practice, fundamentally dictating teachers' instructional trajectories, curricular priorities, and their conceptualization of the learning process (Demirel, 2024). Contemporary research suggests that educators seldom adhere to a monolithic philosophical tradition; instead, they often manifest a synthetic or eclectic profile of orientations, reflecting the inherent complexity of pedagogical practice (Altinkurt et al., 2012; Akyürek, 2021; Ekiz, 2007; Karadağ et al., 2009). Consequently, analyzing these philosophical underpinnings is vital for elucidating the variances observed in instructional strategies, classroom authority structures, and overarching pedagogical frameworks.

Pupil Control Ideology and Classroom Authority

A pivotal construct reflecting teachers' orientation toward classroom authority is pupil control ideology, which encapsulates educators' internalized assumptions regarding the regulation of student behavior and the exercise of authority (Aytaç, 2021; Lunenburg & Mankowsky, 2000; Samfira & Sava, 2021). Originally pioneered by Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967), this concept is conceptualized along a psychometric continuum ranging from custodial to humanistic orientations. While a custodial ideology is rooted in a bureaucratic model—viewing students as individuals requiring rigid discipline and hierarchical supervision to preserve organizational order—the humanistic orientation aligns with a professional-democratic model that prioritizes student autonomy, self-regulation, and mutual trust (Yılmaz, 2007). These divergent paradigms do not merely exist as abstract beliefs; they fundamentally modulate teachers' observable disciplinary interventions and interpersonal interactions (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1990). Consequently, student control ideology remains an indispensable analytical framework for elucidating the nexus between a teacher's philosophical cognitive structure and their practical pedagogical conduct.

Teacher Beliefs, Epistemology, and Classroom Management

Recent educational research increasingly underscores the role of teacher beliefs and epistemological assumptions in orchestrating instructional environments (Akyürek, 2021; Aytaç, 2021; Mardiha & Alibakhshi, 2020). These beliefs function as internal interpretive lenses through which educators navigate classroom complexities and professional dilemmas. From an epistemological standpoint, the perceived nature of knowledge fundamentally dictates the conceptualization of authority: teachers viewing knowledge as a fixed, transmissible entity typically gravitate toward structured, teacher-centered methodologies and authoritative control strategies.

Conversely, those who perceive knowledge as an evolving construct, developed through experiential inquiry, are more predisposed to adopting participatory and student-centered management frameworks.

In this context, educational philosophy orientations serve as a vital component of a teacher's broader cognitive system, directly shaping their approach to student behavior regulation (Samfira & Sava 2021). Despite the burgeoning interest in teacher cognition, empirical studies directly synthesizing educational philosophy orientations with student control ideology remain sparse, as most existing research treats these constructs in isolation (e.g., Altinkurt et al., 2012; Baş & Beyhan, 2013; Oğuz & Kalkan, 2011). By investigating the predictive nexus between these variables, this study seeks to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the normative and epistemological foundations that underpin classroom authority and pedagogical management. Consequently, the present research aims to elucidate the predictive role of teachers' educational philosophy orientations on their tendencies to regulate student behavior, thereby bridging the gap between philosophical abstraction and classroom praxis.

Research Purpose and Research Questions

Comprehensive insight into the regulation of student behavior necessitates an examination of both observable management strategies and the latent belief systems that govern professional practice (Pajares, 1992; Witter & Hattie, 2026). Educational philosophy orientations constitute a core dimension of these cognitive structures, reflecting teachers' fundamental assumptions regarding epistemology, authority, and the pedagogical agency of students (Guttek, 2006, p. 10). These foundational premises directly influence the conceptualization of classroom authority and the subsequent enactment of behavioral control.

While extant literature has independently explored teacher beliefs, classroom management, and pupil control ideology, empirical investigations specifically targeting the predictive nexus between philosophical orientations and student control tendencies remain sparse. Elucidating this relationship is essential for uncovering the normative and epistemological underpinnings that inform classroom governance. Consequently, the primary objective of this study is to examine the predictive role of teachers' educational philosophy orientations on their ideologies of student behavior control. To fulfill this objective, the research addresses the following questions:

- a) What are the predominant levels of educational philosophy orientations among the participating teachers?
- b) What are the prevailing levels of teachers' student behavior control tendencies?
- c) Are there statistically significant relationships between teachers' educational philosophy orientations and their student behavior control ideologies?
- d) To what extent do teachers' educational philosophy orientations significantly predict their tendencies toward student behavior control?

3. Method

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative research approach, specifically utilizing the relational survey model to investigate the interplay between teachers' educational philosophy orientations and their student behavior control tendencies. Relational survey models are instrumental in identifying the existence, direction, and magnitude of associations between two or more variables (Karasar, 2006). This approach is particularly effective when the researcher aims to uncover the predictive power of independent variables over a dependent construct without manipulation of the environment (Creswell, 2014).

In the structural framework of this research, teachers' educational philosophy orientations-comprising perennialism, essentialism, progressivism, existentialism, and reconstructionism-were designated as the independent variables. Conversely, student control ideology was treated as the dependent variable. The primary focus of the design was to ascertain whether these foundational philosophical leanings serve as significant predictors of teachers' behavioral control tendencies, thereby offering a robust empirical assessment of the theoretical assumptions linking pedagogy and authority.

