

## FACTORS INFLUENCING TEACHERS' DISCIPLINARY STRATEGIES

**Yrd. Doç. Dr. Adem Sultan TURANLI**

Erciyes Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi  
Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü  
38039, Kayseri  
[turanli@erciyes.edu.tr](mailto:turanli@erciyes.edu.tr)  
0 533 252 23 44  
0352 437 49 01/37200

**Okutman Dr. Mustafa DURMUŞÇELEBİ**

Erciyes Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi  
Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü  
38039, Kayseri  
[mcelebi@erciyes.edu.tr](mailto:mcelebi@erciyes.edu.tr)

### Abstract

Teachers' disciplinary strategies when faced with disruptive behaviors differ considerably from incident to incident, which requires identification of the factors contributory to this differential treatment. With this aim in mind, this small-scale study was designed to identify certain determinants of teachers' behaviors. In order to gather data, 127 primary school (6 to 8 grades) and high school teachers wrote their preferred strategies for ten problematic incidents. These open-ended responses were content analyzed and encoded in line with the management approaches found in the related literature. The encoded data were quantified and processed in line with the research question. The findings showed that Turkish teachers mostly prefer interactionist or higher control strategies and that their preferred strategies differed according to teachers' gender, subjects, school level and the academic status of disruptive students. Some implications are accordingly suggested for teachers.

**Key words:** Discipline, level of control, misbehavior.

## ÖĞRETMENLERİN DİSİPLİN YAKLAŞIMLARINI ETKİLEYEN ETKENLER

### Özet

İstenmeyen davranışlarla karşılaştıklarında öğretmenlerin tercih ettikleri yöntemler, durumdan duruma önemli değişiklikler gösterir; bu durum, farklı uygulamalara yol açan etkenlerin tespit edilmesini gerekli kılar. Bu çalışma, öğretmenlerin davranışlarının bazı belirleyicilerini belirlemek amacıyla planlandı. Veri toplamak amacıyla, 127 ilköğretim (ikinci kademe) ve lise öğretmeninden, kendilerine verilen on tane örnek durumda nasıl davranacaklarını yazmalarını istendi. Öğretmenlerin cevapları, içerik çözümlemesine

tabi tutuldu ve alanyazında karşılaştırılan sınıf yönetimi yaklaşımlara göre kodlandı. Kodlanan veriler, nitel hale getirildi ve araştırma sorusuna paralel olarak işlendi. Bulgular, Türk öğretmenlerinin, etkileşimci veya daha yüksek kontrol düzeyindeki yöntemleri tercih ettikleri, bu tercih edilen yöntemlerin öğretmenlerin cinsiyeti, konu alanı, çalıştıkları okul düzeyi ve sorun davranışa baş vuran öğrencinin akademik durumuna göre farklılık gösterdiğini göstermiştir. Bunlara yönelik olarak, öğretmenlere bazı önerilerde bulunulmuştur.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Disiplin, kontrol düzeyi, sorun davranış

## **INTRODUCTION**

Most school learning is achieved in classrooms in the presence of a teacher and Glenn (2001) equates teacher quality with school effectiveness. The teacher with a leadership role congruent with his/her position has to cope with problems that s/he confronts, mostly with no external help, while classroom activities proceed. However carefully the teacher plans his/her classes and however deliberate his/her precautions are, misbehavior still occurs. Still, even in such cases 'teaching must go on' and s/he should deal with the misconduct in such a way that students are not distracted or teaching is not interrupted (Kounin, 1970). Brainard (2001) asserts that classroom management is a very important concern for both new and experienced teachers and every teacher should master the art of classroom management in order to achieve a successful career. Jones and Jones (1995) state that the teacher attempts to identify strategies likely to stop the misbehavior and prevent it from recurring. Nonetheless, an influential disciplinary strategy against any misconduct may not be so effective in another case. Consequently, a teacher in this case thinks either that theory is useless or that s/he lacks the ability to manage his/her class. Depending on teachers' theoretical orientations toward classroom management, considerably different strategies are suggested against similar incidents. Such differences result from multi-dimensionality of the field and the multitude of the related factors (Burden, 1995), the knowledge of which the teacher has helps him/her perceive and interpret events properly (Doyle, 1985).

