The effects of primary school teachers' authoritarian and authoritative classroom management styles on students' frustration resilience and language ability in Jiangsu Province, China

Zhenyu Huang[1,2], Yuan-Cheng Chang[1*], Xiaoyong Lin[1,2]
[1]Chinese International College, Dhurakij Pundit University, Thailand; yuan-cheg.cha@dpu.ac.th (Y.C.C.).
[2]College of Education, Suqian University, China.

Abstract: The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of primary school teachers' authoritarian and authoritative classroom management styles on students' frustration resilience and language abilities in Jiangsu Province, China. Data were collected using the Teachers' Classroom Management Style Scale, students' Frustration Resilience Ability Scale, and a language ability assessment tool. The research employed a quantitative descriptive-correlation design and multiple regression analysis, involving 10 teachers and 475 primary school students from Jiangsu Province. Consistent with previous findings, data analysis revealed that both authoritarian and authoritative classroom management styles significantly impacted students' frustration resilience and language abilities. Specifically, students exhibited higher frustration resilience and better language skills when teachers adopted an authoritative style, whereas these outcomes were lower under authoritarian management. These results suggest that an authoritative management style can facilitate improved student performance in terms of frustration resilience and language development compared to authoritarian approaches. The findings provide valuable insights for educators, emphasizing the importance of adopting an authoritative classroom management style. Teachers should aim to foster an environment characterized by authoritative practices while minimizing the negative aspects associated with authoritarian management. Such strategies are likely to enhance students' overall development and academic achievement, contributing to a more positive and productive learning environment.

Keywords: Chinese primary school students, Classroom management style, Frustration resilience, Language ability.

1. Introduction

Classroom management refers to the series of actions teachers take to create and maintain a learning environment that is conducive to achieving teaching goals [1]. Classroom management style refers to the teacher's behavioral style and management ability in this process Djigic and Stojiljkovic [2]. Korpershoek, et al. [3] believe that teachers' classroom management is essentially for the benefit of students. The actions taken by teachers in the classroom are to connect and activate students' learning motivation and learning participation. This view highlights the close connection between teachers' classroom behavior and students' learning outcomes. In a study on teachers' teaching effectiveness, it was found that in order to improve teachers' teaching effectiveness, in addition to using and developing more effective teaching skills and teaching methods, it is equally important to impose effective management behaviors on students during classroom teaching [4]. The study of classroom management style has also become an important aspect of the research on teacher professional development [5].

Frustration resilience refers to the ability of an individual to cope with setbacks without exhibiting adverse reactions such as behavioral instability, or to adapt to them [6]. Student resilience refers to the ability of students to maintain a positive attitude, adapt to changes, and recover quickly when faced with

difficulties, setbacks, or failures Wu, et al. [7]. Fowler, et al. [8] believed that when students want to participate freely and continuously in challenging learning or work, they must tolerate possible failures and mistakes in the process. This level of tolerance may affect the individual's response to failure and ultimate achievement.

Language proficiency refers to an individual's comprehensive ability to use language in a specific language environment, encompassing the understanding of words, sentences, paragraphs, and articles, as well as the skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing Mercer [9]. Hu and Gao [10] emphasized that language proficiency influences students' understanding of classroom content, good language skills help them better understand the teacher's explanations and the textbook content. Ayedoun, et al. [11] also noted that language proficiency is fundamental to students' communication with others, and strong language skills enhance their interpersonal skills. Therefore, exploring the factors influencing language proficiency and identifying methods and approaches to improving students' language proficiency have become important topics for scholars [12].

The purpose of this study is to explore the effect of two different types of classroom management styles of primary school teachers, authoritative and authoritarian, on students' resilience and language ability, and finally to analyze the differences in the effect of resilience on students' language ability under the two management styles.

In service of those aims, this paper will answer the following questions:

(1) Are there differences between the two classroom management styles in terms of students' frustration resilience?

(2) Do the two classroom management styles have an effect on students' language abilities?

(3) Are there differences between the two classroom management styles in terms of the effect of students' frustration resilience on their language abilities?

2. Literature Review

2.1. Classroom Management Style and Related Research

Franklin and Harrington [13] proposed that classroom management refers to the process of controlling students' behavior in the classroom and dealing with inappropriate teaching situations through certain rules. Another view is that teachers' classroom management style is a series of actions taken by teachers to create and maintain a learning environment conducive to achieving teaching goals, as well as the behavior style and management ability demonstrated in this process [2]. The common point among these definitions is that although the subject of classroom management style is the teacher, the service object is the students; secondly, regardless of whether the classroom management style is service-oriented or control-oriented, its main purpose is to promote the smooth achievement of teaching goals [14].

