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ABSTRACT

This thesis describes a study of the relationships between self-efficacy in primary school teachers and their classroom management strategies in England and in Turkey. The study includes a survey of 73 Turkish teachers and 51 British teachers in terms of teacher efficacy in classroom management, followed up by observation and interviews with 6 teachers identified as high and 6 teachers as low efficacy. The role of self-efficacy in classroom management is examined through the application of Bandura's (1977, 1986, 1997) self-efficacy approach. A second important part of this study is the investigation of cultural differences between teachers in England and in Turkey with respect to misbehaviour and its management.

The study demonstrated that as teachers felt more efficacious they were more likely to employ effective, long term and positive methods to deal with misbehaviour and, in doing so, to create a more appropriate and orderly learning environment. This then enhanced teachers' confidence and encouraged positive, quality relationships with pupils.

Similarities rather than differences were common in terms of misbehaviour and methods used by both British and Turkish teachers to deal with it. However, some considerable differences existed, suggesting that, in comparison with British teachers, Turkish teachers lacked in familiarity with the concepts of classroom management and discipline in educational terms through pre or in-service training and training in the use of systematic management strategies based on certain theoretical roots. A striking difference emerged in the application of discipline policies in the British sample as there are no such policies in the Turkish context.

The development of self-efficacy appeared to result from experience, as a means of seeing positive outcomes of their own behaviour, positive encouragement from parents and the head, observing colleagues and from teacher personality. The findings of the study are discussed in order to formulate implications for teacher training courses and for qualified teachers. Training programmes to enhance self-efficacy in classroom management and discipline are suggested.
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INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

For these reasons, great emphasis has been placed on teachers' ability to create and maintain an orderly classroom atmosphere which allows effective learning and teaching to take place. For example, Brophy (1988) identifies classroom management as one of his four components of effective teaching. The other three are instruction, student socialisation and disciplinary intervention. The distinction between classroom management and disciplinary intervention is that the former, if effective, creates a classroom climate which prevents the need for disciplinary intervention.

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

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

(Brophy, 1988, p.3).

Jones and Jones (1998, p.19-20) support Brophy’s idea and suggest five domains of knowledge and skill which need to be implemented effectively for comprehensive classroom management. These are:

a) a solid understanding of current research and theory in classroom management and students’ personal and psychological needs

b) a positive teacher-student and peer relationship

c) instructional methods that facilitate optimal learning

d) organisational and group management methods for developing and committing to behavioural standards

e) a wide range of counselling and behavioural methods for examining and correcting students’ inappropriate behaviour.

It is obvious that in comprehensive classroom management, teachers are expected to have qualifications and skills, not only for conducting instructional activities and the management of groups, but also in the implementation of particular approaches to generate positive relationships and to deal with inappropriate behaviour.

Although social factors, for instance problematic family backgrounds (e.g. divorce, living with single or step parent, abuse, use of drugs), create difficulties for teachers, according to research results teachers are able to make a difference to children’s lives (Jones and Jones, 1998). Moreover, teachers’ ‘inviting messages’ (those which present something beneficial for consideration and acceptance) inform pupils that they are valuable, able and responsible (Purkey and Novak, 1984). Therefore, it is worth considering these positive management strategies from a teacher’s point of view. Being aware of a close link
between instruction and teachers’ competencies to cope with classroom uncertainties, some researchers have tended to concentrate on those dimensions of pedagogical and subject knowledge which lie behind effective teaching (Shulman, 1987).

Such approaches, however, do not take into account those aspects of teaching which have to deal with teachers’ feelings or perceptions about their ability to teach and orchestrate the classroom. Research on self-referent thought cautions that possessing knowledge and skills is not adequate for efficacious teaching (Raudenbush et al., 1992). Bandura’s (1977; 1986) self-efficacy approach to human behaviour has made a great contribution to the area of teaching and learning. Bandura (1997) believes that a teacher’s effectiveness is partly determined by their efficacy in maintaining an orderly classroom which is conducive to learning. Effective action calls for a personal judgement that one can activate the knowledge and skills needed to perform a behaviour successfully, in varied and unpredictable conditions. This judgement is defined as an efficacy expectation, the “conviction that one can successfully execute the behaviour required to produce the outcome” (Bandura, 1977, p.193).

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

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

“The task of creating learning environments conducive to development of cognitive competencies rests heavily on the talents and self-efficacy of teachers. Evidence indicates that teachers’ beliefs in their instructional efficacy partly determine how they structure academic activities in their classrooms and shape students’ evaluations of their intellectual capabilities”.
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Teachers' beliefs in their efficacy also affect their ways of managing classrooms particularly in dealing with students' misbehaviour. When studying teacher efficacy there is a tendency among researchers to compare high and low efficacy teachers' behaviour in the classroom. In one such study, Melby (1995) explored whether high and low efficacy teachers developed qualitatively different thoughts, emotional responses, expectations, control ideologies and behaviour management strategies in situations where discipline problems arose. She indicated that low efficacy teachers were: stressed and angered by misbehaviour; tended to use a punitive and restrictive manner of discipline; had a custodial view of their profession; and gave importance to subject matter rather than students' development. Conversely, teachers with strong efficacy were more effective, optimistic, confident, emotionally calm, non-stressed and encouraged students' intrinsic interests based on convincing methods rather than authoritarian control.

Having outlined the crucial place of self efficacy in teacher effectiveness, both in teaching and classroom management, this study has been designed to explore teacher efficacy in classroom management in a both Turkish and British context. The rationale behind the study may be summarised as follows:

- Since assumptions of teaching are very different in different cultures, this study aims to explore the behaviour management aspects of classroom teaching in a British and Turkish context. Comparing the contexts of both countries would generate useful information which could then be used to improve the current situation and formulate recommendations.

- The reason for doing a comparative study with particular emphasis on teacher efficacy is that in creating a successful learning environment, a person's self-efficacy will be extended, depending on their culture. As Hargreaves (1998) points out, teachers do things from not only a personal conviction but because of being well regarded by their colleagues or group they belong to; that is, the norms of a particular culture determine how teachers perceive themselves.

- The reason for choosing a self-efficacy theory to explore the issue of teachers' behaviour management strategies is that a sense of efficacy helps to determine
teachers' thoughts, feelings, how they select and conduct activities and the amount of effort they expand. If a bond between teachers’ sense of efficacy and their behaviour in the classroom is explored and identified, ways of enhancing efficacy could be planned to ensure a more positive and productive learning atmosphere.

- In England a debate has been maintained on the insufficient number of courses and practice in classroom management in teacher training. Consequently, there is now a demand for improving the current situation, for example, introducing teachers to different behaviour management approaches into in-service training courses and developing school behaviour policy as a result. The outcome of this study will have special value for the Turkish education system. In Turkey, classroom management is newly placed (1998-1999 academic term) in teacher training courses and in practice, teachers suffer from a lack of school behaviour policy and support from other educational institutions, such as guidance centres and in-service training in behaviour management.

For these reasons, this study is based on an attempt to yield implications for teacher training courses, in terms of content and planning materials for classroom management and to provide an outline for training programs for enhancing a sense of teacher efficacy. It should do this at least at the level of policy recommendation.

This thesis consists of six chapters. The first chapter briefly outlines the education system, initial teacher training and counselling services in Turkey. It also explains that this study has been carried out to fulfil the need for the formulation of implications for classroom management courses and practice in Turkish teacher training. The literature review (Chapter 2) includes two sections. The main concern of the first section is the nature of misbehaviour and its effects on classroom learning, strategies employed by teachers to manage misbehaviour and the role of in-service training and particular discipline approaches in classroom management. The second section explores the meaning and measurement of teacher efficacy, its relation to inter or intra-teacher variables and ways of enhancing a sense of efficacy.
Chapter Three begins with an explanation of research paradigms, research methods (qualitative and quantitative) and the ways of combining these methods. It moves on to the rationale behind studying teacher efficacy in classroom management and research questions. Survey, observation (systematic and participant) and interview, which are the main research strategies in this study, are explained including their advantages and disadvantages, with appropriate literature support and the researcher’s own experience in using them. In addition, the development of research instruments, their reliability and validity are part of this chapter.

In Chapter Four, an analysis of some questions from the Questionnaire and efficacy scale and an interpretation of the results are presented. Then systematic observation data and its interpretation are discussed in light of the field notes taken during the observations. Thus, incident examples and descriptions of teachers’ classroom atmosphere in relation to their classroom management are also included in the interpretation.

This chapter is followed by the Fifth Chapter which consists of an analysis and interpretation of the interview text according to the teachers’ origin (country) and their efficacy level. The field notes are combined with quotation when appropriate.

In the discussion and conclusion chapter, an overall discussion of results is presented by referring back to research questions and literature. The limitations of this research and how it could be improved when it is done again are also part of this chapter. Finally, implications are drawn for both the Turkish and English education system and recommendations are given for future studies.
CHAPTER ONE: THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE PRESENT STUDY TO THE TURKISH EDUCATION SYSTEM

1.1 INTRODUCTION

As briefly explained in the Introduction section, investigating classroom management strategies of primary school teachers according to their country of origin (Turkey & England) and efficacy level (high & low) is an important focus for this study. Therefore, hopefully, conclusions and recommendations drawn from this study will be made for the benefit of the education systems of both countries. However, due to some understandable reasons, as will be explained later on in this chapter, the ultimate aim of this study is to generate implications especially for Turkish teacher training and primary education. For this reason, it would be appropriate to give background information about the Turkish education and its schooling system in general and the structure of teacher training courses and the counselling services in particular with an emphasis upon classroom management.

1.2 EDUCATION SYSTEM AND SCHOOLING IN TURKEY

The current education system in Turkey has roots in the Law on Unification of Education in 1924. Since 1924, all schools have been brought under the Ministry of National Education (Gursimsek et al., 1997). Formal education includes pre-school education, basic education, secondary education and higher education.

1.2.1 PRE-SCHOOL EDUCATION (AGE 3-6)

The main aims of pre-school education are to develop the physical, mental and emotional abilities of children, to prepare them for basic education, to help them speak Turkish well and accurately and to encourage them to acquire good habits. It can be organised as day nurseries, kindergartens, and pre-school classes. Pre-school education for children from the age of 36 to 72 months is provided by the Ministry of National Education in kindergartens and pre-school classes. There are also private nurseries, day care centres and kindergartens which serve children from birth to age six (YOK, 1999).
1.2.2 BASIC EDUCATION (AGE 6-14)

The aims of primary education are to provide an atmosphere for children to acquire basic knowledge and the abilities and attitudes needed to be a good citizen, to prepare them, according to their interests and talents, for higher education and adult life. Until the 1997-1998 academic term, primary education comprised 5 years at primary school and 3 years at middle school or junior school. Since then, it has changed to include both primary and middle schools under the name of primary education.

Since primary school is the basis of the National Educational System, every Turkish citizen (all boys and girls) have to attend primary school. The provision is free although there are some private fee paying primary schools under state control. Teachers at basic education schools are trained at university faculties of education and complete at least one year of teaching on provisional status prior to nomination as regular teachers (YOK, 1999).

1.2.3 SECONDARY EDUCATION (AGE 14-18)

After basic education a minimum of 3 years’ attendance is required at secondary school. This is divided into general, vocational and technical education institutions. The aims of secondary education are to prepare students, according to their talents and interests, for higher education institutions and/or vocational and professional areas and to help them gain knowledge of general culture. Students in secondary schools are supposed to develop an awareness of issues influencing both the individual and society. They should also learn how to look for solutions to such problems and to participate the economic, social, and cultural development of country. The secondary education system can be broadly classified as General High Schools, and Vocational and Technical High Schools (YOK, 1999).

1.2.3.1 General High Schools:

These schools offer a minimum 3 years programme and aim to prepare students for higher education. Foreign language high school, Anatolian high school, science high school,
Anatolian fine arts high school and Anatolian teacher preparation high school are the main categories of general high schools.

1.2.3.2 Vocational and Technical High School:

Vocational and technical high schools comprise three-year vocational schools or four-year technical schools. They prepare students for professions or for higher education. There are four main groups of high schools within this category: Technical Schools for Boys, Technical Schools for Girls, Commerce and Tourism Schools, Religious Education Schools.

1.2.4 SPECIAL EDUCATION

The education of children with special needs is designed as to provide them with education opportunities at a different level of schooling. Provision is also made for special needs children to attend mainstream schools. In order to organise, co-ordinate, supervise, and evaluate guidance and psychological counselling, and special education services at educational institutions, a special education guidance and counselling services unit has been established in each province. Currently, there are 99 guidance and research centres served by 540 teacher-counsellors in 80 provinces.

At present special education is available for the following groups of children and young people:

- The visually impaired,
- The hearing impaired,
- The orthopedically impaired,
- The chronically ill.

Special Education Schools and Institutions comprise the following:

Basic Education Schools for the Visually Impaired, Basic Education Schools and Multi-Program High Schools for the Hearing Impaired, Basic Education Schools and Vocational High Schools for the Orthopedically Impaired, Hospital-Based Basic Education Schools,
Schools for Education and Practical Application (for the educable mentally-impaired), Science and arts Centre (for the exceptionally gifted and talented students), Printing House and Evening Vocational Schools for the Visually Impaired, Special Education Classes.

1.3 TEACHER TRAINING IN TURKEY

Education faculties have been responsible for training teachers since 1982. From that time, four years of higher education became compulsory for all candidates at all levels. Although Education faculties have made significant contributions, demanded by the education system for the training of teachers, this training could not, however, adjust to the rapid changes within the country because of inappropriate structuring and a tendency, in some areas, towards an imbalance in priorities, such as insufficient numbers of teachers in pre-school and primary education and excessive numbers of teachers in secondary education (YOK, 1998b).

Another problem is associated with the number and proportion of courses in teacher training. The main courses to be taken by students who are in different teacher education departments of education faculties are general cultural knowledge and skill (12 %), special field knowledge (63 %), pedagogical knowledge and methodology (25 %). However, some aspects of teacher education programmes, such as the unbalanced distribution of these three areas of training, the quality and content of the courses and insufficient practical training periods, have been subject to criticism. (Gursimsek et al., 1997).

Similarly, in a study of initial teacher training in England with implications for the system in Turkey, Senemoglu (1991) points out that Turkish teacher training programmes put more emphasis on theoretical aspects than on school-based experience. Teaching practice, which enabled students to integrate theory with practice, represented a much smaller element of the Turkish teacher training programme. Subject studies and professional studies were the two largest sections of the course while how to teach these subjects and curriculum studies were given lower priority.
1.3.1 CHANGES IN TEACHER TRAINING

In recent years, in an attempt to improve the quality of the education system, many projects and much research have been started. In order to train teachers, the Higher Education Council initiated projects and studies in the designing and restructuring of teacher training programmes at Education faculties at the beginning of 1996. Thus, some changes in BEd and postgraduates programmes in Education faculties took place. One of the reasons for these changes is the extension of primary education from 5-years compulsory education to 8-years compulsory education, which was put into practice in the 1997-1998 academic year. This change resulted in new demands for primary school teachers and subject specialists.

In order to meet this demand, the content of BEd and postgraduate programmes has been changed. New plans and regulations in teacher training courses at BEd and postgraduate level and the designing of PGCE courses for middle school teachers are the first steps towards the training of candidates more efficiently.

However, simply changing the content and the number of courses in old teacher training programmes was seen as preventing the achievement of new goals. As a result, at undergraduate level (BeD lisans), 16 teacher training programmes were developed. In addition, for candidates who have completed their subject training in other faculties but want to be a teacher, a PGCE programme, which is run by Education faculties, was established (YOK, 1998a).

It was thought that the old courses in the teacher training programme were not sufficient to train candidates to a high level of competence. Old lessons, mainly based on theoretical knowledge of educational sciences, were not enough to give teachers practical knowledge, skills and perspectives which they need in the classroom. New teacher training courses, equally balanced with regard to stages and gestalt principles were integrated into the BeD programme. The aim was to train candidates in both subject area and teacher training.
Consistent with these developments and as part of it, 73 research assistants, who work in the education faculty as lecturers, were sent abroad mainly to the UK and USA to do an EdD or a Masters in Education. The researcher is one such research assistant.

1.3.2 CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

Classroom management is one of the courses in teacher training programmes for primary and secondary levels initiated after this regulation. This course aims to give priority to classroom management and discipline. The rationale behind the implementation of this course emerged from the idea that a good teacher should manage a classroom effectively and productively and establish an appropriate atmosphere for learning in the classroom. To be able to educate and orient children who have different socio-economic status (SES), background and personal characteristics on the basis of mutual aims, it is essential for teachers to gain knowledge and skills from this course in terms of classroom control and discipline.

The basic elements of this course are:

- social and psychological factors influencing pupils' behaviour

- classroom atmosphere and group interaction

- developing rules related to classroom management and discipline

- the application of these rules

- use of time in the classroom, organisation of classroom, motivation, communication;

- the start of the year; creating a positive atmosphere which is appropriate for learning

- behaviour problems in the classroom and preventive ways of dealing with those problems

(YOK, 1998a).

This course includes a 2 credit taught course and 2 credit practical work.
1.4 THE RELATION TO THE PRESENT STUDY

In line with these changes, one of the ultimate aims of the present study is to formulate recommendations for the classroom management course in the light of the existing literature and results of this research. Since the issues of classroom management and discipline are not included in teacher training within the framework of any particular course and since they are new concepts with respect to both their theoretical aspects and practice, there is a need for advisory policy recommendations. Examples of such advice on pupil behaviour and discipline has been produced by the UK government through the DfEE Circulars. The circulars are supposed to help schools to sustain good behaviour and discipline based on good practice, as described in the Elton Report (1989) for example.

1.4.1 THE ROLE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN TEACHER TRAINING

The self-efficacy aspect of teacher perception in classroom management can also make a contribution to planning teaching activities which foster trainees' confidence, as teachers' classroom management strategies and their confidence could well be affected by how they are trained. Working with qualified teachers in this study may be relevant to finding out what kind of difficulty teachers who trained some years ago, before the implementation of this course, experienced.

In the literature, there is evidence that teacher trainees and novice teachers suffer from problems in establishing appropriate classroom discipline.

Student teachers are very much concerned with classroom control. Sometimes they spend much more time in dealing with pupils’ disruption rather than encouraging learning (Kagan, 1992; Rogers and Freiberg, 1994). Additionally, beginning teachers tend to be more control-oriented in their management approaches. For example, Johnson (1994) investigated elementary student teachers’ conceptions of classroom management and control during their teaching experience. The majority of respondents had rule-based perceptions. Other alternative conceptions dominance (authoritarian) and nurturance were expressed by a small number of the student teachers. Elementary student teachers had some difficulties in classroom management but this was not because they held weak or inappropriate conceptions in management before they entered the course. Limitations in
measuring "true conceptions" of student teachers and in involving a homogeneous group as a sample made it difficult to reach a better understanding of the degree and nature of the propositional knowledge gained from the teacher training programme.

Teachers' confidence in their ability to manage pupils' behaviour seems to be affected by experience and training. For example, in a comparative study, Campbell (1996) indicated that there were no differences in teacher efficacy between American and Scottish teachers while significant differences between pre-service and in-service teachers of both countries were found, suggesting that experienced teachers exhibit higher levels of teacher efficacy than pre-service teachers. Campbell suggested that activities and experience which could be included in pre-service education programmes to accelerate the development of teacher efficacy.

In their study of experienced and inexperienced teachers, Martin and Baldwin (1996) indicated that experienced teachers had more control over establishing a suitable psychological atmosphere and needed to exert less control in instructional management and communication dimensions. On the other hand, inexperienced teachers were more interventionist in instructional management and communication dimensions but less interventionist in establishing a suitable psychological environment. They interpreted these results as showing that beginning teachers may have unrealistic expectations in respect of how to manage their classrooms. Student teachers may tend to base this management on teacher control and survival skills.

Housego (1992) stressed the importance of changes in The University of British Colombia teacher education programmes designed to improve, standardise, re-order and extend the educational experiences of student teachers. He argued that such changes may result in the enhancement of student teachers' feelings of preparedness to teach, their personal teaching efficacy and teaching efficacy. He found that teacher efficacy did not increase significantly in any of the three terms. Personal teaching efficacy increased significantly in the third term, the extended practicum. This result highlighted the advantage of field experience. He concluded that since teacher efficacy depended on specific teaching situations, student teachers needed experience in a variety of settings as a defence against threats to their perceptions of their efficacy. Their self-evaluative and
analytical skills needed to be augmented. Decline in the total group of student teachers' efficacy over the 2-year period raised a question about the content of activities within the teacher education programme.

A lesson may be drawn from these studies that many teacher training courses have not been designed in a way that encourages or fosters teachers' sense of efficacy. However, this does not mean that nothing can be done. As knowledge and awareness are developed about conditions in which student teachers or novice teachers raise their confidence, training programmes can be designed to provide the optimum environment.

1.5 THE ROLE OF SCHOOL COUNSELLORS IN CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

School counsellors are seen as valuable resources to provide help for teachers, especially beginning teachers, in classroom management and discipline. Martin and Baldwin (1996) identified student welfare as the main focus of school counsellors. Besides counselling individual students, consultation with other school personnel was among the primary role of school counsellors. They emphasised that:

"By consulting with teachers, the school counsellors would be less likely to deal with case-specific discipline problems, and more likely to positively influence the general classroom climate. Indeed, by serving as a consultant regarding overall management concerns, school counsellors may be less likely to be associated with discipline".


School counsellors can take part as facilitators in the implementation of classroom management skills without involving discipline problems directly. One of their main roles is to prevent problems from becoming serious.

However, Foster-Harrison (1995) drew attention to the time pressures on school counsellors, suggesting alternative programmes such as peer counselling. In meeting the developmental needs of the regular students and the needs of at-risk children, school counsellors have limited time to reach all students. Peer programmes are suggested as a solution to facilitate the job of counsellors. In these programmes students are trained and prepared to:
a) assist more children daily than one or two professional counsellors can

b) directly affect the lives of children in a way that teaches self-responsibility while demonstrating care and service for others

c) increase participants’ potential for moral, emotional, social and cognitive development

(Foster-Harrison, 1995, p.95)

School counsellors play a key role in the implementation of peer programme development because they already have the skills and knowledge required by these programmes.

In a similar way, Moody (1997) addressed the increased number of students with emotional and behavioural handicaps and lack of interpersonal and social skills. He suggested pair counselling which can be used by school counsellors to satisfy such students’ needs. Pair counselling consists of play activities for interpersonal development, problem solving activities and activities for moral dilemmas. Such counselling creates a therapeutic atmosphere for children who have inadequate social relationships to improve their skills and awareness.

Both peer programmes and pair counselling seem to be proactive in their nature. They can lessen the number of students with behaviour problems.

1.6 GUIDANCE AND COUNSELLING IN TURKEY

Similarly, the roles of the counsellor in Turkey are identified as remedial, preventive and developmental. In the 1970-1971 academic year 90 counsellors were assigned by the Ministry of National Education to secondary schools. Although there has been an increase in the number of counsellors working in schools and counselling services every year, the rate of increase was rather slow (Kepceoglu, 1986). In the 1997-1998 academic year around 2,199 school counsellors were working in 2,033 schools, most of them secondary schools, with 12 million students attending. Between 1982 and the present day, 19 universities have run a four year bachelor degree in guidance and counselling with particular emphasis on school counselling. Each university has to have its own counselling and guidance centre, as part of the medical-social health, culture and sports
activities department, to help students with their individual, educational and career problems or needs (Dogan, 1998).

The Ministry of National Education has started to employ specifically trained counsellors in elementary and secondary schools. Since the duration of primary education was extended from 5 years to 8 in 1997, counselling services have been issued with new approaches or new directives according to the new system of primary education.

1.7 SUMMARY

This chapter obviously addresses the issue that there is an urgent necessity for the establishment of the principles of classroom management as a course in teacher training and as a practice in primary education in Turkey. In order to fulfil this need, it is worth considering the relevant research literature. Hence, the next chapter will describe and discuss studies of classroom management and teacher efficacy, keeping a link between these studies and the present study.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Since the focus of this study is to examine teachers’ responses to misbehaviour and the impact of teacher efficacy on behaviour management, literature on misbehaviour and the management of misbehaviour will be the main concern of this section. The nature of misbehaviour and its role in classroom management; the methods used by teachers to deal with misbehaviour and teacher efficacy in behaviour management are sub-sections of this chapter. To begin with, explanatory information about classroom management as a significant part of the teaching process and information about managing pupils’ behaviour as an essential aspect of classroom management needs to be given.

2.2 CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT AND MISBEHAVIOUR

2.2.1 CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT AND ITS COMPONENTS

Wilks (1996) summarises that, although in the past (1960s) classroom management was perceived as the same as classroom discipline, a contemporary understanding of it contains general managerial skills, classroom discipline procedures and methods of instruction. General managerial skills, which refer to teacher behaviours, are vital for creating and maintaining a positive, productive learning atmosphere by employing techniques to keep pupils’ attention in lessons and involve them in productive independent activities. The selection of curriculum content, planning of activities, physical organisation of the classroom, preparation of materials for lessons, use of time and general organisation of the classroom are among the general managerial skills.

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

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

(Doyle, 1986, p.395)

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

As can be understood from the quotation presented above, *reacting to misbehaviour* is one of the managerial functions needed to sustain order in the classroom. Similarly Brophy and Evertson’s (1976) understanding of classroom management as a means of “planning and conducting activities in an orderly fashion: keeping students actively engaged in lessons and seatwork activities; and minimising disruptions and discipline problems” (p.51) includes managerial aspects of misbehaviour. However, according to Brophy (1988) teachers are said to be more pro-active and powerful in shaping classroom events. He believes that:

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

(Brophy, 1983, p.266)

2.2.2 CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT AND ITS RELATION TO MISBEHAVIOUR

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

Similarly Charles (1996) says that “discipline is tied directly to misbehaviour, where there is no misbehaviour, no discipline is required” (p. 2). However, one cannot say order in classrooms only consists of responses to misbehaviour. It is also determined by the teacher’s organisation and guidance for classroom activities and academic work (Doyle, 1990).

Rosen, Taylor, O’Leary and Sanderson’s (1990) study with 137 elementary school teachers in New York supports Doyle’s assumption that more teachers reported that they used techniques to manage inappropriate social behaviour more often than inappropriate academic behaviour. This is because they may find inappropriate social behaviour more disruptive to the classroom and also they may perceive social behaviour as malleable, whereas academic performance may be determined by less malleable factors.

In order to understand management, one needs to examine how the teacher monitors classroom events before misbehaviour occurs. (Kounin, 1970). From an organisational point of view, an activity is considered as an essential element in classroom order. Each activity, for instance, a spelling test, a writing lesson or a study period can be described in the sense of its duration, physical aspects, programme of action for subjects and the focal content of the segment. To understand classroom management and order, the programme of action is crucial (seat work, whole class). This perspective contributes to understanding the nature of misbehaviour and finding appropriate discipline approaches (Doyle, 1990).

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

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

(Doyle, 1986, p. 419)

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

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

(Freiberg et al. 1995, p. 37)

These characteristics of student behaviour overlap with the concepts public and contagious mentioned earlier by Doyle (1986).

Conversely, in an effectively managed classroom, more time is allocated to learning activities and pupils spend their time actively involved in particular learning tasks and they also learn how to manage themselves through classroom management (Wilks, 1996). For example, self-monitoring provides an opportunity for pupils to control their own behaviour by using behaviourist strategies, and in doing so to enhance their competence and power. Teachers can assist students in the collection and recording of data on their behaviour so that pupils receive social reinforcement and praise for accurate recording and improvement. Positive consequences of monitoring their own behaviour also help generate an internal locus of control. (Jones and Jones, 1998).

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

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

All literature summarised here so far, has shown the importance of classroom management as a means of managing instructional activities and handling inappropriate behaviour in order to establish an effective learning environment. A great deal of academic explanation and discussion have been concerned with the interrelationship between learning and management or order, and as mentioned before, misbehaviour is one of the biggest threats for teaching and learning activities. Approaches adopted by teachers for dealing with misbehaviour and their beliefs about their ability to cope with problematic behaviour are the main concerns of this research. However, it is also necessary to consider the literature with regard to sources of misbehaviour and the ways of dealing with it.

2.2.3 CAUSES OF MISBEHAVIOUR

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

McGuiness (1993) examines disruptive behaviour in the light of sociogenic factors such as national, social and family influences, psychogenic ones such as self-esteem, self-image, and school related factors such as school ethos, curriculum and teaching methods. He goes on to say that “schools do not exist in a vacuum, nor do teachers work in a climate unaffected by the larger, different worlds within which we and our pupils live” (p.7). For example, living in a deprived inner-city area and having a poor economic situation has a big influence on the child’s physical development and learning. Furthermore, teachers and administrators tend to treat students from low or high income families differently when they do not obey class and school rules (Brantlinger, 1993).
Similarly, according to Freiberg et al. (1995) disruptive behaviour may be seen as a result of classroom, school, and social problems which affect teachers and students. They found that elementary school students whose teachers attended a classroom management programme (consisting of 6 sessions) showed statistically significant higher levels of achievement on both national norm achievement tests and state criterion-referenced achievement tests, in comparison with students who had teachers who had not trained on such a programme, and also these students perceived their environment in a significantly more positive way than comparative students.

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

Galloway and Goodwin (1987) also show that differences between white working class norms and school norms result in a certain amount of deviance. They argued that it cannot be generalised that all pupils from low socio-economic background exhibit emotional and behavioural difficulties. There must be other factors associated with this link.

Although home background is one of the factors affecting behaviour, McNamara and Moreton (1995) suggest that teachers can help children to change the way they perceive themselves and change their behaviour, despite the negative feedback from home. As
Coopersmith (1967) showed, parents, peers and teachers are the most influential groups in shaping self-esteem. Peer group and teacher feedback were two thirds of the influence, while the impact of parents was one third. This was especially valid for academic self-esteem.

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

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

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

(Purkey and Novak, 1984, p.26)

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

Although several factors contribute to the development of problematic behaviour, in this study misbehaviour and the ways of managing misbehaviour are examined from the perspective of teachers' personal characteristics. More specifically, teacher efficacy has been chosen as the area of study as it is one of the influential variables in classroom management. However, before moving on to studies related to teacher efficacy, it would be appropriate firstly to summarise studies focusing on the styles of classroom management adopted by different teachers in order to provide a general framework.

2.2.4 TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS STUDIES IN CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

Kounin's (1970) study is very well known and enormously influential in classroom management. He has provided, and still does, a theoretical and conceptual framework for
research and practice in this area. For this reason, it is worth explaining his study in detail here.

Kounin analysed the individual differences between teachers and he identified several techniques which are influential in increasing or reducing the extent of pupil deviance in classroom management. ‘Movement management’ is described as one important area which refers to how the teacher initiates, sustains and terminates different activities during a lesson. ‘Dangles’ and ‘flip-flops’ are two examples for movement management. “A dangle occurs when the teacher begins an activity, then leaves it ‘in mid air’ by turning to another activity and then finally returns to the original activity. A flip-flop occurs when the teacher terminates one activity, begins a second activity, and then returns to the first activity” (p.257). It was found that the number of flip-flops and dangles are positively correlated to the extent of pupil deviance and if teachers reduce the number of dangles and flip-flops, there would be less pupil deviance. In Hargreaves’s (1975) terminology, a flip-flop occurs when the teacher switch-signals the end of one sub-phase, initiates the subsequent sub-phase, and then jumps back into the original sub-phase. The structure of switch-signals and their relationship with rules are considered important issues because different sub-phases have different rules. In order to be aware of which rules play a part pupils need to know which phase is taking place at that time.

‘Withitness’ and ‘overlapping’ are the main concepts invented by Kounin to describe processes in which teachers attempt to draw pupils’ attention to task. Withitness refers to the situation when the teacher gives a response to the target child at the same time as a misbehaviour happens. In short, the teacher is aware of what is happening in the classroom at all times, for example, who is misbehaving and handles misbehaviour appropriately and promptly. Overlapping, as a means of dealing with two or more events simultaneously, enables teachers, for example, to respond to a misbehaviour by looking while they are monitoring a group of students. These characteristic teacher behaviours prevent pupils from misbehaving and encourage them to stay on task.

The practical implications of Hargreaves’s work as well as Kounin’s work are that switch-signalling is an important skill for teachers and can be used to prevent deviance
from occurring. Student teachers and teachers should be trained to observe the successful
use of switch-signalling in other teachers.

Brophy and Evertson (1976) aimed to measure the variables which emerged from
Kounin's (1970) study by employing high and low inference classroom observation
instruments. Their findings supported Kounin's results concerning characteristics of
successful classroom management and its relation to producing successful student
learning. Teachers who have fewer discipline problems, assigned most of their time to
teaching and completing teaching tasks more successfully, than teachers who spent a
great amount of time getting attention and dealing with discipline problems.

Most successful teachers could monitor what was happening in other parts of the
classroom while they were teaching in small groups. Conversely, less successful teachers
located themselves in a place where they could not monitor the whole classroom.
Successful teachers regularly moved around the classroom to check seatwork or to keep
an eye on events happening in the classroom. Teachers who are called the more ‘with-it’
teachers tended to deal with a problem using appropriate intervention so that it would not
spread or become serious.

Within the same area as Kounin’s study, Evertson and Emmer (1982) observed 13 more
and 13 less effective classroom managers in junior high maths and English classes during
the first 3 weeks of the year, focusing on antecedent behaviours, characteristics and
classroom activities. The more effective teachers were found to be more successful than
the less effective teachers in teaching rules and procedures to their students. In addition,
they were more consistent in managing behaviour and enforcing their system of rules and
procedures. The more effective teachers were more successful in transmitting information
clearly, communicating their expectations about behaviour, and providing corrective
feedback.

Emmer, Evertson and Anderson (1980), Emmer et al. (1982), Emmer et al. (1981) found
that establishing rules and procedures at the beginning of the year are the main
characteristics of effective classroom managers in elementary and junior high school.
Effective managers were concrete and explicit in explaining rules and procedures. They deliberately taught their existing systems to the students. They had prepared procedures to deal with the problems or interruptions anticipated. Effective managers monitored classes closely, stopped inappropriate behaviour promptly and continued to remind students of the rules and procedures during the first weeks of school.

Doyle’s (1984) study with seven junior high school English teachers focused on the characteristics of effectively managed classrooms. Teachers were observed with special attention being paid to classroom rules and procedures and how activities were carried out. He found that successful managers had structured lessons in line with the schedule of the school day. Activities, boundaries of activities and transitions between them were clearly defined, and activities were protected by focusing public attention on work and ignoring misbehaviour.

In the Classroom Strategy Study, Brophy and McCaslin (1992) investigated elementary teachers’ perceptions about problem students and strategies used by these teachers to cope with problem students. Ninety-eight experienced (at least 3 years; K-6) elementary teachers participated to the study. The responses of teachers rated as highly effective in dealing with problem students were compared with the responses of teachers rated as less effective. The teachers were interviewed and responded to two vignettes to express their attitudes and beliefs about each problem student and strategies to cope with the problems presented.

In fact subgroups of teachers (according to teaching location, grade level, role definitions and effectiveness level) reported the same main strategies but the teachers were different in coherence and elaboration of these strategies. Teachers rated as highly effective in dealing with problem students indicated more willingness to become personally involved in working with problem students; expressed more confidence in their ability to elicit significant improvement and provided richer descriptions of long-term problem prevention or remediation strategies.

Wragg and Dooley (1984), in their observation of 34 PGCE students, found that student teachers who gained high grades from supervising tutors for the amount of pupil learning,
had a class with low deviancy and high involvement. There was only a certain amount of agreement between tutors on task involvement. Most deviance was of a minor nature (chatting), few students met serious discipline problems, and severe disruption were rare. Minor chaos and prolonged mild deviance characterised many lessons. Teacher responses were mostly brief and misbehaviour subsequently ceased or lessened.

In another observational study Wragg (1993) compared student teachers and experienced teachers in terms of misbehaviour in their classes and their responses to it. More noisy chatting and inappropriate movement were observed in student teachers' classrooms than in the classrooms of experienced teachers. Experienced teachers were more likely to address their responses to individual pupils, re-involve pupils in their work, use praise and make sustained responses, whereas student teachers tended to direct their responses to groups of pupils, give more orders to cease and use facial expression. Within the same study, Wragg also made comparisons among teachers concerning pupils' on-task level and the amount of misbehaviour as two criteria for effectiveness. Although these teachers were working in the same school and adopted the same school policy, high task involvement and low deviancy were associated with features of effective teachers. This result was attributed to careful consideration of appropriate work for the class and individuals, greater use of reinforcement, consistent classroom rules, good humour which created a positive interaction and regular monitoring of pupils' work. Some teachers had classes with low task involvement and higher misbehaviour. This was related to unclear rules of behaviour and inconsistent application of the rules, prolonged settling process and negative pupil and teacher relationships.

The research presented above focused on the differences between effective or successful and less effective or less successful teachers in classroom management. Effective teachers are found to be more positive, explicit and consistent, in comparison with less effective teachers. These researches also contributed an enormous amount of information to the organisation of classrooms and the management of students. Above all, the question comes to mind ‘What makes teachers effective or successful?’ From the self-efficacy perspective, the answer is teachers’ belief that they can successfully manage pupils’ behaviour. Therefore, it is significant to consider the research into teacher effectiveness.
2.2.5 MISBEHAVIOUR AND METHODS USED BY TEACHERS TO DEAL WITH IT

2.2.5.1 MISBEHAVIOUR

Although the strategies adopted by high and low efficacy teachers to manage pupils’ behaviour are the main concern of this study, a brief review of studies in misbehaviour and methods or strategies reported by teachers and their relation to other variables would be appropriate. This is important as it may allow the researcher to find out variables associated with the ways of managing behaviour, in doing so enabling her to reach a holistic framework for the evaluation of the place of efficacy in classroom management.

