

Düşük ve Yüksek Düzeyde Kontrolü Tercih Eden Öğretmenlerin Sınıf Yönetim Davranışlarının Karşılaştırılması

A Comparative Assessment of High and Low Control Teachers' Classroom Management Behaviors

Adem Turanlı*
Erciyes University Faculty of Education

Ali Yıldırım**
METU- Faculty of Education

Öz

Bu çalışma, öğretmenlerin sınıf yönetimine yaklaşımları ile sınıf yönetimi davranışları arasındaki ilişkileri incelemek amacıyla tasarlanmıştır. Çalışma için sınıf yönetimine yaklaşımları farklı (yüksek ve düşük düzeyde kontrol) olan iki öğretmen seçilmiş Bunların öğrencilerine (n=91), yedi başlık (empati, coşku, öğretim, cesaretlendirme, kontrol, geribildirim ve düzeltme) altında 36 maddeden oluşan bir anket uygulanmıştır. Araştırmacı, öğretmenlerin sınıflarını nasıl yönettiğine ilişkin daha ayrıntılı bilgi toplamak için sınıflarını da gözlemiştir. Anketten elde edilen veriler, yüzde, ortalama ve standart sapma cinsinden çözümlenmiş ve iki öğretmenin sınıfları arasında farklılığın olup olmadığını belirlemek amacıyla bağımsız t-testi uygulanmıştır. Ayrıca gözlemlerden elde edilen veriler, anketten elde edilen verilere dayalı olarak, içerik analizine tabi tutulmuş ve yorumlanmıştır. Çözümlenmeler, farklı yaklaşım içerisinde olan öğretmenlerin, coşku hariç bütün boyutlarda farklılaştığını göstermiştir. Özetle, öğretmenlerin sınıf yönetimi eğilimleriyle sınıflarını yönetim şekilleri arasında anlamlı ilişkiler belirlenmiştir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Sınıf yönetimi, öğretmen yaklaşımı, denetim düzeyi, öğrenci algıları

Abstract

This study was designed to investigate the relationship between teachers' orientations to classroom management and their classroom management behaviours. Two teachers with different orientations to classroom management (low and high control) were selected and their students (n=91) were administered a questionnaire, which included 36 items under seven dimensions (empathy, enthusiasm, instruction, encouragement, control, feedback and correctives, and evaluation). The researcher also observed the classes of the two teachers in order to gather more in-depth data on how the teachers managed their classes. Questionnaire data were tabulated in percentages, means, and standard deviations, and independent t-tests were conducted to compare the teachers to find whether there were any differences between the two teachers. In addition, data from the observations were processed through content analysis and interpreted by relating them to the findings coming from the questionnaire. The analyses indicated that the two teachers with different orientations differed significantly in all the dimensions except for enthusiasm. Significant relationships were found between the teachers' orientations to classroom management and how they managed their classes.

Key Words: Classroom management, teacher orientation, level of control, students' perceptions

Introduction

Effective classroom management requires recognising the ecological nature of behaviour and thinking on ways of operating the classroom to promote desired behaviour and to minimise misbehaviour (Zabel and Zabel, 1996). People in a group behave differently than they do individually (Burden, 1995) and the group usually makes up a new identity and the group dynamics may affect and change individual characteristics. Therefore, group characteristics need emphasising over individual needs in classroom management. Also, a teacher's approach to classroom management must be

* Asst. Prof. Dr. Adem Turanlı, Erciyes University, Faculty of Education

** Prof. Dr. Ali Yıldırım, METU, Faculty of Education

adaptable to the circumstances that may vary from group to group and provide a careful assessment of the learning environment, which allows the teacher to take into account the needs of individual classrooms (Kameenui and Darch, 1995).

Several factors influence teachers' orientations to classroom management. Their goals, values, and beliefs about classroom management affect their decisions about the management system that they would like to establish (Burden, 1995; Martin and Baldwin, 1992; Martin and Baldwin, 1994; Martin and Yin, 1997). Teachers' orientations toward classroom management and discipline may be best classified according to the amount of control they want to exercise in their classrooms (Burden, 1995). Wolfgang and Glickman (1995) offer a corresponding classification of low, medium and high control.

According to low control approaches, students have to control their own behaviour and they have the capacity to make their decisions. The child's thoughts, feelings, ideas, and preferences are taken into account when dealing with instruction, management, and discipline. The teacher has to structure the environment to facilitate students' control over their own behaviour. When rules are made, teachers guide the discussion and help students recognise appropriate behaviour and select related rules and consequences (Charles, 1996; Burden, 1995; Wolfgang & Glickman, 1995).

Medium control approaches suggest the teacher and students be jointly responsible for student behaviour. Although they accept student-centred psychology, teachers of medium control approaches think that learning takes place in a group context. Hence, the teacher emphasizes the needs of the group as a whole over the needs of individual students. Students' thoughts, feelings, and preferences are taken into account when dealing with instruction, management and discipline, but the teacher's primary focus is on behaviour and meeting the academic needs of the group. Students are given opportunities to control their behaviour in order to help them make appropriate decisions (Charles, 1996; Burden, 1995; Wolfgang & Glickman, 1995).

According to high control approaches, students' growth and development are the result of external conditions. To them, students are moulded and shaped by environmental factors. Therefore, teachers need to select desired student behaviours, reinforce appropriate behaviours, and take steps to extinguish inappropriate behaviours. Students' thoughts, feelings and preferences are given little attention because adults are more experienced in instructional matters and should have the responsibility for choosing the best for students. Teachers are to develop the rules and procedures, generally without any help from students. Teachers are to reinforce desired behaviour and take steps to have students stop inappropriate behaviour (Burden, 1995).

Studies indicate that teachers show differences in how they manage their classes according to their background characteristics. For example, Chen (1995) found that teachers from different countries vary in their preferences in handling student behaviours. In addition, Martin and Baldwin (1992) indicated that teachers' ideas regarding appropriate and inappropriate behaviours and how to control misbehaviour vary according to their experience in teaching. Teachers' upbringing in their families also has a bearing on their ways of managing their classes. Kaplan (1992) indicated that authoritarian upbringing in the family results in the selection of punitive strategies in classroom. Similarly, the school level at which teachers teach affects how they approach managing their classes (Gilberts and Lignugariskraft, 1997). In order to identify how teachers with different orientations manage their classes, Stensmo (1995) compared two grade-five teachers with different orientations to classroom management, one with subject matter focus and the other with student focus. The study indicated that both subject matter focus and student focus can be effective in classroom management and that no one management style is better than the other.

