MISBEHAVIOUR IN EFL CLASSES: TEACHERS' AND STUDENTS' PERSPECTIVES[*]

[a]Neşe CABAROĞLU   [b]Zeynep ALTINEL

[a, b] *Çukurova University, Faculty of Education, Department of English Language Teaching, Adana, Turkey*
ncabar@cu.edu.tr
zeynep_sari79@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT

This paper reports findings from a study on student and teacher perceptions of misbehaviour. Data were gathered via questionnaires, observations and semi-structured interviews from 6 teachers and 22 misbehaving students in six different schools with three different socio-economic levels. The data revealed that misbehaving students' explanations and interpretations of misbehaviour, their causes and the interventions strategies used did not allways share similar attributes with those of their teachers'.

Keywords: misbehaviour, student and teacher perspectives, types and causes, socio-economic levels, intervention strategies, classroom management

ÖZET

Bu araştırma, 7. sınıf ingilizce derslerinde karşılaşılan problem davranışlara yönelik öğrenci ve öğretmen görüşlerini inceleyen nitel ve nicel veri toplama araçlarının kullanıldığı bir çalışmadır. Araştırma verileri, 3 farklı sosyo ekonomik düzeydeki okullardan gözlem, görüşme ve anket formları aracılığıyla toplanmıştır. Çalışmaya 6 öğretmen ve onların araştırmacılar ile birlikte belirledikleri sürekli problemli davranış gösteren 22 öğrencisi katılmışlardır. Araştırma bulgularından elde edilen sonuçlar, öğrenci ve öğretmenlerin problemli davranışların nedenlerine ilişkin görüşleri arasında bazı farklılıklar olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Ayrıca öğrencilerin öğretmenlerinin kullandıkları problemli davranışlarla başetme yöntemlerine ilişkin görüşleri de belirlenmiştir.

Anahtar sözcükler: problem davranışlar, öğretmen ve öğrenci görüşleri, sosyo-ekonomik düzey, problem davranışlarla başetme stratejileri, sınıf yönetimi

---

INTRODUCTION

Classroom management is one important aspect of teaching for creating an environment where instruction and learning can occur efficiently. Harmer (1983) states that the effectiveness of the teacher and instruction is dependent upon how successfully a classroom is managed. In relation to this, positive correlations between effective classroom management and student achievement have been found (Emmer, 1997; Marzano, Marzano, and Pickering, 2003; McGarity and Butts, 2006). Therefore, teachers should be aware of the importance of classroom management and its effects on student success.

Although classroom management has been widely discussed from the teachers' perspective in the literature, relatively few major studies have addressed students' expectations and perceptions (Zeidner, 1988; Bru, Stephens, and Torsheim, 2002). Zeidner (1988) showed that there are significant differences between students' and teachers' perceptions of classroom management behaviour with regard to severity in particular. Moreover, each student in one class may perceive any behaviour differently from their friends. These differences may derive from students' varying expectations of education.

In order to analyze students' misbehaviours and their reasons, teachers first need to understand the reason behind 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 topic to be studied.

In Turkey, research on classroom management and student misbehaviour in particular, has focused on several dimensions: the role of teacher in finding solutions for behavioural problems (Demirden, 1994), effects of physical setting, student-teacher interaction of classroom life in Maths, Science, Turkish and English classes (Başar, 1994), and most commonly encountered misbehaviours and identification of supportive help leading teachers to prevent those misbehaviours (Özen and Batu, 1999) are some examples of studies that focused on classroom management issue. In another study, Atıcı (1999) attempted to identify the methods used by 73 Turkish and 51 English primary school teachers in dealing with student misbehaviour. It was found out that while English teachers dealt with misbehaviours more systematically and consistently, Turkish teachers tended to deal with misbehaviours through experience. Another example from the Turkish context is Daloğlu's (2002) study which focused on teacher perceptions about classroom management. The findings from Daloğlu's (ibid) study revealed the importance of teacher experience for successful classroom management. Atcı (2004) is another researcher who focused on intervention strategies employed by primary school teachers to deal with misbehaviour. In a more relatively recent study, Sadık (2008) examined student misbehaviour from the point of view of teacher, student and parents, and the effects of assertive discipline model based training programme on their discipline strategies. In the study, while teachers found coping strategies "positive,

preventive and repairing", students considered them as "punishing, threatening, and unfair" (2008: 1). The most commonly used intervention strategies identified in the study were: "verbal warning, ignoring, warning by gestures, dressing down, and threatening" (ibid.).

Except for the above mentioned studies, research conducted in the area of classroom discipline is most often concerned with teachers' rather than students' perceptions about which management strategies work with which types of discipline problems (Wolfgang and Glickman, 1986; Grossman, 1995). Moreover, student teachers' perceptions have received more attention than students' perception about clasroom management (Moser, 1982; Sage, 1990; Tulley and Chiu, 1995).

The centrality of classroom management, and student misbehaviour aspect in particular, in teaching and the relative scarcity of research in ELT (English Language Teaching) field in Turkey in particular suggested the need for this study. The purpose of the study was to identify perceptions of English teachers about misbehaviours and causes of misbehaviours, and types of misbehaviours they encountered. Additionally, it was aimed to find out misbehaving students' explanations and interpretations of their own misbehaviours, their causes and what they thought about the intervention strategies used by their teachers.

METHOD

The present study combined qualitative and quantitative research methods. Variety of data collection tools and procedures have been employed to collect data from 22 misbehaving students and 6 teachers working in six different schools in Adana, Turkey. The schools were determined according to the socio-economic levels (SEL) of the students (two schools with High SEL, two schools with Middle SEL, and two schools with Low SEL). A questionnaire, semi-structured interviews and observations have been employed to gather data.

