



TEACHERS' SELF-EFFICACY AND CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT SKILLS IN EFL CLASSROOMS

SINIF- İÇİ YÖNETİMİNDE İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN ÖZ YETERLİLİĞİ VE SINIF YÖNETİMİ YETENEKLERİ

Filiz Yalçın TILFARLIOĞLU*
Sibel ULUSOY**

Abstract

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 2009- 2010 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 of learners.

Öz

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, 2009-2010 güz döneminde Kahramanmaraş merkezdeki farklı ilköğretim ve liselerde çalışan toplam 120 İngilizce öğretmeni ile gerçekleştirilmiştir. Veriler hem niteliksel hem de niceliksel yöntemler kullanılarak yordanmıştır. Bulgular 2 ayrı anket ve görüşmeler aracılığıyla edinilmiştir. Öğretmenlere uygulanan anketler aracılığıyla, öğretmenlerin sınıf içi yönetimindeki öz yeterlilikleri ölçülmüştür. Rastgele seçilmiş 4 katılımcıyla yapılan görüşmeler ve sınıf yönetimi anketi aracılığıyla, öğretmenlerin sınıf yönetimiyle ilgili duyguları, deneyimleri ve uygulamaları konusunda daha detaylı bilgi edinilmesini sağlamıştır.

Veriler sınıf içi yönetiminde ilköğretim ve lise İngilizce öğretmenleri arasında iletişim odaklı öz-yeterlilik bağlamında bir farklılık olmadığını ve İngilizce öğretmenlerinin sınıf içi istenmeyen davranışları ve nedenleri algılamaları konularında görüşlerinin farklılıklar sergilediğini ortaya çıkarmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Öz Yeterlilik, Sınıf Yönetimi, Öğretmen Yetiştirme, Öğrencilerin istenmeyen Davranışları.

* Gaziantep Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Öğretim Üyesi

** Kahramanmaraş Anadolu Lisesi

1. INTRODUCTION

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.

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.

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).

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.

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).

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 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.

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. 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.

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).

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.

"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).

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.

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).

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.

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. How do teachers of ELT define disruptive behavior? How do they handle disruptive behaviour in their classes?

2. METHOD

2.1. 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; 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.

2.2. 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 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 wellknown 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. 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. A structured interview was used in the study in order to learn more about the actual practices, feelings, and thoughts of the teachers concerning classroom management problems. In short the researchers aimed at finding an answer to the question: *What goes on really in ELT classroom settings?*

2.3. Design and Procedure

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 notebooks 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 researchers 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. 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.

2.4. Data Analysis

The data gathered through the instruments was analysed by using qualitative and quantitative analysis techniques. The qualitative data collected through interview was analysed seperately. 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. A chi-square test is applied to each item in the SPSS 39 (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) to determine whether the results are statistically significant, as represented by a probability value of $p < 0.05$.

3. RESULTS

The answers of the students given to each statement is examined one by one below:

When results of statement 1; when a student does better than usual, many times it is because I exerted a little extra effort, 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 X_{0^2} (11.07), thus the difference of the teachers is not statistically significant $X_c^2 = 8.7 < X_{0^2} = 11.07$). It is seen that most of the teachers agree that student does better because of their extra effort. A quick glance at statement 2; if a student in my class becomes disruptive and noisy, I feel assured that I know some techniques to redirect him quickly, shows that there is no significant difference between the levels ($X_c^2 = 3.1 < X_{0^2} = 11.07$). 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 of number of the teachers 33 (55%) moderately agree with it. 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. The results in satatement 3; the hours in my class have little influence on students compared to the influence of their home environment clearly show that there is no significant difference between the levels ($X_c^2 = 6.9 < X_{0^2} = 11.07$). 16 (26.7%) of the high school teachers state that they moderately agree with this statement.

There is no significant difference between the levels ($X_c^2 = 1.1 < X_{0^2} = 11.07$) when statement 4; I find it easy to make my expectations clear to students, is examined, it 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. The results in statement 5; I know what routines are needed to keep activities running efficiently, clearly show that there is no significant difference between the levels ($Xc^2 = 6.9 < X_o^2 = 11.07$). 16 (26.7%) of the high school teachers state that they moderately agree with this statement. When looked at statement 6; there are some students who won't behave (well) no matter what I do, it can be seen that there is a slight difference between the levels ($Xc^2 = 11.19 > X_o^2 = 11.07$). 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.

