



Teachers' Reactions Towards Misbehavior in the Classroom

Ahmet Çoban¹

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to determine primary school teachers' reactions towards student misbehavior in the classroom, and to evaluate and analyze these behaviors in terms of different dimensions. We observed the courses of 43 primary school teachers from four different schools. Our aim is to reveal the reactions of primary school teachers towards their students' misbehavior in the classroom, and whether these reactions change regarding variables such as school, class, and course. Furthermore, we analyze teachers' reactions in terms of their gender, alma mater, and seniority. Consequently, teachers' reactions towards students' misbehavior in the classroom differ by schools, classes, and courses; in addition, the teachers' gender, alma mater, and seniority affect these reactions. Remarkably, the research reveals corporal punishment and insulting statements among some of the reactions.

Keywords

Primary school teacher
Classroom
Misbehavior
Reaction

Article Info

Received: 03.10.2015
Accepted: 07.07.2015
Online Published: 08.04.2015

DOI: 10.15390/EB.2015.4520

Introduction

The formation of student behavior (Başar, 1998) in the classroom is defined by a structured learning environment (Aydın, 1998), since behavioral change is generally the goal of education (Demirel, 2007). Effective "teaching and learning" can occur with well-conducted classroom management, since the primary aim of classroom organization is to facilitate teaching and learning (Pollard, 1997). When teachers organize their classroom, they organize not only the classroom, but also their role in the classroom and that of their students. Classroom organization determines what is taught in class and how it is taught (Getzels, 1974, cited in Türnüklü, 2000). The main goal of education is to change students' behaviors; this change can effectively occur in classroom environments where individuals behavior is always at the forefront.

Human needs underlie human behavior. These needs create stimulations that push to meet them. Due to these stimulations, motivation can occur and humans exhibit behavior according to this motivation (Başar, 1998). The classroom environment must be well structured and organized to facilitate a positive learning experience (Merrett & Wheldall, 1993, cited in Gürsel, Sarı & Dilmaç, 2004). However, students who come from any community or any life style, and with different behavioral habits (Grossman, 1991), may naturally misbehave in the classroom (Başar, 1998; Aydın, 1998). Misbehavior within the classroom cannot occur accidentally. A variety of variables, including students, teachers, school structure and classrooms, learning activities and materials, affect students'

¹ Dicle University, Ziya Gökalp Education Faculty, Department of Educational Sciences, Turkey, acoban@dicle.edu.tr

behavior (Türnüklü, 1999). Misbehavior is a student's all-intended or unintended behavior that prevents any educational effort, corrupts the teaching-learning process, seriously hinders schools' normal processes, and disregards and exploits the common rights of students and teachers in schools and classrooms (Başar, 1998; Kyriacou, 1986; Lawrence & Steed, 1984, cited in Türnüklü, 1999; Boz, 2003; Çelik, 2003; Küçükahmet, 2001; Celep, 2008).

Misbehavior in the classroom is inevitable: students may misbehave as a result of prior experiences in or out of school (Bull & Solity, 1996). Students do not deliberately come to school misbehave, but, due to corporal, emotional, and behavioral disturbances caused by factors, students may find themselves in unexpected situations (Küçükahmet, 2001; Şişman et al., 2004). While their teachers are busy with arrangement, administration and planning in the classroom students will always act either favorably or unfavorably (Dillon & Maguire, 1998). According to some scientists, misbehavior does not originate from students' personal identities, but from their teachers' behavior (Stephens & Crawley, 1994). Different students with different characteristics may misbehave for different reasons (Başar, 1998); for instance, vague classroom rules or an unstable classroom climate may trigger misbehavior (Şişman & Turan, 2004). Misbehavior can be considered a precious information source for teachers and a call to improve their classroom management methods. Students' misbehavior helps teachers to understand and interpret students' behaviors reasons (Bull & Solity, 1996).

Student behavior can be modified when the appropriate classroom environment is obtained, when classroom climate is structured, when potentially harmful misbehavior is prevented by convenient approaches, and when students obey classroom rules decided by both the teacher and themselves. "Misbehavior", defined as behavior that prevents the "teaching-learning process" negatively affects in-class communication, but a teacher's negative approach to modifying this behavior may create an unstable classroom environment. Teachers' approaches towards misbehavior may solve actual problems, but sometimes they may increase or complicate problems instead. This situation pertains directly to the quality of the teacher's approach: for example, teachers can use misbehavior as a tool for gaining educational experience. In classrooms consisting of students with different family structure, upbringing, and socio-economic background, teachers are more responsible for establishing classroom harmony (Gürsel et al., 2004). Hence, teachers' management skills of their students' misbehavior are closely related to their occupational and social proficiency.

Despite the fact that some researches (Ada, Baysal & Korucu 2005; Dilekmen, 2001; Memişoğlu, 2005; Okutan, 2004; Türnüklü, 1999; Yiğit, 2001) have examined teachers' views about misbehavior and similar subjects, few researches, using observation techniques to analyze and evaluate, teachers' reactions towards misbehavior have been conducted. The necessity of this research stems from the fact that teachers' reactions towards misbehavior in a classroom environment where the teaching-learning process occurs have to be revealed based on observations, and these reactions need to be analyzed using multiple variables.