In order to identify the schools' socioeconomic levels, two approaches were adopted. Initally, 11 elementary school inspectors working in the Ministry of Education in Adana were asked to fill in a questionnaire which was prepared by the researcher and aimed at obtaining the views of the teachers regarding the socioeconomic levels of the schools. After having determined the socioeconomic levels of the schools according to the inspectors' views, a questionnaire which was developed by Bacanlı (1997) was administered to the selected 6 schools in order to validate (or crosscheck) the socioeconomic levels. The results obtained from the questionnaire were harmonous with those of inspectors' views.

The study sought to answer the following research questions:

- What are the English teachers' perceptions of misbehaviour and its causes?

- What types of misbehaviour do the teachers encounter? Do the types of misbehaviour encountered differ according to the type SEL of schools?
- What kind of intervention strategies do the teachers employ?
- How do the misbehaving students explain and interpret misbehaviour and causes of their misbehaviour?
- How do the teachers explain and interpret misbehaviour and their causes?
- Do the teachers' and misbehaving students' perceptions of misbehaviour and their causes differ?
- How do the misbehaving students view their teachers' intervention strategies?

Participants

Participants of the study consisted of six 7th grade English teachers (4 females, 2 males) working in schools with three different socio-economic levels and their misbehaving students. Teachers' years of working experience ranged from one year to nineteen years. One teacher was selected from each of six schools, every two of which fell in the category of one of the three socio-economic levels.

As for the student participants, 22 misbehaving students from 7th grade were selected according to the comments made by the teachers during the interviews and the observations carried out in the schools by the researchers. Misbehaving students were the ones who continually misbehaved during the observations and from whom teachers mostly complained (in the interviews) as conducting undesired behaviours in class. It should be noted that all the misbehaving students were male. As female students did not show recurrent pattern of misbehaviours they were not included in the study.

The underlying reason behind the choice of 7th graders is primarily the fact that these students passed through their adaptation period to the secondary education and that they have reached their adolescence. Additionally, when compared with 8th graders, 7th graders posses less SBS (i.e. General Proficiency Exam administered in 6th, 7th and 8th year of what is currently called the 2nd stage of primary eduation (previously called as Secondary or Middle school) anxiety.

Data Collection

Various data collection procedures and instruments were used. Initially, observer as participant strategy (Glesne and Peshkin, 1992) was utilized in order to identify misbehaviour types and teachers' intervention strategies. Each teacher was observed at least three times in the same class for an hour. An observation schedule which was adopted from Atcı (2004) and Sayın (2001) was used during the observations. The interview questions, observation schedules and questionnaires were piloted in two schools with two different SELs other than the schools selected for the study.

After each observation session, a follow up semi-structured interview was conducted with each of six teacher-participants. The purpose of the interview was to find out

teachers' perceptions of misbehaviour, its' types and causes, and to determine the student participants. The language of the interviews was Turkish and they lasted between 25 to 40 minutes. Verbal consent was obtained prior to the interviews which were recorded and transcribed.

Additionally, a questionnaire developed by Sayın (2001) was administered to both teachers and students in the observed classes. Teachers' and students' responses helped researchers to find out degree of importance of each misbehaviour type according to the participants.

Following from the observations, interviews were conducted with the students who misbehaved during the lessons in order to identify their perceptions of and causes behind their misbehaviours.

Data Analysis

The data gathered via observations, questionnaire and interviews were analysed by using qualitative and quantitative analysis techniques. The interviews were analysed using content analysis technique as defined by Patton (2002). As Miles and Huberman (1994) put it, data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification were three main steps applied. In order to discover the main themes and patterns embedded in the text, transcriptions of the interviews were subjected to content analysis. After having obtained the consent of the participants, the interviews were audio taped and then transcribed. The transcribed materials were read by the researchers several times to identify main themes. Then, categories and codes for these patterns were determined taking into consideration the research aims. Although the interviews were conducted in Turkish as indicated earlier, where and when appropriate, some relevant excerpts were translated into English. Each quotation is followed by a code number for each participant.

RESULTS

Teachers' Perceptions of Misbehaviour

The data revealed that out of six teachers, five of them indicated that student behaviour which hindered the flow of the lesson and disturbed the peace was misbehaviour.

Although some behaviours were labelled as "misbehaviour" by certain teachers, they were not considered as "misbehaviour" by others. Because of this, teachers were also asked to specify the behaviours which they regarded as misbehaviours. Examples of misbehaviours mentioned included "involvement in irrelevant activities, talking out of turn or when not supposed to talk, making noise (usually by talking), asking irrelevant questions, and physical aggression." One teacher mentioned "students' lack of interest in the lesson" as an example of misbehaviour.

Misbehaving Students' Explanations and Interpretations of Their Own Misbehaviours

In the interviews, when students were asked to define misbehaviour in classroom context, they defined misbehaviour as "bad behaviours that are done consciously or unconsciously", "not obeying the ground rules in the classroom", "acting without considering the consequences", and "behaviours that one does not want to come across with." Four students agreed on the following definition of misbehaviour: "behaviours which disturb the peace in class and disrupt others."

As for the examples of misbehaviours mentioned by misbehaving students were "fighting" (9 students), "talking to friends" (6 students), "disturbing others" (6 students), "not listening to the teacher during the lesson delivery" (4 students), and "behaving disrespectfully to teachers" (4 students). In addition to these "talking without permission, making noise, cheating in exams, not participating in the lesson, swearing, smoking, using drugs, lying and stealing" were other examples of misbehaviour mentioned by the students. Interestingly, one student did not consider "talking to friends" as misbehaviour.