Despite their command on many variables affecting students' attitudes and their academic achievements, teachers of similar student populations may have considerably varied skills in behavior management (Jones and Jones, 1995). While a teacher may punish the student in a congruent way, another one may ignore the misbehavior or choose to punish him/her too severely. Papesh (2001) asserts that the purpose of discipline should not be to punish, but to alter behavior and every situation should not have the same consequences, because no two discipline problems are the same and no two circumstances are identical. In the same line, though sometimes quite easy, it may be difficult to name any conduct as obedient or disobedient behavior. Due to this contextual differentiation, when behaviors are conducted in different contexts and/or at different times, teachers may interpret the incidents differently and react accordingly (Doyle, 1985; Traynor, 2003)).

Therefore, teachers and prospective teachers are suggested to develop a better understanding of the nature of teaching as social, political and ethical work instead of as a simplistic recipe-driven occupation (Hatton, 1998 cited in Habon, 2000).

Teachers' beliefs about classroom management and order are differently categorized in the literature. Teachers' approaches to classroom management can be sorted out according to the level of preferred control over class (Burden, 1995). Wolfgang and Glickman (1995) suggest a three-level grouping of low, medium and high control approaches, which are interchangeably named as non-interventionist, interactionist and interventionist approaches respectively. Despite such a classification, a teacher may prefer to use a strategy of comparatively lower or higher approaches against any misbehavior, when in need.

Non-interventionists (teachers of low control), with the assumption that students have to control their own behaviors and they have the ability to make their decisions, suggest that challenging opportunities enable students to make their decisions and to facilitate their development. Teachers, therefore, need to consider students' thoughts, feelings and preferences while teaching and managing their classes. Interactionists (teachers of medium control) assume that the teacher and students are both responsible for student behavior. Despite such a student-centered psychology like non-interventionists, it is supposed that since learning occurs in a community, students are held responsible for their conducts and group needs have higher priorities over individual ones. Students are allowed to make their own decisions as long as they admit their consequences. Interventionists (teachers of high control), believing in the influence of external forces on people and their inner potential to make sound decisions, choose the desired behavior for students. With more experience in educational issues, the teacher has all the responsibility and group needs have priority over individual needs (Wolfgang and Glickman, 1995; Burden, 1995; Charles, 1996).

Quite a few factors influence teachers' beliefs about classroom management; teachers' values, educational goals, gender and experience (Martin and Baldwin, 1992 and 1994; Burden, 1995; Martin and Yin, 1997). Similarly, Maslovaty (2000) states that teachers' choice of a strategy varies according to the content of the dilemma, the teachers' personal belief systems, teaching contexts and, personal background characteristics. Accordingly, Glenn (2001) maintains that the qualities needed in teaching personnel will vary somewhat depending on different objectives and needs of schools. Traynor (2003) asserts that the factors contributing to their decisions are normally based on the teachers' perceptions of the pedagogical soundness of the strategy.

This study, being in line with the same orientation, aimed to identify whether the teacher's preferred strategies are related to some factors, namely, the gender, the subject of the teacher and the grade level at which s/he teaches and the status of the disruptive student. The distinction of this study from the studies

investigating teachers' approaches toward classroom management was that sampled teachers wrote open-ended responses instead of selecting one given option, which is believed to increase the validity of the responses.

Identifying factors determining teachers' disciplinary strategies is of help to teachers and researchers for a better understanding of different aspects of classroom management. If it becomes certain that teachers are influenced by certain factors not directly related to student behaviors and they respond improperly, then they are to be more careful to avoid the effects of those factors. Otherwise, both students and teachers go on having poor interaction and communication problems.

Taking this into account, this study aims to investigate some of those variables likely to influence teachers' management strategies. Despite the limitations such as the small sample size and the limited number of incidents, this research is hoped to lead to studies about the issue. More specifically, the researcher tries to find answer to the following sub-questions:

- a) Does the gender of teachers influence their classroom management strategies?
- b) Does the subject field that the teachers teach influence their management strategies?
- c) Does the status of students in terms of success influence teachers' management strategies?
- d) Does the level at which teachers teach influence their management strategies?