Purpose

The purpose of this research is to determine primary school teachers' reactions towards students' misbehavior in the classroom, and to evaluate and analyze these behaviors in terms of different dimensions. According to this purpose, the following questions are addressed:

A. Do teachers' reactions towards students' misbehavior differ depending on:

1. Schools
2. Classes
3. Courses

B. Do teachers' reactions towards students' misbehavior differ depending on their:

1. Gender
2. Alma mater
3. Seniority

The category and level of teachers' reactions towards misbehavior can be used to reveal important clues about primary school teachers and classroom environments.

Method

Design of the Research

The observation technique, "the most important and one of the basic data collection tools of qualitative research methodology" (Ekiz, 2003), is used in this research to determine and analyze primary school teachers' reactions towards students' misbehavior in the classroom. "The most important property of the observation technique is that observed individuals stay in their natural environment. Most of the behaviors may only be determined objectively by this technique" (Karasar, 2012).

Population and Sample

The research population consists entirely of primary school teachers who work in the centrum of Sivas. The sample is constructed using the simple random sampling method and consists of 43 primary school teachers from four different schools; 12 teachers from school A, six from school B, 12 from school C, and 13 from school D.

Data Collection Tool

For this research, an observation form that consists of teachers' reactions towards students' misbehavior in the classroom was developed. While developing this form, the following studies were examined: Bull and Solity (1996), Cohen, Manion and Morrison (1998), Wragg (1996), Yılmaz and Şahinkaya (2010), Ada et al. (2005), Başar (1998), Celep (2002; 2008), Memişoğlu (2005), Okutan (2004), Şişman and Turan (2004), Türnüklü (1999), and Yiğit (2001). The "reactions" in the observation form were determined after a literature review with two experts and two teachers.

A team of three observers watched teachers by sitting in different places in the classrooms. The participant observation technique was used in order to preserve the natural classroom environment. To observe teachers in their natural environment, the observers were chosen among pre-service teachers who successfully completed a "School Experience" course. The pre-service teachers were informed on how to observe the primary school teachers without being distracting, and how to fill out the observation form (examples were provided). In the context of "Teaching Practice in Classroom Teaching", the pre-service teachers observed each teacher for one hour of class time and filled out the observation form.

Data Analyses

The average of the observers' scores has been used as the data for each teacher's reaction. For each teacher, descriptive statistics such as frequency and percentage are applied. By using the gathered data, we tried to determine which reactions at which level are given by primary school teachers, and whether these reactions change regarding variables such as school, class, and course. Furthermore, we analyzed and interpreted teachers' reactions in terms of their gender, alma mater, and seniority, and we provided results as well as some implications.

Results

Findings are presented in the order of the questions provided in the "Purpose" section. The teachers' reactions towards students' misbehavior in the classroom and the frequency of reactions are calculated by using frequencies and percentages, according to the frequency tables, and comments about the first five reactions are given.

Concerning the question "Do teachers' reactions towards students' misbehavior depend on schools"; table 1 presents the distribution of 43 primary school teachers from four different schools: 12 teachers from school A, six from school B, 12 from school C, and 13 from school D, along with their reactions towards students' misbehavior in the classroom and the frequency of reactions regarding the schools.

Table 1. Distribution of Teachers' Reactions with Regard to Schools

REACTIONS	SCHOOLS									
	A (12)		B (6)		C (12)		D (13)		TOTAL (43)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Verbal warning	60	19.87	19	13.87	55	21.40	81	22.75	215	20.44
Did not notice	63	20.86	56	40.88	27	10.51	46	12.92	192	18.25
Warned severely (reprimanded)	28	9.27	7	5.11	43	16.73	40	11.24	118	11.22
Asked a question	32	10.60	11	8.03	27	10.51	44	12.36	114	10.84
Made eye contact	18	5.96	13	9.49	39	15.18	36	10.11	106	10.08
Came close to the student	29	9.60	8	5.84	23	8.95	26	7.30	86	8.17
Touched (students' arm, shoulder etc.)	16	5.30	11	8.03	13	5.06	22	6.18	62	5.90
Ignored	18	5.96	8	5.84	17	6.61	15	4.21	58	5.51
Warned without being noticed by other students (gesture)	4	1.32	2	1.46	9	3.50	23	6.46	38	3.61
Corporal punishment	21	6.95	1	0.73			10	2.81	32	3.04
Called for a talk after course	4	1.32					3	0.84	7	0.67
Other:	9	2.98	1	0.73	4	1.56	10	2.81	24	2.28
Total	302	100	137	100	257	100	356	100	1052	100

As seen in table 1, the quantitative proportions of teachers' reactions towards students' misbehavior depend on schools. In school A, in order of frequency, teachers' reactions were "did not notice", "verbal warning", "asked a question", "came close to the student" and "corporal punishment". For school B, reactions were "did not notice", "verbal warning", "made eye contact", "asked a question" and "touched" respectively. In school C, teachers' reactions were "verbal warning", "warned severely (reprimanded)", "made eye contact", "did not notice" and "asked a question" respectively. In school D, reactions were "verbal warning", "did not notice", "asked a question", "warned severely (reprimanded)" and "made eye contact".