Wheldall and Merrett (1988) did a survey of troublesome behaviour which was met by primary school teachers in their classroom. When teachers were asked to identify the two most troublesome children in their classroom, 76% of them declared boys to be the most troublesome and 77% of the teachers identified boys as the second most troublesome. 46% of teachers mentioned ‘talking out of turn’ (TOOT) as most troublesome behaviour, ‘hindering other children’ (HOC) was the second cited by 25% of teachers. None of the other categories were chosen by more than 10% of teachers. The category of ‘physical aggression’ was chosen by less than 1%. Most of the teachers emphasised that TOOT and HOC are not particularly serious misbehaviour but irritating, time-consuming, exhausting and stressful.

The results of a survey of primary school teachers’ views on discipline in Australia by Johnson and Oswald (1993) support Wheldall and Merrett’s study especially with the findings that teachers experienced frequent but minor discipline problems (TOOT, HOC). Primary school teachers found idleness and work avoidance the most difficult, whereas talking out of turn was seen by junior school teachers as the most difficult problem. A small minority of pupils from socio-economically disadvantaged areas, with below average ability may be responsible for most disruptive behaviour. Reasoning and discussion strategies were most often used rather than sanctions. Half of the teachers said they would deal better with discipline problems if the class was smaller, and support services and training were provided.
Akkok et al. (1995) asked primary school teachers in Turkey to report on disciplinary problems inside and outside the classroom. Speaking out of turn, being extremely noisy, complaining about friends to teachers unnecessarily were seen as the most frequent behaviour problems. In addition mocking friends, disobeying the school rules, disturbing others were among the other behaviour problems. Verbal and physical punishment were reported as the most widely used strategy by elementary school teachers in addition to discussing the problem with the child and using signals.

Defining expected and unwanted behaviours; setting limits and giving responsibilities and showing love and affection to children were perceived by teachers as vital for an effective classroom climate.

2.2.5.2 METHODS

Rosen et al. (1990) aimed to identify which management techniques elementary school teachers used to control appropriate and inappropriate academic and social behaviour. 137 elementary school teachers in New York were asked to demonstrate the methods they employed in dealing with appropriate and inappropriate academic and social behaviour and they were also asked to evaluate the frequency of the methods using a 4 point scale (from 0=not at all to 3=very much). The most frequently reported responses (99 % of the teachers) were praise statements, compliments and positive physical contact for appropriate social and academic behaviour rather than concrete consequences (material rewards, detentions, extra assignments). However when they observed a group of teachers (8 teachers) to support the results of the self-reports, they ended up with mostly neutral teacher responses (90 %) to students’ positive and negative behaviour including instruction, answer-question, and statements of fact. Within the remaining responses, positive responses (7 %) occurred with greater frequency than negative ones (2.9 %).

Teachers and the characteristics of their classes can determine the interventions employed by teachers, as shown by Ringer et al. (1993) who found that specific reinforcement techniques were more frequently used by teachers of the first seven grades (K-3 89 %; 4-6 77 %) than teachers of other grades and by more female teachers than male teachers. Female teachers used behaviour plans more frequently than male teachers and teachers of
the first seven grades did. Peer tutoring was used more frequently by teachers of grades 4-6 than by the teachers of other grades and more frequently by female teachers than male teachers, more frequently in regular education, and in elementary school than in high school. According to the results of this study, behaviour-oriented strategies may be more acceptable for elementary school and female teachers. However, it should be noted that the number of female teachers was larger than that of male teachers. Also looking at the same issues and comparing differences between urban and rural areas, with a larger sample might yield different results.

This study did, however, have a contribution to make in the study of teacher efficacy, showing the role of several variables such as grade, teachers’ gender and schools’ region, associated with interventions chosen by teachers. This link should be remembered when the relationship between teacher efficacy and teachers’ management styles is interpreted.

Jack et al. (1996) designed a study to determine the differences between teachers who reportedly used planned classroom management strategies in their social interaction with students and teachers who reported less usage of planned behaviour management strategies. They interviewed 20 teachers to identify how they developed and used classroom management strategies. Interview results showed that one group of teachers got high scores and the other low scores, in the use of planned strategies. Each teacher was also observed, to determine their interaction with students who had serious behaviour disorder (SBD).

Interactions between students with SBD and their teachers were mainly found to be negative. Students’ disruptive behaviour led to negative responses. Although teachers planned to employ structured management approaches, like token economy systems, they might not use them accurately and consistently.

Positive interaction was observed at greater length in the group who reported planned strategies than the group who used fewer planned strategies. But this difference was ascribed to the length of each interaction rather than to differences in the frequency of positive responses. The interpretation of these results may also need caution since management strategies were assessed by their reports on interviews rather than direct
observation. Using a small and heterogeneous (integrated/segregated; aged 5-15) sample was another limitation of this study.

As part of the Positive Teaching Project, Merrett and Wheldall (1987) designed a survey with a sample of 128 British primary school teachers. The OPTIC (Observing Pupils and Teachers in Classrooms) was used to identify how much time children spend engaged in academic tasks and the nature and frequency of teachers’ responses to their behaviour. With OPTIC it was possible to determine teachers’ positive and negative responses to children’s academic, social and on-task behaviour. Each teacher was observed three different times for half an hour each time.

The proportion of total approval was higher than total disapproval. Teachers gave more responses to academic work (66%) than to social behaviour (34%). Academic behaviours gained three times more positive responses than negative responses, while negative responses were given to social behaviour five times more frequently than positive responses. 38 of 128 teachers never mentioned any approval towards social behaviour, six of them gave over twenty of this kind of response, showing clear differences between teachers. Generally, British teachers are more likely to employ approval than disapproval but more approval for academic work than social behaviour. Similarly, in a review of several studies which investigated reactive discipline strategies, Wilks (1996) concluded that teachers mainly use negative verbal responses towards inappropriate social behaviour and positive verbal responses for academic behaviour.

It is understood that misbehaviour definitely results in a negative interaction between pupil and teacher. This may not lessen unwanted behaviour and may even make establishing a good relationship and an appropriate climate for teaching and learning extra difficult. Here, the problem may lie in the lack of training in systematic management strategies for teachers. Some researchers have attempted to train teachers in the use of management strategies within the framework of in-service training. They achieved mostly positive results. These will be presented in the next section.
2.2.6 THE IMPORTANCE OF IN-SERVICE TRAINING IN CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

The necessity and importance of in-service training in teaching teachers how to use systematic approaches has been supported by the literature (Elton Report, 1989; McNamara and Moreton, 1995; Merrett and Wheldall, 1993; Wheldall and Merrett, 1992; Maeve, 1992; Veenman and Raemaekers, 1995). Similar kinds of in-service training should be taken into account in the future for teachers in Turkey as the present investigation indicates that there is a need and demand for training in structured discipline approaches in Turkey.

"Being an effective class manager is not a talent which some people have and others do not- it is a set of skills and an attitude learned through patience and practice" (Bassey, 1989, p.71). Confirming Bassey’s view, according to the Elton Report, teachers say that they learn to manage classrooms ‘on the job’ by trial and error and that training in classroom behaviour management rarely takes place in initial and in-service training (Wheldall, 1992).

It was recommended that the main problem of disruption could be reduced by helping teachers to become more effective classroom managers. Initial and in-service training are very important for this process. All initial teacher training courses should include specific practical training in how to motivate and manage groups of pupils. In-service training, which should be provided through school-based groups, should aim not only to refine classroom management skills but also develop patterns of mutual support among colleagues (Elton Report, 1989).

McNamara and Moreton (1995) also emphasise the importance of in-service training for teachers. They assert that if teachers have not been trained in how to deal with a pupil’s behaviour and their own feelings, they are left with only their school experiences. In order to change disruptive behaviour, teachers should first of all look at their own behaviour, language and appropriate rules in the classroom, rather than initially paying attention to the pupil’s behaviour. In Merrett and Wheldall’s (1993) study, many teachers reported
that attending a training course in classroom behaviour management lessened teachers’ stress and helped to reduce problem behaviour among pupils.

In an attempt to initiate in-service training for teachers in England, Merrett and Wheldall (1990a) developed Positive Teaching Packages as a tool for skills-based in-service training in classroom behaviour management in primary schools. It was based on their positive teaching model of understanding classroom behaviour on the basis of teacher-pupil interactions and applied behaviour analysis for solving behaviour problems.

The Behavioural Approach to Teaching Package (BATPACK), was the first training package (Wheldall and Merrett, 1985) for primary school teachers. The aim was to change teacher behaviour through skill-based training consisting of six one-hour sessions. Teachers involved in these courses expressed very positive feedback. Independent observers also evaluated the courses and found that the use of reprimands diminished, whilst teachers increasingly used praise and reward, resulting in positive changes in the behaviour of their classes. The level of on-task behaviour also rose.

In another study (Merrett and Wheldall, 1990b) 23 teachers from a large primary school attended the BATPACK training. Twenty two of them completed pre and post-training questionnaires and 9 teachers agreed to be observed before and after training. Almost all teachers who filled in the questionnaire reported that they had increased positive responses and most of them had decreased negative ones. The results of the observation of 9 teachers indicated that positive responses increased by around 60 %, and the reduction in negative responses was about 30 %. The level of on-task behaviour was almost 90 %, except for one class and in all classes the level of on-task behaviour increased by around 13 %.

Wheldall and Merrett (1992) revised the first packages and carried out a study with 7 teachers, using the new version. Once again, they found that teachers increased positive responses towards social behaviour and decreased negative ones. There was an improvement in on-task levels compared to pre-training on-task levels. As well as in the UK, the BATPACK training course has also been used in New Zealand, Hong Kong,
Australia and Canada. With the encouraging results of the positive teaching model, Wheldall and Merrett (1992) concluded that:

...Teachers can do something constructive about troublesome classroom behaviour rather than blaming parents, television or food additives. Positive teaching focuses on encouraging pupils to learn to behave more appropriately and hence to stand more chance of learning effectively in school.

(Wheldall and Merrett, 1992, p.63)

Maeve’s (1992) study confirmed Wheldall and Merrett’s conclusion. Influenced by Kounin’s (1970) and other teacher effectiveness studies (Emmer et al. 1980; Doyle, 1984), Maeve looked at the effects on classroom management of a skill-based in-service programme, which relied on cognitive behavioural orientation and aimed at the enrichment of concepts and acquisition of skills. Training materials included video, live theory presentations and written manual. Significant differences were found between experimental and control groups, suggesting that improvement in experimental groups occurred in ‘withitness’, ‘overlap’, ‘transition’, ‘task orientation’ and ‘effective management’. Teachers who attended this programme gained rich conceptualisation, communicated rules clearly, felt more confident in their ability, made greater use of praise and constructive feedback, used overlap especially in small groups and gave clear academic signals. These results also confirmed that findings stemming from the US can be applied to another culture.

Similarly, Veenman and Raemaekers (1995) examined the long term effects of a staff development programme based on teaching effectiveness research. Teachers were observed before and after the training treatment. Short-term and follow-up studies revealed a significant treatment effect for the time on-task levels of pupils in the multi-grade classes and for the instructional and classroom management skills e.g. use of materials/space and dealing with disruptions. Borg and Ascione (1982) also showed that when teachers were trained on the classroom management programmes (using Utah State University Classroom Management Programme) pupil-on-task behaviour in the classroom of those teachers increased significantly. It also led to reductions in mildly and seriously deviant pupil behaviour.
Nelson (1996) evaluated a school-wide programme consisting of school organisational practices, a school-wide classroom management intervention system, individual behavioural programmes and an advisory board. The purpose of the programme was to increase the potential of elementary schools, educate students with disruptive behaviour. Two elementary schools whose students were generally disadvantaged were subjected to the programme over two years. In comparison with control schools, an apparent positive effect emerged for treatment schools in their disciplinary actions and teachers' perceptions of their ability to work with children who exhibited disruptive behaviour. Attending the programme also raised shared goals among staff for dealing with disruptive behaviour. Moreover, children with disruptive behaviour indicated positive improvement in their social adjustment, academic performance and school survival skills.

As the literature shows, when teachers are helped to concentrate on what they can do for positive teaching and positive behaviour management, the application of theoretical knowledge on positive approaches becomes easier. Additionally, training programmes based on several elements of effective teaching and particular skills of classroom management have positive effects on both pupils’ learning or time on task behaviour and teachers’ use of more productive and preventive management strategies.

2.2.7 DISCIPLINE APPROACHES

Crisis management of disruptive behaviour has been applied in the past. But research and educational thinking about discipline and related issues has progressed since the mid 1970s and a more proactive, preventive approach to disruptive behaviour has been accepted. Thus, schools in general and teachers in particular, can be helped to prevent disruptive behaviour from occurring. (Tattum, 1986; Gettinger, 1988).

Research (Brophy, 1983; Doyle, 1986; Jones and Jones, 1998) indicated that in addition to dealing with problems effectively when they happen, preventing problems from occurring, through an environment which encourages learning and appropriate behaviour, is essential for successful classroom management. This process is summarised in Gettinger’s words:
Comprehensive classroom management incorporates both reactive responding to unproductive student behaviour as well as proactive planning for and encouragement of productive behaviour, or what has come to be labelled as “proactive classroom management”. Proactive classroom management, in particular, facilitates productive student behaviour through the design of the entire instructional programme that prevents or allows for early interruption of unproductive behaviours.

(Gettinger, 1988, 227-229)

Similarly, Wilks (1996) asserts that proactive strategies differ from reactive discipline approaches, giving priority to preventive and comprehensive approaches to disruptive behaviour and resting on specific strategies for appropriate and inappropriate behaviour based on theory.

McGinnins et al. (1995) emphasise that continued usage of reactive strategies cannot be a solution for a student with learning and behaviour problems. Consistent use of a coordinated preventive classroom management system should be a part of dealing with behaviour problems, instead of the occasional use of behaviour management techniques as a reaction to these behaviours.

In sum, by making a link between teacher effectiveness studies and establishing a caring atmosphere Brophy (1988) concluded that “... teachers who approach classroom management as a process of establishing and maintaining effective learning environments tend to be more successful than teachers who place more emphasis on their roles as authority figures or disciplinarians” (p.1).

Those comments are very valuable and vital for creating an orderly atmosphere for learning. To help in the adopting of preventive and proactive approaches and making them part of the classroom process, ideas and skills suggested by clinical psychologists and counselling approaches have a valuable place. As Brophy (1988) points out, basic socialisation and counselling skills are needed by teachers particularly for working with students with personal and adjustment problems. However, in their review of research findings of four classroom management programmes (T.E.T., Reality Therapy, Assertive Discipline and Adlerian/Dreikurs’ approaches) Emmer and Aussiker (1990) indicated that these programmes were only useful in supplementing a more comprehensive approach to
classroom management. Planning, preparation, and the development of systematic activities at the beginning of the year would be more effective in preventing small problems from becoming major ones.

However, it should be argued that for effective and positive classroom management, teachers need both planning and preparation, and communication and understanding skills which emerge from counselling or psychological approaches. Bowers and Flinders (1990) criticised teacher effectiveness studies for being technical and mechanistic and ignoring caring and nurturing relationships in the classroom. The importance of both the behavioural skills and “natural virtues” for effective classroom management is emphasised by McManus (1994). In his words “natural virtues” include:

Having a warm and approachable demeanour, a keen sense of moral responsibilities, and a commitment to fostering pupils’ development in the face of obstruction and disaffection (McManus, 1994, p.49).

Jones and Jones (1998) argue that from the late 1980s and continuing until today the counselling approach, behavioural methods and teacher-effectiveness research in working with students has been expanded and increasingly integrated with other approaches (p.16).

It is therefore worth summarising a number of approaches commonly mentioned in literature.

Dreikurs (Dreikurs et al., 1982) for example, developed an approach for teachers to use in order to provide control in the classroom. He expanded Adler’s concepts and approach. First of all teachers need to clarify the aim of misbehaviour (e.g. attention seeking, power and control, revenge and helplessness) and their own feelings towards that misbehaviour, which provides clues as to why the misbehaviour occurs. Having identified the goal of misbehaviour teachers should control their immediate response so as not to reinforce misbehaviour. A later discussion with the child to identify alternative solutions is suggested. Encouragement should be given to make pupils see that their efforts produce positive results and make them feel confident about their abilities.
Dreikurs believes that instead of punishment, allowing students to see the consequences of their behaviour is more productive, for example, if a child talks without putting his/her hands up, the teacher ignores them. In summary, the basic goal of Dreikur's approach is to develop responsibility through a democratic approach, to decide rules and consequences together and hence develop respect for others and themselves.

Glasser's approach to discipline is examined through three different periods (Burden, 1995). In reality therapy (1969), students are given the responsibility for choosing their behaviour. Students and teachers work together to establish rules and the teacher insists on the rules without accepting excuses. According to Glasser's model the teacher should negotiate the child's behaviour, whether the behaviour is helpful for him and for the class and how it could be made helpful. Then the teacher presents appropriate alternatives and they design a plan to abolish problem behaviour.

In control theory (1986), the needs of the student (e.g. belonging, control, freedom, and fun) are considered when looking at discipline problems and finding a solution. Therefore, teachers should build an environment in which students feel satisfied. More recently Glasser (1992, 1993) has broadened his perspective of discipline to involve the organisational aspects of schools and has suggested a transition from boss-management, which causes opposition between students and staff, to lead-management which encourages them to share responsibilities within a collaborative network and implies preventive strategies. He came up with specific strategies for teachers to apply in establishing quality schools.

Another approach which can be applied to pupil-teacher relationship, is Transactional Analysis founded by Berne. According to Berne (1964), three ego states: parent, child and adult, develop through life experience and are kept consciously and subconsciously in the brain.

The parent ego state consists of behaviours, thoughts and feelings copied from parents and parent figures. The adult ego state includes behaviours, thoughts and feelings directly related to here and now. The child ego state involves behaviour, thoughts and feelings replayed from childhood. (Stewart and Joines, 1996).
How can teachers use this information? First of all they need to clarify which ego state students are behaving or speaking from and which ego state is most appropriate for dealing with students' disruptive behaviour. Facial expression, vocal tones, body gestures and language associated with ego states can be helpful to identify ego states. Having clarified ego states, the teacher changes his/her behaviour with non-directive and directive statements and questions, usually derived from the adult ego state and helps students to express and clarify the real meaning of their actions. The main aim of TA is to promote rational thought (adult), to affirm the positive aspects of restraints (the parent) and to facilitate creativity (the child).

Teaching students to choose responsible behaviour and thus promote their self-esteem and academic achievement, is among the main aims of Assertive Discipline (1992). Teachers play a big role in establishing rules and directions, including clear definitions of appropriate and inappropriate behaviour and teaching these rules and directions, working co-operatively with parents and administrators when they need support to deal with student behaviour. When students follow classroom rules, reward or positive recognition is given to motivate them to behave appropriately. There are consequences for misbehaviour which are arranged in a systematic way, for example, when students do not obey the rules a warning is given the first time, a privileges is lost the second time and an additional one the third time, parents are notified the fourth time and they are sent to the head the fifth time.

In recent years, circle of friends and peer support have been applied to classroom behaviour management. A considerable number of Special Needs Co-ordinators and class teachers in primary schools use circle time as a whole class intervention. This approach facilitates an increased ability to work together based on understanding and awareness and respect for the difference in others, on their values and beliefs (Curry, 1997).

The rationale behind the Circle of Friends is to share the responsibility of solving problems with pupils. The main aim of this approach is to establish a circle or group which encompasses the focus child who has special needs. In order to understand the focus child's feelings and behaviour, and to develop empathy, the group leader uses several brainstorming and psychotherapeutic techniques. After developing empathy and
understanding, a group of volunteers become friends of the focus child. The group or circle of friends consists of some sessions or stages in which the group leader and members discuss the role of friendship in their life. They talk about the circles around them and the group leader shows who might be in the first, second, third and fourth circle. After defining who is involved in their circle, they begin to express their feelings if their second and third circles are empty. They mostly show negative feelings such as sadness, depression and loneliness. At the next stage, the group members move on to talk about how they might act as a result of these feelings. Being bad tempered, running away, swearing, trying to get attention are among the common responses. At this point, they start to recognise, with the help of the leader or by themselves, whether the focus child’s behaviour could be a result of not having friends. Then the group leader asks the group what can they do to help the focus child. Their suggestions are listed and this is the beginning of the problem-solving process. They move on to discuss what is unhelpful for the focus child. After discussing what can hurt him/her, the group leader asks for volunteers to become a circle of friends for the focus child. They arrange the first meeting with the focus child (Newton et al., 1996).

Similarly, the peer support approach aims to involve peers in the process of helping the child who has difficulties in her/his feelings and behaviour. In peer support, peer tutors are required to listen and give support to their peers (tutees). Tutees listen to their tutors individually and they can discuss their personal problems, ask questions or talk about their anxieties about academic work and personal matters. When tutees benefit from peer tutoring (improved reading, enhanced confidence, resolution of bullying problems), these benefits can be reinforced by the tutor. This kind of personal attention helps pupils to grow up emotionally and socially as well as academically. Accomplishment of this type can help to protect children from risk of failure in the future and can increase tutees’ self-esteem. Thus, a cyclical link between low self-esteem and learning difficulties can be broken.

As can be understood from the summaries above, the common aims of discipline approaches are to understand the needs or characteristics of children and to consciously encourage responses which enable children to feel understood and make changes in their perceptions of themselves. Hence, teachers can generate positive changes in pupils’
behaviour and help to promote self-awareness. In doing so, teachers may be less likely to meet similar problems again.

2.2.8 SUMMARY

The literature presented so far provides a holistic perspective on classroom management and the threat of misbehaviour to classroom order. This can be summarised below as:

- Classroom management is one of the main tasks for teachers and it is interrelated with teaching or learning tasks.

- Management of misbehaviour or inappropriate behaviour is a crucial issue for teachers since misbehaviour becomes a threat to learning.

- With-it-ness, overlapping, explaining classroom rules and procedures clearly at the beginning of the term, consistency in behaviour management, successful monitoring of pupils’ work, clear explanations of teachers’ expectations are all more likely to be seen in the more effective teachers’ classroom.

- Training programmes for teachers to show them how to apply systematic behaviour management techniques and strategies derived from counselling or clinical psychology, are worth considering.
2.3 SELF-EFFICACY RELATED STUDIES IN THE AREA OF TEACHING AND CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

2.3.1 INTRODUCTION

According to the Elton Report (1989) the teacher’s general competence has a great influence on pupils’ behaviour. Subject knowledge, planning and delivering lessons smoothly and holding pupils’ attention all depend heavily on the teacher’s competence. Feeling competent in the management of groups of pupils, encouraging them to behave appropriately and dealing with inappropriate or disruptive behaviour calmly and firmly are also important. When teachers do not trust their ability to deal with disruption, they create a negative classroom atmosphere by criticising, giving praise rarely and by applying public threats and reprimands.

Over the last two decades, teachers’ sense of efficacy in teaching and learning has been the focus of considerable research and has been identified as a powerful variable through instructional effectiveness studies.

2.3.2 THE RAND STUDIES

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

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

2.3.3 Bandura's Self-Efficacy Approach

The second theoretical strand behind the concept of teacher efficacy is Bandura's (1977) theory of self-efficacy. Bandura suggested a model to explain and predict human behaviour and behaviour changes. He believed that behaviour changes occurred via different methods in which some cognitive variables work as mediators. Self-efficiency is seen as one of the major mediators for behaviour changes and is defined as an expectancy that one can successfully perform any behaviour to get outcomes. There is a reciprocal relationship between behaviour and efficacy expectancy. Efficacy belief affects behaviour and is influenced by successful and unsuccessful behaviour.

Teacher efficacy is identified as a kind of self-efficacy, as ‘beliefs in one’s capabilities to organise and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments’ (Bandura, 1997, p.3). Self-efficacy beliefs determine how much effort people spend, how long they persist even when they meet obstacles, how strong they will be in coping with failure and how much anxiety and depression they feel in dealing with challenging situations (Bandura, 1977, 1993, 1997).

Bandura (1997) points out that there is a considerable difference between possessing sub-skills and being able to combine these sub-skills to produce appropriate behaviour/action and successfully perform them in difficult conditions:

In short, perceived self-efficacy is concerned not with the number of skills you have, but with what you believe you can do with what you have under a variety of circumstances.

(Bandura, 1997, p. 37).

Self-efficacy beliefs are created by four sources of information: enactive mastery experience (performance accomplishment), vicarious experience, verbal persuasion and physiological and affective states.
Mastery experience, as a means of possessing capability, is the most authentic indication of whether one can afford/muster whatever it takes to succeed. Therefore it creates a strong belief in one's personal efficacy whilst failure threatens it, especially before a sense of efficacy is firmly established. Having successful performance raises efficacy beliefs and the likelihood of the expectation that performance will be sufficient in the future. Conversely, the perception of failure in performance decreases efficacy beliefs and builds an expectation that performance will be insufficient in the future. However, performance accomplishment is not the only influential source of information for a sense of efficacy.

Vicarious experience, in which people exposure to observing target skills, modelled by somebody else, also works for the developing of personal efficacy. Since there are no certain measures of adequacy for most activities, people need to consider their capabilities in comparison with the attainments of others. Observing others, who are similar to the observers, while they are performing a task successfully, raises the observers’ efficacy beliefs. They persuade themselves that if others can do it then they are able to do it, with the capability of achieving comparable activities. Bandura (1977) emphasises that the degree of the observer’s identification with the model and also the quality of the model both determine the impact of observing, on efficacy. If the observer identifies closely with the model and if the model performs well, the efficacy of the observer is more likely to increase.

Social Persuasion, may contain feedback for a specific performance from significant others like colleagues, parents. This has a part in strengthening one’s belief that one has the capability to perform what one wants. Although it may have a limited impact on increasing the efficacy belief, especially when one faces difficulties, if significant others around them show their trust in her/his capabilities, efficacy is more likely to rise.

When people are assessing their performance or ability, they partly depend on the information derived from physiological emotional states. This information of personal efficacy is much more related to the domain of physical accomplishment, health functioning and coping with stress. A level of anxiety may cause feelings of incompetence, while excitement results in a feeling of mastery. Since high levels of
arousal can weaken performance, people are more likely to expect success when they are not threatened by aversive arousal than when they are tense or anxious.

2.3.4 MEANING AND MEASURING OF TEACHER EFFICACY

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

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

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

For example, Gibson and Dembo (1984) attempted to develop an instrument to measure teacher efficacy and examine its construct validation and the relationship between teacher efficacy and teacher behaviour. Factor analysis of responses from teachers in elementary school on a 30-item Teacher Efficacy Scale produced two dimensions: Personal teaching efficacy -teachers' belief in their ability to produce positive student change; teaching efficacy, referring to the outcome expectancy proposed by Bandura, the belief that teaching can influence students' learning despite their family background, socio-economic status and school related variables.
In addition, teachers were observed at three different times to examine the relationship between teacher efficacy and teacher classroom behaviour, particularly in terms of teacher's use of time and question-answer feedback sequence. Eight teachers (4 high efficacy and 4 low efficacy) were selected from 208 teachers who participated in the first phase of the study. Teachers were chosen for high and low efficacy groups in relation to the frequency distribution of their scores from the scale. Thus, high efficacy teachers' scores fell within the top 6% of the frequency distribution (high personal teaching efficacy) for factor 1, their scores fell within the bottom 22% for factor 2 (high teaching efficacy). Low efficacy teachers' scores fell within the bottom 45% for factor 1 (low personal teaching efficacy), the top 27% for the factor 2 (low teaching efficacy).

Classroom observation of academic focus and teacher feedback showed differences between high and low efficacy teachers in terms of time spent in whole class versus small groups, teachers' use of criticism and teachers' lack of persistence towards failure situations. Low efficacy teachers spent more time on non-academic material (intellectual games), criticised students for their failures and if they did not get quick responses from students, gave up easily. They were more likely to adhere to a format for reading instructions and less likely to show a sense of 'withitness' (Kounin, 1970) during small group work. In contrast, high efficacy teachers allocated more time to academic activities, provided guidance for students when they met obstacles, gave praise for academic success and devoted less time to small group activity than those of low efficacy.

Gibson and Dembo (1984), interpreted these results in the light of teacher effectiveness studies which showed that more effective teachers carried out more large group or whole class instruction, while less effective teachers tended to work with individual students and small groups.

Woolfolk and Hoy (1990) investigated prospective teachers' (n=182) efficacy and the concept of efficacy itself. In order to compose a scale they took 16 items from Gibson and Dembo's study, and 4 items related to teacher's preparation and 2 Rand items. Factor analysis confirmed the existence of two factors, similar to Gibson and Dembo's study: personal efficacy and teaching efficacy. However, Woolfolk and Hoy suggested that teaching efficacy does not refer to an outcome expectation as defined by Bandura (1986).
Teacher efficacy seems to represent a general belief about the power of teaching to reach difficult children and is called general teaching efficacy. The other dimension of efficacy is found to be a more accurate sign of the teacher’s personal sense of efficacy and is named personal teaching efficacy.

Woolfolk and Hoy found that prospective teachers who have high teaching efficacy are more humanistic toward to their pupils than those with low teaching efficacy. Personal efficacy was positively related to control ideology which rejects teachers’ control of students but accepts a school’s control of teachers.

Although Woolfolk and Hoy came up with personal, versus teaching dimensions, Guskey and Passaro (1994) draw attention to differences between the wording of items in both factors. Items in the personal efficacy factor using the referent ‘I’, were positively worded and had an internal locus, while items in teaching efficacy using the referent ‘teachers’, were negatively worded and had an external locus.

Guskey and Passaro (1994) therefore decided to examine the differences between the personal efficacy and teaching efficacy suggested by Gibson and Dembo (1984) and Woolfolk and Hoy (1990), and the dimension of internal versus external. 283 experienced classroom teachers and 59 pre-service teachers (a total of 342 subjects) completed the Teacher Efficacy scale, an altered form of the teacher efficacy scale of Gibson and Dembo, 1984 with some items reworded to reflect a teaching-internal (T-I) or a personal-external (P-E) orientation.

Guskey and Passaro confirmed that there are two independent efficacy dimensions, but in contrast to previous studies by Gibson and Dembo (1984), and Woolfolk and Hoy (1990), these dimensions referred to internal-external distinctions rather than personal versus teaching distinctions. Guskey and Passaro explained the reason for this difference by saying that, while items loaded on the first factor were internal locus, items loaded on the second factor were externally oriented in both studies. In their words, “Unfortunately, the personal versus teaching distinction emphasised by these researchers masked this internal versus external distinction and, as a consequence, confounded their interpretations of the results” (p.639).
It was found that teachers’ perceptions of their effect on student learning do not rely solely on, nor are strongly related to their perceptions of the influence of external environmental conditions. That is, despite a strong influence of social and economic conditions, some teachers still believe they can change student learning, whereas other teachers may have the perception that they have a limited effect on a student irrespective of social and economic conditions.

This study makes a contribution to the understanding of the teaching efficacy construct, by illustrating the differences between internal (personal), and external (social and demographic variables) factors. When studying classroom management efficacy, it would be worth considering the effects of internal and external factors. For example, external factors such as family-school collaboration or support from head teachers or colleagues, may affect the teacher’s personal efficacy in dealing with disruptive behaviour.

Studies in teacher efficacy consistently indicate two different dimensions, despite a great amount of confusion and discussion over their meaning. Generally there is a consensus among the researchers that the first factor refers to personal teaching efficacy and is concerned with one’s perception of competence as a teacher. The second factor has not been made clear in terms of its meaning. It is often labelled as general teaching efficacy. Some researchers (Gibson and Dembo, 1984; Soodak and Podell, 1996; Riggs and Enochs, 1990) approach the second factor as outcome expectancy, the second concept in Bandura’s social cognitive theory (Tschannen-Moran et al. 1998).

However, as mentioned before, Bandura (1986) stresses the difference between outcome and efficacy expectation. He also points out that outcome expectancy has little effect on the explanation of motivation and is concerned with the evaluation of one’s own capabilities, rather than what others could do in a similar environment. Since items in the second factor of teacher efficacy aim to assess the impact of teachers in general, it does not refer to outcome expectancy.

The research presented so far has approached outcome expectancy like efficacy expectancy and usually called it general teaching efficacy. However, as Bandura stressed, outcome expectancy is not the same as efficacy expectancy. Imants and De Brabander
(1996) also commented that general teaching efficacy should not be considered as an outcome expectation, and personal teaching efficacy is strongly related to Bandura’s concept of perceived self-efficacy. They concluded that teachers’ outcome expectancy and general teaching efficacy are not the core of Bandura’s self-efficacy theory. For this reason, in this study the scale of classroom management efficacy was designed to measure self-efficacy expectation in classroom management rather than outcome expectancy or general management efficacy. Similarly, Raudenbush et al. (1992) made the point that efficacy and outcome expectation are not synonymous. Although they did not ignore the importance of outcome expectancy, they focused on teachers’ perception of their ability to generate a given level or type of teaching performance.

2.3.5 TEACHER EFFICACY AND ITS RELATION TO INTER AND INTRA TEACHER VARIABLES

It may be concluded from the literature that there has been a remarkable promotion in measurement and investigation of teacher efficacy since it was first studied. For example, up to the 1990s researchers studied teacher efficacy as a constant construct across several teaching areas. In the 1990s particularly, researchers have started to approach it as context specific. Teacher efficacy has been considered differently for different subjects like science teaching efficacy or classroom management efficacy. For example, in the investigation of the relationship between the type of task (e.g. pupil-oriented and school or colleague-oriented) and a staff member’s position (e.g. teacher or principal) in the school organisation, Imants and De Brabander (1996) showed that self-efficacy was context dependent and changed according to the specific task at hand. Examining teacher efficacy in relation to inter-teacher and intra-teacher variables is another development in this area. This point of view helps researchers to gain a finer understanding of teacher efficacy as a construct.

In one of the examples for these studies, Benz et al. (1992) compared experienced and pre-service teachers in terms of their effectiveness by carrying out typical teaching tasks represented by 15 vignettes. They examined each item separately and found that teachers gave different responses to the vignettes. Differences within teacher factors were mediated by a between-teacher factor, experience. Pre-service teachers and the college
faculty were more confident than experienced teachers with respect to vignettes about student motivation. Pre-service students were less confident than experienced teachers with regard to vignettes including a larger knowledge base, like planning and evaluating lessons. For socialisation, classroom teachers felt less effective than did entering students and the university faculty. These findings may be attributed to actual distance from the real life of the classroom for pre-service teachers and university professors, or lack of training in motivational strategies for classroom teachers.

In this study, the generalisation of results was restricted because the sample was small, with a lack of random selection of participants and the limited representation of one institution. Participants as teachers had different backgrounds - for example, some of them had a masters degree, others did not. However, one of the strengths of this study was its use of hypothetical situations rather than just individual items to measure efficacy.

2.3.6 VARIABLES INFLUENCING THE STABILITY OF TEACHER EFFICACY

Teacher efficacy is context specific. Teachers feel efficacious for teaching particular subjects to certain students in specific settings, and they can be expected to feel more or less efficacious under different circumstances.

(Tschannen-Moran et al. 1998, p.227-228)

As can be understood from the quotation above, Tschannen-Moran et al. examined teacher efficacy from a context-specific and subject-specific approach. Similarly, Ross et al. (1996) aimed to find out whether teachers’ performance expectancies changed from one teaching situation to another: if they change, whether the influence of within-teacher variables was constant across teachers.

Ross’s et al. study supports the idea that TE (teacher efficacy) is a specific rather than a generalised expectancy because it changes within teachers. The proportion of the variance in TE scores ascribed to within-teacher variables was 21%. Although three within-teacher variables: feelings about past success, being well prepared, and pedagogical content knowledge correlated with TE, teacher perception of student engagement was a significant predictor. Within-teacher variables did not have a constant effect across all teachers; their impact was moderated by between-teacher factors. The influence of
teaching assignments on different categories of teachers was confirmed in large part. In contrast to researchers’ expectations, those who taught English, social studies and art were more influenced by past success. Ross et al. expected past success to continue into the future for Maths and Science, because of the greater predictability of the subjects.

The fact that only self-administered questionnaires were used, with no interviews and the failure to deal with more complex interactions in the relationship between TE and within-teacher variables, were among the weak points of the study.

Similarly, in studying within and between teacher factors, Raudenbush et al. (1992) examined the self-efficacy of 16 high school teachers with regard to intra-teacher variations (e.g. track, level of preparation, students’ age, and class size), and inter-teacher variation (e.g. main effects of classroom setting and teacher-level variables and setting-by-teacher interaction effects). They found that 44% of the variance in TE was attributable to within-teacher factors. Once again, the influence of these within-teacher factors was moderated by between-teacher differences in subject background and organisational context. In higher efficacy teachers’ classes, students were highly engaged, teachers felt well prepared, the academic track and grades were higher, and the class size was larger.

Investigating teacher efficacy with regard to within and between teacher variables allowed researchers to predict how efficacy beliefs are determined by internal and external factors.

Having summarised the results of research which showed that teacher efficacy is not a constant construct across all teaching settings and is mediated by within-teacher and between-teacher variables, the researcher was able to develop an insight into the fact that teachers’ sense of efficacy in classroom management could also be determined by, for example, feeling confident in their subject area, witnessing their own success or pupils’ grade level or the number of children with problem behaviour in the classroom.
2.3.7 TEACHER EFFICACY IN CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

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

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

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

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

This study provides a general framework for low and high efficacy teachers' approaches to classroom management and gives an idea of which sorts of behaviour are more likely to be seen with low or high efficacy levels. At the same time however it shows there is not
a cause and effect relationship between them. As a research method, it also shows the
worth of qualitative methods, which enable researchers to understand the real atmosphere
of a classroom in depth.

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

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

Surprisingly, student teachers’ efficacy and ratings of their teaching performance made by
university supervisors were not found to be related to each other. Emmer and Hickman
interpreted this finding as unexpected and suggested that student teachers who have more
managerial problems may have high classroom management efficacy. High efficacy
might be seen as a part of denial and might enable these teachers to escape the negative
feelings which may derive from a truthful self-evaluation.

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

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

Having a strong sense of efficacy not only contributes to students' achievement, as shown in the study presented above, but also determines teachers' referral choices, as will be discussed in the following study.

