

# Student Classroom Misbehaviour Teachers' Perspective

Tomislava Vidić

Faculty of Teacher Education, University of Zagreb

## Abstract

*Student misbehaviour entails all student behaviour which impedes the conduction of classes and interrupts the teaching-learning process. Previous research on the topic indicates such student behaviour has negative consequences for student achievement and the work and job satisfaction of teachers. This research aimed at examining which misbehaviours are perceived and to which measure by primary and secondary school teachers in Croatia, and the differences in these perceptions with regard to teachers' self-efficacy and the type of school they work at. Moreover, teacher satisfaction with support, education, legislation, and their intention of leaving the profession were also explored. The results showed that the most frequent misbehaviour entails not following instructions and not paying attention during lessons. Self-efficient teachers perceive student misbehaviour less, wherein class teachers perceive it the least. In solving problems related to student misbehaviour, teachers mostly rely on themselves and somewhat less on the help from expert associates, while they feel the most satisfied with the help provided by their colleagues. Teachers are generally dissatisfied with the existing legislation and most of them have not been educated in the field of classroom management in the course of their studies or in the form of additional professional training. Almost all the teachers consider teaching a demanding profession and more than one third of the participants would change their job if the opportunity arose.*

**Key words:** *classroom management; self-efficacy; teachers; student misbehavior.*

## Introduction

Classrooms are complex, bustling places wherein teachers are involved in more than a thousand daily interactions. At the same time they represent a public place, as teacher and student behaviour is visible to anyone present. Considering the multifacetedness of classroom events, with teachers and students having different goals, interests, tasks

and experiences, teachers need to be capable of overseeing and controlling multiple events simultaneously. It is clear that one part of such situations emerges suddenly and is hard to predict (Hallam & Rogers, 2008). Such classroom management by the teacher presents the most demanding part of his/her work. The synthesis of 800 meta-analyses implemented by Hattie (2009) has shown that precisely the teacher's ability to identify, quickly act on potentially inappropriate behaviour and remain emotionally objective has the greatest influence on ensuring well-managed classrooms.

Student misbehaviour represents the problem for schools worldwide. The number of various forms of misbehaviour has dramatically increased over the last two decades so it is not surprising that the literature encompasses different terms defining and describing various types of student misbehaviour (Dalgıç & Bayhan, 2014). They are, for example, misconduct, disciplinary violations (Finn et al., 2008; Thompson, 2009), problem behaviour, disruptive behaviour and misbehaviour (Arbuckle & Little, 2004; Charles, 2014; Cothran & Kulinna, 2007; Sun & Shek, 2012). Student disruptive behaviours are defined as activities that cause distress for teachers in their work, interrupt the teaching process and force the teacher to continuously reprimand the student (Arbuckle & Little, 2004, p. 60). On the other hand, misbehaviour is defined as behaviour that is inappropriate for a situation or a setting in which it occurs (Charles, 2014), that is, behaviour which disrupts the explicit rules or implicit norms of the classroom, hinders classroom work and interrupts the process of teaching and learning (Dalgıç & Bayhan, 2014).

Such disruptions of lessons can be classified differently. Fernandez-Balboa (1991) distinguishes between three types of student misbehaviour: a) off-task, i.e. students not performing the assigned tasks, but doing something else that disrupts the classroom rules and order; b) student nonparticipation; c) student verbal and/or physical behaviour toward students and/or teachers. Meyers (2003) classifies student misbehaviour according to openness and identifies the following: overt (visible to the teacher, such as talking, using mobile phones, eating in class and alike), and covert (passive behaviour such as being late for class, sleeping in class, inactivity, etc.). Kulinna et al. (2006) state three degrees of misbehaviour starting from mild, moderate to severe, and sort all of them into the following eight factors: a) aggressive, b) illegal or harmful, c) dodging participation, d) low engagement or irresponsibility, e) failing to follow directions, f) disrespect, g) complaining, and h) poor self-management.

In the meta-analysis which included research conducted from 2000 to 2012, Dalgıç and Bayhan (2014) presented the most frequent student misbehaviour as follows: constant talking during lessons, task avoidance, coming to class late, verbal hostility towards peers and teachers, indifference to study subject during classes, and destroying school property. It was also proven that such misbehaviour is more frequently detected by subject teachers than class teachers, and that it is more frequent among teachers with 10 or less than 10 years in service than among more experienced teachers, who teach classes with greater number of students.

Comparing the results of research implemented in different countries has shown that student misbehaviour is much alike, with minor deviations due to cultural differences. For example, a research done in China has found that the most frequent misbehaviour is talking out of turn, followed by non-attentiveness, daydreaming and idleness, wherein the interviewed teachers perceived disrespecting teachers with regards to disobedience and rudeness as the most unacceptable behaviour, followed by talking and verbal student aggression (Sun & Shek, 2012). Other research done in China has shown similar results as the most frequently identified forms of misbehaviour are daydreaming (Ding et al., 2008; Shen, et al., 2009), talking during lessons (Ho & Leung, 2002; Shen, et al., 2009) and indifference to classes (Ho & Leung, 2002; Leung & Ho, 2001). In a research implemented in Midwestern states in the US, it was proven that the most frequent misbehaviour from the teacher's perspective is talking during lessons, fidgeting, quarrelling and not paying attention during lessons (Kulinna et al., 2006), while students consider frequent talking, giggling, forming cliques, swearing and arguing as the most frequent (Cothran & Kulinna, 2007). A research done in Croatia reported that less than 10 % of the participant students display externalized behavioural problems while as much as 33,1 % have difficulties in learning and performing school tasks and are quick to give up tasks and started activities (Bukvić, 2020). A research done in Australia has also detected as problem behaviours distractibility, not listening to classes and disrupting the activities of others (Stephenson et al., 2000), but also talking out of turn and hindering other students in their work (Little, 2005). Norwegian and English teacher education students most frequently perceive among students the aggressiveness toward other students, delinquent behaviour, spiteful behaviour, passiveness, antisocial behaviour and off-task behaviour (Stephens et al., 2005).

The majority of previous studies note minor forms of misbehaviour which are basically non-violent behaviours. However, regardless of that fact, such mild and moderate misbehaviour represents a serious problem for teachers and students (Fernández-Balboa, 1991). The principal consequence of such behaviour is reduction of time for successful learning and teaching. As stated by Charles and Senter (2012), student misbehaviour has negative outcomes: it disrupts students' right to learn, interferes with teachers' right to teach, wastes time for learning and teaching; depletes student energy and motivation, creates an atmosphere of fear and stress for students and teachers and dissolves trust and cooperation between teachers and students. Students who wish to learn feel frustrated due to work disruptions, and the emergence of misbehaviour mitigates their fun and enjoyment in class work (Cothran & Kulinna, 2015). However, it was shown that some students do not always consider misbehaviour in class solely negative because such behaviour can improve their status among peers, which they consequently consider a positive outcome (Cothran et al., 2003).

Apart from the negative influence on the students' learning, misbehaviour has a major impact on teachers. A wide range of research confirms that student misbehaviour increases teacher job dissatisfaction (Cothran & Ennis, 1997; Toropova et al., 2021),

influences the emergence of the burnout syndrome, which consequently leads to giving up teaching (Aloe et al., 2013), and enhances teachers' stress levels (Tsouloupas et al., 2013). Along the same lines, it was proven that teachers who do not successfully deal with student misbehaviour are more frequently inclined to resign from the teaching profession (Ingersoll, 2001). Precisely such resignation was an incentive for the qualitative research done by Hong (2012). She examined the differences in some psychological factors, such as self-efficacy, values, beliefs and emotions, between the teachers who stay and the ones who leave the profession. The findings indicate that both groups have similar intrinsic motivation and similarly experience the challenges of teaching such as classroom management and efficient class instruction. Nevertheless, it was proven that teachers who give up teaching have weaker self-efficacy than the stayers and teachers who expect greater support from school administrators. Apart from that, teachers who gave up teaching self-created the feeling of hardship in performing their job, which partially led to their emotional burnout. As opposed to them, teachers who stuck with teaching have developed their own strategies of avoiding burnout at work by setting boundaries in their relationship with students.

The success in classroom management depends on the teacher's belief in his/her competence for teaching (Abu-Tineh et al., 2011). Self-efficacy is defined as a person's belief in being capable of performing certain actions necessary for achieving a specific goal, that is, a belief that one is able to organize and perform actions needed to attain the planned types of outcomes (Bandura, 1997). In the context of education, self-efficacy is defined as teachers' belief in their ability to organize and execute actions required for achieving the desired goals (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Therefore, if a teacher believes he/she is capable of classroom management and meaningful instruction, it is highly likely that he or she will do so. Research heretofore has consistently indicated that teacher's self-efficacy is related to success in teaching and student achievement (Henson, 2001). Compared to teachers with low self-efficacy, the ones with strong self-efficacy perceptions are more effective in using skills indispensable in classroom management (Goddard et al., 2004). Those teachers use classroom management strategies that are better organised and planned more student-centred and appreciative of their ideas (Anthony & Kritsonis, 2007). Furthermore, teachers with a pronounced sense of efficacy are less likely to criticize students, are more persistent in the work with less successful students and use instruction based on small groups more, as opposed to frontal teaching, i.e. teaching the class as a whole (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). In their observational study, Gibson and Dembo (1984) have ascertained the differences between teachers with high and low self-efficacy. Teachers with low self-efficacy easily give up on under-achievers and criticize them more often, while highly self-efficient teachers are less critical of their students and encourage them in their work more often.

The connection between teacher's self-efficacy and classroom management is reflected in the teacher's success expectations and in the influence of such expectations

on classroom management. However, as stated by Henson (2001), such relation is two-directional because a teacher's accomplishment in classroom management impacts his/her self-efficiency. In such a way successful classroom management will reinforce the teacher's self-efficiency and even effect greater success. On the other hand, poor classroom management will reduce teachers' self-efficiency. However, apart from successful classroom management, there are other factors influencing the increase or decrease of teachers' belief in their competence for teaching. One part of the research indicates the importance of the classroom management style and support teachers receive from principals (Bellibas & Liu, 2017; Kurt et al., 2011; Lee et al., 1991; Özdemir et al., 2020) and school administrators (Stipek, 2012), but also the importance of the teacher's professional development (Thoonen et al., 2012). As stated by Bandura (1997, p. 203), expectations of personal efficiency cannot be observed independently of the contextual factors. Tschannen-Moran et al. (1998) clarify that the belief of efficient teaching ability includes teachers' assessment of their skill regarding teaching and the perception of available resources. Accordingly, although self-efficiency remains stable over time, it is also under the influence of contextual factors such as, for example, the support provided for teachers. The relation between support from school administrators and parents has proven to be significant in previous research (Hauser-Cram et al., 2003; Lee et al., 1991; Stipek, 2012). Although the association between teachers' perceptions of their self-efficacy and parental support has not been studied before, a research conducted by Hauser-Cram et al. (2003) revealed an indirect influence of parental support: teachers have high expectations of those students with whose parents they share the same beliefs about discipline and teaching. When teachers believe students' parents are capable of active participation in their children's education and can be relied upon, their ability to enforce student learning increases. On the other hand, the greater the obstacles to parental participation in their children's education (e.g. the absence of home-provided help, irregular meetings in school, lack of interest and desire for participation), the poorer the teacher's self-efficiency (Stipek, 2012).

Apart from depending on self-efficiency, classroom management is also influenced by teachers' professional education. Teachers' professional development entails additional education and training teachers attend after receiving professional certification and employment (Stough & Montague, 2015). Insufficient teacher training in the course of their studies and later professional development represents a crucial difficulty in class management, especially among young teachers (Hirsch et al., 2019; Oliver & Reschly, 2007). Although the importance of education has been recognized worldwide, many young teachers receive insufficient training and weak support from colleagues and mentors in maintaining positive and efficient classroom environment (Baker, 2005; Oliver & Reschly, 2007; Stough & Montague, 2015). Successful classroom management requires continuous professional education throughout an entire teacher's career because in such a way they perfect their knowledge, regularly updating it with new scientific insights, and they have a possibility to reflect on their own practices and beliefs

(Charland, 2006). A research done by Bilač and Miljković (2016) has confirmed the positive influence of reflexive practice on teacher self-assessment of behaviour and satisfaction with classroom discipline management.

Previous research evidences the negative influence of student misbehaviour not only on student achievement but also on teaching and teachers' job satisfaction. As stated by Klasnić et al. (2018), behaviour of today's students can hardly compare to the one of students twenty or more years ago. The authors emphasise these changes are a consequence of the shift in cooperation between students, parents, teachers and the community as a whole. Precisely because school has the most significant role in the process of children's education, it is important to carry out the research to timely detect and recognise changes and to influence unfavourable phenomena as soon and effective as possible. Therefore, classroom management and student misbehaviour present an important field of research. In order to gain insight into the occurrence and forms of misbehaviour in Croatian schools, an empirical research was conducted among teachers working in primary and secondary schools in Croatia.

## **Methodology**

### ***Research aim***

Within this research, we set the following aims:

1 To examine whether the teachers' perceptions of student misbehaviour differ with regard to their workplace.

H1 Class teachers perceive student misbehaviour less often than subject teachers and secondary school teachers.

H2 Subject teachers perceive student misbehaviour less often than secondary school teachers.

H3 Teachers in vocational secondary schools perceive more student misbehaviours than grammar school teachers.

2 To examine the extent to which primary and secondary school teachers perceive student misbehaviour and determine the most frequent types of misbehaviour.

H4 Primary and secondary school teachers mostly perceive mild student misbehaviour.

3 To examine whether teachers' perceptions of student misbehaviour differ with regard to teachers' efficiency in classroom management.

H5 Highly efficient teachers perceive student misbehaviour less than teachers with low efficacy.

4 To examine the degree of teachers' satisfaction with the support from associates, principals and parents.

H6 Teachers are not satisfied with the support from associates, principals and parents.

5 To examine the extent to which teachers consider their job demanding and how satisfied they are with the provided professional training and the existing legislation regulating students' misbehaviour.



H7 Teachers consider that teaching is a demanding profession.

H8 Teachers are not satisfied with the existing legal and school documents regulating student misbehaviour.

H9 Teachers are not satisfied with organised professional training in the field of classroom management.

Apart from the stated aims, the validity and factor structure of the instrument will be checked within this research.