Generally, the preferred reaction among teachers was, in order of frequency “verbal warning”, then “did not notice”, “warned severely (reprimanded)”, “asked a question”, and lastly “made eye contact”. The presence of “physical punishment” among the teachers’ reactions, though at a lower order, reflects problems in the education system. In the “other” category, the following reactions took place by their number of repetitions: “slammed fist on the table” (6), “fined” (4), “Good, that is very good behavior (burlesque)” (4), “rubbish”(1), “buddy”(1), “silly question” (1), “are you barmy”(1), “cur”(1), “don’t look bovine” (1), “made the student repeat the subject” (1), “changed the student’s seat” (1), “kept quiet”(1), and “warned student by name” (1). Even if the frequency of these reactions is low, the existence of insulting statements and the teachers’ incompatible reactions with their educational environment present ongoing problems.

Concerning the question “Do teachers’ reactions towards students’ misbehavior depend on classes”; among 43 primary school teachers, six teach 1st grade, seven teach 2nd grade, 10 teach 3rd grade, eight teach 4th grade, and 12 teach 5th grade. Table 2 presents the distribution of 43 primary school teachers’ reactions towards students’ misbehavior in the classroom and the frequency of those reactions regarding classes.

Table 2. Distribution of Teachers’ Reactions with Regard to Classes

REACTIONS	CLASSES									
	1 st grade		2 nd grade		3 rd grade		4 th grade		5 th grade	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Did not notice	48	28.74	16	9.25	17	8.02	45	18.22	66	26.09
Ignored	7	4.19	13	7.51	9	4.25	10	4.05	19	7.51
Made eye contact	16	9.58	17	9.83	25	11.79	22	8.91	26	10.28
Came close to the student	8	4.79	27	15.61	18	8.49	18	7.29	15	5.93
Touched (students’ arm, shoulder etc.)	10	5.99	22	12.72	10	4.72	13	5.26	7	2.77
Asked a question	23	13.77	22	12.72	39	18.40	17	6.88	13	5.14
Warned without being noticed by other students (gesture)	6	3.59	9	5.20	10	4.72	3	1.21	10	3.95
Verbal warning	20	11.98	25	14.45	41	19.34	75	30.36	54	21.34
Warned severely (reprimanded)	24	14.37	14	8.09	22	10.38	32	12.96	26	10.28
Called for a talk after course					3	1.42			4	1.58
Corporal punishment	5	2.99	8	4.62	13	8.13	3	1.21	3	1.19
Other:					5	2.36	9	3.64	10	3.95
Total	167	100	173	100	212	100	247	100	253	100

As seen in table 2, 1st grade teachers’ reactions were, in order of frequency, “did not notice”, “warned severely (reprimanded)”, “asked a question”, “verbal warning” and “made eye contact”; 2nd grade teachers’ reactions were “came close to the student”, “verbal warning”, “touched”, “asked a question” and “made eye contact” respectively; 3rd grade teachers’ reactions were “verbal warning”, “asked a question”, “made eye contact”, “warned severely (reprimanded)” and “came close to the student” respectively; 4th grade teachers’ reactions were “verbal warning”, “did not notice”, “warned severely (reprimanded)”, “made eye contact” and “came close to the student” respectively; 5th grade teachers’ reactions were “did not notice”, “verbal warning”, “made eye contact”, “warned severely (reprimanded)” and “ignored” respectively. The “corporal punishment” reaction is given by 3rd, 2nd, 1st, 4th and 5th grade teachers respectively. 3rd grade teachers gave the following reactions in the “other” category: “Good! That is very good behavior (burlesque)” (4) and “warned student by name” (1). 4th grade teachers gave the following reactions in the “other” category: “slammed fist on the table” (6), “made the student repeat the subject” (1), “changed the student’s seat” (1), “kept quiet” (1). 5th grade teachers gave the following reactions in the “other” category: “fined” (4), “rubbish” (1), “buddy”(1), “silly question” (1), “are you barmy?” (1), “cur” (1), and “don’t look bovine” (1).

Concerning the question “Do teachers’ reactions towards students’ misbehavior depend on courses”; among 43 primary school teachers, nine are observed in the “Life Science” course, 14 in the “Turkish” course, seven in “Mathematics”, six in “Science and Technology”, four in “Social Sciences”, one in “Music”, one in “Visual Arts”, and one in “Individual and Collective Activities”. Table 3 presents the distribution of 43 primary school teachers’ reactions towards students’ misbehavior in the classroom and the frequency of reactions regarding the courses.