Current literature on effective teaching suggests that the teacher be equipped with both effective instructional and management strategies. While instructing, the teacher also tries to distinguish the effective strategies that work from those that do not. Nevertheless, the literature on effective management shows that any set of specific behaviours cannot be applicable to all classrooms. Good, Biddle and Brophy (1975) state that most recommended strategies are either too simplistic or away from seeing the whole picture of the classrooms. They also claim that in spite of numerous studies on teacher effectiveness that have tried to find certain universal characteristics of teachers which would work in any context and with all pupils, they have not been able to obtain much evidence. Therefore, there exist many

inconsistencies in regard to effective classroom management in the related literature. Burden (1995) states that these inconsistencies can be explained by the complexity of the field and the varying conditions under which the issue is studied.

Surprisingly, teachers working with similar student populations may considerably differ in their abilities to manage students' behaviour and in increasing their achievement (Jones & Jones, 1995). Good, Biddle and Brophy (1975) suggest that teachers differ significantly from one another in their effects on student learning and affective variables such as self-concept and attitudes towards learning and school. Therefore, the existence of a set of pre-identified behaviours or skills may not be an indication of a teacher's high performance in classroom management. In other words, teachers with different orientations to classroom management may display different behaviours, resulting in different consequences in the classroom. Thus, it is important to explore the possible relations between the teachers' orientations to classroom management and how they behave, and how these behaviours influence their teaching and the learning process. With these points in mind, the purpose of the study was to explore and to explain the relationships among these elements, specifically in ELT classes.

Method

Study Design

This study was conducted at the School of Foreign Languages at Erciyes University, Turkey. 890 students studying English for their faculty classes and the 31 teachers working in the school constituted the population of the study. In order to select two teachers with different orientations (low control and high control) to classroom management, the researcher's observations at school and his pre-existing relations with the staff helped identify their orientations to classroom management. The teachers who met the criteria for the inclusion to the study (teaching experience of at least three years and willingness to participate) were then interviewed on their orientations to managing their classes in order to provide further evidence for the validation of the selection. After the selection process, 91 students of two teachers in their four classes (two for each) constituted the sample of the study and were administered a questionnaire in order to identify their perceptions about their teachers' management behaviours. One of the teachers was teaching 43 students and the other was teaching 48. In addition to the questionnaire data, the classes of the two teachers were observed by the researcher in order to both gather in-depth descriptive data and validate the data gathered through the questionnaire.

Classroom Management Questionnaire

A questionnaire was developed to explore the students' perceptions of their teachers' management behaviours in several dimensions. The questionnaire, "*Classroom Management Questionnaire*," included 36 items under seven dimensions. The dimensions were:

- *empathy* (items related to the teachers' skills in employing empathy in class),
- *enthusiasm* (items characterizing the teachers' enthusiasm in teaching),
- *instruction* (items related to teachers' effectiveness in the presentation of the content and the organization of the lessons),
- *encouragement* (items dealing with the teachers' encouraging behaviours),
- *control* (items related to the teachers' way of controlling students' behaviour),
- *feedback and correctives* (items dealing with the provision of feedback and correctives), and
- *evaluation* (items dealing with the teachers' evaluative procedures).

The students were asked to respond to the items in the questionnaire on a five-point Likert type scale ranging from "never" to "always." A pilot study had been conducted to assess the reliability of the questionnaire with 34 students in one class in the same school. The Alpha reliability of the overall scale was found to be 0.86. The Alpha reliabilities of the dimensions were also calculated separately as follows: 0.54 for "empathy", 0.80 for "enthusiasm", 0.71 for "instruction", 0.66 for "encouragement", 0.61 for "control", 0.75 for "feedback/correctives", and 0.55 for "evaluation."

Observation Schedule

A semi-structured observation schedule was prepared in order to collect in-depth data about the items in the questionnaire and on how these behaviours interacted with the students' behaviours. The researcher observed the four classes each for two sessions of fifty minutes. The observations were mostly focused on the teachers' behaviours and their likely effects.

Data Analysis Procedures

The data from the questionnaire were analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics. First, the responses of the students to the questionnaire were analysed in frequencies, percentages, and means. When calculating the mean for each item, in line with Likert-type scales, 1 was assigned to "never", 2 to "rarely", 3 to "sometimes", 4 to "often", and 5 to "always". The frequencies, percentages and the means of the items were presented under the seven dimensions and as an inclusive (overall) scale. Before calculating the means for the dimensions and the inclusive scale, the negatively stated items were reversed as 1=5, 2=4, 3=3, 4=2 and 5=1. Based on the students' responses to the items, a composite score was found for each dimension by calculating the mean of the item means. Using t-test as a statistical procedure, the composite scores were used to examine if there were significant differences between the two teachers in terms of their management behaviours. Furthermore, in order to find out latent behaviour patterns in relation to classroom management, the notes taken during the observations were carefully studied and interpreted parallel to the questionnaire data. The observations provided valuable and insightful data to be qualitatively used and content analysed.

Profiles of the Teachers

Below are presented the profiles of the teachers selected for the study, based on the researcher's out-of-class observations, interactions and interviews with the two teachers, and finally on his observations in class. For practical purposes, the low control teacher was called LC, whereas the high control teacher was called HC. In addition, from now on, *he* will be used as the personal pronoun to imply any one of the teachers included in the study or any teacher in general for the sake of simplicity.

Low Control Teacher (LC): The teacher gives priority to the students' needs and interests and does not want to hurt the students for any academic reason. He believes that when students are well motivated, they can often overcome their problems, and therefore some problems can and should be ignored if they do not disturb other students in the class. He believes that a good atmosphere and a good rapport contribute to the learning environment and student learning. Hence, he very often smiles with students in the classroom, and at the beginning of the lesson, he has a short talk with the class to improve his rapport with them. He also accepts students coming into the class later than he does. He very often walks around students to monitor students' work, and he frequently interacts (on-task or off-task) with students. The teacher also avoids preventing off-task interactions among students which occur from time to time. In case of misbehaviour, the teacher often prefers to use gestures and mimics to stop misbehaviours.

