

ABSTRACT**TEACHERS' SELF-EFFICACY AND CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT
SKILLS IN EFL CLASSROOMS****ULUSOY, Sibel****M.A Thesis, Department of English Language Teaching****Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Filiz Y. TILFARLIOĞLU****December 2008, 108 pages**

The purpose of this study was to determine secondary and high school English language teachers' self-efficacy for classroom management in English as a foreign language communication, to investigate teachers' opinions about misbehaviour, to find the causes of misbehaviour and to examine the teachers' handling ways of misbehaviour in classroom management.

The present study was conducted at the end of the autumn semester of 2007-2008 academic year in Kahramanmaraş. 120 English language teachers working in different secondary and high schools participated in the study. The data was analysed using both qualitative and quantitative in design. The findings were collected through two questionnaires and an interview. The relationship between English language teachers' self-efficacy for classroom management was measured through the questionnaires administered to teachers. Interview and classroom management questionnaire were carried out with 4 participants chosen provided insight into teachers' feelings, experiences and practices concerning classroom management.

The data revealed that there was no significant difference between secondary and high school English language teachers' self-efficacy for classroom management in EFL communication and the perceptions of English language teachers' misbehaviour and its causes shared similarities and slight differences.

Key Words: Self-Efficacy, Classroom Management, Misbehaviour.

ÖZET

SINIF İÇİ YÖNETİMİNDE İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN ÖZ YETERLİLİĞİ VE SINIF YÖNETİMİ YETENEKLERİ

ULUSOY, Sibel

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi ABD

Tez Danışmanı: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Filiz Y. TILFARLIOĞLU

Aralık 2008, 108 sayfa

Bu araştırmanın amacı sınıf içi yönetiminde ilköğretim ve lise İngilizce öğretmenlerinin iletişim bağlamında öz yeterliliği arasında bir fark olup olmadığını belirlemek, öğretmenlerin istenmeyen davranışlar hakkındaki algılamalarını araştırmak, istenmeyen davranışların nedenlerini belirlemek ve öğretmenlerin istenmeyen davranışlarla başa çıkma yollarını incelemektir. Çalışma, 2007-2008 güz döneminde Kahramanmaraş merkezdeki farklı ilköğretim ve liselerde çalışan toplam 120 İngilizce öğretmeni ile gerçekleştirilmiştir. Veriler hem niteliksel hem de niceliksel metodlar kullanılarak toplanmıştır. Bulgular 2 ayrı anket ve görüşmeler yoluyla toplanmıştır. Öğretmenlere uygulanan anketler aracılığıyla, öğretmenlerin sınıf içi yönetimindeki öz yeterlilikleri ölçülmüştür. Rastgele seçilmiş 4 katılımcıyla yapılan görüşme ve sınıf yönetimi anketi öğretmenlerin sınıf yönetimiyle ilgili duyguları, deneyimleri ve uygulamaları konusunda daha derin bilgi edinilmesini sağlamıştır.

Veriler sınıf içi yönetiminde ilköğretim ve lise İngilizce öğretmenleri arasında iletişim bağlamında özyeterlilik anlamında bir farklılık olmadığını ve İngilizce öğretmenlerinin istenmeyen davranışlar ve nedenleri algılamaları gibi bazı konularda temel benzerlikler ve çok az farklılıklar olduğunu ortaya koymuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Öz Yeterlilik, Sınıf Yönetimi, Öğretmen Yetiştirme, Uygunsuz Davranış.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1. PRESENTATION

This chapter presents a brief introduction about the background of the study in question. It provides the key terminology and key people in this field of research and introduces the problem and the aim of the study. The research questions to be answered through the conduct of the study are also put forward. The limitations are decided, and key terms are defined for a common understanding with the reader. Additionally, the synonyms and abbreviations of the key terms have also been presented as used in the literature.

1.2. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Education has been defined in many ways and has taken many functions. In its most general definition education is a period of changing behaviours (Sönmez, 1994). The purpose of education is to provide the individuals with physical, mental and emotional improvement and to make them creative. The individual is taught both personalities and facts, and physical and mental skills. Therefore, the individual become learned and skillful through education.

The process of teaching is a process of communication. Communication is the method by which people share their ideas, information, opinions and feelings and it is a two-way activity between two or more people. Communication in education is the most important element of education. A teacher should have information about psychology and communication theory to do his duty. The goal is to raise lovely, respectful, confident, informed, successful students maintain efficient and satisfactory life. The aim of the education is to create voluntary behaviour differences on the students and so classroom management is the place of these kind of varieties are formed.

Classroom management is one important aspect of teaching for creating an environment where instruction and learning can occur efficiently (Duke, 1976). Cotton (1990) defines effective classroom managers as those teachers whose classrooms are orderly, who have a minimum of student misbehaviour and have high levels of time on task. Harmer (1983) states that the effectiveness of the teacher and the learning activities depend on how successfully classroom is managed.

Each child enters the classroom with her/his own abilities, interests, individual and personal characteristics. Once there, students are expected to follow instructions and carry out tasks which are given or organised by the teacher and to contribute to each other's learning and development by listening well and behaving appropriately.

On the other hand, the teacher enters the classroom with her/his own subject knowledge, lesson plan, personal characteristics, attitudes towards teaching as a profession and perceptions about her/his skills and about students.

These two important elements of the classroom should overlap, at least at a minimum level, in order to create an effective and enjoyable classroom atmosphere for the benefit of both groups. From this point of view, teaching is very demanding and challenging, and sometimes an extremely hard task for teachers to carry out as they have to organise tasks and activities and provide an appropriate learning and development environment which takes into account every single student's needs in the classroom.

For these reasons, great emphasis has been placed on teachers' ability to create and maintain an orderly classroom atmosphere which allows effective learning and teaching to take place. For example, Brophy (1988) identifies classroom management as one of his four components of effective teaching.

These two aspects of classroom teaching seem to share a mutual aim: teachers are responsible for creating an environment in which everybody in the classroom gets maximum benefit, while also dealing with problematic behaviour which threatens this environment. Brophy sees this task as one of extreme complexity. For Brophy effective classroom management:

“implies not only that the teacher has elicited the co-operation of the students in minimising misconduct and can intervene effectively when misconduct occurs, but also that worthwhile academic activities are occurring more or less continuously and that the classroom management system as a whole...is designed to maximise student engagement in those activities, not merely to minimise misconduct”. (Brophy, 1988, p.3).

It is obvious that in classroom management, teachers are expected to have qualifications and skills, not only for conducting instructional activities and the management of groups, but also in the implementation of particular approaches to generate positive relationships and to deal with inappropriate behaviour. So, teachers have been encouraged to search for ways to prevent such behavior from taking place rather than dealing with it as it arises (Nunan & Lamb, 1996; Ur, 1999). Various strategies, such as observing students during class work, being at a proper position to see all students, using body or hand movements and facial expressions, establishing rules at the beginning of the semester, and acting accordingly when students break rules (Turanli, 1999), are employed for the purpose of preventing students' misbehavior (Harmer, 2003; Lewis, 2001; Lickona, 1992; Ur, 1999). To make one example more specific, educationalists claim that teachers should let students take responsibility in the process of establishing rules and discussing the consequences of breaking rules (Aspin, Chapman & Wilkonson, 1994; Lewis, 2001; Lickona, 1992). Being the creator of the rules may eventually lead them towards self-discipline (Lickona, 1992; Robbins & Alvy, 1995; Ur, 1999).

Although social factors, for instance problematic family backgrounds (e.g. divorce, living with single or step parent, abuse, use of drugs), create difficulties for teachers, according to research results teachers are able to make a difference to children's lives (Jones and Jones, 1998). Moreover, teachers' 'inviting messages' (those which present something beneficial for consideration and acceptance) inform students that they are valuable, able and responsible (Purkey and Novak, 1984). Therefore, it is worth considering these positive management strategies from a teacher's point of view. Also, training programs focusing on classroom management can be implemented in order to help teachers improve their skills (Alan, 2003; Henson, 2001; Şentuna, 2002). With these training programs, teachers' confidence in their ability to manage disruptive behavior can develop and this change may lead to an increase in teachers' levels of self-efficacy (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000).

Having tried a considerable amount of approaches, researchers start to deal with teachers' feelings or perceptions about their ability to teach and orchestrate the classroom. Research on self-referent thought cautions that possessing knowledge and skills is not adequate for efficacious teaching (Raudenbush et al., 1992). Bandura's (1977; 1986) self-efficacy approach to human behaviour has made a great contribution to the area of teaching and learning. Bandura (1997) believes that a

teacher's effectiveness is partly determined by their efficacy in maintaining an orderly classroom which is conducive to learning. Effective action calls for a personal judgement that one can activate the knowledge and skills needed to perform behaviour successfully, in varied and unpredictable conditions. This judgement is defined as an *efficacy expectation*, the "conviction that one can successfully execute the behaviour required to produce the outcome" (Bandura, 1977, p.193).

In the last two decades the theory of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977; 1986), which mainly concentrates on one's perception of one's own ability, has been applied to understanding how teachers' feelings about their competence affect their classroom teaching, students' achievement and classroom management. For example, Ross et al. (1996) point out that teacher efficacy is one of the few individual teacher characteristics that reliably predicts teacher practice and student outcomes. Research in this area provides evidence that teacher efficacy positively affects students' achievement and those aspects of associated teachers' behaviour, which also appear to encourage academic achievement (Ashton and Webb, 1986; Gibson and Dembo, 1984; Dembo and Gibson, 1985).

Bandura (1997, p.240) writes about the importance of the self-efficacy of teachers:

"The task of creating learning environments conducive to development of cognitive competencies rests heavily on the talents and self-efficacy of teachers. Evidence indicates that teachers' beliefs in their instructional efficacy partly determine how they structure academic activities in their classrooms and shape students' evaluations of their intellectual capabilities".

Teachers' beliefs in their efficacy also affect their ways of managing classrooms particularly in dealing with students' misbehaviour. When studying teacher efficacy there is a tendency among researchers to compare high and low efficacy teachers' behaviour in the classroom. In one such study, Melby (1995) explored whether high and low efficacy teachers developed qualitatively different thoughts, emotional responses, expectations, control ideologies and behaviour management strategies in situations where discipline problems arose. She indicated that low efficacy teachers were: stressed and angered by misbehaviour; tended to use a punitive and restrictive manner of discipline; had a custodial view of their profession; and gave importance to subject matter rather than students' development. Conversely, teachers with strong efficacy were more effective, optimistic, confident,

emotionally calm, non-stressed and encouraged students' intrinsic interests based on convincing methods rather than authoritarian control.

1.3. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

According to researchers in the field of education, school and classroom management aims at encouraging and establishing student self control through a process of promoting positive achievement and behaviour. Thus, student related factors such as academic achievement, students' behaviour and teacher related factor such as teacher efficacy are directly related to the concept of school and classroom management (Froyen and Iversion, 1999).

Rademacher, Callahan, and Pedersonseelye (1998) state that effective classroom management procedures promote independent learning and success for all students in classroom that are productive, orderly and pleasant. Also, Rancifer (1995) suggests some strategies to foster effective classroom management such as creating a positive classroom climate, planning for teaching before school begins, the first day of school, and throughout the year; prevention strategies and consequences and punishments.

Most of the teachers want to have enjoyable and effective classroom atmosphere. It has been reported that students' family background, culture of the society, teacher's education background and quality of their training, teacher's expectations from students, their experience, and some other factors affect teacher's strategies in the classroom and their attitudes towards students (Aksoy, 1999). In order to establish and maintain classroom order, teachers must deal with inappropriate behaviours. This is the reason why some teachers view their profession as hard, requiring great amount of self-sacrifice and sometimes boring (Atıcı, 1999).

Every student has a different background, personality, different interests and abilities. That is why, each individual wants to carry out different kinds of activities during a lesson: some may listen to the teacher, some write something on their notebook, some get bored, while others misbehave (Öztürk, 2003). Thus teachers have to take into consideration all these individual differences; be patient, tolerant and try to understand the students. For most of the time teachers may not come across with the expected student behaviors (Erden, 1998). In order to analyze students' misbehaviours and their reasons, teachers first need to understand the

reason of problem behaviours (Turanlı, 1999). Since misbehaviour causes loss of attention and interest, and even disturb the peace in the classroom which may hinder learning, it can be said that student misbehaviour is an important issue to be studied.

In Turkey research on classroom management in particular, has focused on several dimensions. One dimension was the role of the teacher in finding solutions for behavioral problems. For example, in a study by Demirden (1994), teachers' approaches to classroom management and the interactions among teachers and students were investigated. It was found that although there were policies, teachers felt that they were left alone to overcome the classroom management problems with their own experience and knowledge. According to the results of this study, teacher and lesson have major effect on the students. Students preferred love and understanding plus an active personality in the teacher. In another study by Daloğlu (2002), teachers' perceptions on particular aspects of classroom management such as beginning the lesson, time management, lesson planning, motivating the students and student misbehaviour were investigated. It was found that experience and the level of self-efficacy of teachers were important for successful classroom management.

A considerable amount of research has been conducted on teachers' self-efficacy for classroom management (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000; Henson, 2001). The interest and the need of teachers in learning about classroom management have also been pointed out in the literature (Alan, 2003; Demirden, 1994; Giallo & Little, 2003; Şentuna, 2002). Teachers with high self-efficacy believe that difficult students can be taught if dealt with through appropriate techniques, while teachers with low self-efficacy doubt their ability in improving the attitude of students (Bandura, 1997). One of the important focus of this research is to explore the impact of English language teachers' self-efficacy for classroom management in EFL communication. It is fairly obvious in the case of teacher training issue that researchers and lecturers have intensified on both training student-teachers about how to use teaching strategies and delving into the outcome of such training. There have been relatively few studies the benefits of having teachers with high level of self-efficacy for classroom management. Therefore, there is a need to conduct research in that area to investigate the effects of self-efficacy level of teachers in secondary and high schools. One of the major concerns of the present study is to investigate the range of possible self-efficacy level with an emphasis on the skill of teaching and managing classroom.

1.4. PURPOSE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This particular study aims at investigating the teachers' self-efficacy in secondary and high schools and also to understand the differences between secondary and high school teachers' beliefs about classroom management, specifically about disruptive behaviour preventing them from managing instruction effectively. The ultimate purpose of the study is to examine the lack of research into teachers' self-efficacy in the field of EFL, and offers opportunities to study these issues. It may also provide information for administrators of schools at both secondary and high school level by identifying issues of self-efficacy as it may relate to teaching and classroom management strategies. This, in turn, may help administrators in making policy decisions for their institutions in order to maintain or increase teachers' efficiency.

Since the beliefs are personal, the research related to gaining insight about this issue should be localized to get more realistic figures about different contexts. A body of the research on teacher education, teachers' self-efficacy, disruptive behaviour, and classroom management might prove to be enlightening. However, the case-sensitive and in-depth research would highlight the unique features of the context in question. Thus, the research, particularly about English language teacher graduates of ELT department of different universities, would be beneficial in terms of developing a more effective schema for the teachers' point of view. Then, the research will make it possible to evaluate both the effective and ineffective elements of teaching for classroom management. Thus, the present study will contribute to the understanding of how teachers develop into updated teachers in terms of their overcoming disruptive behaviour in the frame of a classroom management belief system, and at the same time, provide implications for a more efficient teacher education program.

1.5. STATEMENT OF THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The present study seeks to find answers to the following research questions:

1. Is there a significant difference between teachers' self-efficacy for classroom management in EFL communication regarding high school and secondary school?

2. How do the Secondary and High school English teachers' self-efficacy level relate to each other?

3. Is there any significant relationship between the teachers' self-efficacy and classroom management skills for disruptive behaviour? How do they define disruptive behavior? How do they handle disruptive behaviour in their classes?

1.6. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

As in every study the present study has some limitations. Its case study nature hinders the generalisation of the results of this study to the larger population. Moreover, the case studies in general, have the aim of enlightening the researchers in the field and of helping them understand the phenomena in question. Therefore, the results of this study should be interpreted cautiously. Furthermore, since the theory of Personal Construct Psychology (PCP) suggests that each person has a unique understanding of the world and thus s/he construes the concepts accordingly, assuming that the other participants from other locations in a similar study would produce similar results would be misleading. All in all, such approaches would harm the uniqueness of each participant's professional development about the subject in question. In this study, age and sex differences between participants as well as school characteristics of the participants taught have also been excluded while interpreting the data.

This study is limited to secondary and high schools in the center of Kahramanmaraş. The results of the study can not be generalized to all schools in Kahramanmaraş. Because the study was conducted in Kahramanmaraş, the findings reflect the perceptions of only the 120 English language teachers in this work environment. Also it is limited to information gained through qualitative research design techniques such as interview and quantitative design technique such as questionnaire.

The main limitation of the study is that the classroom management questionnaire and the teacher self-efficacy scale used in this study are not specifically designed to explore the relationship between the secondary and high school English language teachers' self-efficacy for classroom management. The teacher self-efficacy scale did not produce two substantial factors as has been claimed although it has been the predominantly used instrument in the field

(Brouwers & Tomic, 2002; Henson et al., 2001). This might be a reason for not finding any statistically significant relationships between the self-efficacy level of the teachers of English.

Also, because people's sense of self-efficacy varies across contexts, the findings of this study can not be generalized to other schools in Turkey.

1.7. DEFINITIONS OF THE TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Classroom management: "... the orchestration of classroom life: planning curriculum, organizing procedures and resources, arranging the environment to maximize efficiency, monitoring student progress, anticipating potential problems" (Lemlech, 1999, p. 4).

Misbehaviour (Disruptive behaviour): Any student behaviour that is perceived by the teacher to compete with or threaten the academic actions at a particular moment, and creates disruptions in the flow of classroom activities (Burden, 1995, p.15).

Self-efficacy: Self-efficacy is the belief in one's capabilities to initiate and maintain behaviors through which people have control over the events in their environment (Bandura, 1995). Self-efficacy beliefs function as determinants of people's feelings, thoughts, behaviors, and motivation.

HS : High School

SS : Secondary School

EFL : English as a Foreign Language

TEFL : Teaching English as a Foreign Language

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. PRESENTATION

This chapter investigates classroom management and its relation to misbehaviour. Literature on self-efficacy, teachers' self-efficacy, the structure and sources of self-efficacy are the main concern of this section. To begin with, explanatory information about classroom management as a significant part of the teaching process and information about managing students' misbehaviour as an essential aspect of classroom management needs to be given.

2.2. CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT AS A DYNAMIC PROCESS

For a student, the classroom is the second important relations system that comes after the family. The classroom is a social environment which helps learners to feel that they are part of it. The teachers are responsible for directing education and teaching facilities in classroom environment. The classroom is like an orchestra, and the teachers are like conductors directing it (Taş, 2002). That's why teachers' approach to classroom management, classroom atmosphere, students' role in this atmosphere are very important for the effective language learning environment.

There are many different definitions of classroom management in the literature, many of them emphasize the same components of classroom life. In its broadest sense, classroom management is defined as a general term describing teacher efforts to oversee a variety of activities in the classroom including learning, social interaction, and student behaviour (Martin and Baldwin, 1996). In this definition, three broad dimensions of classroom management is emphasized: the person dimension, the instructional dimension, and the discipline component.

Similarly, Stensmo (1995) defines classroom management as the organization of the classroom as a learning environment; the management skills of teachers', order and care; the grouping of students for different tasks and patterns of interaction; and the individualization of student learning. According to Wilks (1996), although in the past (1960s) classroom management was perceived as the same as classroom discipline, a contemporary understanding of it contains *general managerial skills, classroom discipline procedures and methods of instruction*. General managerial skills, which refer to teacher behaviours, are vital for creating and maintaining a positive, productive learning atmosphere by employing techniques to keep students' attention in lessons and involve them in productive independent activities. The selection of curriculum content, planning of activities, physical organisation of the classroom, preparation of materials for lessons, use of time and general organisation of the classroom are among the general managerial skills.

Classroom management and instruction as key teaching tasks are interdependent. In successful classroom managers' classrooms, students are more likely to be on task and their opportunities to learning an academic content are maximised (Brophy, 1983). The relationship between *Order* and *Learning*, as main teaching tasks in the classroom, is well described by Doyle as follows:

Learning is served by the instructional function, that is, by covering a specified block of the curriculum, promoting mastery of elements of that block, and instilling favourable attitudes toward content so that students will persist in their efforts to learn. Order is served by the managerial function, that is, by organising classroom groups, establishing rules and procedures, reacting to misbehaviour, monitoring and pacing classroom events, and the like. (Doyle, 1986, p.395)

It seems obvious that these two tasks, order and learning, are interrelated. Obviously lessons should be planned to grasp and maintain student attention, while a minimum level of orderliness is required for instruction to take place. Since these tasks concurrently exist the teacher feels pressure to maintain order and increase learning. However, in many cases, the teacher's attempts to meet the demands of learning and order complement each other. For instance, while the teacher is monitoring individual work s/he can give corrective feedback and also simply being close to the teacher inhibits inappropriate behaviour.