Participants

The study sample comprised 660 teachers currently employed in public high schools. These data were derived from a larger, comprehensive research dataset that included school administrators (principals and vice-principals) and teachers; however, for the scope of the present study, only the data garnered from teaching staff were utilized for analysis. The demographic profile of the participants reflected a diverse professional background, ensuring a broad representation of the teaching population.

In terms of gender, 66% (n = 436) of the participants were female and 34% (n = 224) were male. The age distribution revealed that 29% (n = 194) of the teachers were 40 years old or younger, 52% (n = 341) were between 41 and 50 years old, and 19% (n = 125) were 51 years or older. Regarding professional seniority, 14% (n = 91) had 10 years or less experience, 32% (n = 211) had between 11 and 20 years, and a majority of 54% (n = 358) had 21 years or more of service. Furthermore, tenure at their current school indicated that 51% (n = 333) had been in their current position for five years or less, 28% (n = 188) for six to ten years, and 21% (n = 139) for over eleven years.

The participants were also categorized by subject area, with 35% (n = 230) specializing in science-related fields, 53% (n = 354) in social sciences, and 12% (n = 76) in skill-based subjects (e.g., physical education, arts, or general ability). Participation in the study was entirely voluntary, with all teachers receiving prior briefing on the research objectives and ethical assurances regarding data confidentiality. Detailed demographic characteristics are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Teachers

Variable	Category	n	%
Gender	Female	436	66
	Male	224	34
Age	≤ 40	194	29
	41–50	341	52
	≥ 51	125	19
Teaching Experience	≤ 10 years	91	14
	11–20 years	211	32
	≥ 21 years	358	54
Length of Service at Current School	≤ 5 years	333	51
	6–10 years	188	28
	≥ 11 years	139	21
Subject Area	Science	230	35
	Social Sciences	354	53
	General Ability	76	12

Data Collection Instruments

Data for the study were gathered using two primary measurement instruments.

Educational Philosophy Orientations Scale: Teachers’ philosophical orientations were assessed using the Educational Beliefs Scale, originally developed by Yılmaz et al. (2011). The initial instrument comprised 40 items categorized into five sub-dimensions representing distinct educational philosophies: progressivism (13 items), existentialism (7 items), reconstructionism (7 items), perennialism (8 items), and essentialism (5 items).

To ensure the construct validity of the scale for the current sample, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was performed. Preliminary diagnostics confirmed the data’s suitability for factor analysis (KMO = .88; Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity $\chi^2 = 3533.22$, $p < .001$). During the initial extraction, eight items (3, 12, 13, 26, 27, 29, 34, and 35) were identified as problematic due to cross-loadings or inadequate factor loadings and were subsequently removed. A follow-up EFA on the remaining 32 items confirmed a stable five-factor structure. The factor loadings for these items ranged from .47 to .82, with the total variance explained by the five factors reaching 62.84%.

In order to examine the construct validity of the scale within the scope of the present study, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted. The results indicated that the data were suitable for factor analysis (KMO = .88; Bartlett’s Test $\chi^2 = 3533.22$, $p < .001$). The initial analysis suggested that several items did not load appropriately on their intended factors. Therefore, eight items (3, 12, 13, 26, 27, 29, 34, and 35) were removed from the scale. Following the removal of these items, the remaining 32 items were subjected to a second exploratory factor analysis. The results supported a five-factor structure corresponding to progressivism, existentialism, reconstructionism, perennialism, and essentialism. Factor loadings ranged between .47 and .82.

The internal consistency of the scale was evaluated using Cronbach’s alpha coefficients. The analysis yielded high reliability indices for the sub-dimensions: .88 for progressivism, .93 for existentialism, .81 for reconstructionism, .78 for perennialism, and .84 for essentialism. The overall reliability coefficient for the entire scale was found to be .90.

To further validate the factorial structure, a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted. The results

indicated an acceptable model fit ($\chi^2= 1654.54$, $df = 454$, $\chi^2/df = 3.55$). Standardized factor loadings ranged from .38 to .88. Complementary fit indices, including RMSEA= .06, CFI= .90, GFI= .86, RMR= .05, NFI= .87, and AGFI= .84, collectively demonstrated that the five-factor model attained a satisfactory level of fit. These psychometric properties confirm that the scale is a valid and reliable instrument for measuring educational philosophical orientations within this research context.

Pupil Control Ideology Scale: Teachers' tendencies regarding student behavior management were assessed using the Pupil Control Ideology Scale, originally developed by Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967). The instrument employs a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Higher aggregate scores reflect a predominant custodial control ideology, whereas lower scores signify a more humanistic orientation.

The scale was adapted into Turkish by Yılmaz (2002). In accordance with the Turkish adaptation, this study utilized the 10-item refined version, which was reported to have a single-factor structure explaining 31% of the total variance with a Cronbach's alpha of .73 in the original adaptation study. Reverse-scored items (e.g., "Students should be allowed to help in making the rules that govern their school life") were recoded prior to analysis to ensure that higher scores consistently indicated a custodial orientation.

To evaluate the instrument's performance within the present study's context, a pilot study was conducted with 370 participants. Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) corroborated the single-factor structure (KMO = .84; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity $\chi^2= 462.95$, $p < .01$), with the explained variance reaching 41.09% and factor loadings ranging from .55 to .70. The internal consistency coefficient for the current sample was robust at $\alpha = .81$. Furthermore, Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) substantiated the model fit ($\chi^2= 172.93$, $df = 35$, $\chi^2/df = 4.94$), with standardized factor loadings between .45 and .67. Complementary fit indices, including RMSEA= .075, CFI= .90, GFI= .95, RMR= .05, NFI= .88, and AGFI= .92. These values indicate that the 10-item instrument demonstrates an adequate level of construct validity for the current teacher sample.