Table 3. Distribution of Teachers’ Reactions with Regard to Courses

REACTIONS	COURSES															
	Life Science(9)		Turkish (14)		Mathematics (7)		ScienceandTech. (6)		SocialSciences(4)		Music (1)		Visual Arts (1)		Ind. & Collec. Act.(1)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Did not notice	22	9.57	72	25.99	27	19.42	22	11.52	45	27.44	1	5.26	2	11.11	1	7.14
Ignored	17	7.39	13	4.69	8	5.76	9	4.71	9	5.49	1	5.26	1	5.56		
Made eye contact	21	9.13	27	9.75	17	12.23	20	10.47	13	7.93	4	21.05	3	16.67	1	7.14
Came close to the student	27	11.74	21	7.58	8	5.76	19	9.95	7	4.27	2	10.53	1	5.56	1	7.14
Touched(students’ arm, shoulder etc.)	26	11.30	18	6.50	4	2.88	11	5.76			2	10.53			1	7.14
Asked a question	38	16.52	38	13.72	13	9.35	13	6.81	6	3.66	1	5.26	3	16.67	2	14.29
Warned without being noticed by other students (gesture)	9	3.91	14	5.05	2	1.44	8	4.19	2	1.22	3	15.79				
Verbal warning	30	13.04	46	16.61	35	25.18	45	23.56	46	28.05	5	26.32	3	16.67	5	35.71
Warned severely (reprimanded)	28	12.17	23	8.30	19	13.67	19	9.95	21	12.80			5	27.78	3	21.43
Called for a talk after course	2	0.87					1	0.52	4	2.44						
Corporal punishment	9	3.91	5	1.81	6	4.32	11	5.76	1	0.61						
Other:	1	0.43					13	6.81	10	6.10						
Total	230	100	277	100	139	100	191	100	164	100	19	100	18	100	14	100

As seen in table 3, there is only one teacher for “Music”, “Visual Arts”, and “Individual and Collective Activities” courses; the data for these courses are left out of the evaluation. For the “Life Science” courses, teachers’ reactions were, in order of frequency, “asked a question”, “verbal warning”, “warned severely (reprimanded)”, “came close to the student”, and “touched”; for the “Turkish” courses, reactions were “did not notice”, “verbal warning”, “asked a question”, “made eye contact” and “warned severely (reprimanded)” respectively; in the “Mathematics” courses, teachers’ reactions were “verbal warning”, “did not notice”, “warned severely (reprimanded)”, “made eye contact”, and “asked a question” respectively; in the “Science and Technology” courses teachers’ reactions were “verbal warning”, “did not notice”, “made eye contact”, “came close to the student” and “warned severely (reprimanded)” respectively; for “Social Sciences” courses teachers’ reactions were “verbal warning”, “did not notice”, “warned severely (reprimanded)”, “made eye contact” and “other” respectively. Most reactions in the “other” category were given in the “Science and Technology” courses: “Good! That is very good behavior (burlesque)” (4), “rubbish” (1), “buddy” (1),

“silly question” (1), “are you barmy?” (1), “cur” (1), “don’t look bovine” (1), “changed the student’s seat” (1), “kept quiet” (1) and “made the student repeat the subject” (1). The reaction “corporal punishment” was given in “Science and Technology”, “Mathematics”, “Life Science”, “Turkish”, and “Social Sciences” respectively.

Concerning the question “Do teachers’ reactions towards students’ misbehavior depend on teachers’ gender”; among 43 primary school teachers, 23 are female and 20 are male. Table 4 presents the distribution of 43 primary school teachers’ reactions towards students’ misbehavior in the classroom and the frequency of reactions regarding the teachers’ genders.

Table 4. Distribution of Teachers’ Reactions with Regard to Teachers’ Gender

REACTIONS	GENDER			
	FEMALE (23)		MALE (20)	
	f	%	f	%
Verbal warning	103	19.85	112	21.01
Did not notice	83	15.99	109	20.45
Made eye contact	63	12.14	43	8.07
Warned severely (reprimanded)	61	11.75	57	10.69
Asked a question	55	10.60	59	11.07
Came close to the student	46	8.86	40	7.50
Ignored	30	5.78	28	5.25
Touched (students’ arm, shoulder etc.)	23	4.43	39	7.31
Warned without being noticed by other students (gesture)	25	4.82	13	2.44
Corporal punishment	18	3.47	14	2.63
Called for a talk after course	3	0.58	4	0.75
Other:	9	1.73	15	2.81
Total	519	100	533	100

As seen in table 4, female teachers’ reactions, in order of frequency, were “verbal warning”, “did not notice”, “made eye contact”, “warned severely (reprimanded)”, and “asked a question”. Male teachers’ reactions were “verbal warning”, “did not notice”, “asked a question”, “warned severely (reprimanded)” and “made eye contact” respectively. “Corporal punishment” is mostly given by female teachers, but this was unexpected, because of the awareness that sociologically, women are more sensitive to violence. The result of this research shows that more comprehensive study is required on the subject. Female teachers gave the following reactions in the “other” category: “fined” (4), “Good! That is very good behavior (burlesque)” (4) and “warned with the name of student” (1). Male teachers gave the following reactions in the “other” category: “slammed fist on the table” (6), “made the student repeat the subject” (1), “changed the student’s seat” (1), “kept quiet” (1), “rubbish” (1), “buddy” (1), “silly question” (1), “are you barmy?” (1), “cur” (1), and “don’t look bovine” (1).

Concerning the question “Do teachers’ reactions towards students’ misbehavior depend on teachers’ alma mater”; among 43 primary school teachers, seven of them graduated from Teacher Training School, 14 obtained an Associate of Education degree, 20 attended the Institute of Education, one graduated from the Faculty of Education and one graduated from the High School of Journalism. Table 5 presents the distribution of 43 primary school teachers’ reactions towards students’ misbehavior in the classroom and the frequency of reactions regarding the teachers’ alma maters.