High Control Teacher (HC): The teacher gives priority to tasks and does not avoid scolding the students for their misbehaviour. He thinks that the first days of a course determine how students will behave later. Therefore, he believes the first days of the year at school will determine how students will behave later on. To him, a well-managed class will succeed more since the more time is spent on instructional tasks, the more learning will occur. He thinks that students are naturally inclined to abuse teachers' goodwill since they are not mature enough to make a good decision. Therefore, he rarely smiles during the class. He does not allow students to enter the classroom after him and controls students' behaviours very closely to prevent misbehaviours. He rarely walks around students in order to monitor their work. In addition, he never tries to create opportunities for interaction, except for question-answer sessions. The teacher almost always stands close to the teacher's desk but seems prepared for the lesson. There exists a classroom context in which the lessons are running smoothly and transitions are very clear.

Results

Below given are the data obtained from the questionnaire and the class observations for each dimension in the questionnaire. The data obtained through the questionnaire are tabulated in percentages and means.

Behaviours Indicating Empathy. The dimension "empathy" included items related to the teachers' skills in employing empathy toward students in class. As Table 1 displays, the students responded that HC almost never scolded the students while LC a bit more frequently did so although the mean scores did not differ much in this regard. Similarly, the two teachers, according to the students, almost always tried to learn the students' names whereas ten percent of LC's students did not agree with the majority. Seemingly, in this respect, HC spent slightly more effort than LC. A great majority of the students stated that their teachers were generally aware of the difficulties that they experienced while learning English although one-third of LC's students claimed that LC only sometimes was aware of these difficulties and accepted them understandingly. Similar to the previous item, the students claimed that when they had problems, LC treated the students less understandingly and patiently than HC.

Table 1.

Behaviours Indicating Empathy for Students (in percentages and means)

	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	n
The teacher scolds students.							
LC	53.5	20.9	18.6	4.7	2.3	1.81	43
HC	77.1	10.4	6.3	4.2	2.1	1.44	48
The teacher tries to learn the students' names.							
LC	9.5	.0	.0	28.6	61.9	4.33	42
HC	.0	2.1	10.4	16.7	70.8	4.56	48
The teacher recognises difficulties that students encounter while they learn English and accepts them.							
LC	4.7	11.6	32.6	37.2	14.0	3.44	43
HC	4.2	6.3	6.3	16.7	66.7	4.35	48
The teacher treats students understandingly and patiently who have difficulty learning English.							
LC	.0	14.0	27.9	23.3	34.9	3.79	43
HC	2.1	2.1	4.2	33.3	58.3	4.44	48

n's vary somewhat due to missing data.

1=never, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes, 4=often, 5=always

When a mean score was calculated to represent the teachers' empathy in their classes, LC was found to have a lower mean score than HC and this difference (0.54) was calculated to be statistically significant at the .05, which meant that HC was more empathetic than LC.

During the observations, neither of the teachers scolded any students for this or that reason. However, HC generally avoided interacting with his students, decreasing the likelihood of misuse and misbehaviour. Also, HC was observed to try to provide the students with additional content knowledge and he seemed to be aware of the likely difficulties to be met. He adjusted his teaching accordingly and provided clues to help the students before the problems arose while LC did not seem to spend much effort in this sense.

HC was observed to behave more patiently when, at the moment of a student's hesitation while answering, he waited for the answer longer or provided cues. However, LC, instead of providing some wait-time, either answered the question himself or addressed it to another student, which seemed to increase the anxiety of LC's students.

Table 2.

Means and SDs for Teachers' Behaviour Indicating Empathy for Students

	Mean	SD	n
LC	3.94	.70	43
HC	4.48	.65	48

 $t(89) = 3.83, p = .000$

Only a few students were observed to ask HC questions related to the topic. Yet, when he was asked questions, he went into the details of the subject and tried to make it clear to the students. On the other hand, in LC's classes, the students were observed to more often ask the teacher questions about ambiguous points and topics that they did not understand. This seemed to be related to the effect of proximity (teacher's being close to the students). In other words, since the teacher walked around the students, the students may have asked him more questions.

Moreover, HC was observed to be much too serious and accordingly could keep his classes under control during the sessions while LC more often ignored misbehaviour in his classes. During observations, HC was observed to hardly ever smile while LC very often had joyful interactions with his students while presenting the content, listening to the students, and answering their questions. Correspondingly, LC's students smiled more often in the presence of their teacher than HC's. Similarly, LC more frequently had interactions with the students at the beginning of the lesson and some time in the middle when students were distracted.

It was also observed that when a moderate disruptive behaviour such as talking to peers occurred while the teacher was teaching, LC often ignored it or just looked at the student/s with a warning expression on his face. In a few similar cases, HC stopped to warn the students or attract them but almost never ignored any distracting behaviour.

Behaviours Indicating Enthusiasm. The dimension "enthusiasm" included items characterising the teachers' enthusiasm in teaching (see Table 3). The students' responses indicated that HC was perceived to be more prepared than LC when they came to the classroom and some of LC's students claimed that their teacher never or rarely came to the classroom prepared. Correspondingly, most of HC's students stated that their teacher never displayed any sign of fatigue contrary to the students of LC. However, both teachers were said to maintain their eagerness to teach until the end of the lessons. On the other hand, HC was perceived to be slightly more willing to teach the students than LC whereas most of HC's students did not think that their teacher ever smiled while LC was stated to smile much more frequently.

Based on the composite scores for the dimension of enthusiasm, a t-test indicated that there was not a difference between the two teachers in terms of their enthusiasm while teaching (see Table 4). However, the researcher observed some differences between the two teachers throughout the sessions. In terms of preparedness for the class, HC seemed to be better planned at the phase of content presentation and rarely hesitated about what to do next. However, LC seemed more spontaneous at this phase and tried to be creative throughout the sessions.