Comparisons of Teachers' and Misbehaving Students' Perceptions of Misbehaviour

The analysis of the interview data revealed that teachers' and students' views on misbehaviour shared similarities with each other. According to the results of interviews teachers focused particularly on such behaviours as "disturbing the flow of lesson, dealing with other things, talking to friends and making noise". On the other hand, misbehaving students explained misbehaviours as "fighting, disturbing the flow of lesson, talking to friends, not listening to the lesson and behaving in a disrespectful way to teachers" (see Table 1).

Table 1. Comparison of Teachers' and Misbehaving Students' Perceptions of Misbehaviour

Types of Misbehaviour	Misbehaving Students (n=22)			Types of Misbehaviour	Teachers (n=6)		
	Freq.	%	Order		Freq.	%	Order
Physical aggression	9	41	**1**	Disturbing the flow of lesson	5	83	**1**
Talking to friends	6	27	**2**	Dealing with other things	3	50	**2**
Disturbing the flow of lesson	6	27	**3**	Talking to friends	3	50	**3**
Not listening to the teacher	4	18	**4**	Making noise	3	50	**4**
Behaving disrespectfully to teachers	4	18	**5**	Talking without permission	1	17	**5**
Talking without permission	3	14	**6**	Asking irrelevant questions	1	17	**6**
Destroying peace in class	3	14	**7**				
Teasing the teachers	3	14	**8**				
Unconscious behaviours	3	14	**9**				
Playing truant from school	3	14	**10**				
Making noise	2	9	**11**				

Teachers' Perceptions of the Causes of Student Misbehaviours

During the interviews, all of the teachers pointed out "characteristics of parents" as the number one reason behind student misbehaviour. In relation to this, teachers mentioned "parents' education level, their indifference towards their children, and divorced parents."

In addition to the parents' attitudes and their characteristics, "media, socio-economic level, class size and students' indifference" were shown as the primary causes of student misbehaviour. With regards to socioeconomic level, teachers mentioned that students who came from low SEL family background with language problems (i.e. students from ethnic minority groups) and those who had to work to help family were the misbehaving students. Table 2 sums up teachers' explanations of causes of student misbehaviours.

Table 2. Teachers' Views of the Causes of Student Misbehaviour

Causes of Student Misbehaviour	Teachers (n=6)		
	Freq.	%	Order
Characteristics of parents	6	100	1
Socio-economic level	5	83	2
Media	4	67	3
Class size	4	67	4
Students' indifference	4	67	5

The following extract from one of the interviews exemplifies the view of a teacher participant in relation to the role of the family:

> 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… (Low SEL School 2-ET)

Another factor mentioned by the teachers is the negative influence of media on students' behaviours. The following extract illustrates this view:

> It [media] influences in a negative way. Generally, it influences the language that 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. (High SEL School 1-ET)

Some teachers indicated socio-economic status and level of students as a potential source of misbehaviour, as presented in the following extract:

> Students with high socio-economic conditions have more self-confidence. They are considered successful in the eyes of their friends. However, I must confess some of these students misbehave too. On the other hand, some students coming from low socio-economic background refuse to obey hygiene rules and they use slang words. As a result they are treated as inferior by their friends (High SEL School 2-ET)

Although most of the teachers agreed on negative consequences of SEL on students' behaviours some teachers said that it did not affect students' behaviours:

> Some students are spoilt because of high SEL but some are not…Students who have educated parents are fond of lessons. However, about their behaviours, it changes. Some do not misbehave, some do. (High SEL School 2-ET)

On the contrary, the following teacher thought that SEL was an important factor:

> Students' with high SEL are spoiled. They have high self-confidence, as a result, they have the mindset that they know the truth or they are right all the time, nobody can interfere. (High SEL School 1-ET)

Class size was also reported as an important factor influencing students' behaviours in classroom. For example one of the teachers emphasised negative effects of class size, as follows:

> Some classes include 70-80 students so it is inevitable that these kinds of behaviours are seen more often. That is to say, having eye contact with students is important in diminishing misbehaviour… (High SEL School 1-ET)

Misbehaving Students' Explanations of Causes of Their Own Behaviours

In the interviews with misbehaving students, they were asked to explain the causes behind their misbehaviours. "Boredom, modelling peers, parents' indifference towards their children, and teacher behaviour and attitudes" were mentioned as the underlying causes of student misbehaviours. In relation to the teachers, students claimed that because some teachers "discriminated their students, threatened them with low grades, or did not reward their students' positive behaviours" they encountered misbehaviour problems.