Data Analysis

The research data were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics 22.0 for descriptive and inferential statistics, and Amos 18.0 for Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). Prior to the primary analyses, the dataset underwent a rigorous screening process. Erroneous entries were corrected in alignment with original participant responses, and missing values-identified as missing completely at random (MCAR)-were handled via the Expectation-Maximization (EM) algorithm.

The analytical procedure was executed in four strategic stages:

- a) Construct Validity and Reliability: The factorial structures of the scales were evaluated through Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) in SPSS and validated via CFA in Amos.
- b) Descriptive Statistics: Measures of central tendency (means) and dispersion (standard deviations) were utilized to determine the prevailing levels of teachers' educational philosophy orientations and their pupil control ideologies.
- c) Comparative Analysis: To examine whether philosophical orientations and control tendencies varied significantly across demographic variables (gender, age, seniority, and subject area), Independent Samples t-tests and One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were employed. The selection of parametric tests was justified by the large sample size ($N = 660$) and the fulfillment of normality assumptions within subgroups. In cases where ANOVA yielded statistically significant results, Tukey-HSD post-hoc tests were performed to identify the specific groups between which the differences originated.
- d) Predictive Analysis: Finally, Pearson correlation and multiple linear regression analyses were conducted to investigate the bidirectional relationships and the predictive power of teachers' philosophical orientations on their student behavior control ideologies. The statistical significance level for all procedures was set at $p < .05$.

Ethical Considerations

The research was conducted in strict adherence to the ethical principles governing human subject research. Prior to the commencement of data collection, formal ethical approval was obtained from the relevant institutional ethics committee. To ensure the integrity of the process, all participants were provided with informed consent, briefing them on the study's objectives and the voluntary nature of their involvement.

Strict measures were implemented to guarantee the anonymity and confidentiality of the participants; no personally identifiable information was solicited, and the data were used exclusively for scholarly purposes. Participants were explicitly informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any stage without penalty. These

procedural safeguards were established to uphold the highest standards of research ethics and to protect the rights of the participating educators.

4. Findings

Descriptive statistics, including arithmetic means (M) and standard deviations (SD), were calculated to establish the baseline levels of teachers' educational philosophy orientations and their pupil control ideologies. The resulting data are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for Educational Philosophies and Pupil Control Ideology

Variable	Mean	SD
Existentialism	4.53	.58
Progressivism	4.38	.63
Perennialism	3.99	.71
Reconstructionism	3.99	.71
Essentialism	2.76	.87
Pupil Control Ideology	2.89	.64

As illustrated in Table 2, the participating teachers manifested notably high levels of adherence to Existentialism (M = 4.53, SD = .58) and Progressivism (M = 4.38, SD = .63). These scores indicate a robust endorsement of learner-centered pedagogical frameworks that prioritize individual autonomy and experiential learning. The mean scores for Perennialism (M = 3.99, SD = .71) and Reconstructionism (M = 3.99, SD = .71) reflected a moderate-to-high level of agreement, albeit lower than the contemporary orientations. Conversely, Essentialism received the lowest level of endorsement (M = 2.76, SD = .87), suggesting a relative distancing from traditional, teacher-centered curricular rigidity.

Regarding the dependent variable, the mean score for Pupil Control Ideology was found to be M = 2.89 (SD = .64). Given that the scale operates on a 1-5 continuum, this value indicates a moderate-to-low tendency toward custodial control, aligning more closely with a humanistic orientation. Overall, the descriptive findings suggest that the teachers in this sample predominantly favor contemporary, student-centered philosophies over traditionalist educational paradigms.

Correlation Analysis

Pearson product-moment correlation analysis was performed to examine the bidirectional relationships between teachers' educational philosophy orientations and their pupil control ideologies. The inter-correlation matrix for all study variables is presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Correlation Matrix for Educational Philosophy Orientations and Pupil Control Ideology

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Perennialism	1.00					
2. Essentialism	.23**	1.00				
3. Progressivism	.46**	-.16**	1.00			
4. Existentialism	.47**	-.16**	.72**	1.00		
5. Reconstructionism	.54**	.12**	.51**	.51**	1.00	
6. Pupil Control Ideology	.10**	.47**	-.09**	-.14**	.05	1.00

Note. ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

As delineated in Table 3, Essentialism demonstrated a moderate and statistically significant positive correlation with Pupil Control Ideology ($r = .47$, $p < .01$). A weak but significant positive correlation was also observed between Perennialism and control ideology ($r = .10$, $p < .01$). These results suggest that teachers who adhere to traditional, teacher-centered educational philosophies tend to manifest higher levels of custodial control tendencies.

Conversely, the student-centered orientations of Existentialism ($r = -.14$, $p < .01$) and Progressivism ($r = -.09$, $p < .01$) were negatively and significantly correlated with pupil control ideology. These negative associations indicate that a shift toward contemporary pedagogical frameworks is linked with a decrease in custodial control and an increase in humanistic classroom orientations. Notably, no statistically significant relationship was found

between Reconstructionism and pupil control ideology ($r = .05, p > .05$). Collectively, these correlation findings provide robust preliminary evidence that teachers' philosophical belief systems are intrinsically linked to their conceptualizations of classroom authority.

