Foreign language classroom management: Types of student misbehaviour and strategies adapted by the teachers in handling disruptive behaviour

Emre Debreli¹ and Inara Ishanova²

Abstract: This study investigates the types of student misbehaviour exhibited in foreign language classrooms and the strategies preferred by foreign language teachers to prevent them. The study additionally explores whether foreign language teachers’ preferred strategies correspond with their actual classroom practices. 44 teachers of English at the English preparatory schools of three universities participated in the study. Semi-structured interviews and observations were used to gather data. The findings illustrate different types of student misbehaviour in foreign language classrooms, some of which are similar to those in general teaching subjects, and some which are specific to foreign language classrooms. Themes including the use of one’s mother tongue, asking irrelevant questions, use of mobile phone, excessive talking and lack of willingness to participate as part of low motivation are found to be important misbehaviour types in foreign language classrooms. Teachers’ preferred strategies to handle student misbehaviour are mostly affective and include the use of body language, not administering punishment and being positive. It is also reported that teachers often fail to follow through with their proposed strategies when dealing with disruptive behaviour.
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PUBLIC INTEREST STATEMENT

In this study, we demonstrate the types of behavioural problems foreign language students exhibit in classrooms, and we ask their teachers which classroom management techniques they use to avoid such issues. We also observe whether and how these teachers employ these skills when confronted with problematic behaviour in the classroom. This issue is pertinent because we have fewer insights into foreign language classroom management compared to general teaching, in spite of significant differences between the two domains of enquiry.
1. Introduction

Classroom management is often associated with the concept of “control”. That is to say, classroom management tends to be accompanied by the idea of handling disciplinary actions or solving issues of order (Chambers, 2003; Labaree, 2004). Teachers are often seen as control mechanisms in establishing such control, and are required to ensure that student behaviour is properly managed in the classroom (Kaufman & Moss, 2010; Putman, 2009). Although numerous researchers claim that classroom management represents an amalgam of the teacher’s method of teaching, organisation of classroom utilities and establishment of discipline (Evertson & Weinstein, 2006; Labaree, 2004; Manning & Bucher, 2003), many also agree that the management of student misbehaviour and establishment of classroom discipline are central to classroom management. From this standpoint, the ways in which teachers cope with student misbehaviour and establish classroom discipline, as well as definitions of student misbehaviour, have become key areas of academic enquiry (Cakmak, 2008; Reagan & Osborn, 2002; Watzke, 2007). While classroom management is widely explored in the context of mainstream education, few seem to have focused on foreign language classrooms more specifically. Such a lack of research potentially implies a dangerous dilemma, of foreign language education being seen as similar to other subject areas in mainstream education, with the effect of neglecting its particular characteristics. In its simplest form, the issue of “communicative proficiency”, and the methods and tasks employed within the classroom for students to achieve communicative proficiency, reveal a sharp discrepancy between foreign language education and other educational areas. This issue is clearly described by Reagan and Osborn (2002):

Although all teachers are empowered to some extent by their presumed expertise, in the case of the foreign language teacher, not only is content at issue but so too is the ability to communicate in what is in essence the language of the classroom. This difference alone makes the foreign language class different from others, and implies a different and even more significant power differential between foreign language educators and their students (p. 9).

That being said, definitions of student misbehaviour, and how it can be handled in a foreign language classroom, might be different from broader mainstream education, and potentially requires greater in-depth exploration. For instance, a physics teacher surrounded with laboratory equipment would probably encounter a different set of classroom management issues from an English teacher aiming to encourage his or her students to strengthen their communication proficiency in the language. In this regard, we believe that how foreign language classroom management differs from other subject areas should be explored and identified.

Therefore, the aim of the present study is to identify types of student misbehaviour according to the perspectives of teachers in pre-university level foreign language classrooms, and to understand how they attempt to avoid student misbehaviour. The study additionally explores whether there is correspondence between what teachers say they do to avoid student misbehaviour in the classroom and what they actually do in a classroom setting. The findings that emerge from the study help to make an important distinction between general education and foreign language education, under the umbrella term “classroom management”, and contribute to our understanding of foreign language classroom management.