Table 5. Distribution of Teachers' Reactions with Regard to Teachers' Alma Mater

REACTIONS	GRADUATION									
	TTS (7)		AED (14)		IE (20)		FE (1)		JOURNAL (1)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Did not notice	17	11.18	64	19.63	104	20.04	4	13.79	3	11.54
Ignored	12	7.89	18	5.52	25	4.82	2	6.90	1	3.85
Made eye contact	23	15.13	19	5.83	57	10.98	3	10.34	4	15.38
Came close to the student	12	7.89	34	10.43	34	6.55	2	6.90	4	15.38
Touched (students' arm, shoulder etc.)	4	2.63	19	5.83	36	6.94	2	6.90	1	3.85
Asked a question	13	8.55	39	11.96	59	11.37	3	10.34		
Warned without being noticed by other students (gesture)	11	7.24	5	1.53	21	4.05			1	3.85
Verbal warning	36	23.68	67	20.55	102	19.65			10	38.46
Warned severely (reprimanded)	20	13.18	31	9.51	52	10.02	13	44.83	2	7.69
Called for a talk after course					7	1.35				
Corporal punishment			21	6.44	11	2.12				
Other:	4	2.63	9	2.76	11	2.12				
Total	152	100	326	100	519	100	29	100	26	100

As seen in table 5, there is only one teacher who graduated from the Faculty of Education and only one from the High School of Journalism; their reactions were left out of the evaluation. The reactions of teachers who graduated from Teacher Training School were, in order of frequency, "verbal warning", "made eye contact", "warned severely (reprimanded)", "did not notice" and "asked a question". The reactions of teachers who graduated with an Associate of Education degree were "verbal warning", "did not notice", "asked a question", "came close to the student" and "warned severely (reprimanded)" respectively. The reactions of teachers who graduated from the Institute of Education were "did not notice", "verbal warning", "asked a question", "made eye contact" and "warned severely (reprimanded)" respectively. The reaction "corporal punishment" was given most frequently by teachers who graduated with an Associate of Education degree, and least frequently by teachers who graduated from the Institute of Education. Teachers who graduated from the Institute of Education gave the following reactions in the "other" category: "Good! That is very good behavior (burlesque)" (4), "slammed fist on the table" (6), and "warned student by name" (1). Teachers who graduated with an Associate of Education degree gave the following reactions in the "other" category: "made the student repeat the subject" (1), "changed the student's seat" (1), "kept quiet" (1), "rubbish" (1), "buddy" (1), "silly question" (1), "are you barmy?" (1), "cur" (1), and "don't look bovine" (1). Teachers who graduated from the Teacher Training School gave the "fined" (4) reaction in the "other" category.

Concerning the question "Do teachers' reactions towards students' misbehavior depend on teachers' seniority"; among 43 primary school teachers, one of them has seniority of 5-10 years, one has 11-15 years, 11 have 16-20 years, five have 21-25 years, and 25 have 26 plus years. Table 6 presents the distribution of 43 primary school teachers' reactions towards students' misbehavior in the classroom and the frequency of reactions regarding teachers' seniority.

Table 6. Distribution of Teachers' Reactions with Regard to Teachers' Seniority

REACTIONS	SENIORITY									
	5-10 years		11-15 years		16-20 years		21-25 years		26 + years	
	(1)	(1)	(11)	(5)	(25)	f	%	f	%	
Verbal warning	10	38.46			67	19.88	17	15.32	121	22.04
Did not notice	3	11.54	4	13.79	79	23.44	7	6.31	99	18.03
Asked a question			3	10.34	34	10.09	13	11.71	64	11.66
Warned severely (reprimanded)	2	7.69	13	44.83	28	8.31	16	14.41	59	10.75
Made eye contact	4	15.38	3	10.34	30	8.90	16	14.41	53	9.65
Came close to the student	4	15.38	2	6.90	23	6.82	12	10.81	45	8.20
Ignored	1	3.85	2	6.90	20	5.93	3	2.70	32	5.82
Touched (students' arm, shoulder etc.)	1	3.85	2	6.90	28	8.31	6	5.41	25	4.55
Corporal punishment					5	1.48	6	5.41	21	3.83
Warned without being noticed by other students (gesture)	1	3.85			15	4.45	6	5.41	16	2.91
Called for a talk after course					2	0.59	5	4.50		
Other:					6	1.78	4	3.60	14	2.55
Total	26	100	29	100	337	100	111	100	549	100

As seen in table 6, there is only one teacher with seniority of 5-10 years, and only one teacher with seniority of 11-15 years; their reactions were left out of the evaluation. The reactions of teachers with seniority of 16-20 years were, in order of frequency, "did not notice", "verbal warning", "asked a question", "made eye contact", "warned severely (reprimanded)", and "touched". The reactions of teachers with seniority of 21-25 years were "verbal warning", "warned severely (reprimanded)", "made eye contact", "asked a question", "came close to the student", and "did not notice" respectively. The reactions of teachers with seniority of 26-plus years were "verbal warning", "did not notice", "asked a question", "warned severely (reprimanded)", and "made eye contact" respectively. The most significant results are as follows: all teachers "warned severely (reprimanded)", and teachers with 16- plus years of seniority carried out "corporal punishment". The "other" reactions of teachers with seniority of 16-20 years include "rubbish" (1), "buddy" (1), "silly question" (1), "are you barmy?" (1), "cur" (1), and "don't look bovine" (1). Teachers with seniority of 21-25 years "fined"(4). The "other" reactions of teachers with 26- plus years of seniority include "Good! That is very good behavior (burlesque)" (4), "slammed fist on the table" (6), "warned student by name" (1), "made the student repeat the subject" (1), "changed the student's seat" (1), and "kept quiet" (1).