Different researchers have conducted diverse research and explorations on the classification of teacher classroom management styles. In a study of primary school teachers in Serbia, the authors used the Classroom Management Style Assessment Protocol (PCMSA), which consists of 3 dimensions and 20 items, based on Martin and Baldwin [15] andThi and Nguyen [5] proposed a management style, namely: non-interventionism, interventionism and interactionism. In an empirical study conducted on 398 junior high school students and 14 English teachers, Baumrind [16] divides management style into three dimensions, namely teaching management, personnel management and behavior management. Turkish researcher Aslan [14] used a cross-sectional survey model to investigate the management style categories of 515 primary school teachers in Isparta (451 of whom were public school teachers and the remaining 64 were private school teachers). The Bosworth [17] developed the classroom management styles into four types: authoritarian, authoritative, permissive, and laissez-faire, based on the teacher's level of involvement and control over students in classroom management. The characteristics of authoritarian and authoritative styles are as follows:

2.1.1. Authoritarian Style

High intensity of rules and downward control are important characteristics of this management style [16]. In an authoritarian classroom management style, the teacher acts like a commander or a boss, leading some researchers to refer to teachers who use this management style as "highly controlling" teachers [5]. Teachers with an authoritarian style will directly tell students what they can and cannot do in my class. However, the teacher will not provide any explanation as to why certain behaviors are allowed or not. When students follow the rules well, they will be rewarded by the teacher as a management incentive, otherwise they will be punished [14].

2.1.2. Authoritative Style

In an authoritative classroom management style, teachers impose certain restrictions and rules on students, but they will give full explanations, and students will be given autonomy within a certain framework of classroom rules [17]. Teachers usually clearly explain why a certain behavior is allowed or not, and maintain a good and harmonious communication relationship between teachers and students [5]. Under the premise that students have a certain degree of autonomy, classroom rules may be generated authoritativeally through discussion and negotiation. However, after the rules are formed, classroom members must fully respect the rules and consciously restrain their own behavior [18]. In addition, when students make mistakes, teachers adopt a method of facing and sharing responsibilities together to cultivate students' self-confidence in facing setbacks and mistakes. At the same time, teachers will gently offer suggestions or warnings to avoid verbal humiliation or punishment of students [18].

This study will deploy the classroom management styles scale developed by Bosworth [17]. The linguistic validity of the tool analysis results revealed that the linguistic validity correlation coefficient ranged between .68and .91 [19].

2.2. Students' Resilience to Frustration and Related Research

Meindl, et al. [20] believed that students' resilience to frustration refers to their ability to withstand the blows and pressure when encountering frustrating situations, and whether they have the ability to escape and resolve difficulties to avoid psychological and behavioral disorders. In other words, it is an individual's ability to recognize, resist and cope with frustration. Strus and Cieciuch [21] further elaborated on students' resilience, arguing that it encompasses three abilities: the ability to effectively handle stress and pressure and adapt to daily challenges; the ability to recover from disappointment, adversity, and trauma; and the ability to get along with others and respect oneself and others. The dimensions of resilience encompass various psychological and behavioral characteristics that individuals exhibit when coping with setbacks [22] including: positive expectations, positive views of frustration, eliciting positive emotions, and seeking external support [23].

Regarding the measurement of frustration resilience, a representative one is the Failure Tolerance Scale, which focuses on school failure and produces action, emotion, and preferred task difficulty scores. It is mainly designed for adolescents aged 7 to17 [24]. Stress Tolerance Scale is a 15 - item self-report scale that assesses an individual's ability to tolerate negative emotions [25]. It consists of four subscales: evaluation of ability and pain experienced, absorption of negative emotions, emotion regulation, and tolerance of painful emotions. Liu and Liu [23] built a resilience scale suitable for Chinese adolescents. This scale consists of 12 items and four factors: positive anticipation, positive frustration outlook, positive emotion induction, and support seeking. Internal consistency alpha coefficients for the total questionnaire and each factor ranged from .604 to .774. The total score correlated significantly with each factor (.578-.747) and with each other (.185-.379). Significant correlations were also observed between the total score, each factor, and the criterion (-.62 -.518). Factor alpha coefficients were: positive frustration outlook .762, positive anticipation .77, support seeking .746, positive emotion induction .698, and overall resilience .83.

Based on Liu and Liu [23] The scale compiled is most consistent with the age, cultural background and other conditions of the subjects in this study. Therefore, this study uses this scale to measure the resilience of Chinese primary school students.

2.3. Students' Language Ability and Related Research

Chomsky was one of the earliest scholars to define language ability. He believed that language ability is an abstract ability and a systematic principle [26] which represents something that the speaker and the listener can understand. Moralidad, et al. [27] points out that language ability refers to an individual's comprehensive ability to use language in a specific language environment , covering the understanding of words, sentences, paragraphs, and articles, as well as the application of listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills. Yudha and Mandasari [28] believed that language proficiency is a component of communicative language ability, and its components include language knowledge and language application. This shows that the definition of language proficiency can be understood from two main aspects, namely language knowledge and the application of language knowledge [29].