Table 3.
Behaviours Indicating Enthusiasm (in percentages and means)

	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	N
The teacher comes to classroom prepared for the class.							
LC	2.3	11.6	7.0	41.9	37.2	4.00	43
HC	.0	2.1	2.1	14.6	81.3	4.75	48
When the teacher is tired, he reflects it to class.							
LC	18.6	30.2	34.9	11.6	4.7	2.53	43
HC	68.8	16.7	10.4	.0	4.2	1.54	48
The teacher remains willing to teach throughout the sessions.							
LC	.0	9.3	27.9	27.9	34.9	3.88	43
HC	2.1	2.1	4.2	18.8	72.9	4.58	48
The teacher has a smiling face throughout the sessions.							
LC	4.7	4.7	23.3	30.2	37.2	3.91	43
HC	43.8	45.8	4.2	4.2	2.1	1.75	48

n's vary somewhat due to missing data.

1=never, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes, 4=often, 5=always

Although LC's attempt for creativity increased students' curiosity, it sometimes led to ambiguity. Consequently, preparedness seemed to help the teachers have a smoother lesson flow since he did not waste time thinking about what to do next. Although neither teacher was observed to be weary in class, LC was observed to be very energetic and cheerful most of the time. Yet, that HC almost never smiled led to the feeling that he was not very happy to be in class. On the other hand, both teachers were open to the questions directed by students and they gave satisfactory responses.

The two teachers seemed highly willing to teach, but in their own way: HC chose to be more serious in class whereas LC walked around with a happy expression on his face and interacted with the students much more frequently than HC. LC's students smiled more often than HC's and were cheerful and relaxed, which was thought to derive from the teachers' behaviour.

Table 4.
Means and SDs for the Teachers' Behaviours Indicating Enthusiasm

	Mean	SD	n
LC	3.81	.84	43
HC	3.88	.48	48

t (89) = .50, p=.617

Instructional Behaviours. The dimension "instruction" included items related to the teachers' effectiveness in the presentation of the content and the organisation of the lessons (see Table 5). In terms of the difficulty level of the language used by the teachers, no difference was found between the two teachers and more than two-thirds of the subjects responded that they did not have much difficulty understanding their teachers in class. However, there were some differences between them in terms of having smooth transitions between activities. According to the responses, HC had better transitions than LC. As for the variety of teaching strategies, there was almost no difference between the two teachers although HC was claimed to use time much more efficiently when preparing the students for pair or group work.

Also, the students claimed that neither teacher could make the essential changes that would gather the students' attention when they were distracted from the class. The questionnaire data indicates that the two teachers used the board quite often, while HC almost always chose to write new structures on the board. Similarly, HC's instructions directions for the exercises were claimed to be clearer and more

intelligible than LC's. As for the clarity of voice, the students' responses showed that the students could hear both teachers clearly with a slight difference in favour of HC.

Table 5.
Behaviours Related to Instruction (in percentages and means)

	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	n
The teacher speaks English at a level the students do not have difficulty understanding.							
LC	4.8	2.4	21.4	38.1	33.3	3.93	42
HC	22.9	6.3	2.1	12.5	56.3	3.73	48
The teacher promptly arranges clear transitions between activities.							
LC	2.3	9.3	25.6	41.9	20.9	3.70	43
HC	8.3	6.3	6.3	20.8	58.3	4.15	48
The teacher tries various teaching techniques in order to attract students.							
LC	25.6	37.2	25.6	9.3	2.3	2.26	43
HC	33.3	29.2	16.7	10.4	10.4	2.35	48
When preparing students for pair- or group-work, the teacher uses the time efficiently.							
LC	9.3	9.3	25.6	37.2	18.6	3.47	43
HC	4.2	2.1	12.5	35.4	45.8	4.17	48
When students are distracted, the teacher makes attractive changes in the lesson flow.							
LC	27.9	11.6	32.6	20.9	7.0	2.67	43
HC	31.3	20.8	22.9	12.5	12.5	2.54	48
While presenting new grammatical structures, the teacher explains them clearly on the board.							
LC	.0	9.3	32.6	30.2	27.9	3.77	43
HC	.0	2.1	.0	2.1	95.8	4.92	48
The teacher gives clear and intelligible directions for subsequent exercises.							
LC	2.3	9.3	16.3	51.2	20.9	3.79	43
HC	.0	2.1	.0	20.8	77.1	4.73	48
During lessons, students can hear clearly what the teacher is saying.							
LC	.0	7.0	11.6	20.9	60.5	4.35	43
HC	.0	2.1	2.1	18.8	77.1	4.71	48

n's vary somewhat due to missing data.

1=never, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes, 4=often, 5=always

A t-test carried out with the composite scores for the dimension of "instruction" indicated that the two teachers differed significantly at the .05 level in terms of effective instruction in favour of HC (see Table 6). In other words, HC had a higher mean score than LC, indicating that HC was perceived to manage instruction more efficiently than LC.

Table 6.
Means and SDs for the Teachers' Instructional Behaviours

	Mean	SD	n
LC	3.49	.60	43
HC	3.91	.60	48

t (89) = 3.32, p=.001

As identified through the questionnaire, the observations also showed that both teachers spoke as intelligibly as possible so that the students could follow them. However, it was observed that HC chose to speak more slowly and with more emphasis on the individual words than LC. In addition, HC had short pauses between sentences in order to make them easier to grasp. In the same line, the two teachers seemed different in terms of their way of managing transitions and HC was observed to have clearer transitions than LC. Likewise, in LC's classes where the lesson flow was faster, transitions sometimes seemed rather vague. During these ambiguous transitions, the students were inclined to misbehave, talking to their classmates or being off-task. In such instances, the teacher (LC) ignored the behaviour in

order to avoid either wasting time or distracting the students. HC was observed to be more efficient in time management when preparing the students for pair- or group-work although neither teacher was seen to tell their students how to organise for pairs or groups. HC's students seemed to be previously taught how to make pairs or groups since it took less time in his classes. It was observed that the longer transitions took, the more misbehaviour occurred, which was commonly observed in LC's classes.

Although not allowed for much flexibility by the school administration, LC seemed somewhat more flexible than HC during the sessions and correspondingly tried to consider the needs of his students while HC was more rigid in his lesson plan. Yet, neither teacher was observed to provide their students with much diversity at the moments of distraction, which allowed for monotony and longer distractions. Instead, both teachers went on dealing with the task at hand, thus leading the students to go off-task, such as doodling or whispering to their friends.