Discussion, Conclusion, and Suggestions

In this research about teachers' reactions towards students' misbehavior in the classroom, important results are found, evaluations are made, and implications are developed. Aydın (1998) states that the most important variable in effective teaching and a favorable classroom climate is teachers' behavior characteristics. Çelik (2003) claims that classrooms are very complicated, and very different events may occur in them. He also emphasizes that, as it is not possible to correctly guess the timing of phenomena in the classroom, teachers should control students' misbehavior while also maintaining the flow of the course.

Karslı (2009) indicate that, since the reasons behind students' behaviors require attention, with reference to the theory of operant conditioning, both convenient behaviors and misbehavior come up at the end of similar processes, and they emphasize that pre-events play a significant role in behavior formation. Memişoğlu (2005) expresses that students like to be recognized, therefore they try to attract teachers' attention by misbehaving if they are unable to attract by behaving favorably. Küçükahmet (2001) states that most students do not know how to behave in some situations. Küçükahmet (2005) indicates that teachers have a strong effect on students' behaviors, and most tend to react quickly and emotionally towards events and people in the classroom. He also adds that teachers who shout and get angry easily try to control any kind of misbehavior by using punishment; therefore, teachers' negative attitudes reflect on students' behaviors and misbehavior occurs.

In Okutan's research (2004), teachers' reactions are as follows: "asked a question", "made eye contact", "came close to student", "verbal warning", "quiet warning", "called for a talk", "touched", "ran out of the class", "forced to stand up in front of the blackboard" and "beating" respectively. Yiğit (2001) shows that teachers' approaches to preventing students' misbehavior depend on the types of behaviors, but the most frequently-used reactions include verbal warnings to all the students in the classroom, individual interviews with the students, and verbal warnings to individual students. Similarly, he emphasizes that, teachers use corporal punishment, even if just a bit. When the results of studies are compared both similar and different results are found. Different results may originate from school, class, and student variables. For instance, Başar (1998) studied with students from a private school, so that may be the reason no "corporal punishment" or "beating" reactions are observed in the research.

According to Özbay (2001), students' behavior may depend on their environment. For example, a student may be quiet and passive in their Mathematics course, but, by contrast, be talkative and cheerful in their Social Science course (Okutan, 2004). This change in environment corresponds with the change in teachers' reactions.

The results of this study and of similar ones show that teachers' reactions towards students' misbehavior are numerous and diverse. The decrease in these reactions depends on the decrease in misbehavior. According to Karslı (2009), teachers aware that preceding and proceeding events effect the formation of certain behaviors can successfully prevent students' misbehavior. Hence, teachers react deliberately towards students' misbehavior and try to understand the reason for the problem. Şişman and Turan (2004) indicate that the behaviors of students and teachers are closely related in the classroom. Under the guidance of effective teachers, misbehavior decreases over time and students' comprehension and level of duty increase. Besides, as Memişoğlu (2005) expresses, teachers must determine which needs motivate misbehavior. If an intervention is made before determining the reason for the students' behavior, misbehavior may occur repeatedly. Therefore, teachers must first understand the real reasons for students' misbehavior; an incoherent problem cannot be solved. In

addition to defining the reasons for actual problems, understanding the behavior itself is necessary to estimate possible, future misbehavior (Aydın, 1998).

Şişman and Turan (2004) claim that misbehavior in the classroom can arise from students not understanding classroom rules, or a triggering classroom environment. Classroom climate is generally the most important factor for identifying behavior direction. Teachers have to analyze classroom environment before they analyze students' behaviors in the classroom. The life in the classrooms may cause students' misbehavior: the physical order of the classroom, boredom, inhibition, frustration, long-running courses, and no awareness classroom events. Teaching and learning environments especially should support and maintain students' learning. According to Şişman and Turan, the classroom environment influences students' misbehavior in the classroom, but according to Başar (1998), the origin of students' misbehavior relies on factors outside the classroom. Thus, if teachers deal exclusively with in-class variables, they may be unsuccessful and not permanent. Giving the priority to the conditions of out-classes, teachers know and control in-class variables.