Regression Analysis

Multiple linear regression analysis was performed to ascertain the extent to which teachers' educational philosophy orientations predict their pupil control ideologies. The results of the regression model, including standardized and unstandardized coefficients, are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4. Multiple Linear Regression Results for Predicting Pupil Control Ideology

Predictor	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>P</i>
Constant	2.21	.18	—	11.94	.000
Perennialism	.02	.03	.03	.76	.44
Essentialism	.33	.02	.45	12.87	.000
Progressivism	.07	.05	.07	1.43	.15
Existentialism	-.16	.05	-.15	-2.88	.004
Reconstructionism	.01	.03	.02	.48	.62

Model Statistics: R = .48, R² = .23 F = 46.60, p < .001

The regression model was found to be statistically significant ($F = 46.60, p < .001$), indicating that the combination of educational philosophies collectively explains 23% of the total variance in pupil control ideology ($R^2 = .23$).

Among the philosophical predictors, Essentialism emerged as the most potent positive predictor of student control ideology ($\beta = .45, p < .001$). This finding suggests that an increase in essentialist beliefs is significantly associated with a stronger inclination toward custodial control. Conversely, Existentialism was a significant negative predictor ($\beta = -.15, p < .01$), implying that teachers with higher existentialist orientations are significantly more likely to adopt humanistic behavioral management approaches.

Interestingly, while perennialism, progressivism, and reconstructionism showed some correlations in previous analyses, they did not reach statistical significance within the regression model ($p > .05$). This indicates that when all philosophies are evaluated simultaneously, essentialism and existentialism are the primary drivers in shaping teachers' tendencies toward classroom authority.

5. Discussion

The present study investigated the predictive power of teachers' educational philosophy orientations on their pupil control ideologies. The findings revealed that essentialism was the most potent positive predictor of custodial control, whereas existentialism served as a significant negative predictor. These results underscore the pivotal role of philosophical belief systems in orchestrating classroom authority and student autonomy.

The robust positive relationship between essentialism and student control ideology aligns with the core tenets of essentialist philosophy. As noted by Gutek (2006), essentialism prioritizes the transmission of a standardized body of knowledge through disciplined, teacher-led instruction. In this paradigm, the educator is the sovereign authority responsible for maintaining organizational order. Consequently, teachers endorsing essentialist views perceive hierarchical discipline as a prerequisite for academic mastery. This finding corroborates the arguments of Rideout and Morton (2010), suggesting that teacher-centered philosophies naturally gravitate toward custodial management models where student compliance is prioritized over self-regulation.

In contrast, existentialism's negative predictive role highlights a shift toward humanistic control. Given that existentialism emphasizes idiosyncratic meaning-making and radical freedom (Gutek, 2006), teachers with this orientation likely view classroom management as a collaborative process rather than a top-down imposition. Interestingly, descriptive results showed that teachers in this sample reported the highest mean scores for existentialism ($M = 4.53$). This suggests a contemporary trend among high school teachers who, despite working in structured public school systems, intellectually favor students' personal development and participatory discipline (Hoy, 2001).

A compelling finding of this study is that progressivism, perennialism, and reconstructionism failed to

significantly predict control ideology in the regression model, despite showing initial correlations. This statistical silence suggests that when essentialist and existentialist beliefs are present, they dominate the formation of authority concepts. Furthermore, as Pajares (1992) posits, the lack of direct translation from philosophical beliefs to behavior may stem from the messiness of teacher cognition. In the Turkish context, centralized curricula and institutional pressures (Hargreaves, 1998) may compel teachers to adopt similar control practices regardless of their progressive or reconstructionist ideals, creating a discrepancy between philosophical aspirations and pragmatic classroom requirements.

This study also enriches the broader literature on teacher cognition. For instance, the results align with Mardiha and Alibakhshi (2020), who linked epistemological beliefs to pedagogical conceptions, and Samfira and Sava (2021), who emphasized that pupil control is rooted in deep-seated cognitive structures. While previous Turkish studies (Altinkurt et al., 2012; Yılmaz, 2007) examined these constructs in isolation, this research provides the first empirical predictive nexus between them in the Turkish high school context.

In conclusion, pupil control ideology should not be reduced to a mere technical preference for classroom order. It is an epistemological byproduct of a teacher's worldview. The findings suggest that educational policies and teacher training programs should move beyond teaching management techniques and instead encourage educators to critically reflect on their philosophical foundations. Understanding that a teacher's stance on authority is a reflection of their belief in the nature of knowledge and human freedom is essential for fostering more democratic and effective learning environments.

6. Conclusion

This study provides empirical evidence that teachers' educational philosophy orientations are fundamentally intertwined with their pupil control ideologies. The findings demonstrate a clear philosophical divide: while essentialist orientations reinforce custodial, teacher-centered control mechanisms, existentialist orientations promote more humanistic, autonomy-supportive classroom environments. This divergence indicates that a teacher's approach to classroom authority is not merely a repertoire of technical management skills but a direct manifestation of their deeper epistemological and axiological beliefs.