As can be understood from the quotation presented above, *reacting to misbehaviour* is one of the managerial functions needed to sustain order in the classroom. Similarly Brophy and Evertson's (1976) understanding of classroom management as a means of "planning and conducting activities in an orderly fashion:

keeping students actively engaged in lessons and seatwork activities; and minimising disruptions and discipline problems” (p.51) includes managerial aspects of misbehaviour. However, according to Brophy (1988) teachers are said to be more pro-active and powerful in shaping classroom events. He believes that:

Successful classroom management involves not merely responding effectively when problems occur but preventing problems from occurring in the first place. In turn, this prevention is accomplished primarily by good planning, curriculum pacing, and instruction that keeps students profitably engaged in appropriate activities. (Brophy, 1983, p.266)

2.3. CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT AND ITS RELATION TO MISBEHAVIOUR

Levin and Nolan (1991) defines misbehaviour as behaviours that interferes with teaching, interfere with the rights of others to learn and are psychologically or physically unsafe. Burden (1995) describes misbehaviour as any student behaviour that is perceived by the teacher to compete with or threaten the academic actions at a particular moment and creates disruptions in the flow of classroom activities. He estimates that in order to develop effective and sufficient classroom management strategies, teachers should first of all determine the misbehaviours encountered in the classroom.

The question ‘Why is misbehaviour or problematic behaviour so important for classroom management?’ is answered by Doyle’s (1990) explanation focusing on the nature of misbehaviour. Misbehaviour is one of the dominant concepts in classroom management because the need for management and discipline becomes most apparent as students misbehave. In their investigation of the relationship between teachers’ ratings of classroom behaviour and student achievement Finn et al. (1995) showed that disruptive students tended to draw more attention from teachers, whereas teachers may ignore inattentive students despite their non-participant behaviour in the classroom.

In order to understand management, one needs to examine how the teacher monitors classroom events before misbehaviour occurs (Kounin, 1970). From an organisational point of view, an activity is considered as an essential element in classroom order. Each activity, for instance, a spelling test, a writing lesson or a study period can be described in the sense of its duration, physical aspects, programme of action for subjects and the focal content of the segment. To understand the classroom management, the programme of action is crucial (seat

work, whole class). This perspective contributes to understanding the nature of misbehaviour and finding appropriate discipline approaches (Doyle, 1990).

Doyle (1986) suggests that what students do in the context of the classroom is the key point to understanding misbehaviour. He goes on to explain that:

From this perspective, misbehaviour is any behaviour by one or more students that is perceived by the teacher to initiate a vector of action that competes with or threatens the primary vector of action at a particular moment in a classroom activity. Vectors perceived as misbehaviour are likely to be (or likely to become) *public*, that is, visible to a significant portion of the class, and *contagious*, that is, capable of spreading rapidly or pulling other members of the class into them. (Doyle, 1986, p. 419)

However, it should be expected that if it contributes to the lesson, *talking out of turn* is not said to be a misbehaviour. Similarly, Freiberg et al. write about misbehaviour:

Student behaviours that disrupt the learning environment have a rippling effect, influencing the disruptive individual, classmates, the school learning environment and the near community. The individual who is referred to the office loses learning time, and the teacher who stops the instruction to respond to disruptions takes away learning time from all students. (Freiberg et al. 1995, p. 37)

Conversely, in an effectively managed classroom, more time is allocated to learning activities and students spend their time actively involved in particular learning tasks and they also learn how to manage themselves through classroom management (Wilks, 1996). For example, self-monitoring provides an opportunity for students to control their own behaviour by using behaviourist strategies, and in doing so to enhance their competence and power. Teachers can assist students in the collection and recording of data on their behaviour so that students receive social reinforcement and praise for accurate recording and improvement.

Lund (1996), who regards misbehaviour as merely inappropriate, also points out that it is difficult to sustain learning and teaching when some students in the classroom are behaving inappropriately. He emphasises that most of the research shows that interaction between student and teacher is the key factor to the effective control of behaviour.

Wheldall and Merrett's (1988) study confirmed these assumptions. They did a survey of troublesome behaviour met by primary school teachers in their classroom. 51 % of teachers answered the question "Do you think that you spend more time on problems of order and control than you ought?" in an affirmative way, with the same percentage of male and female teachers.

It is also necessary to consider the literature with regard to sources of misbehaviour and the ways of dealing with it.

2.3.1 Causes of Misbehaviour

Several reasons for misbehaviour are to be shown. It is possible to group them into family background, socio-economic and cultural context, curriculum, the teacher's attitudes towards the student and also "within child" factors such as ADHD, diet etc. One of the most influential among these is the teacher's attitude and behaviour because especially positive and encouraging behaviour by the teacher can build a student's self-esteem, which is crucial for the development of personality and appropriate behaviour.

McGuinness (1993) examines disruptive behaviour in the light of sociogenic factors such as national, social and family influences, psychogenic ones such as self-esteem, self-image, and school related factors such as school ethos, curriculum and teaching methods. He goes on to say that "schools do not exist in a vacuum, nor do teachers work in a climate unaffected by the larger, different worlds within which we and our pupils live" (p.7). For example, living in a deprived inner-city area and having a poor economic situation has a big influence on the child's physical development and learning. Furthermore, teachers and administrators tend to treat students from low or high income families differently when they do not obey class and school rules (Brantlinger, 1993).

Similarly, according to Freiberg et al. (1995) disruptive behaviour may be seen as a result of classroom, school, and social problems which affect teachers and students. They found that elementary school students whose teachers attended a classroom management programme (consisting of 6 sessions) showed statistically significant higher levels of achievement on both national norm achievement tests and state criterion-referenced achievement tests, in comparison with students who had teachers who had not trained on such a programme, and also these students perceived their environment in a significantly more positive way than comparative students.

Generally speaking, as Charles puts it (1999), classroom misbehaviour occurs intentionally, not inadvertently-that is students purposely do something they know they should not do. Furthermore, he suggests five types of misbehaviour which are aggression, immorality, defiance of authority, class disruptions and goofing off.

Aggression is physical and verbal attacks on the teacher or other students. Immorality is acts such as cheating, lying and stealing. Defiance of authority is refusal of what teacher requests. Class disruptions are talking loudly, calling out, walking about the room, clowning, tossing objects. Goofing off is fooling around, out of seat, not doing assigned tasks, daydreaming.

Home background and social class have also been shown as causes of difficult behaviour and the child may be labelled as 'deviant'. Teachers tend to blame parent oriented sources rather than students for problem behaviour (Baron, 1990). Weishew and Peng (1993) in their identification of variables contributing to misbehaviour specified family variables as significant predictors of student behaviour. Schools in an urban area and schools with greater disadvantaged students had higher proportion of misbehaviour. However, a better atmosphere and a more positive perception of schools were also associated with lower rates of misbehaviour. According to Docking (1987) once socio-economic status was taken into account, children from single parent families were no more likely to exhibit behaviour problems. Detailed observational studies show that when children do not meet the school's norm and expectations they can be labelled as difficult or deviant. For example, Hargreaves et al.(1975) found that the school's norms may work against working class children and contribute to deviance. The child's behaviour seen by the teacher as deviant is actually a reaction to poor teaching, according to interview data with pupils.

Although home background is one of the factors affecting behaviour, McNamara and Moreton (1995) suggest that teachers can help children to change the way they perceive themselves and change their behaviour, despite the negative feedback from home.

As a result, all these factors seem to contribute to students' behaviour. The degree of effects of each factor varies according to the severity of them, and the level of vulnerability of the student. For example, if a student is shy and if it really affects his/her behaviour, teachers tend to attribute this problem to student-oriented elements. Having focused on family or student originated reasons, the teacher is more likely to see events from the point of view of the family and approach him/her as a shy person. After being on the receiving end of this attitude and associated behaviour s/he may become even more shy.

This process is described excellently by Purkey and Novak (1984):

Students who have learned to see themselves as troublemakers may respond by being discipline problems, just as students who have learned to view themselves as scholars may spend many hours in libraries. The dynamics are the same, even if the resulting behaviours are quite different. (Purkey and Novak, 1984, p.26).

It should therefore be noted that finding the sources of any behaviour is not always an easy task.

Doyle (1986) claims that some student actions that appear to be quite similar are reacted differently by teachers when the actions are performed by different students at different times or in different contexts. Therefore, we can say that context of the classroom structure is very important in determining any kind of misbehaviour. Burden (1995) states that all behaviour, desired or not, occurs in context, and whether student behaviour is appropriate or inappropriate largely depends on how well it fits the expectations of the classroom ecosystem. As Zabel and Robert (1996) suggest where, when, how often and under what conditions the behaviour occurs and how it affects other aspects of classroom management can be analyzed in order to understand behaviour in context.

When teachers are to handle certain classroom incidents, their views of child development, their own educational philosophies, and some other factors affect teachers' decisions about how to approach classroom management. Teachers need to examine their management system from time to time, which is an essential step to see whether there are factors in the classroom contributing to misbehaviour (Turanlı, 1999).

Although several factors contribute to the development of problematic behaviour, in this study misbehaviour and the ways of managing misbehaviour are examined from the perspective of teachers' personal characteristics. More specifically, *teacher efficacy* has been chosen as the area of study as it is one of the influential variables in classroom management.

2.4 STUDIES ON CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT AND MISBEHAVIOUR

2.4.1 Studies Abroad

The concern about classroom management is not declining, but is growing year by year. Numerous studies list classroom management among the most serious problems with which teachers must contend and a significant factor in their leaving

the profession (Curvin, 1992). Wheldall and Merrett (1988) conducted a study with 198 teachers from 32 elementary schools in England. According to the results of this study, it was found out that among the most frequently encountered 10 misbehaviours were, 46% talking without permission and 25 % disturbing others. The rest of the misbehaviours were not seen as a misbehaviour by 10 % of the teachers.

Another study was conducted by DES (1989) in England with 3500 teachers working in 220 primary schools and 250 elementary schools by using a questionnaire in order to find out the misbehaviours encountered in the classes at least once a week. It was found out that the teachers had to deal with talking without permission, doing nothing or getting away from the task, interrupting others' task, slowness and making noise. According to the results of the study conducted in primary schools it was determined that the disrupting behaviours that teachers considered were not too serious or violent behaviours. Aggression, swearing, destroying materials appeared rarely a few times in a week.

Lasley et. al. (1989) observed six middle grade teachers in a study examining ways of dealing with misbehaviour. It was reported that effective classroom managers permitted the fewest misbehaviours and were most successful in stopping misbehaviour once it occurred.

Wragg (1995) conducted a study of effective classroom management in British primary schools, with particular emphasis on how teachers dealt with deviant or disruptive behaviour. 239 lessons were observed, 60 teachers and 430 pupils aged 5-12 were interviewed. The study found a lack of congruence between the pupils' perception of disruptive behaviour and that of the teachers.

Bru et. al. (2002) examined relationships between students' perceptions of class management and their self-reported misbehaviour. Findings were based on a national representative sample of 3834 students from 227 classes in grades 6 and 9 who were attending Norwegian schools. According to the results of this study, student misbehaviour seemed only moderately related to general differences in the class management a class encounters. When the results of research made abroad are analyzed it is found that low level misbehaviours were generally encountered including speaking without permission, bothering the other students, making noise, and so on. Moreover, it is seen that severe problems such as stealing, fighting, and destroying materials are rarely encountered.

2.4.2. Studies in Turkey

Demirden (1994) conducted a study of the importance and necessity of classroom management. It was pointed out that English was one of the lessons which needed classroom management skills extensively. In addition, it was stated that not enough emphasis was put on management skills at universities. Also, the teacher's role was explained extensively. In a study by Ozen and Batu (1999), with 45 primary school teachers in 11 elementary schools in Eskisehir questionnaire was used in order to find out the most commonly seen misbehaviours and to determine supportive help leading teachers to prevent these misbehaviours. It was concluded that disturbing the others when leaving classroom or coming in, talking without permission, and leaving the seat were the most frequently encountered misbehaviours.

Türnüklü and Galton (2001) dealt with the comparison of students' misbehaviours in Turkish and English primary classrooms. The results showed that there were differences and similarities between Turkish and English primary classrooms in terms of the causes and types of students' misbehaviours. Both countries regarded instruction and learning as central in defining misbehaviour. Making noise, shouting at and talking without permission were observed in both Turkish and English classrooms. One of the differences between Turkish and English classrooms was inappropriate use of materials. It was observed more in English classrooms. Both countries shared similarities in causes of misbehaviour such as home background, economic standards of families and so on.

In a study by Atcı (2004) with 16 primary school teachers working at nine schools with different socio-economic levels in Adana teachers' interventions in classroom misbehaviours were investigated. According to the results, talking without permission and talking to friends were the most faced misbehaviours. During the interventions teachers used ordering, using symbols and ignoring.

Daloğlu (2002) conducted a study to investigate the perceptions of teachers on particular aspects of classroom management with 142 subjects according to the amount of teaching experience they have. The study revealed that the teachers who had less amount of teaching experience had more difficulty in motivating students and making them participate in the lessons actively. The results also revealed that

teacher groups had different perceptions and strategies in terms of coping with the student misbehaviours.

Sayın (2001) conducted a study of the frequency of encountering misbehaviours of primary school teachers and their views on the reasons of these behaviours; finding and evaluating the methods of these teachers used in order to prevent misbehaviours. Study was done with 1235 teachers in 92 primary schools in Eskişehir. It was found out that complaining about friends to teachers, shouting at friends, making unnecessary noise and talking without permission were the mostly faced student misbehaviours. Their reasons stemmed from teachers' some negative attitudes and treatments, student's families, the physical atmosphere of the class and student's personal features.

Atıcı (1999) conducted a study to determine methods used by 73 Turkish and 51 English primary school teachers in dealing with student misbehaviours. Teachers participated to the study determined their methods in dealing with misbehaviours through a questionnaire and answered to a scale related to teacher efficacy. 6 English and 6 Turkish teachers completing the questionnaire were chosen and observed by a systematic observation form and then interviewed.

According to the results, it was found that while English teachers dealt with misbehaviours more systematically and consistently, Turkish teachers were tended to deal with misbehaviours through experience. Moreover, it was determined that talking without permission, indifference to the lessons, wandering in class and disrupting others were the most observed misbehaviours for both Turkish and English classes. Damaging to class materials and aggression were the least observed misbehaviour for both groups. In the interviews, supportive results of observation were seen.

When we analyze the results of research made in our country we realize that the results are similar to those studies made abroad. The misbehaviours are generally low level misbehaviours. Moreover, teachers rarely come across with severe misbehaviours.

2.5. SELF-EFFICACY

Self-Efficacy (Bandura, 1995; 1997) is grounded on the belief that people struggle to exercise control over the events in their life. To achieve control, people

make judgements about their capabilities to accomplish particular tasks, and these self-efficacy judgements lead people to make choices in dealing with any task. For example, they do not undertake all the activities in their environment, but avoid some by considering the level of their self-efficacy beliefs in relation to that task. If they believe that the task demands are too challenging, and that performing this task will not result in success, they do not deal with it. They also determine the amount of effort, energy and time they will put into an activity, and the ways they will follow to overcome possible difficulties in the light of these considerations. Self-efficacy does not relate to the skills people have, but rather their beliefs about what they can do in different situations. By the same token, this actually suggests that people are diverse in terms of their self-efficacy beliefs across tasks. They may have a high sense of self-efficacy beliefs for a number of tasks, but at the same time the level of their self-efficacy beliefs may be low for other tasks.

Bandura's theory of self-efficacy is based on the observation that different people have different levels of self-efficacy under particular conditions. The main concerns of the theory are the differences between people with high self-efficacy and low self-efficacy in terms of their attitudes towards tasks and the amount of work to be done, the structure of self-efficacy, and sources of self-efficacy.

2.5.1 Structure of Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy beliefs have three dimensions: level, generality, and strength (Bandura, 1997). The level of difficulty of tasks is important in determining the level of self-efficacy people have in particular fields. "Situational conditions" (p. 42) affect people's beliefs in their capacity to accomplish tasks. For example, people ask themselves whether they have the skill and can make the effort to succeed in a task. Depending on how challenging the particular situation is people's level of self-efficacy changes. One may have high efficacy for driving an automatic car, but the same person may have low self-efficacy for driving a stick shift car due to the increase in the level of difficulty of the task.

The strength of self-efficacy beliefs refers to how much and how long people can endure the difficulties and continue working on a task even after experiencing failure. One needs to have a certain degree of self-efficacy to try to make a cake for the first time in their life, but the strength of their self-efficacy

especially carries importance when they face difficulties or failure. If people persist in making cakes and keep trying even after their family or friends have teased them about an initial failure, it can be claimed that they have strong self-efficacy for accomplishing the task. Bandura states that if people have a strong “sense of personal efficacy” (p. 43) for a task, they are likely to succeed in it. The sources that influence people’s beliefs about their capabilities in different contexts are of considerable importance. (Yılmaz, 2004)

2.5.2 Sources of Self-efficacy

Bandura (1995; 1997) states that there are four sources of self-efficacy beliefs: Mastery experiences (enactive attainment), vicarious experience, social persuasion, and physiological states. These sources affect the process of establishing a firm sense of self-efficacy.

2.5.2.1. Mastery experiences

The most influential source, mastery experiences, covers prior task accomplishments that play a key role in establishing a sense of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1995, 1997; Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy & Hoy, 1998). Personal experiences, the successes and failures people have experienced in their lives regarding their past performances tend to raise or undermine efficacy expectations regarding success or failure. If they have completed challenging tasks successfully, their sense of success boost their self-efficacy beliefs. On the other hand, if they have experienced easy successes in dealing with tasks that do not challenge their abilities, this may lead people to expect easy and quick successes in all activities without considering whether these activities are difficult or easy. Such experiences may result in failure and discouragement, and in turn low self-efficacy beliefs. This may also lead to learned helplessness (Dweck, 2000) and people will attribute their failure to their lack of competence and will not persist at all. The ultimate outcome, then, is likely to be amotivation and depression. People can establish a firm sense of self-efficacy through the persistent effort they expend in dealing with obstacles. This suggests that despite failures, if people put in effort to overcome obstacles and setbacks, they may increase their belief in their capabilities through their sustained

effort. By knowing what lies behind success, people will not be discouraged in the face of difficulties and will have a firm sense of self-efficacy.

Teacher self-efficacy beliefs are directly influenced by *mastery experiences* in that only in a situation of actual teaching can an individual assess the capabilities she or he brings to the task and experience the consequences of those capabilities. Thus, it is pointed out that the powerful influence of mastery experiences on efficacy beliefs should have important implications in teacher education; interventions should be designed in a way that incorporates the experiences gathered from actual teaching (Tschannen-Moran et al, 1998).

In this sense, it is maintained that impacting teachers' self-efficacy beliefs positively calls for long-term professional development that compels teachers to think critically about their classrooms and behave actively in instructional improvement. Participatory teacher research has been suggested as one approach to foster such meaningful professional development for teachers (Henson, 2001). Participatory teacher research is a collaborative process by which teachers themselves critically examine their classrooms, develop and implement educational interventions, and evaluate the effectiveness of those interventions. These activities allow teachers to actively participate in the development of practical knowledge about teaching. Based on prior research, it can be concluded that teachers' self-efficacy beliefs are facilitated via teacher research that create mastery experiences.

2.5.2.2. Vicarious experiences

Observing other people is another source influencing the process of forming self-efficacy beliefs. Bandura (1997) refers to research studies that reveal how people form a sense of self-efficacy through evaluating their capabilities by observing others in similar situations. Observing others may raise people's sense of self-efficacy if they witness other people's successes with persistent effort, which in turn leads to believing that they also possess the same capabilities to accomplish similar tasks. Conversely, it may also result in decreases in self-efficacy beliefs when they observe others' failures despite high effort. Schunk and Pajares (2002) state that self-efficacy beliefs are influenced by the similarities of the models selected. For example, modeling others is influential when peers share similarities in their familiarity with tasks they are dealing with. A novice teacher may be uncertain about her capabilities

in dealing with problem students in her classes, and think that she will fail if she tries. Observing that other novice teachers feel the same but are successful in managing students with disruptive behavior will boost her self-efficacy beliefs and allow her to feel that she can manage this task.

As regards vicarious experience for teachers, Tschannen- Moran et al. (1998) indicate that watching others teach, teachers begin to decide who can learn and how much, who is responsible and whether teachers can really make a difference. Models of successful teachers, particularly the ones who are admired credible and similar models, lead to the belief that teaching task is manageable, and that situational and personal resources are adequate (Schunk, 1987).

2.5.2.3. Social persuasion

Social persuasion is related to how others in one's social environment approach that person's capabilities (Bandura, 1997). People feel encouraged when others express faith in their capabilities in doing a task and persuade them of this either explicitly or implicitly. This, in turn, creates increases in self-efficacy beliefs. For example, teachers generally try to encourage their students by expressing trust in their capabilities. Feeling encouraged, students do their best to overcome their difficulties (if any) and succeed. In the same vein, the absence of persuasion can undermine people's sense of self-efficacy. If teachers show distrust, which is discouraging, their students will accept failure before trying to accomplish a task. This will in the end result in a low sense of self-efficacy.

This does not mean that unrealistic persuasion will also strengthen self-efficacy beliefs, especially when followed by disappointing results (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). For example, if teachers boost students' self-efficacy beliefs although task demands are above the capabilities of their students, this will lead to failures and disappointments in the end. It may also undermine students' beliefs in their capabilities, and they will tend to avoid relatively difficult activities and give up quickly in the face of obstacles.

As regards teachers, social persuasion provides information about the nature of teaching, gives strategies and encouragement for overcoming situational obstacles, and provides specific feedback about teacher's performance (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). In the context of teacher development, social persuasion can take the form

of coursework or professional development workshops, or specific performance feedback from supervisors, other teachers and even students (Schunk, 1987). This type of specific performance feedback, which serves as social performance, provides information about how a teacher's skills match the demands of a particular teaching task. It also provides social comprehension information, by which teachers decide whether they are adequate as a teacher, or inferior or superior to other teachers. However, Tschannen-Moran et al., (1998) note that specific performance feedback, which is overly harsh and global, rather than focused and constructive may lower self-efficacy beliefs. In the case of harsh and global feedback, teachers may adopt self-protective strategy of concluding that under the particular set of circumstances, achieving the hoped-for results was impossible. Therefore, teacher educators should provide focused and constructive feedback in order to enhance teachers' sense of self-efficacy.