2. Literature review

2.1. Defining classroom management

In the literature, classroom management is often referred to as a “wide variety of skills and techniques that teachers use to keep students organized, orderly, focused, attentive, on task, and academically productive during a class” (Abbott, 2014, p. 72). This is a simplified definition
of a broad concept, and to fully understand the extent of classroom management one must appreciate the fundamental ideas that exist regarding the phenomenon. Previous research agrees on the fact that students who are highly engaged in the classroom tend not to disrupt or misbehave, and so engaging students with relevant tasks is deemed a key aspect of classroom management (Charles, 2007; Kerdikoshvili, 2012). An earlier work, however, suggests that “classroom management” and “classroom discipline” are interchangeable (Bellon, Bellon, & Blank, 1992). Doyle (1986, p. 14) also argues that “classroom management is certainly concerned with behaviour, but it can also be defined more broadly as involving the planning, organization and control of learners, the learning process and the classroom environment to create and maintain an effective learning experience”. Crookes (2003, p. 144) similarly perceives a properly managed classroom as a relatively orderly room in which “whatever superficial manifestations of disorder that may occur either do not prevent instruction and learning, or actually support them”. The majority of previous work highlights that the main objective of classroom management is to create a positive learning environment for students. However, in its widest conceptualisation, coping with student misbehaviour and establishing classroom discipline seem to be the key elements in defining classroom management (Emmer & Stough, 2001).

In a more comprehensive work, Sowell (2013) suggests dividing the concept of classroom management into two separate categories. These categories are behavioural management and instructional management. Sowell (2013) states that instructional management comprises planning and the factors that affect a teacher’s ability to educate students with certain materials. In contrast, behavioural management is constituted of a teacher’s expectations of students’ behaviour, such as their level of interaction in the classroom, proper behaviour and several other factors. In agreement with the majority of previous studies, we perceive classroom management as a response to a sort of behaviour exhibited by students that interrupts the teaching and learning process, both instructional and behavioural, as Sowell (2013) suggests.

2.2. Classifying and managing classroom misbehaviour: a broad synthesis

Many would agree that successful classroom management leads to better learning outcomes. This is not to say that controlling the classroom would axiomatically yield positive learning outcomes, but that the relationship developed between teacher and students would facilitate a collaborative understanding of the tasks at hand, and thus provide a more positive learning environment. This idea has also been proposed by Wolfgang and Glickman (1986), who emphasise that developing relationships with students and facilitating their learning environment is essential to effective classroom management. This is executed through the teacher’s handling of the classroom, such as via a rule and reward or punishment system. The final element is the teacher’s consistent interaction with the students in order to establish control by involving both parties within the process, whereby students are prompted “to take responsibility for their actions but need the active involvement of a kind but firm teacher” (Wolfgang & Glickman, 1986, p. 19). This issue is often regarded as a burdensome task, especially for pre-service teachers, but for experienced teachers too.

In terms of the underlying causes of misbehavior, many state that cultural differences, lack of student motivation, overly crowded classrooms, time limitations, students with family or personal problems and feelings of inadequacy seem to be the leading factors behind classroom management problems both in primary and secondary levels of education, as well as in higher education (Baker & Westrup, 2000; Brown, 2007; Kayikci, 2009). Such sources of problems are often followed by a series of classroom acts that teachers regularly regard as forms of classroom misbehaviour. Such misbehavior types include chatting, using mobile phones, making non-verbal noises, coming late to the class and not participating during lessons (Elias & Schwab, 2006). According to Elias and Schwab (2006), these misbehavior types apply to all education levels, whereas using mobile phones is not often observed in primary education as students are not allowed to carry mobile phones in school settings in some contexts. In a more comprehensive list, Charles (2007, pp. 19–20) outlines the most common types of classroom misbehaviour as:
Inattentiveness: not showing or not paying adequate attention.

Obtuseness: not participating in the class conversations, meetings and discussions.

Talkativeness: chatting during a theoretical part of a lesson, unrelated to the topic of the lecture.

Moving around the room (energetic students): making forbidden actions, for instance, standing up during a lecture, taking another seat or assembling in one place in the classroom.

Annoying others: disturbing, making a noise, calling out nicknames.

Disruption: shouting out during instruction, talking and laughing inappropriately, having confrontations with others, causing “accidents”.

Lying: telling an untruth to escape liability, confessing a mistake or involving others in difficulties.

Stealing: taking something without permission.

Cheating: fooling someone for one’s own benefit.

Sexual harassment: making forbidden actions related to sex for example, petting (touching, kissing) during the lesson.

Aggression and fighting (aggressive): showing hostility towards others, threatening them, shoving, pinching, wrestling, hitting, bullying.