Standardized tests are an important way to assess language proficiency [30, 31]. In the measurement of primary school students language, it is very common to use standardized language test scores as an indicator of language proficiency Arizmendi, et al. [32]. Graham, et al. [33]. In a study of elementary school students, test scores covering subjects such as language, reading, science, and social studies were used to measure their language proficiency. Due to the particularity of this test group, current elementary school Chinese language tests primarily consist of basic language knowledge, reading comprehension, and writing skills [34]. In this context, the method of using the scores of primary school students on standardized language tests taken within a certain period as an indicator of their language proficiency is the most widely used and accepted method [35, 36].

Therefore, the measurement part of primary school students' language ability in this study will also be measured using test questions suitable for primary school students ' language ability.

2.4. The Relationship Between Variables
2.4.1. The Effect of Teachers' Classroom Management Style on Students' Frustration Resilience

In addition to being related to students' psychological conditions and individual differences, students' resilience to frustration is also closely related to teachers' classroom management styles Wu, et al. [7]. Hidayat [37] indicates that an appropriate teacher's classroom management style promotes student autonomy and self-discipline. An authoritative classroom management style can create a harmonious and autonomous classroom environment for both teachers and students. Students in this environment are more likely to develop resilience in the face of setbacks and demonstrate stronger resilience. However, when a teacher's classroom management style leans toward authoritarianism, the heavy-handed approach can strain teacher-student relationships and the classroom atmosphere. Furthermore, the overly repressive sense of rules can cause students to become timid and overwhelmed when faced with setbacks, leading to poor resilience [38].

2.4.2. The Effect of Teachers' Classroom Management Style on Students' Language Proficiency

The teacher's classroom management style is a key factor affecting the improvement of students' language ability. Teachers create an appropriate environment based on their own classroom management style and provide students with the necessary learning assistance, which will greatly affect students' language learning [39]. Teachers providing appropriate classroom management during the course will help stimulate and maintain students' intrinsic motivation and enable them to perform better in language skills Kitavi [40].

Matusov [41] has shown that authoritarian classroom management styles have a negative effect on students' language development. In such classrooms, teachers often adopt strict control, emphasizing discipline and order, which results in limited opportunities for students to express themselves Lessy, et al. [42]. Thi and Nguyen [5] conducted a study on 14 junior high school English teachers and 398

junior high school students, investigating the effect of teachers' classroom management styles on students' English learning motivation and academic performance. The results showed that an authoritative teacher management style was still the most positive factor influencing students' learning motivation. While an authoritarian management style had both positive and negative effects on students' learning interest, the negative effect was greater overall.

2.4.3. The Effect of Different Classroom Management Styles on Students' Resilience and Language Proficiency

This study will also discuss the relationship between primary school students' resilience and language ability growth under two classroom management styles. As a psychological mechanism, resilience affects the individual's psychological state and the interference of external behavior, which will also affect the development of students' language ability Richardson and Fallona [43]. Yang, et al. [44] has shown that there is a close correlation between students' resilience and their language ability. When faced with academic difficulties, students with better resilience tend to be more inclined to find solutions rather than give up easily. Active coping strategies will help them successfully resolve academic problems and improve their language ability [45].

Furthermore, the effect of frustration resilience on language proficiency varies across students under different classroom management styles Xu and Feng [46]. Afzali, et al. [47] found that when students encounter difficulties in an authoritative management style, they are more willing to proactively seek help and find solutions, demonstrating stronger frustration coping skills, which is beneficial for improving their language proficiency [48]. In contrast, under an authoritarian management style, students' behavior is strictly controlled by the teacher, and all they do is simply follow rules and orders. This prevents students from growing and makes it difficult for them to improve their frustration coping skills and language development [49].

3. Methods

3.1. Population

This study involved 10 primary school Chinese language teachers and 475 sixth-grade students. The 10 teachers were selected from a pool of 336 teachers, five each with authoritarian and authoritative styles. The 475 students were students from each of these 10 teachers' own classes (the average class size ranged from 45 to 50 students). All teachers taught sixth grade, and all students were sixth graders. Since these students are nearing completion of all primary school language knowledge and have experienced considerable language application over the past six years, their language knowledge and application have reached a relatively mature stage, making it more appropriate to assess their language proficiency at this stage.

3.2. Tools

The research tools used in this study are Bosworth [17] the 12- item teacher classroom management style scale was developed and divided into four factors. This study also analyzed the internal consistency coefficient regarding the factors. The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for the authoritarian factor was .89, the authoritative factor was .87, the laissez faire factor was .79, and the indifferent factor was .77. The responses were on the five-point Likert scale: "strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, and strongly agree."