2.5.2.4. Physiological states

As Bandura (1997) states, the physiological and emotional states of people play a role in judging their own capabilities. How people interpret the physiological and emotional responses of their bodies either enhances or diminishes their efficacy beliefs in terms of relating these responses to performance or physical well-being. Similarly, positive and negative moods have the same influence on people in making judgements about their self-efficacy beliefs. This suggests that what carries importance here is not the intensity or frequency of body reactions as well as changes in mood, but how they are perceived and interpreted by people. High self-efficacy is generally associated with interpreting such reactions as energizing facilitators, whereas people having low self-efficacy tend to perceive them as the indicators of vulnerability to stress, fear or anxiety. For example, before teaching a class for the first time, a novice teacher may feel anxious. If that teacher interprets this anxiety as a sign of low efficacy, she will not probably feel competent to teach that class. If, on the other hand, she considers this anxiety as an energy facilitator, instead of feeling incompetent, this will likely enhance her motivation.

2.6. TEACHER SELF-EFFICACY

According to the Elton Report (1989) the teacher's general competence has a great influence on pupils' behaviour. Subject knowledge, planning and delivering lessons smoothly and holding pupils' attention all depend heavily on the teacher's competence. Feeling competent in the management of groups of pupils, encouraging them to behave appropriately and dealing with inappropriate or disruptive behaviour calmly and firmly are also important. When teachers do not trust their ability to deal with disruption, they create a negative classroom atmosphere by criticising, giving praise rarely and by applying public threats and reprimands. Over the last two decades, teachers' sense of efficacy in teaching and learning has been the focus of considerable research and has been identified as a powerful variable through instructional effectiveness studies.

Teacher efficacy was first studied by researchers from the RAND organisation. They placed two items which referred to teacher efficacy in an extensive pre prepared questionnaire and found that teacher efficacy was strongly related to changes in reading achievement in minority students (Armor et al., 1976, cited in Ashton and Webb, 1986). In a second study by RAND, they found that teacher efficacy positively influenced student performance, achieving project goals and attitudes towards using projects methods and materials after the project finished.

The RAND researchers theoretically based their studies on the assumptions of Rotter's (1966) Social Learning Theory and defined teacher efficacy as teachers' beliefs that they could control the reinforcement of their actions (Tschannen-Moran et al. 1998). In other words, it is very much related to the control of reinforcement which relies on teachers themselves (internal) or on environmental conditions (external). Student performance and motivation were supposed to be important reinforcements of teaching behaviours. From this point of view, it is expected that high efficacy teachers believe that they can control or influence student motivation and achievement.

The second theoretical strand behind the concept of teacher efficacy is Bandura's (1977) theory of self-efficacy. Bandura suggested a model to explain and predict human behaviour and behaviour changes. He believed that behaviour changes occurred via different methods in which some cognitive variables work as mediators. Self- efficacy is seen as one of the major mediators for behaviour changes and is

defined as an expectancy that one can successfully perform any behaviour to get outcomes. There is a reciprocal relationship between behaviour and efficacy expectancy. Efficacy belief affects behaviour and is influenced by successful and unsuccessful behaviour.

Teacher self-efficacy, also known as instructional self-efficacy, is “personal beliefs about one’s capabilities to help students learn” (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002, p. 331). Research has shown that teachers’ sense of self-efficacy affects the way they teach and provide order in the classroom (Bandura, 1997). As a result of different teachers’ practices and attitudes towards teaching and classroom management, students’ success in learning subject matter (Bandura, 1997; Brownell & Pajares, 1996; Pintrich & Schunk, 2002; Ross, Hogaboam-Gray & Hannay, 2001) and self-efficacy for learning (Bandura, 1997) vary.

Ashton and Webb (1986) were the first researchers to study teacher efficacy, basically relying on Bandura’s (1977) self-efficacy approach. Bandura points out that both outcome and efficacy expectations affect behaviour. However they are different constructs. Outcome expectancy refers to an estimation of the possible result of performing a task at the expected level of competence. Differently, efficacy expectancy is the perception of being able to integrate necessary actions to perform a given task (Bandura, 1986).

People may believe that particular behaviour will have certain outcomes, but if they think or perceive themselves as unable to execute the necessary behaviour, they will not start the relevant behaviour or even if they do start, they will not be persistent in carrying it out. Bandura (1986) notes that “the types of outcomes people anticipate depend largely on their judgements of how well they will perform in a given situation” (p. 392).

Ashton and Webb (1986) use the term ‘teacher outcome expectancy’ about the consequences of teaching in general. In their terms, personal efficacy is defined as a kind of expectation, where individuals believe that they have the personal ability to perform certain courses of action which result in desirable consequences. Personal efficacy and teaching efficacy have been treated independently in empirical research.

For example, Gibson and Dembo (1984) attempted to develop an instrument to measure teacher efficacy and examine its construct validation and the relationship between teacher efficacy and teacher behaviour. Factor analysis of responses from teachers in elementary school on a 30-item Teacher Efficacy Scale produced two

dimensions: *Personal teaching efficacy* -teachers' belief in their ability to produce positive student change; *teaching efficacy*, referring to the outcome expectancy proposed by Bandura, the belief that teaching can influence students' learning despite their family background, socio-economic status and school related variables.

Teaching efficacy is related to general beliefs that any teacher has the ability to promote student learning despite the obstacles in their environment (Gibson & Dembo, 1984). For example, students may be amotivated and not feel any desire to learn school subjects either extrinsically or intrinsically due to family background, aptitude or school conditions, but teachers may believe that they can control the learning environment despite these influences.

Personal efficacy, on the other hand, refers to teachers' judgements of their own effectiveness as educators. As Gibson and Dembo state, teachers' personal sense of efficacy is related to the beliefs teachers have regarding their own abilities to teach effectively. For example, teachers may perceive themselves as successful in dealing with difficult students in the classroom, rather than merely believing that any teacher can manage such discipline problems. Similarly, when students learn a difficult item and use it in appropriate contexts, their teachers may consider it a consequence of their effective teaching, rather than believing that any teacher can do this.

Bandura (1995), Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk&Hoy (2001), and Woolfolk and Hoy (1990) summarize a number of studies that support the notion that teacher efficacy is related to many student and educational outcomes. According to these studies, teacher self-efficacy beliefs relate to student achievement, student motivation, students' own sense of efficacy, teachers' classroom management strategies, the effort teachers invest in teaching, and teachers' goal setting. Furthermore, teachers with a high sense of self-efficacy are open to new ideas, willing to try new methods they have not used before in their teaching, and are good organizers. Such teachers also tend to have a greater commitment to teaching; thus they do not critically approach student errors and spend more time with slower students.

Ryan and Deci (2002) assert that environment is of great importance in promoting or undermining self-determined, in other words autonomous, behavior. Similarly, Hoy and Woolfolk (1993) state that research is needed to explore possible relationships between teacher efficacy and school environment in terms of the support given, in other words, school climate. The study that Hoy and Woolfolk

carried out indicated that such a relationship between efficacy and school climate is reciprocal; i.e., bi-directional, each affecting the other. The findings reveal that personal efficacy and general teaching efficacy of teachers are influenced by organizational variables, such as principal influence, resource support, institutional integrity, academic emphasis and morale to differing extents. In particular, principal influence, institutional integrity and academic emphasis seem to be salient factors influencing personal and general teaching efficacy.

Hoy and Woolfolk (1993) also state that there exist few studies that have explored possible relationships between teacher efficacy and school climate in the literature. The two studies carried by Newmann et al. and Ashton et al. (as cited in Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993) indicated that aspects of school climate may influence teachers' sense of self-efficacy. In exploring this relationship, Hoy and Woolfolk emphasize the importance of focusing on how individual teachers perceive the school climate and its effect on their sense of efficacy.

2.6.1 Teacher Self-Efficacy in Classroom Management

“Teachers’ efficacy expectations influence their thoughts and feelings, their choice of activities, the amount of effort they expend and the extent of their persistence in the face of obstacles” (Ashton and Webb, 1986,p. 3).

Ashton and Webb (1986) conducted a study into how teachers define their roles and those of their colleagues; how their worries and efficacy attitudes influenced the quality of teacher-pupil relationships; the management methods they used and the instruction they presented in the classroom. Findings given here were derived from ethnographic observation in 4 middle and 4 junior high school classrooms and ethnographic interviews with 23 basic skills teachers in high school.

Although there was some overlap, when Ashton and Webb considered different methods employed by teachers within a particular efficacy group, they were able to make some useful generalisations. Low efficacy teachers were more likely to use particular classroom management strategies, defined their class with a sense of conflict, and control was one of their primary aims. When students misbehaved they used to embarrass students in front of the classroom. Another method they used was to separate “difficult students” from their friends. They called this process excommunication.

By contrast, high sense of efficacy teachers tended to use fewer negative comments about students. During observation the researchers did not see them using embarrassment and excommunication as classroom management techniques. Their classroom atmosphere was relaxed and friendly. When they met misbehaviour in their classroom, they handled it quietly and directly, without negative feelings. They did not think disobeying rules challenged their power or authority. When they wanted to correct students, they expressed their feedback directly or related to certain behaviour. High self-efficacy teachers used corrective and directive comments such as 'move up a seat and stay there', 'I want to see you after class', or 'If you don't listen to me you are going to miss this' (p.79).

Bandura (1997) suggests that teachers' sense of instructional efficacy is not indispensably invariable across different subjects. Hence, a teacher can have high efficacy in mathematical instruction but may not feel in the same way in language instruction. Consistent with Bandura's assumptions, Emmer and Hickman (1991) assert that self- efficacy is a more specific construct than self concept and self esteem because it is related to a self conception of ability or capability, instead of a more global self-evaluation. Therefore, they investigated whether teacher efficacy in classroom management and discipline is different from other dimensions of teacher efficacy.

They found that classroom management and discipline efficacy were different from other types of teacher efficacy and the sub-scales which emerged had acceptable internal consistency and test re-test reliability. Classroom management efficacy and personal teaching efficacy positively correlated with preferences for positive strategies and the external influence factor was negatively correlated with preference for positive strategies. Low efficacy teachers were more likely to criticise their students, and did not persist after wrong answers, whereas high efficacy teachers tended to give praise after correct answers. This finding was consistent with some previous studies (Ashton and Webb, 1986; Dembo and Gibson, 1985).

Surprisingly, student teachers' efficacy and ratings of their teaching performance made by university supervisors were not found to be related to each other. Emmer and Hickman interpreted this finding as unexpected and suggested that student teachers who have more managerial problems may have high classroom management efficacy. High efficacy might be seen as a part of denial and might enable these

teachers to escape the negative feelings which may derive from a truthful self-evaluation.

Having shown that classroom management is a distinct domain with a close relationship to teaching efficacy, this study therefore appears to make a contribution to the investigation of teacher efficacy in classroom management. Keeping these results in mind, classroom management efficacy could be examined in relation to different aspects of teaching, such as feeling efficacious in a subject area or in having a well planned lesson. An example of exploration into such a relationship is given by Woolfolk et al. (1990).

Woolfolk et al., (1990) examined the relationships between dimensions of efficacy and teachers' orientation toward management, control and student motivation. They found that personal efficacy was associated with more humanistic attitudes toward classroom control. Teaching efficacy contributed to both humanistic beliefs about control and support for student autonomy in problem solving. In short, a greater sense of personal and general teaching efficacy resulted in trust in students, sharing responsibility with students to solve classroom problems and a tendency to give up control. It was concluded that when teachers have a well managed classroom they feel more efficacious and simultaneously provide support for student learning. The result showed there is a positive relationship between the class management skills of teachers and the achievement of their students. Regardless of context, witnessing the smooth running of their own class and keeping within the expectations of the school supported a sense of efficacy.

Hughes et al. (1993) designed a study to investigate the role of teachers' causal attributions for student problem behaviours; perception of control over the problem and self-efficacy for resolving the problem in teachers' referral decisions for outside services; and consultation in the classroom or handling the problem by themselves. Fifty-five elementary school teachers were exposed to 12 vignettes about chronic, persistent behavioural problems.

First of all teachers were interviewed with regard to their causal attributions for problem behaviours and their control over the problem, their efficacy for resolving the problem and their choice of intervention. Causal attributions did not predict teachers' decisions on intervention, except for academic problems. If a child has poor academic behaviour and when the problem is attributed to the child's intellectual ability, teachers are more likely to refer a child to outside services. High efficacy

teachers are more likely to cope with the problem themselves than to seek referral or consultation. Self-efficacy did not predict consultation over referral but only the handling of the problem on one's own, rather than seeking assistance.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1. PRESENTATION

This chapter presents the design of the present study. The overall plan of the data collection procedure is presented as well as the participants and data collection instruments. The research is a descriptive study aiming at investigating the levels of English language teachers' self- efficacy for classroom management in EFL communication. Moreover, the data analysis procedure is explained along with the relevant literature.

3.2. RESEARCH DESIGN

In recent years a considerable amount of research has shown that self- efficacy is an important concept for understanding teachers' perceptions about themselves and their behaviour in classrooms. The research has produced many useful ideas, mostly in teaching efficacy, the relationship between efficacy and classroom management, and differences between the efficacy beliefs of secondary and high school teachers. Some researchers have investigated teacher efficacy as a slightly different concept in classroom management and have found a relationship between teaching and management efficacy. There are many studies about misbehaviour and teachers' management strategies, but this study is concerned with exploring misbehaviour and teachers' management strategies in the light of teacher efficacy, which is one of the most important variables among the teacher characteristics.

Therefore, the aim of the study is to investigate the role of teacher efficacy in classroom management, especially the management of inappropriate behaviour and to explore which variables are associated with misbehaviour including the teachers' methods of dealing with it in secondary and high schools. Investigating English language teachers' self-efficacy beliefs about classroom management through qualitative research design allows the researcher to have a purposeful sampling of rich data sources. Moreover, the in-depth analysis component of a qualitative research paradigm enables the researcher following a case study approach, since the result of the study will not be generalized, and the research context is unique (Yin, 1994; Zembylas, 2004). Since this study also includes the case study methodology, it is meaningful mentioning its characteristics:

- ◆◇ A case study copes with the technically distinctive situation in which there will be many more variables of interest than data points, and as one result,
- ◆ It relies on multiple sources of evidence, with data needing to converge in a triangulation fashion, and as another result,
- ◆ It benefits from the prior development of theoretical proposition to guide data collection and analysis. (Yin, 1994, p. 15).

The present study is a combination of qualitative and quantitative in design. The qualitative data collection method is used because it permits a variety of data collection techniques and methods of analysis. Moreover, the method of the present study is naturalistic in the sense that "the researcher does not attempt to manipulate the research setting" (Patton, 1990:39).

In order to support the findings with different measurements, interview was used as qualitative data type and questionnaires were used as quantitative data type. Using both a quantitative and a qualitative approach to evaluate the course effects based on the rationale that studies combining quantitative and qualitative methods provide information of the actual situation and might offer great validity (Chang, 1999 cited in Kızıldağ, 2007).

In this study, a variety of data collection tools and procedures were used in order to gain as rich a picture as possible of the perceptions of participants. The instruments used in the study included: an interview and two questionnaires.

3.3. THE PARTICIPANTS

The participants of the study were 120 secondary and high school English language teachers who were at the time of the study, working at various secondary and high schools located in Kahramanmaraş. Credible descriptive data were needed, and, in line with the qualitative research design, the belief was that voluntary-based participants would be ready to be actively involved with the current study. The participants were always asked for their consent (see Appendix I for consent and information sheets [adapted from Ünver, 2004] about the data collection); as a result, the people attending this study were all volunteers. The Ministry of National Education District Office also gave its consent for conducting the present study.

The main issue about participant selection in qualitative research is sampling strategy. Unlike quantitative research, sampling is purposeful in qualitative research. Researcher seeks for rich-data sources which will make it possible to gather a maximum amount of data in quantity and quality. Such a sampling strategy also enhances the credibility of data and, thus the study results. This study used, mainly, the criterion based sampling strategy. As in Patton's (1990) words, "the logic of criterion sampling is to review and study all cases that meet some *predetermined* (italic added) criterion of importance" (p.176). The criterion chosen was that the participant should work as an English language teacher at different secondary and high schools for this study.

3.4. INSTRUMENTS

In this study, two data collection instruments were used: Questionnaires and interview. Two different questionnaires were applied. The first questionnaire, Emmer and Hickman's (1991) Teacher Efficacy Scale was used (see Appendix II) in this study to measure teachers' self-efficacy for classroom management in EFL communication. This questionnaire was developed by Yılmaz (2004) by adding 12 more items to Gibson and Dembo's Teacher Efficacy Scale, which is the most well-known scale for measuring teacher efficacy (Brouwers & Tomic, 2003; Henson, Kogan, & Vacha-Haase, 2001).

The second questionnaire was used to measure teachers' classroom management skills. To assess these skills Turanlı's (1999) classroom management

questionnaire was used (see Appendix V). The original questionnaire used a 5-point Likert type scale from 'never' to 'always'. However, for purposes of comparison between this questionnaire and the interview used in this study, it was changed into a 6-point Likert type scale from 'strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree'. The number of items, which was originally 57, was reduced to 36. Because the first 36 items in the original questionnaire covered teachers' overt classroom management behaviors and attitudes, the questionnaire in its shortened form served the purpose of this study. The remaining items about student behaviors and the learning environment were omitted from the questionnaire.

The choice of each research method was determined by such factors as, the research interests, the circumstances of the setting, and the people to be studied, and time limitations of the participants and the researcher. All the instruments used to collect data in this study were adapted and employed after the review of literature and were piloted before putting them into practice for the research purposes when possible.

In the following sections, each of these data collection instruments will be described in detail with regard to why they were chosen for the present study in particular. Before the questionnaires given out to the participants, the aim of the research was clearly explained to the participants by emphasizing that it was not an exam in order to relax them and collect reliable responses. They were told about that their responses would shed light about the levels of English language teachers' self-efficacy and their classroom management skills. The items, words and unclear points were clarified by the researcher whenever need arose.

Consequently, the data used in this study that was gathered through teachers and the results which were gained through interview and questionnaires.

3.4.1. Questionnaire

A questionnaire is used for eliciting information about the situation and behaviour of the respondents by posing descriptive questions. It investigates respondents' experiences on a specific topic (Ekmekci, 1999).

Types of Questionnaire

1- Open-ended questions require respondents to write an answer in free form either in the form of a statement, a phrase, or a word.

2- Close questions are easy to use and score since the choices are taken from the given alternatives.

3- Contingency questions are two part questions. The answer to the first part of the question leads the respondent to choose the next cosequent question.

4- Matrix questions are a combination of several questions of the same set into one category .

5- Scaled responses vary depending on the options chosen by the researcher.

Likert Scale is one of the most common scale-response formats used to improve levels of measurement.

Among these types of questionnaire, two different a six-point Likert scales were used in the present study. The questionnaires included ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree in one questionnaire. A closed question item type was used in the questionnaire. The questionnaire covered 36 items, written in the declarative form which was a structured questionnaire that required the subjects to indicate their preference (i.e. Disagree, or Agree) to a strategy description, such as “I am confident of my ability to begin the year so that students will learn to behave well”.

3.4.2. Interview

Interview is used to find out what is on someone else’s mind; to find out from them things we can not directly observe (Patton, 1990). It is conducted to elicit the personal opinions of the subjects about the issue in concern (Ekmekci, 1999). Interviews add an inner perspective to outward behaviours through in-depth information. Everything not observed such as feelings, thought and intentions, how people attach meanings to what goes on in the world can be best learned through interviews.

Types of Interview According to Patton (1990)

1- Informal Conversational Interview: It occurs spontaneously; wording of questions and the topics are not predetermined. Questions emerge from the immediate context.

2- Standardized Open- Ended Interview (Structured): There is lack of flexibility in the wording or order of questions. Responses are open- ended.

3- Interview Guided Approach (Semi-Structured): The interviewer has an outline of topics to be covered but is free to vary the wording and order of the questions to some extent. The tone of the interview is conversational and informal. The interviewer seeks clarification and elaboration on the answer given.

A structured interview was used in the study and it was done in order to learn more about the actual practices, feelings, and thoughts of the teachers concerning classroom management problems. The structured-interview was developed by Yilmaz (2004) and the researcher added some more questions. Besides, it provided the opportunity to explain the intended meaning behind a question when necessary and to ask follow-up questions to gain more clear responses from the participants (Best & Khan, 1998). As a result, interviews proved to be helpful in obtaining more in-depth information (Basit, 2003) for this study.

3.5. DATA COLLECTION

This section explains the piloting procedure of the instruments, data collection and data analysis in detail.

3.5.1. Piloting Procedure

Before the main study, a pilot study was conducted in five schools with 40 English language teachers. The aims of the researcher in conducting this pilot study were :

- to check whether or not my data collection tools worked well (i.e interviews)
- to learn whether or not an addition to the data collection tool was necessary
- to find out whether or not my interview questions were clear and understandable enough
- to understand the appropriateness of my questionnaire
- to check whether I have determined appropriate aims for my study

- to learn how I was as a researcher (the feelings of my participants about my presence, my way of asking questions, etc.)
- to learn whether my data collection tools fit to the aims of my study
- to check the validity and reliability
- to realize my strengths and weaknesses in interviewing
- to test whether data collection tools were suitable

After the pilot study which lasted for a half and a month, the researcher understood that appropriate data collection tools were chosen for the study. There was no need to add more data collection tools. All the data collection tools were sufficient enough to answer my research questions. However, there was a problem with the questionnaire. Because some of the English language teachers did not understand the questions in English so the researcher sent out the questionnaire in Turkish form to the participants.

