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ABSTRACT

This case study investigated on teachers’ classroom control strategies and decision-making simultaneously. In the private secondary school, teachers were strongly prohibited from disciplining students physically to avoid potential litigation threats and complaints from parents as stakeholders. From researcher’s activity as a participant observer, the Head of Discipline (HOD) reported of receiving discipline cases that were considered trivial and unnecessary that could have been rectified at teachers’ personal level. Under such restrictions and circumstance, teachers were investigated on their alternative forms of disciplining and their personal involvement in decision-making. Thus, fifteen teachers including the Head of Discipline (HOD) were chosen through purposive sampling to share on their experience in three areas: (a) as decision-makers; (b) their decision-making process; and (c) their unfavorable conditions and obstacle to personal decision-making. An open-ended Decision-making questionnaire was used together with a voice-recorded interview to collect information on their strategies, process and obstacles to personal decision-making. In addition, the pupil control ideology (PCI) form and Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) were also used to describe their personal profiles on their styles and confidence in classroom control. Data were subsequently transcribed, coded and analyzed sequentially in the three areas. As a result, teachers’ classroom control strategies were categorized into self-directed, student-directed, situation-directed and organizational-directed strategies. Each strategy contained tactics to educate, correct and prevent student from causing discipline problems. Secondly, respondents’ processes of decision-making were described as a pattern that progressed from personal involvement, to collaboration and finally transfer in relation to the perceived level of seriousness in the discipline problem. In addition, respondents were described in their extent of personal involvement through their frequencies of transfers, their PCI/TSES scores, perceptions.
on problem-seriousness, and their personal interventions prior to transfer. Within personal intervention, respondents were able to gather evidence(s), trace discipline problems to cause(s) and differentiate the type(s) of discipline problems. Thirdly, respondents’ highlighted a list of unfavorable conditions and six obstacles to personal decision-making; (a) Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs); (b) negative work culture; (c) social-cultural differences; (d) negative teacher-student relationship; (e) managing students with Learning Disabilities (LD); and (f) parental involvement. Eventually, the researcher compiled a list of suggestions from respondents to improve personal involvement and teachers’ collaborations in organizational decision-making. As an implication of research, this case study has contributed a contextual evidence for the researched organization to understand respondents’ behaviors as classroom leaders and their dilemmas in managing classroom discipline problems. Additionally, the Head of Discipline could rely on data findings to assist respondents in improving their personal decision-making on discipline problems that do not require transfer. Due to the limitations of a case study, no generalization can be made on the findings of this case study to reflect the whole population of teachers in the organization. As a concluding recommendation, respondents who portrayed different styles and levels of confidence through the analyses of the TSES and the PCI form could be paired for peer coaching, or conduct action research individually as a form of organizational learning.
ABSTRAK

Kajian kes ini dilaksanakan untuk mengkaji perilaku guru dalam hal pembuatan keputusan dan strategi pengurusan disiplin kelas. Dari segi konteks kajian yang telah dilakukan di sebuah sekolah menengah swasta, guru-guru dilarang sama sekali menggunakan kekerasan fizikal semasa menguruskan disiplin pelajar. Hal sedemikian berlaku untuk mengelakkan kes saman yang mungkin ditimbulkan oleh ibubapa pelajar susulan daripada tindakan mana-mana guru yang melanggar tatatertib etika perguruan. Hasil pemerhatian penyelidik mengesahkan wujudnya kes-kes disiplin yang kerap dipindahkan daripada guru-guru kepada Ketua Guru Disiplin. Malah, kebanyakan kes yang telah dilaporkan adalah remeh-temeh yang seharusnya dikawal oleh guru secara langsung. Akibat wujudnya kes-kes sedemikian yang dilaporkan oleh Ketua Guru Disiplin, maka penyelidik telah mengambil keputusan untuk mengkaji lima belas responden (termasuk Ketua Guru Disiplin) yang melibatkan tiga aspek eksplorasi utama iaitu: (a) guru sebagai individu yang membuat keputusan; (b) proses pembuatan keputusan; dan (c) halangan peribadi serta keadaan yang tidak memberangsangkan dalam proses pembuatan keputusan. Tiga instrumen kajian digunakan untuk proses pengumpulan data iaitu Decision-making questionnaire, Pupil Control Ideology Form (PCI) dan Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES). Analisis data melibatkan proses transkripsi rekod perbualan di antara penyelidik dan responden, diikuti dengan pengkodan dan akhirnya analisis kualitatif untuk mengenalpasti dan menerangkan corak pembuatan keputusan peribadi. Hasil kajian kes ini telah mengklasifisikan strategi pengurusan bilik darjah responden sebagai berorientasikan diri, pelajar, situasi dan organisasi. Malah, setiap taktik dalam strategi yang disebutkan bermatlamat mengajar, memperbetul dan mengelakkan pelajar daripada terus menimbulkan masalah disiplin kelas. Dari segi corak pembuatan keputusan, tabiat responden berganjar daripada penglibatan diri secara langsung kepada tidak langsung menerusi kolaborasi dan
akhirnya kepada pemindahan kes kepada Ketua Guru Disiplin. Tindakan peralihan corak ini sejajar dengan tahap persepsi responden apabila masalah disiplin kelas bertambah serius. Selain daripada itu, responden turut dikaji dari aspek kekerapan memindahkan kes disiplin kelas kepada Ketua Guru Disiplin, tahap skor peribadi daripada PCI/TSES, persepsi terhadap masalah disiplin kelas yang serius dan sejauh mana mereka ingin melibatkan diri dalam pembuatan keputusan disiplin pelajar. Hasil kajian juga mendapat responden mampu mengumpulkan bukti, mengenalpasti punca (atau faktor) berlakunya disiplin pelajar dan membezakan antara kes yang serius dengan yang kurang serius. Seterusnya, hasil kajian juga mengenalpasti situasi yang tidak memberangsangkan untuk responden melibatkan diri dalam pembuatan keputusan. Malah, penyelidik telah mengklasifikasikan enam halangan dalam pembuatan keputusan peribadi iaitu: (a) Prosedur Operasi Standard (POS); (b) Budaya kerja yang negatif; (c) Kepelbagaian sosio-budaya; (d) hubungan guru-pelajar yang negatif; (e) wujudnya pelajar yang mempunyai masalah pembelajaran; dan (f) penglibatan ibubapa dalam hal ehwal pengurusan pelajar. Penyelidik telah melaporkan senarai cadangan daripada responden untuk memperbaiki proses pembuatan keputusan guru dalam sistem pengurusan bilik darjah. Sebagai implikasi kajian, penyelidik telah berhujah dan menerangkan perilaku dan dilema guru terutamanya dari segi konteks yang dialami oleh responden di sekolah menegah swasta tersebut. Selain daripada itu, Ketua Guru Disiplin dapat mengambilkira hasil kajian kes ini untuk memperbaiki kebolehan guru dalam pembuatan keputusan dan sekaligus cuba mengurangkan tahap perpindahan kes disiplin yang remeh-temeh. Namun demikian, kajian ini tidak boleh disimpulkan secara langsung sebagai mewakili semua guru yang berkhidmat di sekolah tersebut. Sebagai cadangan, kebolehan dan kepelbagaian stail responden dalam pengurusan bilik darjah seharusnya ditingkatkan melalui kajian tindakan atau perkongsian pengetahuan melalui peer coaching.
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