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

First of all teachers were interviewed with regard to their causal attributions for problem behaviours and their control over the problem, their efficacy for resolving the problem and their choice of intervention. Causal attributions did not predict teachers' decisions on intervention, except for academic problems. If a child has poor academic behaviour and
when the problem is attributed to the child’s intellectual ability, teachers are more likely to refer a child to outside services. High efficacy teachers are more likely to cope with the problem themselves than to seek referral or consultation. Self-efficacy did not predict consultation over referral but only the handling of the problem on one’s own, rather than seeking assistance.

2.3.8 THE ROLE OF SCHOOL STAFF IN DEVELOPING TEACHER EFFICACY

Teachers operate collectively within an interactive social system rather than as isolates. Therefore, educational development through efficacy enhancement must address the social and organisational structure of educational systems.

(Bandura, 1997,p.243)

As Bandura suggests, social interaction in the school system is vital for gaining maximum benefit from educational activities for both teachers and students. How this organisational aspect of school affects teacher efficacy may be the starting point of an investigation. One example of this kind is given by Hoy and Woolfolk (1993).

Hoy and Woolfolk examined the relationship between two dimensions of efficacy (general and personal teaching efficacy) and organisational aspects of schools. 179 teachers from 37 elementary schools in New Jersey participated in the study. Principal influence and academic emphasis; two aspects of organisational life, significantly contributed to personal teaching efficacy. They emphasised that schools raise personal teaching efficacy in the following conditions: (a) when teachers perceived that their colleagues set high but achievable goals, (b) create an orderly and serious environment, c) respect academic excellence.

Principals were also perceived as influential in promoting personal efficacy. Surprisingly, there was no relation between personal teaching efficacy and feelings of trust, confidence, friendship, cohesiveness and warmth. Hoy and Woolfolk interpreted this result by proposing that personal efficacy may be determined by meeting instrumental needs and is not associated with an expressive relationship between teachers and principals. These results were found to be consistent with Newmann’s study. Newmann et al. (1989) have
shown that teachers' sense of efficacy was related to administrators' responsiveness and the orderly behaviour of students. The actions of administrators were described in that study as helping teachers to solve instructional and class management problems.

This study by Hoy and Woolfolk considered the role of different professionals in the school system and stimulated some research questions about possible effects of colleagues, support teachers and the head teacher on teacher management efficacy. These factors will therefore also be considered in the research to be described later.

2.3.9 TRAINING PROGRAMMES FOR ENHANCING TEACHER EFFICACY

The focus of efficacy studies began to move from attempts to understand its construct and measure it, to how it can be changed or improved. As expected, the sources of efficacy are the key point at which to change or promote efficacy beliefs, because it is through these sources that a sense of efficacy is established.

For example, Hagen et al. (1998) investigated the effects of a treatment based on vicarious experience and verbal persuasion on the self-efficacy perception of pre-service teachers towards working with difficult-to-teach children. Eighty-nine undergraduate pre-service teachers (14 male and 75 female) in educational psychology courses participated voluntarily in the study. The experimental group watched a 33 minute videotape which described and illustrated effective behaviour management, teachers' discussion of their successful experience in using behaviour management techniques with difficult-to-teach children and research results of the successful use of behaviour management. Control groups were exposed to a placebo videotape which was about society's attitudes to handicapped people.

This study suggests that vicarious experience and verbal persuasion may increase some aspects of pre-service teachers' self-efficacy. But there were no positive results for external influences on the vignette efficacy score. The researchers proposed that this may have been because of the relatively narrow scope of the treatment package, focusing on teaching and classroom management, but not including vicarious experience and verbal persuasion in relation to external factors to the classroom (e.g. home).
Stability of professional efficacy was investigated by Ross (1994) by measuring teacher efficacy on three occasions during an 8 month in-service course. Teacher efficacy was changed through the use of in-service knowledge, not by attending the course. It was explained that during sessions, a small number of teachers shared their individual successes in using co-operative learning to reach students with disadvantaged home backgrounds. This procedure may have persuaded other teachers (vicarious learning) of the effectiveness of co-operative learning, and in doing so their teaching efficacy could be increased. The short period of the programme, the limited opportunities to learn technical knowledge and the feeling of not meeting the new norm (social comparison) may have inhibited an increase in personal teaching efficacy. Ross (1994) emphasises that collaborative relationships between teachers may enhance teacher efficacy. As teachers work together they convince each other of their competence. This procedure in turn encourages collegial interaction.

Similarly Shachar and Shmuelevitz (1997) found that teachers who have higher levels of collaboration with their colleagues tend to have higher general teaching efficacy, and efficacy in increasing students' social relationships, than the teachers who have a low level of collaboration with colleagues. Teachers who applied co-operative learning were more likely to have higher efficacy in terms of promoting the learning of slow students than other teachers did. Personal teaching efficacy may also determine a preference for working with other professionals on student-related problems. Morrison et al. (1994) showed that teachers who felt they were capable of teaching a variety of skills in their classroom tended to work with other professionals on several student-oriented issues.

Fritz et al. (1995) assessed the effectiveness of the Dare To Be You (DTBY) teacher training, on enhancing personal teaching efficacy. This training program (DTBY) focused on teachers as the key element. It aimed at increasing personal efficacy, establishing a positive learning environment, improving social role models, providing age appropriate activities and curriculum activities to use with young people. Using a pre-test, post-test, and 9-month follow up design with control (n=111) and training group (n=130), teachers who attended the DTBY demonstrated a high personal efficacy for meeting their students' needs, felt less external coercion on students' learning, greater satisfaction with their professional role as teachers and increased integration of their professional role with other
roles. More importantly, these gains were sustained and increased over the school year. The researchers suggest that “a recipe for enhancing teacher self-efficacy may include equal measures of active control over the curriculum, encouragement of innovation and support from peers - to focus on insights gained, rather than self-blaming - when new approaches fall flat” (Fritz et al., 1995, p.208).

It is worth mentioning that these kinds of examples are included here because, after conducting this research, the next step would be a training programme for low efficacy teachers to enhance their efficacy beliefs.

2.3.10 SUMMARY

The literature on teacher efficacy has made a contribution to the study of classroom management efficacy through the following points:

- It has provided an understanding of the meaning, structure and ways of measuring teacher efficacy as well as its relation to internal (within teacher) or external (between teachers) variables. More specifically it is understood that:

  - Classroom management efficacy is a domain which is distinct from a sense of efficacy in the area of teaching in general.

  - Teacher efficacy in classroom management refers to teachers’ perceptions of their ability, that they can manage or change any pupil’s behaviour within given circumstances.

  - Bandura’s approach to measuring teacher efficacy has been adopted. Thus, situation-specific items or descriptions of a situation are worded in the form of ‘I can or I am able to…’

- How efficacy develops and through which sources it can be promoted are questions answered with the help of studying the literature. For example, trying newly learned strategies and seeing positive results from them, as well as observing other teachers and gaining support from colleagues and the head, are powerful sources of teacher efficacy.
• Therefore, sources such as people or contexts which help to develop efficacy have been included to be explored in the present study.

• The ideas and research methods for comparing high and low efficacy groups, exploring how efficacy really makes a difference, are also derived from studies in this area. More specifically,

• The ways of identifying teachers as high and low efficacy are adapted from literature that suggests that median, quartiles and group mean and standard deviation should be considered.

Consequently, the literature enabled the researcher to see a number of characteristics associated with high and low efficacy teachers and helped her formulate some of the research questions.

With very useful and rich suggestions from the literature a study was designed to explore the role of self-efficacy in classroom management. In order to carry out this research two-stage research designs were planned and multiple methods were employed as will be explained in the research methods chapter.
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Social science researchers attempt to understand different aspects of people's lives. They have beliefs and assumptions which reflect their perspective of reality and the ways of dealing with that reality when doing research. These assumptions are called "paradigms" in the research literature.

"A paradigm is a worldview, a general perspective, a way of breaking down the complexity of the real world. As such, paradigms, are deeply embedded in the socialization of adherents and practitioners: paradigms tell them what is important, legitimate and reasonable..."

(Patton, 1990, p.37)

Paradigms are defined as the answers to questions, such as "What is the nature of "reality"?". "What is the nature of the relationship between the knower and the known?". "How should the inquirer go about finding out knowledge?". In other words they operate from a starting point that plays a big role in the determination of what the inquiry is and how to study it. (Guba, 1990).

Although there are many paradigms to investigate truth, the rationalistic and the naturalistic paradigms are among the main ones, especially in support of disciplined inquiry (Guba, 1981). A different sort of distinction is made by LeCompte (1990) who draws attention to differences between paradigms in terms of definitions of reality, knowledge deriving from that reality and different interpretations of truth. He says they are also inconsistent at the philosophical and operational level.

Similarly Guba (1990) emphasises the differences between all paradigms at the ontological (the nature of "reality" or the nature of "knowable"), the epistemological (the nature of the relationship between the knower and the known) and the methodological (the ways of finding out knowledge) level.

In terms of the nature of reality proponents of the positivist paradigm assert that:
"There is a single tangible reality "out there" fragmentable into independent variables and processes, any of which can be studied independently of the others; inquiry can converge onto that reality until, finally, it can be predicted and controlled".

(Lincoln and Guba, 1985, p.37)

On the other hand, it is the naturalistic paradigm’s assumption that:

"There are multiple constructed realities that can be studied only holistically; inquiry into these multiple realities will inevitable diverge (each inquiry raises more questions than it answers) so that prediction and control are unlikely outcomes although some level of understanding can be achieved".

(Lincoln and Guba, 1985, p.37).

Social-behavioural phenomena exist mainly in the minds of people, and there are as many realities as persons

(Guba, 1981, p. 77).

In terms of the relationship between the knower and the known the positivist paradigm assumes that an inquirer can set an individual distance from the objects of the inquiry. However, according to the naturalistic paradigm there is an interaction between the inquirer and the respondents in which they affect each other (Lincoln and Guba, 1985; Guba, 1981).

Since a naturalistic inquiry always takes place in a natural arena and cannot be context-free, it requires human instruments such as interviews and observations which are suitable for studying human beings. By contrast, the positivist paradigm relies on the assumption that inquiry is carried out by employing objective observations and measurements. It is assumed that theory consists of a group of propositions which clarify and predict the relationship among phenomena (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). Proponents of the naturalistic paradigm prefer to build theory through the data themselves (Guba, 1981).

Positivist and naturalistic paradigms also differ in their approaches to theory. Adherents of the naturalistic paradigm prefer to have the theory emerge from the data themselves, that is, they wish the theory to be grounded (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). The positivists’ view of theory and their deductive attitude to research has been criticised by Glaser and Strauss (1967) especially on verification of theory development and the a priori definition
of concepts and hypotheses. In the Discovery of Grounded Theory, an inductive approach, it is suggested that the researcher discovers concepts and hypotheses by applying constant comparative analysis. However, Glaser and Strauss also agree with the assumptions of positivists that the main duty of theory is explanation and prediction (Glesne and Peshkin, 1992).

Summing up the characteristics of different paradigms, especially positivist and naturalistic, helps researchers to see the differences between their perspectives and to understand their contribution to the investigation of peoples’ lives by looking at them from a different angle.

3.2 QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE METHODS

Researchers who adopt a naturalistic paradigm are more likely to use qualitative methods, while adherents of positivist paradigms tend to use quantitative methods. Although the paradigms differ in their assumptions about reality and the relationship between the researcher, respondents and methods used by researchers, this should not necessarily lead to conflict as Guba (1981) emphasises:

“The conflict between the two paradigms has frequently been mistaken for a conflict between quantitative and qualitative methods but of course these two dimensions are orthogonal; there is no inherent reason why either paradigm cannot accommodate, and be contributed to, by either methodology”. (Guba, 1981, p.78)

Having adopted an interpretative and naturalistic approach qualitative researchers investigate things in their natural environments, trying to reach the meanings which people give to phenomena (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994). Detailed descriptions of situations, events, people’s interactions and observed behaviour are among the examples of qualitative data. Direct quotations about people’s experiences, attitudes and beliefs, and excerpts, or whole passages from documents, correspondence, records and case histories can be given (Patton, 1980).

Instead of numbers, the data collected consists of words, quotations or pictures such as interview transcripts, field notes, photographs, videotapes, personal documents, memos and other official records (Bogdan and Biklen, 1992). Grounded theory, ethnography, the
phenomenological approach, life histories and conversational analysis are examples of qualitative methods. Researchers from different fields can use these kinds of methods (Strauss and Corbin, 1990).

According to Brannen (1992) the quantitative researcher begins a study with variables previously defined and variable categories which are interrelated to build hypotheses, often before the data collection process. The hypotheses would be tested using the data collected.

By contrast, the qualitative researcher has very general concepts when s/he first begins a study. Changes in definition of the concepts occur during the research process. Because as Brannen points out:

"The qualitative researcher is said to look through a wide lens, searching for patterns of inter-relationship between a previously unspecified set of concepts while the quantitative researchers look through a narrow lens at a specified set of variables".

(Brannen, 1992, p.4)

One cannot assert that qualitative researchers do not have any idea about what they aim to look for or anticipate finding, but these ideas do not have to be certain or defined before the data collection step starts (Brannen, 1992).

Qualitative researchers tend to give more importance to process than outcomes or products. The questions 'how' and 'what' are the main types of question used to find out people's attitudes or the expectations behind their activities. Conversely, quantitative methods often use pre-post test techniques to investigate the same kind of relationship (Bogdan and Biklen, 1992) and the main focus of quantitative studies is the measurement and analysis of causal or correlational relationships between variables, instead of the process. "Inquiry is purported to be within a value-free framework" (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994, p.4).

Qualitative researchers are more likely than quantitative researchers to meet the difficulties of the everyday social world, because:
“Quantitative researchers abstract from this world and seldom study it directly. They seek a nomothetic or etic science based on probabilities derived from the study of large numbers of randomly selected cases. This kind of statement stands above and outside the constraints of everyday life”.

(Denzin and Lincoln, 1994, p.5)

Although both qualitative and quantitative researchers deal with the individual’s perspectives, qualitative researchers are supposed to become closer to the particular case’s point of view through detailed observation and interview. Denzin and Lincoln go on to argue that:

“Qualitative researchers stress the socially structured reality, the intimate relationship between the researcher and what is studied, and the situational constraints that shape inquiry. They seek answers to questions that stress how social experience is created and given meaning”.

(Denzin and Lincoln, 1994, p.4)

How different people assign a “meaning” to different aspects of their life is an important concern for qualitative researchers. The important thing is to catch an individual’s perspectives. Therefore, “qualitative researchers set up strategies and procedures to enable them to consider experiences from the informants’ perspectives” (Bogdan and Biklen, 1992, p.32).

In qualitative research, researchers must be the main instrument in the sense of collecting data (Brannen, 1992). The reasons for becoming involved in a particular context are that:

“Qualitative researchers go to the particular setting under study because they are concerned with context. They feel that action can be best understood when it is observed in the setting in which it occurs”.

(Bogdan and Biklen, 1992, p.30)

Similarly, Lincoln and Guba (1985, p.39) note that:

“Naturalistic ontology suggests that realities are wholes that cannot be understood in isolation from their contexts”.

By contrast, in quantitative research a pre-determined and finely-tuned instrument, which is less flexible and reflective, has often been used (Brannen, 1992). Denzin and Lincoln, (1994) argue that quantitative researchers seldom are able to capture the subject’s
perspective because they have to rely on more remote, inferential empirical materials. However, "the empirical materials produced by the softer, interpretative methods are regarded by many quantitative researchers as unreliable, impressionistic, and not objective" (p.5)

Thus, it becomes clear that both quantitative and qualitative methods should be used as the situation warrants. To seek an appropriate balance between rigour and relevance seems sensible:

"Both tacit and pro-positional knowledge are useful, and, indeed, it is probably the hallmark of competent investigators that they translate tacit knowledge into pro-positional knowledge as quickly as possible. Astute investigators will utilise both themselves and other instruments, depending on circumstances. Information from both the laboratory and the real world has utility in achieving understanding".

(Guba, 1981, p.79)

Having outlined considerable differences between qualitative and quantitative methods in the sense of their view and approaches to the reality of meanings of peoples’ lives, the best thing for a social researcher is to see the advantages and disadvantages of both methods instead of perceiving them as contradictory to each other.

3.3 TRIANGULATION

Although some social science researchers (e.g. Lincoln and Guba, 1985) perceive qualitative and quantitative approaches as incompatible, others (e.g. Patton, 1990) believe that the skilled researcher can successfully combine approaches (Glesne and Peshkin, 1992).

Positivist and interpretative paradigms rest on different assumptions about the nature of the world, and require different instruments and procedures to find the type of data desired. This does not mean however that the positivist never uses interviews nor that the interpretivist never uses a survey. Different approaches allow us to know and understand different things about the world rather than argue about which paradigm or methods are better (Lincoln and Guba, 1985).
Similarly, Patton (1980, p.331) points out that “multiple data will seldom lead to a single, totally consistent picture. It is best not to expect everything to turn out the same”. He goes on to argue that different types of data show different aspects of what is being studied. The point is not to ignore these differences, but to attempt to understand and interpret them.

Each research method such as survey, experiment, participant observation, interview, case study used in social sciences has innate weaknesses. For example, in experiments and surveys, the researcher hardly touches the subject’s inner world while it is difficult to control interpretative elements in participant observation and life histories. Therefore triangulation is said to be a solution to minimise the disadvantages of using single method:

“Triangulation is the application and combination of several research methodologies in the study of the same phenomenon. The diverse methods and measures that are combined should relate in some specified way to the theoretical constructs under examination”.

(Denzin, 1994, p.6461)

Since the meanings of the social world change continuously for the observers and the subjects being observed, one research method cannot by itself catch all of the changing aspects of the social world under study. Each research method involves a different meaning of the world and proposes different pathways for the observer to follow when s/he is doing research. Hence,

“…the most fruitful search for sound interpretations of the real world must rely upon triangulation strategies. Interpretations that are built upon triangulation are certain to be stronger than those that rest on the more constricted framework of a single method”.

(Denzin, 1994, p.6462)

Single-method studies are increasingly viewed as indefensible in social sciences. Therefore, methodological triangulation, using more than one method was a major feature of this research. However, the researcher using different methods should not expect findings generated by different methods to fall into a coherent picture (Patton, 1980; Lincoln and Guba, 1985).
There are four basic types of triangulation defined by Denzin (1994):

a) data triangulation, including time, space, and persons

b) investigator triangulation based on the use of multiple, rather than single observers

c) theory triangulation which involves using more than one theoretical explanation in the interpretation of the phenomenon

d) methodological triangulation which consists of using more than one method or may include within-method or between-method strategies.

In the light of the theoretical explanation about different aspects of qualitative and quantitative methods, the study of teacher efficacy in classroom behaviour management, the subject of this research, was conducted using examples from both qualitative and quantitative methods. The researcher tried to triangulate three different methods (systematic observation, participant observation and interview) to explore the effect of the teachers’ efficacy in their management of pupils’ behaviour.

3.4 THE PURPOSE OF STUDY

In recent years a considerable amount of research has shown that self-efficacy is an important concept for understanding teachers’ and students’ perceptions about themselves and their behaviour in classrooms. The research has produced many useful ideas, mostly in teaching efficacy, the relationship between efficacy and classroom management, and differences between the efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. Some researchers have investigated teacher efficacy as a slightly different concept in classroom management and have found a relationship between teaching and management efficacy.

There are many studies about misbehaviour and teachers’ management strategies in England and United States, but this study is concerned with exploring pupils’ misbehaviour and teachers’ management strategies in the light of teacher efficacy, which is one of the most important variables among the teacher characteristics. It is thought that behaviour management efficacy needs to be investigated in terms of its relation to teachers’ observable behaviour, to methods used by teachers and variables such as gender
and experience. Studying teacher efficacy beliefs in classroom management especially while dealing with inappropriate behaviour, may contribute to understanding the role of efficacy belief in classroom management and an understanding of its relation to other variables.

Although some researchers (e.g. Ashton and Webb, 1986; Gibson and Dembo, 1984; Woolfolk and Hoy, 1990) on studying teaching efficacy aimed to look at differences between high and low efficacy teachers’ classroom management strategies, they chose their samples from the same population, e.g. same state, same city. Conversely, this study is concerned with possible variations between British and Turkish, high and low efficacy teachers’ classroom atmospheres. One of the purposes of the study is to formulate implications especially for the Turkish education system, because prior investigation indicated that there was a need for research intending to clarify the current situation and present strategies for planning courses in pre-service and in-service training.

Therefore, the aim of the study is to investigate the role of teacher efficacy in classroom management, especially the management of inappropriate behaviour and to explore which variables are associated with misbehaviour including the teachers’ methods of dealing with it in primary schools both in England and in Turkey. Consistent with this general aim the following questions are identified as research questions, derived from the literature in classroom management and teacher efficacy, pilot interviews with teachers, and the researcher’s own interests and ideas.

3.4.1 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1-Which three methods do teachers report are most often used to deal with misbehaviour?

2-What are teachers’ opinions about the helpfulness of in-service training?

3-Is there any difference between

- British and Turkish teachers’ efficacy level?

- male and female teachers’ efficacy level?
• efficacy levels of teachers who have different years of experience?

4-What do teachers perceive as the most common misbehaviour occurring in their classrooms?

5-Which range of methods do teachers report using to deal with misbehaviour?

6-What do teachers think about how they learn to manage pupils’ behaviour?

7-Why do teachers think some children have more behaviour problems than others?

8-How do teachers think that feeling confident (efficacious) affects their management style?

9-What kinds of factors do teachers think affect their efficacy in managing misbehaviour?

10-How do teachers think that feeling confident in subject areas influences their classroom atmosphere in terms of behaviour management?

11-How do teachers think that having a school behaviour policy facilitates their job in classroom management?

12-How do low and high efficacy teachers differ in their behaviour management style?

• Are there any differences between high and low efficacy teachers’ responses to misbehaviour occurring in their classroom?

• Do high efficacy teachers use more positive approaches towards misbehaviour than low efficacy teachers?

13-Are there any differences between Turkish and English teachers’ responses to misbehaviour?

14-Are there any differences between Turkish and English teachers’ classrooms in terms of misbehaviour observed?
15-What is the proportion of misbehaviour among different groups of pupils (e.g. boy, girl or group)?

16-Are there any differences between task engagement levels of pupils

- nominated by their teachers as often badly behaved and well behaved?

- nominated by their teachers as often badly behaved in classrooms of high or low efficacy teachers?

The research questions aim to investigate whether having high or low efficacy and being a teacher in Turkey or England makes any difference to teachers’ classroom atmosphere in terms of classroom management.

The questions 1, 2, 6, 11, 13, 14, 15, mainly aim to compare and see whether there is any particular pattern in both countries’ teachers in the sense of variables associated with classroom management. The questions 8, 9, 10, 12 are concerned with efficacy variables while the questions 3, 4, 5, 7, 16 consider both efficacy and country variables.

The main purpose of the questions from 4-11 is to explore teachers’ perceptions (mainly through interview) about their feelings of efficacy, its effects on behaviour management, the sources of efficacy belief, the relationship between subject and behaviour management efficacy, its relation to methods used by teachers and the reasons behind misbehaviour given by teachers. The first 3 questions are answered in a survey, whereas the questions 12-16 are answered in systematic observation and field notes (12, 13, 14, 16).

Question 2 was derived from the pilot interview with teachers. Some teachers said INSET was helpful, some said it was not helpful. This question was asked because the researcher wanted to learn about the role of INSET for behaviour management in Turkey and England and because it may provide useful information for considering critical issues in planning in-service training.
3.5 RESEARCH METHODS USED IN PRESENT STUDY

3.5.1 SURVEY

In order to answer the research questions different types of data collection methods were required. The study consisted of two stages. In the first stage of the study a survey as quantitative method was conducted, using a Behaviour Management Questionnaire, to provide an assessment of teachers’ efficacy in classroom behaviour management and to identify teachers who have high and low efficacy for the second phase of the study. In addition, methods used by teachers in dealing with misbehaviour, and teachers’ ideas about usefulness of in-service training were investigated about in the questionnaire.

Surveys are frequently conducted for the purpose of making descriptive assertions about populations, that is discovering the distribution of certain traits and attributes (Babbie, 1990). They can provide information about the distribution of a wide range of peoples’ characteristics, and of relationships between such characteristics. Surveys should have standardised questions in which the meaning is the same for different respondents as far as is possible (Robson, 1993).

Fink (1995, p.1) suggests that the best survey information system should have the following features:

- specific measurable objectives
- sound research design
- sound choice of population or sample
- reliable and valid instruments
- appropriate analysis
- accurate reporting of survey results.
3.5.1.1 ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF SURVEYS

Like every research method, surveys have some positive and some negative aspects. Surveys are valuable in terms of providing a simple and straightforward approach to the study of attitudes, values, beliefs and motives. It may be possible to reach high amounts of data standardisation with structured surveys that also may be adapted to gather generalised information from almost any human population (Robson, 1993).

One of the disadvantages of surveys is data can be affected by the characteristics of respondents such as their memory, knowledge, experience, motivation, and personality. Since respondents like to be seen favourably by other people, they may not express their beliefs and attitudes accurately. In order to obtain valid information about respondents' feelings and thinking, research instruments or questionnaires should be formulated to avoid ambiguous or superficial items. For high reliability, items need to be standardised and worded carefully after pilot studies (Robson, 1993).

Surveys tend to look at particular aspects of people's beliefs and actions without looking at the context in which they occur. Taken out of context it is easy to misunderstand the meaning of behaviour. Some things are not measurable especially by surveys, and they are also restricted if highly structured questionnaires are used (De Vaus, 1993).

3.6 DEVELOPING AND PILOTING RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

3.6.1 QUESTIONNAIRE AND SELF-EFFICACY SCALE IN CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

Bandura (1986) suggests that asking people about their ability to perform specific teaching tasks (e.g. I can speak effectively to groups) is more productive than asking about their confidence in being a teacher. In general, researchers use Likert type (rating scale) scales to measure any kind of self-efficacy concepts (Bandura, 1986; Ashton and Webb, 1986; Gibson and Dembo, 1984; Emmer and Hickman, 1991). Normally they give a short description of a situation or statement which has taken place in a classroom, then ask respondents to rate their efficacy belief or effectiveness in the targeted area using a 5 or 7 point scale. Some researchers (e.g., Benz et al., 1992; Ashton and Webb, 1986) give a description of a hypothetical situation related to teaching efficacy, and ask how effective
they would be in given situations, then respondents express their efficacy belief on a 7 point scale.

At the beginning of a study, interviews can be used to identify areas for more detailed exploration (Breakwell, 1995). In order to write items for the questionnaire, semi-structured interviews with 6 primary school teachers in Leicester were carried out. The main aims of the interview were to obtain teachers’ ideas on classroom behaviour management and their feelings about dealing with misbehaviour. As Bryman (1992) suggests, qualitative research can provide background information for context and subjects, and can help to develop questionnaires or scales. The interview provided rich information about classroom behaviour management and a number of ideas for either the development of items or an understanding of the real atmosphere of the classroom.

Literature related to classroom management and teacher efficacy (Doyle, 1986; Emmer and Hickman, 1991; Ashton and Webb, 1986) also helped to formulate items. The questionnaire consisted of 28 items and questions. The first 6 questions were related to personal information (experience, in-service training course, school, year group). One item asked which methods teachers often used to handle misbehaviour. There were 21 items for teacher self-efficacy. Four of them (26, 28, 29, 30) were taken from the scale which was developed by Emmer and Hickman (1991) and used in their classroom management and discipline study. Participants were asked to rate their efficacy level by using a 5 point scale from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree”. The questionnaire and efficacy scale are presented in Appendix I.

Piloting helps to word the questions, or order the question sequence and reduce non-response rates. This process is essential to prevent problems which might come out in future (Oppenheim, 1992). In the light of Oppenheim’s suggestions, a small pilot study was carried out with PGCE students in June 1997. Although only a small number of students replied to the questionnaire, they gave very useful feedback about the wording and content of items. Some positive comments they made concerned its fluency, the fact that it was easy to understand and respond to, the shortness of the time taken to complete and its interest in terms of content.
3.6.1.1 FACTOR ANALYSIS

Since analysis of some research questions requires the comparison of mean scores of British (N=51) and Turkish teachers (N=73) in the Behaviour Management Efficacy Scale, the responses of these two groups were combined to carry out factor analysis. Thus, a total of 124 responses to 21 items were subjected to principal component analysis, a factor analytic procedure, to find uncorrelated factors that are at work under the “psychological surface” using the Statistical Package of the Social Sciences 6 (SPSS). Factor analysis helps to group the most highly correlated variables together. A variable can only be assigned to one factor, and factors are named by these allocated variables.

Seven items had eigenvalues greater than 1 and they explained 68.0 % of all variance. Other items had a low percentage of variance. Within these 7 items item 1 accounted for 30.9 % of all variance, while the remaining 37.1 % of variance was explained by the other 6 items. This result was interpreted as one item dominating because it varied so much from one person to another. The other items had low eigenvalues and they did not differ very much. It was unclear whether items which had lower eigenvalues were meaningful psychologically or not. Therefore, the solution of factor limitation was tried to reach the factors which were meaningful within a common framework in terms of psychological terms.

OBLIQUE ROTATION

Oblique rotation was used to find correlations between the factors which reflect what happens in the real world. As Borg and Gall (1989) point out a factor analysis with an oblique solution is applied to identify factors which correlate with each other.

During the application of different numbers of factor solutions (from 7 to 3) the researcher looked at the correlation coefficient between factors and items and also considered the meaning of items in the scale to decide which items were more suitable for each factor. As a result, a three-factor solution which accounted for 45.8 % of the variance was accepted. The correlation coefficients between the items in each scale and total is displayed in Table 1. Two items which did not correlate with any factor were omitted from the scale. Although item 8 was correlated with factor 2 (In charge)
moderately (.53) it lowered the low internal-consistency coefficient (Cronbach's alpha). Therefore it has been moved to factor 3 (behaviour management).
### 3.1 Table 1 Correlations between items in each scale and total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>Correlation with Total</th>
<th>N=124</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNICATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-When I meet inappropriate behaviour I can calmly explain why the behaviour undesirable for me , for other pupils and for teaching</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-If my first strategy does not work I know what to do next</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-I can move around the classroom calmly/ freely</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-I can scan the class and try to make eye contact when I am talking to them</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- I can show or explain the appropriate behaviour expected from children</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-When a child starts to disrupt another child, I can make him/her take part in the lesson by giving an academic task when appropriate</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-My non verbal behaviour gives students signals that I am confident while I am teaching, communicating and dealing with their difficulties</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Without stopping teaching I do something to bring pupils back into lesson if they are talking each other</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-I can communicate with pupils clearly and precisely</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- If it necessary I can work with parents collaboratively to solve the problems</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- I can give praise for appropriate behaviour when it is required</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Reliability</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.82</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IN CHARGE OF CLASSROOM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32- When a problem occurs I am able to handle it quietly and directly without feeling negative, or using sarcasm</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28- I can communicate to children that I am serious about getting appropriate behaviour</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23- If I see any inappropriate behaviour between children (e.g. fighting, kicking, teasing) I can discuss with them what happened first so that they can express their feelings and opinions and start to realise what they actually did</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Reliability</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.76</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26- I have very effective classroom management skills</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30- If a student in my class becomes disruptive and noisy I feel assured that I know some techniques to redirect him quickly</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29- I am confident of my ability to begin the year so that students will learn to behave well</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16- My pupils know that I can find out what is really happening when they have been fighting, thumping or kicking</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-If I catch a misbehaviour earlier, I can handle that behaviour quickly and effectively</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Reliability</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.76</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCALES WHICH EMERGED

The first scale, called *communicating what is needed*, consists of items related to teachers transmitting their expectations, explaining what is appropriate and inappropriate for the class and communicating clearly with pupils verbally or non-verbally. Scale 2, named as *in charge of classroom situation*, includes items reflecting how decisive the teacher is in getting appropriate behaviour, staying in control of events in the classroom and making sure that pupils know about the programme of activities. The third scale consists of items referring to the teacher's perception of *managing pupils' behaviour*.

For each factor, the internal-consistency coefficient (Cronbach's alpha) was computed and found satisfactory: \( r = .82 \) for factor 1, \( r = .76 \) for factor 2, and \( r = .76 \) for Factor 3. In addition, all items from the three factors were added up and reliability was adequate (\( r = .87 \)) for total items as well.

The correlation between newly created scales was also computed. A moderate correlation between scales may be interpreted as implying similar aspects among them in some degree but they also vary in terms of measuring different domains of classroom management. The higher correlation between *communication* and *behaviour management* may refer to more common aspects between these variables in comparison with correlation between other variables.

### 3.2 Table 2 Correlation between scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- In Charge</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Behaviour Man.</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 124

### 3.6.2 ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF QUESTIONNAIRE

Self-completed questionnaires are very convenient in terms of time and researchers' effort in comparison, for example, with interviews. If the construction of the questionnaire is very well planned, the process of coding and analysing can be carried out in a short period of time especially with computer coding and analysis. Questionnaires do also have some
negative sides. Data may be superficial and the honesty of respondents cannot be checked. If they use predetermined responses, participants have to choose one of them even if it is not really suitable. In order to obtain meaningful results, questionnaires must have clear instructions and questions must be worded carefully (Robson, 1993).

3.6.3 VALIDITY

After completing the first draft of the questionnaire it was given to two lecturers (Dr. Merry and Dr. Hargreaves). They examined the first draft in terms of wording and forming of items, content of items and gave some useful feedback. The first form of the questionnaire was changed after taking account of their suggestions. After the pilot study the researcher and the same lecturers looked at the items together and decided whether they represented behaviour management efficacy or not, as well as making changes to the wording of the items.

PGCE students involved in the pilot study made comments on the appropriateness of the items for behaviour management. Applying the lecturers’ and student teachers’ ideas about the content of the questionnaire provided face validity, which in turn is one of the ways of establishing construct validity. It relies on whether items look appropriate or not. Another form, called predictive criterion validity looks at the connection between scale scores and the teachers’ actual behaviours in the classroom (Robson, 1993). In other words, data from systematic observation and interviews will also be utilised to identify whether teachers’ behaviour is consistent with their efficacy scores. For example, systematic observation allows statistical analysis of teachers’ responses so that it is possible to compare the outcome of their responses with their efficacy level.

3.6.4 ADAPTATION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Since the questionnaire was originally written in English it needed to be translated from English into Turkish for Turkish teachers. For this purpose the questionnaire was translated by the researcher who knows both languages, by a secondary school English teacher in Turkey, with English at a very high level, and an educational doctorate student at Nottingham University, who knows English and Turkish very well. The researcher put these three translations together and looked at them item by item and decided which one (or which mixture of them) gave the exact meaning. After completing this stage it was
given to a colleague who works for the guidance and counselling department in Turkey, in order to get feedback about whether all items are appropriate and understandable for Turkish teachers and in the Turkish context. He suggested some changes in the wording of items which were confirmed by the researcher. The Turkish version of the questionnaire can be seen in Appendix II. Unfortunately, there was no chance to work out a pilot study before the real study began because of time limitations as mentioned in the Sample section.

3.7 SAMPLE

A convenience sample, as a form of non-probability sampling, was used for selecting teachers for the first stage of the study (survey) in Turkey and in England. In small scale surveys, generally non-probability samples are used because they are less difficult to arrange and they are especially suitable when the intention of the researchers is not to generalise the findings beyond the sample studied. Choosing the nearest and most convenient persons to participate as subjects is the main characteristic of this form. The process is maintained until the sample size has met the required size (Robson, 1993; Cohen and Manion, 1994).

Although this type of sampling has commonly been used it is difficult to generalise findings derived from the sample to the population (Fink, 1995), but there were some practical reasons for using this kind of sampling rather than using a probability sample. It takes too much time to reach a large number of teachers and it is difficult to deal with the data from a large sample within this study. For these reasons a convenience sample was used.

3.7.1 SAMPLE IN ENGLAND

The population for this study is defined as primary school teachers who work at any school in Leicester. The sample was selected from this population. First of all, PGCE students were asked to take 40 questionnaires to their schools but only a few questionnaires were returned. It was therefore necessary to use another method. A letter which explained the aim and the characteristics of the study was sent to head teachers in ten primary schools in Leicester. An example of this letter can be seen in Appendix III.
Certain schools were chosen because the researcher and the academic adviser (Dr. Merry) had personal contacts with the head teachers or the teachers working in these schools. A week after sending the letters, a telephone call was made to the head teachers to confirm whether they agreed to be involved in the study. Fortunately, almost all head teachers agreed to contribute. After getting the head teachers’ permission, the researcher went to the schools and distributed the questionnaire to KS-2 teachers. This process lasted from the middle of November 1997 to middle of January 1998. There was a covering letter on the questionnaire which explained the aim of the study, its importance and the issue of confidentiality and encouraged them to take part in the study (Cohen and Manion, 1994). The letter is presented in Appendix IV.

It must be recognised that the sample may therefore not be truly representative of Leicestershire teachers and that differences may have arisen within the sample due to the different conditions under which the questionnaires were completed.

The ways of collecting the questionnaires varied. In one school, teachers filled in the questionnaires during break time and the researcher waited and collected the questionnaires from them on the same day. Two schools preferred to send the questionnaires by mail. For the rest of the schools, the researcher went back to the schools to collect the questionnaires at one or two week intervals.

3.7.2 SAMPLE IN TURKEY

The population for the Turkish sample is defined as primary school teachers who work in Adana, the fourth biggest city in Turkey. A similar procedure was applied to reach a sample group. First of all, a letter, which was written by the Dean of the Education Faculty at Cukurova University, was sent to the head teachers of 6 primary schools where primary PGCE students do their teaching practice. After getting their permission, the researcher went to each school and explained the aim and the process of the study to head teachers and deputy heads. Then she was introduced to teachers in break time. She distributed the questionnaires and arranged a time with teachers to collect them within approximately one week between 13th April and 22nd April 1998. Seventy-three out of 100 questionnaires were returned. Two factors appeared to have been influential in securing this degree of co-operation (70 %): the researcher’s explanation about the time
limitation because she had only a month to finish her fieldwork and the positive attitude of head teachers and deputy heads towards the study. They all strongly recommended to the teachers that it would be helpful and useful to participate in this study.