In relation to interviews, 2 voluntary teachers chosen according to the researcher's own observation notes in the school and teachers' point of view about the topic were taken into consideration, liked the researcher's way of asking questions. They said the questions were clear enough and understandable. The researcher did not change the order of questions and sometimes wanted more explanations from the participants. The interviews lasted for 20 minutes for both teachers.

The researcher has learnt from the pilot study:

- To observe the unexpected as well as the expected. To be open to anything. Every teacher had different perceptions of dealing with misbehaviour and classroom management, and had different types of teaching strategies. Not to get surprised.
- Not to forget my data collection materials such as consent form, tape recorder, and so on.
- There was no need to change the interview questions as all participants approved them.
- To transcribe interviews and begin analysis as early as possible.
- To try to be as organised as the researcher could. To prepare a notebook or a file in order to gather all the data in one place.

3.5.2. Data Collection

Questionnaires were delivered to English language teachers of each secondary and high schools and asked to be filled in during a one hour lesson time at that time. Afterwards, interviews were carried out with four teachers of English who were selected randomly two days later. Interviews lasted for between 25 to 40 minutes. A tape-recorder and transcription notebook were used in order to transcribe the interviews. Every word of participants was noted down and translated into English and then transferred to computer. The researcher conducted interviews mostly in appropriate rooms that the teacher participants suggested at school such as teachers' room, school counselor's room, and so forth. In the interviews teachers answered ten main questions in face to face meetings (see Appendix III). Having finished the interview, the classroom management questionnaire was given out to these four teachers of English two days later and wanted to be completed in a one hour lesson time. The researcher's observation notes about how to given out the questionnaires in the school and teachers' interest about the topic were taken into consideration while choosing the teachers to be interviewed.

3.5.3. Data Analysis

Data analysis procedures were initiated when the data collection procedure was completed. The data gathered through the instruments was analysed by using qualitative and quantitative analysis techniques. The qualitative data collected through interview was analysed separately. In addition to this, the quantitative data from the questionnaire was grouped and presented by using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) 15.0. The data obtained through the questionnaires which were administered to both Secondary and High school English language teachers. The results of the questionnaires were analysed using Chi-square statistics in order to see whether there would be any significant differences between the levels of teachers' self-efficacy for classroom mangement in ELT communication. As Ekmekçi (1999, p:114) stated Chi-square test is a nonparametric test of significance used to compare proportions actually observed and expected portions in order to see the significant difference. A chi-square test is applied to each item in the SPSS

(Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) to determine whether the results are statistically significant, as represented by a probability value of $p < 0.05$.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. PRESENTATION

This chapter aims at presenting the analysis of the data obtained by the teacher self-efficacy questionnaire given to the teachers both in secondary and high schools. The questionnaire was distributed 120 English language teachers working in secondary and high schools in Kahramanmaraş. The responses of the questionnaire items were analyzed and entered into computer and their frequencies, the chi-square result were calculated by means of SPSS. The results were then displayed in tables to enable the comparison of the data. Having completed the teacher self-efficacy questionnaire, the classroom management questionnaire and the interview were analyzed.

4.2. ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS OF CHI-SQUARE TEST

Research Question 1: Is there a significant difference between teachers' self-efficacy for classroom management in EFL communication regarding high school and secondary school?

Research Question 2: How do the secondary and high school English teachers' self-efficacy level relate to each other?

Through the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale questionnaire conducted to the both of the groups, English Language Teachers' awareness and their self-efficacy for classroom management especially for EFL communication were determined.

In order to investigate whether there would be any significant difference in teachers' self-efficacy, and to compare questionnaire results, Chi square test statistic analysis programme was used, since the obtained data needed an analysis which require related samples analysis. The results are presented in Table 4.2., Table 4.3.,

Table 4.4., and so on. These tables present the frequency, percentage, χ^2 , df, and the significance value (p) of the each strategy usage.

The comparison of teachers' self-efficacy is presented with the 'p', significance value. The significant value of each self-efficacy strategy use was taken into consideration by showing the statistical changes.

If the statistical value is $< .005$ probability level, they were accepted as statistically significant. In this study thirty-six kinds of items were examined related to the levels of English language teachers' self-efficacy for classroom management in EFL communication.

Table 4.1. When a student does better than usual, many times it is because I exerted a little extra effort.

			Q1				OPTIONS		Total
			strongly Disagree	moderately Disagree	slightly Disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree	
SCHOOL TYPES	HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS	N %	1 1.7 %	4 6.7 %	2 3.3 %	12 20.0 %	23 38.3 %	18 30.0 %	60 100.0%
	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	N %	5 8.3 %	7 11.7 %	2 3.3 %	7 11.7 %	30 50.0 %	9 15.0 %	60 100.0%
Total		N %	6 5.0 %	11 9.2 %	4 3.3 %	19 15.8 %	53 44.2 %	27 22.5 %	120 100.0%
$X_o^2 = 11.07$			$X_c^2 = 8.725$			df= 5		p= 0.05	

When Table 4.1 is examined, the findings indicate that at 0.05 level of significance, their results of chi-square test is found lower than the critical table value of χ^2 (11.07), thus the difference of the teachers is not statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 8.7 < \chi^2 = 11.07$). It is seen that most of the teachers agree that student does better because of their extra effort. As table shows approximately 23 of the high school teachers (38.3 %) state out that they moderately agree with the statement. 1 (1.7 %) of the teachers state out that they strongly disagree with the statement. On the other hand secondary school teachers, 2 of the teachers (3.3 %) state that they do not use this statement, 30 of the teachers (50 %) have the same idea with it and they moderately agree with the statement.

Table 4.2. If a student in my class becomes disruptive and noisy, I feel assured that I know some techniques to redirect him quickly.

			Q2 OPTIONS					Total	
			Strongly disagree	moderately Disagree	slightly Disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree		strongly agree
SCHOOL TYPES	HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS	N %	2 3,3 %	2 3,3 %	3 5,0 %	13 21,7 %	28 46,7 %	12 20,0 %	60 100,0%
	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	N %		1 1,7 %	2 3,3 %	11 18,3 %	33 55,0 %	13 21,7 %	60 100,0%
Total		N %	2 1,7 %	3 2,5 %	5 4,2 %	24 20,0 %	61 50,8 %	25 20,8 %	120 100,0%
$X_o^2 = 11.07$			$X_c^2 = 3.150$			df= 5		p= 0.05	

A quick glance at table 4.2 shows that there is no significant difference between the levels ($\chi^2 = 3.1 < \chi^2 = 11.07$). Table 4.2 shows that none of the secondary school teachers chose “strongly disagree” as an option. Some of the teachers 13 (21.7 %) strongly agree with the statement. A large number of the teachers 33 (55 %) moderately agree with it. On the other hand, 28 of the high school teachers (46,7 %) state out that they moderately agree and usually apply this way. It is seen that very small amount of teachers, thus 2 (3.3 %) of the teachers strongly disagree and they do not use this way while dealing with the disruptive behaviour.

Table 4.3. The hours in my class have little influence on students compared to the influence of their home environment.

			Q3 OPTIONS					Total	
			Strongly disagree	moderately Disagree	slightly disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree		strongly agree
SCHOOL TYPES	HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS	N %	6 10,0 %	7 11,7 %	11 18,3 %	11 18,3 %	16 26,7 %	9 15,0 %	60 100,0%
	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	N %	12 20,0 %	12 20,0 %	10 16,7 %	10 16,7 %	7 11,7 %	9 15,0 %	60 100,0%
Total		N %	18 15,0 %	19 15,8 %	21 17,5 %	21 17,5 %	23 19,2 %	18 15,0 %	120 100,0%
$X_o^2 = 11.07$			$X_c^2 = 6.933$			df= 5		p= 0.05	

The results in Table 4.5 clearly show that there is no significant difference between the levels ($\chi^2 = 6.9 < \chi^2 = 11.07$). The third statement in questionnaire is about the influence of students' home environment. 16 (26.7 %) of the high school teachers state that they moderately agree with this statement. Additionally, 11 (18.3

%) of the teachers slightly agree with it. However, 6 (10 %) of teachers have not got the same idea and they strongly disagree with the statement. On the part of the secondary school teachers, great number of teachers 12 (20 %) chose ‘‘disagree’’ option. 10 (16.7) of the teachers slightly agree with this statement.

Table 4.4. I find it easy to make my expectations clear to students.

			Q4					Total	
			OPTIONS						
			Strongly disagree	moderately Disagree	slightly disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree	
SCHOOL TYPES	HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS	N %	1 1,7 %	1 1,7 %	6 10,0 %	9 15,0 %	22 36,7 %	21 35,0 %	60 100,0%
	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	N %	1 1,7 %		5 8,3 %	10 16,7 %	22 36,7 %	22 36,7 %	60 100,0%
Total		N %	2 1,7 %	1 ,8 %	11 9,2 %	19 15,8 %	44 36,7 %	43 35,8 %	120 100,0%
$X_o^2 = 11.07$			$X_c^2 = 1.167$			df= 5		p= 0.05	

There is no significant difference between the levels ($\chi^2 = 1.1 < \chi^2 = 11.07$) when Table 4.4 is examined. Table 4.4 displays that a great proportion 22 (36.7 %) of the high school teachers share positive point of view on the statement and they say moderately agree. 21 (35. %) of the teachers strongly agree with it. As to the subjects who use strongly disagree, this constitutes 1 (1.7 %) of the teachers. Also, it reveals that a majority of secondary school teachers 22 (36.7 %) have both strongly and moderately agree option. The second large group of teachers 10 (16.7 %) declare that they slightly agree with this strategy in their lessons.

Table 4.5. I know what routines are needed to keep activities running efficiently.

			Q5					Total	
			OPTIONS						
			strongly disagree	moderately Disagree	slightly disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree	
SCHOOL TYPES	HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS	N %	1 1,7 %		1 1,7 %	7 11,7 %	32 53,3 %	19 31,7 %	60 100,0%
	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	N %		1 1,7	3 5,0 %	7 11,7 %	24 40,0 %	25 41,7 %	60 100,0%
Total		N %	1 ,8 %	1 ,8 %	4 3,3 %	14 11,7 %	56 46,7 %	44 36,7 %	120 100,0%
$X_o^2 = 11.07$			$X_c^2 = 4.961$			df= 5		p= 0.05	

The results in Table 4.5 reveal that there is no significant difference between the levels ($\chi^2 = 4.9 < \chi^2 = 11.07$). As table 4.5 shows approximately 32 (53.3 %) of the high school teachers state out that they moderately agree with the statement. 19 (31.7 %) of the teachers strongly agree with it. None of the teachers chose moderately disagree as an option. On the other hand 25 (41.7 %) of the secondary school teachers have the same idea with it and just 3 (5 %) of them slightly disagree with the statement.

Table 4.6. There are some students who will not behave well no matter what I do.

			Q6 OPTIONS					Total	
			strongly disagree	moderately Disagree	slightly disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree		strongly agree
SCHOOL TYPES	HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS	N %	9 15,0 %	9 15,0	4 6,7 %	12 20,0 %	20 33,3 %	6 10,0 %	60 100,0%
	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	N %	7 11,7 %	5 8,3 %	6 10,0 %	8 13,3 %	14 23,3 %	20 33,3 %	60 100,0%
Total		N %	16 13,3 %	14 11,7 %	10 8,3 %	20 16,7 %	34 28,3 %	26 21,7 %	120 100,0%
$X_o^2 = 11.07$			$X_c^2 = 11.190$			df= 5		p= 0.05	

When looked at Table 4.6, it can be seen that there is a slight difference between the levels ($\chi^2 = 11.19 > \chi^2 = 11.07$). While approximately the half of the high school teachers agree with the statement, the rest of them disagree with the statement. When we look at the total 38 (63.3 %) of high school teachers state out that they have the same opinion with the statement. 22 of the teachers (36.7 %) state that they absolutely disagree with it. On the other hand secondary school teachers, 42 of them (66.9 %) state that they agree with this idea and 18 (30 %) of teachers disagree with the statement.

Table 4.7. I can communicate to students that I am serious about getting appropriate behaviour.

		Q7					Total	
		moderately Disagree	slightly disagree	slightly disagree	moderately agree	strongly agree		
SCHOOL TYPES	HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS	N %			8 13,3 %	24 40,0 %	28 46,7 %	60 100,0%
	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	N %	3 5,0 %	2 3,3 %	9 15,0 %	22 36,7 %	24 40,0 %	60 100,0%
Total		N %	3 2,5 %	2 1,7 %	17 14,2 %	46 38,3 %	52 43,3 %	120 100,0%
$X_o^2 = 11.07$		$X_c^2 = 11.190$		df= 5		p= 0.05		

Application of chi-square test indicates that there is no statistical difference between the teachers. Since the critical table value ($\chi^2 = 11.07$) being at $p=0.05$ level is greater than the observed value $\chi^2 = 5.4$, there is no significant difference between the groups (Table 4.7). Approximately all the groups agree with the statement. None of the teachers chose ‘‘strongly disagree’’ option.

Table 4.8. If one of my students could not do an assignment I would be able to accurately assess whether it was at the correct level of difficulty.

		Q8						Total	
		Strongly disagree	moderately Disagree	slightly disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree		
SCHOOL TYPES	HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS	N %	1 1,7 %	3 5,0 %	3 5,0 %	16 26,7 %	28 46,7 %	9 15,0 %	60 100,0%
	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	N %	2 3,3 %	2 3,3 %	4 6,7 %	15 25,0 %	20 33,3 %	17 28,3 %	60 100,0%
Total		N %	3 2,5 %	5 4,2 %	7 5,8 %	31 25,8 %	48 40,0 %	26 21,7 %	120 100,0%
$X_o^2 = 11.07$		$X_c^2 = 4.503$		df= 5		p= 0.05			

The findings in Table 4.8 reveal that there is no significant difference between the two different school types ($\chi^2 = 4.5 > \chi^2 = 11.07$). As table 4.8 shows approximately 28 of the high school teachers (46.7 %) state out that they moderately agree with the statement. 1 (1.7 %) of the teachers state out that they strongly disagree with the statement. On the other hand secondary school teachers, 2 of the teachers (3.3 %) state that they do not use this statement, 20 of the teachers (33.3 %) have the same idea with it and they moderately agree with the statement.

Table 4.9. I know what kinds of rewards to use to keep students involved

			Q9 OPTIONS					Total
			moderately Disagree	slightly disagree	slightly disagree	moderately agree	strongly Agree	
SCHOOL TYPES	HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS	N %		2 3,3	8 13,3 %	27 45,0 %	23 38,3 %	60 100,0%
	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	N %	1 1,7 %	1 1,7 %	6 10,0 %	27 45,0 %	25 41,7 %	60 100,0%
Total		N %	1 0,8 %	3 2,5 %	14 11,7 %	54 45,0 %	48 40,0 %	120 100,0%
$X_o^2 = 11.07$			$X_c^2 = 1.503$		df= 4		p= 0.05	

A quick glance at table 4.9 shows that there is no significant difference between the levels ($\chi^2 = 1.7 < \chi^2 = 11.07$). Table 4.9 reveals that none of the secondary and high school teachers chose “strongly disagree” as an option. Some of the secondary school teachers 25 (41.7 %) strongly agree with the statement. A large number of the teachers 27 (45 %) moderately agree with it. On the other hand, 27 of the high school teachers (45 %) state out that they moderately agree and usually apply this way. It is seen that very small amount of teachers, thus 2 (3.3 %) of the teachers slightly disagree and they do not use this way while using rewards to keep students involved.

Table 4.10. If students are not disciplined at home, then they are not likely to accept it at school.

			Q10 OPTIONS					Total	
			strongly disagree	moderately Disagree	slightly disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree		strongly agree
SCHOOL TYPES	HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS	N %	4 6,7 %	6 10,0 %	2 3,3 %	11 18,3 %	18 30,0 %	19 31,7 %	60 100,0%
	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	N %	3 5,0 %	6 10,0 %	6 10,0 %	8 13,3 %	14 23,3 %	23 38,3 %	60 100,0%
Total		N %	7 5,8 %	12 10,0 %	8 6,7 %	19 15,8 %	32 26,7 %	42 35,0 %	120 100,0%
$X_o^2 = 11.07$			$X_c^2 = 3.497$		df= 5		p= 0.05		

The results in Table 4.10 reveal that there is no significant difference between the levels ($\chi^2 = 3.4 < \chi^2 = 11.07$). As table 4.10 shows approximately 19 (31.7 %) of the high school teachers state out that they strongly agree with the statement. 18 (30 %) of the teachers moderately agree with it. On the other hand 23

(38.3 %) of the secondary school teachers have the same idea with this statement and they strongly agree and just 3 (5 %) of them strongly disagree with the statement.

Table 4.11. There are very few students that I do not know how to handle.

		Q11						Total
		OPTIONS						
		strongly disagree	moderately Disagree	slightly disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree	
SCHOOL TYPES	HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS	N 8 13,3 %	N 6 10,0 %	N 5 8,3 %	N 18 30,0 %	N 12 20,0 %	N 11 18,3 %	N 60 100,0%
	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	N 7 11,7 %	N 4 6,7 %	N 4 6,7 %	N 16 26,7 %	N 17 28,3 %	N 12 20,0 %	N 60 100,0%
Total		N 15 12,5 %	N 10 8,3 %	N 9 7,5 %	N 34 28,3 %	N 29 24,2 %	N 23 19,2 %	N 120 100,0%
$X_o^2 = 11.07$		$X_c^2 = 1.601$			df= 5		p= 0.05	

There is no significant difference between the levels ($\chi^2 = 1.6 < \chi^2 = 11.07$) when Table 4.11 is examined. Table 4.11 displays that a great proportion 18 (30 %) of the high school teachers share this idea and they say slightly agree. 11 (18.3 %) of the teachers strongly agree with it. As to the subjects who use strongly disagree, this constitutes 8 (13.3 %) of the teachers. Also, it reveals that a majority of secondary school teachers 17 (28.3 %) and 12 (20 %) have both strongly and moderately agree option. The other large group of teachers 7 (11 %) declare that they strongly disagree with this strategy in their lessons.

Table 4.12. If a student does not feel like behaving well, there is not a lot teachers can do about it.

		Q12						Total
		OPTIONS						
		Strongly Disagree	moderately Disagree	slightly disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree	
SCHOOL TYPES	HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS	N 15 25,0 %	N 13 21,7 %	N 9 15,0 %	N 14 23,3 %	N 7 11,7 %	N 2 3,3 %	N 60 100,0%
	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	N 14 23,3 %	N 18 30,0 %	N 6 10,0 %	N 8 13,3 %	N 10 16,7 %	N 4 6,7 %	N 60 100,0%
Total		N 29 24,2 %	N 31 25,8 %	N 15 12,5 %	N 22 18,3 %	N 17 14,2 %	N 6 5,0 %	N 120 100,0%
$X_o^2 = 11.07$		$X_c^2 = 4.273$			df= 5		p= 0.05	

The results in Table 4.12 clearly show that there is no significant difference between the levels ($\chi^2 = 4.2 < \chi^2 = 11.07$). The twelfth statement in questionnaire is

about the unwillingness of the students who do not feel like behaving well and the reaction of the teacher. 15 (25 %) of the high school teachers state that they strongly disagree with this statement. Additionally, 13 (21.7 %) of the teachers moderately disagree with it. However, 14 (23.3 %) of teachers have not got the same idea and they slightly agree with the statement. On the part of the secondary school teachers, great number of teachers 18 (30 %) chose ‘‘moderately disagree’’ option. 10 (16.7) of the teachers moderately agree with this statement.

Table 4.13. When a student is having trouble with an assignment, I am usually able to adjust it to his/her level.

		Q13 OPTIONS						Total
		Strongly Disagree	moderately Disagree	slightly disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree	
SCHOOL TYPES	HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS	N 1 1,7 %	2 3,3 %	2 3,3 %	12 20,0 %	19 31,7 %	24 40,0 %	60 100,0%
	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	N 2 3,3 %	5 8,3 %	13 21,7 %	20 33,7 %	20 33,3 %	60 100,0%	
Total	N 1 1,7 %	4 3,3 %	7 5,8 %	25 20,8 %	39 32,5 %	44 36,7 %	120 100,0%	
$X_o^2 = 11.07$		$X_c^2 = 2.715$		df= 5		p= 0.05		

When Table 4.13 is examined, the findings indicate that at 0.05 level of significance, their results of chi-square test is found lower than the critical table value of χ^2 (11.07), thus the difference of the teachers is not statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 2.7 < \chi^2 = 11.07$). It is seen that most of the teachers agree that when a student has trouble with an assignment, the teachers can adjust it to the level of the students. As table 4.13 shows approximately 24 of the high school teachers (40 %) state out that they strongly agree with the statement. 1 (1.7 %) of the teachers state out that they strongly disagree with the statement. On the other hand secondary school teachers, 2 of the teachers (3.3 %) state that they do not agree with this statement, 20 of the teachers (33.3 %) have the same idea with it and they moderately agree with the statement.

Table 4.14. Student misbehaviour that persists over a long time is partly a result of what the teacher does or does not do.