Among all other reasons, "boredom" was the most frequently mentioned reason by the student participants (12 out of 22 students). The following extract exemplifies this:

> When the teachers only lecture without any jokes, I get bored, and when I get bored, I misbehave. (High SEL School 1-St3)

Another student explained that he got bored especially when the teacher did not make any jokes and continued by saying:

> Sometimes I get bored. I feel terrible. When my friends talk, I talk too. When my friends tease with the teacher, I also misbehave. (Middle SEL School 2-St3)

The following student explained why he sometimes misbehaved:

> ….When I find someone's mistake, I want to tease with him. If he has done something wrong before, I want to take revenge. (Low SEL School 2 -St1)

Some students also said that they modelled their peers:

> When my friends play hooky, I play hooky too… (Middle SEL School 2-St1)
> Sometimes, I behave like my friends. These kinds of things mostly happen in teacher X's lesson. (Middle SEL School 2-St6)

Feeling of anger also was shown as a reason behind misbehaviour by some of the students as explained in the following extracts:

> When the class is cheerful, I want to make jokes. …when my friends make me angry, I misbehave. (High SEL School 2-St1)

> When I am annoyed and bad words are said about me I get angry and misbehave. (Low SEL School 1-St4)

Several students explained that their misbehaviours were a reaction to their teachers. Sometimes, because they felt that they were discriminated against or were treated unfairly by their teachers, they misbehaved:

> I only misbehave when someone annoys me…. When my teacher does not call on me, I get irritated. If she calls on a lot of students and not me, I want to misbehave. (Low SEL School 2-St1)

> When I am annoyed and bad words are said about me I misbehave. If I am bored, I sleep in class. (Low SEL School 1-St4)

Two other interesting issues mentioned by the students in relation to the misbehaviour were the gender of the teacher and school subjects:

> In general, when I sit with the friends that I like, during a female teacher's lesson I misbehave. Female teachers do not get angry much but male teachers can get angry and beat.… In social sciences lesson, not only me but also all my friends talk. When we misbehave he does not shout at us or say much to us. He calls on a student to the board in order to explain the subject and the rest begin to talk. When he shouts, we become silent. We do not misbehave in the lessons of teachers that we fear. Moreover, for instance in Maths lesson we don't misbehave. Because, we think that it is an important lesson. When we miss the lesson, we can't understand it again. Social sciences lesson is not like Maths lesson, it is based on memorization. (High SEL School 1-St2)

A student from a high socioeconomic level expressed the following:

> Since in our class there are students from educated families, we attend to the courses. We can not work off our energy outside. Misbehaving is acceptable for me as long as we perform well in our lessons and as long as it is not excessive. (High SEL School 2-St3)

Types of Misbehaviour Teachers Encounter

From a total of 18 observations conducted in schools, the types of misbehaviours recorded are displayed in Table 3.

As can be seen in the table, the most commonly observed misbehaviours were "talking to friends, making noise, dealing with other things, and talking without permission." Moreover, "getting away from the task, not having homework done, tardiness and swearing to friends" were the least observed misbehaviours.

Table 3. Types of Misbehaviour Observed in English Classrooms

Misbehaviour Types Identified	Total (n=18)		Order
	Freq.	**%**	
Talking to friends	16	89	**1**
Making noise	14	78	**2**
Dealing with other things	13	72	**3**
Talking without permission	12	67	**4**
Wandering aimlessly	9	50	**5**
Complaining about friends to the teacher	9	50	**6**
Daydreaming, doing nothing	9	50	**7**
Defying teacher continually	8	44	**8**
Playing truant from school	8	44	**9**
Hitting, kicking, or pushing friends	7	39	**10**
Defacing school property	5	28	**11**
Changing seats without permission	5	28	**12**
Teasing of other friends	4	22	**13**
Forgetting to bring supplies and books	3	17	**14**
Eating in class (Chewing gum)	2	11	**15**
Murmuring at the desk	2	11	**16**
Talking about irrelevant issues	2	11	**17**
Coming late to class	2	11	**18**
Getting away from the task	1	6	**19**
Not having homework done	1	6	**20**
Tardiness	1	6	**21**
Swearing to friends	1	6	**22**

Table 4 displays the frequency of the types of misbehaviours teacher participants mentioned during the interviews.

Table 4. Types of Misbehaviour Identified from the Interviews with Teachers

Types of Misbehaviour	English Teachers (n=6)		
	Freq.	%	Order
Disturbing the flow of lesson	5	83	**1**
Talking to friends	4	67	**2**
Dealing with other things	4	67	**3**
Making noise	3	50	**4**
Easily getting angry	2	33	**5**
Asking indifferent questions	2	33	**6**
Talking without permission	1	17	**7**
Making jokes to each other	1	17	**8**
Eating in class (chewing gum)	1	17	**9**
Disobeying the rules	1	17	**10**
Scratching the desk	0	0	**11**
Damaging the classroom property	0	0	**12**
Being spoilt	0	0	**13**
Fighting	0	0	**14**

In the interviews, when teachers were asked to identify types of misbehaviour they encountered in 7th graders, they mentioned such behaviours as "disturbing the flow of lesson, dealing with other things, talking to friends, making noise, asking irrelevant 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 other types of misbehaviours they encountered.

Types of Misbehaviours Encountered in Schools with Different SELs

The dispersion of 7th graders' misbehaviours recorded in the observations according to the type of school SEL is given in Table 5.