## **METHOD**

The study aimed to identify some factors influencing teachers' management strategies that they would use in order to deal with student misbehavior. The data needed for the study were gathered from 127 teachers (6<sup>th</sup> through 11<sup>th</sup> grades) through an opinionnaire.

In order to decrease the tendency of the respondents toward social desirability, they were asked to write their preferences for the given incidents, instead of choosing one ready option, which in turn made the data analysis procedures harder. Also, due to the nature of open-ended responses to the given incidents, which were later transformed to quantitative data through content analysis, a limited number of teachers were included in the study. Between the sample size and the depth of the analysis was a balance to set up, with the hope to gain insights about the variables determining teachers' approaches to discipline and to lead to elaborate larger-scale studies.

The data were gathered from 127 teachers working in eight public schools, four of which were second part of primary schools (grades 6 to 8) and the other four were high schools (grades 9 to 11). Out of 139 teachers working in those eight schools, 65 were teachers of second part of primary schools (grades 6 to 8) and 74 were in high schools while 12 teachers refused to participate in the study or did not fill in the opinionnaire properly.

### **Instrumentation**

In addition to the questions about background characteristics, the teachers were given 10 incidents (vignettes) exemplifying usual classroom misbehavior (Appendix A). They were asked to write how they would behave in these cases. Although the opinionnaire was prepared in two versions, the only difference was the academic status of disruptive students in the incidents as 'successful' or 'unsuccessful'. The different versions of the questionnaire were randomly distributed in equal numbers.

### **Data Analysis**

All open-ended responses of the teachers were separately listed for each case and sorted out as 'non-interventionist', 'interactionist' and 'interventionist' strategies. Teachers' responses and the groups under which the responses were classified are presented below:

a) non-interventionist strategies: ignoring misbehavior, a mild warning with no verbal interruption, a private talk after class, thinking of the reasons for student misbehavior without any intervention,

b) interactionist strategies: interrupting misbehavior and warning moderately, giving a short speech in class about the effects of misbehavior, interrupting misbehavior and offering help, mildly reminding students of rules and asking them to obey them, offering a solution for the problem, visible verbal and non-verbal warnings to disruptive student,

c) interventionist strategies: sending student out of class (time-out), corporal punishment, sending student to the principal, informing colleagues and/or parents about misbehavior, punishing student with a low grade, giving a serious private lecture to student/s, and shouting and reprimanding student in class.

For a simpler representation, the teachers' preferred strategies were assigned numbers in order to allow for quantitative data analysis. In principle, a lower control strategy was represented by a lower number and a higher control strategy by a higher number. Accordingly, non-interventionist, interactionist and interventionist strategies were assigned 1, 2 and 3 respectively, which indicated a continuum from low to high control strategies. In order to obtain a composite score for each teacher's overall control level, the mean of each teacher's scores through

all the ten incidents was calculated. This composite mean was used to test whether teachers' preferred control levels changed according to demographic characteristics included in the study. One-way analysis and t-test were used as the statistical procedures to answer the research question and the bus-questions. The distribution of the teachers according to the demographic characteristics is displayed in Table 1.

Table 1 Teachers' Demographic Characteristics (in frequency and percentages)

	n	%		n	%
<b><u>Gender</u></b>			<b><u>Subject</u></b>		
Male	67	52.8	Natural sciences	25	19.7
Female	60	47.2	Social sciences	34	26.8
			Philology	40	31.5
			Physical Training and Fine Arts	28	22.0
<b><u>School Level</u></b>			<b><u>Status of Disruptive Student</u></b>		
Primary School (6 to 8 grades)	61	48.0	Successful	65	51.2
High School	66	52.0	Unsuccessful	62	48.8

52.8% (n=67) of the 127 teachers were male and 52% (n=66) worked in high schools. While 25 teachers (19.7%) taught one of the natural sciences like mathematics and chemistry and 34 (26.8%) taught one of the social sciences like geography and history, 40 teachers (31.5%) taught philology (Turkish, a foreign language, or Turkish Literature) and 28 (22.0%) of them taught physical training or any course of fine arts. Finally, 65 teachers (51.2%) responded to the incidents thinking that the disruptive student was a successful one and 62 teachers (48.8%) answered the vignettes for 'an unsuccessful student'.