### **Participants**

The research was carried out online in October 2020. The participation in the research was offered to teachers via a closed group on a social network for teachers, principals and expert associates working in primary and secondary schools in Croatia. The opportunity for research participation was taken by 536 teachers, and 530 teachers were included in the final data processing (the data from six expert associates and principals who did not fill out the questionnaire were excluded). Regarding the questionnaire's design, it was possible to submit it only if all claims were assessed so there were no incomplete questionnaires. Although additional control found no extreme outliers, several outliers were indeed found. By reviewing the data of each participant with the outliers, it was noted that they were in line with the context of the other answers so they could not be considered as outliers. Therefore, all 530 participants were included in data processing. As much as 93,2 % ( $N = 494$ ) of the participants were females, and 6,8 % ( $N = 36$ ) were males. Out of the total number of participants, 21,3 % ( $N = 113$ ) worked as class teachers, 50,6 % ( $N = 268$ ) as subject teachers in primary school, 8,5 % ( $N = 45$ ) as grammar school teachers, 17,9 % ( $N = 95$ ) of them worked in vocational secondary schools, and 1,7 % ( $N = 9$ ) as teachers in secondary art schools. The sample analysis shows that most participants resided in the City of Zagreb (20,1 %;  $N = 106$ ), and the least were from Lika-Senj County (0,6 %;  $N = 3$ ), although all the counties of the Republic of Croatia were represented. The sample analysis regarding the length of work experience indicates a higher number of participants with less than 10 years in service (39,1 %;  $N = 207$ ), 33 % of the participants with between 11 and 20 years of work experience ( $N = 175$ ), 20,4 % between 21 and 30 years in service ( $N = 108$ ), 7,2 % between 31 and 40 ( $N = 38$ ), and 0,4 % of the participants with more than 40 years of work experience ( $N = 2$ ). The majority of the interviewed teachers have not advanced professionally (78,7 %;  $N = 417$ ), however, 11,1 % of them have advanced into a teacher mentor title ( $N = 59$ ), and 10,2 % have gained a teacher counsellor title ( $N = 54$ ).

### **Instruments**

*The Physical Education Classroom Management Instrument* was initially construed for determining student perceptions (Kulinna et al., 2003), and subsequently adjusted for determining teachers' perceptions of student misbehaviour in PE classes

(Kulinna, et al., 2006). The questionnaire entails 59 types of misbehaviour and measures eight factors: aggressive behaviour, illegal or harmful behaviour, dodging participation, low engagement or irresponsibility, failing to follow directions, disrespectful behaviour, complaining, and poor self-management. Regarding that the questionnaire was designed for examining misbehaviour in PE class, some specific misbehaviours have been modified, e.g., the claim *Does not line up right* is rephrased to *Does not sit politely*; *Forgets gym clothes* to *Does not bring school things/books*. The teachers were asked to assess how often they encounter student misbehaviour (e.g. does not pay attention, talks during class...) regardless of the number of grades they work in/or the type of implemented classes (online or live). Teachers have assessed the stated behaviours on a Likert-type five-degree scale: 1-*never* to 5-*always*. Apart from grouping the misbehaviour into factors, the stated behaviours are classified into three categories regarding their seriousness: mild, moderate and severe misbehaviour. As suggested in the original questionnaire (Kulinna et al., 2003, 2006), the mentioned behaviors are classified into three categories regarding the experts' evaluations. With that goal, a group of five teachers was formed: two class teachers, one subject teacher and two secondary school teachers. The length of work experience of the expert group members is in range from 8 to 25 years. The members individually assessed the severity of misbehaviour, and then the average values were calculated and behaviour categories formed.

*The Teachers' Efficacy in Classroom Management Questionnaire* is a part of the *Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale* (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). This scale consists of four claims which teachers used to assess how well they manage the class. Claims such as *how much can you do to control disruptive behaviour in the classroom* were assessed by teachers on a five-degree scale: 1 - *nothing* to 5 - *a great deal*.

Teachers' perceptions of some teaching aspects have been examined via eight claims aiming at determining the teachers' opinions about the support seeking and satisfaction with the provided support, the existing legislature, education and the assessment of teaching's difficulty.

Seeking help and support entailed two questions whereby teachers assessed how often, when in need, they address their colleagues, principals, expert associates, and parents, or work out the problem themselves, and how useful they consider the received help. The stated claims were evaluated by the participants on a five-degree scale: 1 - *not at all satisfied* to 5 - *completely satisfied*.

The satisfaction with the legislation entails two questions: *Do you feel the existing legislation regulates the sanctions for student misbehaviour well?*; *Do you feel the rules of behaviour are regulated well in your school?*

The satisfaction with education in classroom management was examined via three claims: *Do you feel teacher education faculties should enrich their curriculum with the course in classroom management?*; *Did you attend a course on classroom management during your studies at the faculty?*; *How satisfied are you with professional education*



*in classroom management provided by the Ministry of Science and Education, Teacher Training Agency and Agency for Vocational Education and Training?*

The demands of teaching and job satisfaction were assessed via three claims: *Do you consider teaching demanding?; In your opinion, does student misbehavior decrease your efficiency and will to work?; Given the chance, would you change your profession?* All eight questions about legal acts, education and job satisfaction were assessed by the participants on a three-degree scale: 1 – *yes*, 2 – *not sure*, 3 – *no*.

### **Data analysis**

The gathered data were analyzed via statistical program SPSS 18. Exploratory factor analyses were implemented on the results of the questionnaire measuring student misbehaviour and the questionnaire of teachers' efficiency in classroom management, and  $\alpha$  coefficients of the factors' reliability were calculated. Descriptive statistics was used in order to establish the levels of student misbehaviour and teachers' perception. One-way ANOVA was implemented to examine the differences in the perceptions of misbehaviour in primary and secondary school and the differences in teachers' perceptions with regard to the level of their self-efficiency in classroom management. The Bonferroni correction of liminal values of the results' significance was applied, partial Eta squared was calculated for determining the effect sizes of the differences, and Cohen's *d* coefficient in order to compare all the pairs. Student's *t*-test was used for determining the differences in the perceptions of misbehaviour between grammar school teachers and teachers in vocational schools. For testing the size effect, Cohen's *d* coefficient was calculated. The assessments of the teachers' satisfaction with organised professional training, work and legal regulations are shown in percentages.

### **Results**

Since *The Physical Education Classroom Management Instrument* has not been implemented among our population before, a factor analysis via method of the main components with orthogonal varimax rotation was conducted ( $KMO = 0.965$ ; and the Bartlett's Sphericity test  $\chi^2_{df780} = 19210.31$ ;  $p = .000$ ). According to the Kaiser-Guttman criterion of disregarding the claims with insufficient factor loadings, eight factors were found to have characteristic roots over one, but were not saturated with sufficient number of claims. By reviewing the communalities, we established they are often under 0.70, which means that the factor analysis with this solution does not give entirely good factors. As the criteria were met of average communality size greater than 0.60 (average communality is 0.61) and the minimal number of participants over 250 (Field, 2013), the review criterion, i.e. the Cattell's scree plot was applied. The diagram indicated a sudden drop after the fifth factor, and a new analysis was conducted for these five factors. This factor analysis explained 61.16 % of the student misbehaviour variance. After the rotation, the first factor (fails to follow instructions) explained 22.03 % of the variance, the second factor (illegal/harmful behaviour) explained 13.01 %, the third factor (disruptive behaviour) explained 10.12 %, the fourth factor (inappropriate behaviour) explained 8.91 %, and the fifth factor (incomplete work) explained 7.01 %.

the third (irresponsible-passive) 9.52 %, the fourth (irresponsible-aggressive) 9.39 %, and the fifth (aggressive behaviour) explained 7.21 % of the student misbehaviour variance. The obtained Cronbach Alpha coefficients indicate high reliability. The factor structure of the instrument, the related coefficients, and the categories of misbehaviour's seriousness are presented in Table 1.

Table 1  
Factor loadings of the Physical Education Classroom Management Instrument

		1	2	3	4	5	M	SD
14	Interrupts <sup>B</sup>	.817					3.42	1.03
10	Talking <sup>A</sup>	.802					4.01	0.93
11	Giggling <sup>A</sup>	.777					3.59	1.06
19	Not following directions <sup>A</sup>	.762					3.58	1.01
17	Doesn't pay attention <sup>A</sup>	.747					3.38	0.97
15	Doesn't sit politely <sup>A</sup>	.746					3.22	1.09
13	Forgets books and school things <sup>A</sup>	.709					3.41	1.01
18	Doesn't take care of one's things <sup>A</sup>	.708					3.20	1.02
6	Can't sit still (hyperactive) <sup>A</sup>	.640					3.43	0.99
54	Keeps others from working <sup>B</sup>	.624					3.20	1.03
16	Unsafe actions <sup>B</sup>	.603					3.03	1.08
30	Always asks to have instructions repeated <sup>A</sup>	.599					3.39	1.07
38	Whining <sup>A</sup>	.582					3.21	1.06
33	Doesn't participate <sup>B</sup>	.566					3.03	0.97
49	Attention seeking <sup>A</sup>	.538					3.33	1.01
48	Lazy <sup>A</sup>	.536					3.46	1.06
39	Continually saying, "I can't do it" <sup>A</sup>	.524					3.12	1.06
55	Talking back <sup>B</sup>	.501					2.76	1.06
20	Lying <sup>B</sup>	.495					2.94	1.01
51	Smart mouth toward students <sup>B</sup>	.444					2.84	1.06
5	Smoking <sup>B</sup>		.814				2.12	1.29
53	Sneaking out of class <sup>C</sup>		.797				1.77	0.97
23	Consuming alcohol <sup>C</sup>		.760				1.59	0.90
3	Misses or is late for class <sup>B</sup>		.749				2.36	1.09
45	Drug use <sup>C</sup>		.694				1.28	0.61
58	Dresses inappropriately (provocatively and alike) <sup>B</sup>		.607				1.95	0.96
36	Cheating <sup>C</sup>		.598				2.55	1.03
42	Using various excuses to avoid testing <sup>B</sup>		.529				2.69	1.13
4	Gum chewing <sup>A</sup>		.528				2.98	1.17

	1	2	3	4	5	M	SD
44 Sexual harassment <sup>C</sup>		.490				1.49	0.75
40 Displaying gang symbols <sup>C</sup>		.487				1.60	0.84
29 Acts shy and withdrawn <sup>A</sup>			.716			2.79	0.85
25 Poor self-image <sup>A</sup>			.685			2.86	0.93
28 Forming cliques <sup>B</sup>			.625			3.21	1.07
26 Makes fun of other students <sup>B</sup>			.551			3.15	0.98
27 Pretends to be sick <sup>B</sup>			.527			2.81	1.05
24 Showing off <sup>A</sup>			.505			3.26	1.03
32 Gets upset when loses/fails <sup>B</sup>				.547		2.99	1.03
56 Slowly performs school tasks (purposefully dawdles with class work) <sup>A</sup>				.533		2.44	1.06
41 Always must be first or best <sup>A</sup>				.527		2.85	1.04
43 Doesn't think of others <sup>B</sup>				.512		3.08	1.00
59 Smart mouth toward teacher <sup>B</sup>				.487		2.48	1.05
57 Dirty clothes <sup>B</sup>				.436		1.87	0.86
35 Leaving group during activity <sup>B</sup>				.434		1.91	1.03
8 Bullying <sup>C</sup>					.711	2.34	0.98
2 Fighting <sup>C</sup>					.708	2.26	0.87
7 Stealing <sup>C</sup>					.615	1.58	0.68
52 Pushing or punching others <sup>B</sup>					.586	2.64	1.08
37 Playing too rough <sup>B</sup>					.541	2.54	1.07
	$\alpha$	0.96	0.90	0.86	0.83	0.86	

Note: Severity categories: <sup>A</sup>Mild; <sup>B</sup>Moderate; <sup>C</sup>Severe behaviours

The factor structure of the *Teachers' Efficacy in Classroom Management Questionnaire* was verified via principal components method with the varimax rotation ( $KMO = 0.832$ ; Bartlett's Sphericity test  $\chi^2_{df780} = 1260.56$ ;  $p = .000$ ). According to Kaiser-Guttman criterion, one factor has a characteristic root over one (3.045) and explains 76.13 % of the efficiency variance. The communalities are in range from 0.72 to 0.79 and the Cronbach's  $\alpha$  reliability coefficient is 0.90 ( $p < .001$ ). Both questionnaires show satisfactory metric characteristics in accordance with the original model and previous research (Vidić & Miljković, 2019).

Table 2 displays descriptive statistics for all the examined dimensions. The results show that teachers assess their self-efficacy in classroom management as the highest. Review of the perceptions of misbehaviour dimensions indicates that teachers most frequently detect students failing to follow instructions and their passivity during lessons, while student illegal behaviour is detected least frequently. As regards to the perception of misbehaviour concerning seriousness, the most frequent is mild

misbehaviour, and the rarest is severe misbehaviour. All the examined dimensions show high reliability coefficients (from 0.83 to 0.96). The values of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test are in range from 0.032 to 0.093, and they are all statistically significant ( $p < .01$ ). However, the obtained separate indices of skewness and kurtosis are not high, so they are considered acceptable for the implementation of parametric analysis (skewness  $< 1$ , kurtosis  $< 3$ , acc. to Klineu, 2011). At the same time, parametric procedures may be applied only if the distributions of different scales are equally skewed.

Table 2  
Descriptive statistics of the variables ( $N = 530$ )

Variable	items	Min	Max	M	SD	skewness	kurtosis	$\alpha$
Fails to follow instructions	20	1.00	5.00	3.28	0.78	-0.06	-0.46	0,96
Illegal/harmful	11	1.00	5.00	2.03	0.70	0.77	0.36	0,90
Irresponsible - passive	6	1.00	5.00	3.01	0.75	0.09	-0.13	0,86
Irresponsible - aggressive	7	1.00	5.00	2.51	0.71	0.59	0.45	0,83
Aggressive	5	1.00	4.80	2.27	0.75	0.43	-0.09	0,86
Mild	19	1.18	5.00	3.23	0.71	-0.11	-0.36	0,95
Moderate	21	1.04	4.96	2.67	0.68	-0.31	-0.10	0,95
Severe	9	1.00	4.69	1.77	0.54	1.24	2.52	0,88
Efficacy	4	1.00	5.00	3.92	0.62	-0.55	1.36	0,90

The next task was to examine the differences in the occurrence of student misbehaviour with regard to the school the participant teachers work at. The results of the implemented one-way analysis are presented in Table 3. In order to avoid mistakes in measurement, the Bonferroni correction was used, and the differences in significance up to 0.008 ( $p < 0.05$ ) were included, i.e. 0.0025 ( $p < 0.01$ ).

The results of the variance analysis show a statistically significant difference in the perceptions of class and subjects teachers: class teachers more often perceive students failing to follow instructions, irresponsible-aggressive and student mild misbehaviour. Class teachers perceive less irresponsible and passive student misbehaviours than subject teachers and secondary school teachers. Class teachers perceive moderate types of misbehaviour less frequently than the subject teachers and secondary school teachers. The least types of aggressive misbehaviour are perceived by secondary school teachers, thereby they differ from class teachers and subject teachers. Illegal/harmful misbehaviour is perceived more often by secondary school teachers than class teachers and subject teachers, and by subject teachers more than class teachers. Severe types of student misbehaviour are least frequently encountered by class teachers, thereby they are different from secondary school teachers and subject teachers.