Malicious mischief (mischievous): striking the school’s furniture (tables, chairs, boards, windows, shelves) or breaking someone’s tools.

Defiance of authority: manifesting disobedience, replying to a teacher in an aggressive form and not carrying out a teacher’s order.

A number of strategies have been proposed in the literature to avoid or minimise the aforementioned behavioural problems in the classroom, such as giving clear instructions and monitoring students (Hastings & Bham, 2003), giving students responsibilities and keeping them busy (Manning & Bucher, 2003), stating rules clearly and explaining the consequences of breaking them (Corzo & Contreras, 2011), and varying the activities (Labaree, 2004). In addition to these, studies by Martin (2004), Putman (2009), Stoughton (2007) and Zuckerman (2007) also offer strategies to cope with student misbehaviour. Zuckerman’s (2007) study, for example, demonstrates that planning lessons effectively, establishing routines, following classroom rules and norms, arranging classroom seating and dealing with off-task students or changing the pace of the lesson are effective strategies to minimise potential student misbehaviour in the classroom.

Here we turn the focus of our paper to classroom management in foreign language classrooms more specifically, which represents our primary focus given the gap in this area of research and calls made by various scholars (i.e. Martin, 2004) for foreign language classroom management to be studied as a unique domain of enquiry. However, one must note that the literature described above, which has predominantly emerged from mainstream education, is useful to this paper because we believe that in spite of the fact that we see these domains of enquiry as separate, they do share some important commonalities. Therefore, our view is that the information highlighted above is applicable and relevant to foreign language classrooms, even if clear differences also exist, which will be the focus of the remainder of the study.

2.3. Research into managing classroom misbehaviour in foreign language education

Classroom management in foreign language classrooms has been an under-researched area in the literature. Although we have rich findings from the area of general education, these are often taken for granted and assumed for foreign language education. A limited number of studies exploring foreign language education reveal that general education and foreign language classrooms and their management differ in nature (Altinel, 2006; Aydin & Bahce, 2001; Incecay & Dollar, 2012; Kayikci, 2009; Kerdikoshvili, 2012; Korucu, 1996; Merc, 2004; Osam & Balbay, 2004). The aspect of motivation, for example, is not something commonly cited as a type of misbehaviour in studies which refer to general
education, whereas it seems to be an important concern in foreign language education. Kerdikoshvili's (2012) study in Georgia secondary schools, for example, has revealed a close relationship between student learning, motivation to learn the language, and classroom management. More importantly, the study noted that having a group of motivated students increases their interest in the task, and that this becomes a remedy for behavioural problems in the classroom. The opposite dynamic can also be considered: where there is demotivation, student behaviour in the classroom will also be affected (e.g. unwillingness to participate or ignoring tasks), hence requiring teachers to use alternative management skills or techniques. Despite the fact that motivation is often viewed as a psychological arousal, it is widely acknowledged that it is something that can be tackled by teachers (Nakamura, 2000). The main reasons for a lack of motivation are often said to include low self-confidence, high anxiety and inhibition, teachers’ negative attitudes towards students, absence of positive reinforcements, absence of approval and appreciation of students by teachers, and non-supportive classroom environments (Brophy, 2008; Dörnyei, 2005; Gardner, 2001; Renninger, 2009). A similar finding was also identified in Korukcu’s (1996) study, in which English as a Foreign Language (EFL) pre-service teachers in a university setting viewed methods of teaching, student motivation and lesson planning as the most problematic elements of classroom management. Similarly, Aydin and Bahce (2001) study in secondary schools revealed that the most problematic aspects of classroom management included dealing with students who create problems, managing time and motivating students. Despite the fact that these findings are more related to and/or more likely to affect students’ on-task behaviours, findings pertaining to students’ off-task behaviours have also been reported. Sun and Shek (2012), for example, reported that daydreaming, lack of attentiveness, playing with personal items and talking out of turn were the most common off-task behavioural problems in secondary level foreign language classrooms. Despite the fact that the types of misbehavior might differ in different educational levels (i.e. students’ use of mobile phones is not something common in primary education whereas it might be seriously interrupting in higher levels), issues such as chatting, non-attentiveness, and off-task behavioral problems seem to be common in different educational levels.