This study used the Junior High School Student Resilience Scale developed by Liu and Liu [23]. The scale consists of 12 items and four factors: positive expectations, positive frustration perception, positive emotion induction, and social support seeking. It uses a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 = "very inconsistent" to 5 = "very consistent." The scale's reliability and validity were tested and found to be good. The internal alpha coefficients for each factor were: positive frustration perception .762, positive expectations .77, support seeking .746, and positive emotion induction .698, with a total scale alpha coefficient of .83.

This study used content from the 12 compulsory education Chinese textbooks approved by the Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China and published by the People's Education Press in 2016 to design a language proficiency test for primary school students. The test consists of four sections: Words (20 points), Sentences (20 points), Reading (30 points), and Writing (30 points), for a total score of 100 points. The test was designed by a panel of 10 experts and scholars in the field of primary education. The proposed test was then submitted to six experts and scholars in the field of primary school Chinese for evaluation. The experts and scholars' assessment of the structure and suitability of the test, as well as their suggestions for revision, served as a basis for the revision of the test.

After the questionnaires were collected, they were revised based on the experts' suggestions. Questions with high content validity were retained, and questions that the experts and scholars felt should be revised were modified as much as possible. The test paper revision principles were: Try to retain as many test questions as possible. If an expert believes a question is suitable after revision, it will be revised based on the revision suggestions. If an expert suggests adding a question and the revision suggestions are similar to those of other experts, the question will be added based on the suggestion. If two or more experts believe a question is inappropriate, it will be deleted. Finally, the experts' and scholars' revision suggestions were compiled and revised into the primary school language proficiency test paper.

3.3. Date Collection Instruments

This study used questionnaires, language proficiency tests, pre-tests, and post-tests as data collection tools. A questionnaire survey was used to assess the classroom management styles of primary school Chinese teachers; a language proficiency test was used to measure students' language proficiency. Pre-tests and post-tests on language proficiency levels were used to collect data on how teachers' classroom management styles affect students' language proficiency development. A teacher classroom management style questionnaire was used to assess teachers' classroom management style preferences. Ten teachers were then selected, with five teachers in each of the two management styles: authoritarian and authoritative. Students in these ten teachers' classes were then gathered and their language proficiency levels were measured using a language proficiency test.

The language proficiency test was administered twice: at the beginning of sixth grade and at the end of sixth grade, spanning a full academic year (approximately 10 months). A paired-samples t-test was then used to measure differences in language proficiency between the first and second tests under different management styles. Regression analysis was used to examine the correlation between teachers' classroom management styles and students' language proficiency.

4. Findings

4.1. Correlation Analysis

This section mainly uses Pearson correlation analysis to conduct a correlation analysis between the two types of teachers' classroom management styles and students' two language proficiency test scores, as well as the correlation between students' resilience to frustration and the above variables.

4.1.1. Correlation Analysis of Variables Under Authoritarian Classroom Management style

Pearson correlation analysis was used to analyze the correlation between language test scores and frustration tolerance of primary school students under the authoritarian classroom management style. As shown in Table 1, the overall mean value of frustration tolerance of primary school students under this management style was 3.637, the means of the two test scores were 76.784 and 78.747, respectively, and the mean of the difference between the two test scores was 1.963. Frustration tolerance was not significantly correlated with the two test scores or the test score difference, with correlation coefficients of .031, .092, and .095, respectively, and all $p > .05$, which did not reach the significant level. Test score 1 was positively correlated with test score 2, with a correlation coefficient of .778, which reached the

significant level of $p < .001$. Test score 1 was inversely correlated with the test score difference, with a coefficient of -.286, which reached the significant level of $p < .001$. Test score 2 was positively correlated with the test score difference, with a coefficient of .379, which reached the significant level of $p < .001$.

Table 1.
Correlation analysis between variables under authoritarian classroom management style ($n=233$).

	Average	Standard deviation	Frustration Resilience	Test score 1	Test 2	Test score difference
Frustration Resilience	3.637	.940	1			
Test score 1	76.784	12.190	.031	1		
Test score 2	78.747	12.621	.092	.778***	1	
Test score difference	1.963	8.269	.095	-.286***	.379***	1

Note: *** represents p<0.001
"Test score difference" means "Test score 2" minus "Test score 1".

4.1.2. Correlation Analysis of Variables Under Authoritative Classroom Management Style

Pearson correlation analysis was used to analyze the correlation between the language test scores and frustration tolerance of primary school students under the authoritative classroom management style. As shown in Table 2, the overall mean value of frustration tolerance of primary school students under this management style was 3.783, the means of the two test scores were 77.738 and 88.227 respectively, and the mean of the difference between the two test scores was 5.490; frustration tolerance was inversely correlated with the difference between the two test scores, with a correlation coefficient of -.157, and reaching a significant level of $p < .05$; frustration tolerance was positively correlated with test score 1, with correlation coefficients of .302, and reaching a significant level of $p < .001$; frustration tolerance was positively correlated with test score 2, with a correlation coefficient of .275, and reaching a significant level of $p < .001$; test score 1 was positively correlated with test score 2, with a correlation coefficient of .833, and reaching a significant level of $p < .001$; test score 1 was inversely correlated with the test score difference, with a coefficient of -.631, and reaching a significant level of $p <$ The correlation analysis results showed that the correlation coefficients ranged from -.631 to .833, with none exceeding .800, indicating that there was no collinearity problem [50].