3.8 SYSTEMATIC OBSERVATION

After a survey of teachers' efficacy beliefs in classroom behaviour management, in the second part of the study, a quantitative method of systematic observation was employed. Three high and three low efficacy teachers in England and in Turkey (total 6 in Turkey and 6 in England) were selected from the participants who had been involved in the first phase of the study, according to their efficacy score.

The main reason for observing high and low efficacy teachers was to look at the relationship between teacher efficacy and observable classroom behaviour and find out whether high efficacy teachers use more effective and more positive classroom management methods than those of low efficacy teachers (Ashton and Webb, 1986). Bandura (1977) suggests that it is possible to predict observable behaviour based upon both a person's self efficacy and his or her outcome expectancies. There is a reciprocal relationship between self-efficacy and behaviour; efficacy beliefs affect behaviour but are influenced by successful behaviour.

As a way of collecting information about the nature of the physical and social world, one of the aims of observation in educational research is to obtain information about teaching and learning and initiate an educational debate (Foster, 1996). According to Croll (1986) there are two approaches for observational research: systematic observation and ethnographic or qualitative observation which Merriam (1988) calls participant observation.

"Quantitative approaches to observational research in schools have aimed to describe in numerical terms some of the key patterns and regularities of school life. Researchers adopting this approach try to produce accurate quantitative data on the frequency, duration, intensity and sometimes the quality of particular behaviours or patterns of interaction occurring in schools".

(Foster, 1996, p. 3)

Croll (1986) draws attention to the objectivity of systematic observation:
"Systematic classroom observation attempts to arrive at descriptions of classrooms which are absolutely explicit in their purposes and which remove part of the subjectivity which occurs when individuals describe events".

(Croll, 1986, p.4)

In the classroom *Live observation* is one of the most frequently used approaches. Here, an observer records the events using paper and pencil and does not use any mechanical device to reproduce events and takes field notes during and after the process of observation. An observer can therefore direct her/his attention towards different pupils or different views of events and adjust herself/himself quickly to events happening in the classroom.

However, live observation brings about some problems as Croll (1986, p.51) points out:

"The events being observed can only be recreated in terms of the observation system used and that the nature of the systematic observation system is limited by the requirement that it must be possible for an observer to observe and record virtually simultaneously".

The choice of behaviours to be recorded depends on the purpose of the study. It is generally recommended that target behaviours should be coded and recorded immediately after they happen (Medley and Mitzel, 1963). Since the live observer cannot look up coding decisions in the manual while observation is taking place, the system of categories and the rules for assigning events to them must also be simple enough for a trained observer to remember them. In more structured recording, the researcher must have a clear view on the behavioural focus of the research, which behaviour will be recorded and how samples of target behaviour are judged to be different from other behaviour. However, having trained in using a carefully planned observation system an observer should then be capable of reliably coding events into more complex categories (Croll, 1986).

In this study, the researcher observed the teachers using a systematic observation schedule to compare their efficacy beliefs and their behaviour especially towards pupils’ misbehaviour and to understand whether teachers behaviour in dealing with inappropriate behaviour is influenced by efficacy belief.
During an observation, the researcher sat in an appropriate place in the classroom so that she was able to see all the pupils and the teacher. Sometimes she had to change her place and move because pupils or the teacher changed their places. The researcher tried to observe each teacher equally in terms of time. Each teacher was observed for 3 hours at three different times (3×1), in order to obtain a representative estimate of teachers and pupils’ behaviour. A small number of teachers (12) were involved in the second stage of the study because of practical reasons such as limitations on time, resources and the availability of only one researcher to act as an observer.

3.8.1 BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT OBSERVATION SCHEDULE

The process of structured observation includes three stages:

a) the recording of events in a systematic manner as they happen

b) the coding of these events into pre-specified categories

c) subsequent analysis of the events to give descriptions of teacher-pupil interaction

(Galton, 1994, p. 811).

When carrying out a systematic observation, an observer allocates classroom events to already defined categories. When researchers are recording such events either they can use audiotape or videotape and code the data immediately after recording, or record and code the events simultaneously in the classroom (Galton, 1994). In line with this explanation about the structure of systematic observation an observation schedule was developed.

3.8.1.1 THE PROCESS OF DEVELOPING THE SCHEDULE

Qualitative observation can be used as a means of pilot work which helps the researcher to identify the sort of behaviour she/he wants to highlight and to develop research instruments (Foster, 1996). Some researchers, before starting to develop systematic observation schedules, go to classrooms, do some informal qualitative observation in order to understand the aspects of the classroom, to identify observational variables and to generate hypotheses.
Before developing the schedule, the researcher did a naturalistic observation using a tracking sheet which consisted of time, location (plan), interaction, audience and comment. Five hours of naturalistic observation took place in two different teachers’ classes and each session took 1 hour. During these sessions the researcher wrote down everything possible which was related to behaviour management. It gave a number of useful ideas about what was happening in the classroom, what kinds of misbehaviour were often observed, the teacher’s responses to this behaviour, the role of teacher location and seating arrangement and activities in behaviour management.

Some particular patterns of behaviour for both the teacher and pupils were considered as useful in the development of the schedule. After that, a pilot study was carried out using the first draft of the schedule in three different teachers’ classrooms. It consisted of 9 hours observation. During the pilot study some changes were made in the light of ideas derived from the observations. For example, some new items which were thought important were placed in the misbehaviour and the teacher response categories and some others were removed from the first draft.

“It is useful to provide observers with experience of coding under classroom conditions as soon as possible. It is often difficult to identify the context in which a behaviour takes place on videotape which in turn means that the decision about the use of a particular category is not as clear-cut as the trainer might wish”.

(Galton, 1994, p.813)

As Galton emphasised, the pilot study also helped the researcher to train herself in using the schedule, to become familiar with real classroom atmosphere, to gain experience in the observation of some important aspects of teacher and pupil behaviour and to define essential elements of their behaviour.

In the development of the systematic observation schedule, Nottingham Class Management Observation Schedule (NCMOS) by Wragg et al. (1978) and Climate and Control System (CCS) by Soar and Soar (1980, cited in Ashton and Webb, 1986) provided the conceptual and theoretical framework. Especially, the shape and style of these schedules are similar to the new schedule since the main characteristics for both of them are to look at the chain of misbehaviour-teacher response-pupil response.
In the determination of the categories of misbehaviour, teacher response and pupil response they were also very informative. For example, for the section on misbehaviour the names of some categories were taken from CCS: aimless wandering, laughs, speaks out loud without permission (talks without taking turn in the new schedule); some were taken from NCMOS: irrelevant to task, insulting pupil (irritate pupil in the new schedule), inappropriate use of material.

In the section on teacher response, the categories of ignore, signals, criticise, take material, orders-commands (give order in the new one) were from CCS, while the categories of punishment, reprimand, statement of rule, humour, praise or encouragement come from NCMOS. In terms of pupil response, although different names were used to describe the reaction of the pupil, the categories of this section mainly derived from the NCMOS. However, it should be noted the operational definition of the section and the categories were made by the researcher with the help of personal experience, pilot observation and the dictionary.

3.8.1.2 THE AIM OF THE SCHEDULE

The schedule aims to gather information about the behaviour management of primary school teachers with particular emphasis on misbehaviour occurring in lessons and teachers’ ways of dealing with it. The focus is upon teacher managerial behaviour concerning pupils’ misbehaviour and pupils’ response to teacher.

The observation schedule has 5 sections in which an observer records pupil misbehaviour, teacher’s response to misbehaviour, pupil response to teacher’s behaviour, type of activities, teacher location and pupils involved in misbehaviour.

The use of the schedule depends on event sampling so that when a misbehaviour happens, if the teacher sees and gives a response to it, first the observer records what is the misbehaviour, then teacher’s response and then the pupil’s response to the teacher. In addition, details such as audience, teacher location, activities should be placed in the related columns. Each category in every section has a code number and that number should be put in the relevant cell in the relevant column when the observer needs to use that category.
Before the observation starts the section on background information including date, name of teacher, subject of lesson, time the observation starts, year group, the number of children in the classroom is completed. The observer writes this information on the top of the schedule. The actual process of observation starts when most of the pupils and the teacher settle down and begin the lesson. However, the details of how pupils enter the classroom and how the teacher settles them down are written for later interpretation of systematic observation. However, the main aim is to record interactions during the actual lesson to find out how the teacher copes with misbehaviour when s/he is carrying out teaching activities. The schedule is displayed in Appendix V.

During the classroom observation, the observer also looked at three disruptive and three well behaved pupils' on-off task behaviour in each class every five minutes and assessed their task engagement level putting (+) for on-task and (-) for off-task in the assigned column. These pupils were nominated by their teachers in a response to the question “Can you indicate 3 well behaved pupils and 3 who often misbehave in your classroom?”.

3.8.1.3 DEFINITION OF EACH SECTION AND CATEGORIES IN THESE SECTIONS

Misbehaviour, which consists of 9 categories, means any behaviour which disturbs pupils or the teacher and negatively affects the flow of lesson. It should be seen and responded to by the teacher in order to be recorded.

TYPES OF MISBEHAVIOUR

*Talk out of turn:* Talk loudly when it is not necessary and without taking turn.

*Irritate pupil:* Do something which annoys other pupils and prevents them from studying, such as taking materials or belongings.

*Wandering aimlessly:* Leave the seat and walk around the classroom without intending to do something related to work. Some movements e.g. get or return materials, go to the teacher to show something at an appropriate time are not involved in this category.

*Physical aggression:* Behaviour that intentionally inflicts harm or injury on another person (Hetherington and Parke, 1993) e.g. pull, push, kick, hit or attack other pupils intending hurt to them physically.
**Inappropriate use of material:** Use material for an inappropriate purpose in a careless, incorrect manner, e.g. harming the material by throwing, shaking, breaking etc.

**Irrelevant to task:** Not connected to the task which has to be carried out, do not pay attention and do irrelevant things e.g. inappropriate posture or movement for the task (Wragg et al., 1978).

**Laughs:** Laugh loudly at unexpected times and destroy other people’s concentration or work.

**Other:** Behaviours which do not fit into one of the categories listed above but which could still be categorised as misbehaviour.

### TYPES OF TEACHER RESPONSE

Any teacher’s response towards misbehaviour which is supposed to stop or reduce misbehaviour.

**Encouragement or praise:** Tell pupils that what they are doing is good and they should continue to do that, give hope, encouragement or confidence to pupils. Express strong approval for their qualities or achievements e.g., “Well done, this is a lovely piece of work”.

**Humour:** Give humorous response to pupil behaviour (Wragg et al., 1978) in that the teacher is trying to make things amusing instead of being serious e.g., make joke, make pupils laugh.

**Statement of rule:** Restate the classroom rule in a formal and definite way. Clearly express the rules to let pupils know teacher’s intention or opinion.

**Reprimand:** Criticise pupils severely for what they have done in front of the class.

**Criticise:** Express disapproval towards pupil behaviour like saying ‘what a shame’, ‘only you can do this’, ‘do not be silly’.
- Reprimand and criticise differ in their degree. Reprimand is more serious, longer and more public than criticise, while criticise usually involves expressing disapproval or dissatisfaction towards pupil’s behaviour one to one.

**Change place:** When pupils begin to do something which irritates other pupils or teacher, change their place, send them to another table or seat in the classroom.

**Ask question or give task:** While a child is misbehaving, ask a question or give a task which aims to prevent them from continuing the same behaviour and involves them in academic work.

**Shout:** Talk to them in a loud voice (short and sudden).

**Look at pupil:** Look pupils in the face and eyes in order to make them realise that they should stop it as soon as possible.

**Talk to pupil:** Talk to pupils calmly one to one to understand the reasons for the behaviour and persuade them what they should be doing, how they should be behaving in the classroom.

**Ignore:** Pretend that the teacher did not see or hear the inappropriate action. Note that this is still meant to discourage the unwanted behaviour by not giving the pupil attention.

**Touch:** The teacher puts hand on pupils’ shoulder gently to show his awareness and supportive feelings.

**Give order:** Tell pupils what to do to prevent them from disobeying the classroom rules, give instruction as to what should be done such as ‘go to your seat’, ‘stop doing that’, ‘sit down’.

**Pupil named:** Call pupil’s name as a means of drawing their attention to their behaviour or stop what they have been doing.

**Take material:** Take material when pupils are using it inappropriately or unnecessarily in a way that it also prevents studying.
Punishment: This category consists of physical punishment and other sanctions such as not letting them go out at break time, extra work to be done during break time.

Use signals: Use some verbal and sound signals to gain pupils’ attention by knocking on the blackboard, tables or saying 'shh'.

Warning: Give an advance notice that something unpleasant/unwanted will happen.

Other: Teachers’ responses which are not mentioned in categories presented above.

PUPILS INVOLVED IN MISBEHAVIOUR

In this section a group of pupils who are involved in inappropriate behaviour is described.

1-Boy: misbehaviour done by only one boy during an incident.

2-Girl: misbehaviour done by only one girl during an incident.

3-Group: between two and four pupils involved in misbehaviour.

4-More than five pupils.

TEACHER LOCATION

The distance of the teacher from the pupil(s), who is involved in inappropriate behaviour judged approximately by eye into 3 categories.

1-Far from pupil: the teacher is at the blackboard or the table, the pupil is at the back of the classroom.

2-Half distance: the teacher is half way across the room.

3-Close: very near to the child.

ACTIVITIES

1- Whole class teaching: teacher is working with or lecturing to all children in the classroom.

2- Individual work: pupils are working on tasks individually.
3- Group work: a group of children working together on the same task co-operatively.

**TASK ENGAGEMENT LEVEL**

On-task: includes attending to work, collecting resources, attending to or interacting with the teacher, following instructions, helping another child or looking at their own work (Hastings and Schwieso, 1995, p. 282).

Off-task: refers to behaviour that does not involve attending to teacher, work and instruction but does involve irrelevant activities.

### 3.8.2 SAMPLE

In order to choose teachers for the second part of the study a purposive sampling approach was used. In purposive sampling, researchers hand-pick the cases to be included in the sample on the basis of their judgement of their typicality. In this way, they build up a sample that satisfies specific needs (Cohen and Manion, 1994). The principle of selection in purposive sampling is the researcher’s judgement as to typicality or interest. The rationale of such an approach is very different from statistical generalisation from sample to population (Robson, 1993).

The logic and the power of the purposive sampling depends on selecting *information-rich* cases for study in depth. Information-rich cases are those from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the research (Patton, 1990).

In the definition of high and low efficacy, group mean, standard deviation and median were considered. A total scale score can be obtained for each respondent from the self-efficacy scale on the behaviour management questionnaire. It was assumed that teachers who were identified as belonging to the low efficacy group all had scores 1 standard deviation or more below the group mean, while teachers who were classified as members of a high efficacy group scored 1 standard deviation or more above the group mean. This classification was made separately for each sample group in Turkey and England, that is the classification was based on separate group means for the two countries. The scores of high efficacy teachers fell into the top third of the sample’s efficacy score whereas teachers identified as low efficacy were those whose scores fell into the bottom third of
samples in both countries. Information about the sample for observation and interview is summarised in Table 3 and Table 4.

### 3.3 Table 3 Sample for observation and interview / England

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACH</th>
<th>EFFICA</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>EXPERI</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/HIGH</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/HIGH</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/HIGH</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/LOW</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>5 MONTH</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/LOW</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>MALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/LOW</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>MALE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEAN= 78  SD= 8  MEDIAN= 77  N= 51

### 3.4 Table 4 Sample for observation and interview / Turkey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACH</th>
<th>EFFICA</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>EXPERI</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/HIGH</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/HIGH</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>MALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/HIGH</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/LOW</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/LOW</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 MONTH</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/LOW</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>MALE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEAN= 85  SD= 7  MEDIAN= 86  N= 73

### 3.8.3 RELIABILITY

"Reliability is established by demonstrating that the measurement instrument will establish the same result on a second occasion when that which is being observed is unchanged (test-retest reliability) or else that different combinations of items in the test battery, taken separately, will arrive at the same result (split half reliability or related procedure such as the alpha co-efficient)."

(Croll, 1986, p. 149)

However, the application of this definition to the analysis of observational data is rather confusing (Croll, 1986). The definitions of particular concepts involved in judging
reliability for reliability in observation can be found in Medley and Mitzel (1963, p. 253-254)

"The term reliability coefficient refers to the correlation to be expected between scores based on observation made by different observers at different times".

"The correlation between scores based on observations made by different observers at the same time will be referred to as a coefficient of observer agreement".

"A correlation between scores based on observations made by the same observer at different times will be referred to as a stability coefficient".

Since the two correlated measures are derived from a single sample of behaviour, the coefficient of observer agreement does not say to what extent an obtained score represents a true score. Similarly, it is difficult to say that a stability coefficient estimates a score accurately because a correlation between observations is carried out by a single observer. In other words, the coefficient of the observer agreement is concerned with the objectivity of an observational system; the coefficient of stability is related to the consistency of behaviour over time. The answer to 'how accurate a measure?' can only be found in the reliability coefficient (Medley and Mitzel, 1963).

Reliability is considered as a crucial issue in structured observation schedules, especially if an observer obtains different results when using the same instrument at different times or if there is variation among the results of different observers using the same instrument. Therefore, intra-observer reliability (observer consistency), what Medley and Mitzel call stability coefficient and inter-observer reliability (inter-observer agreement) are the two kinds of reliability (Robson, 1993)

"Observer consistency is the extent to which an observer obtains the same results when measuring the same behaviour on different occasion (e.g. when coding the same audio-or video tape at an interval of a week). Both observer consistency and inter-observer agreement are measured by the same means. ...They involve the calculation either of the degree of correlation between the two sets of measurements, or of the agreement (sometimes called concordance) between them".

(Robson, 1993, p.221)
In the light of the literature presented above, for the behaviour management schedule intra-observer reliability was calculated by computing the consistency between two observations which were carried out by the same researcher. In order to do this, 45 incidents which represent misbehaviour and the teacher's responses to this behaviour were copied from video cassettes already developed. The researcher watched the newly created video twice with an interval of a week using the last form of the observation schedule.

First of all, agreement and disagreement for each category between two observations is shown on a 'confusion matrix' which clearly shows where the differences are. Then the proportion of agreement (Po) is calculated dividing the number of agreements by the sum of the number of agreements and number of disagreements. The proportion expected by chance (Pc) needs to be known to make clear whether the same code is used by chance or not. Cohen's Kappa is then computed by using the following formula:

\[ K = \frac{Po - Pc}{1 - Pc} \]

The agreement and disagreement between the two observations can be shown in the contingency table and Kappa value (Robson, 1993, 223) was computed, using Cohen's Kappa formula, for misbehaviour (0.69), the teacher's response (0.75) and pupil response to teacher (0.65). According to Fliess (1981, cited in Robson) the following rules can be taken as criteria:

Kappa of 0.40 to 0.60: 'fair;

Kappa of 0.60 to 0.75: 'good'

Kappa of above 0.75: 'excellent'

3.8.4 VALIDITY

A measure is said to be valid if variations in scores made by it represent actual differences, not differences caused by different observers. According to Medley and Mitzel (1963, p.250) for an observational scale, the validity of measurements of behaviour depends on the realisation of three conditions:
1-A representative sample of the behaviours to be measured must be observed.

2-An accurate record of the observed behaviours must be obtained.

3-The records must be scored so as to faithfully reflect differences in behaviour.

Since it is rarely possible to obtain a random sample in practice, a non-random sample can be used but care must be taken to make it as representative as possible. The second condition-accurate recording of behaviour and the third condition-meaningful scoring are interwoven since scoring of a record depends on how recording is made. However, it is hardly possible to record everything that occurs in a classroom (Medley and Mitzel, 1963).

In line with Medley and Mitzel’s assumptions, the main aim of the observation schedule is to include certain kinds of teacher’s response to misbehaviour and pupils’ response to teacher but not all aspects of both. This makes it easy to focus on target behaviours and record them as accurately as possible. Furthermore, in the Behaviour Management Observation system, categories in each section and the coding system are clearly defined before the actual research starts. The researcher has clear aims about which aspects of teachers’ and pupils’ behaviour would be concerned. She has also trained herself in how to use the system in terms of assigning the right codes to the right behaviour.

“Although the choice of categories and the definition of the criteria may be highly subjective, reflecting the values of those who construct the system, the technique itself is objective in the sense that the criteria used to describe classroom life are clearly defined. Thus, when the system is used correctly it is unaffected by the personal biases of individual observers”.

(Galton, 1994, p. 812)

The face validity of the observation instrument, by referring to a clear-cut definition of categories, can provide high observer agreement. However as Galton (1994) suggests “the more complex the observation instrument, the less advisable it is to take face validity for granted” (p.813). It may be asserted that the observation system is not too complex for practical usage because at one time, 5 incidents chosen from 36 categories in 5 sections were recorded. When a misbehaviour occurs the observer needs to put the code of
misbehaviour, the code of teacher’s response, pupil’s response to teacher, teaching activity, audience and teacher location.

Field notes taken by the researcher during systematic observation can also be used to improve validity. Incident examples which show what the child does, what the teacher’s response is and whether the teacher’s approach is more likely to be positive or negative, effective or ineffective were the concern of the field notes. Information derived from these field notes enabled the researcher to use this information and validate the results of systematic observation, because data which emerged from field notes and interviews was triangulated with systematic observation data. This made it possible to reach a clear picture about each teacher’s management approaches and find particular points to support the results of systematic observation.

3.9 PARTICIPANT OBSERVATION

In addition to systematic observation, the researcher took some field notes related to classroom management, such as examples of incidents which occurred in the classroom, teachers’ and pupils’ behaviour, seating arrangements, teaching activities and the flow of these activities. However, it should be noted that this was not a completed or full participation observation. It was “observer as participant” in Patton’s (1980) words where the observer is accepted primarily as a researcher.

Quantitative and qualitative approaches can be used to examine the same problem from different angles (Foster, 1996). For example, in the ORACLE research quantitative observation was used to examine teaching style and students’ adaptation to new schools (Galton and Willcocks, 1983). In order to explore students’ experiences and schools’ characteristics more deeply, qualitative observation was carried out as well. Similarly, Wragg (1993) used a mixture of observation methods to explore some aspects of classroom management in student teachers’ and experienced teachers’ classrooms. Field notes and analysis of classroom events helped to explain and illuminate data collected through quantitative methods.

The main purpose of using participant observation here was to understand whether high and low efficacy teachers differed in their approaches to pupils’ misbehaviour. Observing
how some teachers establish and sustain activities helps us to understand some patterns of classroom events and to define what the teacher needs to do to succeed and maintain order in the classroom (Doyle, 1984).

“Through participant observation, it is possible to describe what goes on, who or what is involved, when and where things happen, how they occur, and why—at least from the standpoint of participants—things happen as they do in particular situations”.

(Jorgensen, 1989, p.12)

In the systematic observation schedule, half the page was assigned for participant observation. If needed, the back of the page and another paper were also used for writing notes. Since the use of systematic observation relies on the occurrence of misbehaviour which does not happen all the time, the researcher had time to describe when and how the teacher started and ended a lesson, during a lesson how s/he managed transitions between activities, where the pupils were, what they were doing and which teaching activities were taking place. All these were primary issues for participant observation.

Teachers’ responses to misbehaviour, language and methods they used to deal with misbehaviour, the level of help and encouragement given by teachers and whether they explained their expectations (e.g. what to do next after finishing any task, what pupils need to do) clearly are the main features of teachers’ behaviour when managing classroom. In some cases, after an observation session the researcher interviewed the teacher and asked some questions about particular incidents which had taken place in order to obtain extra information to confirm or make clearer her observation. As Merriam (1988) emphasised, participant observation, especially when joined with interview, provides a holistic view of the situation being examined. Examples of incidents consisted of a brief description of the pupil’s behaviour, a record of the activity s/he was involved in at that time, the teacher’s response and what happened after the teacher’s response. A similar approach was used in the transfer study (Galton and Willcocks, 1983) where the observer went into classrooms and wrote detailed notes about what s/he saw in addition to systematic observation. The two observations took place at different times.
Even if participant observers do not have a structured scale before going into the classroom, they have some opinions related to their interest in the topic. The success of participant observation depends heavily on the researcher’s skill and talent, because as human beings are the main research instrument they must be able to understand the complexity of human interaction even over a short period of time. For this reason, participant observers should be trained to be attentive and responsive towards data gathering. Researchers’ biases are the main problems in this kind of observation because they influence how data is seen, recorded and interpreted. Subjectivity affects the degree to which the data gathered is reliable.

The main criticism of participant observation as a research method is the subjective and unreliable nature of human behaviour (Merriam, 1988) but Patton (1980) suggests that after having been trained how to write accurate descriptions and gaining practice in recording field notes, a researcher learns how to isolate detail from trivia.

### 3.9.1 ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF OBSERVATION

Foster (1996) identifies the advantages and disadvantages of observation.

> “It is possible to obtain detailed accurate information about classrooms which is not accessible in interviews, questionnaires or written documents. . . . For a number of reasons participants’ accounts may be inaccurate. . . . Since observation involves the researcher noting down what he or she sees as it occurs, observational data are more likely to be accurate...”

( Foster, 1996, p. 13)

Sometimes observers may be able to see events that participants cannot, or they may not be aware of, though the opposite can be equally true. A careful and planned observation may be the only way to identify significant patterns and systems in behaviour over a period of time. When some school personnel are not able to be involved in interviews or questionnaires or they are reluctant to be involved for a number of personal reasons such as shortage of time or other professional commitments, observation may be the only and less demanding way of collecting data.

One of the disadvantages of observation is that there may be no chance to observe some behaviour or phenomenon because of its inaccessibility, e. g. when the behaviour
occurred in the past. Sometimes it is difficult for observers to understand the real meaning of behaviour or its context because as Foster points out:

"...Observations are inevitably filtered through the interpretative lens of the observer. We must remember that observations can never provide us with a direct representation of reality. Observers inevitably select what they observe and what observations they record. They also interpret what they see. The observers’ existing knowledge, theories and values will inevitably influence the data they produce and the accounts and evaluations they produce. The danger is that this may introduce biases and inaccuracies into their work so that invalid, and therefore misleading, descriptions, explanations or evaluations are produced”.

(Foster, 1996, p.14)

School personnel may change their behaviour consciously or unconsciously when they are being observed. If they change their behaviour during observations it would be difficult to reach accurate representations of their usual behaviour, and also any judgements made about these behaviours will be invalid assessments of normal practice. Furthermore, observation is a very time consuming and costly way of collecting data. That is why most researchers are able to study only a restricted range of subjects or a small sample of the behaviour that is of interest.

3.10 INTERVIEW

After observing teachers, using the systematic observation system, and taking field notes, an interview with the same teachers was conducted, because an interview can provide information which cannot be obtained otherwise, as Patton points out:

"We interview people to find out from them those things we cannot directly observe. We cannot observe feelings, thoughts, and intentions; we cannot observe behaviour that took place at some previous point in time. We cannot observe situations that preclude the presence of an observer. We cannot observe how people have organised the world and the meanings they attach to what goes on in the world- we have to ask questions about those things. The purpose of interviewing, then, is to allow us to enter into the other person’s perspective”.

(Patton, 1990, p. 278)

A similar point is made by Seidman (1991)
“Interviewing provides access to the context of people’s behaviour and thereby provides a way for researchers to understand the meaning of that behaviour. . . . Interviewing allows us to put behaviour in context and provides access to understanding their action”.

(Seidman, 1991, p. 4)

Merriam (1988) examines the kind of interview on a continuum from highly structured questionnaire-driven interviews to open-ended, conversational style. Similarly Seidman (1991) distinguishes between tightly structured standardised, closed questions to open-ended, seemingly unstructured, anthropological interviews.

3.10.1 SEMI STRUCTURED INTERVIEW

At the beginning of the survey the researcher informed verbally the head teachers that she would focus on a group of teachers to observe and interview in the second part of the study. For ethical reasons, the arrangements for the interviews with the teachers were discussed with them during observation visits. After systematic and participant observation of high and low efficacy teachers in their classroom, an interview with them took place concerning what they felt about managing misbehaviour, their perceptions of factors influencing their management style and their efficacy beliefs. A semi-structured interview was used for gathering in-depth data to understand the sources of teachers’ efficacy beliefs and their classroom management style.

In semi-structured interviews, which Powney and Watts (1987) call ‘respondent interview’ as an alternative to standardised (structured) interview, all the respondents are expected to give certain information. Although the questions are previously defined before the interview starts, neither the order of the questions not the wording of them is determined beforehand. Researchers have the chance to respond to the situation, the worldview of the respondent and new ideas on the topics (Merriam, 1988). In other words, they can modify the order of questions depending on their perceptions of appropriateness of the topics in the context of the conversation, they can change wording, omit some questions which are not appropriate for particular respondents or add new ones and also ask for explanations when required (Robson, 1993).
Technically, the qualitative research interview is semi-structured: it is neither an open conversation nor a highly structured questionnaire. It is conducted according to an interview guide that focuses on certain themes and that may include suggested questions. There is an openness to change of sequence and forms of questions in order to follow up the answers given and the stories told by the subjects (Kvale, 1996).

Twelve teachers (6 in Turkey, 6 in England) were interviewed. They were the same teachers who were involved in the observational study. The researcher by herself functioned as interviewer as Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggested. There were 17 questions prepared in the form of the semi-structured interview where the researcher asks extra questions when she does not understand the interviewee's reply or when she thinks it is appropriate to go further with particularly unclear responses saying “Can you explain this more?” or “Can you give an example?”. Some of the exploratory questions were already pre-prepared for the interview sheet, while some of them were formulated by the interviewer, if needed, at the time of the interview process. Interview questions can be seen in Appendix VI.

The researcher kept Kvale’s suggestions in mind when planning the interview questions. Kvale (1996) suggests that the question of “how” should be asked and answered after the questions of “why” and “what”. Note taking and audiotape recording were used for recording the interviews. Tape recording allows the interviewer to focus on the topic and the dynamics of the interview. The tape can be re-listened to when needed during the transcription process but it cannot provide visual aspects of the setting and the body languages of the participants (Kvale, 1996).

Three of the Turkish teachers did not want the researcher to record their interviews. Although the researcher informed them it was confidential they said they did not feel comfortable speaking into the tape. In such cases it was agreed to use note taking as a recording method, as otherwise data derived from these interviews would be lost. Although full note-taking makes it difficult for the interviewer to concentrate on the dynamics of the interview and inhibits a participant from speaking fluently (Powney and Watts, 1987) in this case, the risk of having a partial record as data was thought more beneficial than obtaining no interview data from these teachers. Furthermore having had
experience in counselling psychology, especially in the interview process, the researcher tried to carry out the interviews with minimum loss of information while simultaneously she attended to the process actively and wrote down as much as possible of what participants said after each question.

Consistent with Seidman’s (1991) very useful suggestions, she also knew the basic characteristics of the interview process such as opening and ending, the flow of interview, uses of time, and the importance of non-verbal behaviours of both researcher and interviewees. Keeping in mind these very important aspects, after presenting each question she tried to keep quiet and not interrupt apart from some reflective signs, such as mere nodding, ‘mm’, which showed her awareness and attendance to the process in line with Merriam’s (1988) advice that a good interviewer avoids arguing, pays special attention to verbal and non-verbal messages and is a good listener.

Since the interview questions were originally written in English they needed to be translated into Turkish. For this reason, they were given to two Ed.D students who know both Turkish and English very well. The researcher compared the three translations, including her own, question by question and decided whether one or a combination of all three translations of each question, gave the exact meaning in Turkish. There were no major differences between the three translations, nor did the researcher encounter any complaints from Turkish teachers when carrying out the interviews. Interview questions written in Turkish is presented Appendix VII. In order to avoid any loss of meaning in the responses, interviews with Turkish teachers were transcribed in Turkish.

Interviews with 6 English teachers in three different schools took place in their free time during a day, lunch time or after school between 4th March and 31st March 1998. Since the researcher had been in these teachers’ classrooms for observation, it was easy to arrange a meeting with the teachers for interview. At the last session of the observation of each teacher, an appointment was made for interview. The interviews lasted approximately 25 minutes, three of them were recorded on tape and full note taking was used for recording the other three interviews.
experience in counselling psychology, especially in the interview process, the researcher tried to carry out the interviews with minimum loss of information while simultaneously she attended to the process actively and wrote down as much as possible of what participants said after each question.

Consistent with Seidman's (1991) very useful suggestions, she also knew the basic characteristics of the interview process such as opening and ending, the flow of interview, uses of time, and the importance of non-verbal behaviours of both researcher and interviewees. Keeping in mind these very important aspects, after presenting each question she tried to keep quiet and not interrupt apart from some reflective signs, such as mere nodding, 'mm', which showed her awareness and attendance to the process in line with Merriam's (1988) advice that a good interviewer avoids arguing, pays special attention to verbal and non-verbal messages and is a good listener.

Since the interview questions were originally written in English they needed to be translated into Turkish. For this reason, they were given to two Ed.D students who know both Turkish and English very well. The researcher compared the three translations, including her own, question by question and decided whether one or a combination of all three translations of each question, gave the exact meaning in Turkish. There were no major differences between the three translations, nor did the researcher encounter any complaints from Turkish teachers when carrying out the interviews. Interview questions written in Turkish is presented Appendix VII. In order to avoid any loss of meaning in the responses, interviews with Turkish teachers were transcribed in Turkish.

Interviews with 6 English teachers in three different schools took place in their free time during a day, lunch time or after school between 4th March and 31st March 1998. Since the researcher had been in these teachers’ classrooms for observation, it was easy to arrange a meeting with the teachers for interview. At the last session of the observation of each teacher, an appointment was made for interview. The interviews lasted approximately 25 minutes, three of them were recorded on tape and full note taking was used for recording the other three interviews.
Interviews with 6 Turkish teachers in three different schools occurred in their free time during a day or after school between 24th April and 1st May 1998. The same procedure was used for making an appointment with the teachers for the interview. The interviews took approximately 30 minutes. Three of them were recorded on tape, and with the other three teachers the researcher wrote down everything that they said.

3.10.2 ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF INTERVIEW

Robson (1993) wrote about advantages of interview:

"The human use of language is fascinating both as a behaviour in its own right, and for the virtually unique window that it opens on what lies behind our actions... Face to face interviews offer the possibility of modifying one's line of inquiry, following up interesting responses and investigating underlying motives in a way that postal and other self-administered questionnaires cannot. Non-verbal clues may give messages which help in understanding the verbal response possibly changing or even in extreme cases, reversing its meaning". (Robson, 1993, p.229)

Powney and Watts (1987) point out the advantages of one-to-one interviews in comparison with group interviews: they are easy to manage, and since only one respondent is interviewed at one time analysis is more straightforward and also a relative confidentiality can be assured (Powney and Watts, 1987).

A common critique of interview studies is that the findings cannot be generalised because there are too few subjects. Transcriptions and analysis are the most time consuming part of the interview study (Kvale, 1996). Seidman (1991) summarises how the interviewing research is labour intensive:

The researcher has to conceptualise the project, establish access and make contact with participants, interview them, transcribe the data, and then work with the material and share what she or he has learned (Seidman, 1991).

3.10.3 RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY

As Robson (1993) notes, the lack of standardisation and interviewer’s biases are the main threats to reliability, and managing these problems requires a degree of professionalism.
As mentioned before, one of the big advantages for this researcher in dealing with these problems was that having been trained in counselling psychology (at Masters and PhD level) and having had enough experience to conduct interviews from the starting stage to the end, she had gained theoretical background and practical skills in how to conduct interviews and was aware of which aspects of the interview needed care. For standardisation, 17 questions which were prepared ahead of the actual interview were asked of all respondents providing maximum standardised conditions including the presentation of the questions with special attention to the exact wording and sequence of questions, probes or explanation if required. She was confident enough to create a therapeutic atmosphere of interaction in which all respondents felt comfortable and secure. At the beginning she explained what the interview was about and emphasised confidentiality of the information given to all respondents.

Although the interviewees were unique in their sex, age, personality, ethnic origin, experience etc. the researcher tried to play the same role during every interview, in line with Seidman's advice.

"Every aspect of the structure, process, and practice of interviewing can be directed toward the goal of minimising the effect the interviewer and the interviewing situation have on how the participants reconstruct their experience. ...The interviewer must nevertheless recognise that the meaning is, to some degree, a function of the participant’s interaction with the interviewer. Only by recognising that interaction and affirming its possibilities can interviewers use their skills to minimise the distortion that can occur because of their role in the interview". (Seidman, 1991, p.16-17)

Since the researcher was the only person to carry out this research, it would not be possible to provide a quantified reliability check because it requires two persons to transcribe the same interview passage (Kvale, 1996). Instead the researcher listened to some parts of the interview more than once to make sure that the transcribed part was the same as the original passage. This was especially the case for interviews with British teachers. Some parts of the interview passages of Turkish teachers have been given as quotations. These passages were translated from Turkish to English by the researcher and another person who knows English and Turkish well. Then the researcher looked at both translations and decided which one, or which combinations of them, gave the original meaning accurately.
3.11 SUMMARY

To sum up, having used four different methods to explore teacher efficacy in classroom management, the researcher was able to identify characteristics which were more likely to be associated with low or high efficacy teachers. Thus, the next chapter mainly presents findings derived from a survey method and systematic observation and some of the participant observation data. In other words, data from the survey is triangulated with observation and interview. In a similar way, systematic observation results are interpreted with appropriate support from field notes.
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE AND SYSTEMATIC OBSERVATION DATA

4.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter first of all, the analysis of some questions from the Questionnaire, and some interpretations of these results are presented. Then, data from the systematic observation and its interpretation are discussed in the light of the field notes taken during the observations. Incident examples and the description of teachers’ classroom atmosphere in relation to their classroom management strategies contributed to the interpretation.

As mentioned in the Research Method chapter, 12 teachers, 6 in Turkey (3 high, 3 low efficacy), 6 in England (3 high, 3 low efficacy) were observed three different times. Each observation lasted 1 hour, using a systematic observation schedule which enabled the researcher to record any misbehaviour which occurred in the classroom, the teacher’s response to misbehaviour and pupils’ response to the teacher’s behaviour. In addition, the teacher’s location, teaching activity, and the subject being taught at that time were also recorded.