Although the issue of foreign language classroom management and student misbehavior have been investigated to some extent, teachers were often not included in such research, therefore, we do not know much about what they really think on specific issues related to foreign language classroom management. Furthermore, we have fewer insights into the phenomenon from the pre-university level participant group, which stand in between high school and university. The strategies used by foreign language teachers to cope with student misbehavior as opposed to the findings from mainstream education, remains a significant gap in the literature. In spite of the fact that many of the issues that teachers perceive as student misbehavior in general education and the strategies they use to cope with them may be similar in foreign language classrooms, it is also very plausible that foreign language classroom issues are distinctive and to date unknown. With this in mind, the present paper focuses on foreign language classrooms and aims to explore these differences.

3. Method
As stated before, the purpose of the present study is to explore the types of student misbehavior encountered by EFL teachers in the classroom, the strategies they use to avoid student misbehavior, and whether their proposed strategies actually correspond with their actions. In this study we perceive “misbehaviour” as a kind of act, either instructional or behavioural, off-task or on-task, which causes an interruption of the classroom or negatively affects the teaching/learning process from the perspective of EFL teachers. With this in mind, the present study seeks answers to the following research questions:

(1) What kinds of student misbehaviour types do EFL teachers perceive they face in the classroom?
(2) What kinds of classroom management strategies do EFL teachers prefer when responding to student misbehavior?
(3) Do EFL teachers’ preferred classroom management strategies to respond student misbehaviour correspond with their actions in the classroom?

The study adopted a qualitative research design for several reasons. First, owing to the lack of research in the area of foreign language education exploring the theme of classroom management (Zuckerman, 2007), it was thought that this issue should be explored in significant depth, hence an open investigation approach was needed to reveal in detail any potential emergent themes, as opposed to a more structured quantitative approach (Bryman, 2012). In this way, it was believed that new themes could be gathered, which may be distinctive from existing themes in mainstream education. Second, since the present study required the observation of teachers in their classrooms, the use of predetermined categories, as is common in quantitative research, would limit the study to specific themes. Instead, a qualitative approach was deemed to offer a more naturalistic exploration of the issues as they emerge in the classroom (Bryman, 2012; Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011; Patton, 2002). This is again applicable to research questions one and two, as the aim was to leave the types of student misbehaviour and the strategies that can be used by teachers open, without limiting them to a pre-arranged set of questions (e.g. such as via a questionnaire). Finally, the present study intended to gather data from a relatively small number of participants, but that would provide a holistic picture of the phenomenon. Qualitative research is often associated with such detailed exploration of an issue, and so it was deemed more suitable for the present study.

3.1. Research instruments

The research instruments chosen for the present study were semi-structured interviews and naturalistic observations. The reasons why these instruments chosen were to gather data, and the ways in which they were used in the study, are described in the following sections.

3.1.1. Semi-structured interviews

Of the three widely known interview types (structured, semi-structured and unstructured) in the literature, semi-structured interviews were used in this study. Semi-structured interviews are often preferred owing to their flexible nature, which enables researchers to change the order and wording of questions, depending on the wave of the conversation (Kvale, 2007). Researchers using semi-structured interviews often prepare a set of themes or questions to be raised during the interview, albeit distinctive from the prescribed set of questions often used in structured interviews (Kvale, 2007). That is to say, the predetermined themes or questions are often used to facilitate the conversation between the researcher and his or her participants, but they may not be used in a particular sequence. In this way, participants are allowed to speak freely without the researcher forcing them to give specific answers to specific issues. The instrument was also chosen because it allows researchers to ask follow-up questions and further probe the issues raised during the interview. In other words, the pre-arranged themes or questions are used loosely to provide direction to the interviews. Given that these characteristics were suited to the present study’s purposes, semi-structured interviews were chosen as a data collection instrument. The set of interview questions used (although not in a particular order and not necessarily raised with each participant) can be found in Appendix A.