Application of chi-square test in statement 7; I can communicate to students that I am serious about getting appropriate behavior, indicates that there is no statistical difference between the teachers. Since the critical table value ($X_o^2 = 11.07$) being at $p=0.05$ level is greater than the observed value $\chi^2 = 5.4$, there is no significant difference between the groups. Approximately all the groups agree with the statement. None of the teachers chose "strongly disagree" option. The findings in statement 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, reveal that there is no significant difference between the two different school types ($Xc^2 = 4.5 > X_o^2 = 11.07$). As it shows approximately 28 of the high school teachers (46.7%) state out that they moderately agree with the statement. A quick glance at statement 9; I know what kinds of rewards to use to keep students involved, shows that there is no significant difference between the levels ($Xc^2 = 1.7 < X_o^2 = 11.07$). It 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 of 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.

The results in statement 10; if students aren't disciplined at home, then they aren't likely to accept it at school) reveal that there is no significant difference between the levels ($Xc^2 = 3.4 < X_o^2 = 11.07$). Approximately 19 (31.7%) of the high school teachers state out that they strongly agree with the statement.

There is no significant difference between the levels ($Xc^2 = 1.6 < X_o^2 = 11.07$). The results in statement 11; there are very few students that I don't know how to handle, displays that a great

proportion 18 (30%) of the high school teachers share this idea and they say slightly agree. The results in statement 12; if a student doesn't feel like behaving (well),there's not a lot teachers can do about it) clearly show that there is no significant difference between the levels ($X_c^2 = 4.2 < X_o^2 = 11.07$). 15 (25%) of the high school teachers state that they strongly disagree with this statement. When statement 13; when a student is having trouble with an assignment, I am usually able to adjust it to his/her level, 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 X_o^2 (11.07), thus the difference of the teachers is not statistically significant ($X_c^2 = 2.7 < X_o^2 = 11.07$). 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. Approximately 24 of the high school teachers (40%) state out that they strongly agree with the statement.

There is no significant difference between the levels ($X_c^2 = 3.8 < X_o^2 = 11.07$) when statement 14; student misbehavior that persists over a long time is partly a result of what the teacher does or doesn't do, is examined. A 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. The findings in statement 15; student behavior in classrooms is more influenced by peers than by the teacher, reveal that there is no significant difference between the two different school types ($X_c^2 = 4.06 > X_o^2 = 11.07$). 20 of the high school teachers (33.3%) state out that they moderately agree with the statement. The results in statement 16; when a student gets a better grade than usual, it is probably because I found better ways of teaching that student, reveal that there is no significant difference between the levels ($X_c^2 = 6.4 < X_o^2 = 11.07$). As table 4.16 shows that 21 (35%) of the high school teachers state out that they moderately agree with the statement. A quick glance at statement 17; I don't always know how to keep track of several activities at once, shows that there is no significant difference between the levels ($X_c^2 = 4.9 < X_o^2 = 11.07$). 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 of 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.

Data displayed in statement 18; when I really try, I can get through to most difficult students, reveals that there is no significant difference between the levels ($X_c^2 = 3.1 < X_o^2 = 11.07$). 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. The data in statement 19; I am unsure how to respond to defiant (refusing to obey) students, states that there is no difference between the levels of the teachers related with how to answer to defiant students ($Xc^2 = 3.1 < X_{o^2} = 11.07$). 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.

It can be concluded from the results of statement 20; a teacher is very limited in what can be achieved because a student's home environment is a large influence on achievement, that there is no significant difference between the levels ($Xc^2 = 8.5 < X_{o^2} = 11.07$). 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 number of the teachers 25 (41.7%) chose moderately agree option. According to the results of statement 21; I find some students to be impossible to discipline effectively, there is no significant difference between the levels ($Xc^2 = 4.1 < X_{o^2} = 11.07$). 15 (25%) of the high school teachers state out that they slightly agree with the statement. Statement 22; when the grades of my students improve, it is usually because I found more effective teaching approaches clearly indicates that there is no significant difference between the levels ($Xc^2 = 6.4 < X_{o^2} = 11.07$). 26 (43.3%) of the high school teachers state out that they moderately agree with the statement. As results of statement 23; sometimes I am not sure what rules are appropriate for my students, reveal that there is no significant difference between the levels ($Xc^2 = 3.2 < X_{o^2} = 11.07$). 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.