In England, one high and two low efficacy teachers were working in a school where most children were from middle class backgrounds. The other school was located in a rather poor area of the city and two high and one low efficacy teachers were observed there. In Turkey, three low and one high efficacy teachers were working in an area where schools had children from working class families. Two high efficacy teachers were working in a district which was considered a middle class area.

4.2 THE RESULTS OF QUESTIONS FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRE

4.2.1 METHODS REPORTED BY TEACHERS FOR DEALING WITH MISBEHAVIOUR

From twelve methods provided in the questionnaire, teachers were asked to choose three methods which they most often used to deal with misbehaviour. They answered the
question by putting a tick beside the options or circling them. The results of this question are summarised in Table 1.

4.1 Table 1 Percentages of methods reported by teachers most often use to deal with misbehaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHODS</th>
<th>ENGLAND N=51 %</th>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>TURKEY N=73 %</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Praise</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk/explain</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change place</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove child</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk parents</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk as group</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look myself</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn attention</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignore</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shouting</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A rank correlation of methods used by two groups revealed that differences in percentages in the reported use of methods by teachers in Turkey and in England was significant (r= 0.65, P< 0.05).

Interestingly giving praise and talk or explain to pupils are among the first methods reported by both Turkish and British teachers. Giving praise has the highest and a similar percentage (23 % in England, 21 % in Turkey) in both groups while shouting out is reported as the least used method by both groups. However, supported by observation data, shouting at pupils seemed more common than was reported by teachers.

Surprisingly, remove the child from the situation is never mentioned by Turkish teachers. This may be because of employing different school behaviour policies. From the interviews with British teachers, it is understood that when a child becomes really
disruptive, they can send the child to another colleague’s classroom to cool down as part of behaviour policy. However, Turkish teachers rarely or never have such an opportunity because there is no place identified in advance to send a child who is being disruptive.

Talk with parents (18%) is one of the most common ways Turkish teachers follow, compared with only a third of this percentage of British teachers (6%). Again, this may be explained by the existence of a certain behaviour policy in some British schools. Most British teachers interviewed and observed were using an Assertive Discipline policy which basically relies on giving warnings for misbehaviour at different stages, and rewards for appropriate behaviour. Because of this teachers first of all try to deal with problematic behaviour within the classroom but if it continues until the third warning, they call the parents or send a letter to them. In Turkey, however, since teachers did not use a structured discipline approach, after spending some effort talking to the pupil or trying to improve his/her behaviour, if they do not achieve any positive result, parents are involved for collaboration.

Another interesting result emerged from the answers of teachers in England. They reported that they use punishment (9%) almost twice as much as teachers in Turkey (5%). When the results of systematic observation, field notes and questionnaire are considered together, Turkish teachers seemed to employ a negative response such as shouting, criticising, giving order in a very authoritative manner when pupils misbehave. During systematic observation the researcher witnessed two teachers using physical punishment (pulling children’s ears). Nevertheless, these results from a small sample of teachers must be interpreted with caution. They may tend to present themselves in a positive way because of social desirability.

Similarly in both groups, ignore and shouting get the smallest proportion of the total percentage. However, the possibility of ignoring misbehaviour is higher in England than in Turkey. It may be asserted that Turkish teachers are more likely than British teachers to be more authoritative and alert towards misbehaviour. In particular some of those observed tended to give a direct and loud response as soon as they saw it. Again, from the interviews with British teachers, some of them said they use ignoring as a strategy so as not to acknowledge attention-seeking behaviour.
One similar point between teachers in both countries is their critical review of their own behaviour. Although British teachers tend to consider variables relating to themselves slightly more than Turkish teachers do, a similar percentage of teachers (4% in Turkey, 5% in England) agreed with the use of this method.

Since the seating arrangement in Turkish classrooms basically consists of sitting in a row, where children are more likely to have to sit permanently (it rarely changes except for group work once a month) Turkish teachers (7%) may not change pupils’ places as a response to misbehaviour as much as British teachers (12%). On the other hand, seating arrangements in the British classroom are changed in relation to the activity and subject, for instance, from table to carpet, carpet to table, table to table. That is why teachers can and may change pupils’ place as a strategy for dealing with misbehaviour.

4.2.2 RESULTS RELATED TO IN-SERVICE TRAINING

Table 2 summarises the responses about in-service training courses. Although more Turkish teachers (50%) than British teachers (37%) reported they attended in-service training in behaviour management, British teachers are more likely than Turkish teachers to gain a positive impression of both its usefulness and its balance of theory and practice. None of the British teachers said it was not helpful whereas a number of Turkish teachers (14%) found it was not helpful at all. This finding is also supported by what teachers said in interview. The majority of Turkish teachers were not satisfied with the content of the in-service course they took, especially in terms of practicality. It should be noted that the course they attended was mostly in different subject areas of teaching e.g. science rather than behaviour management. Conversely, some teachers in England find it very useful having the opportunity to train themselves in a particular approach to behaviour management, despite some thinking it is not transferable to a classroom situation.

For in-service training, the categories of helpful and very helpful were combined to test against the category of little help by using Chi-square ($\chi^2$) test for British and Turkish groups. Differences between both groups were significant ($\chi^2=5.8, \text{df}=1, p<0.002$), suggesting that British teachers get much more benefit from in-service courses than Turkish teachers.
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4.2 Table 2 The Percentages of teachers reporting ideas about content and usefulness of in-service training course in Turkey and in England

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In-Service Training</th>
<th>TURKEY</th>
<th>ENGLAND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>62.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content of Course</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainly Theoretical</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainly Practical</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of Both</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usefulness of Course</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Helpful</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Helpful</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Helpful</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It may be concluded from these results that British teachers in this study seem more likely to report a positive experience of in-service training in terms of its usefulness and practical aspects in comparison with Turkish teachers.
4.3 RESULTS RELATED TO THE CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT EFFICACY SCALE

4.3.1 EXPERIENCE AND TEACHER EFFICACY

Table 3 Means and standard deviations of four groups of experience on each scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Behaviour Management</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>In charge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1- 0-5 years</td>
<td>20.25</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>45.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- 6-11 years</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>47.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- 12-20 years</td>
<td>21.09</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>48.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- 21-above</td>
<td>22.07</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>49.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire Group</td>
<td>21.16</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>48.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from the table above, the more experience teachers have, the higher mean scores they get. Statistically significant differences are found for communication scale (F= 2.91, P< .03) especially among the experience group 1 and 3, and 1 and 4, and in charge of classroom sub-scale (F= 2.93, P< .03) between the group 1 and 4. Although a statistical significance has not been achieved for behaviour management (F= 1.85, P> .14), differences between mean scores for this scale are all in the same direction with the means increasing with experience.

This result suggests that experience is most influential in allowing teachers to transmit their expectation and explain what is appropriate and inappropriate for a class, giving a message non-verbally to pupils that the teacher is confident in communicating with them and in dealing with problems. It may be concluded that with more years of experience of classroom events during their careers, they gain insight or communication skills to transmit their expectations and look confident. Being decisive in getting appropriate behaviour and making sure pupils understand the programme of activities (flow of lesson) are also determined by experience.

Conversely, dealing with specific behaviour problems such as aggressive behaviour or noise, and confidence in gaining good behaviour are not determined by experience. In
managing particular behaviour problems, and gaining confidence in getting pupils to learn good behaviour and effective class management skills, teachers may need more sophisticated and special training in behaviour analysis and applying some particular methods to particular problems. That is why having so much experience may not affect feeling confident in these area.

4.3.2 COUNTRY AND TEACHER EFFICACY

4.4 Table 4 Means and standard deviations for both groups on each scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Behaviour Man. Mean</th>
<th>Behaviour Man. SD</th>
<th>Communication Mean</th>
<th>Communication SD</th>
<th>In charge Mean</th>
<th>In charge SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>20.35</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>45.64</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>21.72</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>50.16</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>13.26</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire Group</td>
<td>21.16</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>48.30</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>12.84</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As displayed in Table 4, teachers in Turkey had higher scores on each scale than British teachers did. There is a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the two groups on each scale. That is, Turkish teachers have a higher sense of efficacy in behaviour management ($F= 5.6, P< .01$) in communication sub-scale ($F= 30.3, P< .001$) and in charge of the classroom ($F= 6.9, P< .009$). One possible explanation for Turkish teachers having high efficacy scores may be that average of teachers' experience is higher (Mean =17) than those of British teachers (Mean=13.23).

Another explanation may be that Turkish teachers’ understanding of classroom management would be different from that of British teachers. Actually, in the Turkish education system neither in teacher training, nor in-service training is the issue of classroom or behaviour management emphasised sufficiently to generate a framework for teachers. Significant correlations between scales (see Table 5) for the Turkish group demonstrated that Turkish teachers may have a lack of analytic ability to discriminate different dimensions of classroom management while such discrimination is more likely to occur in the British group.
4.5 Table 5 Correlation coefficients between scales for Turkish and British group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>TURKISH N= 73</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Behaviour man.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Communication</td>
<td>0.40*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-In charge</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ENGLISH N= 51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Significant at P&lt; .01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Significant at P&lt; .001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observation and interview data revealed that Turkish teachers tend to perceive classroom management and talk about it using general (tacit) terms. In other words, they possess a less explicit or concrete understanding of it. They may perceive themselves as coping or say they can cope with it (this confidence may also emerge from the authoritarian perception of teachers’ role by teachers and society ) but once teachers are observed and interviewed it becomes clear that there is a difference between what they say and what they do in reality. On the other hand, British teachers have a more complex understanding and awareness of the issues associated with classroom management, like knowing that it is difficult and requires an enormous amount of effort to orchestrate effectively. However, caution should be applied in generalising this result to all Turkish and British teachers because of the small sample size in the study. Social desirability can be influential in self-administered questionnaires so that teachers might present themselves in a way that they like to be seen, rather than relying on authentic feelings.
As can be seen from the table, for Turkish teachers, the mean of each experience group in each scale differ to some degree. Actually, there is an obvious increase for all groups as the years of experience increase. In order to understand whether these variations were statistically significant, t-tests were used and found significant differences between the means of the group with 9 years experience and the group with more than 21 years experience (t = -2.50, df=35, P<0.01) for the behaviour management scale and communication scale (t = -2.07, df=35, P<0.04). As teachers’ years of experience increase, their efficacy seems to be higher.

For British teachers, similar differences existed between the mean of each experience group in each scale: for example, for behaviour management and in charge scale, the group with from 10 to 20 years experience and the group with more than 21 years experience; and the group with 9 years experience and 10 to 20 years experience; for communication scale, the group of 9 years experience and of more than 21 years experience.
experience. However, these differences did not reach a significant level. The reason for this might be the small sample size in comparison with sample size in the Turkish group.

Furthermore, two way analysis of variance was used to examine the interaction between experience and country, and gender and country for each scale. As illustrated in Table 7 no interaction was found except for country and gender in charge scale because interaction was nearly significant (F=3.613, df= 1, P>0.06). For this scale, in the Turkish group, the mean scores of men and women teachers (Mw= 13.23; Mm= 13.32) were almost the same, while in the British group, the mean score of women (Mw=12.71) was higher than that of men (Mm=11). These results may be attributed to the teachers’ origin, that being a teacher in Turkey may be a more dominant variable than being a female or male teacher in determining their attitudes towards staying in control of events in the classroom. In other words regardless of gender Turkish teachers have similar perceptions of being in charge in the classroom, suggesting that this resemblance may be caused by the way they were trained or how they perceive their role as teacher in their cultural context.

4.7 Table 7 Analysis of variance by country and gender for the in charge scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Way Inter.</td>
<td>16.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.03</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country/Gender</td>
<td>16.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.03</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>43.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.44</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>496.98</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>540.30</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.4 GENDER AND TEACHER EFFICACY

It was expected that there would be a difference in the efficacy scores of male and female teachers and since primary teaching is often seen as a feminine profession female teachers could have been expected to have a higher sense of efficacy. But the result of one-way analysis of variance shows that there is not any significant difference between the two groups in all sub-scales (In charge $F= .47$, $P > .49$; communication $F= .64$, $P > .42$; behaviour management $F= .01$, $P > .90$). Although there is no significant difference in behaviour management and in charge sub-scales, as presented in Table 8 female teachers have slightly higher scores while male teachers have higher scores on the communication scale. However, it should be noted that because of the small sample size in general (34 male and 82 female) and small number of male teachers, generalisation from the results should be restricted.

4.8 Table 8 Means and standard deviations for female and male teachers for each scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Behaviour Man.</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>In charge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21.31</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>48.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21.23</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>49.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire Grp.</td>
<td>21.29</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>48.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 THE RESULTS OF SYSTEMATIC OBSERVATION

4.4.1 MISBEHAVIOUR OBSERVED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEHAVIOUR</th>
<th>TURKEY Frequency</th>
<th>TURKEY %</th>
<th>ENGLAND Frequency</th>
<th>ENGLAND %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talk out of turn</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irritate Pupil</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wander aimlessly</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misuse Material</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant to task</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laughs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Behaviour</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from Table 9, talking when they should not talk is among the most frequently met misbehaviour in teachers’ classrooms in both countries. However, the percentage of this behaviour in the Turkish sample is higher than that in Britain. This may be because of the sensitivity of Turkish teachers to even quiet talk and whispering between children, or because of the actual existence of that behaviour. In comparison with England, since a teacher-centred and a more authoritative approach has been accepted in Turkey, teachers are more likely to be alert to pupils’ unnecessary talk and tend to respond. Pupils are expected to sit and listen to the teacher or follow instructions quietly. On the other hand, unless pupils’ talk really irritates others, attracts the teacher’s attention or interrupts the flow of the lesson, British teachers tend to let it go, especially if it derives from the work or study.

Another possible explanation emerges from two year 1 groups observed in Turkey. Since year one is the first grade and children have not internalised classroom rules, they may not wait their turn to talk. In upper grades, answering a question or a request of the teacher when s/he assigned somebody else to answer, was interpreted by Turkish teachers as another form of talking without taking turn. It may be because of the lack of a structured
discipline approach to shape pupils’ behaviour. Therefore, the amount of this behaviour is higher in the Turkish classroom.

Consistent with Akkok et al. (1995) results, behaviour classified as irrelevant to task (inattentiveness), not paying attention to what is going on in the classroom and being unwilling to become involved in activities carried out, have very similar proportions in the both groups (20.1 % in England; 19.4 % in Turkey). Several reasons could explain this behaviour. These could be pupil related or individual variables, for example, having a different ability level, age and problematic family background and teacher. They could also be school or curriculum related variables, for example, lack of teacher’s skill to manage classroom activities, to motivate pupils, poor lesson plan or flow, uninteresting curriculum.

Similarly, wandering aimlessly or being out of seat was the third type of problem behaviour observed in the British and Turkish classroom. However, the proportion of this behaviour in English classrooms is slightly higher than that in Turkish classrooms. Since classroom organisation and seating arrangement in England is characterised by sitting at tables instead of in rows, children often need to move from table to carpet or carpet to table, change seating arrangements according to activities and go to a bookcase to take material etc. During these movements they may spend much more time than is expected or necessary.

In Turkish classrooms, children usually sit in rows. They just go to the corner to sharpen their pencils or put rubbish in the bin or to the teacher’s table to take or give materials. Actually the proportion of out of seat in the Turkish context was found unacceptable, but when the year groups involved in the study are considered it becomes understandable. Two year 1 groups were observed where much more out of seat behaviour was seen. Since year 1 is the first year in primary school, children may not be mature enough to learn and internalise classroom rules such as not wandering around.

Similar numbers of pupils in England and Turkey disturb other pupils, generally those sitting next or near to them by doing irrelevant things such as poking, not letting them
study, playing with materials or toys which prevents peers from concentrating on the task or studying.

Aggression, inappropriate use of material or damage to material and laughing are among the least observed behaviour in classrooms of both countries. Similarly, in Wheldall and Merrett’s (1988) study, ‘physical aggression’ had less than a 1 percent score. For aggression, it may be said that children tend to show aggressive behaviour in playgrounds or open areas rather than the classroom because of the nature of activities and because less supervision is provided compared with the classroom situation. However, in British classrooms aggression and the percentage of misuse of material was observed to be higher than that in Turkish classrooms. This is because British pupils have much more opportunity to access and use materials and relevant equipment (e.g. dictionary, ruler, sharpener, experiment tools) than Turkish children do. Children in Turkey hardly have anything to use from classroom or school. They bring their materials from home.

In the section of misbehaviour, other, one of the categories, has a considerable percentage in high (4.3 %) and low (5.4 %) efficacy teachers’ observation. When the researcher needed to use this category or when misbehaviour observed did not fit any category in the misbehaviour section, she briefly wrote down in the relevant cell what the behaviour was. During the analysis she went back to the systematic observation schedule to see what was involved in the other category and she came up with the following results: in low efficacy teachers’ classrooms, disobedience or not listening or considering what the teacher said (28 %); complaining about other children (22 %) like ‘she does not let me study’ or ‘he is not doing his work’, ‘she is playing, not studying’; playing with toys (17 %). The remaining behaviours were leaving the classroom without permission, throwing paper on the floor and inappropriate dressing. In high efficacy teachers’ classrooms, playing with toys, eating, complaining, leaving the table messy and using someone else’s belongings without permission were observed. There was not enough frequency for each type of behaviour for this group for a percentage to be computed.
4.4.2 PUPILS INVOLVED IN MISBEHAVIOUR

Table 10 presents the number of pupils involved in misbehaviour observed. In both groups, boys have the higher percentage of misbehaviour, in line with previous literature. For example, Wheldall and Merrett (1988) asked teachers to identify the two most troublesome children in their classroom. 76% of them showed boys to be the most troublesome and 77% of the teachers identified boys as the second most troublesome. The reasons for these differences are complex. For example, research has shown that boys and girls differ in the expression of their aggression. Boys are more likely to respond immediately after being attacked than are girls. Boys appreciate aggression more and expect less parental disapproval for aggressive behaviour than girls (Hetherington and Parke, 1993).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>TURKEY Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>ENGLAND Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 Pupil</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Turkish sample, second most common source of misbehaviour was seen to be groups of 2-4 pupils, while in the British sample, individual girls emerged as the second most common source. It is very rare to see a large group (more than 5) being disruptive. If there was, it was a kind of noise, talking all together at the same time especially at the beginning and ending of lessons or during transitions in lesson.
4.4.3 RESULTS OF SYSTEMATIC OBSERVATION AND FIELD NOTES FOR METHODS USED BY TEACHERS IN BOTH COUNTRY

As can be seen from Table 11 in both the British and Turkish classroom contexts, *giving order* and *telling what to do* are most frequently used by teachers dealing with misbehaviour. This may be because teachers may think that if they say or remind pupils what they are expected to do, pupils will stop or change their behaviour. Or they may do this automatically. "Go to your seat", "pay attention to the lesson", "do not disturb your friend", "look at your work", "stop what you are doing", "listen to me", "line up", "sit down" are among the examples of giving orders and telling what to do.

4.11 Table 11 Observed methods used by teachers to deal with misbehaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHODS</th>
<th>TURKEY</th>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>ENGLAND</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Give order</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use signals</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look at pupil</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State rules</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shout</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask Question</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Named</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk to pupil</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticise</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take Material</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change place</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touch</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignore</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humour</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reprimand</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the observations the researcher noticed that praise was mostly given to successful academic effort and performance rather than to improve problematic behaviour in both groups. For this reason, while she was using the praise/encouragement category, she simply put an extra code like 8-A, meaning praise for academic task, or 8-B, meaning praise for behaviour, which shows whether it was for academic work or behaviour. In both countries, academic work such as right answers, good drawing or reading or asking good questions were the main reasons for verbal praise (91 % in England; 92 % in Turkey) like saying ‘well done’, ‘good boy’, ‘good girl’, ‘you are doing really well’. Almost the same percentage of British (9 %) and Turkish teachers (8 %) tended to praise or encourage pupils for appropriate behaviour or to prevent misbehaviour.

In a survey with a sample of 128 British primary school teachers Merrett and Wheldall (1987) came up with similar results. The proportion of total approval was higher than total disapproval. Teachers gave more response to academic work (66 %) than to social behaviour (34 %). Positive responses were issued for academic behaviour three times more than negative responses, while negative responses were given to social behaviour five times more frequently than positive responses.

But in the present study especially when the field notes taken by the researcher during systematic observation are considered, British teachers tended to encourage pupils to improve their behaviour and continue with their work especially when they were doing irrelevant things or not paying attention to the lesson. A sense of efficacy also may mediate the level of teachers’ encouragement.

An example of an incident from a high efficacy English teacher’s classroom may represent how encouragement was employed. Pupils were doing an experiment in groups at their tables. The teacher was visiting tables and monitoring the work pupils were carrying out. One of the girls was not doing anything and when the teacher asked why she was not working, she started to cry. Then the teacher went to her, put her hand on her shoulder and asked what was wrong with her. She replied she could not manage to do the experiment because she found it difficult. After the teacher had calmed her down, she explained calmly and clearly again what she needed to do and encouraged her by saying, “I am sure you can do it, you are capable of doing this experiment”. After that the teacher
went to other tables to check pupils’ work, the girl began to work on the experiment. After some time the teacher came again and looked at her work and said, “Well done, you are doing very well, working very hard”.

*Using signals* was observed twice as often in Turkish classrooms in comparison with British classrooms. This can be explained by the difficulty of dealing with a more noisy and talkative classroom. The field notes suggest that British teachers tended to use more verbal signals like ‘sh’ particularly as a means of warning while Turkish teachers tended to employ signals like knocking the table or blackboard in addition to saying ‘sh’. Since class size is much bigger (at least 45-50 pupils) than that of an English classroom, teachers had to draw pupils’ attention, especially when they went off task or make a noise by employing these signals, especially at the beginning of the lesson and during transitions.

The proportion of *statement of rules* is higher in Turkish classrooms than in British classrooms, probably because Turkish teachers do not have a systematic procedure to explain rules and consequences, unlike British teachers. There are rules for the classroom and the school to be explained by all teachers but because of the lack of consistency and the indecisive approach towards the implementation of those rules due to the lack of structure and systematic procedure or discipline policy, teachers had to explain rules again and again. This was especially valid for talking without taking turns, one of the most common behaviour problems in both groups. Although the teachers repeated the same rules again and again, pupils still continued to talk while another pupil was talking, partly because of teachers’ inconsistent responses to the same behaviour with the same or different pupils.

For example, in a session of one low efficacy teacher in Turkey, the teacher asked a question “Have any of you been to the independence day ceremony?”, “Why do we have a celebration day?”. Most pupils replied at the same time. Then the teacher shouted and reminded them “Put your hand up if you want to say something”. Pupils considered what he told them for a while. The same pattern was repeated after some time. He shouted again by saying, “Yes, in turn, not all of you”.
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On the other hand, in the British context, the rules and consequences are explained and more importantly, they are actually used to maintain classroom order. It is clear what is going to happen if pupils do not obey the rules, in terms of both the consequences for them and responses from teachers. For instance, one high efficacy teacher was monitoring pupils’ work at a table. A girl from the other table asked for help and the teacher said firmly, “Wait, I will come and help you after finishing this table”. The girl listened to what she said and waited. This response is also an indicator of how the teacher behaved decisively and consistently.

In another high efficacy teacher classroom, pupils were used to putting hands up before talking. If somebody talks without taking a turn or interrupting other pupils, the teacher does not pay attention to that child. When a boy was saying something related to the lesson, another boy interrupted or wanted to say something. The teacher said, “I cannot hear you J because somebody was talking”. Then the boy who had interrupted got the message and J carried on. Thus, one can say that the teacher’s response was beneficial for the whole class and for the boy who was trying to interrupt.

The categories of: take material, humour, punishment, pupil being named and other, are among the responses least observed in the British classroom, while reprimand, humour, ignore, change place, touch, take material and other are also less likely to be used by Turkish teachers. Take material, humour and other are mutual categories.

*Change place* is more frequently used by British teachers than Turkish teachers. This can be the result of having different seating arrangements in the two groups. Pupils in Turkey generally sit in rows back to back, while in England a group of 5-6 pupils sit at a table and the seating arrangement often changes according to activities or subjects. This gives the teacher a chance to change pupils’ places. Also, as part of the discipline approach, pupils being disruptive are sometimes sent to a special place or another part of the classroom.

*Shouting out* at pupils being disruptive was more common (7 %) among Turkish teachers than British teachers (3 %). Since the Turkish education system is teacher-centred, teachers may have an understanding of pupil-teacher relationships which is more authoritative and prevents them from communicating with pupils in an equal relationship.
atmosphere. In this context, the meaning of shouting gives a message that teachers are superior to pupils, they should be kept quiet, on task or whatever the teachers expect. Many times shouting is associated with giving orders such as 'listen', 'do not talk', 'sit on your back', 'do not interrupt your friend'.

The number of pupils and their seating arrangement in the classroom also affects the application of this method. In the Turkish context, the classroom is crowded, at least 40-50 pupils in a classroom and they all sit in rows. Sometimes the teacher has to shout across the classroom, especially when pupils become noisy, to draw their attention to the lesson, or to warn loudly a group of pupils sitting at the back of the classroom.

Calling to the pupil loudly (pupil named) may be related to shouting which is more often observed in a Turkish context than a British one. When teachers see pupils doing irrelevant things or being inattentive to what is going on in the lesson, they tend to call pupils' names. Calling the pupil's name means s/he should stop what s/he is doing and concentrate on the work being carried out.

Although warning, (that is, telling pupils it is going to be a problem if they continue what they have been doing) was employed by teachers, in the two countries the percentage of warning seems to be higher in British than in Turkish classrooms. Teachers observed in England had been using an assertive discipline policy which basically relies on giving warnings for inappropriate behaviour and rewards for appropriate behaviour. That is why more warnings may appear in the British classroom. However, it should be noted that not all of the warnings given were part of an assertive discipline policy.

Asking questions, generally in the form requiring information about the task/lesson being conducted, has a similar percentage in both groups. The majority of these responses included task-oriented questions aimed at bringing pupils' attention back to the lesson.

Talking to a pupil one to one immediately after the incident and saying how s/he should behave, giving advice or trying to understand the pupil's behaviour were observed with similar frequency in the Turkish and British context. This kind of talking can be interpreted as having positive and negative sides. Talking to pupils before they forget the details of events contributes to pupils' awareness of them and finding a solution.
However, it may kill the concentration of the rest of the class because it takes time and others lose their attention. However, in the field notes, especially for high efficacy teachers, it is possible to see some successful examples of dealing with problematic behaviour without destroying the attention of the rest of the classroom.

Generally, looking at pupils as a means of warning was similarly employed by both groups. Teachers look at pupils especially when they are lecturing to see if some pupils are not involved in the lesson or are disturbing each other. They temporarily stop the lecture or lower the volume slightly at the same time going on with the lecture. Some teachers especially in Turkey look at the pupil and say her/his name as well.

4.4.4 PUPILS’ TASK ENGAGEMENT LEVEL

During systematic observation the level of task engagement of two disruptive and two well-behaved pupils (all nominated by the teacher) was recorded every five minutes by simply putting (+) for on task and (-) for off task. The analysis of data for this procedure has only been done for the Turkish group. In the British context, task engagement of similar numbers of pupils was also recorded but because of data loss (i.e. absence of target child) it could not be analysed. The percentages of being off and on task for target pupils are shown in tables 12 and 13. A significant difference ($\chi^2 = 5.4$, df =1, $P< 0.001$) was found between task engagement level of pupils nominated as disruptive and normal. Furthermore, the difference between task engagement level of pupils in high and low efficacy teacher classrooms was found to be just significant ($\chi^2 = 3.84$, df =1, $P< 0.05$).

These results confirmed the assumption, made earlier in the literature review chapter, that misbehaviour is a threat to learning in the classroom. When children engage in inappropriate behaviour, naturally they cannot concentrate on academic tasks set by the teacher. However, this interaction may be changed by the level of teachers’ confidence because teachers with a high sense of efficacy are more capable of involving pupils in learning activities. This applies even to children who demonstrate more disruptive behaviour. Feeling confident in their ability to handle misbehaviour, they may employ effective strategies to capture pupils’ attention, and in doing so prevent children from misbehaving.
### Table 12 Task engagement levels of pupils described by their teachers as disruptive and normal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Engagement</th>
<th>Disruptive</th>
<th>Normal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On task %</td>
<td>71 (n=325)</td>
<td>92 (n=422)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off task %</td>
<td>29 (n=131)</td>
<td>8 (n=34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total incidents</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 5.4$, df = 1, $P < 0.001$

### Table 13 Task engagement levels of disruptive pupils in high and low efficacy classrooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Engagement</th>
<th>High Efficacy</th>
<th>Low Efficacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On task %</td>
<td>75 (n=172)</td>
<td>67 (n=153)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off task %</td>
<td>24 (n=56)</td>
<td>33 (n=75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total incidents</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 3.84$, df = 1, $P < 0.05$
4.4.5 THE RESULTS OF SYSTEMATIC OBSERVATION AND FIELD NOTES FOR METHODS USED BY HIGH AND LOW EFFICACY TEACHERS

Table 14 summarises the percentages of methods employed by high and low efficacy teachers. When teachers in both countries are examined in relation to the methods they used to deal with misbehaviour in their classroom, the data from systematic observation shows that although there is not a sharp division between teachers according to the efficacy variable, low efficacy teachers seemed to employ negative methods more (such as criticise pupil, reprimand, use punishment) while the usage of these methods is hardly seen, or at least much less, in high efficacy teachers' classrooms. The field notes were used to support and interpret systematic observation data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHODS</th>
<th>High Efficacy</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Low Efficacy</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Give Order</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look Pupil</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Signals</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement Rule</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask Question</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk to Pupil</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Named</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shout</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take Material</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touch</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humour</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Place</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticise</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reprimand</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignore</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instead, as summarised in Figure 1, encouragement/praise, humour, ask question, look at pupil, talk to pupil, which are said to be more effective and positive, were more often observed in high efficacy teachers' classrooms in comparison with low efficacy teachers.
However, it should be noted that it is difficult to attribute certain methods to certain groups of teachers, because all teachers, whether high or low efficacy in the study, tended to employ similar strategies in differing proportions. For example, high efficacy teachers shout as well as low efficacy teachers to manage pupils' problematic behaviour, but they applied this method half as often as low efficacy teachers.

![Diagram](image)

4.1 Figure 1 The relationship between methods adopted by high efficacy teachers and consequences

Looking at a pupil, which can be called a positive or less disturbing response for pupils, is picked to illustrate how high efficacy teachers apply non-verbal behaviour powerfully and quietly without losing pupils' attention. This does not mean, however, that low efficacy teachers never use non-verbal methods when they are managing pupils' behaviour.

*Ask question, look at pupil, humour, warning and talk to pupil* may be considered as preventive and more productive or less disturbing methods for the pupil misbehaving, for other pupils in the classroom and also for the teacher. The interaction between uses of these methods and positive outcomes is illustrated in Figure 1. As will be explained and exemplified in the next few pages, these positive outcomes are more likely to contribute to enhancing teachers' sense of efficacy. For instance, when the teacher finds the child disturbing another child or not concentrating on the task or whole class lecturing, the teacher can ask a question which is related to the subject they have been working on. Therefore, this strategy was of benefit for everybody in the classroom; the child being disruptive was invited to become involved in the lesson quietly, other pupils were not
prevented from listening to the teacher or doing whatever they had been doing and finally
the teacher did not have to stop what s/he was saying or doing.

For example, one high efficacy teacher in England was reading a story and pupils were
sitting around her on the carpet. She asked questions on their opinions about the story.
One girl was not listening. The teacher was aware of this. She looked at her and asked,
“What do you think is going to be happen next”. The girl suddenly picked the question
up. At first she did not want to say anything but the teacher insisted until she replied.

Although humour was not common in either group, some high efficacy teachers
(eespecially one in Turkey and one in England) included it in their style of teaching and
managing the classroom. In other words, they do not tell a joke or use humour all the time
but it becomes part of their management style and makes the classroom atmosphere relax
and makes pupils feel better or positive. Then, with the effects of these positive feelings
they carry out tasks easily.

It seems that strategies such as ask question, humour, encouragement/praise and look at
pupil may all have a positive influence on motivating pupils to concentrate on their work
or to behave appropriately. High efficacy teachers are more likely to give-behaviour
specific verbal encouragement. Here is an example of verbal encouragement from a high
efficacy teacher in England in a science lesson in which they were doing an experiment.
She warned them by saying, “15 minutes to finish” and gave feedback about the work of
each table: “I am very pleased with K’s table, they are working very quietly. I am pleased,
L’s table.” Around 12:00 pupils and the teacher went to the carpet. She said, “Can you all
sit down and look this way please.” One of the tables looked rather messy. She asked,
“Who is going to tidy up these materials?” 4-5 children voluntarily tidied up the table.
“Well done, thank you, I am going to give a point to K’s table. They are waiting quietly
and their table is very nice”, she said. Another high efficacy teacher said at the end of the
lesson, “Right, stop what you are doing. You worked very sensibly this morning, well
done”. Then she finished the lesson by summarising what they had done and giving
instruction about what they were going to do.

Encouraging pupils to participate in the lesson by asking questions or inviting them to
talk are more common in high efficacy teachers’ classroom. Even when the pupils are
struggling or they are unwilling to talk, teachers motivate them by giving clues and waiting for their answers. In short, their behaviour may give a message to pupils that they have the potential to succeed and with the teacher’s support it becomes easier to activate this potential.

The following incident may illustrate the approach of low efficacy teachers. One pupil, S (the teacher told that he is the pupil with attention seeking behaviour) wrote a story on shiny paper which he should not have done. The teacher responded: “I believe that you can write better than this”. S put the paper in the bin and looked upset. Although the teacher and helper encouraged him to write the story again, he lost attention and wandered around. Then he started to write again. The other day the same teacher did not like S’s colouring and compared it with another pupil’s. S looked a little bit upset.

In a low efficacy teacher’s classroom in Turkey, some pupils were writing, some were reading to the class as the teacher pointed. One girl wanted to read as well but the teacher said to her, “I told you. You finish your writing. Have you finished”? and she did not let her read. The observer (researcher) deliberately paid attention to the girl after the conversation. Following this conversation, the girl seemed to have lost her motivation and stayed off task for a while.

**Warning** as a means of reminding the child what would happen if they did not behave appropriately would seem to function as a means of controlling their behaviour. Consequently, for high efficacy teachers warning may function as a preventative strategy. The likelihood of employing preventive and more productive methods may be interpreted as a sign of having good management skills and feeling confident which leads to a warm classroom atmosphere. A good pupil-teacher relationship may indicate consistent management skills. As explained in the analysis of the interviews, performance accomplishment, which is a source of efficacy, here is represented as seeing positive consequences of the teacher’s discipline approach e.g. look at pupil, humour, warning, ask question. This performance accomplishment contributed to the development of efficacy and would explain how high efficacy teachers feel about their ability to manage their classroom.
Conversely, low efficacy teachers tended to apply less successful strategies which result in a feeling of inadequacy or failure (see Figure 2). They may think using strategies such as *shouting*, *criticising*, *reprimanding*, function as emergency measures without concentrating on their long term and generally negative effects on pupils. However, as Figure 2 shows, the uses of these strategies often resulted in pupils being more off task and more misbehaviour. These negative outcomes then may cause to feeling of failure and discourage teachers to feel efficacious.

![Diagram showing the relationship between methods adopted by low efficacy teachers and consequences](image)

4.2 Figure 2 The relationship between methods adopted by low efficacy teachers and consequences

As the results of systematic observation are interpreted in the light of field notes, it seems clear that applying these methods would not be the appropriate solution in the management of pupils' behaviour. For example, a low efficacy teacher in Turkey (and one in England as well) had great difficulty gaining pupils' attention, maintaining teaching activities and dealing with the problematic behaviour which occurred during the lesson. The researcher observed that some particular points characterised her attitudes and behaviour. This was also valid for some of the other low efficacy teachers. Inconsistent responses, like sometimes shouting and criticising or sometimes ignoring and smiling, to similar behaviour either by the same child or a different child characterised her general approach. She looked very rushed and panic-stricken, flying from one side to another, especially in whole class teaching or activities, and tended to handle individual problems very noisily at the expense of causing other pupils to lose their attention.
For instance, one low efficacy teacher said, “pupils are noisy because I am a noisy person”. In the same teacher’s classroom, one boy was playing with a small piece of paper but not making any noise. The teacher called out his name and criticised him in the classroom by announcing, “You are silly, stupid”. The pupil looked very quiet.

“Open your note-book! You have a problem with using your note-book, you left some lines blank (showing classroom). You must not use it like that. Even yet you are complaining about money?”. This speech took place in a low efficacy teacher’s classroom in Turkey. She was teaching year 1 and had 5 months experience. One can imagine how this kind of discouragement would destroy self-esteem and self-confidence of young children. Although she sometimes gave verbal encouragement like ‘well done’, ‘very nice work’, she often made negative comments or feedback about pupils’ behaviour.

Reprimand, criticising pupils in the classroom and punishment may cause low self-esteem for the pupil being criticised and interrupt the flow of lesson. It also prevents pupils from carrying on tasks.

Table 15 presents the proportion of misbehaviour which continued after teachers’ attempts to stop it. The results of pupils’ responses to the teachers’ intervention also supports the idea that the success rate in stopping inappropriate behaviour in low efficacy teachers’ classrooms is lower than that in high efficacy teachers’ classrooms. A statistically highly significant difference ($\chi^2 = 50.14$, df=1, $P < .001$) was found in teachers’ attempts to terminate misbehaviour, suggesting that high efficacy teachers were more successful in their attempts to stop misbehaviour and bring pupils back to the lesson, than their low efficacy counterparts.
4.15 Table 15 Outcomes of teachers’ attempts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pupil Response</th>
<th>High Efficacy</th>
<th>Low Efficacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>95 (n=267)</td>
<td>73 (n=243)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>5 (n=15)</td>
<td>27 (n=92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total incidents</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ²= 50.14, df=1, P<.001

Give order and tell what to do come first among the methods for both groups but low efficacy teachers (% 29) are more likely than high efficacy teachers (% 15) to apply this method. This method can take the form of giving a command in an authoritative manner in order to handle pupils’ behaviour quickly without thinking about the interaction deeply. Low efficacy teachers may feel stress depending on their feeling about their ability to manage pupils’ behaviour. Feeling less confident and more anxious may result in a very quick and rushed response.