		Q14 OPTIONS						Total
		strongly disagree	moderately Disagree	slightly disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree	
SCHOOL TYPES	HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS	N 2 3,3 %	N 15 25,0 %	N 7 3,3 %	N 13 21,7 %	N 15 25,0 %	N 8 13,3 %	60 100,0%
	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	N 6 10,0 %	N 9 15,0 %	N 7 8,3 %	N 13 21,7 %	N 18 30,0 %	N 7 11,7 %	60 100,0%
Total		N 8 6,7 %	N 24 20,0 %	N 14 5,8 %	N 26 21,7 %	N 33 27,5 %	N 15 12,5 %	120 100,0%
$X_o^2 = 11.07$		$X_c^2 = 3.839$		df= 5		p= 0.05		

There is no significant difference between the levels ($\chi^2 = 3.8 < \chi^2 = 11.07$) when Table 4.14 is examined. Table 4.14 displays that an equal proportion 15 (25 %) of the high school teachers share positive and negative point of view on the statement and they say both moderately agree and disagree. 13 (21.7 %) of the teachers slightly agree with it. As to the subjects who use strongly disagree, this constitutes 2 (3.3 %) of the teachers. Also, it reveals that a majority of secondary school teachers 18 (30 %) have moderately agree option. The second large group of teachers 13 (21.7 %) declare that they slightly agree with this idea.

Table 4.15. Student behaviour in classrooms is more influenced by peers than by the teacher.

		Q15 OPTIONS						Total
		strongly disagree	moderately Disagree	slightly disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree	
SCHOOL TYPES	HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS	N 3 5,0 %	N 5 8,3 %	N 10 16,7 %	N 15 25,0 %	N 20 33,3 %	N 7 11,7 %	60 100,0%
	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	N 1 1,7 %	N 4 6,7 %	N 6 10,0 %	N 17 28,3 %	N 19 31,7 %	N 13 21,7 %	60 100,0%
Total		N 4 3,3 %	N 9 7,5 %	N 16 13,3 %	N 32 26,7 %	N 39 32,5 %	N 20 16,7 %	120 100,0%
$X_o^2 = 11.07$		$X_c^2 = 4.062$		df= 5		p= 0.05		

The findings in Table 4.15 reveal that there is no significant difference between the two different school types ($\chi^2 = 4.06 > \chi^2 = 11.07$). As table 4.15 shows 20 of the high school teachers (33.3 %) state out that they moderately agree with the statement. 3 (5 %) of the teachers state out that they strongly disagree with the statement. On the other hand secondary school teachers, 1 of the teachers (1.7 %) state out that they strongly disagree with the statement.

state that they do not share this idea, 19 of the teachers (31.7 %) have the same idea with it and they moderately agree with the statement.

Table 4.16. When a student gets a better grade than usual, it is probably because I found better ways of teaching that student.

		Q16 OPTIONS						Total
		strongly disagree	moderately Disagree	slightly disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree	
SCHOOL TYPES	HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS	N 1 1,7 %	2 3,3 %	6 10,0 %	17 28,3 %	21 35,0 %	13 21,7 %	60 100,0%
	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	N 2 3,3 %	4 6,7 %	5 8,3 %	19 31,7 %	26 43,3 %	4 6,7 %	60 100,0%
Total	N %	3 2,5 %	6 5,0 %	11 9,2 %	36 30,0 %	47 39,2 %	17 14,2 %	120 100,0%
$X_o^2 = 11.07$		$X_c^2 = 6.499$		df= 5		p= 0.05		

The results in Table 4.16 reveal that there is no significant difference between the levels ($\chi^2 = 6.4 < \chi^2 = 11.07$). As table 4.16 shows that 21 (35 %) of the high school teachers state out that they moderately agree with the statement. 13 (21.7 %) of the teachers strongly agree with it. Just one of the teachers chose strongly disagree as an option. On the other hand 26 (43.3 %) of the secondary school teachers have the same idea with it and just 2 (3.3 %) of them strongly disagree with the statement.

Table 4.17. I do not always know how to keep track of several activities at once.

		Q17 OPTIONS						Total
		strongly disagree	moderately Disagree	slightly disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree	
SCHOOL TYPES	HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS	N 16 26,7 %	12 20,0 %	10 16,7 %	13 21,7 %	7 11,7 %	2 3,3 %	60 100,0%
	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	N 7 11,7 %	15 25,0 %	14 23,3 %	15 25,0 %	6 10,0 %	3 5,0 %	60 100,0%
Total	N %	23 19,2 %	27 22,5 %	24 20,0 %	28 23,3 %	13 10,8 %	5 4,2 %	120 100,0%
$X_o^2 = 11.07$		$X_c^2 = 4.942$		df= 5		p= 0.05		

A quick glance at table 4.17 shows that there is no significant difference between the levels ($\chi^2 = 4.9 < \chi^2 = 11.07$). Table 4.17 reveals that just 3 (5 %) of secondary school teachers chose “strongly agree” as an option. Some of the secondary school teachers 14 (23.3 %) slightly disagree with the statement. A large number of the teachers 15 (25 %) chose both moderately disagree and slightly agree options. On the other hand, 16 of the high school teachers (26.7 %) state out that they strongly disagree with the statement. It is seen that very small amount of teachers, thus 2 (3.3 %) of the teachers slightly agree and they do not share this opinion.

Table 4.18. When I really try, I can get through to most difficult students.

		Q18 OPTIONS						Total
		strongly disagree	moderately Disagree	slightly disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree	
SCHOOL TYPES	HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS	N 1 1,7 %	3 5,0 %	5 8,3 %	11 18,3 %	22 36,7 %	18 30,0 %	60 100,0%
	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	N 4 6,7 %	1 1,7 %	5 8,3 %	12 20,0 %	23 38,3 %	14 25,0 %	60 100,0%
Total	N 5 4,2 %	4 3,3 %	10 8,3 %	23 19,2 %	45 37,5 %	33 27,5 %	120 100,0%	
$X_o^2 = 11.07$		$X_c^2 = 3.138$		df= 5		p= 0.05		

Data displayed in table 18 reveals that there is no significant difference between the levels ($\chi^2 = 3.1 < \chi^2 = 11.07$). The great number of high school teachers 22 (36.7 %) moderately agree with the statement and most of them agree on it. On the other hand 23 of the secondary school teachers (38.3%) state out that they are thinking in the same way and they marked moderately agree option. Just one of the teachers chose “moderately disagree” as an option.

Table 4.19. I am unsure how to respond to defiant (refusing to obey) students.

		Q19						Total
		OPTIONS						
		strongly disagree	moderately Disagree	slightly disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree	
SCHOOL TYPES	HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS	N 11 18,3 %	13 21,7 %	10 16,7 %	15 25,0 %	9 15,0 %	2 3,3 %	60 100,0%
	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	N 15 25,0 %	7 11,7 %	13 21,7 %	15 25,0 %	9 15,0 %	1 1,7 %	60 100,0%
Total		N 26 21,7 %	20 16,7 %	23 19,2 %	30 25,0 %	18 15,0 %	3 2,5 %	120 100,0%
Xo ² =11.07		Xc ² = 3.140		df= 5		p= 0.05		

The data in Table 4.19 states that there is no difference between the levels of the teachers related with how to answer to defiant students ($\chi^2 = 3.1 < \chi^2 = 11.07$). 15 (25 %) of the high school teachers slightly agree with the opinion and 11 (18.3 %) of them strongly disagree with the statement. By the same token 15 (25 %) of the secondary school teachers chose slightly agree as an option and most of them disagree with this statement.

Table 4.20. A teacher is very limited in what can be achieved because a student's home environment is a large influence on achievement.

		Q20						Total
		OPTIONS						
		strongly disagree	moderately Disagree	slightly disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree	
SCHOOL TYPES	HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS	N 1 1,7 %	9 15,0 %	7 11,7 %	18 30,0 %	16 26,7 %	9 15,0 %	60 100,0%
	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	N 6 10,0 %	7 11,7 %	4 6,7 %	11 18,3 %	25 41,7 %	7 11,7 %	60 100,0%
Total		N 7 5,8 %	16 13,3 %	11 9,2 %	29 24,2 %	41 24,2 %	16 13,3 %	120 100,0%
Xo ² =11.07		Xc ² = 8.555			df= 5		p= 0.05	

It can be concluded from the results in Table 4.20 that there is no significant difference between the levels ($\chi^2 = 8.5 < \chi^2 = 11.07$). Table 4.20 reveals that just 4 (6.7 %) of secondary school teachers chose "slightly disagree" as an option. Some of the secondary school teachers 11 (18.3 %) slightly agree with the statement. A large of number of the teachers 25 (41.7 %) chose moderately agree option. On the other hand, 18 of the high school teachers (30 %) state out that they slightly agree with the

statement. It is seen that very small amount of teachers, thus 1 (1.7 %) of the teachers strongly disagree and they do not share this opinion.

Table 4.21. I find some students to be impossible to discipline effectively.

		Q21 OPTIONS						Total
		strongly disagree	moderately Disagree	slightly disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree	
SCHOOL TYPES	HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS	N 9 15,0 %	N 8 13,3 %	N 10 16,7 %	N 15 25,0 %	N 14 23,3 %	N 4 6,7 %	60 100,0%
	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	N 7 11,7 %	N 9 15,0 %	N 8 13,3 %	N 9 15,0 %	N 19 31,7 %	N 8 13,3 %	60 100,0%
Total		N 16 13,3 %	N 17 14,2 %	N 18 15,0 %	N 24 20,0 %	N 33 27,5 %	N 12 10,0 %	120 100,0%
$X_o^2 = 11.07$		$X_c^2 = 4.122$		df= 5		p= 0.05		

According to the results in Table 4.21, there is no significant difference between the levels ($\chi^2 = 4.1 < \chi^2 = 11.07$). As table 4.21 shows that 15 (25 %) of the high school teachers state out that they slightly agree with the statement. 14 (23.3 %) of the teachers moderately agree with it. Just 4 of the teachers chose ‘strongly agree’ as an option. On the other hand 19 (31.7 %) of the secondary school teachers have moderately agree option and 7 (11.7 %) of them strongly disagree with the statement.

Table 4.22. When the grades of my students improve, it is usually because I found more effective teaching approaches.

		Q22 OPTIONS						Total
		strongly disagree	moderately Disagree	slightly disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree	
SCHOOL TYPES	HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS	N 1 1,7 %	N 4 6,7 %	N 4 6,7 %	N 13 21,7 %	N 26 43,3 %	N 13 21,7 %	60 100,0%
	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	N 1 1,7 %	N 2 3,3 %	N 4 6,7 %	N 10 16,7 %	N 34 56,7 %	N 9 15,0 %	60 100,0%
Total		N 1 ,8 %	N 6 5,0 %	N 8 6,7 %	N 23 19,2 %	N 60 50,0 %	N 22 18,3 %	120 100,0%
$X_o^2 = 11.07$		$X_c^2 = 3.852$			df= 5		p= 0.05	

Table 4.22 clearly indicates that there is no significant difference between the levels ($\chi^2 = 6.4 < \chi^2 = 11.07$). As table 4.43 shows that 26 (43.3 %) of the high school teachers state out that they moderately agree with the statement. 13 (21.7 %) of the teachers chose both strongly and slightly agree options. None of the teachers

chose ‘strongly disagree’ as an option. On the other hand 34 (56.7 %) of the secondary school teachers have the same idea with it and just 1 (1.7 %) of them strongly disagree with the statement.

Table 4.23. Sometimes I am not sure what rules are appropriate for my students.

		Q23 OPTIONS						Total
		strongly disagree	moderately Disagree	slightly disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree	
SCHOOL TYPES	HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS	N 12 20,0 %	11 18,3 %	10 16,7 %	21 35,0 %	4 6,7 %	2 3,3 %	60 100,0%
	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	N 11 18,3 %	14 23,3 %	8 13,3 %	16 26,7 %	9 15,0 %	2 3,3 %	60 100,0%
Total		N 23 19,2 %	25 20,8 %	18 15,0 %	37 30,8 %	13 10,8 %	4 3,3 %	120 100,0%
$X_o^2 = 11.07$		$X_c^2 = 3.224$		df= 5		p= 0.05		

As shown in Table 23, the results reveal that there is no significant difference between the levels ($\chi^2 = 3.2 < \chi^2 = 11.07$). The twenty-third statement in questionnaire is about being sure of what rules are appropriate for the students. 21 (35 %) of the high school teachers state that they slightly agree with this statement. Additionally, 12 (20 %) of the teachers strongly disagree with it. However, just 2 (3.3 %) of teachers have not got the same idea and they strongly agree with the statement. On the part of the secondary school teachers, great number of teachers 16 (26.7 %) chose ‘moderately disagree’ as an option. 14 (23 %) of the teachers moderately disagree with this statement.

Table 4.24. If a student masters a new concept quickly this might be because I knew the necessary steps in teaching the concept.

		Q24 OPTIONS						Total
		strongly disagree	moderately Disagree	slightly disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree	
SCHOOL TYPES	HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS	N 3 5,0 %	1 1,7 %	2 3,3 %	11 18,3 %	34 56,7 %	9 15,0 %	60 100,0%
	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	N 1 1,7 %	1 1,7 %		16 26,7 %	30 50,0 %	12 20,0 %	60 100,0%
Total		N 4 3,3 %	2 1,7 %	2 1,7 %	27 22,5 %	64 53,3 %	21 17,5 %	120 100,0%
$X_o^2 = 11.07$		$X_c^2 = 4.604$		df= 5		p= 0.05		

When Table 4.24 is examined, the findings indicate that at 0.05 level of significance, their results of chi-square test is found lower than the critical table value of χ^2 (11.07), thus the difference of the teachers is not statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 4.6 < \chi^2 = 11.07$). It is seen that most of the teachers agree that whether a student masters a new concept, this might be because the teacher knew the necessary steps. As table 4.24 shows 34 of the high school teachers (56.7 %) state out that they moderately agree with the statement. 1 (1.7 %) of the teachers state out that they moderately disagree with the statement. On the other hand secondary school teachers, 1 of the teachers (1.7 %) state that they do not agree with this statement, 16 of the teachers (26.7 %) have the same idea with it and they slightly agree with the statement.

Table 4.25. The amount that a student can learn is primarily related to family background.

		Q25 OPTIONS						Total
		strongly disagree	moderately Disagree	slightly disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree	
SCHOOL TYPES	HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS	N 7 11,7 %	N 5 8,3 %	N 10 16,7 %	N 11 18,3 %	N 16 26,7 %	N 11 18,3 %	N 60 100,0%
	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	N 5 8,3 %	N 5 8,3 %	N 7 11,7 %	N 13 21,7 %	N 20 33,3 %	N 10 16,7 %	N 60 100,0%
Total		N 12 10,0 %	N 10 8,3 %	N 17 14,2 %	N 24 20,0 %	N 36 30,0 %	N 21 17,5 %	N 120 100,0%
$X_o^2 = 11.07$		$X_c^2 = 1.521$			df= 5		p= 0.05	

There is no significant difference between the levels ($\chi^2 = 1.5 < \chi^2 = 11.07$) when Table 4.25 is examined. Table 4.25 displays that an equal proportion 11 (18.3 %) of the high school teachers share positive point of view on the statement and they say both strongly and slightly agree. 16 (26.7 %) of the teachers moderately agree with it. As to the subjects who use strongly disagree, this constitutes 7 (11.7 %) of the teachers. Also, it reveals that a majority of secondary school teachers 20 (33.3 %) have moderately agree option. The second large group of teachers 13 (21.7 %) declare that they slightly agree with this idea.

Table 4.26. I can keep a few problem students from ruining an entire class

			Q26					Total	
			OPTIONS						
			strongly disagree	moderately Disagree	slightly disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree	
SCHOOL TYPES	HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS	N %	2 3,3 %	3 5,0 %	6 10,0 %	12 20,0 %	23 38,3 %	14 23,3 %	60 100,0%
	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	N %	3 5,0 %	2 3,3 %	5 8,3 %	11 18,3 %	28 46,7 %	11 18,3 %	60 100,0%
Total		N %	5 4,2 %	5 4,2 %	11 9,2 %	23 19,2 %	51 42,5 %	25 20,8 %	120 100,0%
$X_o^2 = 11.07$			$X_c^2 = 1.385$			df= 5		p= 0.05	

A quick glance at table 4.26 shows that there is no significant difference between the levels ($\chi^2 = 1.3 < \chi^2 = 11.07$). Table 4.26 reveals that 28 (46.7 %) of the secondary school teachers chose “moderately disagree” as an option. Some of the secondary school teachers 11 (18.3 %) strongly agree with the statement. Just 2 (3.3 %) of the teachers moderately disagree with it. On the other hand, 23 of the high school teachers (38.3 %) state out that they moderately agree and usually apply this way. It is seen that very small amount of teachers, thus 2 (3.3 %) of the teachers strongly disagree and they do not keep problem students from ruining an entire class.

Table 4.27. If parents would do more with their children at home, I could do more with them in the classroom.

			Q27					Total	
			OPTIONS						
			strongly Disagree	slightly disagree	slightly disagree	moderately agree	strongly agree		
SCHOOL TYPES	HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS	N %		1 1,7 %	6 10,0 %	19 31,7 %	34 56,7 %	60 100,0%	
	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	N %	1 1,7 %		7 11,7 %	16 26,7 %	36 60,0 %	60 100,0%	
Total		N %	1 ,8 %	1 ,8 %	13 10,8 %	35 29,2 %	70 58,3 %	120 100,0%	
$X_o^2 = 11.07$			$X_c^2 = 2.391$			df=4		p= 0.05	

It can be concluded from the results in Table 4.27 that there is no significant difference between the levels ($\chi^2 = 2.3 < \chi^2 = 11.07$). Table 4.27 reveals that just 1 (1.7 %) of secondary school teachers chose “strongly disagree” as an option. Some of the secondary school teachers 16 (26.7 %) moderately agree with the statement. A large of number of the teachers 36 (60 %) chose strongly agree option. On the other hand, 34 of the high school teachers (56.7 %) state out that they strongly agree with

the statement. It is seen that very small amount of teachers, thus 1 (1.7 %) of the teachers slightly disagree and they do not share this opinion.

Table 4.28. If students stop working in class, I can usually find a way to get them back on track.

			Q28					Total
			OPTIONS					
			strongly Disagree	slightly disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree	
SCHOOL TYPES	HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS	N %		2 3,3 %	10 16,7 %	35 58,3 %	13 21,7 %	60 100,0%
	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	N %	1 1,7 %	3 5,0 %	10 16,7 %	31 51,7 %	15 25,0 %	60 100,0%
Total		N %	1 ,8 %	5 4,2 %	20 16,7 %	66 55,0 %	28 23,3 %	120 100,0%
$X_o^2 = 11.07$			$X_c^2 = 1.585$		df= 4		p= 0.05	

The findings in Table 4.28 reveal that there is no significant difference between the two different school types ($\chi^2 = 1.5 > \chi^2 = 11.07$). As table 4.28 shows 35 of the high school teachers (58.3 %) state out that they moderately agree with the statement. 2 (3.3 %) of the teachers state out that they slightly disagree with the statement. On the other hand secondary school teachers, 1 of the teachers (1.7 %) state that they do not share this idea, 31 of the teachers (51.7 %) have the same idea with it and they moderately agree with the statement.

Table 4.29. If a student did not remember information I gave in a previous lesson, I would know how to increase his/her retention in the next lesson.

			Q29					Total	
			OPTIONS						
			strongly disagree	moderately disagree	slightly disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree	
SCHOOL TYPES	HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS	N %	1 1,7 %	2 3,3 %	4 6,7 %	4 6,7 %	36 6,0 %	13 21,7 %	60 100,0%
	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	N %		1 1,7 %	1 1,7 %	8 13,3 %	29 48,3 %	21 35,0 %	60 100,0%
Total		N %	1 ,8 %	3 2,5 %	5 4,2 %	12 10,0 %	65 54,2 %	34 28,3 %	120 100,0%
$X_o^2 = 11.07$			$X_c^2 = 7.103$		df= 5		p= 0.05		

There is no significant difference between the levels ($\chi^2 = 7.1 < \chi^2 = 11.07$) when Table 4.29 is examined. Table 4.29 displays that a great proportion 36 (60 %) of the high school teachers share positive point of view on the statement and they say moderately agree. 13 (21.7 %) of the teachers strongly agree with it. As to the subjects who use strongly disagree, this constitutes 1 (1.7 %) of the teachers. Also, it reveals that a majority of secondary school teachers 29 (48.3 %) have moderately agree option. The second large group of teachers 21 (35 %) declare that they slightly agree with this strategy in their lessons.

Table 4.30. Home and peer influences are mainly responsible for student behaviour in school.

		Q30 OPTIONS						Total
		strongly disagree	moderately Disagree	slightly disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree	
SCHOOL TYPES	HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS	N 1 % ,8 %		3 2,5 %	12 10,0 %	19 15,8 %	25 20,8 %	60 100,0%
	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	N % %	2 1,7 %	1 ,8 %	8 6,7 %	26 21,7 %	23 19,2 %	60 100,0%
Total	N % %	1 ,8 %	2 1,7 %	4 3,3 %	20 16,7 %	45 37,5 %	48 40,0 %	120 100,0%
$X_o^2 = 11.07$		$X_c^2 = 5.972$		df= 5		p= 0.05		

Application of chi-square test indicates that there is no statistical difference between the teachers. Since the critical table value ($\chi^2 = 11.07$) being at $p=0.05$ level is greater than the observed value $\chi^2 = 5.9$, there is no significant difference between the groups (Table 4.30). Approximately all the groups agree with the statement. None of the teachers chose ‘strongly disagree’ as an option in secondary school teachers.