When statement 24; if a student masters a new concept quickly this might be because I knew the necessary steps in teaching the concept, 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 X_{o^2} (11.07), thus the difference of the teachers is not statistically significant ($Xc^2 = 4.6 < X_{o^2} = 11.07$). 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. 34 of the high school teachers (56.7%) state out that they moderately agree with the statement. There is no significant difference between the levels ($Xc^2 = 1.5 < X_{o^2} = 11.07$) when statement 25; the amount that a student can learn is primarily related to family background, is examined. 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.

A quick glance at statement 26; I can keep a few problem students from ruining an entire class, shows that there is no significant difference between the levels ($Xc^2 = 1.3 < X_{o^2} = 11.07$). 28 (46.7%) of the secondary school teachers chose "moderately disagree" as an option. 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. It can be concluded from the results in statement 27; if parents would do more with their children at home, I could do more with them in the classroom, that there is no significant difference between the levels ($Xc^2 = 2.3 < X_{o^2} = 11.07$). Just 1 (1.7%) of secondary school teachers chose "strongly disagree" as an option. 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.

The findings in statement 28; if students stop working in class, I can usually find a way to get them back on track, reveal that there is no significant difference between the two different school types ($Xc^2 = 1.5 > X_{o^2} = 11.07$). 35 of the high school teachers (58.3%) state out that they moderately agree with the statement. There is no significant difference between the levels ($Xc^2 = 7.1 < X_{o^2} = 11.07$) when statement 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, is examined. A great proportion 36 (60%) of the high school teachers share positive point of view on the statement and they say moderately agree. Application of chi-square test indicates in statement 30; home and peer influences are mainly responsible for student behavior in school, that there is no statistical difference between the teachers. Since the critical table value ($X_{o^2} = 11.07$) being at $p=0.05$ level is greater than the observed value $\chi^2 = 5.9$, there is no significant difference between the groups. Approximately all the groups agree with the statement. None of the teachers chose "strongly disagree" as an option in secondary school teachers.

The results in statement 31; teachers have little effect on stopping misbehavior when parents don't cooperate, reveal that there is no significant difference between the levels ($Xc^2 = 6.3 < X_{o^2} = 11.07$). 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. When statement 32; the influences of a student's home experiences can be overcome by good teaching, 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 X_{o^2} (11.07), thus the difference of the teachers is not statistically significant $X_c^2 = 2.3 < X_{o^2} = 11.07$). It is seen that most of the teachers agree that the influences of a student's home experiences can be overcome by good teaching. When looked at statement 33; even a teacher with good teaching abilities may not reach many students, it can be seen that there is a slight difference between the levels ($X_c^2 = 11.37 > X_{o^2} = 11.07$). 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.

There is no significant difference between the levels ($X_c^2 = 4.4 < X_{o^2} = 11.07$) when statement 34; compared to other influences on student behavior, teachers' effects are very small, is examined. A great proportion 20 (33.3%) of the high school teachers share negative point of view on the statement and they say moderately disagree. 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. The results in statement 35; I am confident of my ability to begin the year so that students will learn to behave well, reveal that there is no significant difference between the levels ($X_c^2 = 5.7 < X_{o^2} = 11.07$). 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. The findings in statement 36; I have very effective classroom management skills, reveal that there is no significant difference between the two different school types ($X_c^2 = .078 < X_{o^2} = 11.07$). 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.

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.

Table 4.1: Results of the teacher self- efficacy scale 1-20.