4.5 SUMMARY

As the questionnaire, systematic observation and field notes presented here confirm, teachers, irrespective of their origin and efficacy tended to use similar methods to manage pupils’ behaviour. However, detailed analysis of field notes and triangulation of the different methods demonstrate that high efficacy teachers differ from their low efficacy counterparts in their consistent and decisive use of certain management strategies. Preventive and positive approaches are more likely to be adopted by these high efficacy teachers. Having a structured discipline approach and behaviour policy provide a great advantage for British teachers. It leads to a collaborative relationship between teachers and facilitates consistent use of management strategies. Some variations between the two groups of teachers in terms of misbehaviour and management strategies can be explained by differences in for example, seating arrangement, class size, the age of starting primary school, opportunity for in-service training in classroom management and the perceptions
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of the teachers’ role held by teachers themselves and by pupils. The results presented in this chapter have consisted mainly of what the researcher observed and what the teachers reported in the questionnaire. Interpreting these findings in the light of what the teachers said in interview would help to achieve a more holistic and clearer picture about the sources of differences. This is the subject of the next chapter.
CHAPTER FIVE: RESULTS OF INTERVIEW ANALYSIS

5.1 THE ANALYSIS OF INTERVIEW

As explained in the Research Method chapter, 6 teachers in Turkey (3 high, 3 low efficacy), and 6 teachers in England (3 high, 3 low efficacy) were interviewed after the observation study. The full interviews with Turkish teachers were not translated into English because of a lack of time. After completing the transcription stage, the researcher read all interview texts several times to clarify the main phenomena and themes. Then she was able to identify categories and codes for these categories in the light of the research aims.

The analysis of interviews mainly relied on the assumptions of the Constant Comparative Method of Grounded Theory (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). As Miles and Huberman (1994) suggest, data reduction, data display and conclusion drawing and verification are three steps of analysis that are followed during the analysis process.

In the first step, each incident was coded into categories by making comparisons between incidents. In this stage, questions like 'what is this?' ‘what does it represent?’ helped to give a name to an event, idea or incident (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). The rule of the Constant Comparative Method, “while coding an incident for a category, compare it with the previous incidents in the same and different groups coded in the same category” (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, p.106), had been kept in mind during coding. The process of grouping concepts that seem to pertain to the same phenomena is called categorising (Strauss and Corbin, 1990, 65). These categories are named in relation to the data they represent.

The researcher wrote down concepts which referred to phenomena embedded in the text on the right side of relevant paragraphs or lines and considered categories and appropriate names for those categories while she was reading through the transcript. ‘Misbehaviour’, ‘behaviour management’ and ‘efficacy’ were defined as main categories. Misbehaviour consists of 3 sub-categories, management includes 4 sub-categories and efficacy involves
4 sub-categories. Every category and sub-category has its own code which is easily recognised. Main categories and their sub-sections are presented as follows:

MISBEHAVIOUR

- The Types of Misbehaviour
  - Behaviour Problems
  - Out of Task/Inattention
- Causes of Misbehaviour
  - Family Related Problems
  - School and Teacher Related Reasons
  - Individual Problems
- Teaching Activities

BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT

- Methods Used by Teachers
  - The Uses of Ignoring as a Strategy
- Factors Influencing Behaviour Management
- Persons to share problems
- Explanation of rules and expectations

SELF-EFFICACY

- Feelings About Managing Misbehaviour
- Subject Efficacy and Classroom Management
- The Sources of Efficacy
• Teachers’ Evaluation of Their Efficacy

After defining categories and finishing the coding process, phenomena embedded in the interview text were placed in an appropriate category or sub-category using NUDIST, a computer program for qualitative data analysis. In the light of the assumption of Constant Comparative Theory, the researcher was able to make a comparison between cases or incidents according to the origins of teachers (Turkish and British) and their self-efficacy score (high and low). Quotations from the interview texts have been given as examples to support the point the researcher made and illustrate the respondents’ points of view. After each quotation information about teachers including their code (e.g. Oc), their efficacy level (e.g. high or low), year group they taught and their nationality (Turk or English) are displayed.

5.2 MISBEHAVIOUR

5.2.1 THE TYPES OF MISBEHAVIOUR

As mentioned in the research method chapter, one of the aims of this study is to identify types of misbehaviour met by primary school teachers in England and in Turkey. As shown in Table 1, despite many similarities among the teachers’ responses in both countries a number of differences emerged, which may be attributed to cultural elements of teaching and schooling. For example, the numbers of kinds of misbehaviour noted by British teachers was larger than that of Turkish teachers. This may point to the more detailed analysis of pupils’ behaviour into sub categories or may show the real presence of more variations in misbehaviour in British classrooms. Talking at the wrong time, inattention, making noises, disturbing each other, swearing were mentioned by the Turkish teachers as common misbehaviours they meet in their classroom. Teachers in England said that attention-seeking behaviour, shouting out to teachers or each other, disturbing each other, inattention, talking at the wrong time and aggression are forms of misbehaviour they often come across in their classroom. The majority of Turkish teachers think that not paying attention to lessons (being off task) is the main problem and also causes misbehaviour such as disturbing other pupils or playing with toys or materials. The
following examples may illustrate Turkish teachers' views about the types of misbehaviour:

When pupils are not interested in the lesson or task, they disturb people around them and do irrelevant things. Then they begin to pull their friends or other children in to accompany them. At the end 2-3 pupils lose their attention. (Oc, low,4)

Losing attention and being noisy are the most frequently met problems. When some children are not interested in the lesson, they begin irrelevant activities like talking to friends, looking at their note-book or books, disturbing others. Sometimes reading a book or drawing a picture are among the activities they do at the wrong times. (Ba, high,1)

Similarly, a British teacher described the situation showing how inattention results in disturbing other children:

I don’t have that much disruptive behaviour in this particular class. We have a ‘carpet time’, that is when the children are on the carpet and we discuss aspects of work and I explain a piece of work. You get all the children together but some may not pay attention, they may be doing other things, distracting other children, for example poking another child. The same happens when they are working but are not terribly involved in a particular task so they stop and disturb other children. (F, high,3-4)
5.1 Table 1 Types and causes of misbehaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>British Teachers</th>
<th>Turkish Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>Attention seeking, Aggression, Positive babbling, Swearing Disturbing other pupils, Not paying attention to lesson,</td>
<td>Marital problems, Insufficient discipline at home Lack of support from home Uninteresting curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>Shouting, Fiddling Attention seeking, Talking, Disturbing other pupils</td>
<td>Family problems (marital) Teacher’s noise Low self-esteem Low ability Lack of guidance and discipline from home</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although there was not so much variation between high and low efficacy teachers with regard to perceived misbehaviour, shouting out at the teacher was said by two low efficacy teachers in England to be one of the most annoying problems. One of them described “many attention seeking behaviours: wanting my time, shouting out instead of waiting, chatting to each other at completely the wrong times”. However, some high efficacy teachers in England and Turkey complained about ‘positive babbling’. These kinds of differences may reflect the severity of the problem behaviour and may occur in low efficacy teachers’ classroom.
5.2.2 Causes of Misbehaviour

5.2.2.1 Family Related Problems

As can be seen from Table 1, irrespective of their efficacy level most of the teachers in both countries seem to regard family background as the most important cause of misbehaviour. Within family background, teachers mentioned several elements such as marriage problems, lack of discipline at home or inconsistent discipline between home and school, lack of support towards children's learning and development. However, there seemed a number of variations among teachers when their efficacy level and their nationality are taken into account. For example, repeating the year was seen only by Turkish teachers as a reason for problematic behaviour. In addition, individual differences in pupils' ability level, low ability and low self-esteem were considered relevant by low efficacy teachers while factors involving the teacher or curriculum were perceived as causes of misbehaviour by two British and two Turkish high efficacy teachers. Teachers in England were more likely than Turkish teachers to focus on marital problems such as marriage breakdown. For example, some of them commented:

We are in quite a poor area of the city with a lot of social problems, aren't we? A lot of boys are brought up by a father who is not their own, a mother who hasn't got a stable partner and there are lots of social problems which we really can't affect in any way. They bring these problems from home into the school. There isn't a lot we can modify. (S, high, 5-6, Eng.)

I think their background is very poor. For example M in my class has had a very disrupted family life. His parents split up and his mother found a new partner. He managed to settle down and after Christmas he was brilliant, he really studied. Since half term his family broke again and his behaviour has changed. A lot of the children have step-parents and family breakdown is very common (A, low, 3-4, Eng.)

British teachers are also concerned with lack of discipline at home or inconsistent discipline between school and home. As one said:
I think one of the causes of misbehaviour is how they are treated at home. I think that has a lot of influence on how they behave in school. If they do something wrong at home and are not told off, not disciplined about it, then they often think it is OK to come to school and do exactly the same and not be told off in school.(F, high, 3-4)

However, a lack of care and guidance especially about children’s learning and development were perceived as influential in pupils’ behaviour in the classroom by a similar number of British and Turkish teachers. Lack of parental care and support was mainly attributed to living in a rather poor area in terms of economic, cultural and social conditions. For example, one British teacher drew attention to poor parenting skills by saying

...Some parents have brought up their children the same way they were brought up. If they haven’t experienced good parenting themselves they never have a chance to acquire the skills needed to guide their own children. (A, low, 4, Eng.)

Poverty and the negative effects of poor socio-economic conditions were more strongly emphasised in the Turkish context. One high efficacy teacher in Turkey pointed out that lack of material support at home influences children’s learning and behaviour:

...In general the social and cultural environment was not a beneficial one for the children. The majority of the children (90 %) came from very poor economic and cultural areas. Most of the families struggled with poor living conditions such as low wages and lack of involvement in social and cultural activities which caused cultural deprivation. Families did not have enough facilities and opportunities to educate their children. ...When the families do not provide materials like books to support children’s learning and development or if they do not value education, children are frustrated in their learning or education. (Oz, high, 4, Turk)

Similarly a high efficacy teacher in England commented:

...They have not got the support at home for their learning and good behaviour. Obviously it is difficult to generalise. There are exceptions but I think this applies
to a lot of our difficult children. ... I often think I would like to take them home with me and look after them properly, give them the right sort of environment, care. I am sure the home makes all the difference.(S, High, 5-6, Eng.)

5.2.2.2 INDIVIDUAL PROBLEMS

Two Turkish low efficacy teachers emphasised that having to repeat the same class may result in misbehaviour because those children lost interest in and motivation for learning, in addition to having negative feelings such as inferiority derived from not being in the same class as their peers. These teachers had pupils who had been attending the same class twice. One of them described how these pupils felt and behaved relying on her experience with this kind of problem:

... Repeating the same class causes this problem. As they attend the same class twice they lose their attention. They just come to school because their parents want them to, not for learning. Being older than other children and not attending the same class with their peers results in psychological and behavioural problems or attention seeking. (Po, low, 1, Turk)

One Turkish and one British teacher (low efficacy) were concerned with the variations in the level of pupils’ ability. For instance, children who have higher or lower ability in comparison with their peers can lose their attention and interest and begin to do irrelevant things when teachers do not get the right balance between ability levels.

When the child does not find appropriate teaching materials for himself he loses attention, especially if he has a higher or lower ability level than his peers. ...Some teachers cannot provide teaching tasks that take into consideration high and low ability levels. They just plan the level of teaching activities according to the average group. For this reason, children with higher or lower abilities lose interest if they do not find what they are looking for. High ability children do not find relevant material; low ability groups have difficulties in understanding the tasks. As a result, they behave in an inappropriate way. (Oc, low, 4, Turk)
5.2.2.3 SCHOOL AND TEACHER RELATED FACTORS

High efficacy teachers in both countries were more likely than their low efficacy counterparts, to emphasise the role of the curriculum, the school and teacher-oriented elements, when talking about the causes of misbehaviour and the solutions to it. This may be interpreted as a sign of seeing pupils' behaviour in a comprehensive way, considering all possible factors, rather than sticking to one factor such as family background. They may also have a more internal locus of control, partly because their self-esteem is not threatened and they are confident with their ability to cope with the situation. The awareness of their strengths and perhaps also their weaknesses may make them feel that they have more control of the situation.

One of the high efficacy teachers in Turkey suggested that teachers should provide guidance and give encouragement in both academic areas and behaviour rather than just blaming the family. Using family background as an excuse cannot provide a solution. Here again, one high efficacy teacher in England mentioned the role of subject interest in pupils' behaviour:

> I would say that if they don't feel very interested in the subject they will not put any effort into their work. I know how in the past you would say to children, "Right today we are going to have a RE lesson". And that was it. They automatically switched off because they were not interested in religion. Although we have to teach it as part of the curriculum, they would say they do not want to do it. (F, high, 3-4, Eng.)

As can be understood from the quotations above, despite the similar explanations for the kind and causes of misbehaviour, when teachers' responses are examined in detail, it is possible to discover differences which can be attributed to teachers' efficacy and their country of origin. How far these two variables interact with the type and the number of misbehaviours when different teaching activities are taking place will be explored in the following section.
5.2.3 TEACHING ACTIVITIES

It was thought that the amount of misbehaviour may vary according to teaching activities because the nature of activities varies, for example in group or individual work and whole class teaching. Therefore, it is necessary to explore this issue. The majority of teachers in both countries, especially high efficacy teachers, said it was easy to handle children’s behaviour in whole class teaching. One said:

I don’t think much misbehaviour occurs in whole class teaching. When they are sitting on the carpet or while I am by the blackboard, they are mostly interested in what is going on. When I am working on a particular table, others become off task and stop concentrating on their work. If the lesson is well planned and I stimulate them, they are mostly interested in the task. (H, high, 5-6, Eng.)

Another teacher commented:

During whole class teaching they seem fine. …I am in charge and they are a lot more willing to listen when I am teaching the whole group. Usually they are quite motivated and demonstrate this by keeping their heads down to work unless as I said before they are not interested in what we are doing. I would say that sometimes during paired work, they would be talking a little bit. (F, high, 3-4, Eng.)

High efficacy teachers tended to see noise derived from the work situation of individual or whole class teaching as positive or working noise. For example, two teachers in Turkey found the noise associated with work acceptable, reporting very similar ideas:

…When children study by themselves, they feel free and become more active but I do not treat that as problematic behaviour since I know this is because of the activity or task they are doing. They are not robots, they need to talk, ask questions and to learn from their friends. This kind of communication helps their learning. That is why I do not approach this kind of talking as misbehaviour and I just let them talk to each other. (Ba, high, 1, Turk)
Whole class teaching results in more activities and noise but this is a positive noise. At this point teachers' management skills become important, especially when dealing with pupils who are not involved. (Oz, high, 4, Turk)

One of the high efficacy teachers pointed out that pupils' behaviour did not change according to different teaching situations and the important thing is to keep them occupied. However, one low efficacy teacher found his children naughty in all teaching situations because:

I find with this particular class, it does not make a difference. They are so unpredictable and naughty that it doesn’t matter whether I am teaching as a whole class or they are sitting together on the carpet. … I think they are better when they have a clear task, something they know about and are comfortable with. They quite often say they don’t understand new concepts (A, low, 4, Eng.)

Two low efficacy teachers in Turkey thought that pupils misbehave more during whole class teaching. This may be interpreted in the light of the teachers’ teaching and motivating skills. Consistent with their low efficacy feeling, they may believe they cannot get all pupils’ attention at the same time in whole class teaching. By referring back to the field notes, they looked less confident about mastering how to carry out activities in a whole class situation.

For example, in the class of a low efficacy teacher in Turkey, the teacher was writing on the board and dictating notes related to science for pupils to write down. Some children were wandering around aimlessly. In general, the classroom was noisy and unnecessary talk was going on. The teacher said, “I am going to come and check who is writing, some of us seem not to be writing”. Some pupils shouted out saying, ‘teacher come and look’ or ‘don’t come and don’t check’. The teacher did not respond to these comments. Then she began to warn pupils, calling out their names like, “A are you writing? You are wasting your time”. With this particular classroom the level of noise sometimes became very disturbing and the teacher often rushed from one corner to another to deal with individual problems. During this time, many children went off task because the teacher ceased
instructing and automatically directed pupils’ attention to the argument between the target pupils and her.

The other low efficacy teacher in England was explaining what was expected from pupils for that term. Some of them interrupted the teacher although she said hands up before speaking and some of them started to talk out of turn.

5.3 METHODS USED BY TEACHERS TO DEAL WITH MISBEHAVIOUR

5.3.1 DIFFERENCES BETWEEN TURKISH AND BRITISH TEACHERS

In terms of methods teachers used to deal with misbehaviour, there seemed a considerable difference between Turkish and British teachers. As summarised in Table 2 all teachers interviewed in England used elements of systematic and structured methods such as assertive discipline or house points. In assertive discipline or a house points system, teachers employed a group of strategic ways of focusing on the positive side of a pupil’s behaviour rather than the negative. Rewards for appropriate behaviour, sanctions for inappropriate behaviour (consequences which pupils do not like) were the main elements of assertive discipline.
### Table 2 Methods used by teachers to deal with misbehaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
<th>British</th>
<th>Turkish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Efficacy</td>
<td>Assertive discipline (warning and reward), Change place, look, touch, ask question</td>
<td>Motivate, encourage pupil, talk to pupil and family, give task, warning, humour, collaboration with family, positive and negative reinforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Efficacy</td>
<td>Assertive discipline, Question and answer, send to the head, positive and negative reinforcement, give house points</td>
<td>Talk to child and say what he has done is wrong, talk to family, administer punishment, reminding of rules</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, changing places, asking questions, touching, looking at the pupil (eye contact), positive and negative reinforcement and sending to the Head were among the methods British teachers mentioned.

By contrast, Turkish teachers seemed to rely on methods they discovered by themselves. Although a variety of methods was possible among the teachers, talking to the child and family, positive and negative reinforcement and sometimes corporal punishment (a few teachers reported this), warning, humour, repeating the rules, asking questions or giving tasks were the main methods for Turkish teachers.

### 5.3.3 Differences between High and Low Efficacy Teachers

There was no single variable which distinguished behaviour management strategies employed by high efficacy teachers from those of low efficacy teachers and it would clearly be hard to generalise that all teachers within a particular category used precisely the same techniques. Sometimes teachers in both categories used the same or similar methods. However, when methods likely to be employed by a particular group (for instance low efficacy teachers) were considered, it was possible to group them. Field notes and observation data combined with interviews made it easier to identify characteristics of a particular group. For example, regardless of their origin, high efficacy
teachers were more likely than their low efficacy colleagues to use positive, productive and long term methods as can be illustrated from the interview and incident example below:

If they are really naughty, I change their place, look at them, putting my hand on their shoulder to show my awareness of the behaviour, saying their name and asking questions (when they are day dreaming, not interested). This kind of thing becomes part of teaching, you don’t think much about it, you have already internalised it. If they are really noisy I don’t let them go out until they are quiet. (H, high, 5-6, Eng.)

An incident from this teacher’s classroom would be an appropriate example to illustrate her approach. One boy was arguing with a girl during seat-work. They were at the same table. The boy stopped what he was doing and started to cry. The teacher went to that table and touched him (put her hand on his shoulder) and said, “Calm down”. She asked questions of the pupils in that group and tried to change focus. It also helped them to concentrate on their work instead of focusing on the event. Then she took some tissue to N and talked to him one to one for a while. He was on task again and the teacher continued to monitor pupils’ work by visiting tables.

Two high efficacy teachers in Turkey expressed their ways of dealing with problematic behaviour as follows:

Teachers should continuously provide activities and tasks in order to make pupils active. For example, when you say, “Do your work individually at your seat”, children who have behaviour problems need to be warned or alerted by your saying “You will do this task, reading or answering the question”. Thus, I can make them feel I am keeping an eye on them. After that, they do not exhibit much misbehaviour. (Ba, high, 1, Turk)

…My approach is generally in the form of humour. I use humour to gain attention. When I get the attention of a target pupil through humour, I do not lose control over other pupils for whom the humour is also meaningful. If I gave a very rule-oriented talk or severe/rough response to children who misbehave, I may
cause them to lose their attention even if they are very much involved in the lesson. For example, “Didn’t you sleep last night or how late did you watch TV or have you washed your face?”. By this question I mean that you are still sleeping, but I don’t say “Wake up, don’t sleep” very loudly. As children understand my communication style, they pick up some new clues very quickly. Teachers’ behaviour has an enormous effect on pupils. If teachers approach them with compassion like friends or parents and if they reflect these feelings in their behaviour, there will not be any problems between pupil and teacher. (Oz, high, 4, Turk)

The field notes also confirmed that announcement of what the child has done wrong, a kind of criticism in the classroom, punishments like cleaning the classroom, detention, doing the same thing to the child as s/he did were the examples mentioned by low efficacy teachers in England and in Turkey.

…Making it known I am not pleased. If it is very serious, I send them to the Head but very rarely. I use question and answer method. I ask them if they think what they have done is good. “Do you think your mum and dad, head teacher would like your behaviour?”. They say, “no”. “Tell me what is wrong”, I ask and they tell me. Mainly I ask them what they think about their behaviour (P, low, 4, Eng.)

From the field notes, an example of an incident would illustrate the atmosphere of this teacher’s classroom. One girl was playing with a bracelet and the teacher was very angry. He called the girl up, took the bracelet and said, “Stand up by the blackboard”. She stood up for 2 minutes and then went back to her place. In another incident, the observer did not understand what had happened but something definitely had but it had not really disturbed other pupils or the lesson. The teacher said to a pupil very loudly, “You have been silly. Do not be silly! I told you yesterday didn’t I? Why is it that you are silly not anyone else? Don’t be silly and sit properly”.

Here are some examples from Turkish teachers:

Talk to the child who misbehaves and say what s/he has done wrong. Usually I talk to them and I do not give punishments. I try to make them aware of their
actions so that they may give up inappropriate behaviour. Sometimes I do the same thing to the child who disturbs another child. I ask how would you feel if you were him or her?. (Ko, low, 5, Turk)

Talk to them individually. I try to see/talk to parents but they do not seem to understand the feelings of the child. Sometimes I give punishments such as cleaning the classroom, or emptying the bin but I try to choose something that reflects my knowledge of the child. (Po, low, 1, Turk)

Especially when field notes are combined with what teachers said in interview it becomes easy to draw the conclusion that feeling confident enables teachers to adopt strategies which are of benefit for everyone in classroom. Quietly dealing with misbehaviour without breaking the pupils' concentration by using non-verbal signals and behaviour, encouraging and motivating them to concentrate on what they have done right, being aware of what is happening in the classroom, being firm and consistent in their behaviour are all characteristics associated with more confident teachers.

5.3.4 THE USES OF IGNORING AS A STRATEGY

The answers to the question, "Would you ever ignore misbehaviour"? were very similar amongst teachers in both countries in that many of them tended to ignore the beginning of misbehaviour. In other words, regardless of their origin and efficacy level, when the misbehaviour occurs, especially if it is attention-seeking, the teachers said they can ignore it or watch and wait. However, when the reasons given by teachers for ignoring or not ignoring are examined, some differences attributable to the efficacy variable emerged. For example, high efficacy teachers pointed out that sometimes they deliberately have to ignore misbehaviour in order not to ruin the concentration of other children or not to give an opportunity to some pupils to get the teachers' attention in an undesirable way. The following two examples from British teachers illustrate their views:

Sometimes I have to ignore it. This is a professional judgement. If you use the name of a pupil again and again and say, “Stop this, stop that”, they lose all concentration on their task. (H, high, 5-6, Eng.)
That depends doesn’t it. ...Yes I would but I would do it deliberately as a strategy. I wouldn’t ignore it to just let it go. There are times when you are being deliberately pushed but you just ignore it and work with those whose behaviour is good because sometimes bad behaviour is an effort to get your attention. I try not to reward bad behaviour with extra attention. (S, high, 5-6, Eng.)

Two high efficacy teachers in Turkey said they may ignore the moment the behaviour occurs but they deal with it later on by warning or talking to the child. As one explained:

If I am so busy dealing with a child, like monitoring, I can warn the child later on that he must improve his behaviour. As I do so consistently the child can learn how to control his behaviour day by day. (Ba, high, 1, Turk)

Although some low efficacy teachers may ignore misbehaviour, especially if they see it as attention-seeking, one said it was difficult to ignore it because children might think the teacher cannot manage the situation. This may be because low efficacy teachers may feel insecure if they ignore misbehaviour and worry that the children will think they cannot cope with it, whereas high efficacy teachers may not worry about this since they are more confident. Another low efficacy teacher focused on the negative side of pupils’ behaviour by saying:

Yes, watch misbehaviour, wait 3 or 4 minutes and If they continue I call them and ask them what they think about their behaviour and say, “You are wasting my time, classroom time and your time”. (P, low, 4, Eng.)

However, a high efficacy teacher used a quite positive warning to draw pupils’ attention:

...If say, I was doing something with one group, I would just turn round to the whole class and say, “I am looking to see who is working really quietly, I am looking to see who is working hard”. And normally that gets them back on task rather than focusing on one child who was talking. I do like general statements so that they all know that they should be working. That usually works but if it carries on I resort to the other methods I have just explained. (F, high, 3-4, Eng.)
Teachers’ attitudes towards ignoring misbehaviour should be assessed as part of their management strategies and level of confidence. As illustrated in the quotations presented above, with respect to their efficacy level, teachers tended to adopt different tactics and behaviour.

5.3.5 FACTORS INFLUENCING BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT

As illustrated in Table 3 similar trends emerged among teachers for facilitating behaviour management irrespective of country and efficacy variables, but a number of variations also emerged. Experience and support from colleagues and Head teachers were very common facilitators. Use of support teachers and behaviour policy was only seen in the British context. Giving more importance to pupil-teacher relationships and to children’s characteristics were associated more with approaches of high efficacy teachers in both countries.

5.3 Table 3 Factors influencing behaviour management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficacy</th>
<th>British Teachers</th>
<th>Turkish Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Experience, personality, knowing children, colleagues, working in different schools, support teacher, parallel teacher, discipline policy, head teacher</td>
<td>Experience, knowing children, colleagues, working in different schools, head teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Experience, colleagues, knowing children, support teacher, parallel teacher, discipline policy, head teacher</td>
<td>Experience, knowing children, colleagues, head teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.5.2 EXPERIENCE

A great majority of the teachers believed that experience was one of the most important elements in learning how to manage pupils’ behaviour. Learning from their own experience over the years about which method works and which does not work was the
main lesson learned from experience. For example, two teachers described how experience had been a powerful aid to their understanding of behaviour management:

…Over the years you learn what doesn’t work. You make lots of mistakes in your early years and remember the mistakes you make. For example, you realise that sending them outside does not usually work. (P, low, 3-4, Eng.)

… I don’t think there is any substitute for learning on the job. No amount of training will ever be enough. You really learn child management skills on the job, don’t you? You learn from other people first, and then eventually you get your own style and you just learn as you go along. If you find something works for you, you stick with it. (S, high, Eng.)

5.3.5.3 LEARNING FROM COLLEAGUES

As part of experience, observation of colleagues and learning some strategies from them were emphasised by several teachers as crucial learning methods. In the Self-efficacy approach this kind of learning is called vicarious learning, and is a source of efficacy. Learning from each other can develop collaborative relationships. A collaborative network among colleagues was explained by a high efficacy teacher in England; (a very similar process was defined by a Turkish, high efficacy teacher as well):

Willing to work with other colleagues, observing them, taking their advice, giving time to children to find out how they want to behave, why they behave in a particular way and starting to think about it. Student teachers observe my sessions and I observe their sessions then we discuss issues together, use each other. I learn from them and they learn from me.

Two high efficacy teachers also stressed the importance of working in different schools which enabled them to meet many pupils from different socio-economic and cultural backgrounds:

Working in a different region of the country helped me to learn how to manage pupils’ behaviour. …Actually working in a different area such as a quite wealthy
one or a very poor one enabled me to learn how people behave differently within certain environments. (Oz, high, 4, Turk)

5.3.5.4 KNOWING CHILDREN

Knowing children and their characteristics was seen by teachers as the main facilitator in behaviour management. They believed that if one knew the personal characteristics of pupils, one could predict which responses would work well with which pupils’ behaviour and could then decide how to handle problematic behaviour and develop strategies. For example, one low efficacy teacher in England said, “I think management has got to be tailored to every child. Knowing children is a bonus”.

High efficacy teachers had much to say about knowing children. Since development of a democratic and flexible atmosphere in which to give freedom to children and establish discipline is difficult in Turkey, because of the authoritarian education system, two high efficacy teachers in Turkey agreed that having positive attitudes towards children, being intimate and flexible and loving them, is crucial. Both teachers believed that not being too strict or rule oriented, being flexible and encouraging pupils to express themselves in a democratic atmosphere were the key factors for knowing children and establishing discipline. One was very enthusiastic about arranging purposeful activities in order to know more about children:

The best solution to behaviour management is knowing the children. If we know the children, there will not be any problems. When I first meet pupils I employ particular strategies as part of behaviour management. To begin with, I create a flexible atmosphere in which they will have a chance/right to introduce or talk about themselves, their hobbies, interests, home life and unforgettable events. Thus I can enter their inner world easily. This is one of the best ways of getting to know children. The other way is to make them draw a picture. ...I go on to make them talk about the picture. If we do not do this, we cannot understand her/his point of view. ...I mean you can understand his world by probing. (Oz, high, 4, Turk)
5.3.5.6 SUPPORT TEACHER

Support teachers were also seen as facilitators for behaviour management. However, Turkish teachers did not have much to say about support teachers because schools do not have this kind of system to help classroom teachers with difficult children.

Although support teachers were perceived as helpful for children with learning difficulties or academic difficulties, some English teachers thought it an excellent idea to have support teachers to aid classroom management as well:

Support teachers are brilliant. We have got a good support system in school. We have enabled special needs children to go to a different room with the help of a support teacher. We also have ancillary help. On Tuesday morning and Tuesday afternoon. … That really helps because I am in such a small room. If I can get one group to go out with another teacher to prepare or do some activity I can focus my attention on the children that are left. It tends to be much better if I can get a group working somewhere else or have a support teacher working with a group in the class because I can focus on the other children then. (F, high, 3-4, England)

It is always handy to have another person in the classroom. If I had a choice between a smaller class and no support teacher, or a larger class and a support, I would go for the larger class with support teacher because you can concentrate on working with groups knowing that the support teacher is giving you extra backing. (A, low, 4, England)

Investigation of elements which facilitate behaviour management revealed that the ways of learning to manage pupils’ behaviour seemed to encompass both the teachers’ individual experience of situations and the organisational characteristics of the school. This second factor, concerning how teachers perceive support in the workplace and the existence of a discipline policy, will be discussed in the next section.

5.3.5.7 DISCIPLINE POLICY

A sharp difference between the two countries was evident over having school behaviour policies. All teachers in England in the study have, in their schools, certain behaviour
policies which advise teachers how they are expected to discipline children. An Assertive Discipline policy, which basically relies on rewards for appropriate behaviour and a warning system for inappropriate behaviour, is used by these teachers. Teachers think that it makes behaviour management easier. One explained how the system works:

... We have a special assembly which has been used for celebrating success. I have a “free time scheme”. ... We have a week where we collect points, so that we have a treat at the end of the week, that sort of thing. Assertive discipline involves not arguing with the children if you want to get them to do something. You just keep repeating what it is you want them to do. So if you want the child to sit down”, and you just keep saying to them, “Sit down, sit down, sit down”, in fact it works in the end. (S, high, 5-6, Eng.)

Despite the common agreement about the usefulness of an assertive discipline policy, one low efficacy teacher said, “The trouble is, children get used to it. Some children acknowledge it has no effect on them”.

By contrast, there is no definite behaviour policy shared by all teachers in any one school in Turkey. Every teacher has found his/her own way, depending on the general principles of the Minister of Education, teacher training, experience and his/her own personal characteristics. This may make classroom management harder for low efficacy teachers because, as will be discussed in the following section, a behaviour policy provides teachers with a structured discipline approach which is easy to follow.

5.3.5.8 PERSON TO SHARE PROBLEMS

Many teachers interviewed in Turkey and England have shown that their colleagues are the first people in the school with whom they share a difficulty. But more specifically British teachers have talked about parallel teachers or certain teachers with whom they exchange their pupils in a situation where a pupil is really getting disruptive in the classroom. That is, the help given or taken has a structured basis as explained in the following quotations from two teachers:
Yes, I tend to talk to my colleague Mrs. S (you observed her class). Because we change our children, she and I know the children. I talk to the special needs co-ordinator then the head teacher. It tends to be friends whom I go to first. Also, colleagues always come to me to discuss their difficulties. (H, high, 5-6, England)

Yes, we have a discipline system where you would exchange a child who needed time to settle down. I would send my children to Mrs H. …Yes we have an arrangement to take children away for time out. (A, low, 4, England).

The help Turkish teachers got from colleagues was a kind of giving or taking of advice, sharing feelings rather than relying on practical support. Head teachers seemed to be another source to go to when teachers had a problem they could not solve by themselves. It is difficult to generalise but head teachers in Turkey were more likely to be involved at an earlier stage in a situation including a problematic pupil’s behaviour in comparison with head teachers in England. In the Turkish situation, the lack of a behaviour policy and support from certain sources such as SENCO or a Guidance Centre may lead teachers to go to head teachers rather than their colleagues. Two low efficacy teachers in Turkey did not feel happy with sharing their problems with peers and sometimes they did not want to talk about it with their colleagues. One said:

Actually I would like to talk about these kinds of things but my colleagues’ approach is rather superficial. They think my children are naughty and I am incompetent. This annoys me. I think they do not understand me and approach the issue superficially. That is why I do not tell them. (Ko, low, 5, Turk)

The other teacher said having different teachers’ advice was helpful but sometimes it made her confused as to which advice should be followed.

5.4 RULES AND EXPECTATIONS

5.4.1 DIFFERENCES BETWEEN TURKISH AND BRITISH TEACHERS

Most of the teachers involved in the study reported that they explained their expectations and the classroom rules to pupils at the beginning of the term, usually using the first lesson or, at least, the first days and weeks. By looking more closely at what teachers said,
it became clear that teachers in England were more likely than Turkish teachers to be explicit and decisive in their expectations about what was appropriate or inappropriate behaviour and the consequences of certain behaviour. The reason for this difference may be that British teachers have a certain behaviour policy which makes clear the teachers’ expectations and the school rules, including the consequences of appropriate and inappropriate behaviour. Making classroom rules with pupils was more common among British teachers than those of Turkish teachers. Turkish teachers generally tended to explain their expectations using rather general concepts or expressions instead of concrete or explicit terms. Some examples are given below to show how the two countries’ teachers differ in those aspects: the first one from British teachers, the second from a Turkish teacher.

...We had a big thing about classroom rules at the beginning of this year. All the children wrote what they thought the rules should be and we made a list of them together. And I laid down very strongly what behaviour expectations I had of the children. So I implemented those with force, right from the beginning of the year, otherwise I would have had quite a noisy class. (F, high, 3-4, Eng.)

...Sometimes I talk about rules. For example, “Stand up when I enter the classroom, respect friends, do not hit your friend, if you do so s/he will hit you back then it becomes a fight, respect friends”. I do not tell all of them at the same time because they do not take it in and they forget. I try to give explanations for rules such as why you should sit down when writing. Sometimes I give examples from their own life to explain things, following the principle of moving from concrete to abstract. (Po, low, 1, Turk).

As a result of not having a proscribed school behaviour policy or a systematic discipline approach, Turkish teachers may have to repeat classroom rules or their expectations of behaviour very often. Few British teachers continued to explain their behaviour expectations as they went along; more repetition seemed to occur in the Turkish classrooms. The observation study also supported this conclusion. Even when the teachers in Turkey repeated the rule, “Do not talk before you put your hands up” many times, most
pupils still did not internalise this. One of the reasons for this gap may be inconsistencies in the teachers’ response and attitude towards the pupils’ behaviour as shown below:

Yes, I remind them on the first day of term but continue to remind them. I explain my wish that they should be successful and mature and have improved behaviour appropriate to their age. I explain to them, but not every time, because I do not always give the same response to the same misbehaviour. At the beginning of term and during the term, I explain what is going to happen if they do not obey the rules. Sometimes I feel I am spending more time talking about rules than the lesson. (Ko, low, 5, Turk)

5.4.2 DIFFERENCES BETWEEN HIGH AND LOW EFFICACY TEACHERS

It may be right to conclude, from the interviews with high efficacy teachers in both countries, that they aim to give responsibility to the child or encourage pupils to take responsibility when they introduce classroom rules and maintain those rules. They did this not only in words but also by behaving consistently in the implementation of classroom rules and of their expectations.

We have classroom rules which we make and talk about, expected and shared rules, for example language we don’t want to hear in the classroom. They know what happens when they hurt somebody. They can choose to sit with their friends but if they start chatting or making a noise I separate them. They know the responsibility of sitting with friends is to be on task and not chat together. (H, high, 5-6, Eng.)

…In order to make them feel secure I try to explain the behaviour they need to avoid or adopt, telling a real story or event and concentrating on the right and wrong side of it. When they exhibit appropriate behaviour I praise them, I definitely praise them. I explain that in terms of learning and achievement appropriate behaviour will influence their future life and their status in society. I use metaphors they can understand to illustrate my point. When they become ready to accept this logic, I encourage and support them in maintaining appropriate behaviour in their academic and personal lives. (Ba, high, 1, Turk).
However, some low efficacy teachers seem to want pupils to obey the rules. If they disobey, the result is more likely to be punishment or making them feel that what they have done is not right. The first teacher explained how the children perceived him negatively:

...If they show inappropriate behaviour, they know I am not pleased. I never actually threaten them but they think I might do. For example, if they misbehave they think I might not let them play football. Actually I don’t threaten them but they think I might. (P, low, 3-4, England)

The second continued:

...In my opinion it is better to tell the child that what he has done is wrong. I explain the behaviour required; if they study, they will be successful; if they do not obey the rules it will be harmful for them and for the class. (Oc, low, 4, Turk)

It can be seen from the quotations above that teachers with low sense of efficacy tended to follow a conditional and rule based strategy whereas teachers with high efficacy tended to give more importance to the perspective of children in the implementation of classroom rules.