Table 5. Types of Misbehaviours in English Teachers' Classroom

Misbehaviour Types	High SEL (n=6)			Middle SEL (n=6)			Low SEL (n=6)		
	Freq.	%	Order	Freq.	%	Order	Freq.	%	Order
Talking to friends	5	83	**1**	6	100	**1**	5	83	**5**
Talking without permission	5	83	**2**	1	17	**19**	6	100	**1**
Making noise	5	83	**3**	3	50	**4**	6	100	**4**
Defying to teacher continually	4	67	**4**	1	17	**14**	3	50	**9**
Dealing with other things	3	50	**5**	4	67	**2**	6	100	**2**
Complaining about friends to the teacher	3	50	**6**	2	33	**8**	4	67	**7**
Wandering aimlessly	2	33	**7**	3	50	**5**	4	67	**6**
Daydreaming, doing nothing	2	33	**8**	4	67	**3**	3	50	**11**
Eating in class (Chewing gum)	1	17	**9**	1	17	**12**	0	0	**17**
Damaging school property	1	17	**10**	1	17	**16**	3	50	**10**
Teasing of other friends	1	17	**11**	1	17	**13**	2	33	**13**
Changing seats without permission	1	17	**12**	2	33	**10**	2	33	**12**
Getting away from the task	1	17	**13**	0	0	**20**	0	0	**22**
Talking about irrelevant issues	1	17	**14**	0	0	**22**	1	17	**14**
Not having homework done	0	0	**15**	1	17	**15**	0	0	**19**
Forgetting to bring supplies and books	0	0	**16**	3	50	**7**	0	0	**21**
Playing truant from school	0	0	**17**	2	33	**9**	6	100	**3**
Coming late to class	0	0	**18**	1	17	**17**	1	17	**15**
Tardiness	0	0	**19**	1	17	**18**	0	0	**20**
Murmuring at the desk	0	0	**20**	2	33	**11**	0	0	**18**
Swearing to friends	0	0	**21**	0	0	**21**	1	17	**16**
Hitting, kicking or pushing friends	0	0	**22**	3	50	**6**	4	67	**8**

As is seen in Table 5, the most frequently observed misbehaviour of 7th graders in schools with high SEL were "talking to friends, talking without permission, making noise, and defying to teacher continually". However, "not having homework done, forgetting to bring supplies and books, playing truant from school, coming late to class, tardiness, murmuring at the desk, swearing to friends, and hitting, kicking, or pushing friends" were the types of misbehaviour that were never observed. In schools with middle SEL, most observed misbehaviours of 7th graders were "talking to friends, dealing with other things, and daydreaming, doing nothing". However, "getting away from the task, swearing to friends and talking about irrelevant issues" were never observed misbehaviours. Additionally, in schools with low SEL mostly faced misbehaviours of 7th graders were "talking without permission, playing truant from school, making noise, dealing with other things and talking to friends". However,

"eating in class (chewing gum), murmuring at the desk, not having homework done, tardiness, forgetting to bring supplies and books and getting away from the task" were never observed misbehaviours.

In the interviews, teachers from HSEL expressed that "talking to friends, disturbing the flow of lesson, dealing with other things, making noise, easily getting angry, disobeying the rules, talking without permission, eating in class (chewing gum) and asking irrelevant questions" were misbehaviours they most frequently encountered in classes. Additionally, teachers from MSEL expressed that "disturbing the flow of lesson, talking to friends and dealing with other things" were misbehaviours most frequently encountered. Additionally, teachers from LSEL expressed that "disturbing the flow of lesson, dealing with other things, making noise, talking to friends, easily getting angry, asking indifferent questions, and making jokes" were the most frequently encountered misbehaviours.

Intervention Strategies Used to Deal with Misbehaviour

The data from the observations in relation to the interventions strategies teachers used to cope with misbehaviour and their dispersion are shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Teachers' Intervention Strategies According to SEL of Schools

Intervention Strategies	High SEL (n=6)			Middle SEL (n=6)			Low SEL (n=6)		
	Freq.	%	Order	Freq.	%	Order	Freq.	%	Order
Ignoring	4	67	**1**	6	100	**1**	3	50	**1**
Verbal Warning	3	50	**2**	5	83	**2**	3	50	**2**
Shouting	3	50	**3**	0	0	**7**	2	33	**3**
Reminding the rules	3	50	**4**	1	17	**4**	1	17	**7**
Making explanations	2	33	**5**	1	17	**5**	1	17	**8**
Hurting with words	1	17	**6**	1	17	**6**	2	33	**4**
Calling name	0	0	**10**	2	33	**3**	2	33	**5**
Eye-contact	1	17	**7**	0	0	**8**	2	33	**6**
Scolding	1	17	**8**	0	0	**9**	1	17	**9**
Threatening	1	17	**9**	0	0	**10**	1	17	**10**

As can be seen in the table, it was observed that teachers most frequently applied ignoring, verbal warning, and reminding rules as intervention strategies. Additionally, threatening was the least frequently observed strategy employed by the teachers.

During the interviews, teacher participants stated that they mostly applied such verbal strategies as warning, shouting, talking with students and threatening. Other additional strategies employed were "communicating with parents of misbehaving students, using eye contact, changing seats, and giving punishments or responsibilities." When these

findings are compared with those from the observations, it is seen that "ignoring the misbehaviour" was not mentioned as a strategy during the interviews although it was the most frequently observed intervention strategy employed by all teachers, regardless of the type of SEL of school.

The interview extract below reveals how and when teachers use various interventions strategies:

> I talk about their behaviours during the break. If the behaviours that influence the flow of the lesson recurrently occur in spite of my warnings, I write a letter to the parents in order to inform them. I also warn students during the lesson when necessary. Some students get the message from my eye-contact, while others need to hear some words...
> (High SEL School 1-ET)

In the following example, the teacher explains how she applies various coping strategies step by step.

> Initially, I use eye-contact. If the student still goes on misbehaving, I warn him/her by calling his/her name. Then I may I threaten him to give low grade, or to send them to the office if they insist on misbehaving. Moreover, if the misbehaviour is severe, for example swearing to friends or behaving disrespectfully towards me I make them fill the classroom disciplinary form.
> (Low SEL School 1-ET)

As can be seen in the extract above, depending on the severity and cooperation or lack of cooperation of the student, the degree of the management strategy also varies.