3.1.2. Observations

In the present study, naturalistic observations were used to gather data from participants. This type of observation method allows researchers to observe participants in their natural environment, in this case, the classroom. One of this instrument’s strengths is its greater validity compared with other observation types, since observing participants in their natural context can reveal more realistic data. The drawback of this instrument, on the other hand, is that it is difficult to apply in large-scale studies owing to time constraints, which perhaps result in narrower generalisation of the findings. Nevertheless, this was not a crucial concern for the present study, as the intention was to explore the phenomenon in depth with a relatively small number of participants.
The observation checklist used in the present study (see Appendix B) was developed by the researchers after the interview data were analysed. Following categorisation of the interview data, the researchers used this categorisation in the observation checklist. The intention here was to crosscheck the most common misbehaviour types in classrooms (as proposed by teachers) and to crosscheck whether the teachers actually used their expressed preferred strategies to tackle misbehaviour. Therefore, the themes mentioned by the teachers in the interviews were also used in the observation checklists and the observers were expected to comment on each of those themes to explore their validity. In addition, a final section was added to the checklist to give observers an option of noting down issues that had not previously been assumed. The aim of this observation was to record instances related to a misbehaviour type and the way in which it was handled, according with the principles of qualitative research. The checklist used in the study can be considered rather structured, that is, the researchers ticked specific themes in the checklist according to the relevance of their observations and provided brief comments. The observation aspect of the study specifically intended to answer research question three, pertaining to whether the teachers employed the strategies that they had raised about avoiding student misbehaviour in their classrooms.

### 3.2. Context and participants

44 foreign language teachers of English who were working in the English preparatory schools of three universities in Northern Cyprus participated in this study. Cyprus is a divided island, and Northern Cyprus specifically is not officially recognized. In spite of its small population (300,000), a large number of students from more than 90 countries (but especially Turkey) attend Northern Cyprus’ universities for their undergraduate and postgraduate education. The Ministry of Education announced that over 100,000 students studied here in 2017, rendering them one-third of North Cyprus’ population. In Northern Cyprus, thirteen universities currently operate, and provide various bachelor’s, master’s and doctorate programs. English is the language of instruction on many of these programmes, and students registering at these universities must prove their English proficiency if required by the programme in question. If a student fails to do this, he or she must attend English preparation courses for up to a year and must be successful in order to proceed. In these English preparation courses, students are placed in groups based on their proficiency, and receive intensive English education.

The structure of these courses in all universities is very similar: 20–25 hours of lecture time per week. Approximately 24 students are placed in each classroom, and having completed a specific level (e.g. beginner), successful students’ progress to the next level, and continue their studies until they reach the level required by the university. The majority of the students in these programmes are placed in beginner and elementary level classrooms, with only a few starting with a high level of language proficiency. At the time of this research, a total of 72 English teachers working on these programmes at different universities were asked to participate in the study, this being the total number of English teachers working in three universities. 44 agreed to participate. Their ages ranged from 23 to 44 years of age, and the least experienced teacher possessed three years of teaching experience. Their gender distribution was 32 females and 12 males. Most of these teachers were teaching English to beginner and elementary level groups of students, who were noted as sharing a similar cultural and educational background, and who were generally Turkish.

At the beginning of the research, the teachers who consented to participate in the study were contacted, and possible interview days were arranged. Interviews were conducted over a five week period. The interviews were held at participants’ offices and lasted 28–36 minutes. These interviews aimed to attain answers to research questions one and two regarding the common student misbehaviour types that appear in language classrooms, and to learn about teachers’ actions to avoid student misbehaviour. Teachers’ classrooms were subsequently observed for a period of approximately nine weeks. Each participant teacher’s lessons were observed a minimum of three times. Lessons lasted 50 minutes each. During the observations, teachers were observed based on a prepared checklist, with particular attention to whether they employed the strategies they illumined during the interviews. Prior to the research, teachers’ and their institutions’ consent...
was sought and they were assured that the data collected would be kept strictly confidential, and used only for research purposes.

4. Findings
In this section, the findings of the present study are presented under the three research questions posed, and the categories that emerged from the analysis are provided to explore the specific themes in more detail.

4.1. Student misbehaviour types (research question 1)
Analysis of the data related to research question one, “What kind of student misbehaviour types do EFL teachers face in the classroom?” revealed seven common misbehaviour types, cited by most of the teachers in their interviews. These are provided in Table 1.