TEACHER SELF-EFFICACY SCALE	Xo² value	Xc² value	df value	p value
1. The relationship between the effort of the teacher and student's success.	Xo ² =11.07	Xc ² = 8.725	df= 5	p= 0.05
2.The techniques of the teacher and student behaviour.	Xo ² =11.07	Xc ² = 3.150	df= 5	p= 0.05
3. The hours in class class and the influence of their home environment.	Xo ² =11.07	Xc ² = 6.933	df= 5	p= 0.05
4. Expectations of the teacher clear to students.	Xo ² =11.07	Xc ² = 1.167	df= 5	p= 0.05
5. Routines keep activities running efficiently.	Xo ² =11.07	Xc ² = 4.961	df= 5	p= 0.05
6. Misbehaving students.	Xo ² =11.07	Xc ² = 11.190	df= 5	p= 0.05
7. Communication between students and the teacher.	Xo ² =11.07	Xc ² = 11.190	df= 5	p= 0.05
8. Assignment and the correct level of difficulty.	Xo ² =11.07	Xc ² = 4.503	df= 5	p= 0.05
9. Rewards to use to keep students involved.	Xo ² =11.07	Xc ² = 1.503	df= 4	p= 0.05
10.The relationship of behaviours at home and school.	Xo ² =11.07	Xc ² = 3.497	df= 5	p= 0.05
11. Students that the teacher doesn't know how to handle.	Xo ² =11.07	Xc ² = 1.601	df= 5	p= 0.05
12. students' misbehaviour and nothing teachers can do about it.	Xo ² =11.07	Xc ² = 4.273	df= 5	p= 0.05
13. Adjusting the level of assignments.	Xo ² =11.07	Xc ² = 2.715	df= 5	p= 0.05
14. Teachers attitude is the result of student's misbehaviour.	Xo ² =11.07	Xc ² = 3.839	df= 5	p= 0.05
15. Student behavior influenced by peers more than by the teacher.	Xo ² =11.07	Xc ² = 4.062	df= 5	p= 0.05
16. A student's getting better grade is teh result of teacher's better ways of teaching..	Xo ² =11.07	Xc ² = 6.499	df= 5	p= 0.05
17. Keeping track of several activities at once.	Xo ² =11.07	Xc ² = 4.942	df= 5	p= 0.05
18. The way to get through to most difficult students.	Xo ² =11.07	Xc ² = 3.138	df= 5	p= 0.05
19. Being unsure to respond to defiant (refusing to obey) students.	Xo ² =11.07	Xc ² = 3.140	df= 5	p= 0.05
20. A teacher is very limited because of a student's home environment is influenced on achievement.	Xo ² =11.07	Xc ² = 8.555	df= 5	p= 0.05

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 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.

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.

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. 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 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.

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.

Table 4.2 Results of the teacher self- efficacy scale 21-36.

TEACHER SELF-EFFICACY SCALE	Xo² value	Xc² value	df value	p value
21. Some students are impossible to discipline effectively.	Xo ² =11.07	Xc ² = 4.122	df= 5	p= 0.05
22. The grades of students and teacher's more effective teaching approaches.	Xo ² =11.07	Xc ² = 3.852	df= 5	p= 0.05
23. Sure about rules for students.	Xo ² =11.07	Xc ² = 3.224	df= 5	p= 0.05
24. A student mastering and the necessary steps in teaching the concept.	Xo ² =11.07	Xc ² = 4.604	df= 5	p= 0.05
25. The amount that a student can learn and family background.	Xo ² =11.07	Xc ² = 1.521	df= 5	p= 0.05
26. Keeping a few problem students from ruining an entire class.	Xo ² =11.07	Xc ² = 1.385	df= 5	p= 0.05
27. Parents effort and and the classroom.	Xo ² =11.07	Xc ² = 2.391	df=4	p= 0.05
28. Students stop working in class and teachers' getting them back on track.	Xo ² =11.07	Xc ² = 1.585	df= 4	p= 0.05
29. A student's not remember information and knowledge of the teacher to increase His/her retention in the next lesson.	Xo ² =11.07	Xc ² = 7.103	df= 5	p= 0.05
30. Home and peer influences and student behavior in school.	Xo ² =11.07	Xc ² = 5.972	df= 5	p= 0.05
31. Teachers little effect on stopping misbehavior and parents' cooperation.	Xo ² =11.07	Xc ² = 6.308	df= 5	p= 0.05
32. The influences of a student's home experiences and good teaching.	Xo ² =11.07	Xc ² = 2.368	df= 5	p= 0.05
33. Even a teacher with good teaching abilities and not reaching many students.	Xo ² =11.07	Xc ² = 11.375	df= 5	p= 0.05
34. Compared to other influences on student behavior, teachers' effects are very small.	Xo ² =11.07	Xc ² = 4.477	df= 5	p= 0.05
35. Being confident of teacher's ability to begin the year.	Xo ² =11.07	Xc ² = 5.710	df= 4	p= 0.05
36. Having very effective classroom management skills.	Xo ² =11.07	Xc ² = ,078	df= 3	p= 0.05

4. DISCUSSION

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.

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.

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.

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". 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. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

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 research demonstrates that the participants needed more practical experience before they started working full-time. From this point of view, in-service and preservice 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. 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.