By illuminating the philosophical underpinnings of classroom discipline, this research contributes to a more holistic understanding of the belief systems that govern pedagogical authority. It suggests that any attempt to transform classroom management practices must first address the underlying philosophical frameworks that educators hold. Ultimately, this study opens new pathways for exploring the philosophy-practice nexus, encouraging researchers and practitioners alike to reconsider the role of ideological foundations in shaping the everyday dynamics of teaching and learning.

Implications for Practice and Policy

The empirical evidence provided by this study yields several critical implications for teacher education, professional development, and educational leadership.

- a) **Reflective Teacher Education:** The results demonstrate that classroom authority is an extension of a teacher's philosophical identity. Therefore, pre-service teacher education programs should move beyond the transmission of pedagogical techniques and incorporate structured opportunities for philosophical reflection. Prospective teachers should be encouraged to critically examine their assumptions regarding authority, discipline, and student autonomy. By fostering this self-awareness, programs can help future educators understand the "why" behind their "how," leading to more intentional and coherent classroom practices.
- b) **Holistic Professional Development:** Current professional development initiatives often prioritize technical toolkits for classroom management. However, this study suggests that such strategies may remain superficial if they conflict with a teacher's internal belief system. Professional development should integrate philosophical discourse with practical interventions. Training that addresses the cognitive foundations of discipline—specifically the tension between essentialist (custodial) and existentialist (humanistic) approaches—can empower teachers to develop more reflective and balanced behavioral regulation strategies.
- c) **Strategic Leadership and Policy:** For educational policymakers and school administrators, these findings highlight the necessity of recognizing philosophical diversity within the teaching staff. Understanding that a teacher's disciplinary approach is rooted in deep-seated beliefs can assist leaders in cultivating school climates that are not only orderly but also philosophically coherent. Policies aimed at fostering

constructive teacher-student relationships should acknowledge that classroom order is not a one-size-fits-all technical standard but a value-laden pedagogical choice.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Despite the significance of its findings, the present study is subject to several limitations that should be acknowledged.

- a) **Self-Report Bias:** First, the data were collected through self-report scales, which primarily capture teachers' perceived beliefs rather than their observable behaviors. As pedagogical beliefs and actual classroom practices are not always isomorphic, future research could employ triangulation-complementing survey data with qualitative methodologies such as classroom observations or semi-structured interviews-to gain a more nuanced understanding of how philosophical orientations manifest in day-to-day instruction.
- b) **Contextual Generalizability:** Second, the scope of this research was limited to teachers in public high schools within a specific regional context. Consequently, the generalizability of the findings to different educational levels (e.g., primary or higher education) or private institutional settings remains to be established. Future comparative studies across diverse school types and educational systems are recommended to verify the cross-contextual stability of these relationships.
- c) **Multilevel Interactions:** Finally, while the present study focused exclusively on individual-level philosophical orientations, the broader doctoral research from which these data were drawn suggests that school-level variables-such as leadership styles and school climate-also play a critical role. Future investigations should consider multilevel modeling (MLM) to explore the complex interactions between a teacher's personal philosophy and organizational factors in shaping pupil control ideology.

Author's Note

This article is derived from the author's doctoral dissertation. No part of this study has been previously published or presented in another publication in its current form.

CRedit authorship contribution statement

The author was solely responsible for the conception and design of the study, data collection, data analysis, interpretation of findings, and writing of the manuscript.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank all participating teachers for their voluntary contribution to this study. The author also expresses sincere gratitude to the doctoral advisor and the members of the dissertation committee for their valuable guidance and support throughout the research process.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate

Ethical approval for this study was obtained from the relevant institutional ethics committee prior to data collection. Participation in the study was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained from all participants. The confidentiality and anonymity of the participants were strictly maintained throughout the research process.

Declaration of AI Usage Statement

No artificial intelligence tools were used in the generation of the research data, analysis, or interpretation. AI-assisted tools were used solely for language editing and proofreading purposes.

References

- Altinkurt, Y. Yılmaz, K. & Oğuz, A. (2012). İlköğretim ve ortaöğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin eğitim inançları. [Educational beliefs of primary and secondary school teachers]. *Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 31(2), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.7822/egt174>.
- Akyürek, E. (2021). An investigation into the relationship between pedagogic inference quality and epistemic cognition of pre-school teachers. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 92, 167-184. <https://doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2021.92.9>