4.1.1. Using mobile phone
The majority of the teachers (n = 26) in the study mentioned that students’ use of mobile phones in the classroom represented one of the most common forms of student misbehaviour they faced. Despite the fact that some of the teachers stated that the use of mobile phones could at times be useful when used for educational purposes (e.g. for spell-checking and researching vocabulary), the majority (n = 22) thought that they caused disruption. T17 and T4’s comments were representative:

The most common student misbehaviour in my classrooms is the use of mobile phones, which often causes excessive chat between each other, and they often lose concentration and they do not listen to me. I often see them checking Instagram or Facebook, and some even sending messages. When I warn them about the issue, they often say they were using it to look up a word in the dictionary and so on. (T17)

If I realise that they go off-task after finishing their work, I start asking them one by one. When they get bored, they start using their phones and this kills me every time. Although they mostly use their phones for online dictionaries, there are students who cannot make it without checking the social media. And when one starts with the phone, the rest often follow. (T4)

4.1.2. Using mother tongue (L1)
A common theme of the interviews was that the teachers wanted their students to avoid using their mother tongue (Turkish) during English classes. The underlying belief was that English classes were the only time that students had the opportunity to practise their target language, hence they ought to use English. More importantly, this also formed a strict policy in all of the universities in which the teachers worked. For these reasons, all of the teachers stated that “no mother tongue use” represented one of the most important rules of their classrooms. In spite of the seriousness of the case, many of the teachers complained about students who would still attempt to use their mother tongue for various reasons. For example, T3, T6, T7, T9, T11, T16, T17, T18, T22 and T28 all stated that their students occasionally opted for Turkish when they deemed their English proficiency to be insufficient or when they did not understand a specific grammar task. Although this was not a serious concern for these teachers, many also stated that some students used Turkish intentionally, to make jokes and disrupt the lesson. According to these teachers, this constituted the most serious and common student

| Table 1. Common misbehaviour types in EFL classrooms |
|------------------------------------------------------|
| Types of student misbehaviour                         |
| Using mobile phone                                     |
| Using mother tongue (L1)                              |
| Lack of willingness to study as part of low motivation |
| Excessive talking                                     |
| Asking irrelevant questions                           |
misbehaviour type in their foreign language classrooms. On the other hand, a considerable number of teachers described other scenarios in which their students tended to use their mother tongue. T2 and T41's comments in this regard were representative of the group:

Most of my students use mother tongue (Turkish) when they are going to share or tell about their thoughts in a discussion. Their excuse is that they find it difficult to tell what they intend to say in Turkish in English, owing to their limited proficiency. (T2)

Another reason they [students] tend to use Turkish is that perhaps something related to our examination system. That is to say, we often assess our students’ performance via written examinations, thus they care less about oral proficiency. (T41)

The real concern of the teachers here might also be owing to the popular global perception regarding the ban of L1 use from foreign language classrooms. The above views can thus be interpreted as an emotional concern of the teachers, rather than a serious practical concern of a misbehaviour type. The most accurate prediction regarding the L1 issue, on the other hand, would be that owing to the institutions’ strict policy on banning L1 from L2 classrooms, teachers feel obligated to see this issue as a type of disruptive behaviour, and develop a negative reaction towards it when it is raised.

4.1.3. Lack of willingness to study as part of low motivation

In the study, the majority (n = 26) of the teachers raised the issue of students being insufficiently motivated, and raised the issue of demotivation as a misbehaviour type. The main concern of the teachers here, however, seems not be on viewing demotivation as a type of misbehaviour, but its consequences. That is to say, teachers mostly linked students' lack of willingness to participate (e.g., not contributing to the lesson, not answering the questions asked, not attending the lessons regularly, and exerting passive behavior towards the lesson) to their insufficient motivation caused by other external factors. One of these factors was that the motivation to enter university was for the students to study their content areas, and not to study English. Moreover, a considerable number of the teachers thought that since the lessons required students to speak in front of others, they were disliked by the students, diminishing their motivation, or perhaps causing anxiety. Another factor for low motivation, according to T3, T4, T12, T18, T37, T38 and T44, was again related to the school system, as students are required to attend five hours of lessons every day, a routine that they found tedious. On the other hand, teachers T9, T11, T17, T18, T23 and T31 believed that motivation was a major problem in their classrooms and that it actually determined whether learners embarked on a task, how much time they devoted to it, and for how long they would persevere. T18's comment was typical:

It is often difficult to increase our students' motivation towards learning English. They are often not motivated ... I am not talking about their enthusiasm in participating while dealing with the tasks given to them, but how they approach the idea of learning English in general. They do not see this as something beneficial for the future, but they come to classes just to pass their exams ... Their motivation of learning the language is rather extrinsic.