## **FINDINGS**

The initial analysis of the responses indicated that the teachers' mean scores changed from 1.76 to 2.70 while the overall mean of all the teachers' composite scores was calculated as 2.20. This finding suggests that teachers preferred interactionist or interventionist strategies to prevent misbehavior. A brief search through our whole schooling system definitely verifies this finding; one reason for this may be that the teachers who teach in schools were already taught in line with very traditional approaches and they accordingly apply the strategies that they encountered as a student. Another reason may be that almost all students come from families where parental control is excessive and therefore students may expect, similar attitudes from their teachers or the teachers just think they do. In order to better understand the underlying patterns in teachers' attitudes, a closer look at the results will be needed. In order to determine the factors influencing teachers' strategies, if there exists any, t-tests and F-tests were used as statistical

procedures and the results are presented below along with the means and the standard deviations of the sub-groups.

The female teachers were calculated to have a lower mean score ( $X=2.08$ ) than the male teachers ( $X=2.31$ ). Although the means are very close to each other, the difference between the female and male teachers was found statistically significant at the .001 level, suggesting that female teachers tended to be less strict in their approaches to students' disruptive behaviors than male teachers.

On the other hand, the teachers teaching at high school had a higher mean score ( $X=2.28$ ) than the teachers teaching at primary school ( $X=2.11$ ) and the difference between them was found to be statistically significant at the .01 level, which indicates that teachers teaching higher grades prefer stricter disciplinary strategies.

The teachers who evaluated the given incidents for 'a successful student' had a lower mean ( $X=2.12$ ) than the teachers who responded for 'an unsuccessful student' ( $X=2.28$ ). The difference between the two groups was calculated to be statistically significant at the .01 level. This finding suggests that teachers approach successful students more tolerably than unsuccessful ones when involved in any disruptive behavior.

Table 2 Means and Standard Deviations for Differences in Teachers' Approaches to Misbehavior According to Demographic Characteristics

<b>Gender</b>	X	SD	n	
Male	2.31	.28	67	t=4.54 p<.001
Female	2.08	.29	60	
<b>School Level</b>				
Primary School (Grades 6-8)	2.11	.28	61	t=3.17 p<.01
High School (Grades 9-11)	2.28	.31	66	
<b>Status of Disruptive Student</b>				
Successful	2.12	.31	65	t=3.08 p<.01
Unsuccessful	2.28	.28	62	
<b>Subject</b>				
Natural Sciences	2.40	.25	25	F=11.81 p<.001
Social Sciences	2.31	.28	34	
Philology	2.09	.28	40	
Physical Training and Fine Arts	2.04	.27	28	

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) tested for the differences resulting from the subject fields that the teachers were teaching. It was found that the teachers teaching a social science had the highest mean score ( $X=2.40$ ), the teachers teaching a natural science had a mean score of 3.31. On the other hand, the teachers

teaching Turkish, a foreign language (mostly English), or Turkish Literature had a mean score of 2.09 and the teachers of physical training or a course of fine arts had the lowest mean score ( $X=2.04$ ). The means were found to be statistically different at the .001 level. Post hoc comparisons indicated that teachers teaching natural and social sciences differed from teachers of philology or arts and preferred stricter strategies toward misbehavior.

## **DISCUSSION**

Despite the small sample size demanding cautious generalizations, some insightful conclusions are possible. The findings of this study indicate that Turkish teachers working in primary schools (grades 6 to 8) and high schools (grades 9 to 11) mostly prefer interactionist or interventionist approaches against disciplinary problems that come out in class.

As Martin and Baldwin (1992 and 1994), Burden (1995) and Martin and Yin (1997) claim, gender makes a difference in classroom management. This study shows that female teachers prefer more interactionist and less interventionist approaches to misbehavior than male teachers while male teachers mostly prefer interventionist and punitive strategies, which is congruent with the perceived role of men in the Turkish families as rule makers. Contrary to female teachers who are more affectionate toward students, male teachers prioritize discipline and rarely ignore misbehavior. Appointing mostly male teachers as school principals may result from this difference of attitude between the sexes since strict rules may be thought to be necessary to rule various groups of any kind.