6. 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. The research 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

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- Brophy, J.E. (1983). Classroom organisation and management. *The Elementar School Journal*. 83 (4), 265-285.
- 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.
- Cotton, K. (1990). School Improvement Research Series. School Wide and Classroom Discipline. *School Improvement Research Series*, December, 1-20.
- Doyle, D. (1990). Classroom management techniques. In O. C. Moles (Ed.), *Student Discipline Strategies: Research and Practice*. State University of New York Press.
- Doyle, W. (1986). Classroom organization and management. In M. C. Wittrock. (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching*. (3rd ed.). Macmillan. New York. 392-431.
- Duke, D.L. (1976). Who misbehaves?- A high school studies its discipline problems, educational administration. *Quarterly*, 12, 65-85.
- 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.
- 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.
- Harmer, J. (1983). *The practice of English language teaching*. Longman. London.
- Harmer, J. (2003). *The practice of English language teaching*. (3rd ed.) Longman. Essex.

- 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.
- Jones, V. F. & Jones, L. S. (1998). *Comprehensive Classroom Management: Creating Communities of Support and Solving Problems*. (5th ed.), Allyn and Bacon. Boston.
- Kounin, J. S. (1970). *Discipline and Group Management in Classrooms*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- 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.
- 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.
- Purkey, W. W. & Novak, J. M. (1984). *Inviting School Success: A Self-Concept Approach to Teaching and Learning*. Wadsworth Publishing Company Belmont. California.
- Raudenbush, S., Rowen, B. & Cheong, Y. (1992). Contextual effects on the selfperceived efficacy of high school teacher. *Sociology of Education*, 65, 150-167.
- Şentuna, E. (2002). *The interests of EFL instruction in Turkey regarding INSET content*. Unpublished master's thesis, Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- Ur, P. (1999). *A course in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.
- Yılmaz, E. (2004). *The relationship between novice and experienced teachers' selfefficacy for classroom management and students' perceptions of their teachers' classroom management*. Unpublished master's thesis, Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Wilks, R. (1996). Classroom management in primary schools: a review of the literature. *Behaviour Change*. 13 (1), 20-32.

TEACHER SELF-EFFICACY SCALE
1. When a student does better than usual, many times it is because I exerted a little extra effort.
2. If a student in my class becomes disruptive and noisy, I feel assured that I know some techniques to redirect him quickly.
3. The hours in my class have little influence on students compared to the influence of their home environment.
4. I find it easy to make my expectations clear to students.
5. I know what routines are needed to keep activities running efficiently
6. There are some students who won't behave (well), no matter what I do.
7. I can communicate to students that I am serious about getting appropriate behavior.
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.
9. I know what kinds of rewards to use to keep students involved.
10. If students aren't disciplined at home, then they aren't likely to accept it at school.
11. There are very few students that I don't know how to handle.
12. If a student doesn't feel like behaving (well),there's not a lot teachers can do about it.
13. When a student is having trouble with an assignment, I am usually able to adjust it to his/her level.
14. Student misbehavior that persists over a long time is partly a result of what the teacher does or doesn't do.
15. Student behavior in classrooms is more influenced by peers than by the teacher.
16. When a student gets a better grade than usual, it is probably because I found better ways of teaching that student.
17. I don't always know how to keep track of several activities at once.
18. When I really try, I can get through to most difficult students.
19. I am unsure how to respond to defiant (refusing to obey) students.
20. A teacher is very limited in what can be achieved because a student's home environment is a large influence on achievement.
21. I find some students to be impossible to discipline effectively.
22. When the grades of my students improve, it is usually because I found more effective teaching approaches.
23. Sometimes I am not sure what rules are appropriate for my students.
24. If a student masters a new concept quickly this might be because I knew the necessary steps in teaching the concept.
25. The amount that a student can learn is primarily related to family background.
26. I can keep a few problem students from ruining an entire class.
27. If parents would do more with their children at home, I could do more with them in the classroom.
28. If students stop working in class, I can usually find a way to get them back on track.
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.
30. Home and peer influences are mainly responsible for student behavior in school.
31. Teachers have little effect on stopping misbehavior when parents don't cooperate.
32. The influences of a student's home experiences can be overcome by good teaching.
33. Even a teacher with good teaching abilities may not reach many students.
34. Compared to other influences on student behavior, teachers' effects are very small.
35. I am confident of my ability to begin the year so that students will learn to behave well.
36. I have very effective classroom management skills.