While presenting new grammatical structures, HC explained them first and wrote some examples on the board while LC rarely used the board for explanations or gave examples. As for the clarity of the directions for the activities, both teachers were observed to do their best to clarify them. LC also added his own remarks, probably in order to make activities more interesting for the students. Nevertheless, in spite of the teacher's good will, this seemed to occasionally cause the students to be more distracted. On the contrary, HC expected his students to understand the directions without much clarification, and interestingly they did so. Furthermore, in line with the data from the questionnaire about the clarity of the directions, HC spoke a bit more loudly than LC, which decreased the probability of ambiguity among his students due to little understanding.

Behaviours Encouraging Students. The dimension "encouragement" included items dealing with the teachers' encouraging behaviours (see Table 7). The students' responses indicated that LC provided each student with equal opportunity to participate in the class less often than HC. Similarly, the majority of LC's students stated that their teacher dealt with some students more closely than the others while HC was claimed to be more impartial in dealing with his students. Likewise, HC was stated to encourage his students to overcome their timidity more frequently than LC in spite of high item means for both.

Table 7.

Behaviours Encouraging Students (in percentages and means)

	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	n
The teacher gives each student equal opportunity to participate in the class.							
LC	4.7	16.3	27.9	20.9	30.2	3.56	43
HC	.0	4.2	2.1	20.8	72.9	4.63	48
The teacher deals with certain students more closely.							
LC	39.5	23.3	14.0	18.6	4.7	2.26	43
HC	66.7	22.9	2.1	6.3	2.1	1.54	48
The teacher helps us to overcome our timidity while we are trying to speak English.							
LC	7.0	11.6	27.9	32.6	20.9	3.49	43
HC	8.3	4.2	10.4	25.0	52.1	4.08	48
The teacher tries to have students gain the confidence that they can learn English well.							
LC	14.3	26.2	40.5	9.5	9.5	2.74	42
HC	14.6	10.4	18.8	39.6	16.7	3.33	48
The teacher tries to encourage students to take part in class activities.							
LC	7.0	14.0	20.9	32.6	25.6	3.56	43
HC	2.1	6.3	12.5	39.6	39.6	4.08	48

n's vary somewhat due to missing data.

1=never, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes, 4=often, 5=always

Also, the responses indicated that LC more often attempted to have his students gain self-confidence in improving their English, again with very high means for each. Finally, HC was claimed to encourage his students to participate in classroom activities more frequently than LC did.

The composite scores representing the teachers' encouraging behaviours (the dimension of "encouragement") were found to be statistically different (see Table 8). Although both teachers were claimed to encourage the students quite often, LC had a much lower mean than HC, indicating that HC's behaviours were found by the students to be more encouraging than LC's.

Table 8.

Means and SDs for Teachers' Behaviours Encouraging Students

	Mean	SD	N
LC	3.42	.78	43
HC	4.12	.70	48

$t(89) = 4.51, p = .000$

LC was observed to ask more questions to students than HC, and he also gave more opportunities to his students to state their opinions. Those who took part in the instructional activities in LC's classes were limited to the same ten students or so. However, HC tried to equally distribute the time allocated although the amount of voluntary participation in the activities was limited to a few students. While the questionnaire indicated that LC less often tried to help the students gain self-confidence, no difference was observed between the teachers during the classes. This contradictory finding might result from some teacher behaviours that were difficult to observe in class by the observer but that had already been identified by the students. In addition, as for encouraging participation in the activities, HC did not apply any behaviour obviously directed to student encouragement although the questionnaire data was left unsupported, which claimed that HC more often encouraged the student participation than LC.

Behaviours Related to Controlling Class. The dimension "control" included items related to the teachers' way of controlling students' behaviour (see Table 9). As can be seen in Table 9, HC's students responded that their teacher almost always went on monitoring the class while giving explanations whereas lower frequencies were calculated for LC. In contrast to this, HC's students claimed that their teacher spent almost all the instructional time in front of the class while although LC was claimed by his students to do so much less often. On one hand, LC's students responded that their teacher used his mimics and gestures to solve the problems less often than HC and that their teacher shouted at and reprimanded them more frequently than HC. However, the two teachers found to be equally strict in controlling the class. Finally, the students' responses implied that LC lost the control of the class more frequently than HC although the item means in the questionnaire turned out to be much less than "sometimes."

The composite scores for the dimension of "control" revealed that the two teachers significantly differed in terms of the way they controlled their classes (see Table 10). Although both teachers displayed these behaviours more frequently than sometimes, LC had a lower mean than HC, indicating that HC was better at controlling his classes than LC.

Table 9.
Behaviours Related to Controlling Class (in percentages and means)

	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	n
The teacher keeps monitoring the class while he is giving some explanation about the topic.							
LC	2.3	16.3	34.9	32.6	14.0	3.40	43
HC	.0	6.3	4.2	27.1	62.5	4.46	48
The teacher spends most of the time close to his desk.							
LC	14.0	41.9	30.2	11.6	2.3	2.47	43
HC	2.1	4.2	4.2	22.9	66.7	4.48	48
The teacher tries to solve the discipline problems with his mimics and gestures, without interrupting.							
LC	14.0	23.3	11.6	37.2	14.0	3.14	43
HC	6.5	8.7	15.2	34.8	34.8	3.83	46
The teacher shouts at and reprimands students.							
LC	4.7	25.6	25.6	30.2	14.0	3.23	43
HC	50.0	29.2	14.6	2.1	4.2	1.81	48
The teacher is in a strict mood to control the class.							
LC	.0	39.5	32.6	18.6	9.3	2.98	43
HC	27.1	8.3	20.8	12.5	31.3	3.13	48
The teacher loses the control of the class while calling the roll.							
LC	27.9	23.3	32.6	9.3	7.0	2.44	43
HC	70.8	14.6	6.3	2.1	6.3	1.58	48

n's vary somewhat due to missing data.