Considering the fact that it was assumed teachers from vocational secondary schools will encounter student misbehaviour more often than grammar school teachers, the differences were checked via Student's t-test. The results show that teachers in vocational schools ( $M = 2.07$ ;  $SD = 0.80$ ) perceive aggressive behaviour more than grammar school teachers ( $M = 1.59$ ;  $SD = 0.49$ ;  $t(138) = -3.643$ ;  $p = .003$ , Cohen  $d = 0.71$ ). Similarly, teachers in vocational

Table 3  
Differences in the perceptions of misbehaviour – the results of variance analysis

Variable	Class Teachers (N = 113)		Subject Teachers (N = 268)		High School Teachers (N = 149)		F (2,527)	p	$\eta_p^2$	Cohen's <i>d</i>	
	A		B		C						
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD					
Fails to follow instructions	3.07	0.86	3.41	0.71	3.19	0.80	9.360	.000**	0.03	A - B	0.44
Illegal/harmful	1.37	0.39	2.00	0.53	2.59	0.70	154.483	.000**	0.37	A - B A - C B - C	1.35 2.15 0.96
Irresponsible - passive	2.50	0.73	3.19	0.67	3.08	0.74	38.377	.000**	0.13	A - B A - C	0.98 0.79
Irresponsible - aggressive	2.32	0.71	2.63	0.67	2.45	0.74	8.153	.000**	0.03	A - B	0.44
Aggressive	2.34	0.80	2.45	0.66	1.89	0.75	30.313	.000**	0.10	A - C B - C	0.59 0.80
Mild	3.00	0.75	3.37	0.64	3.16	0.72	12.720	.000**	0.05	A - B	0.53
Moderate	2.31	0.66	2.78	0.61	2.73	0.73	21.763	.000**	0.08	A - B A - C	0.74 0.61
Severe	1.49	0.41	1.80	0.49	1.91	0.63	23.153	.000**	0.08	A - B A - C	0.70 0.81

Note. \* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$

schools ( $M = 2.83$ ;  $SD = 0.76$ ) experience moderate misbehaviour more than grammar school teachers ( $M = 2.55$ ;  $SD = 0.54$ ;  $t(138) = -2.288$ ;  $p = .010$ , Cohen  $d = 0.44$ ). Statistically significant differences were also proven in severe misbehaviour dimension, i.e. teachers in vocational schools perceive it ( $M = 2.03$ ;  $SD = 0.69$ ;  $t(138) = -2.969$ ;  $p = .001$ , Cohen  $d = 0.58$ ) more than grammar school teachers ( $M = 1.70$ ;  $SD = 0.40$ ;  $t(138) = -2.969$ ;  $p = .001$ , Cohen  $d = 0.58$ ).

The next task was to examine the extent to which primary and secondary school teachers experience student misbehavior, and the most frequent types of student misbehaviour. The data on student misbehaviour classified according to seriousness show mild misbehaviour as the most frequent ( $M = 3.23$ ;  $SD = 0.71$ ), followed by moderate misbehaviour ( $M = 2.67$ ;  $SD = 0.68$ ), while severe misbehaviour occurs rarely ( $M = 1.77$ ;  $SD = 0.54$ ). By ranking the obtained mean values, the most frequent misbehaviour is presented in Table 4. As can be seen, talking during classes, giggling and not following directions present the most frequent forms of misbehaviour across all levels and types of schools. Mild types of misbehaviour are most frequently perceived at all school levels, while forming cliques within the class, smoking and not participating in the work are among the most frequent moderate misbehaviours in secondary schools.

Table 4

*Five most frequent forms of student misbehaviour in primary and secondary school (N = 530)*

		<i>Five most frequent forms of student misbehaviour</i>		M	SD
classroom teachers (N = 113)	Talking <sup>A</sup>			3,98	1,01
	Can't sit still (hyperactive) <sup>A</sup>			3,57	1,05
	Arguing <sup>A</sup>			3,47	1,05
	Giggling <sup>A</sup>			3,38	1,19
	Always asks to have instructions repeated <sup>A</sup>			3,38	1,08
subject teachers (N = 268)	Talking <sup>A</sup>			4,09	0,89
	Giggling <sup>A</sup>			3,75	0,95
	Arguing <sup>A</sup>			3,74	0,89
	Lazy <sup>A</sup>			3,71	0,93
	Not following directions <sup>A</sup>			3,71	0,94
grammar school teachers (N = 45)	Talking <sup>A</sup>			3,76	0,83
	Gum chewing <sup>A</sup>			3,40	0,99
	Not following directions <sup>A</sup>			3,40	0,86
	Giggling <sup>A</sup>			3,33	1,11
	Forming cliques <sup>B</sup>			3,33	0,88
vocational school teachers (N = 95)	Talking <sup>A</sup>			3,98	0,96
	Smoking <sup>B</sup>			3,78	1,06
	Lazy <sup>A</sup>			3,65	1,06
	Not following directions <sup>A</sup>			3,57	1,05
	Forgets books and school things <sup>A</sup>			3,56	1,09
art school teachers (N = 9)	Not following directions <sup>A</sup>			3,78	1,20
	Late assignments <sup>A</sup>			3,78	0,97
	Talking <sup>A</sup>			3,67	1,22
	Doesn't participate <sup>B</sup>			3,67	1,22
	Forgets books and school things <sup>A</sup>			3,56	1,24

The next research task was to examine whether the teachers differ as regards to their perceptions of misbehaviour concerning their own efficiency in classroom management. Since it was determined teachers assess their own efficiency in classroom management as significantly high (only 12 teachers have efficacy assessments in range from 1.00 do 2.75), low, i.e. high efficiency is represented by the results of the lower and upper third of the overall results obtained in this research. Therefore, low efficiency is marked by values  $M < 4.00$  ( $N = 202$ ), average by  $M = 4.00$  ( $N = 176$ ), and high efficiency by  $M > 4.00$  ( $N = 152$ ). The results of the implemented variance analysis are presented in Table 5.

The results show there are statistically significant differences in failing to follow instructions dimension, wherein highly efficient teachers perceive students failing to follow instructions less than low-efficient teachers. Similarly, highly efficient teachers perceive less aggressive student misbehaviour. However, taking into account the size of the impact, it is evident that it is at a small level.



Table 5

The results of one-way variance analyses: Differences in the perception of misbehaviour as regards to self-efficacy perceptions (N = 530)

Variable	Low efficacy teachers (N = 202)		Average efficacy teachers (N = 176)		High efficacy teachers (N = 152)		F (2,527)	P	$\eta_p^2$	Cohen's d	
	A		B		C						
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD					
Fails to follow instructions	3.41	.78	3.25	.77	3.12	.77	6.222	.002**	0.02	A - C	0.38
Illegal/harmful	2.03	.67	2.02	.71	2.05	.74	0.091	.913	0.00		
Irresponsible - passive	3.07	.77	2.99	.73	2.95	.75	1.124	.326	0.00		
Irresponsible - aggressive	2.61	.73	2.47	.69	2.44	.69	2.888	.057	0.01		
Aggressive	2.40	.74	2.26	.78	2.11	.71	6.341	.002**	0.02	A - C	0.39
Mild	3.34	.70	3.21	.69	3.11	.71	4.580	.011	0.02		
Moderate	2.76	.67	2.64	.69	2.57	.68	3.737	.024	0.01		
Severe	1.81	.54	1.76	.55	1.71	.52	1.697	.184	0.01		

The next task was to determine the teachers' opinions about the support in solving problems in classroom management and their satisfaction with the provided support. The results are presented in Table 6. They show that teachers mostly rely on their own work in dealing with student misbehaviour, then on the help from expert associates and students' parents, somewhat less on the help from colleagues, and the least on the help from principals. In their assessment of satisfaction with the received help, teachers show the greatest satisfaction with help from colleagues, and less from principals and parents.

Table 6

Means and standard deviations

	M	SD		M	SD
When I notice a student misbehaving more often, I...			Satisfaction with provided help from:		
try to solve the problem myself	4.24	0.81	colleagues	3.55	1.22
turn to my colleagues for help	3.08	0.92	expert associates	3.23	1.27
ask for help from expert associates	3.30	0.98	principals	2.87	1.37
turn to the principal	2.30	1.04	parents	2.82	1.06
ask for help from students' parents	3.19	1.09			

The next task of this research was to find out how satisfied the teachers are with the existing legal regulations, school rules as regards to student misbehaviour, organized education in classroom management, and to which extent they consider teaching demanding. The obtained results are presented in Table 7.

Table 7

Satisfaction with regulations, education and the teaching job - response frequencies (N = 530)

	Yes	Not sure	No
Do you feel the existing legislation regulates the sanctions for student misbehaviour well?	6.2 %	7.1 %	86.7 %
Do you feel the rules of behaviour and the sanctions for non-compliance are regulated well in your school?	31.5 %	11.8 %	56.7 %
Does student misbehaviour reduce your efficiency and work enthusiasm?	70.38 %	6.42 %	23.21 %
If given the opportunity, would you change your job?	38.3 %	0 %	61.7 %
Do you feel teaching is demanding?	95.1 %	3.8 %	1.1 %
Did you attend a course in classroom management during your studies at the faculty?	6.2 %	3.6 %	90.2 %
Do you feel teacher education faculties should offer a course in classroom management?	94.0 %	3.8 %	2.3 %
Are you satisfied with organized education in the field of classroom management?	3.8 %	18.9 %	77.3 %

The results show that teachers are dissatisfied with the existing legislation regulating student misbehaviour and somewhat less, but still dissatisfied, with school regulations. More than 70 % of the teachers feel that student misbehaviour decreases their work efficiency and enthusiasm and, given the opportunity, as much as 38.3 % would change their job. More than 95 % of the participant teachers consider teaching a demanding profession and perceive as its most difficult aspects working with students with behavioural problems (41.5 %), cooperation with parents (29.3 %) and administrative work (20.8 %), whereas a smaller proportion of the teachers consider working with students in general to be difficult (3.6 %), followed by cooperation with colleagues (3.6 %) and principals (1.3 %). Regarding specialized education in classroom management, 94 % of the participants feel such education is necessary. More than 77 % of the participant teachers are dissatisfied with professional education in the field of classroom management conducted by the governing state institutions.

## Discussion

With this research we aimed to find out the most frequent student misbehaviour tackled by teachers in their educational work in primary and secondary schools. Student misbehaviour entails all those behaviours not appropriate for the teaching process and represents a problem of schools worldwide. Such behaviour poses an impediment to students because it stops them from learning and prevents teachers from carrying out the planned class work. The results of this research indicate frequent occurrence of mild misbehaviour, which encompasses not paying attention to lessons and passive irresponsible student behaviour such as, for example, talking and giggling during lessons or disregarding work instructions. Similar results were obtained in the research

implemented in the last thirty years in China (Ho & Leung, 2002; Sun & Shek, 2012), England (Wheldall & Merrett, 1988; Houghton et al., 1988), Australia (Little, 2005), Greece (Koutrouba, 2013) and other countries (Crawshaw, 2015). Although such behaviour may not seem worrying at first glance, it decelerates the teaching process and demands additional effort on behalf of the teachers in tackling it. It is a well-known fact that unless teachers do not react and stop such forms of misbehaviour, they will escalate, intensify, i.e. become more frequent and occur among an even greater number of students (Sun & Shek, 2012).

The comparison of the obtained results regarding the participants' level and type of education has revealed statistically significant differences in all the examined variables of misbehaviour. Expectedly so, class teachers, who work with the youngest students, experience the least inappropriate damaging behaviours, such as consumption of alcohol or drugs, dodging classes and alike. Such results are in line with the results of previous research. Namely, it was proven that harmful illegal behaviours are less frequent when compared to not paying attention to classes, but are perceived as the most unacceptable forms of misbehaviour by teachers (Crawshaw, 2015). It was initially assumed that class teachers will spot mild forms of misbehaviour more frequently, but the results of this research show they are most frequent in subject teaching. Class teachers are faced with irresponsible passive and aggressive behaviours and moderate and severe student misbehaviour least frequently. Subject teachers are faced with student misbehaviour most frequently: they notice more disregard for classroom work, irresponsible passive and aggressive types of student behaviour. It can be assumed that some forms of misbehaviour are more common among students in subject teaching due to the puberty period in which a series of emotional and physical changes take place. During this period students have a more difficult time accepting authority and rules and have a narrower attention span (Forbes & Dahl, 2010), so these can be the reasons for the occurrence of misbehaviour in school. Apart from that, the transition from class to subject teaching entails a change in the school work procedures. While in class teaching students learned with only one teacher, in subject teaching each subject is taught by a different teacher. It is possible that students' adjustment to various ways of teaching contributes to greater disagreements. Similar results were found in a research by Arbuckle and Little (2004), which revealed that student misbehaviour increases precisely in this transitional period and change of settings.

Apart from developmental changes, poorer school achievement and peers are the factors influencing student misbehaviour. The results of this research show that teachers in vocational schools perceive illegal/harmful, moderate and severe misbehaviour more than grammar school teachers do. It is possible such results are a consequence of educational settings because, as stated by Bilić and Golub (2011), attending grammar schools, i.e. vocational schools, is assuredly determined by intellectual and academic aspirations. Grammar schools put more academic strain on their pupils and they are more directed to academic achievement. This direction is possibly the reason for students resorting to all forms of misbehaviour less frequently.

In order for teachers to be successful in teaching, they need to be convinced of their own ability to do so (Bandura, 1997). Self-efficacy in classroom management is the belief of teachers in possessing the ability to manage the class (Aloe et al., 2013), and precisely this teacher trait is related to the increase of student misbehaviour (Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Goddard et al., 2004; Gordon, 2001; Henson, 2001). This research found differences in only two examined dimensions, i.e. it was proven that students of highly-efficient teachers are less often inattentive in class and less aggressive. Although it may seem these results are not entirely in accord with previous research because no statistically significant differences were found in the other examined dimensions, they point to important insights. If we analyse the student misbehaviour pertaining to the dimension of not paying attention to classes, it can be noted that this dimension includes the most frequent forms of student misbehaviour, such as talking during class, giggling, not minding the instructions, laziness, fidgeting, etc. Therefore, the most prevailing types of misbehaviour identified in this research rarely occur with teachers who are of above average self-efficacy in classroom management. Along the same lines, the established statistically significant differences in the aggressive behaviour dimension have shown it occurs less in classes taught by above-average efficiency teachers. The dimension of aggressive behaviour encompassed in this research includes theft, fighting and peer bullying. It can be inferred that the increase of teacher's self-efficacy in classroom management reduces the prevalence of student misbehaviour in classes. Namely, a research by Gibson and Dembo (1984) has shown that highly self-efficient teachers motivate students to solve problems, while teachers with poor self-efficacy have a tendency to criticize students for their behaviour more often. Furthermore, highly-efficient teachers are more persistent in the work with underachievers, while teachers with poor self-efficacy show greater dissatisfaction with their work and the symptoms of burnout. There is a series of factors influencing teachers' self-efficacy; among others, they are the availability of the support for teachers (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007), education and professional training (Gebbie et al., 2011; Stough & Montague, 2015).

The research points to a number of components which, when implemented into teachers' professional training and education, have a positive effect on the application of various strategies in teachers' work and self-efficacy (Stough & Montague, 2015). It is worrying that the results of this research show more than 90 % of the participant teachers had no course in classroom management during their studies, and 77 % is not satisfied with the education in classroom management organized in the course of their professional education. At the same time, 94 % of the participants agree that such education is indispensable for successful teaching. As a matter of fact, it seems that teachers are expected to successfully perform their work, efficiently manage the class and, lastly, raise their students without the provision of necessary education in the field. Student misbehaviour is not a problem solely for the class and school, but is also a threat to preparing students for future life and their functioning in society.

Therefore, the support is necessary in the form of education or help from colleagues, expert associates, principals and superior responsible institutions.