Every day, students of second part of primary schools and those of high schools meet several teachers who generally choose to use different strategies. While female teachers behave more sympathetically, male teachers often prefer stricter strategies. Since such different attitudes may confuse students about how to behave, it is another important issue to consider. Diminishing male teachers' paternal role of authority and female teachers' maternal role may help to avoid the problems and decrease the differential treatments from class to class.

Another finding related to the school level where teachers work suggests that teachers working in a primary school prefer lower control strategies than teachers working in a high school and they avoid punitive strategies. It is concluded that teaching at higher grades means applying higher control strategies in class. This difference is believed to derive from the fact that students in primary schools are younger and teachers thereby assume some parental roles. Also, students at higher grades conduct misbehavior more frequently in general; probably because of the effect of the period of puberty and adolescence they go through, which may cause teachers to be over-cautious about student behaviors.

Students are affected by environmental and developmental factors. Therefore, it seems reasonable to employ management strategies that take their



characteristics into consideration. A serious problem about this point may arise when a teacher teaches an age group that s/he is not familiar with and uses either stricter or much more moderate strategies than students are used to. In such a case, students may suffer from the inconsistency. That is why a teacher should try to learn the properties of his/her students well, especially when teaching that age group for the first time.

It was also found that the academic status of disruptive student involved in misbehavior affects the teachers' preferred strategy. This pattern implies that when successful students misbehave, their teachers mostly ignore their conducts or they choose to use less interventionist strategies against their misconducts while, in the same case, unsuccessful students are more severely treated or punished. Most teachers assume that successful students do not normally conduct misbehavior, and if they do, there is supposed to be an acceptable and reasonable excuse. In other words, since academically unsuccessful students are believed to be more likely to commit misbehavior, they are more vulnerable to teacher reprimands and if the student who exhibits misbehavior is academically successful, teachers tend to consider classroom incidents from the student's point of view and think more empathetically.

Teachers' management strategies toward successful students involved in any misconduct are more moderate, which is reasonable but likely to be misinterpreted to be unfairness. As already stated, classroom context and how the student is perceived affects the teacher's response to the misbehavior. Therefore, the teacher should behave in a way not to be misinterpreted in terms of partiality. Hard work and success are expected by all to make a sense. However, teachers should be careful not to be unfair and should avoid judgments which might harm or deprive students of their human rights.

It was also concluded that teachers of different subject fields behave differently when faced with disciplinary problems. While teachers of natural and social sciences prefer more of interventionist strategies, teachers of philology, fine arts and physical training largely prefer interventionist strategies. The courses such philology, arts and physical training may require a more frequent and more intense interaction, which results in teachers' showing more tolerance to misbehavior. For instance, in a foreign language class, students should participate more frequently, which exposes them to various risks such as committing language mistakes and misconducts. If the teacher takes any misbehavior too seriously and stops to deal with it, most of the class time is wasted. After a class of natural or social sciences where more interventionist strategies are preferred, students in a class of philology, fine arts or physical training where less interventionist strategies are preferred may experience ambiguity. Hence, teachers working in any one school need to be aware of their colleagues' management strategies and try to develop common strategies to handle disruptive behaviors.

Various studies have dealt with a different group of factors likely to affect teachers' classroom management strategies (Martin and Baldwin, 1992 and 1994; Burden, 1995; Martin and Yin, 1997; Maslovaty, 2000; Glenn, 2001; Traynor, 2003). This study indicates that lots of factors influence teachers' disciplinary strategies toward disruptive behavior. The better the teachers acknowledge these factors, the sounder decisions they can make when they come across misbehavior. The differences arising from the influence of such factors, which are not under the control of either the teacher or the students, make teacher attitudes difficult to interpret, from outside the class. Hence, classroom incidents cannot be correctly interpreted without considering the components of a whole class. If it were the correct strategy to handle the class as a uni-dimensional entity, classroom management would be extremely easy but it is not. Each class and incident should be uniquely and contextually interpreted. Also, from inside the class, the teacher should bear it in mind that his/her decisions are seriously influenced by the context that makes classroom life dynamic and complicated. The existence of an abundance of factors influencing teachers' and students' behaviors requires that more attention should be paid throughout decision making processes to manage the classroom properly. Since the teacher is to consider the context where misbehavior occurs, s/he should not be expected to behave in the same way in similar incidents. Despite this contextual differentiation, identifying and choosing the right strategies against students' misbehavior are believed to help teachers create a better learning environment, on the one hand. In order to avoid ambiguity, teachers are suggested to explain their expectations to their students and avoid reproachful strategies like scolding. On the other hand, since this contextual differentiation may result in perceived inequity, the teacher should avoid behaviors like favoring certain students while ignoring others.