1=never, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes, 4=often, 5=always

During the observed sessions, it was seen that when they were asked a question, HC spoke to the whole class in response while LC spoke only to the student who had asked the question. Accordingly, HC could watch and monitor the other students while in LC's classes, some students were observed to misbehave when the teacher was distracted. However, HC spent most of his time close to the teacher's desk while LC chose to walk around students to monitor them. HC was observed to use gestures more often than LC, preventing some possible misbehaviour and thus avoiding consequent interruptions, which in turn resulted in smoother classes. It was also noticed that LC behaved more tolerantly toward disruptive students and rarely scolded them for their misbehaviours or off-task behaviours.

Table 10.

Means and SDs for the Teachers' Behaviours Related to Controlling Class

	Mean	SD	N
LC	3.24	.64	43
HC	3.54	.49	48

$t = (89) = 2.60, p = .011$

HC was observed to be much stricter toward his students than LC although not much misbehaviour occurred in his classes and he reprimanded his students at the few incidents that occurred in his classes. It was also noticed that instead of calling out each name for the roll call, HC just registered the absent students without distracting them. On the other hand, LC called the students' names loudly at the beginning of each class, but had some difficulty controlling the class.

Behaviours Aiming to Give Feedback / Correctives. The dimension "feedback/correctives" included items related to the provision of feedback and correctives (see Table 11). The students' responses indicated that HC walked around his students less often in order to see how they were doing the given task, which was parallel with the time he spent close to his desk. Yet, LC was claimed to walk around the

students and monitor students' work. HC hardly ever walked around to help students while LC did so much more frequently. It was also found that HC gave his students satisfying responses for their questions and satisfactory correctives for their mistakes more frequently than LC.

Table 11.

Behaviours Aiming to Give Feedback and Correctives (in percentages and means)

	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	n
The teacher monitors students in order to see how they are doing the task.							
LC	.0	16.3	16.3	37.2	30.2	3.81	43
HC	12.5	29.2	27.1	16.7	14.6	2.92	48
While students are doing a task, the teacher walks around and helps them.							
LC	4.7	16.3	7.0	37.2	34.9	3.81	43
HC	50.0	29.2	14.6	.0	6.3	1.83	48
The teacher gives satisfactory answers to the questions that students have asked.							
LC	4.7	.0	23.3	60.5	11.6	3.74	43
HC	.0	.0	2.1	29.2	68.8	4.67	48
The teacher gives students satisfactory correctives regarding their mistakes.							
LC	2.3	7.0	27.9	39.5	23.3	3.74	43
HC	.0	.0	4.3	34.0	61.7	4.57	47

n's vary somewhat due to missing data.

1=never, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes, 4=often, 5=always

The composite scores for the dimension of 'feedback and correctives' indicated that the two teachers significantly differed in terms of feedback and correctives provision (see Table 12). Although the two teachers exhibit these behaviours more frequently than sometimes, HC had a lower mean for feedback and corrective provision than LC, indicating that HC provided more feedback and correctives or was, in this sense, more effective than LC.

Table 12.

Means and SDs for the Teachers' Behaviours Aiming to Give Feedback and Correctives

	Mean	SD	n
LC	3.78	.78	43
HC	3.49	.60	48

t (89) = 2.01, p=.048

During the classroom observations, it was noticed that whereas LC walked around more and monitored what the students were doing, HC rarely did this. HC spent most of his time close to his desk and chose to monitor the class from the front. Walking around the students seemed to make it easy for LC to see the students' work and give them instant feedback. Contrary to LC, HC gave longer correctives for the students' mistakes/errors. It was also observed that when HC needed to give some correctives for their mistakes, he preferred to address to the whole class, whereas LC just talked to the student who had asked the question.

Behaviours Aiming to Evaluate Students' Performance. The dimension "evaluation" included items dealing with the teachers' behaviours related to evaluation (see Table 13). The data displayed that HC more often nominated various students to read out their work after a writing task than LC. Likewise, HC was claimed to wait longer for slow learners than LC while answering a question. In the same line, HC was said to allot more time to practise the topics that were studied although LC often displayed this behaviour, too.

Table 13.
Behaviours Aiming to Evaluate Students' Performance (in percentages and means)

	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	n
After a writing task, the teacher asks different students to read their work.							
LC	7.0	11.6	14.0	37.2	30.2	3.72	43
HC	2.1	.0	8.3	29.2	60.4	4.46	48
When the teacher asks comparatively slow learners questions, he provides them with more time.							
LC	4.7	11.6	16.3	41.9	25.6	3.72	43
HC	2.1	4.2	4.2	29.2	60.4	4.42	48
The teacher allows more time for practising the topics that have been studied.							
LC	4.7	4.7	37.2	44.2	9.3	3.49	43
HC	2.1	.0	12.5	27.1	58.3	4.40	48
Throughout the class, the teacher asks different students various questions about the topic for evaluative purposes.							
LC	7.0	20.9	23.3	32.6	16.3	3.30	43
HC	12.8	14.9	23.4	31.9	17.0	3.26	47
The teacher sets us challenging assignments about some important topics.							
LC	4.7	11.6	20.9	16.3	46.5	3.88	43
HC	2.1	6.4	27.7	34.0	29.8	3.83	47

n's vary somewhat due to missing data.

1=never, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes, 4=often, 5=always

The two teachers were perceived by their students to be equally fair in delivering the questions in order to check whether the topic had been understood although their means for this item were only somewhat higher than "sometimes." The students' responses indicated that both teachers frequently set challenging assignments on important topics with almost no difference.

The composite scores for the dimension of evaluation indicated that the two teachers differed significantly in terms of how they evaluated their students' progress in favour of HC (see Table 14), which meant that HC more often evaluated his students' progress or that he could evaluate their progress more effectively.

Table 14.
Means and SDs for the Teachers' Behaviours Aiming to Evaluate Students' Performance

	Mean	SD	n
LC	3.62	.68	43
HC	4.08	.60	48

$t(89) = 3.41, p = .001$

During the classes, HC was observed to ask more students to read their work after a writing task than LC did. Also, when HC asked a question, he allowed more time for his students than LC so that they could think about the answer when they needed to. However, LC chose to provide cues when the student stopped to think. Consequently, the student either completed the answer or avoided answering altogether. In terms of practicing the topics that were studied, both LC and HC often tried to provide the required time. However, in order to check whether the topic had been understood, the two teachers were satisfied with the exercises in the coursebook and brought no additional materials. In the same way, neither teacher was observed to assign any homework that was worth noting.