With this research we sought to find out how teachers solve problems of misbehaviour. It was proven that they try to tackle the problem themselves most frequently; if they ask for help, they mostly rely on the support from expert associates and parents, somewhat less from colleagues, and the least from principals. At the same time they are most satisfied with the support and help from colleagues, somewhat less with the help from expert associates, and the least with the help from principals and parents. As stated by Hoy and Woolfolk (1993), only a healthy school climate with an accent on positive student development and academic achievement, with an influential principal who works in the interest of teachers, empowers the development of teachers' confidence in being able to influence the student. Furthermore, the teacher's belief that they can reach each of their students is empowered by the organizational factors that help teachers in managing and teaching their students. Only institutional integrity, which entails the protection of teachers from unreasonable pressures and demands, and the teacher's morale contribute to teaching efficiency. The obtained results show that the participant teachers feel lonely in their struggle with student misbehaviour. Low assessments of received support from parents and principals surely do not nurture successful teaching in the classroom. Teachers in this research show great dissatisfaction with legal regulations of student misbehaviour, so it seems that, with the poor existing support and insufficient help, they do not have many possibilities in tackling and uprooting student misbehaviour. Setting rules which present a frame for appropriate behaviour for the students is necessary for achieving discipline in the classroom (Rijavec & Miljković, 2010). Students who perceive rules as clear and just and know the consequences for breaking them rarely misbehave and more positively perceive teachers and school in general (Bear, 2015). The schools which set clear and just rules, which are perceived as such by students, have less delinquent behaviour, and their students are less exposed to violence (Gottfredson et al., 2005). It is therefore important to include teachers in setting rules at the school and state level because the rules designed by teachers in the classroom need to be in sync with school and national rules. If students do not perceive rules or their implementation as consistent, they will most probably not obey them.

Most teachers in this research feel that student misbehaviour decreases their own efficiency and the will to work. Moreover, even 95 % of the teachers consider teaching a demanding profession. However, the fact that 38 % of them would change their job given the opportunity is certainly a call for reflection. Giving up teaching is considered the largest impediment to quality school functioning. The greatest portion of research on the reasons for which teachers leave their job was done in the USA (Ingersoll, 2001) precisely because it was proven that the teaching profession outnumbers others regarding the people resigning from it (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011). Some data show the percentage of teachers leaving their profession is between 40 and 50 % (Freeman et al., 2014; Ingersoll & Strong, 2011), and already 25 % of leavers is

considered worrying due to negative influence on work organization and efficiency of schools (Ingersoll, 2001). If the state's cost of teacher education is added to that, the damage of abandoning the profession becomes even greater. There is a variety of reasons for which teachers leave their profession, but insufficient pedagogical training, school setting, and student behaviour and motivation are among the regularly named (Freeman et al., 2014). Croatia does not have systematic monitoring or research into the reasons for which teachers leave their profession, nor is the information known about how many teachers have changed their job due to dissatisfaction. It is possible to presume this percentage is not as high as in the USA due to the job market and scarce opportunities of finding an adequate job. However, the practice shows it is becoming harder to find teachers from the STEM field because they find work in other professions more easily. Regardless of the fact that more than one third of the teachers in this research would change their profession, they most probably will not do so due to the lack of other adequate jobs. This fact must be a strong incentive for new research with the goal of empowering teachers' working conditions and providing them with expert and legislative support.

It is important to point out certain limitations of this research. First, it should be emphasized that it utilized convenience sampling and included a smaller number of male participants and teachers from art schools. Besides, the research aimed to find out which student misbehaviour is most frequently encountered by teachers, but some characteristics of the classes in which the teachers worked were not examined in the process. Namely, the information about the number of students in a class, the size of classrooms, and the experience in working with troubled students could additionally explain the obstacles teachers are faced with in their work with students. New insight would secure a better and more quality provision and organization of professional training, both on the state and school level.

## **Conclusion**

Although the results obtained in this research show that teachers most frequently encounter mild student misbehaviour such as not paying attention and passivity during classes, the results also indicate the need for understanding the overall situation and additional interventions with the aim of diminishing the occurrence of student misbehaviour as much as possible.

Teachers' efficient classroom management is the basis for teaching in the classroom. The results of previous research have been known to emphasize the success and influence of teacher education in classroom management on decreasing the frequency of student misbehaviour. The results of this research reveal the necessity of systematic teacher training in classroom management, both on the level of faculties and subsequent professional development. Changes cannot be expected if teachers are not provided with the means, education and work support. At the same time, teachers' dissatisfaction with the existing legislation urges the profession to find better, more quality solutions in this field.



It would be useful for further research to additionally examine the components of (dis)satisfaction with teaching and the influence of student misbehaviour on the dissatisfaction and burnout of teachers. More than one third of the participant teachers in this research would change their job if given the opportunity, which presents a piece of information of crucial importance, the one that should by no means be ignored; on the contrary, it urges additional qualitative and quantitative research.

## References

- Abu-Tineh, A. M., Khasawneh, S. A., & Khalaileh, H. A. (2011). Teacher self-efficacy and classroom management styles in Jordanian schools. *Management in Education*, 25(4), 175–181. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0892020611420597>
- Aloe, A. M., Amo, L. C., & Shanahan, M. E. (2013). Classroom management self-efficacy and burnout: A multivariate meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 26(1), 101–126. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-013-9244-0>
- Anthony, T. D., & Kritsonis, W. A. (2007). A mixed methods assessment of the effectiveness of strategic e-mentoring in improving the self-efficacy and persistence (or retention) of alternatively certified novice teachers within an inner city school district. *Doctoral Forum National Journal for Publishing and Monitoring Doctoral Student Research*, 4(1), 1-8.
- Arbuckle, C., & Little, E. (2004). Teachers' perceptions and management of disruptive classroom behaviour during the middle years (years five to nine). *Australian Journal of Educational & Developmental Psychology*, 4, 59-70.
- Baker, P. H. (2005). Managing student behavior: How ready are teachers to meet the challenge? *American Secondary Education*, 33(3), 51-64. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41064554>
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. Freeman.
- Bear, G. G. (2015). Preventive and classroom-based strategies. In E. T. Emmer, & E. J. Sabornie (Eds.), *Handbook of Classroom Management* (pp. 15-39). Routledge.
- Bellibas, M. S., & Liu, Y. (2017). Multilevel analysis of the relationship between principals' perceived practices of instructional leadership and teachers' self-efficacy perceptions. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 55(1), 49-69. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-12-2015-0116>
- Bilač, S., & Miljković, D. (2016). Utjecaj refleksivne prakse na samoprocjenu ponašanja i zadovoljstvo poslom učitelja u upravljanju razredom i disciplinom [The influence of the reflective practice on the behaviour self-assessment and job satisfaction of teachers in classroom management and discipline]. *Školski vjesnik: časopis za pedagoška i školska pitanja*, 65(3), 357-377.
- Bilić, V., & Ljubin Golub, T. (2011). Patološko igranje videoigara: Uloga spola, samopoštovanja i edukacijske sredine [Pathological videogame use: The role of gender, self-esteem and educational context]. *Hrvatska revija za rehabilitacijska istraživanja*, 47(2), 1-13.
- Bukvić, Z. (2020). Educational support to students with behavioural problems in elementary school. *Croatian Journal of Education*, 22(2), 425-450.

- Charland, W. (2006). The art association/higher education partnership: Implementing residential professional development. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 107(6), 31-39. <https://doi.org/10.3200/AEPR.107.6.31-39>
- Charles, C. (2014). *Building classroom discipline (11th ed.)*. Pearson.
- Charles, C. M., & Senter, G. W. (2012). *Elementary classroom management, 6th ed.* Pearson.
- Cothran, D. J., & Ennis, C. D. (1997). Students' and teachers' perceptions of conflict and power. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13(5), 541-553. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(97\)85542-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(97)85542-4)
- Cothran, D. J., Kulinna, P. H., & Garrahy, D. A. (2003). "This is kind of giving a secret away...": Students' perspectives on effective class management. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 19(4), 435-444. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(03\)00027-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(03)00027-1)
- Cothran, D., & Kulinna, P. (2007). Students' reports of misbehavior in physical education. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 78(3), 216-224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.2007.10599419>
- Cothran, D., & Kulinna, P. (2015). Classroom management in physical education. In E. T. Emmer, & E. J. Sabornie (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management* (pp. 239-260). Routledge.
- Crawshaw, M. (2015). Secondary school teachers' perceptions of student misbehaviour: A review of international research, 1983 to 2013. *Australian Journal of Education*, 59(3), 293-311. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0004944115607539>
- Dalgıç, G., & Bayhan, G. (2014). A meta-analysis: Student misbehaviors that affect classroom management. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*, 9(2), 101-116.
- Ding, M., Li, Y., Li, X., & Kulm, G. (2008). Chinese teachers' perceptions of students' classroom misbehaviour. *Educational Psychology*, 28(3), 305-324. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410701537866>
- Fernández-Balboa, J.-M. (1991). Beliefs, interactive thoughts, and actions of physical education student teachers regarding pupil misbehaviors. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 11(1), 59-78. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.11.1.59>
- Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics (4th ed.)*. SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Finn, J., Fish, R., & Scot, L. (2008). Educational sequelae of high school misbehavior. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 101(5), 259-274. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JOER.101.5.259-274>
- Forbes, E. E., & Dahl, R. E. (2010). Pubertal development and behavior: Hormonal activation of social and motivational tendencies. *Brain and Cognition*, 72(1), 66-72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandc.2009.10.007>
- Freeman, J., Simonsen, B., Briere, D. E., & MacSuga-Gage, A. S. (2014). Pre-service teacher training in classroom management. *Teacher Education and Special Education: The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children*, 37(2), 106-120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406413507002>
- Gebbie, D. H., Ceglowski, D., Taylor, L. K., & Miels, J. (2011). The role of teacher efficacy in strengthening classroom support for preschool children with disabilities who exhibit challenging behaviors. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 40(1), 35-46. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-011-0486-5>
- Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76, 569-582. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.76.4.569>

- Goddard, R. D., Hoy, W. K., & Hoy, A. W. (2004). Collective efficacy beliefs: Theoretical developments, empirical evidence, and future directions. *Educational Researcher*, 33(3), 3-13. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X033003003>
- Gordon, L. M. (2001). Higher teacher efficacy as a marker of teacher effectiveness in the domain of classroom management. *Annual meeting of the California Council on Teacher Education*, San Diego, CA.
- Gottfredson, G. D., Gottfredson, D. C., Payne, A. A., & Gottfredson, N. C. (2005). School climate predictors of school disorder: Results from a national study of delinquency prevention in schools. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 42(4), 412-444. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427804271931>
- Hallam, S., & Rogers, L. (2008). *Improving behaviour and attendance at school*. McGraw Hill: Open University Press.
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible Learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Routledge.
- Hauser-Cram, P., Sirin, S. R., & Stipek, D. (2003). When teachers' and parents' values differ: Teachers' ratings of academic competence in children from low-income families. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95(4), 813-820. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.95.4.813>
- Henson, R. K. (2001). Relationships between preservice teachers' self-efficacy, task analysis, and classroom management beliefs. *Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association*, New Orleans, LA.
- Hirsch, S. E., Lloyd, J. W., & Kennedy, M. J. (2019). Professional development in practice: Improving novice teachers' use of universal classroom management. *The Elementary School Journal*, 120(1), 61-87. <https://doi.org/10.1086/704492>
- Ho, C.-L., & Leung, J.-P. (2002). Disruptive classroom behaviors of secondary and primary school students. *Educational Research Journal*, 17(2), 219-233.
- Hong, J. Y. (2012). Why do some beginning teachers leave the school, and others stay? Understanding teacher resilience through psychological lenses. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 18(4), 417-440. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2012.696044>
- Houghton, S., Wheldall, K., & Merrett, F. (1988). Classroom behaviour problems which secondary school teachers say they find most troublesome. *British Educational Research Journal*, 14(3), 297-312. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1500984>
- Hoy, W. K., & Woolfolk, A. E. (1993). Teachers' sense of efficacy and the organizational health of schools. *The Elementary School Journal*, 93(4), 355-372. <https://doi.org/10.1086/461729>
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(3), 499-534. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312038003499>
- Ingersoll, R. M., & Strong, M. (2011). The impact of induction and mentoring programs for beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(2), 201-233. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654311403323>
- Klasnić, I., Đuranović, M., & Maras, N. (2018). Effective school discipline - The precondition for successful teaching. In V. Lubkina, S. Ušća, & A. Zvaigzne (Eds.), *Society, Integration, Education. Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference*. 2 (pp. 229-239). Rezekne Academy of Technologies. <https://doi.org/10.17770/sie2018vol1.3125>

- Kline, R. (2011). *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling (3th ed.)*. The Guilford Press.
- Koutrouba, K. (2013). Student misbehaviour in secondary education: Greek teachers' views and attitude. *Educational Review*, 65(1), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2011.628122>
- Kulinna, P., Cothran, D., & Regualos, R. (2003). Development of an instrument to measure student disruptive behavior. *Measurement in Physical Education and Exercise Science*, 7(1), 25-41. [https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327841MPEE0701\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327841MPEE0701_3)
- Kulinna, P., Cothran, D., & Regualos, R. (2006). Teachers' reports of student misbehavior in physical education. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 77(1), 32-40. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.2006.10599329>
- Kurt, T., Duyar, I., & Çalik, T. (2011). Are we legitimate yet? A closer look at the casual relationship mechanisms among principal leadership, teacher self-efficacy and collective efficacy. *Journal of Management Development*, 31(1), 71-86. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02621711211191014>
- Lee, V. E., Dedrick, R. F., & Smith, J. B. (1991). The effect of the social organization of schools on teachers' efficacy and satisfaction. *Sociology of Education*, 64(3), 190-208. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2112851>
- Leung, J. P., & Ho, C. L. (2001). Disruptive behavior perceived by Hong Kong primary school teachers. *Educational Research Journal*, 16(2), 223-237.
- Little, E. (2005). Secondary school teachers' perceptions of students' problem behaviours. *Educational Psychology*, 25(4), 369-377. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410500041516>
- Meyers, S. (2003). Strategies to prevent and reduce conflict in college classrooms. *College Teaching*, 51(3), 94-98. <https://doi.org/10.1080/87567550309596419>
- Oliver, R. M., & Reschly, D. J. (2007). *Effective classroom management: Teacher preparation and professional development*. National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.
- Özdemir, G., Şahinii, S., & Öztürk, N. (2020). Teachers' self-efficacy perceptions in terms of school principal's instructional leadership behaviours. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 16(1), 25-40. <https://doi.org/10.29329/ijpe.2020.228.3>
- Rijavec, M., & Miljković, D. (2010). *Pozitivna disciplina u razredu [Positive discipline in a classroom]*. IEP - D2.
- Shen, J., Zhang, N., Zhang, C., Caldarella, P., Richardson, M. J., & Shatzer, R. H. (2009). Chinese elementary school teachers' perceptions of students' classroom behaviour problems. *Educational Psychology*, 29(2), 187-201. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410802654909>
- Stephens, P., Kyriacou, C., & Tønnessen, F. E. (2005). Student teachers' views of pupil misbehaviour in classrooms: A Norwegian and an English setting compared. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 49(2), 203-217. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313830500049004>
- Stephenson, J., Linfoot, K., & Martin, A. (2000). Behaviours of concern to teachers in the early years of school. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 47(3), 225-235. <https://doi.org/10.1080/713671118>
- Stipek, D. (2012). Context matters: Effects of student characteristics and perceived administrative and parental support on teacher self-efficacy. *The Elementary School Journal*, 112(4), 590-606. <https://doi.org/10.1086/664489>
- Stough, L., & Montague, M. (2015). How teachers learn to be classroom managers. In E. T. Emmer, & E. J. Sabornie (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues* (pp. 446-458). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203074114.CH23>