Instead of quick reactions towards misbehavior, as Başar (1998) emphasized, teachers should inform students where and how behavior can or cannot be exhibited, and students may be given signs and clues about this subject. Furthermore, Ada et al. (2005) state that if teachers explain the results of misbehavior and give explanations about positive behaviors to students, students will, in turn, exhibit positive behaviors. Hence, as Smith (1990) remarked, prevention of misbehavior is related to teachers' teaching management skills. Teachers, with behavior management skill and knowledge should not ignore students' misbehavior instead they should make students feel free to get help about more positive behaviors (Başar, 1998). However, while teachers act in this way, as Çelik (2003) claims, their strategies must depend on a scientific basis. If teachers develop a strategy based on their own personal assumptions, chaos may occur in the classroom. Researchers who study effective teacher behaviors to prevent such situations (Bowman, 1983; Brophy, 1986; Emmer & Evertson, 1981; Gottfredson, 1989; Luke, 1989) emphasize that teachers' communication expectations must be high to control students' misbehavior. Students in a classroom where communication expectations are high and everyone is sincere and candid to one another can accept teachers more easily. In such an environment, students be sure that their teacher teaches always useful and good things (Şişman and Turan, 2004). Thus, as Memişoğlu (2005) indicates, teachers should act by first considering how their verbal and non-verbal behaviors affect their students.

Several researches (Reed, 1989; Rickman & Hollowell, 1981; Vocke, 1992), indicate that teachers feel insufficient to handle classroom management after pre-service training (Celep, 2008).

All in all primary school teachers' reactions, in order of frequency, can be arranged as follows: "verbal warning", "did not notice", "warned severely (reprimand)", "asked a question", "made eye contact", "came close to student", "touched (arm, shoulder etc.)", "ignored", "warned without being noticed by other students (gesture)", "corporal punishment", and "called for a talk after course". The teachers' reactions found by Başar (1998) include "ignored", "verbal warning", "did not notice", "reprimand", "came close to student", "asked a question", "quiet warning", "made eye contact", "called for a talk", and "touched".

Aimed at determining and analyzing primary school teachers' reactions towards students' misbehavior in the classroom, the research has deduced that teachers' reactions also differ by school. The teachers' reactions observed in this research were in order of frequency, "verbal warning", "did not notice", "warned severely (reprimanded)", "asked a question", "made eye contact", "came close to student", "touched (arm, shoulder etc.)", "ignored", "warned without being noticed by other students (gesture)", "corporal punishment", and "called for a talk after course". Teachers' "other" reactions

include, by number of repetitions, “slammed fist on the table”, “fined”, “Good! That is very good behavior (burlesque)”, “rubbish”, “buddy”, “silly question”, “are you barmy?”, “cur”, “don’t look bovine”, “warned student by name”, “made the student repeat the subject”, “changed the student’s seat”, and “kept quiet”. The “corporal punishment” reaction is seen in three of four schools. This situation is remarkable, because three guests (three observers) sat in the classroom while the punishment occurred. In Dilekmen’s study (2001), primary school teachers’ more frequently chose to exhibit corporal punishment (27.32 %). Meanwhile, Okutan (2004) found that elementary and high school teachers chose a degree of “always and sometimes” for the reaction “beating” at 12%. Furthermore, Ada et al. (2005) determined that teachers react, even if at a very low level, with corporal punishment towards students’ misbehavior. According to Cangelosi (1998) and Rich (1991), corporal punishment has to be carried out in schools. Besides the very damaging results, no favor is obtained except temporary accommodation; this accommodation becomes a growing incompatibility when the fear of punishment disappears. Corporal punishment is incompatible with laws and human respect, and long-term effects are destructive. It makes human being aggressive. The punished individual reflects that same punishment on another at the first opportunity (Başar, 1998). Reactions such as “warned severely (reprimanded)”, “corporal punishment” and “other” negatively affect students’ development and learning in grades one through five. The research has deduced that teachers’ reactions depend on class level, and 3rd grade teachers most frequently exhibit these reactions. Consequently, teachers’ reactions also depend on the course, and the reactions are exhibited most frequently in Social Studies courses.

The teachers’ reactions also depend on their gender, and, remarkably, female teachers “warn severely (reprimand)” their students and exhibit “corporal punishment”. Reactions also depend on the teachers’ alma mater, and those who graduated from Teacher Training School and earned an Associate of Education degree exhibited those reactions more frequently. Teachers’ seniority also influences reactions, and the reactions in the categories “warn severely (reprimand)”, “corporal punishment” and “other” are mostly exhibited by teachers close to retirement. Besides, it is remarkable that most of the primary school teachers are already over the retirement age.

Taking into context the elementary education curriculum implemented since the 2004-2005 academic year, the teaching and learning processes are based on students’ trials, argumentation, and interrogation. Therefore, this situation affected teachers’ in-class responsibilities.

In our country, adding a “Classroom Management” course to the curriculum in the reconstructing process of Faculties of Education can be considered an important step. This course informs teachers on how to react to students’ misbehavior in the classroom. Extensive “guidance services” in elementary schools may decrease students’ misbehavior. The increase of in-service training courses for “classroom management” and “identification techniques of students” provides important benefits for managing classroom, understanding students, and communicating effectively. Implementing routine parent-teacher meetings may also prevent student misbehavior, and teachers’ emotional health should be monitored regularly. Since the teaching profession requires stringent performance from teachers, those who are entitled to retire and have relatively little patience should consider retiring to improve the classroom environment.