Misbehaving Students' Views of their English Teachers' Intervention Strategies

From the analysis of the interviews with student participants, two different points of views emerged with regards to what they thought about their teachers' interventions strategies. Some of the students explained that they liked and approved their teachers' intervention strategies. For example, in the extract below, the student explained how his teacher intervened and what he liked about it:

> Well, I like it especially the way she handles the students who teases others. She makes them feel worse. When they give false answers, she teases with them. I admire her. (High SEL School 2-St2)

Some misbehaving students indicated that their teacher's intervention strategies did not work:

> His intervention strategy works only for while. He hits the table once. After a while we begin to talk again. Nobody cares. (Middle SEL School 2-St1)

Another student said:

> I like the way she copes with us. When the teacher warns when we are misbehaving we keep silent for a while. Then we begin to talk again. (Low SEL School 1-St3)

The following examples show why students did not like/approve their teachers' misbehaviour coping strategies:

> When we fight, he doesn't deal with it. He sends misbehaving ones to the head teacher. Students don't keep silent. I don't like his intervention strategies. (Middle SEL School 2-St3)

> She demoralizes people with the words she uses. (High SEL School-St1)

One of the students felt that "boys were being discriminated against girls" as the teacher was "more protective of the girls" as a result, he said, he did not like the teacher's intervention strategies.

Moreover, most of the students stated that they liked to have fun in the lessons and that they preferred teachers who intervened in misbehaviour at the right time and in an effective and appropriate way. Interestingly, some students pointed out that they did not misbehave in other lessons although they did misbehave in the English lessons. The following student explained why this was so:

> I am more silent in Turkish lessons. Her approach towards the students is different. When she is angry, she shouts angrily but she also cares about us much and tries to solve the misbehaviour problem. She sometimes chit chats with us during the lesson. She makes jokes. When she sees us sad, she asks the reason, and then she forgets our misbehaviours immediately. However, English teacher does not forget. She shouts less. So, we talk in her lessons more. (Low SEL School 2-St1)

From what St1 says, once more, the importance of choice and effectiveness of the intervention strategies come to the fore.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this study we investigated English teachers' and their misbehaving students' perceptions of classroom misbehaviours and their types in schools with 3 different socio economic levels, teachers' interventions strategies and their students' views about those strategies.

Consistent with the related literature, teacher and student participants in the study perceived the behaviours which hindered the flow of the lesson and disturbed the peace as misbehaviour (Ilgar, 2000; Turnuklu and Galton, 2001).

Our findings also indicated that the views of the teachers and students completely differed on the causes of misbehaviours. While teacher participants perceived "the characteristics of students' parents" as the most important reason behind student misbehaviour, student participants indicated "boredom" as the major source of misbehaviour. In line with the related literature, the variables contributing to misbehaviour as perceived by teacher participants of the present study were parent oriented sources (Atıcı, 1999; Miller, 2003; Aksoy, 1999; Weishew and Peng, 1993), class size (Özdemir, 2004; Freiberg et al., 1995), socio economic level (Yiğit, 2005; Bratlinger, 1993) and media (Sadık, 2008; Sayın, 2001). Interestingly, none of the teacher participants mentioned teacher related sources of misbehaviours. Instead they referred to sources other than the teacher. In accordance with this, there is convincing evidence that teachers tend to perceive their own roles in and approaches to misbehaviour positively (Sadık, 2008; Demir, 2003; Aydın, 2001).

Although very different from that of teachers' views student participants of the study thought that major factors that accounted for their misbehaviour, in line with the literature, were "boredom, modelling peers, parents' indifference towards their children, and teacher behaviour and attitudes towards them." Similarly, there is convincing evidence to suggest that boredom (Temel, 2006), modelling peers (Kniveton, 1989), parents' indifference towards their children (Aksoy, 1999; Edwards, 1993), and teacher behaviour and attitudes towards students (Erdoğan, 2003; Miller, Ferguson and Byrne, 2000; Guttmann, 1982) are among the underlying reasons of student misbehaviour.

Our data suggested that the most frequently encountered misbehaviours by the teachers were "talking with other students" (number one reason both in high and Middle SEL schools) and "talking without permission" (number one reason in low SEL schools). The high frequency for "talking without permission" (or "talking out turn") reported by the participants in our study is also in line with a number of studies (e.g. Atıcı, 1999; Beaman et al., 2007; Doğanay and Sadık, 2007; Kyriacou et al., 2007; Infantino and Little, 2005; Little, 2005; Ho and Leung, 2002; Keskin, 2002; Leung and Ho, 2001; Poulu and Norwich, 2000; Haroun and O'Hanlon, 1997; Wheldall and Merret, 1988).

As to the intervention strategies used by the teachers, observation findings suggested that "ignoring" and "giving verbal warning" were the most frequently used strategies by the teachers regardless of the SEL of the schools they worked in. Interview data also supported this finding: all the teacher participants indicated that they mostly preferred "verbal warning" to cope with student misbehaviour. Similar findings were reported in previous studies conducted in Turkey (e.g. Sadık, 2008; Keskin, 2000; Atıcı, 1999) and abroad (e.g. Weinstein, 1996).

The views of misbehaving students with regards to their teachers' intervention strategies were also of interest in the present study. While some students liked and approved the way their teachers intervened in their misbehaviours, others did not feel the same way. For example, some students thought that some teachers' intervention strategies were weak and that they saw no reason to cooperate with the teacher or changing their

behaviours. They also expressed negative feelings towards teachers who used "reprimanding" as a coping strategy. Additionally, some of the misbehaving (male) students felt being unfairly discriminated against female students. These findings are in line with the results of the existing literature (e.g. Sadık, 2008; Öztürk, Koç, and Şahin, 2003; Terzi, 2001; Tulley and Chiu, 1998).