- Apps, J.W. (1973). *Toward A Working Philosophy of Adult Education*. Syracuse University
- Aytaç, A. (2021). The relationship between teachers' epistemological beliefs and pupil control ideology. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 20(79), 1205-1217. <https://doi.org/10.17755/esosder.853560>
- Baş, G. (2013). An analysis of pupil control ideology of primary teachers from different variables. *Bartın University Journal of Faculty of Education*, 1(1), 97-109. <https://izlik.org/JA39CE98DT>
- Baş, G. & Beyhan, Ö. (2013). Öğretmen adaylarının öğretme-öğrenme anlayışları ile öğrenci kontrol ideolojileri arasındaki ilişki. [The relationship between preservice teachers' teaching-learning conceptions and pupil control ideologies]. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, (Special Issue)* (1), 14-26.
- Brauner, C. J. & Burns, H. W. (1982). Eğitim felsefesi [Philosophy of education] (S. Büyükdüvenci, Trans.) *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 15 (2), 291-298.
- Büyükdüvenci, S. (1987). *Eğitim Felsefesi Üzerine Yazılar*. [Essays on philosophy of education]. Yargıçoğlu.
- Cadavid, V. & Lunenburg, F. C. (1991, April). *Locus of control, pupil control ideology, and dimensions of teacherburnout*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.
- Celep, C. (1997). Öğretmen adaylarının öğrenci kontrol yönelimleri [Preservice teachers' pupil control orientations]. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 21(106), 12-22. <https://educationandscience.ted.org.tr/article/view/330>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, And Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Çetin, A., Ünsal, S., & Hekimoğlu, E. (2021). 2018-2019 Öğretim yılında güncellenen öğretmen yetiştirme lisans programının incelenmesi. [An examination of the updated teacher education undergraduate program in the 2018-2019 academic year]. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 52, 337-358. <https://doi.org/10.53444/deubefd.904931>
- Demirel, Ö. (2024). *Eğitimde Program Geliştirme-Kuramdan Uygulamaya*. [Curriculum development in education: From theory to practice]. Pegem Akademi
- Doğanay, A. (2011). Hizmet öncesi öğretmen eğitiminin öğretmen adaylarının felsefi bakış açlarına etkisi [The effect of preservice teacher education on teacher candidates' philosophical perspectives]. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 36(161), 332-348.
- Doğanay, A. & Sarı, M. (2003). İlköğretim öğretmenlerinin sahip oldukları eğitim felsefelerine ilişkin algıların değerlendirilmesi-öğretmenlerin eğitim felsefeleri [An evaluation of primary school teachers' perceptions of their educational philosophies]. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 1 (3), 321-337. <https://izlik.org/JA38FR58KL>
- Duman, B. & Ulubey, Ö. (2008). Öğretmen adaylarının benimsedikleri eğitim felsefelerinin öğretim teknolojilerini ve interneti kullanma düzeylerine etkisi ile ilgili görüşleri. [Preservice teachers' views on the effects of their adopted educational philosophies on their use of instructional technologies and the Internet]. *Muğla Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 20, 95-114.
- Ekiz, D. (2007). Öğretmen adaylarının eğitim felsefesi akımları hakkında görüşlerinin farklı programlar açısından incelenmesi [An examination of preservice teachers' views on educational philosophy movements across different programs]. *Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 24, 1-12.
- Ertürk, S. (2016). *Eğitimde Program Geliştirme* [Curriculum development in education]. Edge Akademi.
- Gutok, G. L. (2006). *Eğitime Felsefi ve İdeolojik Yaklaşımlar* [Philosophical and ideological perspectives on education] (N. Kale, Trans.). Ütopya.
- Hargreaves, A. (1998). *Changing Teachers, Changing Times- Teachers Work and Culture in The Postmodernage*. Redwood Books.
- Hoy, W. K. (2001). The pupil control studies: A historical, theoretical and empirical analysis. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 39(5), 424-441. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000005812>

- Hoy, W. K. & Forsyth, P. B. (1986). *Effective Supervision, Theory into Practice*. McGraw Hill.
- Hoy, W. K., & Woolfolk, A. E. (1990). Socialization of student teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 27, 279-300. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1163010>
- Karadağ, E., Baloğlu, N. & Kaya, S. (2009). Okul yöneticilerinin eğitim felsefesi akımlarını benimseme düzeylerine ilişkin ampirik bir çalışma. [An empirical study on school administrators' adoption levels of educational philosophy movements]. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Felsefe Dergisi*, 12, 181-200.
- Karasar, N. (2006). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi* [Scientific research method]. Nobel.
- Kilpatrick, W. H. (1951). *Philosophy of Education*. The Macmillan Company.
- Kottkamp, R. B. & Mulhern, J. A. (1987). Teacher expectancy motivation, open and closed climate and pupil control ideology in high school. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 20, 9-18.
- Kozikoğlu, İ., & Uygun, N. (2018). Investigation of the relationship between teachers' philosophies of education beliefs and curriculum design approaches. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 47(2), 411-438. <https://izlik.org/JA46MP29KW>
- Livingston, M. J., McClain, B. R., & DeSpain, B. C. (1995). Assessing the consistency between teachers' philosophies and educational goals. *Education*, 116(1), 124-129.
- Lunenburg, F.C. & Mankowsky, S. A. (2000, April). *Bureaucracy and pupil control orientation and behavior in urban secondary schools*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.
- Lunenburg, F. C., Sartori, M. A., & Bauske, T. (1999, August). *Classroom climate, teacher control behavior, and student self-control: Urban public and military high schools compared*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration, Jackson Hole.
- Mardiha, S. M., & Alibakhshi, G. (2020). Teachers' personal epistemological beliefs and their conceptions of teaching and learning: A correlational study. *Cogent Education*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2020.1763230>.
- Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı [Ministry of National Education]. (2024). *Türkiye Yüzyılı Maarif Modeli: Ortak metin* [Century of Türkiye education model: Common framework]. <https://tymm.meb.gov.tr/ortak-metin>
- Oğuz, E., & Kalkan, M. (2011). Examining teacher candidates' attitudes towards teaching profession and pupil control ideology. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 3(3), 903-917.
- Öztürk, H. (1992). *Eğitim Felsefesi* [Philosophy of education]. Arı Ofset.
- Pajares, F. M. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research*, 62, 307-332. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543062003307>
- Rideout, G. W. (2006). Educational beliefs and the learning environment. *Academic Exchange Quarterly*, 10 (2), 67-71.
- Rideout, G. W. & Morton, L. (2010). Pre-service teachers' beliefs and pupil control ideology: The custodializing practicum. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 48(1), 64-88. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231011015421>
- Sabarwal, S., Abu-Jawdeh, M., & Kapoor, R. (2022). Teacher beliefs: Why they matter and what they are. *The World Bank Research Observer*, 37(1), 73-106. <https://doi.org/10.1093/wbro/lkab008>
- Samfira E.M. & Sava F.A. (2021) Cognitive-behavioral correlates of pupil control ideology. *PLoS ONE* 16(2): e0246787. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0246787>.
- Ülken, H. Z. (2013) *Eğitim Felsefesi* [Philosophy of education]. Doğu- Batı.
- Willower, D. J., Eidell, T. L., & Hoy, W. K. (1967). *The School and Pupil Control Ideology*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