Table 2.
Correlation analysis between variables under authoritative classroom management style ($n=242$).

	Average	Standard deviation	Frustration Resilience	Test score 1	Test score 2	Test score difference
Frustration Resilience	3.783	0.912	1			
Test score 1	77.738	11.728	0.302***	1		
Test score 2	83.227	9.140	0.275***	0.833***	1	
Test score difference	5.490	6.512	0.157**	-0.631***	-0.097	1

Note: ** represents p<0.01, *** represents p<0.001
"Test score difference" means "Test score 2" minus "Test score 1".

4.2. Regression Analysis

This section mainly uses linear regression analysis to examine whether there are significant differences between the two classroom management styles in the effects of primary school students' resilience to frustration and their language abilities.

Regression analysis was used to analyze the difference between the two language ability tests of 475 primary school students (233 authoritarian and 242 authoritative) under two different types of classroom management styles and their frustration tolerance, as shown in Table 3: The frustration tolerance of primary school students under the authoritarian management style failed to significantly predict their language ability ($\beta = .095$, $t = .148$); Under the authoritative management style, primary school students' frustration tolerance can significantly predict their language ability. Specifically, the

stronger the students' frustration tolerance, the better their language ability performance ($\beta = -.157$, $t =$ -2.464).

Table 3.
Regression analysis between variables under different types of management styles.

Model (Classroom Management Style)	Model 1 (Authoritarian)		Model 2 (Authoritative)	
Independent variable	β	t	β	t
Frustration Resilience	0.09 5	0.148	-0.157	-2.464*
F	2.103		6.071*	
R^2	0.009		0.025	
Adj R^2	0.005		0.021	

Note: * represents p<0.05.

5. Discussion and Conclusions

5.1. Differences Between two Primary School Teachers' Classroom Management Styles in Students' Resilience to Frustration

The results of the study show that there is a significant difference between the authoritarian and authoritative classroom management styles of primary school teachers in Jiangsu Province, China in terms of students' ability to cope with frustration. Specifically, students under the authoritative management style are significantly better than those under the authoritarian style in terms of their ability to cope with frustration Sad [51]. Shank and Santiague [52] and others found similar results.

Under an authoritative management style, teachers and students maintain a healthy and harmonious communication relationship [14]. When students make mistakes, teachers foster their confidence in coping with frustrations and mistakes through shared responsibility, avoiding verbal humiliation or punishment [53]. Students under this management style tend to maintain an optimistic and relaxed attitude when faced with setbacks, understanding that mistakes and errors do not result in harsh penalties [54]. Furthermore, due to the strong teacher-student relationship, students are more likely to proactively seek help from teachers when dealing with setbacks, enabling them to handle them more quickly and effectively [18] reducing negative emotions such as frustration, loneliness, and despair that can arise from setbacks.

5.2. Differences in Students' Language Proficiency between Two Primary School Teachers' Classroom Management Styles

The results of the study show that there are significant differences in the language ability performance of primary school teachers in Jiangsu Province between authoritarian and authoritative classroom management styles. Specifically, students under the authoritative management style perform significantly better than those under the authoritarian style in terms of language ability. This result is consistent with Adedigba and Sulaiman [54] and others' research results are similar.

Under an authoritative management style, students are empowered to exercise autonomy over their learning, maintaining and strengthening their motivation [55]. According to self-determination theory, motivation stems from the learner's intrinsic motivation and is the fundamental driving force for continuous learning and achieving better outcomes [18]. Students under an authoritative management style are able to maintain a state of autonomy and efficiency, leading to better language learning performance. Furthermore, an authoritative management style promotes a learning atmosphere of equality, cooperation, and communication between teachers and students. Students under this management style also receive timely and effective guidance and support from teachers, enabling them to maintain a high level of efficiency in their language learning process [54]. Consequently, students under this management style experience the most significant growth and improvement in language proficiency, significantly exceeding those under an authoritarian management style.

5.3. The Effect of Two Primary School Teachers' Classroom Management Styles on Students' Resilience and Language Ability

The research results show that the authoritarian classroom management style has no positive effect on primary school students' ability to cope with frustration and language ability. This result is consistent with previous research [54, 56]. Furthermore, under an authoritative classroom management style, primary school students' resilience to frustration has a positive effect on their language proficiency. This result is consistent with previous research [54, 57].