- Sun, R., & Shek, D. (2012). Classroom misbehavior in the eyes of students: A qualitative study. *The Scientific World Journal*, 8, 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1100/2012/398482>
- Thompson, B. (2009). Disruptive behaviours in Barbadian classrooms: Implications for universal secondary education in the Caribbean. *Journal of Eastern Caribbean Studies*, 34(3), 39-58.
- Thoonen, E. E., Slegers, P. J., Oort, F. J., & Peetsma, T. T. (2012). Building school-wide capacity for improvement: The role of leadership, school organizational conditions, and teacher factors. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 23(4), 441-460. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2012.678867>
- Toropova, A., Myrberg, E., & Johansson, S. (2021). Teacher job satisfaction: The importance of school working conditions and teacher characteristics. *Educational Review*, 73(1), 71-97. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2019.1705247>
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing and elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(7), 783-805. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(01\)00036-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00036-1)
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(6), 944-956. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006>
- Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk Hoy, A., & Hoy, W. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research*, 68(2), 202-248. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543068002202>
- Tsouloupas, C. N., Carson, R. L., & MacGregor, S. K. (2013). The development of high school teachers' efficacy in handling student misbehavior (TEHSM). *The Journal of Educational Research*, 107(3), 230-240. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2013.788992>
- Vidić, T., & Miljković, D. (2019). Povezanost pristupa poučavanju s percipiranom samoefikasnosti, zadovoljstvom poslom i životom te emocijama učitelja u osnovnoj školi [Relationship between approaches to teaching and the perceived elementary school teachers' self-efficacy, life and job satisfaction, and emotions]. *Psihologijske teme*, 28(2), 291-312. <https://doi.org/10.31820/pt.28.2.4>
- Wheldall, K., & Merrett, F. (1988). Which classroom behaviours do primary school teachers say they find most troublesome? *Educational Review*, 40(1), 13-27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0013191880400102>

---

**Tomislava Vidić**

Faculty of Teacher Education

University of Zagreb

Savska cesta 77, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia

[tomislava.vidic@ufzg.hr](mailto:tomislava.vidic@ufzg.hr)

# Neprimjerena ponašanja učenika iz perspektive učitelja

---

## Sažetak

*Neprimjerena su ponašanja učenika sva ona koja ometaju rad u učionici i prekidaju proces učenja i poučavanja. Dosadašnja istraživanja ukazuju kako takva ponašanja učenika imaju negativne posljedice na postignuća učenika te na rad i zadovoljstvo poslom učitelja. Ovim se istraživanjem nastojalo ispitati koja neprimjerena ponašanja i u kojoj mjeri doživljavaju učitelji u osnovnim i srednjim školama u Hrvatskoj te razlike u tim percepcijama s obzirom na njihovu samoučinkovitost i vrstu škole u kojoj rade. Dodatno, ispitano je zadovoljstvo učitelja podrškom, edukacijom, zakonskim propisima te namjera odustajanja od posla. Rezultati su pokazali kako su najčešća neprimjerena ponašanja iz skupine nepraćenja uputa i nastave. Samoučinkoviti učitelji doživljavaju manje, a najmanje neprimjerenih ponašanja opažaju učitelji razredne nastave. U rješavanju problema učitelji se najviše oslanjaju sami na sebe, a nešto manje na pomoć stručnih suradnika, dok su najzadovoljniji pruženom pomoći svojih kolega. Učitelji su općenito nezadovoljni postojećim zakonskim propisima i većina njih nije tijekom studija i stručnoga usavršavanja imala edukacije iz područja upravljanja razredom. Gotovo svi učitelji smatraju kako je učiteljski posao zahtjevan, a više od trećine ispitivanih učitelja promijenilo bi posao ako bi za to imali priliku.*

**Ključne riječi:** *neprimjerena ponašanja; samoučinkovitost; učitelji; upravljanje razredom.*

## Uvod

Učionice su složena, užurbana mjesta u kojima su učitelji uključeni u više od tisuću interakcija dnevno. Istovremeno su i javna mjesta s obzirom da su ponašanja učitelja i učenika vidljiva svima koji su prisutni. S obzirom na višedimenzionalnost događaja u učionici u kojoj učitelji i učenici imaju različite ciljeve, interese, zadatke i iskustva, učitelji moraju biti sposobni nadzirati i kontrolirati više događaja istovremeno. Jasno je da dio takvih situacija nastaje iznenadno i teško ih je predvidjeti (Hallam i Rogers, 2008). Takvo učiteljevo upravljanje razredom predstavlja najzahtjevniji dio njegova posla. U sintezi 800 metaanaliza koju je proveo Hattie (2009) pokazalo se kako je upravo sposobnost učitelja da prepozna i odmah djeluje na potencijalno neprimjereno ponašanje te istovremeno zadrži emocionalnu objektivnost, ima najveći utjecaj na osiguravanje uspješnoga upravljanja razredom.



Loša ponašanja učenika predstavljaju problem škola u čitavom svijetu. Broj neprimjerenih ponašanja dramatično je povećan u posljednja dva desetljeća, stoga ne čudi što u literaturi postoje različiti termini kojima se definiraju i opisuju različita loša ponašanja učenika (Dalgıç i Bayhan, 2014). To su, primjerice, nedolično ponašanje, disciplinski prekršaji (Finn i sur., 2008; Thompson, 2009), problemi u ponašanju, ometajuća ponašanja te neprimjerena ponašanja učenika (Arbuckle i Little, 2004; Charles, 2014; Cothran i Kulinna, 2007; Sun i Shek, 2012). Ometajuća ponašanja učenika definiraju se kao „aktivnosti koje uzrokuju probleme učitelju u radu, prekidaju proces poučavanja i prisiljavaju učitelja da kontinuirano opominju učenika“ (Arbuckle i Little, 2004, str. 60). S druge strane, neprimjerena ponašanja definiraju se kao ponašanja koja nisu primjerena okruženju i situaciji u kojoj se javljaju (Charles, 2014), odnosno kao ponašanja koje narušavaju eksplicitna pravila ili implicitne norme učionice, ometaju rad u učionici i prekidaju nastavni proces poučavanja i učenja (Dalgıç i Bayhan, 2014).

Takva ometanja nastavnoga procesa mogu biti različito klasificirana. Fernandez-Balboa (1991) neprimjerena ponašanja učenika dijeli u tri vrste: a) učenik ne izvršava zadatke koje bi trebao već neke druge kojima remeti rad i pravila rada u učionici, b) učenikovo nesudjelovanje u radu, c) učenikovo verbalno i/ili fizičko agresivno ponašanje prema učiteljima ili učenicima. Meyers (2003) neprimjerena ponašanja klasificira prema otvorenosti na: otvorena (ona koja su vidljiva učitelju, poput pričanja na satu, korištenje mobilnih telefona, hranjenje na satu i sl.) i prikrivena (pasivna ponašanja kao npr. kašnjenje na nastavu, spavanje na nastavi, neangažiranost i sl.). Kulinna i sur. (2006) dijele ponašanja u tri stupnja, od lakših, težih do osobito teških, a sva ih svrstavaju u osam faktora: agresivna, nezakonita i štetna, izbjegavanje rada, niska angažiranost i neodgovornost, nepraćenje uputa, nepoštivanje, prigovaranje i slabo upravljanje samim sobom.

U metaanalizi koju su proveli proveo Dalgıç i Bayhan (2014), a koja je uključivala istraživanja provedena u razdoblju od 2000. do 2012. godine, prikazana su najčešća neprimjerena ponašanja učenika. Pokazalo se kako su najčešća neprimjerena ponašanja pričanje učenika za vrijeme sata, izbjegavanje rada, kašnjenje na nastavu, verbalno neprijateljstvo prema drugim učenicima i učiteljima, nezainteresiranost za sudjelovanje u nastavi te uništavanje školske imovine. Također se pokazalo kako takva ponašanja češće opažaju predmetni nastavnici nego učitelji razredne nastave, češća su kod učitelja s 10 ili manje od 10 godina radnoga iskustva negoli kod iskusnijih učitelja te su češća kod učitelja koji predaju u razredima s većim brojem učenika.

Uspoređujući rezultate istraživanja provedenih u različitim državama pokazalo se kako su neprimjerena ponašanja učenika vrlo slična, s manjim odstupanjima zbog kulturoloških razlika. Primjerice, u istraživanjima koja su provedeno u Kini najčešća neprimjerena ponašanja su pričanje za vrijeme nastave, nepažnja, sanjarenje i nerad, pri čemu ispitivani učitelji najneprihvatljivijim smatraju nepoštivanje učitelja, nepristojnost, pričanje i verbalnu agresiju učenika (Sun i Shek, 2012). Druga istraživanja provedena u Kini pokazala su slične rezultate te su najčešća neprimjerena ponašanja

učenika sanjarenje na nastavi (Ding i sur., 2008; Shen i sur., 2009) i pričanje za vrijeme nastave (Ho i Leung, 2002; Shen i sur., 2009), nepraćenje nastave (Ho i Leung, 2002; Leung i Ho, 2001). U istraživanju koje je provedeno u srednjozapadnim državama u SAD-u pokazalo se kako su najčešća neprimjerena ponašanja iz percepcije učitelja pričanje za vrijeme nastave, nemirno sjedenje, svađanje i nepraćenje nastave (Kulinna i sur., 2006), dok učenici najčešćim procjenjuju pričanje za vrijeme nastave, smijuljenje, stvaranje grupica, psovanje i svađanje (Cothran i Kulinna, 2007). U istraživanju koje je provedeno u Hrvatskoj pokazalo se kako manje od 10 % ispitivanih učenika pokazuje eksternalizirane probleme u ponašanju dok čak 33,1 % ima poteškoća u učenju i izvršavanju zadataka te brzo odustaju od zadatka i započetih aktivnosti (Bukvić, 2020). U istraživanju provedenom u Australiji također se pokazala nepažnja i nepraćenje nastave te ometanje rada ostalim učenicima (Stephenson i sur., 2000), ali i pričanje za vrijeme nastave te ometanje drugih učenika u radu (Little, 2005). Norveški i engleski studenti učiteljskih studija najčešće među učenicima opažaju agresivnost prema drugim učenicima, delinkventna ponašanja, prkosno ponašanje, pasivnost, antisocijalna ponašanja i neizvršavanje zadataka (Stephens i sur., 2005).

Većina dosadašnjih istraživanja bilježi lakše oblike neprimjerenih ponašanja koji u pravilu nisu nasilna ponašanja. Međutim, bez obzira na to, takva lakša i srednje teška neprimjerena ponašanja predstavljaju ozbiljan problem za učitelje i učenike (Fernández-Balboa, 1991). Glavna posljedica takvih ponašanja jest smanjenje vremena za uspješno učenje i poučavanje. Kako navode Charles i Senter (2012), neprimjerena ponašanja učenika ugrožavaju pravo učenika na učenje, omataju učitelje u poučavanju, dovode do gubitka vremena za učenje i poučavanje, smanjuju učenikovu motivaciju i energiju, stvaraju ozračje straha i stresa za učenike i učitelje te smanjuju povjerenje i suradnju između učitelja i učenika. Učenici koji žele učiti osjećaju se frustrirano zbog ometanja rada, a pojava neprimjerenih ponašanja smanjuje im zabavu i uživanje u radu (Cothran i Kulinna, 2015). Iako, pokazalo se kako neki učenici smatraju da neprimjerena ponašanja učenika na nastavi nisu uvijek samo negativna jer im takva ponašanja mogu povećati status među vršnjacima pa to onda smatraju pozitivnim učinkom (Cothran i sur., 2003).

Osim negativnoga utjecaja na učenje učenika, neprimjerena ponašanja imaju velik utjecaj na učitelje. Brojna su istraživanja koja potvrđuju da neprimjerena ponašanja učenika povećavaju nezadovoljstvo učitelja poslom (Cothran i Ennis, 1997; Toropova i sur., 2021), utječu na pojavu sindroma sagorijevanja koji posljedično dovodi do odustajanja od učiteljskoga posla (Aloe i sur., 2013) i povećavaju stres učitelja (Tsouloupas i sur., 2013). Isto tako, pokazalo se da učitelji koji se neuspješno nose s problemima u ponašanju učenika češće odustaju od učiteljske profesije (Ingersoll, 2001). Upravo takvo odustajanje od profesije bilo je povod kvalitativnoga istraživanja koje je provela Hong (2012). U svojem je istraživanju ispitivala razlike u nekim psihološkim faktorima, poput samoučinkovitosti, vrijednosti, uvjerenja i emocija, između onih učitelja koji ostaju i onih koji odustaju od učiteljske profesije. Rezultati su pokazali kako obje skupine

učitelja imaju sličnu intrinzičnu motivaciju i slično doživljavaju izazove učiteljskoga posla kao što su upravljanje razredom i učinkovito poučavanje. No, pokazalo se kako učitelji koji odustaju od učiteljske profesije imaju slabiju samoučinkovitost od onih koji ostaju raditi i koji očekuju veću podršku školskih suradnika. Osim toga, učitelji koji su odustali od učiteljskoga posla sami su sebi stvarali osjećaj težine obavljanja posla koja je posljedično dovela do njihova emocionalnoga sagorijevanja. Za razliku od njih, učitelji koji su ostali raditi pokazali su da imaju vlastite strategije za izbjegavanje sindoma sagorijevanja na poslu postavljajući granice u odnosu s učenicima.

Koliko uspješno će učitelj upravljati razredom, ovisi o njegovu vlastitu uvjerenju da je sposoban za taj posao (Abu-Tineh i sur., 2011). Samoučinkovitost se definira kao uvjerenje pojedinca da je sposoban izvesti određene radnje potrebne za postizanje specifičnoga cilja, odnosno uvjerenje da ima sposobnosti za organiziranje i izvršavanje akcije na način potreban za postizanje planirane vrste učinka (Bandura, 1997). U kontekstu obrazovanja, samoučinkovitost se definira kao uvjerenje učitelja da je sposoban organizirati i izvršiti radnje potrebne za postizanje željenoga cilja (Tschannen-Moran i sur., 1998). Dakle, ako učitelj vjeruje da je sposoban upravljati razredom i uspješno poučavati, vrlo je vjerojatno da će tako i raditi. Dosadašnja istraživanja ukazuju na konzistentne rezultate povezanosti samoučinkovitosti, uspješnosti poučavanja i postignuća učenika (Henson, 2001). U usporedbi s učiteljima s niskom samoučinkovitošću, učitelji s visokom samoučinkovitošću su učinkovitiji u korištenju vještina potrebnih za upravljanje razredom (Goddard i sur., 2004). Takvi, visoko samoučinkoviti učitelji bolje su organizirani, bolje planiraju, usmjereni su na učenika i češće prihvaćaju prijedloge učenika (Anthony i Kritsonis, 2007), rjeđe kritiziraju učenike, uporniji su u radu s manje uspješnim učenicima te češće dijele učenike u skupine zbog usmjerenoga poučavanja nego poučavanja frontalnim načinom (Tschannen-Moran i sur., 1998). Gibson i Dembo (1984) opservacijskim istraživanjem ustanovili su razlike između visoko i nisko samoučinkovitih učitelja. Nisko samoučinkoviti učitelji lako odustaju od učenika koji postižu slabiji uspjeh i češće ih kritiziraju, dok su visoko samoučinkoviti učitelji manje kritični i češće ohrabruju učenike u njihovu radu.