- Witter, M., & Hattie, J. (2026). Teacher belief systems: the complex and novel interactions between teachers' pedagogical and motivational beliefs. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 1-29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2026.2627549>
- Yılmaz, K. (2002). *İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin liderlik davranışlarıyla öğretmenlerin öğrenci kontrol yaklaşımları ve öğrencilerin okul yaşamının niteliğine ilişkin alguları arasındaki ilişkiler* [Relationships among primary school principals' leadership behaviors, teachers' pupil control orientations, and students' perceptions of school life quality] (*Unpublished master's thesis*). Osmangazi University.
- Yılmaz, K. (2007). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin okul yöneticilerinin liderlik davranışları ve öğrenci kontrol ideolojilerine ilişkin görüşleri [Primary school teachers' views on school administrators' leadership behaviors and pupil control ideology]. *TED Eğitim ve Bilim Dergisi*, 32 (146), 12-23.
- Yılmaz, K., Altinkurt, Y. & Çokluk, Ö. (2011). Eğitim inançları ölçeği'nin geliştirilmesi: Geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması [Development of the educational beliefs scale: A study of validity and reliability]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 11 (1), 335-350.

GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET

Giriş

Sınıf yönetimi çoğu zaman öğretmenin mesleki becerileri, deneyimi ve kullandığı stratejilerle açıklanmaktadır. Ancak öğretmenin sınıfta otoriteyi nasıl kurduğu, öğrenciyi hangi konuma yerleştirdiği ve disiplin süreçlerini nasıl anlamlandırdığı, daha derin eğitimsel inançlarla da ilişkilidir. Eğitim felsefesi yönelimleri, öğretmenlerin bilgiye, öğrenmeye, öğretmenin rolüne ve öğrencinin konumuna ilişkin temel kabullerini şekillendirmekte; bu kabuller sınıf içi otorite ve öğrenci davranışlarını yönetme biçimlerine yansımaktadır. Bu bağlamda öğrenci kontrol ideolojisi, öğretmenlerin öğrencileri dışsal denetime ihtiyaç duyan bireyler olarak mı, yoksa özerklik ve öz düzenleme geliştirme potansiyeline sahip özneler olarak mı gördüklerini anlamaya imkân vermektedir. Alan yazında öğretmen inançları, eğitim felsefeleri ve sınıf yönetimi üzerine çeşitli çalışmalar bulunmasına karşın, eğitim felsefesi yönelimlerinin öğrenci kontrol ideolojisini doğrudan yordayıcı bir yapı olarak ele alındığı araştırmalar sınırlıdır. Bu çalışmada öğretmenlerin eğitim felsefesi yönelimlerinin öğrenci kontrol ideolojisini ne ölçüde yordadığı incelenmiştir.

Yöntem

Araştırma, nicel araştırma yaklaşımı çerçevesinde ilişki tarama modeliyle yürütülmüştür. Çalışma grubunu Türkiye'de resmî liselerde görev yapan 660 öğretmen oluşturmuştur. Katılımcılar cinsiyet, yaş, mesleki kıdem, okulda çalışma süresi ve branş bakımından farklı özelliklere sahiptir. Veriler, Eğitim İnançları Ölçeği ve Öğrenci Kontrol İdeolojisi Ölçeği aracılığıyla toplanmıştır. Eğitim İnançları Ölçeği; ilerlemecilik, varoluşçuluk, yeniden kurmacılık, daimicilik ve esasicilik alt boyutlarından oluşmaktadır. Öğrenci Kontrol İdeolojisi Ölçeği ise öğretmenlerin öğrenci davranışlarını yönetmede gözetimci ya da insancıl kontrol anlayışına ne ölçüde yaklaştıklarını belirlemektedir. Ölçeklerin yapı geçerliği açımlayıcı ve doğrulayıcı faktör analizleriyle incelenmiş, güvenilirlikleri Cronbach alfa katsayılarıyla değerlendirilmiştir. Verilerin analizinde betimsel istatistikler, Pearson korelasyon analizi ve çoklu doğrusal regresyon analizi kullanılmıştır.

Bulgular

Betimsel bulgular, öğretmenlerin en yüksek ortalama puanlarının varoluşçuluk ve ilerlemecilik alt boyutlarında toplandığını göstermiştir. Bu bulgu, öğretmenlerin genel olarak öğrenci merkezli ve bireysel gelişimi önceleyen eğitim felsefelerine daha yakın olduklarına işaret etmektedir. Buna karşılık esasicilik, en düşük ortalamaya sahip felsefi yönelim olarak belirlenmiştir. Öğrenci kontrol ideolojisi puanları ise öğretmenlerin gözetimci kontrol anlayışından çok insancıl kontrol anlayışına daha yakın bir eğilim sergilediklerini göstermiştir.