In an authoritative classroom management style, teachers grant students full autonomy and respect their role as leaders. Even when developing classroom rules, teachers invite students to participate and collaborate [54]. These initiatives internally enhance students' recognition of their own learning behaviors and strengthen their intrinsic motivation, thereby enhancing their language learning performance [50]. Furthermore, because the classroom management atmosphere is egalitarian and tolerant, when students encounter difficulties and setbacks in their studies, those under an authoritative management style are more likely to proactively seek help from classmates and teachers, proactively seeking solutions to problems, and thus demonstrating better coping skills [48].

6. Suggestions

Based upon the findings, various recommendations were provided.

1. Research results indicate that elementary school teachers have different preferences when it comes to classroom management styles. While students under authoritative management tend to have higher learning enthusiasm and greater resilience to frustration than those under authoritarian management, requiring all teachers to adopt a single management style is both difficult and unrealistic. To maintain a balance between classroom discipline and teaching effectiveness, it is crucial to find a balance between authoritarian and authoritative styles when guiding teachers in their management style choices.

2. We recommend that future research utilize different data collection tools. For example, we should use interviews and classroom observations, as well as case studies and mixed-subject research models, to measure students' resilience and language skills. Furthermore, we hope to develop a more comprehensive scale to assess teachers' classroom management styles.

3. In addition to authoritarian and authoritative management styles, it is recommended to include more classroom management styles and expand the classification and measurement methods of different styles. For example, as mentioned above, there are interventionist, non-interventionist, permissive management styles, and laissez-faire management styles.

4. Conduct comparative research on the management styles perceived by school administrators, teachers, and students to identify teachers' classroom management styles and behaviors from multiple perspectives. Regularly request teachers to upload their management experiences and students to provide feedback on their perceived management behaviors. This approach can improve classroom teaching effectiveness and student development through improved classroom management practices.

Institutional Review Board Statement:

Ethical approval for the study was granted by the Human Research Ethics Committee of Dhurakij Pundit University on 19 November 2024, No. DPU_BSH 1611/2567.

Transparency:

The authors confirm that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study; that no vital features of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as planned have been explained. This study followed all ethical practices during writing.

Copyright:

References

[1]   Z. Abidin, "Effectiveclassroom management as a quick solution to improve student participation and motivation in the learning process," *Zabags International Journal of Education*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 75-88, 2024. https://doi.org/10.61233/zijed.v2i2.22

[2]   G. Djigic and S. Stojiljkovic, "Classroom management styles, classroom climate and school achievement," *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 29, pp. 819-828, 2011. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.11.310

[3]   H. Korpershoek, T. Harms, H. de Boer, M. van Kuijk, and S. Doolaard, "A meta-analysis of the effects of classroom management strategies and classroom management programs on students' academic, behavioral, emotional, and motivational outcomes," *Review of Educational Research*, vol. 86, no. 3, pp. 643-680, 2016. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315626799

[4]   S. Kim, M. Raza, and E. Seidman, "Improving 21st-century teaching skills: The key to effective 21st-century learners," *Research in Comparative and International Education*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 99-117, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745499919829214

[5]   T. T. Thi and H.-T. T. Nguyen, "The effects of classroom management styles on students' motivation and academic achievement in learning English," *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 223-239, 2021. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.20.1.12

[6]   M. Nakhostin-Khayyat, M. Borjali, M. Zeinali, D. Fardi, and A. Montazeri, "The relationship between self-regulation, cognitive flexibility, and resilience among students: A structural equation modeling," *BMC Psychology*, vol. 12, no. 1, p. 337, 2024. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-024-01843-1

[7]   M. Wu, H. Huang, Y. Fu, and X. Zhang, "The effect of anti-frustration ability on academic frustration among Chinese undergraduates: A moderated mediating model," *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 14, p. 1033190, 2023. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1033190

[8]   C. Fowler, J. Jiao, and M. Pitts, "Frustration and ennui among amazon MTurk workers," *Behavior Research Methods*, vol. 55, no. 6, pp. 3009-3025, 2023. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-022-01955-9

[9]   S. Mercer, "Language learner engagement: Setting the scene," in Second Handbook of English Language Teaching, X. Gao Ed. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2019, pp. 643-660. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-02899-2_40

[10]   J. Hu and X. Gao, "Understanding subject teachers' language-related pedagogical practices in content and language integrated learning classrooms," *Language Awareness*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 42-61, 2021. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2020.1768265

[11]   E. Ayedoun, Y. Hayashi, and K. Seta, "Adding communicative and affective strategies to an embodied conversational agent to enhance second language learners' willingness to communicate," *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 29-57, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-018-0171-6

[12]   L. Su, N. Noordin, and D. Yang, "Unraveling the path to success: Exploring self-regulated language learning among chinese college efl learners," *SAGE Open*, vol. 13, no. 4, p. 21582440231218537, 2023. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231218537

[13]   H. Franklin and I. Harrington, "A review into effective classroom management and strategies for student engagement: Teacher and student roles in today's classrooms," in *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 2019, vol. 7: Redfame Publishing Inc, p. 1, doi: https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v7i12.4491.