In order to provide an effective and desirable educational environment for students and teachers alike, equipping teachers with the necessary knowledge and skills to cope more positively with the challenges of classroom teaching is important. Although a small number of teachers and their misbehaving students have been involved in the present study, it can be concluded, based on the rich observation and interview data, that students mostly misbehave in the lessons where teachers do not make jokes (or do not add fun element to their teaching), do not draw students' attention to the lesson with real life examples or examples from students' own lives and do not involve the students in the lesson. Additionally, in order to create a harmonious atmosphere, teachers should provide positive reinforcements by praising students and giving positive feedback. It is also crucial for teachers to understand the driving factors behind student misbehaviour.

The present study also revealed that teachers did not use a particular systematic approach in dealing with misbehaviour and often ignored these behaviours. This may be due to the fact that teachers do not know how to cope with misbehaviours. In relation to this problem, during pre-service education student teachers should be made familiar with proactive and preventative management concepts and approaches. Additionally, they should be required to try out some of classroom and behaviour management skills during their teaching practice. As for the teachers, in-service training courses should be provided in order to refine their classroom management skills. These courses or seminars can be organised in cooperation with universities and psychological counsellors in schools. Finally, teachers should be encouraged to work in close cooperation with psychological counsellors in order to cope with student misbehaviours.

REFERENCES

Aksoy, Naciye (1999*). Classroom management and student discipline in elementary schools of Ankara (Turkey).* Ed.D. dissertation, University of Cincinnati, United States, Ohio. Retrieved July 3, 2009, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text.(Publication No. AAT 9960863).

Altınel, Z. (2006). *Student misbehaviour in EFL classes: Teachers' and students' perpectives.* Unpublished MA Thesis, Çukurova University, Institute of Social Sciences, Adana, Turkey.

Atcı, A. (2004). *İlköğretim 1. kademe öğretmenlerinin sınıf içi problem davranışlara yönelik müdahalelerinin incelenmesi.* Unpublished MA Thesis, Çukurova University, Institute of Social Sciences, Adana, Turkey.

Atıcı, M. (1999). *An exploration of the relationships between classroom management strategies and teacher efficacy in English and Turkish primary school teachers.* Unpublished PhD Thesis. Leicester University, UK.

Aydın, B. (2001). İlköğretim okullarında sınıf disiplinin sağlanması. *Unpublished PhD Thesis,* Abant İzzet Baysal University, Institute of Social Sciences, Bolu, Turkey.

Bacanlı, H. (1997). *Sosyal ilişkilerde benlik kendini ayarlamanın psikolojisi.* İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.

Başar, H. (1994). *Sınıf yönetimi.* Ankara: Pegem Özel Eğitim Hizmetleri.

Beaman, R., Wheldall, K., and Kemp, C. (2007). Recent research on troublesome classroom behaviour: A review. *Australian Journal of Special Education*, 31(1), 45-60.

Bratlinger, E. (1993). Adolescent's interpretation of social class influences on schooling. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 28(1), 1-12.

Bru, E., Stephens, P., and Torsheim, T. (2002). Students' perceptions of class management and reports of their own misbehaviour. *Journal of School Psychology, 40*(4), 287-307.

Daloğlu, E. M. (2002).*Teacher perceptions on classroom management in teaching English as a foreign language.* Unpublished MA Thesis, Uludağ University, Institute of Social Sciences, Bursa, Turkey.

Demir, Y. (2003). *Sınıf öğretmenlerinin sınıfta karşılaşılan problem davranışlara karşı baş etme stratejileri.* Unpublished MA thesis, Çukurova University, Institute of Social Sciences, Adana, Turkey.

Demirden, (1994).Effective approaches to classroom management in teaching English at secondary schools. *Unpublished MA Thesis,* Middle East Technical University, Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara, Turkey.

Doğanay, A. and Sadık, F. (2007). Sınıf İçi İstenmeyen Davranışlarla İlgili Öğretmen, Öğrenci ve Veli Görüslerinin Karsılastırılması. *Ç.Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi,* 16(1), 539-560

Edwards, C. H. (1993). *Classroom Discipline and Management.* New York: Macmillan.

Emmer E.T., Carolyn, M.E., Barbara, S.C., and Murray E.E. (1997). *Classroom management for secondary teachers.* Boston: Massachusetts: Ally and Bacon.

Erdoğan, İ. (2003). *Sınıf Yönetimi.* İstanbul: Sistem Yayıncılık.

Freiberg, H. J., Stein, T. A., and Huang, S. (1995). Effects of classroom management intervention on student achievement in inner-city elementary schools. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 1(1), 36-66.

Glesne, C., and Peshkin, A. (1992). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction.* New York: Longman.

Grossman, H. (1995). *Classroom behaviour management in a diverse society.* (2nd Ed.). Mountain View, California: Mayfield Publishing.

Guttmann, J. (1982). Pupils', teachers' and parents' casual attributions for problem behaviour at school. *Journal of Educational Research,* 76(1), 14-21.

Harmer, J. (1983). *The practice of English language teaching.* London: Longman.

Haroun, R., and O'Hanlon, C. (1997). Teachers' perceptions of discipline problems in a Jordanian secondary schools. *Pastoral Care*, 15(2), 29-36.

Ho, C., and Leung, J. (2002). Disruptive classroom behaviours of secondary and primary school students. *Educational Research Journal*, 17(2), 219-233.