Teachers' Overall Management Behaviours. A composite score representing the teachers' overall classroom management behaviours was obtained for each by calculating the mean of all the item means in the questionnaire in order to test for statistical differences between the two teachers with different orientations toward classroom management. It was found that the two teachers differed significantly in terms of managing their classes (see Table 15) and that HC had a higher score than LC, indicating that HC was perceived to be more effective in classroom management.

Table 15.
Means and SDs for the Teachers' Overall Management Behaviours

	Mean	SD	n
LC	3.57	.56	43
HC	3.92	.45	48

$t(89) = 3.22, p = .002$

The majority of the data gathered from the questionnaire and the findings of the class observations confirmed each other. The study indicated that HC was more effective in his management behaviours than LC. Nevertheless, the students in LC's classes appeared to be more animated and willing to participate in the activities although the activities did not seem to be carefully planned. Yet, due to the confusion resulting from badly planned classes, there was often disorder in LC' classes when the students were participating in the activities because the teacher (LC) often ignored misbehavior. In contrast, HC had better-planned and more smoothly flowing classes although his students seemed to be uninterested in the activities. Surprisingly, although HC's students did not seem to be willingly participating in the activities or the teacher did not encourage them to do so, the students turned out to be happy with him and he was appreciated more than LC was.

Discussion

The low control teacher (LC) is more student-oriented and takes over fewer responsibilities. He prefers to provide his students with more flexibility in making the rules, thinking that they are mature enough to choose the "right" or the "wrong." In other words, in making decisions about classroom life and organizing activities, students are given more freedom and the teacher expects them to manage their behaviours accordingly. On the other hand, the high control teacher (HC) seems to be stricter and more task-oriented. He seems to assume that students cannot identify their academic needs and the teacher needs to make all decisions and arrangements. In addition, the high control teacher (HC) tries to do his best to help students as long as they are eager to learn. However, he thinks that the teacher does not have to worry about the performance of his students if they are inattentive or unwilling to learn.

Data from both the questionnaire and from the observations indicate that the low and high control teachers significantly differ in their management behaviours. Although interaction improves the quality of the learning environments, lacking of it seems to decrease the likelihood of misbehaviour in ELT classes, like in classes of the high control teacher (HC). Having too intimate relations, as the low control teacher (LC) did, leads to students' abusing of this behaviour. When the teacher behaves very intimately, students are inclined to misbehave, as in the classes of the low control teacher (LC). Having a short informal conversation with the class enables the teacher to have a good start, giving students the time to make their materials ready, as in the classes of the low control teacher (LC). However, some students tend to elongate it too often.

Predicting the difficulties that the students might encounter, as the high control teacher (HC) did, decreases the ambiguity and positively contributes to the discipline. This also means that when the directions are clear to students, there occurs less misbehaviour, implying that a teacher should try to predict the difficulties his students may encounter. Such careful procedures are supposed to increase instructional time since the lesson is not interrupted frequently. On the other hand, walking around students, as the low control teacher (LC) did, encourages students to ask their questions in mind, but staying close to the teacher's desk discourages students from asking questions.

Elongating explanations in response to the question asked, as the high control teacher (HC) did, exhaust some students because they are found redundant. On the other hand, while clarifying a point to a student, the teacher should go on monitoring the class. Otherwise, losing eye contact with students, as the low control teacher (LC) often did, often leads students to misbehave. Patience and sympathy seem to be of great importance in language learning contexts. Students appreciate the teacher behaving patiently and sympathetically, as the high control teacher (HC) did, since it helps to decrease anxiety resulting

from a new but threatening context. Likewise, providing enough wait-time for an answer, as the high control teacher (HC) did, contributes positively to student learning, and the opposite, as the low control teacher (LC) did, makes students nervous or panicked.

When prepared for class, the teacher has more smoothly running classes because there is less uncertainty in the directions for the activities and the transitions between the activities. Directions for the following activities and transitions between the activities take considerable time, which requires that the teacher be skilful in managing them successfully. On the other hand, being spontaneous, as the low control teacher (LC) often was, may help the teacher arouse student interest in ELT classes, although it also resembles haziness. Having students think that the teacher is lost for a short time and coming back with a creative activity, to some extent, points to your with-it-ness and your skills in classroom. Another behaviour that requires strong talent is smiling with students because some students are tempted to abuse it and, as in the classes of the low control teacher (LC), it may lead students to misbehave since they may regard the teacher's empathy as a weakness. Consequently, the teacher should beware of when, why and with whom to smile or laugh. In addition, the place where the teacher stands in class while teaching especially in a foreign language class determines whether students will ask questions when they need to. In other words, when the teacher walks around, students feel more comfortable to ask questions. Standing close to the teacher desk, as the high control teacher (HC) often did, prevents interaction between students and the teacher without which language teaching cannot be thought.

As in the classes of the high control teacher (HC), clarity in the directions by the teacher decreases misbehaviour resulting from ambiguity. Being slow but clear in transitions from one activity to another as the high control teacher (HC) was helps the teacher have smoothly running classes. On the other hand, being quick but vague in transitions, as the low control teacher (LC) was, accordingly causes the teacher to encounter more managerial problems. In addition, the teacher's competence in organising pairs and groups saves time and decreases misbehaviour, as in the classes of the high control teacher (HC). Especially in crowded classes, lack of organisational skills may lead to chaos and weaken the teacher's authority. Hence, at the very beginning of the course, the teacher should spend some time teaching students how to make pairs and groups when they are told to. In addition, flexible planning and teaching, as the low control teacher (LC) did, reduces monotony in class and arouses students' interest when they are distracted although it does not guarantee the continuance of their interest.

The board seems to be an important instructional tool in ELT classes, when used effectively, in teaching new structures and vocabulary items, as the high control teacher (HC) did, since it attracts attention, reduces ambiguity and prevents questions likely to be asked afterwards. Teacher's comments on how the activity is relevant to students' future needs, as the low control teacher (LC) often did, contribute considerably to students' interests. In other words, relevance to the needs improves student learning. Moreover, students expect the teacher to design interesting activities and to spend most of the allotted time on them, as the high control teacher (HC) often did although too much detail about a new structure, as the high control teacher (HC) did, bores some students.