5.5 FEELINGS ABOUT MANAGING MISBEHAVIOUR

The question, “Do you feel confident when dealing with misbehaviour?” resulted in various answers from teachers according to their efficacy score. The high efficacy teachers answered this question using very confident words reflecting their certainty:

...I am confident in any area of teaching, I have to be. If they know you are in control, it is half the battle. (H, Eng.)

...I feel competent when I am dealing with misbehaviour. I feel I am competent in the classroom and I think children understand this. (Ba, Turk)

Teachers with low sense of efficacy also commented about their level of confidence but using rather less assertive words. They also seemed to have negative feelings about
themselves or the children. Their feelings may be determined by the behaviour of the children by meaning that they were lack of locus of control:

I feel confident but sometimes I criticise myself. If the child improves his behaviour I think, “I achieved this”. If he does not change, I think I am not being successful. (Ko, Turk)

Positive changes in pupils’ behaviour make me happy but negative results make me worry over which method would have been more beneficial. Sometimes I look at books. I feel confident but not always. (Po, Turk)

When you are teaching, if the child does not listen to you, this means that the child does not feel you are important. It makes me angry. Yes, I trust myself. If I make desirable changes in his behaviour, this makes me confident. (Oc, Turk)

- Have you ever felt that you cannot cope with misbehaviour?

Sometimes it happens. Whatever you do does not seem to help you to manage the classroom. But at the end you do it.

However, it should be noted that the number of children with disruptive behaviour could influence teachers’ confidence from one classroom to another, as one high and one low efficacy teacher emphasised:

I do feel confident now. I didn’t when I first started to teaching. I mean this is my third year in teaching. …These children are very responsive. And they know that your word is the last word. They know if they ignore you then they are going to be referred to a higher authority like the head teacher. So I do feel confident. You do get a lot of support in this school. The Head teacher is very good at backing you, as is my head of year. She is very good as well. (F, high, 3-4, Eng.)

…I used to feel very confident. I never had a class like this and it does gradually ruin your confidence. Times when you don’t succeed with the children when for example, two children fight over tidying up. They easily find an excuse for argument. Some of the children carry on arguing because they don’t have
negotiation skills and the maturity to settle. It really becomes a stressful experience. I do feel with this particular group that whatever I do doesn’t seem to help. (A, low, 4, Eng.)

Variables related to characteristics of particular pupils and to classes with so much problematic behaviour could influence how efficacious teachers feel. Other factors influencing their efficacy level were being well prepared and feeling confident in subject knowledge. Thus, the following section explores the relationship between subject efficacy and classroom management.

5.6 SUBJECT EFFICACY AND CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

The question, “Do you think feeling confident in your subject area affects your classroom atmosphere in terms of classroom management?” had very similar answers from the teachers. All teachers interviewed agreed that feeling confident in the subject area affected the classroom atmosphere positively because it affected the flow of the lesson. When they were confident about how to plan lessons and tasks and how to carry on during the lesson, pupils were successfully involved in tasks. If they were not confident, pupils could quickly pick up their lack of confidence and play with it and they also went off the task and started to misbehave. Here are some examples from both high and low efficacy teachers:

You have to know what you are doing, you have to be clear about tasks, learning outcomes, what you want to teach and the lesson must be very clear. This reduces disruptive behaviour. If the teacher has a well planned lesson the children don’t have the chance to misbehave; children can be motivated and excited. (H, high, Eng.)

...If I feel confident in a subject, the lesson is fluent. I know what I am doing, I feel absolutely confident. If am not good at it and I don’t know what to do next, the kids start to be fidgety or misbehave. I feel comfortable and happy in English and History. Science is my weakest subject. If I don’t set the right task, this causes some misbehaviour. (P, low, Eng.)
When you feel confident in a subject area you teach well by looking competent. The more knowledge you have, the more help you provide for pupils. Thus, children’s capacity for learning is increased and this results in a successful class. This affects pupils’ behaviour positively. They want to learn more things and they do not misbehave. (Po, low, Turk)

However, the majority of the high efficacy teachers (4 of them) believed that sharing their difficulties or weaknesses in any subject prevented the pupils from going off the task or misbehaving:

...Teachers may meet a question to which they do not have an answer. It has never happened to me. I read a lot on my subject areas and on general knowledge. I believe that teachers should have general information. They should answer all sorts of questions pupils ask and, if they do not know the answer, they should say, “I do not know this topic but we can investigate together”. They should investigate. Teachers should not give wrong information. (Oz, high, Turk)

...I have problems with things like music. I am not so confident in it. But I think the best thing to say is, “I am not very confident about teaching this to you, you have to help me along with this”. And we try to do our best. It helps. I think the best thing is to be honest. ...So it is best to be honest and straight forward. (F, high, Eng.)

It may be said that feeling efficacious ensures that high efficacy teachers communicated openly with pupils since they thought that they had nothing to lose if they expressed their weakness. This also showed how they developed their confidence as they were aware of their weaknesses and could work to eliminate them.

5.7 THE SOURCES OF EFFICACY

The sources of efficacy are one of the main interests in this study. It would be helpful if it were to become clear which sources are influential in the development of self-efficacy when planning in-service training programs for teachers to develop their efficacy.
5.7.1 PERSONALITY

A teacher’s personality was perceived as the most influential element among teachers, especially among high efficacy teachers with particular emphasis on democratic and positive attitudes in their relationships with children:

The main thing is personality. It comes from that. I am a deputy head and sometimes acting head. Some of the children are frightened of me before they meet me. But in the classroom they know me, they are not afraid of me because they know I care about them. This is the main thing. (H, high, Eng.)

Personal characteristics of the teacher are very important. Sometimes I talk with my colleagues. It is true to say that pupils are the mirror of their teacher. Through my observation of different teachers and comparisons made between their classrooms and mine, I understand that there is a difference between my pupils and theirs. Teachers’ personality can affect pupils and their behaviour. (Ba, high, Turk)

A number of the high efficacy teachers were concerned about their communication styles with children. For example, one said, “If I establish good communication I feel comfortable. I would not feel equally confident dealing with a colleague’s problem”, presumably meaning that she would not know the colleague’s children. The other claimed that being trustworthy in relationships with children and having positive relationships was also crucial in developing self-efficacy. She also thought that seeing her own successful influence on children enhanced her confidence. This referred to performance accomplishment, one of the sources of a sense of efficacy, derived from teachers witnessing their own successful results in managing pupils’ behaviour. Here again, a high efficacy teacher summarised how experience and democratic relationships were important in classroom management:

...After gaining experience teachers can understand children. I think I treat my pupils very differently from other teachers. That is, provide a democratic atmosphere; I want them to express what they think, feel free to tell me anything e.g. their problems at home. They feel close to me and also the trusting
relationship which I have established helps them to talk to me easily. A democratic attitude and encouragement for academic tasks, respect and communication with love in a positive relationship. (Oz, high, Turk)

5.7.2 EXPERIENCE AND HELP FROM OTHERS

As a means of developing efficacy a considerable number of teachers in both countries mentioned gaining experience in discovering workable strategies as they went along. One low efficacy teacher in England said: “Experience is probably the most significant factor because you pick up different ideas when you are working with different children; different things work with different pupils”. Feeling assured that they were working in a school where teachers could get support when needed was a powerful source of help for some teachers. For example, a high efficacy English teacher commented: “If you have a really bad day or something goes drastically wrong, you can go to the staff room and talk to people about it. I think that helps” Additionally, positive feedback from parents and the head teacher and support from back-up teachers were perceived as sources of confidence by two low efficacy teachers in England. One of them seemed very concerned with the head and parents’ feedback:

To be honest the most important thing is if you know that your head teacher and the parents believe what you are doing is all right and if they are happy then that builds your confidence. If your head criticises you consistently you don’t feel confident. The three main things are experience, support from head teacher and parents. If they think what you are doing is good you feel confident. (P, low, Eng.)

The most important thing is what you get from the senior management team. They handle problems for you because if you had to deal with every single problem you wouldn’t have time in the day to do it. Your class could be disruptive so really, back up for you is important, back up teachers, people who, if you do have a problem, are there to support you. (A, low, Eng.)
5.7.3 IN-SERVICE TRAINING

The effects of INSET on teacher efficacy was assessed by teachers, mainly focusing on two aspects of it: practicality and the theoretical side. Two high efficacy teachers found in-service training very theoretical, and not practical, while two other high efficacy teachers said they found it helpful. Examples of both viewpoints are presented below:

I have not attended in-service training in this area. As I said, everything does not go as it is described in books. It is not practical. ...In-service training is planned just as a part of formal regulations. They only give theoretical explanations. It is based on theoretical knowledge, there is not any practical or interactional aspect to it. (Ba, high, Turk)

At my last school we did assertive discipline and inset training which was run by Leicester County Council. And it was really good. ...I found it really beneficial and really positive. The children knew that if they behaved well they got a reward. If they did not behave well then there was a consequence such as having break time taken away. I still employ that strategy now. (F, high, Eng.)

Low efficacy teachers had much to say about its usefulness or weakness. One low efficacy teacher accused INSET people of not knowing about real teaching situations, just giving theoretical and time-consuming advice which was really difficult to transfer into real classroom situations:

We often have people who come to give in-service training. They don’t seem to know how to do it themselves. If I say to these people, let’s try doing it they can’t. When you ask them how long did you teach, they say not long. They haven’t really got lots of ideas. It doesn’t work. Inset people don’t seem to understand the daily round of teaching. ...Somebody comes and tells you why don’t you try this. I would like to say to them, ‘you do it first’. ...It is difficult to stand back and look. They can stand back because they have time. I wonder how much time they have. (P, low, Eng.)
To sum up, overall the comments made by teachers tended to be consistent with the theoretical explanations of how efficacy develops or under which conditions it improves. For instance, observing their interactions or behaviour with individual pupils, seeing their successful responses and the positive effects of caring, and forming trustworthy relationships with pupils all contributed to the framework of successful performance, which is a source of efficacy. Perception of the workplace as supportive and encouraging reflected how social persuasion as an efficacy source found its expression in the real life situation of the classroom.

Study of both high and low efficacy teachers was valuable in identifying effective sources of efficacy. Positive encouragement from external sources like parents and the head, and negative impressions of in-service training tended to be seen in the comments of low efficacy teachers. The quality of pupil-teacher relationships was of concern for high efficacy teachers. This was reflected in a general tendency to focus on perceptions of their role as teachers and being caring, loving and encouraging in their communications with children. This conclusion suggested that feeling efficacious was also related to teachers’ perceptions of their teaching role from an emotional perspective and to their desire to appreciate each pupil’s unique identity, to love, support and encourage, helping each pupil to become an independent person.

5.8 TEACHERS’ EVALUATION (RATINGS) OF THEIR EFFICACY

The last interview question was how teachers assessed their confidence on a 5 point scale. High efficacy teachers gave scores between 4-5, while low efficacy teachers’ scores were between 3-4. This may not seem very different but more importantly the comments were very valuable in terms of quality and capturing essential variables which may be key points in sense of efficacy (see Table 4).
5.4 Table 4 Teachers’ evaluation of their efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
<th>RATINGS</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High (S)</td>
<td>4.5 to 5</td>
<td>I think my discipline as good as most. So 4.5 to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (F)</td>
<td>4 to 5 I would say</td>
<td>I feel that I am quite successful with this class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (Se)</td>
<td>I can't give 1 or 5 , 4 I can give</td>
<td>Sometimes there would be problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (K)</td>
<td>Between 4 &amp; 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (Ba)</td>
<td>I can give 5 to myself</td>
<td>I trust myself, I can manage classroom. I believe that children have an impression that I am confident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (Oz)</td>
<td>I feel myself to be 4</td>
<td>My colleagues always say I am 5. They may not know me as well as I do. The important thing is see one’s own difficulties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (P)</td>
<td>3, 3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (L)</td>
<td>I say 3</td>
<td>However compared to before Christmas it has improved. As I am learning, it is improving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (A)</td>
<td>Before Christmas I would say 4 but now 3</td>
<td>I was coping better with poor behaviour. Reasons for this my illness and class became irritable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (Ko) Turk</td>
<td>Say 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (Po) Turk</td>
<td>It may be 3 or 4</td>
<td>We can say 3.5. I am not good enough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (Oc) Turk</td>
<td>Around 3-4</td>
<td>I don’t see myself very effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5.9 SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The overall results from the interviews with appropriate support from the field notes, are summarised and discussed in the light of literature, highlighting the main differences between teachers according to country and efficacy variables.

5.9.1 VARIABLES ASSOCIATED WITH NATURE AND CAUSES OF MISBEHAVIOUR

- One important point a few teachers made was that the amount of misbehaviour changed from one classroom to another. Sometimes much more difficult pupils came together in one class and made behaviour management difficult for teachers. This also affected the sense of efficacy, as a number of both high and low efficacy teachers mentioned. However, pupils’ misbehaviour was not the only factor. Smylie (1988) for example, found that the proportion of low-achieving students in a teacher’s classroom also affected personal efficacy negatively.

- At other times, especially in Turkey, the year group made a difference to the amount and the type of misbehaviour. For example, Year One is the first year for children at school, since there is no nursery class in Turkey, and they need time to learn and internalise classroom rules. That is why Turkish teachers who teach Year One may complain much more than teachers who teach older age groups about misbehaviour, such as loss of attention, wandering aimlessly around the classroom and making a noise. This finding is consistent with literature.

Brophy and Evertson (1978) identified four general stages for students’ intellectual and social development which need to be considered in classroom management. They emphasised that in Stage-1 (from kindergarten to grades 2-3) students needed a greater amount of formal instruction in both rules, expectations and classroom procedures and routines. Raudenbush, Rowan and Cheong (1992) also found that teachers in their study reported that younger students were less mature and harder to engage than juniors and seniors. In addition, teachers who taught younger students generally reported lower efficacy.
• Repetition of a year as a perceived cause of misbehaviour was another difference between the two countries. Two teachers in Turkey described it as a cause of misbehaviour while none of the teachers in England mentioned it since it is very uncommon in English schools.

• Although most teachers saw the family background as the main cause of misbehaviour, marriage problems or a marriage breakdown seemed to be the main reasons given by British teachers. The rapid increase in single mother or parent numbers nowadays may be a reason for this different view of families (Jones and Jones, 1998). Turkish teachers were more likely to focus on the lack of parental interest and support depending on pupils’ poor socio-economic background. However, British teachers also complained about parents not caring about pupils’ learning and emotional development. Teachers involved in the study in both countries were working in quite poor areas.

5.9.2 VARIATIONS IN MANAGEMENT APPROACHES ADOPTED BY TEACHERS IN ENGLAND AND TURKEY

• As a result of having a school behaviour policy shared by all teachers and having trained in one of the systematic behaviour management approaches, teachers in England seemed very clear in their expectations of appropriate behaviour and the consequences of inappropriate behaviour. And, more importantly, they were sure which methods could be employed when dealing with problematic behaviour. This led to a consistent management approach, which is one of the most productive ways of responding to pupils’ behaviour.

• For Turkish teachers, the main pattern, which emerged from interviews and also observations, was the accidental approach or solution to misbehaviour. In other words, teachers found their own ways as they went along and they mostly relied on trial and error methods to reach better strategies. As they said, this may result in putting lots of time and effort into just repeating what pupils were expected to do rather than concentrating on learning and academic tasks. Another result of this approach was an inconsistent response which confused pupils about how they were supposed to behave.
VARIATIONS IN STRATEGIES ADOPTED BY HIGH AND LOW EFFICACY TEACHERS

When the interview and observation results were assessed together, it was possible to see teachers in both England and Turkey who presented inconsistent responses towards the same behaviour from different children or similar behaviour from the same children at different times. Some of the teachers also tended to rely on less effective and more negative methods like criticism, shouting out and reprimands to deal with misbehaviour. Some of them looked indecisive in their responses to the child.

On the other hand, some teachers in Turkey, despite the disadvantages of not having trained in a particular management method, lack of school behaviour policies and other institutional support, could establish a very positive classroom atmosphere (less misbehaviour, more involvement in tasks) and they could employ very effective and positive strategies like humour, asking questions, giving tasks, touching and looking at pupils to deal with misbehaviour.

The answer to the question 'what makes this difference’ may be related to the teachers’ sense of efficacy, the teachers’ expectation that they can influence or change the pupils’ behaviour. Although it was difficult to draw a very sharp line between high and low efficacy teachers and although they sometimes used similar methods such as shouting, giving orders and encouragement to manage pupils’ behaviour it may be asserted that efficacy makes a difference. When high efficacy teachers from both England and Turkey were examined, differences between them could be summarised on certain points.

• High efficacy teachers seemed to consider school and teacher oriented elements as well as family variables. They agreed that even when the children came from very poor and problematic environments there was always something teachers could do.

• High efficacy teachers’ views of the children’s world and their behaviour were very rich. They believed that establishing a trusting and loving relationship was the key factor. Similarly, Hargreaves (1998, p.850) found that “the teachers in our study valued the emotional bonds and understandings they established with students, and valued the purposes of educating their students as emotional and social beings as well.
as intellectual ones”. Showing love and affection to children was given importance by Turkish high efficacy teachers in establishing an effective classroom atmosphere. This was particularly interesting because in Turkey, strategies for bringing up children and the attitudes of teachers and administrators were often seen as mostly authoritarian (Akkok et al., 1995).

Once a teacher has established this close relationship s/he is less likely to meet misbehaviour, and even if s/he encounters problematic behaviour, it can be dealt with easily with the help of this positive relationship. They emphasised that in order to build a positive relationship teachers should have a democratic attitude to encourage all pupils to express their needs or desires without any fear and they should not be authoritarian because being too strict may cause low confidence and low self esteem.

- High efficacy teachers seemed more consistent in what they did in the classroom and what they said in interview. For example, one teacher used humour to gain pupils’ attention and make them alert or to deal with misbehaviour. The researcher also witnessed several examples of humour used by the teacher during observation. The other high efficacy teacher said she looked at pupils, said their names or asked question or touched them to deal with misbehaviour. Her behaviour during observation was very much consistent with what she said in interview. For instance, when she was reading a story to a whole class, pupils were sitting on the carpet and listening to the teacher. At the back of the group, one pupil was not listening. Then the teacher, without stopping reading, called the pupil’s name and said something about the story. The pupil became involved in the lesson.

- By contrast, there was less consistency between what low efficacy teachers said in interview and what they did in the classroom. For example, a low efficacy teacher in Turkey was shouting out at pupils, criticising them and sometimes giving physical punishment but in the interview she said that talking to pupils and not giving punishment were her main methods. For example, one pupil changed his place and went to another table. She called and wanted him to come to her and said very loudly in front of the class, “How many times have you done the same thing? It should not happen again. If you move, others will move and then what will happen?” She told
him what she wanted by criticising him rather loudly. Then most of the children lost their attention and they started to talk and make a noise.

- Another example from the same teacher's classroom: one boy twisted another boy's arm and that boy began to cry. Again very loudly and in front of the class the teacher said, "Why are you doing this? You do not have any right to do this. Do I behave like that to you when you do something wrong?" Some of the children answered the teacher's question by saying, "You hit us with a stick and you smack". This incident showed not only a very disturbing and ineffective way of dealing with problem behaviour but also, with proof from the pupils, it indicated that the teacher used corporal punishment but did not mention this in interview.

- In the development of self-efficacy experience, the personal characteristics of teachers and especially the positive support from the head teacher and colleagues were mentioned by both high and low efficacy teachers.

In Hoy and Woolfolk's (1993) study, both colleagues and principals in schools were found to be influential in developing teachers' teaching efficacy. This was especially true of administrators who helped teachers to solve instructional and management problems. Ross (1994) also emphasised that collaborative relationships between teachers may enhance teacher efficacy. As teachers worked together, they convinced each other about their competence, which in turn encouraged collegial interaction.

Similarly, Shachar and Shmuelevitz (1997) found that teachers who had a higher level of collaboration with their colleagues tended to have higher general teaching efficacy and efficacy in increasing students' social relationship than the teachers who had a low level of collaboration with colleagues.

- In conclusion, high efficacy teachers in both countries seemed to have effective management skills such as consistency and positive attitudes which led to a warm classroom atmosphere and good teacher-pupil relationship. Low efficacy teachers tended to use less successful strategies which resulted in feelings of failure and not coping. Applying less effective strategies may be caused by "learned helplessness" (Abrahamson et al. 1978) which refers to the way in which teachers stop trying new
methods because of the belief that they cannot do. They were more likely to blame family background and to exhibit inconsistency in their responses to pupils and showed less willingness to talk about behaviour management.

Overall, in spite of the small sample and the danger of categorising, the degree of efficacy did emerge as a factor influencing the way these teachers perceived themselves and managed their pupils.

In the discussion and conclusion chapter, these points will be very meaningful when interview data is considered in conjunction with the results derived from observation and questionnaire data.
CHAPTER SIX: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

INTRODUCTION

In this comparative study, the researcher triangulated three different methods (systematic observation, participant observation and interview) to explore the effects of the teachers’ efficacy in their management of pupils’ behaviour. Additionally, the researcher sought to investigate how similar British and Turkish teachers might be in their classroom management. This chapter presents a review of how the research went and of the limitations of the study. It also puts the overall results of survey, observation and interview together. The findings are presented with explanations by the researcher, related to the literature on classroom management and teacher efficacy. Finally, suggestions are given for future studies, and recommendations are made for classroom management courses and practices.

6.2 THE REVIEW OF RESEARCH METHODS

One of the biggest advantages for applying different sorts of methods to explore the same or similar issues with the same groups is in achieving comprehensive and rich picture of the cases.

Systematic observation as a quantitative method, enabled this researcher to record misbehaviour and the teacher’s response to that behaviour in the classroom at the point in time when the incident happened. It also provided statistical data with which to compare teachers, using efficacy and country as independent variables. However, sometimes the researcher found this approach limited in that it was impossible to record what was really happening in terms of the possible reasons for pupil and teacher behaviour, the factors which initiate the event, what happened next, and what the teacher said pupils were doing at that time. For these reasons, the researcher needed to write about examples of incidents which characterised the ways that teachers dealt with pupil behaviour, in the form of field notes.

Examples of incidents which showed what constituted misbehaviour, the teacher’s response and the effectiveness of this response and whether the teacher’s approach tended
to be positive or negative, effective or ineffective, were the focus on the field notes. Information derived from these field notes enabled the researcher to validate the results of systematic observation. Additionally, the information which emerged from field notes and interviews was triangulated with systematic observation data. It made it possible to construct a clearer picture about each teacher's management approaches and to find particular points in support of the results of systematic observation. Since it is difficult to record such long or complex interactions between the teacher and pupils using a coding system in systematic observation, especially for interpreting and supporting systematic observation data, field notes provided rich information that made the classroom picture clearer.

Selecting teachers and their availability for the study was easier than was first thought. In order to choose a sample in England, a letter which explained the aim and the characteristics of the study was sent to some head teachers known by the researcher and the academic adviser. Fortunately, almost all head teachers agreed to contribute to the study. But one of the schools could not accept the researcher's visit for observation and interview because they had an inspection at that time. They suggested another time (after inspection). Another teacher from a different school (high efficacy) was recruited to the study.

In Turkey, schools involved in the study were informed by a letter which was written by the Dean of the Education Faculty at Cukurova University. It was easier and less time consuming than was to be expected to distribute and collect the questionnaires and select cases for the second part of the study. Two factors appeared to have been influential in securing this degree of co-operation: the researcher's explanation about limitations of time because she had only a month to finish her field work and the positive attitude of head teachers and deputy heads towards the study. They all strongly recommended to the teachers that it would be helpful and useful to participate.

However, two low efficacy teachers, especially one with only 5 months experience, seemed uncomfortable at being observed and several times asked which aspects of the classroom were being observed, despite having been told that the focus was upon pupils' behaviour and teacher-pupil interaction. The other teacher did not ask any specific
question but it was clear from her non-verbal behaviour that she was not comfortable especially at the beginning of the observation session.

This situation is seen by Foster (1996) as problematic, because school personnel may change their behaviour consciously or unconsciously when they are being observed. If they change their behaviour during observations it would be difficult to reach accurate representations of their usual behaviour, and also any judgements made as a result of this behaviour may be invalid assessments of typical practice.

There was a difficulty in observing each teacher for the same length of time because of difference in the duration of a lesson in both countries. In England, each observation session lasted approximately 1 hour, almost equivalent to a single lesson, while in Turkey each teacher had to be observed over two lesson on each visit since a lesson lasts 40 minutes in Turkish classrooms. This was intended to solve the problem of needing to observe each teacher for similar amounts of time. However, the particular solution had certain disadvantages, especially for the observation of Turkish teachers. Lesson beginnings (settling down), transitions and ending processes, each were recorded twice in one observation session since two lessons were involved in each visit. This might have affected classroom atmosphere, and more specifically the type and amount of misbehaviour.

As explained earlier, the teachers interviewed were the same teachers involved in the observation study. That is, the researcher and the teachers had a chance to become familiar with each other before the interview started. This was especially helpful in developing a trustworthy relationship between interviewer and interviewee. At the beginning of the interview process each teacher was informed about the aim and content of the interview, its confidentiality, the possible time required to complete the interview and the recording process.

Having been trained in counselling, the researcher possessed good active listening skills and was aware of how important it was to keep quiet, not interrupt when a participant was talking. If the teacher's answer contained irrelevant information, the researcher always tried to bring him/her back to original question. For example, one question was "What
influences your confidence about managing disruptive behaviour? Could you tell about your experience, teacher training course, inset, personal characteristics, reading?”. One Turkish teacher responded by talking about the usefulness of in-service courses in general. It was necessary to remind him of part of the question by asking, ‘Did those courses affect your confidence? How?’. In this way the interviewee was able to concentrate on the main focus of the question.

In Turkey, interviews took place in the staff room or a lab when other teachers were teaching in the classroom. The interviews with three teachers were interrupted by some colleagues coming to the staff room or some pupils coming to the lab but the researcher was careful to note where the conversation stopped and to remind teachers where it should restart. Teachers did not seem disturbed by these interruptions. In England, interviews with two of the teachers were carried out in two separate sessions because of time limitations.

To sum up, having used three different methods to explore teacher efficacy in classroom management, this researcher was able to identify characteristics which were more likely to be associated with low or high efficacy teachers. Furthermore, this research led to the identification of variables associated with teacher efficacy and behaviour management and enabled the researcher to formulate implications for schools and especially Turkish schools and policy makers in their education system.

6.3 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

To begin with, this study was carried out by only one researcher. For this reason unavoidably it has some limitations. In the first stage of the study, that is the survey, the sample size in Leicester (N=51) and Adana (N=73) are big enough to do statistical analysis.

However, since interview and observation are time consuming and labour demanding in their application and analysis, the number of participants in the second part of the study has to be confined somehow. Moreover, the researcher had a limited time to complete field work and write about it. The data that emerged from interview and observation is invaluable in the sense of its complementarity, coherence and richness. But caution
should be exercised in generalising the results to larger groups, for example all Turkish and British teachers.

Another limitation is that the observation of teachers was conducted by one person who knew whether teachers had high or low efficacy scores. She tried to be objective and followed a standard procedure without any biases when she was observing teachers. If there was another observer or observers who did not know the teachers’ efficacy level, it would have been possible to compare and validate information derived from the different observer. However, a video of two high (one in Turkey and one in England) efficacy teachers and one low efficacy teacher was shown to research students and the lecturer in a research seminar without telling them which one was a high and a low efficacy teacher. Then they were asked what they thought about the teachers’ management style who they thought had a high or low sense of efficacy. They mostly gave positive comments for teachers with high efficacy and predicted them accurately. It should be noted that for ethical reasons the teachers had been informed that the video of their class might be shown to a group of research students and university tutors as part of the study, and none of the teachers had objected.

Furthermore, at the end of the interview teachers were asked how they would evaluate their confidence to manage a classroom on a 5 point scale. Five or four and certainty with their ability characterised the answers of high efficacy teachers; mostly 3 or 4 and uncertain comments were associated with the answers of low efficacy ones. This result reinforced observation results and also established a level of the objectivity of the researcher.

6.4 RESULTS FROM QUESTIONNAIRE AND SELF-EFFICACY SCALE

6.4.1 METHODS USED BY TEACHERS

In the survey, teachers reported that they more frequently used rather positive and neutral methods such as praise, talk to child or family and change places to deal with misbehaviour (Rosen et al., 1990). However, in literature, teachers’ responses towards disruptive behaviour were generally negative (Merrett and Wheldall, 1987; Merrett and Jones, 1994; Jack et al., 1996). This may be because these studies used observation as the
research method and in the present study teachers were asked to respond to the questionnaire. They may want to present themselves positively due to social desirability.

Some differences existed between the teachers in the two countries. Change place, or remove the child are more likely to be preferred by English teachers while other methods such as talk to parents, talk to pupils as a group seemed more common in Turkish classrooms. As explained in the Results chapter, this finding may be attributed to differences of classroom management structure in the two cultures.

6.4.2 IN-SERVICE TRAINING

British teachers reported positive experiences with in-service training as far as its practicality and usefulness are concerned whereas Turkish teachers tended to see those courses as rather theoretically orientated and expressed less satisfaction with them. This may be that in-service training in England included more specific and applicable skills which teachers can transfer to their classroom. Literature (Merrett and Wheldall, 1988; Wheldall and Merrett, 1992; Maeve, 1992) support this finding. For example, Maeve (1992) found very positive results suggesting that teachers who attended an in-service programme have shown significant improvement in comparison to the control group.

However, in interview, a number of British teachers said the course they attended was theoretical and difficult to transfer to real life. Similarly, the majority of Turkish teachers expressed that they hardly ever had in-service courses with particular emphasis in behaviour management.

6.4.3 TEACHER EFFICACY, EXPERIENCE AND COUNTRY

Ghaith and Yaghi (1997) found a negative correlation between experience and general teaching efficacy. Some decline in teachers' sense of efficacy is pointed by Guskey and Passaro (1993) as they remain longer in their career. By contrast, in this study, experience, as numbers of years in teaching, is found as a significant variable for gaining a sense of efficacy especially in the area of communication and being in charge of a classroom. This contradiction with previous studies can be explained by examining different dimensions of teacher efficacy in different areas. The present study focused on
teachers' efficacy (personal efficacy) in classroom management whereas the two previous studies investigated general teaching efficacy which refers to the belief that teachers can change student learning despite factors beyond school control.

However, in a comparative study of teacher efficacy for pre and in-service teachers in Scotland and America, Campbell (1996) demonstrated that in-service teachers in both countries had higher level of efficacy than pre-service teachers in both countries. Melby (1995) also found that low efficacy teachers were more likely to be new and inexperienced. Similarly, according to the results of the present study, as the years of experience increase, teachers are more likely to have a high sense of efficacy. One explanation for this finding is that they encounter countless examples of classroom events and pupils' behaviour. As mentioned before in the results chapter, the most powerful source of efficacy is performance accomplishment. It would not be wrong to conclude that the more experience teachers have, the much more opportunity and time they possess to see their own success. This then can reinforce their confidence. Interview data also supported this result. For example, one teacher commented “…After gaining experience teachers can understand children. This comes from personality and experience…”

Interestingly, Turkish teachers' efficacy level is significantly higher than those of British teachers in all scales. Consistently, analysis of variance by experience and country, and gender and country revealed no interaction between these variables. That is, there is still a country effect, suggesting that Turkish teachers feel more efficacious in behaviour management, in being in charge and in communication. One explanation for this finding is that the mean scores of Turkish teachers’ experience is higher in comparison with British teachers. There is evidence that experience is one of the constituents in gaining sense of efficacy in classroom management.

As interview and observation data are put together however, it is apparent that Turkish teachers have a tacit understanding of classroom management instead of giving analytic thought to each element of it, due to lack of education and training in that topic. For example, one teacher said “We have not met any concept like classroom management either during teacher training or in-service training”. Another teacher suggested, “You university people and researchers should come and show us particular methods or
techniques to manage pupils' behaviour". Significant correlation between sub-scales for the Turkish group might be interpreted as displaying a lack of analytic ability to discriminate different dimensions of classroom management. From this point of view, when they were responding to the self-efficacy scale, they might not think about which skills or abilities are really meant. They say they can do it, but in reality they may not be as confident as they suggest.

6.5 RESULTS FROM OBSERVATION AND INTERVIEW

6.5.1 MISBEHAVIOUR

The literature revealed that especially at primary level, teachers mostly encounter minor behaviour problems like talking out of turn, disturbing others, inattentiveness rather than serious or major ones (Wragg and Dooley, 1984; Wragg, 1993; Merrett and Wheldall, 1987; Johnson and Oswald, 1993; Akkok et al., 1995). The findings of the present study also support the literature. Talking out of turn, being off task, wandering aimlessly and irritating others were among the behaviours mostly observed. But in interviews, a number of British teachers were concerned with aggression, attention-seeking and shouting out to teachers or each other. This is partly consistent with systematic observation results because the amount of aggression and misuse of material for example was higher in the British context than the Turkish one. However, it should be noted that these behaviours were infrequently observed.

In line with observation findings, for Turkish teachers, inattention, talking at wrong times, making a noise were the main concerns in interviews. Aggression or serious behaviour was hardly mentioned by these teachers. This may mean that the level of teachers' tolerance towards pupils' behaviour is more authoritarian and the role adopted by Turkish teachers constrains their flexibility. This then results in a low level of aggression or of damaging material. For example, in their study with Turkish teachers Akkok et al.(1995) found that the child-rearers', teachers' and administrators' attitudes toward children in Turkey were mostly authoritarian.
6.5.2 CAUSES OF MISBEHAVIOUR

Consistent with existing literature (Baron, 1990) the vast majority of teachers regardless of their country and efficacy level attributed the sources of misbehaviour to family background. Marriage problems were dominant among British teachers’ explanations and also mentioned by a number of Turkish teachers (Jones and Jones, 1998). Poverty, low socio-economic-cultural conditions, lack of parental interest and care were emphasised by both groups. Similarly, in the literature a number of researchers have found that socio-economic conditions can determine children’s behaviour either with the negative effect of poverty (Brantlinger, 1993; Weishew and Peng, 1993; McGuinness, 1993; Docking, 1987) or social class differences between home and school (Hargreaves, 1975; Galloway and Goodwin, 1987).

In the discussion of responsible sources for problem behaviour, school and teacher orientated factors are remembered by the researcher as well as family-focused reasons (McGuinness, 1993; Freiberg et al., 1995; McNamara and Moreton, 1995; Purkey and Novak, 1984). In line with the literature, a few teachers in this study had a similar perspective to the one given below:

“We say the family is a big determinant in children’s behaviour but how about us? I mean we, teachers and our education system? Are we perfect? What is our role?” These words/questions belong to a high efficacy teacher who works in a very poor area of a city in Turkey, but has a very warm and trusting relationship with pupils and has an orderly run classroom. In a similar way, the role of subject interest and the importance of motivating children in a lesson were stressed by a number of high efficacy teachers in both countries. This shows that high efficacy teachers have a holistic view of pupils’ behaviour rather than a limited perspective of it and that they recognise the importance of their own role in affecting children’s behaviour.

6.5.3 METHODS

The main pattern that emerged from the systematic observation regarding methods employed by teachers was that there was not such a wide variation among teachers, but
when the pattern was examined in detail it would be possible to make meaningful generalisations with reference to the two countries.

Rosen et al. (1990) indicated that the most frequent teacher response to negative and positive students' behaviour was neutral including instructions and providing statement of fact. In the present study as well, methods are said to be neutral rather than negative or mostly positive and similarities between both groups of teachers are the main pattern. However, when the first nine methods (accounting for 81.3% for Turkish; 84.4% for British) are examined, British teachers used more give order, encouragement, change place and warning but made less use of statement of rules, look at pupil and use of signal. Statement of rules, use of signals, shouting, and pupil naming were a high proportion in the Turkish context while less encouragement happened in comparison with the British context. Giving order or telling what to do comes first in both groups as a method (Wragg and Dooley, 1984). Although the remaining pattern looks similar for each country it is possible to see variations which can be attributed to differences of classroom setting and approaches to or understanding of classroom management.

Change place, warning and encouragement were among the most preferred techniques in British cases; use signals, look at pupil and shout were mostly seen in the Turkish context. One explanation for this finding is that there is a tendency among British teachers to employ more positive and coherent methods. It also represents systematic use of methods which are based on a behaviour policy shared by all staff in school. For example, change place and encouragement reflect the presence of a behaviour policy. In interview, the teachers in England commented that they have a school behaviour policy which tells them to use warning for inappropriate behaviour and reward for appropriate behaviour. Assertive discipline, changing place, asking questions, touch, looking at pupil, positive and negative reinforcement, sending child to the head are the strategies mentioned by British teachers in interview.

On the other hand, for Turkish cases those methods which were seen in different proportions from the British context may suggest that the choice of methods follows a neutral or unplanned route and depends on individual teacher-based decision. In interview, Turkish teachers agreed that they learned classroom management by trial and
error and they have no structured discipline system for the classroom. Thus, they used methods which they discovered along their career: talking to the child and family, positive and negative reinforcement, punishment, warning, humour, repeating the rules, asking questions and giving tasks which are consistent with systematic observation results.

The total appearance of methods said to be negative, is not more than 7%. This follows a similar pattern in both groups, suggesting that amongst this 7% reprimand for British classrooms, and punishment for Turkish classrooms were more frequently seen. Criticism was equal for both. Interview findings and literature in Turkey (Akkok et al., 1995) support this result because a number of teachers said they used punishment as a method.