Ilgar, L. (2000), *Eğitim yönetimi, okul yönetimi, sınıf yönetimi.* İstanbul: Beta Yayıncılık

Infantino, J., and Little, E. (2005). Students' perceptions of classroom behaviour problems and the effectiveness of different disciplinary methods, *Educational Psychology*, 25(5), 491-508.

Keskin, M.A. (2002). Sınıf Öğretmenlerinin Karşılaştıkları İstenmeyen Öğrenci Davranışları ve Kullandıkları Başetme Yolları. *Unpublished MA Thesis,* Hacettepe University, Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara, Turkey.

Kniveton, B. H. (1989). Peer models and classroom misbehaviour. *School Psychology International,* 10(2), 105-112. Retrieved June 30, 2009 from: http://spi.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/10/2/105

Kyriacou, C., Avramidis, E., Hoie, H., Stephens, and P., Hultgren, A. (2007). *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 33(3), 293-307.

Leung, J., and Jo, C. (2001). Disruptive behaviour perceived by Hong Kong primary school teachers. *Educational Research Journal*, 16(2), 223-237.

Little, E. (2005). Secondary school teachers' perceptions of students' problem behaviours. *Educational Psychology*, 25(4), 369-377.

Marzano, R. J., Marzano, J. S., and Pickering, D. J. (2003). *Classroom management that works*. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

McGarity, J.R. and Butts, D. P. (2006). The relationship among teacher classroom management behaviour, student engagement, and student achievement of middle and high school science students of varying aptitude. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 21*(1), 55-61.

Miles, B. and Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis.* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE.

Miller, A. (2003). *Teachers, parents and classroom behaviour: A psychological approach.* Maidenhead: Open University.

Miller, A., Ferguson, E., and Byrne, I. (2000). Pupils' casual attributions for difficult classroom behaviour. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 70(1), 85-96.

Moser, C. J. (1982). Changing attitudes of student teachers on classroom discipline. *Teacher Educator, 18(1)*, 10-15.

Özdemir, E. (2004). *Sınıf ortamında istenmeyen davranışlar: Sınıf yönetimi.* (Eds. Ş. Erçetin and Ç. Özdemir). Ankara: Asil Yayın Dagıtım.

Özen, A., and Batu, S. (1999). *Sınıf öğretmenlerinin sınıf kontrolüne yönelik sorunlarının ve gereksinim duyduklari destek hizmet türlerinin belirlenmesi.* 4th National Educational Sciences Proceedings, 1, Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları No: 1076, 308-315. Eskişehir.

Öztürk, B., Koç, G., and Şahin, F. T. (2003). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin öğrencileri arasında ayrım yapma durumu ve bu ayrımın bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 1(1), 109-118.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods.* (3rd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE.

Poulu, M, and Norwich, B. (2000). Teachers' perceptions of students with emotional and behavioural difficulties: severity and prevalence. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 15(2), 171-187.

Sadık, F. (2008). The investigation of strategies to cope with students' misbehaviours according to teachers and students' perspectives. *Elementary Education Online*, 7(2), 232-251.

Sage, M. E. (1990). Preservice teachers' attitudes toward middle level prior to student teaching. *Action in Teacher Education, 11*(4), 19-23.

Sayın, N. (2001). *Sınıf öğretmenlerinin karşılaştıkları istenmeyen öğrenci davranışları ve bu davranışların nedenlerine ilişkin görüşleri ile istenmeyen davranışları önleme yöntemleri*. Unpublished MA Thesis, Anadolu University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Eskişehir, Turkey.

Temel, A. (2009). *Okulda ve sınıfta disiplin*. Retrieved July 02, 2009 from:
(Http://www.Maltepe.Edu.Tr/05_Haber/Reh_Sempozyum/Ali_Temel.Doc)

Terzi, Ç. (2001). *Öğretmenlerin sınıf yönetim anlayışlarına ilişkin görüşlerinin belirlenmesi*. Unpublished MA Thesis, Anadolu University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Eskişehir, Turkey.

Tulley, M., and Chiu, L. H. (1995). Student teachers and classroom discipline. *The Journal of Educational Research, 88*(3), 164-171.

Tulley, M., and Chiu, L. H. (1998). Children perceptions of the effectiveness of classroom discipline techniques. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 25*(3), 189-197.

Turanlı, A. S. (1999). *Influence of teachers' orientations to classroom management on their classroom behaviours, students' responses to these behaviours, and learning environment in ELT classrooms*. Unpublished MA Thesis, Middle East Technical University, Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara, Turkey.

Turnuklu, A. and Galton, M. (2001). Students' misbehaviours in Turkish and English primary classrooms, *Educational Studies*, 27(3), 291-305.

Weinstein, C.S. (1996). *Secondary classroom management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Weishew, N. L. and Peng, S. S. (1993). Variables predicting students' problem behaviours. *Journal of Educational Research*, 87(1), 5-17.

Wheldall, K., and Merret, F. E. (1988). Which classroom behaviours do primary school teachers say they find most troublesome? *Educational Review*, 40(1), 13-17.

Wolfgang, C. H., and Glickman, C. D. (1986). *Solving discipline problems: Strategies for classroom teachers*. (2nd Ed.). New York: Allyn and Bacon.

Yiğit, B. (2005). Sınıfta disiplin ve ögrenci davranışlarının yönetimi. *In Sınıf Yönetimi*. (Eds.) M. Şişman and S. Turan. Ankara: Pegema Yayıncılık.

Zeidner, M. (1988). The relative severity of common classroom management strategies: Student's perspective. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 58(1), 69-77.