Povezanost samoučinkovitosti učitelja i upravljanja razredom očituje se u učiteljevu očekivanju uspjeha i utjecaju takvoga očekivanja na upravljanje razredom. No, kako navodi Henson (2001), takva je povezanost dvosmjerna jer će se uspjeh učitelja u upravljanju razredom odraziti na njegovu samoučinkovitost. Tako će uspješno upravljanje razredom doprinijeti većoj samoučinkovitošću učitelja i još većoj uspješnosti, a loše upravljanje razredom smanjit će samoučinkovitost učitelja. No, osim uspjeha u upravljanju razredom postoje drugi faktori koji mogu povećati ili umanjiti uvjerenje učitelja da su sposobni raditi svoj posao. Dio istraživanja ukazuje na važnost stila upravljanja i podrške koju učitelji dobivaju od ravnatelja (Bellibas i Liu, 2017; Kurt i sur., 2011; Lee i sur., 1991; Özdemir i sur., 2020), stručnih suradnika (Stipek, 2012), ali ukazuju i na važnost profesionalnoga razvoja učitelja (Thoonen i sur., 2012). Kako navodi Bandura (1997, str. 203), očekivanja osobne učinkovitosti ne mogu se promatrati

nezavisno od kontekstualnih faktora. Tschannen-Moran i sur. (1998) pojašnjavaju kako uvjerenje o sposobnosti učinkovitoga poučavanja učitelja uključuje njihovu procjenu uspješnosti poučavanja i percepciju dostupnih resursa. Prema tome, iako je samoučinkovitost stabilna kroz vrijeme, isto je tako pod utjecajem kontekstualnih faktora kao što je primjerice podrška koju učitelji primaju. Povezanost podrške školskih suradnika i roditelja pokazala se značajnom u ranijim istraživanjima (Hauser-Cram i sur., 2003; Lee i sur., 1991; Stipek, 2012). Iako povezanost učiteljskih percepcija podrške od roditelja i samoučinkovitosti učitelja nije ranije istraživana, u istraživanju koje su provele Hauser-Cram i suradnice (2003) pokazala se posredna uloga: učitelji imaju visoka očekivanja od učenika za čije roditelje vjeruju da dijele slična uvjerenja o disciplini i poučavanju kao oni sami. Kada učitelji vjeruju kako su roditelji njihovih učenika sposobni aktivno sudjelovati u obrazovanju djece, takvo uvjerenje da se mogu osloniti na roditelje povećava njihovu sposobnost promicanja učenja učenika. S druge strane, što su veće prepreke u sudjelovanju roditelja u obrazovanju djece (npr. izostanak pomoći koju pružaju kod kuće, neredovito informiranje u školi, manjak interesa i želje za sudjelovanjem), to je manja samoučinkovitost učitelja (Stipek, 2012).

Osim samoučinkovitosti za uspješno upravljanje razredom važno je profesionalno obrazovanje učitelja. Profesionalni razvoj učitelja podrazumijeva dodatni razvoj i edukaciju koju učitelji polaze nakon položenoga stručnog ispita i zaposlenja (Stough i Montague, 2015). Nedovoljna pripremljenost učitelja tijekom studija i kasnijega profesionalnog razvoja predstavlja najvažniju poteškoću u upravljanju razredom, posebno kod mladih učitelja (Hirsch i sur., 2019; Oliver i Reschly, 2007). Iako je važnost edukacije prepoznata diljem svijeta, mnogi mladi učitelji svjedoče o nedovoljnoj pripremljenosti i slaboj podršci kolega i mentora u uspostavljanju pozitivnoga i učinkovitoga razrednog okružja (Baker, 2005; Oliver i Reschly, 2007; Stough i Montague, 2015). Uspješno upravljanje razredom zahtijeva kontinuirano profesionalno usavršavanje tijekom čitave učiteljske karijere jer tako učitelji usavršavanju svoja znanja, redovito prate nove znanstvene spoznaje i omogućuje im refleksiju vlastite prakse i uvjerenja (Charland, 2006). Istraživanje koje su provele Bilač i Miljković (2016) potvrdilo je kako refleksivna praksa ima pozitivan utjecaj na samoprocjenu ponašanja i zadovoljstvo poslom učitelja u upravljanju razredom i disciplinom.

Dosadašnja istraživanja pokazuju da neprimjerena ponašanja učenika imaju negativan utjecaj na uspjeh učenika, ali i na rad i zadovoljstvo poslom učitelja. Kako navode Klasnić i sur. (2018) ponašanje današnjih učenika teško se može usporediti s ponašanjem učenika prije dvadeset i više godina. Autorice ističu kako su te promjene posljedica promjena u suradnji učenika, roditelja, učitelja i zajednice u cjelini. Upravo zbog toga što škola ima najznačajniju ulogu u procesu obrazovanja djece, važno je provoditi istraživanja kako bi se na vrijeme otkrile i prepoznale promjene te kako bi se na nepovoljne pojave moglo što prije i što učinkovitije djelovati. Stoga upravljanje razredom i neprimjerena ponašanja učenika predstavljaju važno područje istraživanja. Radi stjecanja uvida u pojavnost i oblike neprimjerenih ponašanja u hrvatskim

školama, provedeno je empirijsko istraživanje u kojem su sudjelovali učitelji zaposleni u osnovnoj ili srednjoj školi u Hrvatskoj.

## **Metodologija**

### ***Ciljevi istraživanja***

U ovom istraživanju postavljeni su sljedeći ciljevi:

1. Ispitati razlikuju li se učiteljske percepcije neprimjerenih ponašanja učenika s obzirom na radno mjesto.

H1 Učitelji razredne nastave rjeđe opažaju neprimjerena ponašanja učenika negoli učitelji u predmetnoj nastavi i srednjoj školi.

H2 Učitelji predmetne nastave rjeđe opažaju neprimjerena ponašanja učenika negoli učitelji u srednjoj školi.

H3 Učitelji u strukovnoj školi opažaju više neprimjerenih ponašanja učenika negoli učitelji u gimnaziji.

2. Ispitati u kojoj mjeri učitelji osnovne i srednje doživljavaju neprimjerena ponašanja učenika te koja su najčešća neprimjerena ponašanja učenika.

H4 Učitelji u osnovnim i srednjoj školi najviše opažaju lakše oblike neprimjerenih ponašanja učenika.

3. Ispitati razlikuju li se učiteljske percepcije neprimjerenih ponašanja učenika s obzirom na učinkovitost učitelja u upravljanju razredom.

H5 Visoko učinkoviti učitelji opažaju manje neprimjerenih ponašanja učenika negoli nisko učinkoviti učitelji.

4. Ispitati u kojoj su mjeri učitelji zadovoljni podrškom suradnika, ravnatelja i roditelja.

H6 Učitelji nisu zadovoljni podrškom suradnika, ravnatelja i roditelja.

5. Ispitati u kojoj su mjeri učitelji smatraju da je njihov posao zahtjevan te koliko su zadovoljni postojećim zakonskim propisima koji reguliraju neprimjerena ponašanja učenika i edukacijama.

H7 Učitelji smatraju da je učiteljski posao zahtjevan.

H8 Učitelji nisu zadovoljni postojećim zakonskim i školskim propisima koji reguliraju neprimjerena ponašanja učenika.

H9 Učitelji nisu zadovoljni organiziranim stručnim usavršavanjem u području upravljanja razredom.

Osim navedenih ciljeva, ovim će se istraživanjem provjeriti valjanost i faktorska struktura upitnika neprimjerenih ponašanja učenika.

### ***Uzorak ispitanika***

Ispitivanje je provedeno u listopadu 2020. godine *online* putem. Sudjelovanje u istraživanju ponuđeno je učiteljima putem zatvorene grupe na društvenoj mreži koja okuplja učitelje, ravnatelje i stručne suradnike zaposlene u osnovnim i srednjim školama u Hrvatskoj. Istraživanju se odazvalo 536 ispitanika, a u konačnu obradu podataka

uključeno je 530 učitelja (izostavljeni su podatci 6 stručnih suradnika i ravnatelja koji su ispunili anketu). S obzirom na oblikovanje upitnika, moguće je bilo podnijeti ga jedino ako su sve tvrdnje procijenjene, stoga nije bilo nepotpuno ispunjenih upitnika. Dodatnom kontrolom nisu pronađene ekstremne vrijednosti (*extreme outliers*), ali je pronađeno nekoliko odstupajućih vrijednosti (*outliers*). Pregledom podataka svakoga ispitanika s odstupajućim vrijednostima uočeno je da su isti u skladu s kontekstom ostalih odgovora te se ne mogu smatrati odstupajućim vrijednostima. Stoga je u obradi rezultata zadržano svih 530 ispitanika. Čak 93,2 % ( $N = 494$ ) ispitanika je ženskoga, a 6,8 % ( $N = 36$ ) muškoga spola. Od ukupnoga broja ispitanika njih 21,3 % ( $N = 113$ ) radi na mjestu učitelja razredne nastave, 50,6 % ( $N = 268$ ) čine predmetni nastavnici u osnovnoj školi, 8,5 % ( $N = 45$ ) je gimnazijskih nastavnika, 17,9 % ( $N = 95$ ) je nastavnika u srednjim strukovnim školama te 1,7 % ( $N = 9$ ) je nastavnika u srednjim umjetničkim školama. Analiza uzorka pokazuje da je sudjelovalo najviše ispitanika iz Grada Zagreba (20,1 %;  $N = 106$ ), a najmanje iz Ličko-senjske županije (0,6 %;  $N = 3$ ), no zastupljene su sve županije Republike Hrvatske. Analiza uzorka s obzirom na duljinu radnoga staža pokazuje da je najviše ispitanika s manje od 10 godina iskustva (39,1 %;  $N = 207$ ), 33 % ispitanika ima između 11 i 20 godina iskustva ( $N = 175$ ), 20,4 % između 21 i 30 godina ( $N = 108$ ), 7,2 % između 31 i 40 ( $N = 38$ ), a 0,4 % ispitanika ima više od 40 godina radnoga iskustva ( $N = 2$ ). Većina ispitivanih učitelja nije napredovala u zvanje (78,7 %;  $N = 417$ ), 11,1 % napredovao je u zvanje mentora ( $N = 59$ ), a 10,2 % u zvanje savjetnika ( $N = 54$ ).

### **Instrumenti**

*Upitnik procjene neprimjerenih ponašanja učenika (Physical Education Classroom management Instrument)*, inicijalno je konstruiran za ispitivanje učničkih percepcija (Kulinna i sur., 2003), a kasnije prilagođen za ispitivanje učiteljskih percepcija neprimjerenih ponašanja učenika na satima Tjelesne i zdravstvene kulture (Kulinna i sur., 2006). Upitnik se sastoji od 59 neprimjerenih ponašanja, a mjeri osam faktora: agresivno ponašanje, ilegalno ili štetno, izbjegavanje rada, niska angažiranost ili neodgovornost, neslušanje uputa, nepoštivanje, prigovaranje i loše upravljanje samim sobom. S obzirom da je upitnik inicijalno zamišljen za ispitivanje neprimjerenih ponašanja učenika na satima Tjelesne i zdravstvene kulture, neka su, specifična, ponašanja modificirana. Tako je npr. tvrdnja *Ne stoje u vrsti* preoblikovana u *Ne sjede pristojno; Zaboravljaju opremu za TZK u Ne donose potreban pribor/knjige*. Od učitelja se tražilo da procijene koliko se često susreću s neprimjerenim ponašanjima učenika (npr. učenici ne prate nastavu, razgovaraju za vrijeme sata...) bez obzira na broj razreda u kojima rade i/ili oblik provedene nastave (*online* ili *uživo*). Učitelji su svako od 59 ponašanja procjenjivali prema učestalosti javljanja na Likertovoj ljestvici od pet stupnjeva: 1 – *nikad* do 5 – *uvijek*.

Osim grupiranja ponašanja u faktore, navedena su ponašanja razvrstana u tri kategorije prema ozbiljnosti: lakša, teža i osobito teška neprimjereni ponašanja. Kao



što je predloženo u originalnom upitniku (Kulinna i sur., 2003; Kulinna i sur., 2006), navedena se ponašanja razvrstavaju u kategorije prema procjenama eksperata. S tim je ciljem formirana skupina od pet nastavnika od kojih dvoje radi u razrednoj nastavi, jedan u predmetnoj nastavi te dvoje u srednjoj školi. Duljina radnoga iskustva članova ekspertne skupine kreće se u rasponu od 8 do 25 godina. Članovi su samostalno procjenjivali težinu neprimjerenoga ponašanja, a potom su izračunate prosječne vrijednosti te formirane kategorije ponašanja.

*Upitnik procjene učinkovitosti u upravljanju razredom* dio je upitnika Učiteljske procjene učinkovitosti (*Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale*, Tschannen-Moran i Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). Upitnik se sastoji od četiri tvrdnje kojima učitelji procjenjuju koliko dobro mogu upravljati razredom na ljestvici. Tvrdnje poput *Koliko uspješno možete upravljati neprimjerenim ponašanjem učenika u učionici?*, učitelji su procjenjivali na ljestvici od 5 stupnjeva: 1 – *nimalo* do 5 – *jako dobro*.

Učiteljske percepcije nekih aspekata posla ispitane su pomoću osam tvrdnji kojima se nastojalo doznati mišljenje učitelja o traženju podrške i zadovoljstvu pruženom podrškom, postojećim zakonskim propisima, edukacijom te procjena zahtjevnosti učiteljskoga posla.

Traženje pomoći i podrške sastoji se od dva pitanja kojima su učitelji procjenjivali koliko se često za pomoć obraćaju svojim kolegama, ravnateljima, stručnim suradnicima, roditeljima ili sami rješavaju problem te koliko korisnom smatraju dobivenu pomoć. Navedene tvrdnje ispitanci su procjenjivali na ljestvici od pet stupnjeva, 1 – *uopće nisam zadovoljan/na* do 5 – *u potpunosti sam zadovoljan/na*.