6.5.4 DIFFERENCES BETWEEN HIGH AND LOW EFFICACY TEACHERS

Research which looked at differences between the classroom atmosphere of teachers with high and low efficacy demonstrated that teachers’ behaviour is determined by their sense of efficacy. More specifically a higher sense of efficacy enables teachers to be more humanistic about control, to be decisive and consistent, to provide encouragement and praise for academic success, to direct less criticism and fewer negative comments, and to have a positive effect on on-task behaviour or learning. On the other hand, more criticism and indecisive behaviour (lack of persistence), less concentration on academic tasks are among the characteristics of teachers with low levels of efficacy (Woolfolk, Rosoff and Hoy 1990; Woolfolk and Hoy, 1990; Gibson and Dembo, 1984; Emmer and Hickman, 1991; Ashton and Webb, 1986; Guskey and Passaro, 1994; Melby, 1995). The results of the present study agree with many aspects of those findings as explained below.

According to systematic observation results, there did not seem to be much variation in methods employed by high and low efficacy teachers. In other words, both groups tended to apply a similar variety of methods to deal with misbehaviour. However, preventive and positive methods e.g. encouragement, humour, touch were more common among high efficacy teachers. These teachers seemed to possess the characteristics of the “lead-manager”, as explained by Glasser (1992) in The Quality School. He describes the lead-manager as “constantly trying to see that small problems are solved before they become large ones. Taking a little time to listen to a student who is a potential troublemaker is part
of being a good lead-teacher” (Glasser, 1992, p.143). When the first six methods are inspected, warning and looking at a pupil for high efficacy teachers, shouting and changing place for low efficacy teachers came out as different categories. The other four, give orders, use signals, encouragement and state rules are the same for both groups.

Despite low overall use of negative strategies e.g. shout, reprimand, criticise in comparison with other methods, these methods were chosen more by low efficacy teachers. An extract from the field notes may illustrate the situation more vividly. One low efficacy teacher was saying to the pupil: “…you have been silly, do not be silly, sit properly…” In interview a number of low efficacy teachers also expressed that they occasionally used detention, punishment and criticism whereas encouragement, humour, touch and positive encouragement were emphasised by high efficacy teachers. One said: “…I change their place, look at them, put my hand on their shoulder to show my awareness of the behaviour…”. This relates to the concept ‘withitness’ identified by Kounin (1970). Field notes also confirmed what teachers said in interview. The researcher witnessed several examples of the effective use of management strategies as given in the results chapter.

Another marked characteristic of high efficacy teachers was being decisive and consistent in their behaviour; looking firm and confident in managing activities, behaviour of groups and individual pupils. As discussed in the interview chapter, teachers showed persistence in getting answers and appropriate behaviour but they did this in a very encouraging way rather than forcing pupils to respond. These results are very similar to those in literature mentioned before (Gibson and Dembo, 1984; Emmer and Hickman, 1991; Ashton and Webb, 1986).

The use of reactive and negative strategies by low efficacy teachers was supported by field notes as in the interview chapter. Inconsistency in either their behaviour towards pupils or what they did in the classroom or what they said in interview was evident. One explanation for this finding may be lack of awareness of their own behaviour and classroom dynamics.
Although the present study is mainly concerned with teachers' managerial strategies to deal with misbehaviour, overall results considered certain characteristics associated with teachers' strategies in the organising of activities, management of groups and monitoring of pupils' work. One important point is that high efficacy teachers tended to show characteristics of successful classroom managers defined by Kounin (1970) and teacher effectiveness studies (Brophy and Evertson, 1976; Evertson and Emmer, 1982; Emmer, Evertson and Anderson, 1980; Emmer et al., 1982; Emmer et al., 1981; Doyle, 1984; Wragg, 1993). In her study of teacher efficacy and classroom management Melby (1995) also pointed out that teacher efficacy is a convincing variable in affecting general teacher effectiveness in the area of classroom management.

"...I can make them feel I am keeping an eye on them...", said a high efficacy teacher in interview. As given in an example in the interview analysis and results chapter, they showed awareness of what is actually happening in the classroom at any moment (withitness). For example, one teacher was reading a story to a whole class and a boy was not paying attention to the teacher. She managed to involve him in the activity by asking him a question or for a comment. The other teacher was monitoring pupils' work by visiting tables. During these visits she saw that one girl was crying and she was not doing her work. Whilst she was talking to her to try and understand what had happened and was trying to calm her down, at the same time she was answering questions from other pupils. This and similar incidents were interpreted as an indication of 'overlapping'.

6.5.4.1 PUPIL TASK ENGAGEMENT LEVEL

In line with the literature (Gibson and Dembo, 1984; Guskey and Passaro, 1994; Raudenbush et al., 1992), high and low efficacy teachers are not only differentiated by their management strategies but also by the task engagement level of their pupils, in other words providing an appropriate learning environment. Since high efficacy teachers employ preventive methods and have already established an orderly atmosphere in their classroom, pupils seemed to concentrate better on their work for a longer period of time. This result was supported by statistical analysis (Chi-square) and field notes as well. Conversely, the level of pupils' off-task in low efficacy teachers' classrooms was found higher according to statistical results and field notes. With classrooms of some teachers it
was hard for pupils to concentrate on task as some pupils were being noisy or disruptive and the teacher dealt with these problems rather loudly, by shouting, reprimanding and responding in a reactive way at the expense of losing other children’s attention.

6.5.4.2 TEACHING ACTIVITIES

In interview, a number of low efficacy teachers said that pupils misbehave more during whole class teaching. Field notes confirmed that with the negative effects of feeling that they cannot get all pupils’ attention at the same time due to their lack of confidence they seemed less efficacious in dealing with problematic situations while carrying out activities. Gibson and Dembo (1984), and Raudenbush et al. (1992) also found a close relation between a high sense of efficacy and carrying out whole class instruction.

“...I feel competent when I am dealing with misbehaviour. I feel I am competent in the classroom and I think children understand this”. As reflected in this sentence, when teachers were asked about their confidence in dealing with misbehaviour there was evidence that high efficacy teachers expressed their certainty using firm words. Less assertive words and uncertainties characterised the answers of low efficacy teachers e.g. “...I feel confident. Sometimes I criticise myself. If the child does not change his behaviour I think I am not successful”.

6.5.5. EXPLANATION OF RULES AND EXPECTATION

Almost all teachers agreed that they explained classroom rules and their expectations at the beginning of term and repeated occasionally when needed. But when field notes are taken into account, variations in the implementation of rules are manifest according to teachers’ origin and efficacy level. The main pattern for Turkish teachers in implementation of rules is relying on the theoretical explanation of it in words. Therefore, successful implementation of those rules in real life very much depends on the talents or skills of individual teachers.

On the other hand, behaviour policy facilitates the actual use of classroom rules and makes them part of classroom life for British teachers. In other words, more repetition of the rules from the teacher’s side and more disobedience from the pupil’s side was
observed in the Turkish context. Systematic observation results also support the finding of a high percentage of statement of rules in the Turkish classroom.

Nevertheless, regardless of teachers' origin, some teachers still seemed to have trouble in teaching rules in England while some in Turkey looked very successful in this aspect despite there being no behaviour policy. At this point, sense of efficacy may be a contributory factor, because teachers with high efficacy were more likely to be persistent in pursuing rules. For instance, in one high efficacy teacher's classroom in England a boy was talking and the other one wanted to say something without putting his hand up, but the teacher did not let him talk. He was made to take his turn.

6.5.6. FACTORS INFLUENCING HOW TO MANAGE PUPILS BEHAVIOUR

"...You really learn child management skills at the job". Consistent with existing literature (Merrett and Wheldall, 1993), learning from their own experiences including working in different schools, and co-operating with colleagues were emphasised by teachers as a powerful way of gaining skills in managing pupils' behaviour. Once again another teacher said, "I do not think there is any substitute for learning on the job". "...Over the years you learn what does not work" another teacher commented. One was concerned with collaborative relationships between teachers being: "Willing to work with other colleagues, observe them, take their advice."

A strong emphasis was placed on knowing characteristics of children, by high efficacy teachers especially, with particular emphasis on good pupil-teacher relationships. For example, "...giving time to children to find out how they want to behave, why they behave in a particular way and start to think about it." This finding supports the results of Woolfolk, Rosoff and Hoy's (1990) study.

Although the support teacher is mainly responsible for children with learning difficulties, still some teachers agreed on his or her usefulness in sharing responsibilities and taking care of a group of children. It helped them to work with the rest of group comfortably. One said: "...It is always handy to have another person in the classroom." The head teachers and other teachers in school were seen as support sources in sharing problems. In the English context, such help from colleagues is organised more like having a parallel
teacher or back up teacher to send the troublesome child to as part of their behaviour policy. On the other hand, for Turkish teachers it is as a source of giving or taking advice and emotional support.

6.5.7. SOURCES OF EFFICACY

A number of researchers found a relation between being well prepared and teaching efficacy (Raudenbush et al., 1992; Ross et al., 1996). There was strong evidence in interviews that being confident in a subject area, including how to plan lessons or tasks and carry out these tasks during lessons, affects the flow of the lesson positively and this then influences classroom management.

In recent years, the role of Head teachers and collaborative relationships among colleagues have been shown as strong determinants for teachers’ sense of efficacy in the literature (Hoy and Woolfolk, 1993; Newmann et al., 1989; Ross, 1994; Shachar and Shmuelevitz, 1997). There is support in interview for these findings as well. Positive feedback and help from the head teacher and colleagues are identified as important elements in building confidence and appropriate management strategies. Feedback, as a means of getting some indication about the results of what a person is doing, is recognised by Hall and Hall (1988) as an important element of experiential learning. Consistent with Hall and Hall’s explanation teachers can get feedback from their colleagues through verbal statements or they can invite their friends to provide feedback for them.

Consistent with the literature, factors contributing to the development of self-efficacy for teachers in this study were identified as: seeing their own successful influence on children (Ross et al., 1996; Woolfolk, Rosoff and Hoy, 1990); teacher personality transmitting a mostly democratic and positive attitude towards children; and trustworthiness and good pupil-teacher relationships (Ashton and Webb, 1986; Woolfolk et al., 1990). Teacher personality seems a strong determinant of feeling efficacious. This connection, or the importance of personal qualities, is strongly emphasised by McManus (1994) under the term of “natural/personal virtues”. He explains how essential natural virtues are: “Regular feedback on progress tells pupils that the teacher cares about them; only those teachers who really do care, will be able to sustain the effort required: what they have are personal
qualities and virtues, not mere skills” (p.53). Despite the positive effects of in-service training on teacher efficacy reported in literature (Fritz et al., 1995; Ross, 1994, Hagen et al., 1998), some teachers in the present study found it theoretical and not helpful. However, British teachers and teachers with high efficacy were more likely to have a positive view about it.

6.6 IMPLICATIONS

6.6.1 IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHER TRAINING

In his very useful comparison of today’s teacher education programmes and those programmes twenty years ago, Weber (1991) sees effective management as a prerequisite to effective instruction, though instruction and management are considered separate but interrelated concepts. He writes about characteristics of today’s teacher education programmes:

Teacher education students are taught that effective classroom managers use proactive or preventive strategies to avert inappropriate student behaviour, responsive or corrective strategies to change inappropriate student behaviour, and supportive strategies to maintain appropriate student behaviour.


Whilst a debate is taking place in the US and UK with the view of improving the current situation and achieving a more satisfactory outcomes as regards classroom management in teacher training, the situation in Turkey is hardly comparable with that in these countries. Classroom management in teacher training programmes was included as a minor subject within a course such as educational psychology until the 1998-1999 academic year in Turkey. Since then a particular course named ‘classroom management’ has been run in teacher training programmes at primary and secondary level. However, there is a need for strategies in planing the content of this course. Therefore, recommendations will be made in the light of literature and results of the present study here.
Teacher training courses in Turkey should train candidates in a way that ensures all candidates become familiar with proactive and preventative management concepts and approaches. To begin with, interrelationships between instruction and management and the idea that “it is effective management, not good lessons, that prevents managerial problems” (Weber, 1991, p. 27) should be emphasised. Students should be introduced to the elements of effective classroom management e.g. establishing rules and routines and making them clear for pupils at the very beginning of term, planning lesson activities ahead but being ready for unplanned happenings, transmitting her/his expectations clearly at the beginning, during transitions and at the end of lesson, monitoring pupils’ work and providing constructive feedback. During teaching practice they should be required to try at least some of those skills and consult with their course tutor or mentor teacher.

Having studied classroom management, the researcher may suggest some implications for the content of this course. Lectures, which aim to give the theory and practice of classroom management, can be planned accordingly using recent and relevant literature. In these lectures, small group discussions can focus on, for example, the causes of disruptive behaviour and ways of dealing with it or factors associated with disruptive behaviour. Or a hypothetical example of problematic behaviour can be given and students can work on that incident in pairs or small groups to find out how they would approach such behaviour. Then in a large group, the whole class can discuss the issues to determine workable solutions.

6.6.2 OFFICIAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Additional guidance, which sets out the responsibilities of qualified teachers and student teachers (University of Leicester, 1998-99) and encourages them to employ appropriate management strategies, should be provided as recommendations on paper. This kind of example of recommendations is given by Circulars in England. For example, skills in classroom management and teaching expected to be demonstrated by qualified teachers, when assessed, are clearly defined in Requirements for courses of Initial Teacher Training 4/98. Paragraphs g and i are given as examples below:

\( g \) monitor and intervene when teaching to ensure sound learning and discipline.
i) set high expectations for pupils’ behaviour, establishing and maintaining a good standard of discipline through well focused teaching and through positive and productive relationship.

The guidance offered by Circular 8/94 aims to help schools maintain good behaviour and discipline. Additionally, the role of the Head teacher, teachers and the Governing body are articulated in detail and several aspects of good behaviour and discipline such as behaviour policy, rewards and punishments, partnership with parents are covered in the circular.

As can be understood, a clear definition of requirements for teachers in classroom management may become a first step in training students and qualified teachers to meet standard expectations.

6.6.3 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR LOW EFFICACY TEACHERS

The result of this study reveals that high efficacy teachers are more able to create an atmosphere in which pupils concentrate on academic tasks and to prevent behaviour problems from starting. Even if they meet behaviour problems they deal with them without losing other pupils’ attention and with a minimum level of disruption to academic tasks. For these reasons, the right matching between the sense of efficacy and the teachers’ behaviour should be made clear for training programmes. The question “How to enhance efficacy” has been subjected to research in recent years. There is evidence for positive effects of this kind of training programme in teacher efficacy and in their behaviour (Fritz et al., 1995; Ross, 1994; Hagen, 1998; Shachar and Shmuelevitz, 1997). Therefore, training programmes for teachers who have low efficacy can be planned to improve their efficacy level. This then makes it possible for pupils to get the maximum benefit from learning activities. This kind of training programme can be designed by considering the sources of efficacy. Self-efficacy beliefs are created from four sources: enactive mastery experience (performance accomplishment), vicarious experience, verbal persuasion and physiological and affective states.
Mastery experience is the strongest one. As teachers observe their successful performance in dealing with particular behaviour problems, they can gradually establish their confidence. Therefore, training programmes should encourage them to see what they are doing successfully (with the help of a diary about their behaviour in classroom management) and enable them to try newly learned strategies in their classroom to reinforce successful achievement.

Vicarious experience, in which people's exposure to target skills modelled by somebody else, also works in promoting personal efficacy. Observing other teachers, who are similar to the observers, while they are performing a task successfully, raises the observers' efficacy beliefs. Teachers can be exposed to the actions of successful teachers on video or in real life, during training sessions.

Social persuasion, including feedback from the course tutor or colleagues for a specific performance, also strengthens belief that s/he has the capability to perform what s/he wants. For example, Ross (1994) emphasises that collaborative relationships between teachers may enhance teacher efficacy. As teachers work together they convince each other about their competence. Then this procedure in turn encourages collegial interaction.

In all those programmes which rely on sources of efficacy, the analysis of successful teachers' behaviour should be described first of all and shown to trainees step by step. For example, skills and behaviours (verbal or non-verbal) associated with a successful start to a year will be included.

Organisational structure of schools, particularly the attitudes of head teachers towards a working relationship with teachers and their individual support for teachers, has become an essential part of teacher efficacy. In addition, collaborative work between teachers is a very powerful way of enhancing a sense of efficacy and in doing so maximising pupils' on-task behaviour and success. Having established a systematic help-network, teachers can develop a productive work environment and warm personal relationships. This then encourages more collaboration. Collaboration among teachers can be realised by the simple giving or taking of advice, sharing feelings, providing feedback, and having the
opportunity to observe each other, talking about their experience in particular problems and functioning as role models in presenting useful ideas and skills. This kind of help can of course be planned in a structured way for school-wide application. For these reasons, a structured programme based on informative sources of efficacy should be designed to encourage teachers to work together.

6.6.4 SUGGESTIONS FOR QUALIFIED TEACHERS

"Without a whole school consensus and parental support any behavioural scheme is idealistic. It is impossible to carry the 'theoretical' out solely in your classroom if you are doing it on your own". As excellently expressed by a British teacher with high efficacy, even though teachers are on their own in the classroom, support provided by the Head, other teachers and parents is vital for individual teachers to be confident and effective in their relationship with pupils.

This study clearly shows that a school-wide behaviour policy makes classroom management easier, more consistent and positive. In England, schools involved in the study had behaviour policies and the teachers expressed how useful they were and how they made communication easier among school staff. The importance of Whole-school Behaviour Policies was also emphasised in Circular 8/94 (DFE, 1994) which recommended that:

Head teachers and teachers should, in consultation with governors, develop and act upon whole-school behaviour policies which are clearly understood by pupils, parents and the other staff. Policies should be based on a clear and justifiable set of principles and values, and should be regularly reviewed (p.11).

Therefore in Turkey, there is an urgent need for a policy which tells everybody in the school how they should behave in certain circumstances. It should be clearly defined on paper and then transferred to real life.

Morrison et al. (1994) emphasise the importance of collaborative work among classroom teachers and support personnel in the learning of new skills and implementation of reforms to satisfy academic, social, behavioural and self-esteem aspects of pupils' need. The school counselling service is identified as the source of this kind of help. In seeking
strategies to reduce misbehaviour by improving the student-teacher relationship, school counsellors could function as mediators in student-teacher conflicts.

Consultation is defined as one of the responsibilities of school counsellors. It is suggested that they work together with teachers, principals and parents to generate an atmosphere conducive to optimal learning and growth. School counsellors can do this by providing consultation and information, and training about discipline approaches (Benshoff et al., 1994; Hall and Lin, 1994). In their explanation of the consultation model, Hall and Lin (1994) suggest that school counsellors can help teachers to solve current problems and to improve their skills to deal effectively with similar problems in future.

In addition, through in-service training, teachers could be helped to improve their relationships with students (Weishew and Peng, 1993). School counsellors would be the right people to work with teachers collaboratively in introducing and implementing behaviour and discipline policies. An advantage of working with counsellors is that they have already established a working relationship with teachers. This makes cooperation easier. They can help teachers to run systematic approaches within a circle of friends or behaviourist oriented-programme (e.g. assertive discipline).

Martin and Baldwin (1996) argue that school counsellors can arrange mentor programmes in which novice teachers have a chance to observe experienced teachers. This helps inexperienced teachers to develop realistic psychological understanding and forms of management practice which are less controlling. Counsellor-led support groups also provide an opportunity for those teachers who want to share problems and help each other.

In addition to the structured programmes, (or before introducing them) there should be some sessions on self theories. School counsellors are well educated in self-approaches which explain how self-concepts and self-esteem develop, attitudes and behaviours which are harmful to self-esteem and behaviours that support or enhance self esteem. Teachers should be aware that their attitudes and behaviours are essential for generating positive feelings in pupils themselves. Otherwise, the mechanical use of behaviour-oriented approaches may result in disappointment.
6.7. SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE STUDIES

In this study, systematic observation and field notes including incident examples and the teacher’s classroom management strategies took place in the same sessions. It would have been better to carry out the two kind of observations separately at different times. It might have enhanced the amount of interaction and the quality of the incidents recorded so the data would have been enriched by deeper insights.

Efficacy beliefs change according to dimensions such as the degree of similarity of activities, qualitative features of situations, characteristics of the individual and behavioural, cognitive and affective modalities (Bandura, 1997, p. 43). In interviews, one teacher said that the number of disruptive children in the classroom affected his confidence. Other teachers mentioned that the type and number of misbehaviour incidents changed from one classroom to another. Whether increased misbehaviour in the classroom reduces teacher efficacy needs further investigation. Observing high and low efficacy teachers when they are teaching in different classrooms would have generated the answer to this question. In those studies it would be interesting to look at the effects on self-efficacy in classroom management of variables such as pupils’ age or grade, class size and level of teachers’ preparation and subject knowledge.

Classroom interaction can only be understood fully if all elements of it are studied. Therefore considering the pupils’ point of view as well as the teachers’ could have added richness and deeper understanding to the picture that emerged as a result of the analysis. If interviews had been carried out with pupils, their focus would have been on the pupils’ knowledge of classroom and school rules, their understanding of what constituted appropriate behaviour or inappropriate behaviour in the classroom and their perception of the teacher’s confidence and managing style.

This study is descriptive in nature, investigating relationships between teachers’ sense of efficacy and classroom management. An experimental study which utilises the sources of efficacy and is based on a treatment-control group design could be the next stage in attempting to enhance the self-efficacy of teachers with low levels of confidence.
6.8. CONCLUSIONS

The present study provides a valuable and useful exploration of the relationship between classroom management strategies and teacher efficacy in British and Turkish primary school teachers. What marks this study unique is the way in which it examines classroom management strategies in respect of self-efficacy in two different countries. The conclusions drawn from the study rely on comparison between participants according to the variables self-efficacy and country of origin.

- Sense of efficacy is identified as one of the most powerful determinants in establishing positive classroom discipline and creating a productive learning environment. Because strategies used by high efficacy teachers seemed preventive, long term and positive, pupils in those teachers’ classrooms spent most of their time concentrating on tasks or learning.

- School behaviour policy, which is not in action in Turkey, facilitates classroom management in the following ways:
  - provides a mutual discipline approach for all staff in school
  - makes collaboration among teachers and other colleagues systematic
  - determines a discipline approach that is consistent
  - makes it possible to communicate with pupils clearly and openly especially in the explanation and implementation of the rules
  - encourages pupils to take responsibility for their own behaviour

- The main difference between Turkish and British teachers is seen in their training for classroom management during initial teacher training and in-service training. That is, Turkish teachers had not been introduced to this topic in any structured way until the 1998-1999 academic year.
• Feeling confident in the subject area (having prepared and planned lessons well), having support from the Head and colleagues, attending well designed in-service courses, teachers' own perception about their role as teachers, their personal characteristics and witnessing their own success emerged as influential elements in developing self-efficacy in classroom management.

• Having focused on a sense of efficacy as one of the personal characteristics of teachers in two different cultures, this study has shown that there is a clear need for support both for Turkish teachers and for low efficacy teachers in both countries in their classroom management. Teachers may be given support through in-service training in particular management strategies, or provided with a clear behaviour policy. Additionally, especially in Turkey, policy makers should consider planning guidance for both teacher trainees and qualified teachers in classroom management.

This is a very rare comparative study of teacher efficacy. It not only helps to clarify the role that a sense of efficacy has in relation to classroom management, but also stimulates new research topics and questions. The examination of teacher efficacy by considering several internal (teacher oriented) and external (organisational/environmental) factors in classroom management in primary and secondary level will be a worthwhile subject to study in future.
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APPENDIX I

QUESTIONNAIRE ABOUT PERCEPTIONS IN CLASSROOM BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT

YOUR NAME:

SCHOOL NAME:

GENDER: □ FEMALE □ MALE

1-Which year group are you teaching now?

2-How long have you been a teacher?

3-Have you attended any in-service training courses run by an educational psychologist?

□ YES □ NO

If your answer is “Yes” go to question 4, if “No” go to question 7

4- When did you attend the last one?

5-Was the course (please circle):

□ Mainly theoretical □ Mainly practical □ Balance of theory and practice

6a- I found course:

□ Very helpful □ Helpful □ A little helpful □ Not helpful

6b- It was:

□ Idealistic □ Difficult to transfer to classroom □ Not practical

□ Helpful only if you have small number of children

• Please say briefly why this was?
Which three methods do you use most often to handle disruptive behaviour? (PLEASE PUT A TICK)

☐ Turn their attention to another activity
☐ Change their places
☐ Talk and explain one to one
☐ Give praise for appropriate behaviour
☐ Remove the child from the situation
☐ Ignore the behavior
☐ Give punishment, like taking something they like from them or using dinner time to finish tasks
☐ Talk with parents
☐ Look critically myself (my coping style)
☐ Talk with them as a group after event. (group discussion)
☐ Shouting
☐ Other (Please specify)
BEHAVIOR MANAGEMENT EFFICACY SCALE

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Please number your responses in the boxes provided.


1- I can give praise for appropriate behaviour when it is required
   
2- If I catch misbehaviour earlier, I can handle that behaviour quickly and effectively
   
3- When I meet inappropriate behaviour I can calmly explain why the behaviour is undesirable for me, for other pupils and for teaching
   
4- I can show or explain the appropriate behaviour expected from children
   
5- If necessary I can work with parents collaboratively to solve the problems
   
6- If my first strategy does not work I know what to do next
   
7- When a child starts to disrupt another child, I can make him/her take part in the lesson by giving an academic task when appropriate
   
8- My pupils know that I can find out what is really happening when they have been fighting, thumping or kicking
   
9- If I see any inappropriate behaviour between children (e.g. fighting, kicking, teasing) I can discuss with them what happened first so that they can express their feelings and opinions and start to realise what they actually did
   
10- My non-verbal behaviour gives students signals that I am confident while I am teaching, communicating and dealing with their difficulties
11- Without stopping teaching I do something to bring pupils back into lesson if they are talking to each other

12- I can move around the classroom calmly/ freely

13- I can scan the class and try to make eye contact when I am talking to them

14- I can communicate with pupils clearly and precisely

15- I have very effective classroom management skills

16- I can communicate to children that I am serious about getting appropriate behaviour

17- I am confident of my ability to begin the year so that students will learn to behave well

18- If a student in my class becomes disruptive and noisy I feel assured that I know some techniques to redirect him/her quickly

19- When a problem occurs I am able to handle it quietly and directly without feeling negative, or using sarcasm
ADINIZ VE SOYADINIZ:

CALISTIGINIZ OKUL:

CINSIYETINIZ: □ KADIN □ ERKEK

1- Su anda hangi sinifi okutuyorsunuz? .......

2- Ne kadar suredir ogretmenlik yapiyorsunuz? .......

3- Su ana kadar sorunlu ogrenci davranışları ile basetmeyi iceren ve eğitim psikologları ya da Rehberlik Araştırma Merkezi tarafından düzenlenenen hizmet içi eğitim kursuna katıldınız mı?
   □ Evet □ Hayir

* Eger cevabiniz evet ise 4. soruya, hayir ise 7. soruya geciniz.

4- En son katıldığınız hizmet içi eğitim kursunun tarihi yazınız? .......

5- Kursun genel yapısiyla ilgili olarak asağıda verilen seçeneklerden sizin için uygun olda isaretleyiniz.
   □ Genellikle kuramsalı
   □ Genellikle uygulamaya yolculuk
   □ Kuramsal ve uygulama boyutunu birlikte ieriyordu

6a- Kursu sizin için yararlı olup olmaması açısından değerlendirir misiniz?
   □ Çok yararlı □ Yararlı □ Biraz yararlı □ Yararlı değil

6b- Kurs hakkındaki görüşunuzu asagıda verilen seçeneklerden birini seçerek belirtir misiniz?
   □ Anlatılanları gerçek sınıf ortamina uyarlamak mümkün değil (idealdaki kalıyor)
   □ Sınıf ortamina aktarılması zor
   □ Uygulamaya yolculuk değil
   □ Sınıfta öğrenci sayısı az olduğunda uygulaması kolay

* Lutfen işaretlediginiz seçeneke ilgili ne düşünüğünüzü kisaca belirtir misiniz?
7- Sınıfınızda rahatsız edici davranışlarla baş_derken aşağıdaki metodlardan **en sık** kullandığınız üç tanesini işaretleyiniz.

- □ Dikkati başka bir aktiviteye çevirmeye
- □ Yerini değiştirmeye
- □ Tek tek konuşma ve açıklama yapma
- □ Uygun davranış odullendirmeye
- □ Ögrenciyi ortamdan (siniftan) uzaklastırma
- □ Davranışı görmemezlikten gelme
- □ Sevdikleri bir seyden mahrum bırakma, tenefuste yarımlar kalan odevini tamamlama gibi cezalar verme.
- □ Velilerle görüşme
- □ Kendi davranışlarını eleştirel bir şekilde gözden geçirme
- □ Herhangi bir olumsuz olaydan sonra onlarla grup halinde konuşma
- □ Bagırma
- □ Diger (lutfen belirtiniz)
DAVRANIS YONETIMI YETKINLIK OLCEGI

Asagidaki ifadeleri dikkatlice okuduktan sonra, her ifadeyi size uygunluk derecesine gore degereendiriniz. Eger ifade size kesinlikle uygun degilse 1, uygun degil ise 2, biraz uygun ise 3, uygunsa 4, tamamiyla uygunsa 5 rakamlarini ifadelerin karsisindaki ayrilan karelerin icine yazarak belirtiniz.

 Kesinlikle Uygun degil 1  Uygun Degil 2  Biraz Uygun 3
 Uygun 4  Tamamiyla Uygun 5

1- Gerektiginde uygun davranisi odullendiririm. □
2- Eger yaramazlık davranisinin erken farkina varirsam, onunla cabuk ve etkili bir sekilde basedebilirim. □
3- Uygun olmayan bir davranisla karsilastigimda, bunun benim, diger ogrenciler ve ders icin neden istenmedik bir davranis oldugunu sakinlikle aciklayabilirim. □
4- Ogrcilerden beklenen uygun davranislarin neler oldugunu aciklayabilirim. □
5- Eger gerekirse, problemleri cozmek icin velilerle ortaklasa calisabilirim. □
6- Eger kullandigim bir yontem sonuc vermez ise, bir sonraki asamada ne yapacagimi bilirim. □
7- Bir ogrenci digerini rahatsız etmeye basladiginda, dersle ilgili bir gorev vererek O’nun derse katilimini saglayabilirim. □
8- Ogrncilerim, yumruklayip tekmeleyerek, kavga etme gibi aralarinda gecen uygun olmayan davranislarin altinda ne olup bittigini ortaya cikarabilecegimin farkindadirdar.
9- Cocuklar arasında uygun olmayan bir davranış gördüğümde, olayı neyin başlattığını (ilk önce ne olduğunu) araştırabilirim; böylece onlar duyguya ve görüşlerini ifade etme olanlığı bulup gerçekte ne yaptıklarının farkına varırlar.

10- Ders anlatırken, öğrencilerle iletişim kurarken ve sorunlarla başederken, sozel olmayan davranışlarımızı öğrencilerin güvenli olduğum mesajı verir.

11- Öğrenciler ders sırasında birbirleriyle konuşmaya başladıında, dersi bolmeden dikkatlerini derse çekmek için bir şey yapabiliririm.

12- Sınıfta sakin ve rahat bir şekilde dolasabiliririm.

13- Öğrencilerle konuşurken sınıfı gözden geçirep onlarla göz teması kurabilirim.

14- Öğrencilerle açık ve net bir şekilde iletişim kurabilirim.

15- Sınıf yönetim konusunda oldukça etkili becerilere sahibim.

16- Uygun davranışlar elde etme konusunda kararlı olduğumu öğrencilerle gösterebilirim.

17- Öğrencilerin iyi davranışlarını öğreneceklerini konusunda kendi yetenekime güvenerek ders yılına baslarız.

18- Bir öğrenci rahatsız edici ve gurultulu olduğunda, O'nu yönlendirmek için bazı teknikler kullanmakta kendimi güvenli hissedirim.

19- Bir проблемle karşılaştığımda sessizce ve doğrudan, olumsuz ve alayci duygular yaşamaksızın onunla başedebilirim.
Dear Head Teachers

I am writing to ask if you would be willing to ask some of the KS2 teachers in your school to fill in a short questionnaire about coping with disruptive behaviour, for some research we are carrying out. It would take about ten minutes to complete.

We do realise that teachers are very busy! However, we would be very grateful for your help in trying to find out more about an area which obviously concerns many teachers, and we would of course be very pleased to share the results with you.

If you feel able to help, the researcher, Meral Atici, will arrange to come out to the school.

Best wishes

Dr. Roger Merry 

Meral Atici
APPENDIX IV

QUESTIONNAIRE ABOUT PERCEPTIONS IN CLASSROOM BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT

Dear Colleagues,

I am an Ed. D. student at Leicester University in School of Education. I have been studying classroom management particularly behaviour management in the primary school in England and Turkey.

This questionnaire is about your perceptions and ideas in classroom management with particular emphasis disruptive behaviour. I would suggest that when you are filling the questionnaire it is helpful to think yourself in each situation given and decide what would feel about it. It probably takes no more than 15 minutes to complete the questionnaire. All information from you will be confidential.

Many thanks for completing the questionnaire

MERAL ATICI

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
APPENDIX V

BEHAVIOR MANAGEMENT OBSERVATION SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIS.</th>
<th>T.RS</th>
<th>P.RS</th>
<th>PUPL</th>
<th>ACT.</th>
<th>LOC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Name of Teacher: ......................................... Date: ....................
Subject of Lesson: ........................................ Year Group: ........
Time for Start and Ending: ....................... Number of Pupils:......

INCIDENT EXAMPLES/FIELD NOTES

|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|

[Table continues with empty rows]
APPENDIX VI

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR ENGLISH TEACHERS

1- What kinds of misbehaviour do you often come across in your class?
2- Do you think some students have more behaviour problem than others? If yes, why?
3- Is there any particular time period during a lesson and a day you encounter more misbehaviour? Could you tell more about it?
4- Is your classroom layout always like it is now? Do you think this affects children’s behaviour? If yes, how?
5- Are your children more likely to be naughty in different teaching situations like when they are working by themselves or in a whole class setting? Could you tell more about this?
6- How do you deal with misbehaviour in your classroom? Which range of methods would you use?
   • Would you ever ignore misbehaviour?
7- How do you feel when dealing with misbehaviour? Do you feel confident to cope with it? Could you tell more about this?
   • Have you ever felt that you can’t cope with it?
8- Do you think feeling confident influences your managing style? How? Could you explain more?
9- How did you learn about managing pupil’s behaviour?
10- What influences your confidence about managing disruptive behaviour? (Prompt and ask about experience, teacher training course, inset, personal characteristics, reading?)
11- What sorts of things makes behaviour management easier? (Prompt e.g. knowing children, having a support teacher?)
12- Do you think feeling confident in your subject area (teaching) influences your classroom atmosphere in terms of behaviour management? How?
13- Is there a school policy shared by all teachers?
   • Please say more about it. Is it easy to put in practice?
14- If you have a problem is there a person you would share your difficulty with?
15- Do you explain your expectations to pupils at the beginning of term? Please say more about this.
16- When pupils are clear about your expectations how does this affect classroom atmosphere?
17- Suppose you have a five point scale which shows how effective you are in behaviour management, what rating you would give to yourself?
APPENDIX VII
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR TURKISH TEACHERS
GORUSME SORULARI
1-Sinifinizda en çok karsılaştığınız rahatsız edici davranışlar nelerdir?
2-Bazı öğrencilerin diğerlerine göre daha çok davranış sorunlarına sahip olduğunu düşünüyor musunuz? Eğer evet ise nedenleri nelerdir?
3-Ders ve gün boyunca istenmeyen davranışların coğlukla görüldüğü bir zaman dilimi var mı? Bu konuda biraz daha bilgi verir misiniz?
4-Sinif düzeniniz sürekli bu şekilde mi? Sinif düzeninin (oturum şeklinin) çocukların davranışlarının etkilediğini düşünüyor musunuz? Eğer ise nasıl?
• 5-Bireysel çalışırken ya da tüm sinif öğretmeni gibi farklı öğretim durumlarında öğrencileriniz daha yarımaz olma eğiliminde midirler? Bu konuda biraz daha bilgi verir misiniz?
6-Sinifinizde istenmeyen davranışlarla nasıl basediyorsunuz? Ne tür metodlar kullanıyorsunuz?
• Hic bu davranışları gormemekten geldiginiz oldu mu?
7-Istenmeyen davranışların üstesinden gelirken nasıl hissediyorsunuz? Onunla basetme konusunda güvenli hisseder misiniz? Bu konuyu biraz daha açıklar mı?
• His bu davranışların üstesinden gelemeyeceginiz hissettiginiz anlar oldu mu?
8-Kendinizi güvenli hissetmenizin yönetim tarzını etkilediğini düşünüyor musunuz?
Eğer etkiliyorsa ise nasıl? Biraz açıklar misiniz?
9-Ogrencilerin istenmeyen davranışları ile basetmeyi nasıl öğrendiniz?
10-Rahatsız edici davranışları yönetirken güvenli hissetmenizde ne gibi faktörler etkili oldu? Deneyim, öğretmen eğitim kursu (formasyon), hizmet içi eğitim, kişisel özellikler ile ilgili sorular sor!
11-Ne tür seyler davranış yönetiminin daha kolay hale getirir? Örneğin, öğrenciyi tanıma, yardımcı öğretmenin olması gibi.
12-Konu alanında kendinizi güvenli hissetmenizin sınıftaki atmosferi davranış yönetimi açısından etkilediğini düşünüyor musunuz? Eğer ise nasıl?
• öğretmenlik deneyiminizin sınıf yönetimi tarzınıza nasıl bir etkisi var?
13-Okulunuzda butun ogretmenler tarafından kullanılan bir davranis yonetmeligi var mı? Eger var ise biraz bilgi verir misiniz? Bunlari uygulamaya gecirmek kolay oluyor mu?
14-Bir probleminizin oldugunda bunu paylasabileceginiz kimse var mı?
15-Donem basinda, ogrencilerinizden beklentilerinizi, uygun olan ve olmayan kurallari aciklar misinz? Bu konuda biraz daha ayrintili bilgi verir misiniz?
16-Ogrencilerinizin sizin beklentilerinizden haberdar olmalarini sınıf atmosferiniiniz nasıl etkiler?
17-Davranis yönetimi konusunda ne kadar etkili oldukunuzu gösteren 5 noktali bir olcekte kendinizi degere lendirdiginizi dusunun. Kendinize nasil bir deger verirdiniz?