[14]   S. Aslan, "An analysis of the primary school teachers' classroom management styles in terms of some variables," *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 955–970, 2022.

[15]   N. K. Martin and B. Baldwin, *Beliefs regarding classroom management style: Differences between novice and experienced teachers*. MLA, Chicago: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED387471, 1994.

[16]   D. Baumrind, "Current patterns of parental authority," *Developmental Psychology*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 1–103, 1971.

[17]   B. Bosworth, "What is your classroom management profile? Teacher talk," *A Publication for Secondary Education Teachers*, vol. 2, no. 1, 1997.

[18]   J.-L. Berger and C. Girardet, "Vocational teachers' classroom management style: The role of motivation to teach and sense of responsibility," *European Journal of Teacher Education*, vol. 44, no. 2, pp. 200-216, 2021. https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2020.1764930

[19]   S. Aktan and F. Sezer, "Examining the psychometric properties of the classroom management styles scale," *Kastamonu Education Journal*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 439-449, 2018.

[20]   P. Meindl *et al.*, "A brief behavioral measure of frustration tolerance predicts academic achievement immediately and two years later," *Emotion*, vol. 19, no. 6, p. 1081, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000492

[21]   W. Strus and J. Cieciuch, "The circumplex of personality metatraits and the hexaco model: Toward refinement and integration," *Journal of Personality*, vol. 89, no. 4, pp. 803-818, 2021. https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12616

[22]   Q. Wang, W. Wang, H. Huang, and B. Wan, "The mediating roles of psychological resilience and frustration tolerance in the relationship between coping styles and mood states of high-level basketball referees," *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. Volume 14 - 2023, 2023. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1096649

[23]   Z. Liu and X. Liu, "Preliminary development of a questionnaire on resilience to frustration among middle school students," *Journal of Inner Mongolia Normal University (Natural Science Chinese Edition)*, vol. 45, no. 3, pp. 415–417, 2016.

[24]   M. M. Clifford, "Failure tolerance and academic risk-taking in ten-to twelve-year-old students," *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, vol. 58, no. 1, pp. 15-27, 1988.

[25]   J. S. Simons and R. M. Gaher, "The distress tolerance scale: Development and validation of a self-report measure," *Motivation and Emotion*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 83-102, 2005. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-005-7955-3

[26]   B. E. Adelman, "An underdiscussed aspect of chomsky (1959)," *The Analysis of Verbal Behavior*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 29-34, 2007. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03393044

[27]   L. G. P. Moralidad, C. E. M. Barcelona, Y. J. B. Castro, J. T. Solis, M. M. Navia, and C. C. Villaseñor, "English language proficiency of students in relation to reading comprehension," *International Research Journal of Science, Technology, Education, and Management*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 51–61, 2025. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15904038

[28]   H. T. Yudha and B. Mandasari, "The analysis of game usage for senior high school students to improve their vocabulary mastery," *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 74–79, 2021. https://doi.org/10.33365/jeltl.v2i2.1329

[29]   I. Onishchuk *et al.*, "Characteristics of foreign language education in foreign countries and ways of applying foreign experience in pedagogical universities of Ukraine," *Revista Romaneasca Pentru Educatie Multidimensionala*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 44-65, 2020.

[30]   A. M. Elleman and E. L. Oslund, "Reading comprehension research: Implications for practice and policy," *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 3-11, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1177/2372732218816339

[31]   L. K. Fryer, K. Nakao, and A. Thompson, "Chatbot learning partners: Connecting learning experiences, interest and competence," *Computers in Human Behavior*, vol. 93, pp. 279-289, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2018.12.023

[32]   G. D. Arizmendi, J. R. Palma, and D. L. Baker, "Predicting science and social studies vocabulary learning in Spanish–English Bilingual children," *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, pp. 1-19, 2025. https://doi.org/10.1044/2025_LSHSS-24-00045

[33]   S. Graham, S. A. Kiuhara, and M. MacKay, "The effects of writing on learning in science, social studies, and mathematics: A meta-analysis," *Review of Educational Research*, vol. 90, no. 2, pp. 179-226, 2020. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654320914744

[34]   Y. K. Wong, "Role of decoding competence in the Chinese reading comprehension development of ethnic minority students in Hong Kong," *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, vol. 22, no. 8, pp. 1016-1029, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2017.1329273

[35]   A. Pace, R. Alper, M. R. Burchinal, R. M. Golinkoff, and K. Hirsh-Pasek, "Measuring success: Within and cross-domain predictors of academic and social trajectories in elementary school," *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, vol. 46, pp. 112-125, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2018.04.001

[36]   C. Noble *et al.*, "The impact of shared book reading on children's language skills: A meta-analysis," *Educational Research Review*, vol. 28, p. 100290, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2019.100290

[37]   H. H. M. Hidayat, Irawan, "The influence of classroom management implementation in the implementation of student learning in the department of Islamic education management, faculty of tarbiyah and teacher training UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta," *Zona Education Indonesia*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 47-61, 2023.