References

- Ada, S., Baysal, N., & Korucu, S. (2005). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin sınıf içi olumsuz davranışlara gösterdikleri tepkilerin karakter eğitimi ve 2005 ilköğretim programı açısından değerlendirilmesi. *Değerler Eğitimi*, 3(10), 7-18.
- Aydın, A. (1998). *Sınıf yönetimi*. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Başar, H. (1998). *Sınıf yönetimi*. Ankara: Pegem Özel Eğitim ve Hizmetleri.
- Boz, İ. (2003). *Sınıf yönetme sanatı*. İstanbul: Zambak Yayınları Eğitim Serisi.
- Bowman, R. (1983). Effective classroom management: a primer for practicing professionals. *Clearing House*, 57(3), 116-118.
- Brophy, J. E. (1986). Classroom management technique. *Education and Urban Society*, 18(2), 182-194.
- Bull, S., & Solity, J. (1996). *Classroom management*. London: Routledge.
- Cangelosi, J. S. (1988). *Classroom management strategies*. New York: Longman Inc.
- Celep, C. (2002). *Sınıf yönetimi ve disiplin*. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Celep, C. (2008). *Sınıf yönetiminde kuram ve uygulama*. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (1998). *A guide to teaching practice*. New York: Routledge.
- Çelik, V. (2003). *Sınıf yönetimi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Demirel, Ö. (2007). *Öğretme sanatı*. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.
- Dilekmen, M. (2001). İlköğretim sınıf öğretmenlerinin sınıf içi davranışları. *Çağdaş Eğitim*, 276, 31-36.
- Dillon, J., & Maguire, M. (1998). *Becoming a teacher*. Great Britain: Redwood Books.
- Ekiz, D. (2003). *Eğitimde araştırma yöntem ve metodlarına giriş*. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Emmer, E. T., & Evertson, C. M. (1981). Synthesis of research on classroom management, *Educational Leadership*, 38(4), 342-347.
- Getzels, J. V. (1974). Images of the classroom and visions of the learner *School Review*, August, 527-530.
- Gottfredson, D. C. (1989). *Developing effective organizations to reduce school disorder. Strategies to Reduce Student Misbehavior*. Washington D. C. : Educational Research and Improvement.
- Grossman, H. (1991). Multicultural classroom management. *Contemporary Education*, 62, 161-166.
- Gürsel, M., Sarı, H., & Dilmaç, B. (Eds.) (2004). *Sınıf yönetimi*. Konya: Eğitim Kitapevi.
- Karasar, N. (2012). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. Ankara: Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.
- Karlı, M. D. (Ed.) (2009). *İlköğretimde sınıf yönetimi*. Ankara: Kök Yayıncılık.
- Küçükahmet, L. (Ed.) (2001). *Sınıf yönetiminde yeni yaklaşımlar*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Küçükahmet, L. (Ed.) (2005). *Sınıf yönetimi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Kyriacou, C. (1986). *Effective teaching in schools*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Lawrence, J., & Steed, D. M. (1984). European voices on disruptive behaviour in schools: definitions concern and types of behaviour. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, XXXII, 4-17.
- Luke, M. D. (1989). Research on class management and organization: review with implications for current practice. *Quest*, 41, 55-67.
- Memişoğlu, S. P. (2005). Sınıf ortamında istenmeyen davranışlara yol açan öğretmen davranışları *Çağdaş Eğitim*, 323, 32-39.
- Merrett, F., & Wheldall, K. (1993). How do teachers learn to manage classroom behaviour? A study initial training with special reference to classroom behaviour management. *Educational Studies*, 19, 91-106.
- Okutan, M. (2004). *Sınıf yönetiminde örnek olaylar*. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.
- Özbay, Y. (2001). *Gelişim ve öğrenme psikolojisi*. Trabzon: Erol Ofset.

- Pollard, N. M. (1997). *Reflective teaching in the primary school: an handbook for the classroom*. London: Cassell.
- Reed, D. (1989). Student teacher problems with classroom discipline: implication for program development, *Action in Education*, 11(3), 59-65.
- Rich, J. M. (1991). Should student be punished? *Contemporary Education*, 62, 180-184.
- Rickman, L., & Hollowell, J. (1981). Some auses of student teacher failure, *Improving College and University Teaching*. 29(4), 176-179.
- Smith, R. (1990). *The effective school*. Educational Pub. Ltd. Lancaster.
- Stephens, P., & Crawley, T. (1994). *Becoming an effective teacher*. England: Ellenborough House.
- Şişman M., & Turan, S. (Eds.) (2004). *Sınıf yönetimi*. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.
- Türnüklü, A. (1999). İlköğretimde sınıf içi istenmeyen davranışlar ve nedenleri. *Yaşadıkça Eğitim*, 64, 30-34.
- Türnüklü, A. (2000). İlköğretimde sınıf düzeni, *Yaşadıkça Eğitim*, 65, 36-40.
- Wragg, E.C. (1996). *Classroom teaching skills*. London: Biddles Ltd.
- Yılmaz, S., & Şahinkaya, N. (2010). The relationship between methods use against the misbehaviour performed in the classroom and emphatic tendencies of teachers. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2010), 2932-2936.
- Yiğit, B. (2001). İlköğretim öğrencilerinde görülen istenmeyen davranışlar ve öğretmenlerin önlemek için izlediği yaklaşımlar. *Trakya Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 1(2), 15-25.