Table 4.31. Teachers have little effect on stopping misbehaviour when parents do not cooperate.

			Q31					Total	
			OPTIONS						
			strongly disagree	moderately Disagree	slightly disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree	
SCHOOL TYPES	HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS	N %	1 1,7 %	5 8,3 %	8 13,3 %	13 21,7 %	20 33,3 %	13 21,7 %	60 100,0%
	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	N %	5 8,3 %	2 3,3 %	5 8,3 %	15 25,0 %	15 25,0 %	18 30,0 %	60 100,0%
Total		N %	6 5,0 %	7 5,8 %	13 10,8 %	28 23,3 %	35 29,2 %	31 25,8 %	120 100,0%
$X_o^2 = 11.07$				$X_c^2 = 6.308$		df= 5		p= 0.05	

As shown in Table 4.31, the results reveal that there is no significant difference between the levels ($\chi^2 = 6.3 < \chi^2 = 11.07$). The thirty-first statement in questionnaire is about the effect of teachers on stopping misbehaviour when parents do not cooperate. 20 (33.3 %) of the high school teachers state that they moderately agree with this statement. Additionally, 13 (21.7 %) of the teachers strongly agree with it. However, 8 (13.3 %) of teachers have not got the same idea and they slightly disagree with the statement. On the part of the secondary school teachers, great number of teachers 18 (30 %) chose "slightly disagree" as an option. 15 (25 %) of the teachers moderately agree with this statement.

Table 4.32. The influences of a student's home experiences can be overcome by good teaching.

			Q32					Total	
			OPTIONS						
			strongly disagree	moderately disagree	slightly disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree	
SCHOOL TYPES	HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS	N %	1 1,7 %	1 1,7 %	5 8,3 %	21 35,0 %	22 36,7 %	10 16,7 %	60 100,0%
	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	N %	2 83,3 %	4 6,7 %	4 6,7 %	19 31,7 %	21 35,0 %	10 16,7 %	60 100,0%
Total		N %	3 2,5 %	5 4,2 %	9 7,5 %	40 33,3 %	43 35,8 %	20 16,7 %	120 100,0%
$X_o^2 = 11.07$			$X_c^2 = 2.368$		df= 5		p= 0.05		

When Table 4.32 is examined, the findings indicate that at 0.05 level of significance, their results of chi-square test is found lower than the critical table value of χ^2 (11.07), thus the difference of the teachers is not statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 2.3 < \chi^2 = 11.07$). It is seen that most of the teachers agree that the influences of

a student's home experiences can be overcome by good teaching. As table 4.32 shows approximately 22 of the high school teachers (36.7 %) state out that they moderately agree with the statement. 1 (1.7 %) of the teachers state out that they strongly disagree with the statement. On the other hand secondary school teachers, 2 of the teachers (3.3 %) state that they do not agree with this statement, 21 of the teachers (35 %) have the same idea with it and they moderately agree with the statement.

Table 4.33. Even a teacher with good teaching abilities may not reach many students.

		Q33 OPTIONS						Total
		strongly disagree	moderately Disagree	slightly disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree	
SCHOOL TYPES	HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS	N 9 15,0 %	6 10,0 %	1 1,7 %	19 31,7 %	18 30,0 %	7 11,7 %	60 100,0%
	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	N 4 6,7 %	4 6,7 %	7 11,7 %	14 23,3 %	15 25,0 %	16 26,7 %	60 100,0%
Total	N %	13 10,8 %	10 8,3 %	8 6,7 %	33 27,5 %	33 27,5 %	23 19,2 %	120 100,0%
$X_o^2 = 11.07$		$X_c^2 = 11.375$			df= 5		p= 0.05	

When looked at Table 4.33, it can be seen that there is a slight difference between the levels ($\chi^2 = 11.37 > \chi^2 = 11.07$). While approximately the half of the high school teachers agree with the statement, the rest of them disagree with the statement. When we look at the total 44 (73.4 %) of high school teachers state out that they have the same opinion with the statement. 16 of the teachers (26.7 %) state that they absolutely disagree with it. On the other hand secondary school teachers, 45 of them (75 %) state that they agree with this idea and 15 (25 %) of teachers disagree with the statement.

Table 4.34. Compared to other influences on student behaviour, teachers' effects are very small.

			Q34					Total	
			OPTIONS						
			strongly disagree	moderately Disagree	slightly disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree	
SCHOOL TYPES	HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS	N %	12 20,0 %	20 33,3 %	14 23,3 %	10 16,7 %	2 3,3 %	2 3,3 %	60 100,0%
	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	N %	13 21,7 %	21 35,0 %	11 18,3 %	9 15,0 %	6 10,0 %		60 100,0%
Total		N %	25 20,8 %	41 34,2 %	25 20,8 %	19 15,8 %	8 6,7 %	2 1,7 %	120 100,0%
$X_o^2 = 11.07$			$X_c^2 = 4.477$			df= 5		p= 0.05	

There is no significant difference between the levels ($\chi^2 = 4.4 < \chi^2 = 11.07$) when Table 4.34 is examined. Table 4.34 displays that a great proportion 20 (33.3 %) of the high school teachers share negative point of view on the statement and they say moderately disagree. 10 (16.7 %) of the teachers slightly agree with it. As to the subjects who use strongly agree, this constitutes 2 (3.3 %) of the teachers. Also, it reveals that a majority of secondary school teachers 21 (35 %) have moderately disagree option. The second large group of teachers 13 (21.7 %) declare that they strongly disagree with this opinion.

Table 4.35. I am confident of my ability to begin the year so that students will learn to behave well.

			Q35					Total
			OPTIONS					
			strongly Disagree	slightly disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree	
SCHOOL TYPES	HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS	N %		1 1,7 %	12 20,0 %	31 51,7 %	16 26,7 %	60 100,0%
	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	N %	1 1,7 %	1 1,7 %	4 6,7 %	38 63,3 %	16 26,7 %	60 100,0%
Total		N %	1 .8 %	2 1,7 %	16 13,3 %	69 57,5 %	32 26,7 %	120 100,0%
$X_o^2 = 11.07$			$X_c^2 = 5.710$		df= 4		p= 0.05	

The results in Table 4.35 reveal that there is no significant difference between the levels ($\chi^2 = 5.7 < \chi^2 = 11.07$). As table 4.35 shows approximately 31 (51.7 %) of the high school teachers state out that they moderately agree with the statement. 16 (26.7 %) of the teachers strongly agree with it. None of the teachers chose 'strongly disagree' as an option. On the other hand 38 (63.3 %) of the

secondary school teachers have the same idea with it and just 2 (3.3 %) of them both slightly and strongly disagree with the statement.

Table 4.36. I have very effective classroom management skills.

		Q36 OPTIONS				Total
		slightly disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree	
SCHOOL TYPES	HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS	N 1 1,7 %	N 11 18,3 %	N 33 55,0 %	N 15 25,0 %	N 60 100,0%
	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	N 1 1,7 %	N 12 20,0 %	N 33 55,0 %	N 14 23,3 %	N 60 100,0%
Total		N 2 1,7 %	N 23 19,2 %	N 66 55,0 %	N 29 24,2 %	N 120 100,0%
X _o ² =11.07		X _c ² = ,078		df= 3		p= 0.05

The findings in Table 4.36 reveal that there is no significant difference between the two different school types ($\chi^2 = .078 < \chi^2 = 11.07$). As table 4.36 shows 33 of the high school teachers (55 %) state out that they moderately agree with the statement. 15 (25 %) of the teachers state out that they strongly agree with the statement. On the other hand secondary school teachers, 1 of the teachers (1.7 %) state that they do not share this idea, 33 of the teachers (55 %) have the same idea with it and they moderately agree with the statement.

4.3. THE RESULTS OF THE INTERVIEW AND CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Research Question 3: Is there any significant relationship between the teachers' self-efficacy and classroom management skills for disruptive behaviour? How do they define disruptive behaviour? How do they handle disruptive behaviour in their classes?

The focus of the interview analyses presented in this study is on qualitative examples of the strategies providing the evidence of the teachers' awareness of managing the classroom strategies use and learning their point of view about disruptive behaviour. The interview and Classroom Management questionnaire were analysed together since the questions of the interview and the statements of the questionnaire are parallel to each other. Besides, not only the interview but also the classroom management questionnaire was conducted with the same four English Language teachers. Results from the interview revealed the following conclusions.

4.3.1. THE RESULTS OF THE INTERVIEW

In this study, ten questions were asked to four English language teachers and wanted to be answered.

The first question of the interview was about the meaning of disruptive behaviour or in another words misbehaviour. Definitions and descriptions of misbehaviour vary according to school, teachers' judgement and expectations of the classroom behaviour. Although some behaviours were labelled as "misbehaviour" by certain teachers, they were not defined as "misbehaviour" by others. Because of this possibility, teachers were asked to specify the behaviours which they regarded as misbehaviours. When teachers were asked to define misbehaviour in classroom context, they stated misbehaviour mostly as; disturbing the flow of lesson, dealing with other things, talking to friends, and making noise.

The following extracts are given to illustrate teachers' definition of misbehaviours;

Misbehaviour is behaving and speaking in a way that disturbs oneself and other students' attention such as asking irrelevant questions, hitting and talking/chatting with the peer. (SS-Teacher C)

Some students have lack of interest, talk with their neighbours, especially chew gum, and do not listen to the lesson. (HS-Teacher A)

As seen above, any behaviour which affects the flow of learning and teaching procedures is defined as a misbehaviour.

The second question of the interview was about classroom management and it was the most difficult question for the teachers. They could not find the words to define and they spent much time to express themselves. The secondary school teachers said that they felt themselves luckier than high school teachers in classroom management.

The examples are;

...err..Oops! Actually, it is the thing that I am practicing while teaching.. But I have not thought about it before...Classroom management shows who is the authority. If there is not problem, it means that the class is being managed and the authority is obvious. (HS-Teacher A)

...OK. Let me think, I think, it is the reflection of my all teaching and personal ability. It is related with the students' age I think..and I am luckier than a high school English language teacher. (SS- Teacher C)

The third question of the interview was the causes of misbehaviour. According to the findings of interviews, English teachers focused particularly on the characteristics of parents, media, socio-economic level, class size and students' indifference as the primary causes of misbehaviour.

The following are examples of how English teachers indicated characteristics of parents as a reason of misbehaviours;

...family structure is not pleasant. Most of the students' parents are very poor. Parents are indifferent and they have low education level...(SS-Teacher D)

...To me family is the main source of all the misbehaviours at school. My students are not loved by their parents. They are beaten most of the time at home or at work. Thus they hit each other and then say we are only joking teacher. They come to school without any aims, having dilemmas of what is right...(HS-Teacher A)

Media refers to any mass media means including television and radio programs, newspapers, magazines and so forth. The following extracts illustrate media as an important factor influencing students' behaviours in classroom;

...It influences in a negative way. Generally, it influences the language students use. Students' way of speaking has changed. For instance, soap operas such as Avrupa Yakası, Kurtlar Vadisi have influence on students' behaviours and their speech. They call each other with the nick names they have learnt from these soap operas. (HS-Teacher A)

Class size were also reported as important factor influencing students' behaviours in classroom. For example, one of the teachers emphasised negative effects of class size by saying;

...Some classes include 40-50 students so it is inevitable that these kinds of behaviours are seen more. That is to say, having eye contact with students is important in diminishing misbehaviour... (SS-Teacher C)

In 4th question, teachers were asked to identify types of misbehaviour they encountered in their classes, they showed behaviours such as; "disturbing the flow of lesson, dealing with other things, talking to friends, making noise, asking indifferent questions and easily getting angry (being rebellious)" as the most frequently encountered misbehaviour.

Moreover, teachers reported that "talking without permission, disobeying the rules, eating in class (chewing gum), being spoiled, and making jokes to each other" were also misbehaviours they encountered.

Here are some of the quotations from the interviews emphasizing these behaviours;

In 7th graders, making jokes, speaking with neighbours, chewing gum in class, and changing seats without permission are mostly seen misbehaviours. They are not destroying problems as in 8th graders. (SS-Teacher D)

10th graders are exactly in adolescence. So they get easily angry- rebellious, try to be the leader among their friends, and talk without permission. Girls are fond of make up. They step up to the sexuality, grow up physically, date out, fail in lessons, disobey the rules. (HS-Teacher B)

The fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth questions of the interview were all about the handling strategies of the teachers. The findings of the interview showed that teachers have two main handling strategies: prevention and intervention. Preventive strategies are used before the disruption occurs. In other words, a teacher prepares the classroom atmosphere in such a way that s/he eliminates the potential sources for misbehaviours. On the other hand, intervention means attending to the disrupting action there and then. The teacher starts dealing with the disruption after it occurs.

Although teachers were not aware about preventive strategies, some of them mentioned it indirectly. *Planning more effective lessons* is a strategy where “teacher anticipates potential disruption sources and eliminates them through his/her effective instructional planning.” An effective lesson plan would keep students on task and lessen the time spent for handling with misbehaviours. Participant C exemplifies her types of activities to attract the student’s attention.

.... The main aim, here, is to keep the students comfortable and busy. I usually try to have them choose the activities they want to do. Songs or games are their favorites. This way I really have less disruption in my classes. (SS-Teacher C)

The following quotations show some examples from the interviews emphasizing verbal warning, communicating with parents and using eye contact;

.....I talk during the break about their behaviours. If the behaviours that influence the flow of lesson continuously goes on I write a letter to the parents in order to inform them. I warn students during the lesson. Some students properly understand my eye-contact, some understand my words... (SS-Teacher D)

The following examples indicate threatening, giving punishments, giving responsibilities and changing seats;

...In general, at first I use eye-contact with students. If student still goes on misbehaving, I warn him/her by calling his/her name. I threaten him/her by giving a minus. I warn them about sending them administration. Moreover, if the type of misbehaviour is severe such as swearing to friends or behaving disrespectfully towards me I make them fill the disciplinary form. (HS-Teacher A)

...Generally I talk to the whole class even though it lasts for one lesson. I warn them. Sometimes I shout at them loudly. I threaten them with marking them. If these are repeated for three times I send them to disciplinary. If necessary, I talk to them after lesson as a friend. I give these kind of students some responsibility in the first hours of my lesson... As a punishment I give them homework, and change their seats mostly I want them to sit in front of the teacher's table...(SS-Teacher C)

While the teachers of English in Secondary schools prefer to talk to the psychological counselor of the school for misbehaving students, the teachers of English language in High schools just inform the administrators or prefer to solve the problem on their own.

The following quotations show some examples from the interviews about getting help when the teachers need to deal with misbehaviour.

...No, I do not. I do not need to. Beginning years of my job, I used to send students to the administrators. (HS-Teacher B)

...I get help from psychological counselor of school. (SS-Teacher D)

The 9th question was about teachers' competence, how much they feel confident about their teaching, whether they feel confident about different aspects of their teaching. For example, their knowledge of subject matter, or the way they deliver their knowledge... their classroom management, or whatever comes to their mind.

...Yeah, I feel confident about knowledge of subject matter, the way I deliver it.. It think... I have been teaching for a long time...but I think I need some training...but not short term ones.. long term ones... because I think we always have something learn. There are lots of new things. I think it would be nice to renew my knowledge, or ... types to... styles of teaching...methods of teaching... this would be nice. (HS-Teacher B)

...knowledge of subject matter ... I mean ... I feel competent as much as my colleagues feel competent. I don't think I am highly good... actually I don't know to what extent I am good or bad.... Average....(SS-Teacher D)

The last question of the interview was that whether the teachers feel successful in classroom management. As secondary school English language teachers think that being successful in classroom management depends the students

and parents, high school English language teachers think that they are absolutely successful.

The examples are;

...It depends upon the views of students and parents. Yet, I think I am successful. (SS-Teacher C)

...Yes. I think so. Because, I have no problems in lessons. (HS-Teacher D)

4.3.2. THE RESULTS OF THE CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

There were thirty-six statements in the classroom management questionnaire and these items were filled by four English language teachers who answered the questions of the interview. The teachers were the same teachers who were involved in the interview study.

According to the findings, secondary and high school English language teachers' point of view about classroom management were slightly different from each other. For example, the fifth statement of the questionnaire was answered in a different way by both groups. While high school English language teachers comes to the class prepared for the lesson, secondary school English language teachers marked this statement as "disagree" and they accepted that they did not do any kind of preparation for their classroom. Also as in sixth statement, when secondary school English language teachers were tired, they reflects it to themselves and their students and that day they preferred to rest at the table by giving their students class homework. However, high school English language teachers were going on having lesson even if they were tired and ill.

When looked at the twenty-fourth statement of the questionnaire, it can be easily seen that high school English language teachers tried to solve the discipline problems using his/her mimics and gestures instead of interrupting the lesson flow. On the other hand, secondary school teachers preferred to reprimand the students shouting at them if there were misbehaving students.

By the same token, secondary school English language teachers marked "strongly agree" option about being in a strict mood in order to control the class while high school English language teachers answered this item as "strongly disagree".

Having analysed all the items, four teachers shared almost the same opinion about classroom management except a few statements.

4.4. SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

The findings of this study show similarities and differences between secondary and high school teachers' self efficacy for classroom management in EFL communication. How much stress teachers experience, the factors they see as the reasons for classroom management problems, and the kinds of methods they use to manage their classes are considered while commenting on the similarities and differences between the groups.

The results of chi-square test showed that there were not significant differences between secondary and high school English language teachers' self-efficacy for classroom management in EFL communication. However, secondary and high school English language teachers were slightly different from one another in terms of their point of view about classroom management, misbehaviour, its causes and the ways of handling misbehaviour in classroom management.

According to the results of the interview, four English teachers mentioned most frequently encountered misbehaviours in their lessons as; disturbing the flow of lesson, dealing with other things, talking to friends and making noise. Additionally, the classroom management questionnaire showed that secondary and high school English language teachers have almost same ideas and they were aware of their managing skills.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

5.1. PRESENTATION

This chapter deals with the conclusion of this study. First, the research questions are answered. Then, the implications of the study and suggestions for future study are presented.

5.2. DISCUSSION

This study aimed at investigating the difference between the teachers' self-efficacy in secondary and high schools and also to understand the differences between secondary and high school teachers' beliefs about classroom management, specifically about disruptive behaviour, its causes and how the teachers handle them effectively. The ultimate purpose of the study is to examine the lack of research into teachers' self-efficacy in the field of EFL. Thus, the study aimed to find answers to the following research questions.

1. Is there a significant difference between teachers' self-efficacy for classroom management in EFL communication regarding high school and secondary school?
2. How do the secondary and high school English teachers' self-efficacy relate to each other?
3. Is there any significant relationship between the teachers' self-efficacy and classroom management skills for disruptive behaviour? How do they define disruptive behaviour? How do they handle disruptive behaviour in their classes?

The participants of the study were 120 secondary and high school English language teachers who were at the time of the study working in various secondary and high schools in Kahramanmaraş. In order to collect appropriate data, teacher self-efficacy scale questionnaire, semi-structured interview and classroom management questionnaire were used as data collection tools.

When the results were evaluated the following findings were gained:

First of all, Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale made it clear that the participants were not aware of their self-efficacy and its importance before the study. However, after the questionnaire, they started to discover this magic power on their own and their eyes shone with having very crucial teaching and learning element. They were interested in the questionnaire very much and wanted to have sources about this issue. The results of the chi-square test showed that there were no significant differences in English language teachers' self-efficacy for classroom management in EFL communication. Having analysed the data, it can be easily understood that the value of chi-square was bigger than the result and there were not differences between secondary and high school English language teachers' self-efficacy for classroom management.

Secondary and high school English language teachers' perceptions of student misbehaviours include such behaviours as; disturbing the flow of lesson, making noise, dealing with other things, talking to friends, coming to school without any preparation, complaining about friends to the teacher, shouting at friends, hitting, kicking or pushing friends, and talking without permission.

In the studies conducted in our country and abroad, behaviours that are defined as misbehaviours are; talking without permission, bothering the other students, making noise, and so on. Some misbehaviours have similarities with the interview and questionnaire results of the present study. For instance; in secondary classes of private elementary school, Başar (1994) observed the following student misbehaviours; disturbing friends, leaving seats without reason, talking without permission, and not doing the assigned tasks.

Wragg (1993) had similar results from his study in England. He revealed that talking loudly or secretly, wandering in class, not using the course materials properly, not obeying the teacher and taking others' possessions without permission were the most frequently observed misbehaviours in primary schools.

According to the study conducted by Johnson, Oswald and Adey (1993), it was found that ‘talking without permission was mostly encountered in the ‘seldom’ proportion. However, according the results of present study this type of misconduct was indicated as ‘usually’ encountered. In the study, conducted by DES (1989) in England ‘talking without permission’ was the misbehaviour which teachers teachers mostly struggled with. In the study carried out by Türnüklü (1999) talking aloud, disturbing friends, using class materials inappropriately, and wandering aimlessly were mostly encountered misbehaviours in Turkish and English classes.

Sayın’s study (2001) also shares similarities with the present study to some extent. That is to say, talking without permission and making noise were the misbehaviours teachers ‘mostly’ experienced. This study shares similarities with Burden ’s (1993) study in that in both studies talking without permission, talking to friends, wandering aimlessly, making noise, dealing with other things and disturbing the flow of lesson were encountered as misbehaviours.