### References

- Burden, B. (1995). **Classroom management and discipline: Methods to facilitate cooperation and instruction**. New York: Longman.
- Charles, C. M. (1996). **Building classroom discipline**, 5<sup>th</sup> ed. New York: Longman.
- Doyle, W. (1985). Recent Research on Classroom Management: Implications for Teacher Preparation. **Journal of Teacher Education**. 36, 31-35.
- Glenn, Robert E. (2001). What Teachers Need to Be. **Education Digest**, 67 (1), 19-21.
- Hatton, E. (1998) Social and cultural influences on teaching, in: E. Hatton (Ed.) **Understanding Teaching: curriculum and the social context of schooling**, 3-16.

- Hoban, G. (2000). Making Practice Problematic: listening to student interviews as a catalyst for teacher reflection. **Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education**, 28 (2), 33-47.
- Jones, V. F. and Jones, L. S. (1995). **Comprehensive classroom management: Creating positive learning environment for all Students**. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Kounin, J. S. (1970). **Discipline and group management**. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Martin, N. K and Baldwin, B. (1992). “**Beliefs regarding classroom management style. The differences between preservice and experienced teachers.**” Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association. Knoxville, Louisiana.
- Martin, N. K. and Baldwin, B. (1994). “**Beliefs regarding classroom management style: Differences between novice and experienced teachers.**” Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Southwest Educational Research Association. San Antonio.
- Martin, N. K. and Yin, Z. (1997). “**Attitudes and beliefs regarding classroom management style: Differences between male and female teachers.**” Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, Austin.
- Maslovaty, N. (2000). Teachers' Choice of Teaching Strategies for Dealing with Socio-Moral Dilemmas in the Elementary School. **Journal of Moral Education**, 29 (4), 429-444.
- Papesh, S (2001). Choosing Classroom Battles Wisely. **Education Digest**, 66 (5), 29-32.
- Traynor, P. L. (2003). Factors Contributing to Teacher Choice of Classroom Strategies. **Education**, 123 (3), 586-599.
- Wolfgang, C. H. and Glickman, C. D. (1995). **Solving discipline problems: Strategies for classroom teachers**. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

## **APPENDIX A**

### **Classroom Incidents**

1. Ten minutes before your class ends, one of your successful students says: “Sir/madam, we are bored. Shall we end the lesson?” What would you do or say in this case?
2. During an examination, one of your successful students has a glimpse of his/her friend on the right and whispers something. After five minutes or so, you notice that he/she is now whispering to the student on the left. What would you do or say in this case?
3. You have found some very small pieces of papers with some notes related to another course, hidden in the book of one of your successful students, which may have been prepared for cheating. What would you do or say in this case?
4. During the lesson, you notice that one of your successful students has been reading a storybook hidden in the book for your course. What would you do or say in this case?
5. You see that one of your successful students leaves his/her seat without permission and takes another seat somewhere else in class while you are presenting your lesson. What would you do or say in this case?
6. You are teaching an important subject. While your students are attentively listening to you, one of your successful students turns aside and says something to the student next to him/her. When you see them going on whispering, you glare at them in order to warn them but they still go on whispering. What would you do or say in this case?
7. When you are about to start presenting an important topic, one of your successful students wants you to allow him/her to go out for a couple of minutes. You tell him/her that s/he can go out in 10 minutes. However, the student stops listening to you and starts doodling something in his/her notebook. What would you do or say in this case?
8. Your students are doing a group-work. You notice that one of your successful students is not participating in the activity and dealing with something else although you have talked to him/her about the need for collaborative work many times before. What would you do or say in this case?
9. While your students are working on an activity, one of your successful students has difficulty with it and starts murmuring as loudly as to be heard by his/her classmates. What would you do or say in this case?
10. Ten minutes after your lesson starts, when you have started presenting an important topic, one of your successful students knocks at the door and asks for permission to enter. What would you do or say in this case?