[38]   T. Pressley, H. Croyle, and M. Edgar, "Different approaches to classroom environments based on teacher experience and effectiveness," *Psychology in the Schools*, vol. 57, no. 4, pp. 606-626, 2020. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22341

[39]   R. Lazarides, H. M. Watt, and P. W. Richardson, "Teachers' classroom management self-efficacy, perceived classroom management and teaching contexts from beginning until mid-career," *Learning and Instruction*, vol. 69, p. 101346, 2020. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2020.101346

[40]   M. J. Kitavi, "Influence of head teachers' leadership style s on pupils' performance at Kenya certificate of primary education in Matinyani sub county, Kitui county kenya," PhD Thesis, University of Nairobi, 2014.

[41]   E. Matusov, "A student's right to freedom of education," *Dialogic Pedagogy: A Journal for Studies of Dialogic Education*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 1–28, 2020. https://doi.org/10.5195/dpj.2020.356

[42]   Z. Lessy, L. K. Pary, and M. E. Adamek, "Communication methods for moving from authoritarian to allocative or distributed leadership, in Yogyakarta province, Indonesia, as adopted by a high school principal: A case study," *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 331-353, 2024. https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2022.2131580

[43]   V. Richardson and C. Fallona, "Classroom management as method and manner," *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, vol. 33, no. 6, pp. 705-728, 2001. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220270110053368

[44]   S. Yang, D. Shu, and H. Yin, "'Frustration drives me to grow': Unraveling EFL teachers' emotional trajectory interacting with identity development," *Teaching and Teacher Education*, vol. 105, p. 103420, 2021. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103420

[45] R. W. May, F. D. Fincham, M. A. Sanchez-Gonzalez, K. Bauer, and T. H. Voigt, "School burnout: Overcoming barriers to recognition, prevention, treatment, and policy adaptation," Frontiers Media SA, 2023. https://surl.li/eapmup

[46] J. Xu and X. Feng, "Mindsets, resilience and student engagement as predictors of L2 achievement among Chinese English learners: Insights from fuzzy-set qualitative comparative analysis," *System*, vol. 124, p. 103358, 2024. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103358

[47] L. Afzali, S. Hosseinian, and R. Nooripour, "Mediating role of academic competence in the relationship between perceived teaching style and academic resilience among adolescents," *BMC Psychology*, vol. 12, no. 1, p. 553, 2024. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-024-02011-1

[48] R. P. Berliana and W. N. Habiby, "Teacher perceptions and implementation of a democratic classroom atmosphere in elementary schools," *Jurnal Cakrawala Pendas*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 318-335, 2024. https://doi.org/10.31949/jcp.v10i2.8915

[49] A. A. PALER, "Correlational analysis on classroom management style and level of teaching performance," *Correlational Analysis on Classroom Management Style and Level of Teaching Performance*, vol. 104, no. 1, pp. 9-9, 2022.

[50] N. Merdiaty and S. Sulistiasih, "Empowering learning: The mediating role of teachers in enhancing students' intrinsic motivation," *Al-Ishlah: Jurnal Pendidikan*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 5163-5172, 2024. https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v16i4.6430

[51] S. N. Sad, "Investigation of the communication skills, professional seniority, school stage

and gender as predictors of teachers'classroom management styles," 2021. https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=1007614

[52] M. K. Shank and L. Santiague, "Classroom management needs of novice teachers," *The Clearing house: A Journal of eduCaTional sTraTegies, issues and ideas*, vol. 95, no. 1, pp. 26-34, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1080/00098655.2021.2010636

[53] M. McNerney, "Cultivating a classroom of calm: How to promote student engagement and self-regulation," ASCD, 2024. https://surl.li/liiiqh

[54] O. Adedigba and F. R. Sulaiman, "Influence of teachers' classroom management style on pupils' motivation for learning and academic achievement in Kwara state," *International Journal of Educational Methodology*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 471-480, 2020. https://doi.org/10.12973/ijem.6.2.471

[55] H. Hanafiah and N. A. Dewi, "The impact of utilizing an authoritative approach on classroom," *FIRM Journal of Management Studies*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 298-309, 2025.

[56] R. T. Obispo, G. Magulod, and D. J. C. Tindowen, "Teachers' classroom management styles and student-teacher connectedness and anxiety," *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, vol. 20, no. 5, pp. 123-141, 2021. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.20.5.7

[57] A. Gkontzou and D. Zachos, "Researching teachers'classroom management style in greece with two methodological tools," *Facta Universitatis, Series: Teaching, Learning and Teacher Education*, pp. 045-055, 2023.