Another remarkable result of the interview was about English teachers’ perceptions of causes of student misbehaviours. Secondary and high school English language teachers mentioned such reasons as; characteristics of parents, class size, socio-economic level, media, teachers’ making discrimination between students, teacher inconsistent in applying class rules, teacher’s not giving importance to his/her students and teacher’s lacking of communication abilities.

Sayın’s study (2001) also shares similarities with the present study. That is to say, misbehaviours stemmed initially from some negative behaviours of teachers and students’ family mostly in both studies. In relation to family, Aksoy (1999) stated that family problems, family’s indifference to child education, their negative attitudes towards their child and media were among the most important reasons of misbehaviour.

As children enter adolescence, changes take place in the nature of their friendships. In general, adolescents spend more time with their peers than they do with family members (Slavin, 1997). Adolescents who have harmonious friendships also report higher levels of self-esteem, are less lonely, do better in school than adolescents who do not have supportive friendship (Savin-Williams and Berndt, 1990).

By 7th grade, same-sex friends are perceived to be as supportive as parents (Furman and Buhrmester, 1992). Conformity to peer pressure is highest among 11 to

13-year-olds, but by late adolescence, conformity to peer pressure has decreased back to levels found in middle childhood (Berndt, 1979). As with elementary school-aged children, popular and well-accepted adolescents tend to display academic skills, prosocial behaviour and leadership qualities, whereas rejected and low accepted children tend to display aggressive and antisocial behaviour and low levels of academic performance (Parkhurst and Asher, 1992; Wentzel, 1991a; Wentzel and Erdley, 1993). In the present study some examples related to these kinds of factors were stated in the interviews by teachers. Some of the teachers mentioned about academic difference and its influence on students misbehaviour in the following examples;

Most adolescents experience emotional conflicts at some point since they are going through rapid and dramatic changes in body image, expected roles, and peer relationships. Thus, the transition from elementary to a higher level of school can be stressful (Harter, Whitesell and Kowalski, 1992; Hirsh and Redkin, 1987; Simmons, Burgeson, Carleton-Ford and Blyth, 1987).

Leifer, Gordon and Graves (1974) have shown that even violent models on TV can influence a student's aggressive behaviour. These views also support the interview findings of this study done with teachers.

When the English language teachers asked the ways of handling misbehaving students, they preferred to apply different strategies for their students. While secondary school English language teachers mostly applied verbal strategies such as; verbal warning, ignoring and threatening, high school English language teachers chose talking with students, communicating with parents, using eye contact and giving responsibilities as intervention strategies in handling misbehaviour. Moreover, English teachers expressed that their intervention strategies mostly did not differ depending upon the level of class.

Differences seen in questionnaire and interview results may stem from teachers' not realizing the intervention strategies they apply and applying some intervention strategies automatically and not stating these strategies during the interviews. These findings share similarities with the results of Atıcı's (1999) study done with primary school teachers in Turkey and England. Atıcı found that Turkish teachers mostly use such strategies as; commands, signs, and looking at students in dealing with misbehaviours. Keskin (2002) indicated that warning with words is the most commonly used strategy in handling misbehaviour. Moreover, he stated that

about one to three teachers preferred this strategy initially. The reason why teachers mostly use verbal warnings may stem from the idea that this strategy stops the misbehaviour immediately which is why teachers may apply this strategy automatically.

Using signs and ignoring are the strategies mentioned in the literature as mostly used strategies. Weinstein (1996) suggested that using signals is a nonverbal strategy used by teacher without disturbing other students. The reason why teachers use these strategies most often may stem from teachers not wanting to disturb the flow of lesson or not distracting other students. Ignoring may be used when misbehaviour is not too distracting.

In this study, it is found that teachers generally apply positive strategies such as verbal warning, communicating with parents, talking with students, using eye contact, and giving responsibilities as the intervention strategies. Moreover, it is seen that teachers apply negative strategies such as threatening, insulting, giving punishments, and shouting “seldomly”. As Gnagey (1981) suggests yelling, threatening, ridicule, nagging, and so on are all forms of verbal punishment that are often used in the classroom.

One similar point between teachers in both groups is their critical review of their own behaviour while answering the interview. When four teachers were evaluated together, teachers did not mark a majority of the items in the classroom management questionnaire as a different. One more striking finding of the classroom management questionnaire was the different point of view of the teachers. Although secondary school English language teachers saw and felt comfortable and lucky themselves, high school English languages were more responsible and bound to their job.

5.3 IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study showed that teachers did not use a particular systematic approach in dealing with misbehaviour and often ignored these behaviours. This attitude may stem from teachers’ not knowing how to cope with misbehaviours. Participants usually were in a dilemma about which strategy is preferable for which problems. Sometimes they even described their situation as being in a bottomless hole. They had many strategies in their repertoires; however, they could not pick which one to

employ. On the other hand, sometimes they felt helpless because they could not find any solutions for some recurring disruptions.

This study demonstrates that the participants needed more practical experience before they started working full-time. During these practical sessions, the terminology may be over-emphasized. Personal and peer reflections, whole class discussions as well as simulations with samples from real practice teaching may help participants to empower themselves in terms of handling unwanted student behaviours. Teaching methodology classes as well as classroom management courses are both important to provide the closest simulations of the teaching experience. Such courses may also provide student teachers with more preventive skills such the use of effective teaching materials. From this point of view, in-service and pre-service teacher education programmes should be given to teachers. During these education, teachers will be able to learn necessary information about classroom management, be aware of such problems beforehand and learn strategies to come over those. Moreover, they will have the opportunity of forming relations with their colleagues about different views and encourage cooperation with each other.

Educational seminars should be given to the teachers of secondary and high schools about behaviour management; how to deal with them and also about institutes that teachers can obtain help from. These seminars should be organized in cooperation with universities and psychological research centers.

Psychological counselors working in schools should be in cooperation with teachers continuously on how to deal with misbehaviours. Thus, teachers will be more aware of these behaviours and intervene to them at the right time.

All the teachers in a school should determine a common policy in handling misbehaviours and apply it systematically.

5.4. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This study was conducted in almost 40 state schools of Kahramanmaraş city Center district . In a similar study, the scope of the study may be enlarged and private schools may be included. In this way, private schools and state schools may be compared.

This study was conducted with secondary and high school English language teachers' self-efficacy in English lessons. A similar study may be conducted with

other levels and in different lessons. Thus, lessons may be compared in different aspects.

Misbehaviour is a large area to investigate. It is important to highlight that in this study only some aspects of student misbehaviour were investigated.

In another study, teacher misbehaviours and related issues may be researched thoroughly. Moreover, interview with parents may be included in another research so that causes of misbehaviours may be developed and analyzed in more detail from the perspective of parents. Management problems in classes are one of the major reasons for the teachers to quit the profession. In spite of this fact, an official document about burnout rates of teachers due to misbehaviours could not be found in the archive of relevant institutions in Turkey. Such a report would be very beneficial in terms of interpreting the results of this study. Thus, to fill the gap in the field a holistic study is suggested to find out the percentage of burnout and teacher retention.

REFERENCES

- Aksoy, N.(1999). *Classroom management and students discipline in elementary schools of Ankara*. Doktora Tezi, OHIO: University of Cincinnati.
- Alan, B. (2003). *Novice teachers' perceptions of an in-service teacher training course at Anadolu University*. Unpublished master's thesis, Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Ashton, P. T. & Webb, R. B. (1986). *Making A Difference: Teachers' Sense of Efficacy and Student Achievement*. London and New York: Longman.
- Aspin, D. N., Chapman, J. D., & Wilkinson, V. R. (1994). *Quality schooling: A pragmatic approach to some current problems, topics, and issues*. Cassell. London. 43-56.
- Atıcı, A.(2004). *İlköğretim 1. kademe öğretmenlerinin sınıf içi problem davranışlara yönelik müdahalelerinin incelenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Adana.
- Atıcı, M.(1999). *An exploration of the relationships between classroom management strategies and teacher efficacy in English and Turkish primary school teachers*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Leicester University.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioural change. *Psychological Review*. 84, 191-215.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (Ed.) (1995). *Self-efficacy in changing societies*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge. 50-54.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. W.H. Freeman and Company. New York. 52:1-26.
- Baron, M. A. (1990). Who's to blame for misbehaviour in our schools?. *The Clearing House*. 63, 333-334.

- Başar, H. (1994). *Sınıf yönetimi*. Pegem Özel Eğitim Hizmetleri Ltd.Şti. Ankara.
- Berndt, T.(1979). Developmental changes in conformity to peers and parents. *Developmental Psychology*, 15, 608-616.
- Best, J. W. & Khan, J. V. (1998). *Research in education* (8th ed.). Allyn and Bacon. London.
- Brantlinger, E. (1993). Adolescent's interpretation of social class influences on schooling. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*. 28 (1), 1-12.
- Brophy, J. E. & Evertson, C. (1976). *Learning From Teaching: A Developmental Perspective*. Allyn and Bacon. Boston.
- Brophy, J.E. (1983). Classroom organisation and management. *The Elementary School Journal*. 83 (4), 265-285.
- Brophy, J. (1988). Educating teachers about managing classrooms and students. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. 4 (1), 1-18.
- Brouwers, A., & Tomic, W. (2000). A longitudinal study of teacher burnout and perceived self-efficacy in classroom management [electronic version]. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16, 239-53.
- Brownell, M. T., & Pajares, F. M. (1996). The influence of teachers' efficacy beliefs on perceived success in mainstreaming students with learning and behavior problems: A path analysis [electronic version]. *Research Bulletin*, 27, 11-24.
- Bru, E., Stephens, P., and Torsheim, T. (2002). Students' perceptions of class management and reports of their own misbehavior. *Journal of School Psychology*, 40(4), 287-307.
- Burden, P.R. (1995). *Classroom management and discipline*. Longman. New York.
- Charles, C.M. (1999). *Building classroom discipline*. (6th ed.). Longman. New York.
- Cotton, K. (1990). School Improvement Research Series. School Wide and Classroom Discipline. *School Improvement Research Series*, December, 1-20.
- Curvin, R. (1992). *Rediscovering hope: Our greatest teaching strategy*. Bloomington, Ind. National Educational Service.
- Daloğlu, E. M. (2002). *Teacher perceptions on classroom management in teaching English as a foreign language*. Master Thesis, Uludağ University Institute of Social Sciences, Bursa.

- Deci, E. L., Ryan, R. M., Gagne, M., Leone, D. R., Usunov, J., & Kornazheva, B. P. (2001). Need satisfaction, motivation, and well-being in the work organizations of a former Eastern Bloc country. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 930-942.
- Dembo, M.H. & Gibson, S. (1985). Teachers' sense of efficacy: an important factor in school improvement. *The Elementary School Journal*. 86 (2), 173-184.
- Demirden, (1994). *Effective approaches to classroom management in teaching English at secondary schools*. Master Thesis, Middle East Technical University Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara.
- DES (1989). Discipline in Schools. *The Elton Report*, HMSO. London.
- Docking, J. (1987). *Managing Behaviour in the Primary School*. David Fulton Publishers. London.
- Doyle, W. (1986). Classroom organization and management. In M. C. Wittrock. (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching*. (3rd ed.). Macmillan. New York. 392-431.
- Doyle, D. (1990). Classroom management techniques. In O. C. Moles (Ed.), *Student Discipline Strategies: Research and Practice*. State University of New York Press.
- Duke, D.L. (1976). Who misbehaves?- A high school studies its discipline problems, educational administration. *Quarterly*, 12, 65-85.
- Dweck, C. S. (2000). *Self-theories: Their role in motivation, personality, and development*. Psychology Press. Philadelphia.
- Ekmekçi, Ö. (1999). *Research manual for social sciences*.(Vol.2). Selt Publishing. Turkey.
- Elton Report. (1989). *Discipline in schools: Report of the Committee of Enquiry*. DES and the Welsh Office, GBDS. London.
- Emmer, E.T. & Hickman, J. (1991). Teacher efficacy in classroom management and discipline. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. 51, 755-765.
- Erden, M. (1998). *Öğretmenlik mesleğine giriş*. Alkım Yayınları. İstanbul.
- Finn, J. D., Pannazzo, G. M. & Voelkl, K. E. (1995) Disruptive and inattentive withdrawn behaviour and achievement among fourth grades. *The Elementary School Journal*. 95 (5), 421-434.

- Freiberg, H. J., Stein, T. A. & Huang, S. (1995) Effects of a classroom management intervention on student achievement in inner-city elementary schools. *Educational Research & Evaluation*, 1 (1), 36-66.
- Froyen, L.A & Iverson, A.M.(1999). *Schoolwide and classroom management*. The Reflective Educator-Leader, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, pp. 128- 129, 193-209, 217, 221, 256-258.
- Furman, W., & Buhrmester, D.(1992). Age and sex differences in perceptions of networks of personal relationships. *Child Development*, 63, 103-105.
- Giallo, R., & Little, E. (2003). Classroom behavior problems: The relationship between preparedness, classroom experiences, and self-efficacy in graduate and student teachers [electronic version]. *Australian Journal of Educational & Developmental Psychology*, 3, 21-34.
- Gibson, S. & Dembo, M.H. (1984) Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 76 (4), 569-582.
- Gnagey, W. J. (1981). *Motivating classroom discipline*. University Press of America, Inc.
- Hargreaves, D. H., Hester, S. K. & Mellor, F. J. (1975). *Deviance in Classrooms*. Routledge & Kegan Paul. London.
- Harmer, J. (1983). *The practice of English language teaching*. Longman. London.
- Harmer, J. (2003). *The practice of English language teaching*. (3rd ed.) Longman. Essex.
- Harter, S., Whitesell, N. R., & Kowalski, P. (1992). Individual differences in the effects of educational transitions on young adolescents' perceptions of competence and motivational orientation. *American Educational Research Journal*, 29, 777-807.
- Henson, R. K. (2001, February). *Relationships between preservice teachers' selfefficacy, task analysis, and classroom management beliefs* [electronic version]. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Henson, R. K., Kogan, L. R., & Vacha-Haase T. (2001). A reliability generalization study of the teacher efficacy scale and related instruments. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 61, 404-420.

- Hoy, W. K., & Woolfolk, A. E. (1993). Teachers' sense of efficacy and the organizational health of schools [electronic version]. *The Elementary School Journal*, 93, 355-372.
- Johnson, B., Oswald, M. & Adey, K. (1993). Discipline in South Australian primary schools. *Educational Studies*, 19 (3), 289-305.
- Jones, V. F. & Jones, L. S. (1998). *Comprehensive Classroom Management: Creating Communities of Support and Solving Problems*. (5th ed.), Allyn and Bacon. Boston.
- Keskin, M.A. (2002). Sınıf Öğretmenlerinin Karşılaştıkları İstenmeyen Öğrenci Davranışları ve Kullandıkları Başetme Yolları. *Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. Ankara.
- Kızıldağ, A. (2007). *A Longitudinal study on English language teachers' beliefs about disruptive behaviour in classrooms: Case studies from practicum to the first-year in the profession*. A Ph. D. Dissertation. Çukurova University Social Sciences Institutes, Adana.
- Kounin, J. S. (1970). *Discipline and Group Management in Classrooms*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Lasley, T. J. & others (1989). *Activities and desists used by more and less effective classroom managers*. Ohio:US.
- Leifer, A. D., N. J. Gordon, and S.B. Graves. (1973). Classroom management in the elementary grades. In D. L. Duke (ed.). *Classroom Management*, NSSE Yearbook II, University of Chicago Pres, Chicago. 182-216.
- Lemlech, J. K. (1998). *Classroom management: Methods and techniques for elementary and secondary teachers*. Longman. New York.
- Levin, J. And Nolan, J.F. (1991). *Principles of classroom management: A hierarchical approach*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Lewis, R. (2001). Classroom discipline and student responsibility: the students' view [electronic version]. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 307-319.
- Lickona, T. (1992). *Educating for character: How our schools can teach respect and responsibility*. Bantam Books. London.
- Lund, R. (1996). *A Whole-School Behaviour Policy*. Kogan Page. London.

- Martin, N. K. & Baldwin, B. (1996). *Perspectives regarding classroom management style: Differences between elementary and secondary teachers*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Assosiation, New Orleans.
- McGuinness, J. (1993). *Teachers, Pupils and Behaviour: A managerial approach*. Cassell. London.
- McNamara, S. & Moreton, G. (1995). *Changing Behaviour: Teaching children with emotional and behavioural difficulties in primary and secondary classrooms*. David Fulton Publishers. London.
- Melby, L. C. (1995) *Teacher Efficacy and Classroom Management: A study of Teacher Cognition, Emotion, and Strategy Usage Associated With Externalising Student Behaviour*. Ph.D. dissertation., University of California. California.
- Nunan, D., & Lamb, C. (1996). *The self-directed teacher: Managing the learning process*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.
- Özen, A. and Batu, S. (1999). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin sınıf kontrolüne yönelik sorunlarının ve gereksinim duydukları destek hizmet türlerinin belirlenmesi. 4. *Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kongresi Bildirileri 1*. Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları 1076. Eskişehir.
- Öztürk, B. (2003). Sınıfta İstenmeyen Davranışların Önlenmesi ve Giderilmesi. *Sınıf Yönetimi*. Ed: E.Karip. Pagem Yayıncılık. Ankara.
- Pajares, F. (2002). *Overview of social cognitive theory and of self-efficacy*. Retrieved February, 5,2004, from <http://www.emory.edu/EDUCATION/mfp/eff.html>.
- Parkhurst, J. T., & Asher, S. R. (1992). Peer rejection in middle school: Subgroup differences in behaviour, loneliness, and interpersonal concerns. *Developmental Psychology*, 28, 231-241.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and methods*. (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, Sage. California.
- Pintrich, P. R., & Schunk, D. H. (2002). *Motivation in Education: Theory, research, and applications* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Purkey, W. W. & Novak, J. M. (1984). *Inviting School Success: A Self-Concept Approach to Teaching and Learning*. Wadsworth Publishing Company Belmont. California.

- Rademacher, J.A., Callahan, K and Pedersonseelye, V.A. (1998). How do your classroom rules measure up-guidelines for developing an effective rule management routine. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 33 (5), 284-289.
- Rancifer, J.L. (1995). *Revolving classroom door: Management strategies to eliminate the quick spin*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Regional Association of Teacher Educators, Lake Charles, Arizona.
- Raudenbush, S., Rowen, B. & Cheong, Y. (1992). Contextual effects on the self-perceived efficacy of high school teacher. *Sociology of Education*, 65, 150-167.
- Robbins, P., & Alvy, H. B. (1995). *The principal's companion: Strategies and hints to make the job easier*. Corwin Press. London.
- Ross, J.A., Cousins, J.B. & Gadalla, T. (1996). Within-teacher predictors of teacher efficacy. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. 12 (4),385-400.
- Ross, J. A., Hogaboam-Gray, A., & Hannay, L. (2001, April). *Effects of teacher efficacy on computer skills and computer cognitions of Canadian students in K-3* [electronic version]. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle.
- Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalised expectations for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs*. 80, 1-28.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L (2002). Overview of self-determination theory: An organismic dialectical perspective. In E. L. Deci & R. M. Ryan (Eds.), *Handbook of self-determination research* (pp. 3-33). The University of Rochester Press. Rochester, NY.
- Sayın, N. (2001). *Sınıf öğretmenlerinin karşılaştıkları istenmeyen öğrenci davranışları ve bu davranışların nedenlerine ilişkin görüşleri ile istenmeyen davranışları önleme yöntemleri*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Anadolu Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Eskişehir.
- Schunk, D. H., & Pajares, F. (2002). The development of academic self-efficacy. In A. Wigfield & J. Eccles (Eds.), *Development of achievement motivation* (pp. 16-31). Academic Press. San Diego.
- Slavin, R. E. (1997). *Educational psychology*. (5th ed.). Allyn and Bacon.

- Stensmo, C.(1995, April). Classroom management styles: two case studies. *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Assosiation*. San Fancisco, 18-22.
- Sönmez, V. (1994). *Program geliřtirmede öğretmen el kitabı*. PEGEM Yayınları. No :12, 7. Basım. Ankara.
- Şentuna, E. (2002). *The interests of EFL instruction in Turkey regarding INSET content*. Unpublished master's thesis, Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Taş, S. (2002, September). Students' expectations of teachers' classroom management behaviour in foreign language teaching classes. *The 1st International Symposium on Modern Approaches Methods and ELT Problems*. 5-7 Isparta.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk, A. & Hoy, W.K. (1998) Teacher efficacy: its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research*. 68 (2), 202-248.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct [electronic version]. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 783-805.
- Turanlı, A. S. (1999). *Influence of teachers' orientations to classroom management on their classroom behaviors, students' responses to these behaviors, and learning environment in ELT classrooms*. PHD. Thesis, The Middle East Technical University, Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara.
- Türnüklü, A. (1999). *Classroom management in Turkish and English primary classrooms*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Leicester.
- Türnüklü, A. & Galton, M. (2001). Students' misbehaviours in Turkish and English primary classrooms. *Educational Studies*, 27(3).
- Ur, P. (1999). *A course in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.
- Ünver, M. M. (2004). *An exploration of perceived self-determination and self-efficacy of EFL instructors in a Turkish state university*. Master Thesis, University of Bilkent.
- Weinstein, C.S. (1996). *Secondary classroom management*. McGraw-Hill.
- Weishew, N. L. & Peng, S. S. (1993) Variables predicting students' problem behaviours. *Journal of Educational Research*. 87 (1), 5-17.