Zadovoljstvo zakonskim propisima sastoji se od dva pitanja: *Smatrate li da postojeći zakonski propisi dobro reguliraju sankcije za neprimjereni ponašanja učenika?* i *Smatrate li da su u vašoj školi dobro regulirana pravila ponašanja?*

Zadovoljstvo edukacijom o upravljanju razredom ispitano je trima tvrdnjama: *Jeste li tijekom studija imali kolegij o upravljanju razredom?*, *Smatrate li da na nastavničkim fakultetima treba postojati kolegij o upravljanju razredom?* te *Koliko ste zadovoljni organiziranim edukacijama MZO-a, AZOO-a, ASOO-a o temi upravljanja razredom?*

Zahtjevnost i zadovoljstvo poslom ispitana je trima tvrdnjama: *Smatrate li da je učiteljski posao zahtjevan?*, *Smanjuju li neprimjereni ponašanja učenika Vašu učinkovitost i volju za radom?* te *Kada biste imali priliku, biste li promijenili svoj posao?*

Svih osam pitanja o zakonskim propisima, edukacijama i zadovoljstvu poslom ispitanci su procjenjivali na ljestvici od tri stupnja, 1 – *da*; 2 – *nisam siguran*; 3 – *ne*.

### **Analiza podataka**

Prikupljeni podatci analizirani su pomoću statističkoga programa SPSS 18. Provedene su eksplanatorne faktorske analize na upitniku neprimjerenih ponašanja učenika i upitniku učinkovitosti u upravljanju razredom te izračunati a koeficijenti pouzdanosti faktora. Deskriptivna statistika korištena je kako bi se ustanovile razine neprimjerenih ponašanja učenika iz percepcije učitelja. Jednosmjerna ANOVA korištena je kako bi



se ispitale razlike u percepcijama neprimjerenih ponašanja osnovnoj i srednjoj školi te razlike u percepcijama učitelja s obzirom na razinu njihove samoučinkovitosti u upravljanju razredom. Primijenjena je Bonferroni korekcija granične vrijednosti značajnosti rezultata, a za određivanje veličina efekata razlika izračunat je parcijalno kvadrirano eta i Cohenov  $d$  koeficijent za usporedbe među svim parovima. Studentov  $t$ -test korišten je za utvrđivanje razlika u percepcijama neprimjerenih ponašanja između gimnazijskih učitelja i učitelja u strukovnim školama. Za provjeru veličine efekta izračunat je Cohenov  $d$  koeficijent. Procjene zadovoljstva učitelja edukacijama, poslom i zakonskim propisima prikazane su u postotcima.

## Rezultati

Budući da upitnik neprimjerenih ponašanja učenika nije do sada primjenjivan na našoj populaciji, provedena je faktorska analiza metodom glavnih komponenata s ortogonalnom (varimax) rotacijom ( $KMO = 0,965$ ; Bartlettov test sfericiteta  $\chi^2_{df780} = 19210,31$ ;  $p = .000$ ). Prema Kaiser-Guttmanovom kriteriju nakon izbacivanja tvrdnji s nedovoljnim faktorskim zasićenjem, osam je faktora imalo karakteristične korijene veće od jedan, ali nisu bili saturirani dovoljnim brojem tvrdnji. Pregledom komunaliteta ustanovljeno je da su oni često manji od 0,70 što znači da faktorska analiza ovim rješenjem ne daje sasvim dobre faktore. Kako su zadovoljeni kriteriji prosječne veličine komunaliteta višega od 0,60 (prosječni komunalitet iznosi 0,61) i minimalnoga broja ispitanika većega od 250 (Field, 2013), primijenjen je kriterij pregleda oblika Cattelova dijagrama (*scree plot*). Dijagram je upućivao na nagli pad nakon petoga faktora te je provedena nova analiza na pet faktora. Ovom faktorskom analizom objašnjeno je 61,16 % varijance neprimjerenih ponašanja učenika. Nakon rotacije prvi faktor nepraćenje uputa i nastave objašnjava 22,03 %, drugi faktor ilegalna štetna ponašanja objašnjava 13,01 %, treći faktor neodgovorna pasivna ponašanja objašnjava 9,52 %, četvrti neodgovorna agresivna 9,39 % i peti faktor agresivna ponašanja objašnjava 7,21 % varijance neprimjerenih ponašanja učenika. Dobiveni koeficijenti Cronbachova alfa ukazuju na visoke pouzdanosti. Faktorska struktura upitnika, pripadajući koeficijenti i kategorije ozbiljnosti neprimjerenih ponašanja prikazani su u Tablici 1.

### Tablica 1.

Faktorska struktura upitnika učinkovitosti učitelja u upravljanju razredom provjerena je metodom glavnih komponenata s ortogonalnom (varimax) rotacijom ( $KMO = 0,832$ ; Bartlettov test sfericiteta  $\chi^2_{df780} = 1260,56$ ;  $p = ,000$ ). Prema Kaiser-Guttmanovom kriteriju jedan faktor ima karakteristični korijen veći od jedan (3,045) i objašnjava 76,13 % varijance učinkovitosti. Komunaliteti iznose od 0,72 do 0,79. Cronbachov  $\alpha$  koeficijent pouzdanosti iznosi 0,90 ( $p < ,001$ ). Oba upitnika pokazuju zadovoljavajuće metrijske karakteristike koje su u skladu s originalnim modelom i ranijim istraživanjem (Vidić i Miljković, 2019).

U Tablici 2 prikazani su deskriptivni pokazatelji za sve ispitivane dimenzije. Rezultati pokazuju kako učitelji najvišim procjenjuju vlastitu samoučinkovitost u upravljanju

razredom. Pregled procjena dimenzija neprimjerenih ponašanja pokazuje kako učitelji najčešće uočavaju nepraćenje uputa učenika i pasivnost učenika na nastavi dok su najrjeđa ilegalna ponašanja učenika. U procjenama pojavnosti neprimjerenih ponašanja s obzirom na njihovu ozbiljnost, najčešća su lakša neprimjerena ponašanja, a najrjeđa osobito teška neprimjerena ponašanja. Sve ispitivane dimenzije pokazuju visoke koeficijente pouzdanosti mjerenja (od 0,83 do 0,96). Vrijednosti Kolmogorov-Smirnovljeva testa kreću se od 0,032 do 0,093 i sve su statistički značajne ( $p < ,01$ ). Ipak, dobiveni zasebni indeksi asimetričnosti i indeksi spljoštenosti nisu veliki i u okvirima su prihvatljivih za provedbu parametrijskih analiza (asimetričnost  $< 1$ , spljoštenost  $< 3$ , prema Klineu, 2011). Ujedno, parametrijski se postupci smiju koristiti ako su distribucije različitih skala podjednako asimetrične.

#### Tablica 2.

Sljedeći zadatak bio je ispitati postoje li razlike u pojavnosti neprimjerenih ponašanja s obzirom na školu u kojoj rade ispitivani učitelji. Rezultati provedene jednosmjerne analize varijance prikazani su u Tablici 3. Kako bi se izbjegle pogreške mjerenja, korištena je Bonferroni korekcija te su uključene razlike značajnosti do 0,008 ( $p < 0,05$ ), odnosno 0,0025 ( $p < 0,01$ ).

#### Tablica 3.

Rezultati analize varijance pokazuju kako učitelji predmetne nastave statistički značajno češće negoli učitelji razredne nastave uočavaju nepraćenje uputa, neodgovorna agresivna ponašanja i lakša neprimjerena ponašanja. Učitelji razredne nastave uočavaju manje neodgovornih pasivnih ponašanja učenika negoli učitelji predmetne nastave i učitelji u srednjim školama. Učitelji razredne nastave rjeđe uočavaju teže oblike neprimjerenih ponašanja negoli učitelji predmetne nastave i učitelji srednjih škola. Najmanje agresivnih ponašanja uočavaju učitelji srednjih škola i u tome se razlikuju i od učitelja razredne nastave i učitelja predmetne nastave. Ilegalna štetna ponašanja češće uočavaju učitelji srednjih škola nego učitelji razredne nastave i učitelji predmetne nastave, a učitelji predmetne nastave više nego učitelji razredne nastave. S osobito teškim oblicima neprimjerenih ponašanja najmanje se suočavaju učitelji razredne nastave i u tome se razlikuju od učitelja srednjih škola i učitelja predmetne nastave.

S obzirom da se pretpostavljalo da će se učitelji u strukovnim školama češće suočavati s neprimjerenim ponašanjima učenika negoli gimnazijski učitelji, Studentovim t-testom provjerene su razlike. Rezultati pokazuju da učitelji u strukovnim školama ( $M = 2,07$ ;  $SD = 0,80$ ) doživljavaju više agresivnih ponašanja negoli učitelji u gimnaziji ( $M = 1,59$ ;  $SD = 0,49$ ;  $t(138) = -3.643$ ;  $p = .003$ , Cohen  $d = 0.71$ ). Slično tome, učitelji u strukovnim školama ( $M = 2,83$ ;  $SD = 0,76$ ) doživljavaju više težih oblika neprimjerenih ponašanja nego gimnazijski učitelji ( $M = 2,55$ ;  $SD = 0,54$ ;  $t(138) = -2,288$ ;  $p = ,010$ , Cohen  $d = 0,44$ ). Statistički značajne razlike pokazale su se i u dimenziji osobito teških oblika neprimjerenih ponašanja koje učitelji u strukovnim školama ( $M = 2,03$ ;

$SD = 0,69$ ;  $t(138) = -2,969$ ;  $p = ,001$ , Cohen  $d = 0,58$ ) doživljavaju češće negoli učitelji u gimnaziji ( $M = 1,70$ ;  $SD = 0,40$ ;  $t(138) = -2,969$ ;  $p = ,001$ , Cohen  $d = 0,58$ ).

Sljedeći zadatak bio je ispitati u kojoj mjeri učitelji osnovne i srednje doživljavaju neprimjerena ponašanja učenika te koja su najčešća neprimjerena ponašanja učenika. Podatci o neprimjerenim ponašanjima klasificiranim prema ozbiljnosti pokazuju kako su najčešća lakša neprimjerena ponašanja ( $M = 3,23$ ;  $SD = 0,71$ ), zatim teža ( $M = 2,67$ ;  $SD = 0,68$ ), dok se osobito teška neprimjerena ponašanja javljaju rijetko ( $M = 1,77$ ;  $SD = 0,54$ ). Rangiranjem dobivenih srednjih vrijednosti prikazana su najčešća neprimjerena ponašanja (Tablica 4). Kao što se može uočiti, razgovaranje pričaње za vrijeme sata, smijuljenje i nepraćenje uputa predstavljaju najčešće oblike neprimjerenih ponašanja u svim razinama i vrstama škola. Najčešće se, u svim razinama i vrstama škola, uočavaju lakši oblici neprimjerenih ponašanja, a od težih se javljaju formiranje grupa (klika) unutar razreda te pušenje i nesudjelovanje u radu u srednjoj školi.

#### Tablica 4

Sljedeći zadatak istraživanja bio je ispitati razlikuju li se nastavnici u percepcijama neprimjerenih ponašanja s obzirom na vlastitu učinkovitost u upravljanju razredom. S obzirom da je uočeno kako učitelji znatno visokim vrijednostima procjenjuju vlastitu učinkovitost u upravljanju razredom (svoga 12 učitelja imaju procjene učinkovitosti u rangu od 1,00 do 2,75), nisku, odnosno visoku učinkovitost predstavljaju rezultati donje i gornje trećine ukupnih rezultata dobivenih o ovom istraživanju. Prema tome, niskom se učinkovitošću smatraju vrijednosti  $M < 4,00$  ( $N = 202$ ); prosječnom učinkovitosti  $M = 4,00$  ( $N = 176$ ), a visokom učinkovitosti učitelji s  $M > 4,00$  ( $N = 152$ ). Rezultati provedene analize varijance prikazani su u Tablici 5.

#### Tablica 5

Rezultati pokazuju kako postoje statistički značajne razlike u dimenziji nepraćenja uputa za rad pri čemu visoko učinkoviti značajno manje opažaju nepraćenje učenika negoli nisko učinkoviti učitelji. Slično tome, visoko učinkoviti učitelji opažaju manje agresivnih ponašanja učenika. Ipak, uzimajući u obzir veličinu utjecaja, vidljivo je kako su oni niske razine.

Sljedeći zadatak bio je doznati u kojoj su mjeri učitelji oslanjaju na pomoć suradnika, ravnatelja i roditelja te koliko su zadovoljni pruženom podrškom. Dobiveni rezultati prikazani su u Tablici 6. Rezultati pokazuju kako se u suočavanju s neprimjerenim ponašanjima učenika, učitelji najviše oslanjaju na vlastiti rad, zatim na pomoć stručnih suradnika i roditelja učenika, nešto manje na pomoć kolega, a najmanje na pomoć ravnatelja. U procjenama zadovoljstva primljenom pomoći učitelji pokazuju najveće zadovoljstvo pomoći kolega, stručnih suradnika, a manje ravnatelja i roditelja.

#### Tablica 6.

Sljedeći zadatak ovoga istraživanja bio je doznati koliko su učitelji zadovoljni postojećim zakonskim i školskim propisima koji reguliraju neprimjerena ponašanja

učenika, koliko su zadovoljni organiziranom edukacijom o upravljanju razredom te smatraju li da je učiteljski posao zahtjevan. Dobiveni rezultati prikazani su u Tablici 7.

Tablica 7.

Rezultati pokazuju kako su učitelji nezadovoljni postojećim zakonskim propisima kojima se regulira neprimjereno ponašanje učenika, a nešto manje, ali još uvijek nezadovoljni, školskim propisima. Više od 70 % učitelja smatra kako im neprimjerena ponašanja učenika smanjuju učinkovitost i entuzijazam u radu te bi, kad bi imali priliku, njih čak 38,3 % promijenilo posao. Više od 95 % ispitivanih učitelja smatra da je učiteljski posao zahtjevan, a najtežim aspektima posla procjenjuju rad s učenicima s problemima u ponašanju (41,5 %), suradnju s roditeljima (29,3 %), administrativne poslove (20,8 %) dok manji dio učitelja teškim smatra općenito rad s učenicima (3,6 %), suradnju s kolegama (3,6 %) i suradnju s ravnateljem (1,3 %). Frekvencija odgovora vezanih uz stručno obrazovanje pokazuje kako više od 90 % učitelja nije tijekom studija imalo edukaciju o upravljanju razredom, a 94 % učitelja smatra da takva edukacija potrebna. Više od 77 % ispitivanih učitelja nezadovoljno je stručnim usavršavanjem u području upravljanja razredom koje provode nadležne državne ustanove.

## Rasprava

Ovim se istraživanjem nastojalo doznati koji su najčešći oblici neprimjerenih ponašanja učenika s kojima se suočavaju učitelji u osnovnom i srednjoškolskom odgojno-obrazovnom radu. Neprimjerena ponašanja učenika su sva ona koja nisu primjerena u nastavnom procesu i problem su škola u čitavom svijetu. Takva ponašanja predstavljaju prepreku učenicima jer ih sprječavaju u učenju, a učiteljima onemogućavaju provođenje planiranoga nastavnog rada. Rezultati ovoga istraživanja ukazuju na čestu pojavnost lakših oblika neprimjerenih ponašanja iz skupine nepraćenja nastave i pasivnih neodgovornih ponašanja učenika kao što su, naprimjer, razgovaranje i smijuljenje tijekom nastave i nepraćenje uputa za rad. Slični su rezultati dobiveni u istraživanjima provedenim u posljednjih tridesetak godina u Kini (Ho i Leung, 2002; Sun i Shek, 2012), Engleskoj (Wheldall i Merrett, 1988; Houghton i sur., 1988), Australiji (Little, 2005), Grčkoj (Koutrouba, 2013) i drugim zemljama (Crawshaw, 2015). Iako se možda takva ponašanja na prvi pogled ne čine zabrinjavajućima, ona itekako otežavaju rad učiteljima, usporavaju nastavni proces i zahtijevaju dodatne napore učitelja u obuzdavanju takvih ponašanja. Poznato je da ako učitelji ne reagiraju i ne zaustave takve oblike neprimjerenih ponašanja, ona će eskalirati, postati intezivnija i češća te se pojavljivati kod još većega broja učenika (Sun i Shek, 2012).