Korelasyon analizi sonuçlarına göre esasicilik ile öğrenci kontrol ideolojisi arasında pozitif yönlü ve orta düzeyde anlamlı bir ilişki bulunmuştur. Bu bulgu, esasicilik yönelimi arttıkça öğretmenlerin daha gözetimci ve otorite merkezli kontrol anlayışına yaklaşma eğiliminde olduklarını göstermektedir. Buna karşılık ilerlemecilik ve varoluşçuluk ile öğrenci kontrol ideolojisi arasında negatif yönlü anlamlı ilişkiler belirlenmiştir. Yeniden

kurmacılık ile öğrenci kontrol ideolojisi arasında ise anlamlı bir ilişki bulunmamıştır.

Çoklu doğrusal regresyon analizi sonuçları, eğitim felsefesi yönelimlerinin birlikte öğrenci kontrol ideolojisindeki toplam varyansın %23'ünü açıkladığını göstermiştir. Regresyon modelinde esasicilik, öğrenci kontrol ideolojisinin en güçlü pozitif yordayıcısı olarak belirlenmiştir. Varoluşçuluk ise öğrenci kontrol ideolojisini anlamlı biçimde negatif yönde yordamıştır. Daimicilik, ilerlemecilik ve yeniden kurmacılık modele birlikte dâhil edildiğinde anlamlı yordayıcılar olarak belirlenmemiştir.

Tartışma ve Sonuç

Araştırma bulguları, öğretmenlerin öğrenci davranışlarını yönetme biçimlerinin tek başına teknik sınıf yönetimi stratejileriyle açıklanamayacağını göstermektedir. Sınıf içi otorite anlayışı, öğretmenlerin benimsedikleri eğitim felsefesi yönelimleriyle yakından ilişkilidir. Özellikle esasiciliğin öğrenci kontrol ideolojisinin en güçlü pozitif yordayıcısı olması, öğretmen merkezli, disiplin odaklı ve bilgi aktarımını önceleyen felsefi kabullerin daha gözetimci sınıf yönetimi anlayışını destekleyebileceğini göstermektedir. Esasicilikte öğretmen, sınıfın merkezinde yer alan otorite figürü olarak konumlandırılmakta; düzen, disiplin ve temel bilgi aktarımı eğitim sürecinin önemli unsurları arasında görülmektedir. Bu nedenle esasicilik yönelimi güçlendikçe öğrencinin daha çok denetlenmesi gereken bir varlık olarak algılanması beklenebilir.

Varoluşçuluğun öğrenci kontrol ideolojisini negatif yönde yordaması, öğrencinin bireyselliğini, özgürlüğünü ve sorumluluk geliştirme kapasitesini önceleyen felsefi kabullerin daha insancıl kontrol anlayışıyla ilişkili olduğunu göstermektedir. Bu yaklaşımda öğretmenin görevi öğrenciyi dışsal kontrol mekanizmalarıyla yönlendirmekten çok, onun bireysel gelişimine ve öz düzenleme kapasitesine rehberlik etmektir. Bu nedenle varoluşçu yönelimi güçlü olan öğretmenlerin daha katılımcı ve özerklik destekleyici sınıf yönetimi anlayışına yaklaşımları anlamlıdır.

İlerlemecilik ve yeniden kurmacılığın regresyon modelinde anlamlı yordayıcılar olarak belirlenmemesi, öğretmenlerin felsefi yönelimleri ile sınıf içi uygulamaları arasındaki ilişkinin doğrusal ve tek boyutlu olmadığını düşündürmektedir. Öğretmenler öğrenci merkezli felsefi yönelimleri benimsemelerine rağmen, sınıf yönetimi söz konusu olduğunda okulun örgütsel yapısı, merkezi sınav baskısı, öğretim programlarının yoğunluğu, okul kültürü ve uygulama koşulları gibi bağlamsal değişkenlerden etkilenebilmektedir. Bu nedenle öğretmenlerin beyan ettikleri felsefi yönelimler ile öğrenci davranışlarını yönetme biçimleri arasında her zaman tam bir örtüşme beklenmemelidir.

Sonuç olarak bu araştırma, eğitim felsefelerinin öğretmenlerin sınıf yönetimi anlayışının bilişsel ve normatif temellerinden biri olduğunu ortaya koymaktadır. Öğrenci kontrol ideolojisi, yalnızca sınıf düzenini sağlamaya yönelik teknik bir tercih olarak değil, öğretmenin bilgi, otorite, öğrenci ve öğrenme hakkındaki daha derin kabullerinin sınıf içindeki görünümü olarak değerlendirilmelidir. Bu doğrultuda öğretmen yetiştirme programları ile hizmet içi eğitimlerde sınıf yönetimi tekniklerinin yanında eğitim felsefesi, öğretmen inançları, öğrenci özerkliği ve sınıf içi otorite üzerine eleştirel farkındalık çalışmalarına da yer verilmesi önerilmektedir. Gelecek araştırmalarda okul iklimi, liderlik, öğretmen öz yeterliği, merkezi sınav baskısı ve okulun örgütsel yapısı gibi değişkenlerin eğitim felsefeleriyle birlikte çok düzeyli modeller kapsamında incelenmesi önerilmektedir.