- Wentzel, K.R., & Erdley, C.A. (1993). Strategies for making friends: Relations to social behaviour and peer acceptance in early adolescence. *Developmental Psychology* 29, 819-826.
- Wheldall, K. & Merrett, F. (1988). 'Which classroom behaviours do primary school teachers say they find most troublesome?'. *Educational Review*. 40, 13-27.
- Wilks, R. (1996). Classroom management in primary schools: a review of the literature. *Behaviour Change*. 13 (1), 20-32.
- Woolfolk, A. E., & Hoy, W. K. (1990). Prospective teachers' sense of efficacy and beliefs about control [electronic version]. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82, 81-91.
- Woolfolk, A. E., Rosoff, B. & Hoy, W. K. (1990). Teachers' sense of efficacy and their beliefs about managing students. *Teaching & Teacher Education*. 6 (2), 137-148.
- Wragg, E. C. (1993). *Primary teaching skills*. London: Routledge.
- Wragg, E. C. (1995). *Primary Teaching Skills*. Routledge. London & New York.
- Yılmaz, E. (2004). *The relationship between novice and experienced teachers' self-efficacy for classroom management and students' perceptions of their teachers' classroom management*. Unpublished master's thesis, Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Yin, R. K. (1994). Case study research: *Design and methods* (2nd ed.). Applied social research methods series: Vol. 5. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Zabel, M.K., and Robert, H. (1996). *Classroom management in context: Orchestrating positive learning environments*. Houghton Mifflin Company. USA.
- Zembylas, M. (2004). The emotional characteristics of teaching: An ethnographic study of one teacher. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20, 185-201.

APPENDIX I
Informed Consent Form

Dear Colleague,

My name is Sibel Ulusoy. I am an MA TEFL student at Gaziantep University. You are invited to participate in my research study investigating the relation between teachers' beliefs about their capabilities in teaching (self-efficacy).

This form explains the research study. Please read the form and talk to the researcher about any questions you may have. Then, if you agree to participate in the study, please sign and date this form in front of the person who explained the study to you. You will be given a copy of this form to keep.

You will be asked to take the survey which is designed to explore teachers' sense of self-efficacy. The survey consists of 36 questions and your participation in this experiment will take approximately 30 minutes. Eight of the participants will be interviewed regarding the Survey results. The interview will take approximately 20 minutes. You will be asked to write your names on the survey which is required to select interviewees. Because the study focuses on teachers' sense of self-efficacy and the interviewees will be selected considering the level of their self-efficacy. However, all responses will be treated as confidential, and your individual privacy will be maintained in all presented and published data resulting from the study.

Sibel Ulusoy.

I have read the explanation provided to me. I have had all my questions answered to my satisfaction, and I voluntarily agree to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this consent form.

Name and Signature of the Participant

Date

.....

.....

APPENDIX II**THE SURVEY**

PART A : Please answer the following questions as appropriate.

Name : _____

Gender: **M** Female **T** Male

Years of Experience : _____

Years of experience at your school: _____

The name of your school : _____

Your BA degree : *(please check the appropriate one for you)*

e Teaching English as a Foreign Language

T English Language and Literature

T American Culture and Literature

T Translation and Interpretation

T Other (Please specify) _____

Your MA and/or PhD degree : *(please specify the field)*

PART :B TEACHING QUESTIONNAIRE

MHow many years have you been teaching English including this year?

.....

Please indicate the degree to which you disagree or agree with each item by circling the appropriate numeral to the right of each statement. There are no correct or incorrect answers.

Your responses will remain confidential.

Key:

1 = Strongly disagree **2** = Moderately disagree **3** = Slightly disagree
4 = Slightly agree **5** = Moderately agree **6** = Strongly agree

DISAGREE	AGREE					
TEACHER SELF-EFFICACY SCALE						
	Strongly	Moderately	Slightly	Slightly	Moderately	Strongly
1. When a student does better than usual, many times it is because I exerted a little extra effort.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. If a student in my class becomes disruptive and noisy, I feel assured that I know some techniques to redirect him quickly.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. The hours in my class have little influence on students compared to the influence of their home environment.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. I find it easy to make my expectations clear to students.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. I know what routines are needed to keep activities running efficiently.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. There are some students who won't behave (well), no matter what I do.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. I can communicate to students that I am serious about getting appropriate behavior.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. If one of my students couldn't do an assignment I would be able to accurately assess whether it was at the correct level of difficulty.	1	2	3	4	5	6

DISAGREE	AGREE						
		Strongly	Moderately	Slightly	Slightly	Moderately	Strongly
		TEACHER SELF-EFFICACY SCALE					
9. I know what kinds of rewards to use to keep students involved.		1	2	3	4	5	6
10. If students aren't disciplined at home, then they aren't likely to accept it at school.		1	2	3	4	5	6
11. There are very few students that I don't know how to handle.		1	2	3	4	5	6
12. If a student doesn't feel like behaving (well),there's not a lot teachers can do about it.		1	2	3	4	5	6
13. When a student is having trouble with an assignment, I am usually able to adjust it to his/her level.		1	2	3	4	5	6
14. Student misbehavior that persists over a long time is partly a result of what the teacher does or doesn't do.		1	2	3	4	5	6
15. Student behavior in classrooms is more influenced by peers than by the teacher.		1	2	3	4	5	6
16. When a student gets a better grade than usual, it is probably because I found better ways of teaching that student.		1	2	3	4	5	6
17. I don't always know how to keep track of several activities at once.		1	2	3	4	5	6
18. When I really try, I can get through to most difficult students.		1	2	3	4	5	6
19. I am unsure how to respond to defiant (refusing to obey) students.		1	2	3	4	5	6
20. A teacher is very limited in what can be achieved because a student's home environment is a large influence on achievement.		1	2	3	4	5	6
21. I find some students to be impossible to discipline effectively.		1	2	3	4	5	6
22. When the grades of my students improve,it is usually because I found more effective teaching approaches.		1	2	3	4	5	6
23. Sometimes I am not sure what rules are appropriate for my students.		1	2	3	4	5	6
24. If a student masters a new concept quickly this might be because I knew the necessary steps in teaching the concept.		1	2	3	4	5	6
25. The amount that a student can learn is primarily related to family background.		1	2	3	4	5	6

DISAGREE	AGREE							
TEACHER SELF-EFFICACY SCALE			Strongly	Moderately	Slightly	Slightly	Moderately	Strongly
			26. I can keep a few problem students from ruining an entire class.	1	2	3	4	5
27. If parents would do more with their children at home, I could do more with them in the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5	6		
28. If students stop working in class, I can usually find a way to get them back on track.	1	2	3	4	5	6		
29. If a student did not remember information I gave in a previous lesson, I would know how to increase his/her retention in the next lesson.	1	2	3	4	5	6		
30. Home and peer influences are mainly responsible for student behavior in school.	1	2	3	4	5	6		
31. Teachers have little effect on stopping misbehavior when parents don't cooperate.	1	2	3	4	5	6		
32. The influences of a student's home experiences can be overcome by good teaching.	1	2	3	4	5	6		
33. Even a teacher with good teaching abilities may not reach many students.	1	2	3	4	5	6		
34. Compared to other influences on student behavior, teachers' effects are very small.	1	2	3	4	5	6		
35. I am confident of my ability to begin the year so that students will learn to behave well.	1	2	3	4	5	6		
36. I have very effective classroom management skills.	1	2	3	4	5	6		

APPENDIX III

Interview Questions

- 1- What is disruptive behavior?
- 2- What is classroom management?
- 3- What do you think about the possible reasons of disruptive behaviour?
 - a) How does classroom environment (conditions, materials, class size) affect misbehaviours?
 - b) Do parents' education level influence students' behaviours in courses?
 - c) How do the media influence students' behaviours in courses?
- 4- Are there misbehaviour types peculiar in your classes? What kind of disruptive behaviors have you met so far?
- 5- How do you cope with them?
 - a) Do you have certain methods?
 - b) Do you explain your expectations from students in terms of classroom management at the beginning of the semester?
 - c) Do you intervene verbally and tell disruptive students to end their behaviors?
- 6- What kind of precautions should be taken not to have disruptive behaviors in the class?
- 7- Do your intervention strategies differ depending upon the level of classes?
- 8- Do you get any help when you have problems in dealing with misbehaviour?
Who are these people ?
- 9- Do you feel confident about your knowledge of subject matter, the way you deliver knowledge or your classroom management ability?
- 10- Do you think you are successful in classroom management ?

APPENDIX IV

INTERVIEW NOTES OF TEACHER A

- 1) Some students' having lack of interest, talking with the neighbour, especially chewing gums, not listening to the lesson.
- 2) ...err..Ooops! Actually, it is the thing that I am practicing while teaching.. But I have not thought about it before...Classroom management shows who is the authority. If there is not problem, it means that the class is being managed and the authority is obvious.
- 3) a) During the lesson, they communicate with their eyes. They throw papers to each other.
- b) Parents cannot observe children. They don't know with whom they make friends. They make friendship with very immoral people. ...To me family is the main source of all the misbehaviours at school. My students are not loved by their parents. They are beaten most of the time at home or at work. Thus they hit each other and then say we are only joking teacher. They come to school without any aims, having dilemmas of what is right.
- c) It influences in a negative way. Generally, it influences the language students use. Students' way of speaking has changed. For instance, soap operas such as Avrupa Yakası, Kurtlar Vadisi have influence on students' behaviours and speech. They call each other with the nick names they have learnt from these soap operas.
- 4) They are influenced from each other. Because, they are models of each other.
- 5) It changes. If there are a lot of misbehaving students, I react more.
- 6) I call them and talk with them. I call students' parents. I tell administrators.
- 7) ...In general, at first I use eye-contact with students. If student still goes on misbehaving, I warn him/her by calling his/her name. I threaten him/her by giving a minus. I warn them about sending them administration. Moreover, if the type of misbehaviour is severe such as swearing to friends or behaving disrespectfully towards me I make them fill the disciplinary form.
- 8) Beforehand, we sent students to psychological counselor. We inform administrators. Yet, they are not under control. They can cheat their parents.
- 9) Yes, I think so.
- 10) Yes.

TEACHER B

- 1) In my opinion misbehaviour is not dealing with the lessons, dealing with other things, making noise are misbehaviours. In other words, eating in the class, talking with the neighbours, chatting, making jokes with every word are examples of misbehaviour.
- 2) err...It is an ability that seperates good teacher from an ordinary teacher..It is not told but practised.
- 3) Students' indifference, boredom, family problems or since they are the only child of their family they try to be the leader of the class too.
 - a) We do not have any lack of materials in the class. Class size can be one of the factors influencing students' behaviours. For instance, in a class with 20 students everything could be better.
 - b) Students having educated families are interested in the lesson. They are fonder of the lessons. About their behaviours, some are very spoilt, some are not. It changes from student to student.

- c) It influences completely. For instance, the music they listen, the films, soap operas they watch affect their behaviours.
- 4) 10th graders are exactly in adolescence. So they get easily angry- rebellious, try to be the leader among their friends, and talk without permission. Girls are fond of make up. They step up to the sexuality, grow up physically, date out, fail in lessons, and disobey the rules.
- 5) Generally, I try to solve the problems by talking. If their behaviours do not change even though my warnings, I talk and communicate with their parents. I tell them that their names are given to the administrators. I tell them they may be sent away from their schools. It really works students change.
- 6) I use warning, reminding the rules, shouting.
- 7) No. It doesn't change much. Generally, the methods that I use are the same. Yet, the way that I apply my methods may change according to the levels of classes.
- 8) No, I do not. I do not need to. Beginning years of my job, I used to send students to the administrators.
- 9)...Yeah, I feel confident about knowledge of subject matter, the way I deliver it. I think... I have been teaching for a long time... But I think I need some training... But not short term ones. Long term ones... because I think we always have something learn. There are lots of new things. I think it would be nice to renew my knowledge, or... types to... style of teaching... methods of teaching... this would be nice.
- 10) Yes, I think so. I try to help my students love the lesson without any pressure. And I believe that I achieve this.

TEACHER C

- 1) Misbehaviour is behaving and speaking in a way that disturbs oneself and other students' attention such as asking irrelevant questions, hitting and talking/chatting with the peer.
- 2) OK. Let me think, I think, it is the reflection of my all teaching and personal ability. It is related with the students' age I think..and I am luckier than a high school English language teacher.
- 3) Completely, the reason stems from the general feature of the students and their psychological mood . For instance, hyperactive students misbehave mostly.
- a) Class size is appropriate in our school. Some classes include 40-50 students so it is inevitable that these kinds of behaviours are seen more. That is to say, having eye contact with students is important in diminishing misbehaviour. When I use materials students' misbehaviour lessens 50 % percent. However in English lesson, materials are not sufficient. For instance, there are not computers in classes.
- b) It influences greatly. Families who know how to grow a child deal with their children a lot. Therefore, their children are more successful in courses than students with low socio-economic conditions. However, students with low socio-economic conditions are more respectful.
- c) They watch TV too much, which also hinders their lessons. They go to internet cafes.
- 4) 7th grade students are exactly in adolescent period. So they easily get angry rebellious, try to be leader among their friends and talk without permission. Girls are fond of making up. They step up to the sexuality, grow up physically, date out, fail in lessons, disobey the rules.
- 5) Yes. I pay attention to 7th and 8th classes more. I try to treat in a way that both what they want and what I want come true. I find the half way for two sides. Discipline is necessary for the people that live in a society. It is beneficial to behave

sensitively when the students are in adolescence period. For instance, when a student says to you 'It is none of your business' in the middle of a lesson, it is not a nice situation... Experience teaches a lot. There are 40 students in a class which means 40 characters. A teacher should consider everything before s/he treats. A student whom I warned to sit down, said he would not and left the class immediately. Then I talked to him during the break and he apologized to me. The main aim, here, is to keep the students comfortable and busy. I usually try to have them choose the activities they want to do. Songs or games are their favorites. This way I really have less disruption in my classes.

6) I get angry and sometimes I insult on them even though I don't want. Sometimes I beat them on their hands or send away to outside. Initially, I look into their eyes. When I can not bear, I apply other methods. However what works best is when I use offensive words while talking. At that time they feel humiliated and change their behaviours.

7) ...Generally I talk to the whole class even though it lasts for one lesson. I warn them. Sometimes I shout at them loudly. I threaten them with marking them. If these are repeated for three times I send them to disciplinary. If necessary, I talk to them after lesson as a friend. I give these kind of students some responsibility in the first hours of my lesson... As a punishment I give them homework, and change their seats mostly I want them to sit in front of the teacher's table...

8) I get help from psychological counselor. Sometimes I observe teachers who are efficient to me. I am a bit strict. There is no limit in success. The solution does not lie on us only. We need to renew ourselves.

9) Yes certainly.

10) ...It depends upon the views of students and parents. Yet, I think I am successful.

TEACHER D

1) Instead of getting information, being students' interest on other things, fighting . It may stem from teachers or students. Psychological problems also lead to misbehaviour. They may have problems in acquiring models of positive behaviour. Lack of preschool education is a factor. Students work. They have low socioeconomic conditions, use a different language in their lives and in teaching dimension. So they have language problems. Language causes misbehaviour. They make harm to the materials. They learn by living. They feel that they are excluded.

2) Classroom management keeps many abilities in it. If you can not control all of them at the same time, then you will have problems.

3) a) Of course. Physical conditions in class are not healthy. The class size is more than ideal. It takes time to model their teachers since they are influenced by friends in their surrounding.

b) This school is full of examples. Students feel that they are excluded in every way such as culturally, economically. When they see others' gaining what they wish, they feel failure. Family structure is not pleasant. Most of the students' parents are very poor. Parents are indifferent and they have low education level.

c) It influences much.

4) In 7th graders, making jokes, speaking with neighbours, chewing gum in class, and changing seats without permission are mostly seen misbehaviours. They are not destroying problems as in 8th graders.

5)-

6) I talk during the break about their behaviours. If the behaviours that influence the flow of lesson continuously goes on I write a letter to the parents in order to inform

them. I warn students during the lesson. Some students properly understand my eyecontact, some understand my words. I haven't sent a student to the administrator up to now. I haven't beat my student for 19 years.

8) I get help from psychological counselor of school.

9) ...knowledge of subject matter ... I mean ... I feel competent as much as my colleagues feel competent. I don't think I am highly good... actually I don't know to what extent I am good or bad.... Average...

10) Yes, I think so. Because I have no problems in lessons.

APPENDIX V

CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

MHow many years have you been teaching English including this year?

.....

Please indicate the degree to which you disagree or agree with each item by circling the appropriate numeral to the right of each statement. There are no correct or incorrect answers.

Your responses will remain confidential.

Key:

1 = Strongly disagree 2 = Moderately disagree 3 = Slightly disagree
4 = Slightly agree 5 = Moderately agree 6 = Strongly agree

DISAGREE	AGREE						
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE		Strongly	Moderately	Slightly	Slightly	Moderately	Strongly
		1	2	3	4	5	6
1. The teacher speaks to the students disdainfully.		1	2	3	4	5	6
2. The teacher tries to learn the names of the students in order to call them with their names.		1	2	3	4	5	6
3. The teacher is aware of the difficulties the students may face while learning English and accepts them sympathetically.		1	2	3	4	5	6
4. The teacher treats the students understandingly and patiently who have difficulty learning English.		1	2	3	4	5	6
5. The teacher comes to the class prepared for the lesson.		1	2	3	4	5	6
6. When the teacher is tired, s/he reflects this to the class.		1	2	3	4	5	6
7. The teacher keeps his/her willingness to teach throughout the sessions.		1	2	3	4	5	6
8. The teacher has a smiling face throughout the sessions.		1	2	3	4	5	6
9. The teacher speaks English at a level the students do not have difficulty understanding.		1	2	3	4	5	6
10. The teacher adjusts the transitions between exercises so that the students do not have difficulty following them.		1	2	3	4	5	6

DISAGREE	AGREE							
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE			Strongly	Moderately	Slightly	Slightly	Moderately	Strongly
			1	2	3	4	5	6
11. The teacher tries various teaching techniques in order to attract the students to the lesson.			1	2	3	4	5	6
12. When preparing the students for pair or group work, s/he uses the time efficiently.			1	2	3	4	5	6
13. When the students are distracted, the teacher makes changes in the lesson flow that can attract the students.			1	2	3	4	5	6
14. If there is any grammatical structure related to the subject being studied, the teacher writes it clearly on the board.			1	2	3	4	5	6
15. The teacher gives clear and understandable instructions for the exercises to be done.			1	2	3	4	5	6
16. During the lessons, the students can hear clearly what the teacher is saying.			1	2	3	4	5	6
17. The teacher gives each student equal opportunity to participate in the class.			1	2	3	4	5	6
18. The teacher deals with certain students more closely.			1	2	3	4	5	6
19. The teacher helps us to overcome our timidity while we are trying to speak English.			1	2	3	4	5	6
20. The teacher tries to have the students gain the confidence that they can learn English very well.			1	2	3	4	5	6
21. The teacher tries to encourage the students to take part in class activities.			1	2	3	4	5	6
22. The teacher keeps monitoring the class while s/he is giving any explanation related to the lesson.			1	2	3	4	5	6
23. The teacher spends most of the time by his/her desk.			1	2	3	4	5	6
24. The teacher tries to solve the discipline problems using his/her mimics and gestures instead of interrupting the lesson flow.			1	2	3	4	5	6
25. The teacher reprimands the students shouting at them.			1	2	3	4	5	6
26. The teacher is in a strict mood in order to control the class.			1	2	3	4	5	6
27. The teacher loses the control of the class while calling roll.			1	2	3	4	5	6
28. During the lesson, the teacher monitors each student carefully in order to see how they are doing the task.			1	2	3	4	5	6
29. The teacher gives satisfactory answers to the questions that the students ask.			1	2	3	4	5	6

DISAGREE	AGREE							
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE			Strongly	Moderately	Slightly	Slightly	Moderately	Strongly
			30. While the students are doing any classroom task, the teacher walks around the students and helps them.	1	2	3	4	5
31. The teacher gives satisfactory correctives related to the mistakes that the students have made.	1	2	3	4	5	6		
32. After a writing task, the teacher asks different students to read their work.	1	2	3	4	5	6		
33. The teacher provides the students with the time they may need when s/he asks comparatively slow learners any questions.	1	2	3	4	5	6		
34. In order to reinforce, the teacher provides the students with the opportunity of practicing what they have studied.	1	2	3	4	5	6		
35. The teacher asks different students various questions related to the subject in order to check whether the subject has been understood.	1	2	3	4	5	6		
36. The teacher sets challenging assignments related to important topics.	1	2	3	4	5	6		

CURRICULUM VITAE

Sibel Ulusoy was born in Gaziantep in 1980. She graduated from the Foreign Language Education Department English Language Teaching Program at Çukurova University in 2005. She has a presentation submitted to national conference of Yüzüncü Yıl University in Van. She speaks English fluently and she has survival French skills. She has been working as an English language teacher at 19 Mayıs High School in Kahramanmaraş since 2005.

ÖZGEÇMİŞ

Sibel Ulusoy 1980 yılında Gaziantep'te doğdu. Çukurova Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü İngilizce Öğretmenliği Programı'ndan 2005 yılında mezun olmuştur. Van Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi ulusal konferansına sunduğu bir çalışması bulunmaktadır. İyi derecede İngilizce konuşmaktadır. Aynı zamanda temel düzeyde Fransızca bilgisine sahiptir. 2005 yılından beri Kahramanmaraş 19 Mayıs Lisesinde İngilizce öğretmeni olarak çalışmaktadır.