Sharing the time equally among students, as the high control teacher (HC) did, and allowing for more practice, as the low control teacher (LC) did, are two important and effective teacher behaviours since they encourage students to participate in activities more often. The teacher's mood also affects the learning environment. A too serious expression on the teacher's face while teaching, as the high control teacher (HC) had, may discourage students from participating although leniency may lead to abuse. On the other hand, compelling students to answer questions, as the high control teacher (HC) often did, provides the chance of success and may enable timid students to get rid of their fear. When students experience success in answering the question in such cases, they often wish to participate willingly later.

When asked a question, addressing the explanation to the whole class, as the high control teacher (HC) did, enables the teacher to monitor the whole class although students who do not need any explanation about the topic may get bored. Nevertheless, the opposite, speaking only to the student who has asked for explanation and ignoring the rest of the class, as the low control teacher (LC) did, results in misbehaviour since the teacher cannot monitor the class and this suggests that the teacher should go on monitoring all students while he deals with something else. On the other hand, gestures and mimics, though effective, are rarely preventive to stop serious misbehaviour unless they are completed with other

management behaviours. Furthermore, both the inflexibility of the high control teacher (HC) and the permissiveness of the low control teacher (LC) may lead to more problems.

Calling the roll without distracting students while they are on the task, as the high control teacher (HC) did, prevents some prospective problems and, similarly, roll calling at the beginning of the session, as the low control teacher (LC) did, allows time for preparation and, consequently, prevents some possible problems. Furthermore, maintaining order successfully contributes to the learning environment since students feel more secure, and the level of control that the teacher imposes onto the class influences students' participation. While the strictness (that of the high control teacher - HC) discourages students from participation, the over-tolerance (that of the low control teacher - LC) leads to more problems and sometimes causes the teacher to lose control.

Walking around students and monitoring the activity in the classroom, as the low control teacher (LC) did very often, enable the teacher to instantaneously give cues and correctives to individual students. However, standing at the front, close to the teacher's desk, makes it easier to oversee the class as a whole whereas it restricts the teacher's monitoring individual students. Namely, the teacher at the front can control the class more easily, whereas the teacher among students can provide individual help and feedback. Providing satisfactory explanations for questions, as the high control teacher (HC) did, decreases ambiguity and misbehaviour, and it increases students' willingness to participate in activities. Also, talking to the whole class about the mistakes of any student, like the high control teacher (HC) did, discourages students from participating in the activities in which they are likely to make mistakes. Thus the explanations for the questions, and the prompts and correctives need to be concise and clear lest the students are bored.

Asking students to read out their work after a writing task for evaluative purposes, as the high control teacher (HC) did, encourages students because publicizing their work makes it meaningful to have spent effort on the activities. In addition, providing enough time for a question to be answered, as the high control teacher (HC) often did, helps decrease students' anxiety, whereas nominating another student to answer it if the first one is late for the answer, as the low control teacher (LC) often did, bothers students and makes them nervous. Thus, the teacher needs to be very careful about managing students' anxiety in terms of participation and evaluating students' output.

To sum up, students who really want to improve their English prefer to be in a well-managed classroom. Although a teacher who gives priority to students rather than tasks may first receive more popularity and seem more sympathetic to students, they later come to be disappointed with the teacher's applications unless they contribute to their learning. A low control teacher mostly prefers to give emphasis to students' needs and interests whereas a high control teacher chooses to give priority to instructional tasks, which seems to be the biggest difference between a high and low control teacher. When evaluated as a whole, the high control teacher seems to be a better classroom manager, whereas the low control teacher has some comparatively stronger skills. In other words, both orientations provide certain strengths and weaknesses in different contexts, and therefore, ELT teachers are suggested to have an eclectic orientation. Hence, it is necessary to identify teacher behaviours of various orientations that contribute positively to student learning.

Along with the knowledge of the subject matter, a foreign language teacher needs to be equipped with a large repertoire of effective management strategies, without being stuck within a specific orientation. No one strategy is effective per se; their effectiveness is context-dependent. In other words, certain behaviours of differing orientations may function better in one context than in another, and therefore it is vital that the teacher be selective in choosing the better one according the requirements of the context.

References

- Burden, B. (1995). *Classroom Management and Discipline: Methods to Facilitate Cooperation and Instruction*. New York: Longman.
- Charles, C. M. (1996). *Building Classroom Discipline* (5th ed.). New York: Longman.
- Chen, J. J. (1995). *The Perceptions of Teachers and Fourth Grade Students from China, Taiwan, and the US toward Classroom Management Strategies*. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Francisco.
- Gilberts, G. H. & Lignugariskraft, B. (1997). Classroom Management and Instruction Competencies for Preparing Elementary and Special Education Teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. 13 (6), 597-610.
- Good, T. L., Biddle, B. J. & Brophy, J. E. (1975). *Teachers Make a Difference*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Kameenui, E. J. & Darch, C. B. (1995). *Instructional Classroom Management: A Proactive Approach to Behavior Management*. New York: Longman.
- Kaplan, C. (1992). Teachers' Punishment Histories and Their Selection of Disciplinary Strategies. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*. 17 (3), 258-265.
- Martin, N. K. & Baldwin, B. (1992). *Beliefs Regarding Classroom Management Style. The Differences between Preservice and Experienced Teachers*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association. Knoxville, Louisiana.
- Martin, N. K. & Baldwin, B. (1994). *Beliefs Regarding Classroom Management Style: Differences between Novice and Experienced Teachers*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Southwest Educational Research Association. San Antonio.
- Martin, N. K. & Yin, Z. (1997). *Attitudes and Beliefs Regarding Classroom Management Style: Differences between Male and Female Teachers*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, Austin.
- Stensmo, C. (1995). *Classroom Management Styles: Two Case Studies*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Francisco, April, 18-22.
- Wolfgang, C. H. & Glickman, C. D. (1995). *Solving Discipline Problems: Strategies for Classroom Teachers*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Zabel, R. H. & Zabel, M. K. (1996). *Classroom Management in Context: Orchestrating Positive Learning Environment*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Makale Geliş:21-01-2004

İncelemeye Sevk: 12-04-2004

Düzeltilme:02-03-2007

Kabul: 28-06-2007