Usporedba rezultata dobivenih u podjeli ispitanika prema razini i vrsti škole pokazala je da postoje statistički značajne razlike u svim ispitivanim dimenzijama neprimjerenih ponašanja. Očekivano, učitelji razredne nastave, koji rade s učenicima najmlađe školske dobne skupine, doživljavaju najmanje nedozvoljenih štetnih ponašanja koja uključuju, naprimjer, konzumaciju alkohola, droge, bježanje s nastave i slično.

Takvi su rezultati u skladu s rezultatima ranijih istraživanja. Naime, pokazalo se da su nedozvoljena štetna ponašanja rjeđa u odnosu na nepraćenje nastave, ali ih učitelji smatraju najneprihvatljivijim oblicima neprimjerenih ponašanja (Crawshaw, 2015). Početno se pretpostavljalo kako će učitelji razredne nastave češće uočavati lakše oblike neprimjerenih ponašanja, ali rezultati ovoga istraživanja pokazuju kako su oni najčešći u predmetnoj nastavi. Učitelji se razredne nastave najrjeđe suočavaju s neodgovornim pasivnim i agresivnim ponašanjima te težim i osobito teškim oblicima neprimjerenih ponašanja učenika. Najčešće se s neprimjerenim ponašanjima učenika susreću učitelji predmetne nastave. Oni primjećuju više nepraćenja rada učenika, nedogovornih pasivnih i agresivnih ponašanja učenika. Može se pretpostaviti da su neki oblici neprimjerenih ponašanja češći kod učenika predmetne nastave zbog perioda puberteta u kojem se odvija niz emocionalnih i tjelesnih promjena. Učenici tijekom toga razdoblja teže prihvaćaju autoritet i pravila i imaju smanjenu koncentraciju (Forbes i Dahl, 2010) pa to mogu biti razlozi pojave neprimjerenih ponašanja u školi. Osim toga, prijelazom učenika iz razredne u predmetnu nastavu mijenja se način rada. Dok su u razrednoj nastavi učenici radili s jednim učiteljem koji im je predavao većinu nastavnih predmeta, u predmetnoj nastavi svaki nastavni predmet predaje drugi učitelj. Moguće je da prilagodba učenika na različite načine rada doprinosi većim neslaganjima. Slični su rezultati dobiveni u istraživanju koje su provele Arbuckle i Little (2004) u kojem se pokazalo kako se upravo u tom prijelaznom razdoblju i promjeni okruženja povećava broj neprimjerenih ponašanja učenika.

Osim razvojnih promjena, na neprimjerena ponašanja učenika utječu slabiji školski uspjeh te vršnjaci. Rezultati ovoga istraživanja pokazuju da učitelji u strukovnim školama češće doživljavaju nedozvoljena štetna ponašanja te teška i osobito teška neprimjerena ponašanja u odnosu na učitelje iz gimnazija. Moguće je da su takvi rezultati posljedica edukacijske sredine jer, kako navode Bilić i Ljubin Golub (2011), pohađanje gimnazije, odnosno strukovne škole zasigurno je određeno intelektualnim i akademskim aspiracijama. U gimnazijama je akademsko opterećenje učenika veće te su oni usmjereniji na postizanje školskoga uspjeha. Moguće je da zbog takve usmjerenosti učenici rjeđe pribjegavaju svim oblicima neprimjerenih ponašanja.

Da bi učitelji bili uspješni u radu, oni moraju biti uvjereni da su za to sposobni (Bandura, 1997). Samoučinkovitost u upravljanju razredom je uvjerenje učitelja da je sposoban upravljati razredom (Aloe i sur., 2013) i upravo se ta karakteristika učitelja povezuje sa smanjenim brojem neprimjerenih ponašanja učenika (Gibson i Dembo, 1984; Goddard i sur., 2004; Gordon, 2001; Henson, 2001). U ovom su istraživanju ustanovljene razlike u samo dvije ispitivane dimenzije te se pokazalo kako kod iznadprosječno učinkovitih učitelja učenici rjeđe ne prate nastavu i manje su agresivni. Iako se može činiti da ovakvi rezultati nisu u cijelosti u skladu s ranijim istraživanjima jer nisu ustanovljene statistički značajne razlike u ostalim ispitivanim dimenzijama, oni ukazuju na važne spoznaje. Ako se analiziraju neprimjerena ponašanja učenika zastupljena u dimenziji nepraćenja nastave, može se uočiti da ta dimenzija uključuje

najčešća neprimjerana ponašanja, naprimjer razgovaranje za vrijeme sata, smijuljenje, nepraćenje uputa za rad, lijenost, nemir i dr. Dakle, najčešća neprimjerena ponašanja koja su identificirana u ovom istraživanju rjeđe se javljaju kod učitelja koji imaju iznadprosječnu samoučinkovitost u upravljanju razredom. Isto tako, ustanovljene statistički značajne razlike u dimenziji agresivnih ponašanja pokazuju kako se ona rjeđe pojavljuju u razredima gdje su iznadprosječno samoučinkoviti učitelji. Dimenzija agresivnih ponašanja obuhvaćenih ovim istraživanjem uključuju krađe, tučnjave i vršnjačko nasilje. Može se zaključiti da bi se povećanjem samoučinkovitosti učitelja u upravljanju razredom smanjila pojavnost neprimjerenih ponašanja učenika na nastavi. Naime, istraživanje koje su proveli Gibson i Dembo (1984) pokazalo je kako visoko samoučinkoviti učitelji potiču učenike na rješavanje problema dok učitelji koji nisu samoučinkoviti češće kritiziraju učenike zbog ponašanja. Visoko samoučinkoviti učitelji ustrajni su u radu s učenicima koji postižu slabije rezultate, dok oni nisko samoučinkoviti pokazuju veće nezadovoljstvo poslom i simptome sindroma sagorijevanja na poslu. Postoji čitav niz faktora koji utječu na samoučinkovitost učitelja, između ostalih, to su dostupnost podrške učitelju (Hoy i Woolfolk, 1993; Tschannen-Moran i Woolfolk Hoy, 2007) te edukacija i stručno usavršavanje (Gebbie i sur., 2011; Stough i Montague, 2015).

Istraživanja ukazuju na čitav niz komponenti koje, kada su implementirane u profesionalni razvoj i edukaciju učitelja, imaju pozitivan učinak na primjenu različitih strategija u radu i samoučinkovitost učitelja (Stough i Montague, 2015). Zabrinjavajuće je da rezultati ovoga istraživanja pokazuju kako više od 90 % učitelja tijekom studija nije imalo kolegij upravljanja razredom, a 77 % njih nije zadovoljno edukacijama iz područja upravljanja razredom koje su organizirane tijekom njihova stručnoga usavršavanja. Istovremeno, 94 % ispitivanih učitelja slaže se kako su takve edukacije neophodne za uspješno obavljanje učiteljskoga posla. Zapravo, čini se kako se od učitelja očekuje uspješno obavljanje posla, uspješno upravljanje razredom i, na kraju, odgajanje učenika, a da pritom nije osigurana edukacija iz toga područja. Neprimjerena ponašanja učenika nisu problem samo razreda i škole, ona su prijetnja u pripremanju učenika za budući život i njihovo funkcioniranje u društvu, stoga je neophodna podrška u obliku edukacije ili pomoći kolega, stručnih suradnika, ravnatelja i nadležnih institucija.

U ovom se istraživanju pokušalo doznati kako učitelji rješavaju probleme neprimjerenih ponašanja. Pokazalo se kako najčešće sami pokušavaju riješiti problem, a ako traže pomoć najviše se oslanjaju na podršku stručnih suradnika i roditelja, nešto manje kolega, a najmanje ravnatelja. Istovremeno, najzadovoljniji su podrškom i pomoći kolega, nešto manje stručnih suradnika, a najmanje ravnatelja, odnosno roditelja učenika. Kako ističu Hoy i Woolfolk (1993), samo zdrava školska klima, ona koja je usmjerena na pozitivan razvoj učenika i koja ima utjecajnoga ravnatelja koji radi u interesu učitelja, omogućava stvaranje uvjerenja učitelja da je sposoban utjecati na učenika. Nadalje, uvjerenje učitelja da može doprijeti do svakog učenika proizlazi iz organizacijskih faktora koji pomažu učitelju u radu. Samo institucionalni integritet, koji



podrazumijeva zaštitu učitelja od nerazumnih pritisaka i zahtjeva okoline, i učiteljev moral doprinosi učinkovitosti u radu. Dobiveni rezultati ukazuju da se ispitivani učitelji osjećaju usamljeno u vlastitoj borbi s neprimjerenim ponašanjima učenika. Niske procjene dobivene podrške roditelja i ravnatelja zasigurno ne omogućavaju uspješan rad učitelja u razredu. Učitelji u ovom istraživanju pokazuju veliko nezadovoljstvo zakonskim propisima koji reguliraju neprimjerena ponašanja učenika pa se čini da uz slabu podršku i pomoć nemaju puno mogućnosti u smanjivanju neželjenih ponašanja. Postavljanje pravila koja učenicima daju okvir za prikladno ponašanje nužno je za stvaranje discipline u razredu (Rijavec i Miljković, 2010). Učenici koji vide pravila kao jasna i pravedna, koja znaju posljedice za kršenje tih pravila, rjeđe se neprimjereno ponašaju, a učitelje i školu u cjelini pozitivnije percipiraju (Bear, 2015). Škole u kojoj učenici pravila doživljavaju jasnim i pravednim imaju manje delinkventnih ponašanja i učenici su im manje izloženi nasilju (Gottfredson i sur., 2005). Stoga je važno uključiti učitelje u donošenje pravila na školskoj i državnoj razini jer pravila koja oni donose u učionici moraju biti usuglašena sa školskim i nacionalnim. Ako učenici ne doživljavaju pravila ili njihovu primjenu ne doživljavaju dosljednom, vjerojatno se istih neće ni pridržavati.

Većina učitelja u ovom istraživanju smatra da im neprimjerena ponašanja smanjuju vlastitu učinkovitost i volju za radom, čak 95 % učitelja smatra da je učiteljski posao zahtjevan. No, podatak da bi 38 % ispitivanih učitelja promijenilo posao kada bi za to imalo priliku, svakako je poziv na promišljanje. Odustajanje od posla učitelja smatra se najvećim problemom u kvalitetnom funkcioniranju škole. Najveći broj istraživanja razloga zbog kojih učitelji napuštaju posao proveden je u SAD-u (Ingersoll, 2001) upravo zato što se pokazalo kako je učiteljska profesija, u usporedbi s drugima, profesija s najvećim brojem odustajanja od posla (Ingersoll i Strong, 2011). Neki podatci govore kako se postotak učitelja koji napuštaju profesiju kreće između 40 i 50 % (Freeman i sur., 2014; Ingersoll i Strong, 2011), a već se odustajanje 25 % učitelja smatra zabrinjavajućim zbog negativnoga utjecaja na organizaciju rada i učinkovitost škole (Ingersoll, 2001). Pribroje li se tomu troškovi koje je država imala za školovanje učitelja, šteta odustajanja od posla postaje još veća. Brojni su razlozi zbog kojih učitelji odustaju od posla, ali nedostatan pedagoško osposobljavanje, školsko okruženje te ponašanje i motivacija učenika redovito se pojavljuju na listi razloga za napuštanjem posla učitelja (Freeman i sur., 2014). U Hrvatskoj nema sustavnoga praćenja i istraživanja razloga zbog kojih učitelji napuštaju posao, a nije poznat ni podatak koliko je učitelja promijenilo posao zbog nezadovoljstva poslom. Može se pretpostaviti da taj postotak nije visok kao u SAD-u, ali razlog tomu je vjerojatno u tržištu rada i nemogućnosti pronalaska adekvatnoga posla. Ipak, praksa pokazuje da je sve teže zaposliti učitelje STEM područja jer oni lakše pronalaze zaposlenje u drugim profesijama. Bez obzira na to što više od trećine učitelja u ovom istraživanju koji bi promijenili posao vjerojatno to neće učiniti zbog nedostatka adekvatnih drugih poslova, ovaj podatak mora biti poziv na nova istraživanja, a sve s ciljem unaprjeđivanja radnih uvjeta učitelja te pružanja stručne i zakonodavne podrške.



Važno je istaknuti određena ograničenja ovoga istraživanja. Prvo, treba naglasiti da je ono provedeno na prigodnom uzorku te uključuje manji broj muških ispitanika i mali broj učitelja zaposlenih u umjetničkim školama. Osim toga, istraživanjem se nastojalo doznati s kojim se neprimjerenim ponašanjima učenika učitelji najčešće susreću, ali pritom nisu ispitane neke karakteristike razreda u kojima učitelji rade. Naime, podaci o broju učenika u razredu, veličini učionice, iskustvu u radu s učenicima s različitim poteškoćama mogla bi dodatno objasniti prepreke s kojima se suočavaju učitelji u svojem radu s učenicima. Nove spoznaje omogućile bi bolju i kvalitetniju ponudu i organizaciju stručnoga usavršavanja, kako na državnoj tako i na školskoj razini.

## **Zaključak**

Iako rezultati dobiveni u ovom istraživanju pokazuju kako se učitelji najčešće susreću s lakšim oblicima neprimjerenih ponašanja poput nepraćenja nastave i pasivnosti učenika na nastavi, rezultati ukazuju na potrebu razumijevanja cjelokupne situacije i dodatne intervencije kako bi se pojava neprimjerenih ponašanja što više smanjila.

Vještine učinkovitoga upravljanja razredom učitelja osnova su za rad u učionici. Poznati su rezultati ranijih istraživanja koji ukazuju na uspješnost utjecaja edukacije učitelja za upravljanje razredom te smanjenje neprimjerenih ponašanja učenika. Rezultati ovoga istraživanja upućuju na nužnost sustavnoga osposobljavanja učitelja u upravljanju razredom, kako na fakultetskoj razini tako u kasnijem stručnom usavršavanju. Ne mogu se očekivati promjene, ako se učiteljima ne osiguraju sredstva, edukacija i podrška u radu. Isto tako, nezadovoljstvo učitelja postojećim zakonskim propisima nalaže struci pronalaženje boljih, kvalitetnijih rješenja u tom području.

U sljedećim bi istraživanjima bilo korisno dodatno ispitati komponente (ne)zadovoljstva poslom učitelja te utjecaj neprimjerenih ponašanja učenika na nezadovoljstvo i sindrom sagorijevanja učitelja. Više od trećine ispitivanih učitelja u ovom istraživanju promijenilo bi posao kada bi za to imali priliku, a to je podatak koji se nikako ne bi smio zanemariti i zahtijeva dodatna kvalitativna i kvantitativna istraživanja.