Although T18 in the above extract explicitly mentions demotivation as a misbehavior type, this issue might be interpreted as demotivation being the source of misbehaviour, rather than being the misbehaviour itself. This is also apparent in the majority of the teachers' responses where they referred to students' lack of willingness to participate in lessons, not attending the lessons and staying passive in the lessons. A closer look at the above extract shows that T18's comments reflect the idea that her students were not in class because they actually wanted to learn English, but that learning English operates as a hurdle, possibly stimulating students to approach their studies with an exam- or point-oriented approach. The teacher's primary concern here was that students were unwilling to learn English, thus perhaps not willing to participate, which might be originating from the source of demotivation.
4.1.4. Excessive talking
Excessive talking, or in teachers’ words, “chatting”, formed one of the prominent themes of the interviews, which teachers (n = 22) regarded as an important form of student misbehaviour in their classrooms. When asked what they meant about excessive talking, the majority of the teachers referred to a “meaningless chat” between students, or “gabbling” in the classroom. The majority of the teachers mentioned that when checking homework individually, or when paying individual attention to a student, their peers would chat among one another. Another example cited for excessive talking was that students would start to talk when they lost interest in a task. Nevertheless, the majority of the teachers seemed less concerned with the excessive talking issue than with students chatting among each other in their mother tongue. As discussed in section 4.1.2, the specific use of the mother tongue was crucial to the teachers. Therefore, these two categories should be viewed as interrelated. This issue is clearly described by T14:

It is very easy for the students to lose concentration on the task and start gabbling, and once they start, it takes time to stop them. What is more serious is that as soon as they start chatting between each other, this happens in their mother tongue which makes things more difficult on my part ... I think the reason for this is that teaching a language requires more collaborative activities such as group and pair-works, where we give students more opportunities of interaction between each other, thus we have a higher risk of losing track of the activity. I do not think this happens in other subject classrooms where the teacher is more like a knowledge transmitter since proficiency is not the main concern.

Thus T14’s argument is that the main factor behind excessive chatting which is irrelevant to the lesson is because of the activities she uses in her lessons that would promote more student interaction, which, at the end of the day, are expected to develop students' proficiency in the target language. However, she also seems to face problems in controlling activities in which students lose motivation and shift to their mother tongue or irrelevant conversation, which she regards as excessive talking.

4.1.5. Asking irrelevant questions
Another common theme in interviews, which a considerable number of teachers (n = 23) regarded as a type of student misbehaviour, was students asking irrelevant questions to disrupt the lesson flow. According to the teachers, students exhibited this behaviour owing to a “loss of motivation”, getting bored or becoming tired. The types of irrelevant questions could be personal, such as about the teacher's personal life, or anything that was completely different from the task at hand. Although the teachers said that they ignored these kinds of questions and warned their students not to do so, the issue was somewhat common in most of the classrooms. T5 exemplifies this point:

I was teaching past tense. Their task was to produce sentences orally using past tense. They were asked to tell stories about themselves from the past. We did this with the first two students successfully. However, the third student suddenly started asking questions like ‘how long have you been teaching English?’ ‘Don’t you feel bored teaching English every day?’ and ‘Is it true that teachers of foreign languages earn more than other subject teachers?’ And this simply caused a distraction of the class and others went on asking similar nonsense questions.

Based on teachers’ responses in the interviews, this issue seemed to be common in most of the classrooms, and that it delayed the pace of the lesson.

4.2. Strategies teachers use to avoid student misbehaviour (research question 2)
In this category, the most common themes the teachers raised to avoid student misbehaviour are discussed. The most common strategies are displayed in Table 2.
4.2.1. Using classroom rules

According to the majority of the teachers (n = 28), clearly defined classroom rules represented a key way of handling behavioural problems in the classroom. More importantly, these teachers believed that consistently sticking to these rules could reduce behavioural problems in the long run. As T18 claimed:

Well, at first, I set rules and explain to them what they should do or what they should not do in the classroom. I always try to prevent the behavioural problems beforehand. I consistently remind them of the rules in a positive manner. They should know that they are in a formal classroom setting, and this setting has its own rules.

Similarly, T41 explained her thoughts on setting classroom rules thusly:

Each teacher must have clearly explained rules of what he/she expects from his/her students. When I say rules, I am not talking about being strict, or I am not expecting my students to be soldiers. I mean, rules should be exposed to the students in a positive manner, and they should be clear enough. The students should understand why they should not act in a way they do, rather than just knowing that some things are forbidden.

The above quotations illustrate teachers’ strong beliefs about setting classroom rules with the intention of decreasing levels of student misbehaviour. They seem to believe that when classroom rules are clearly defined, and more importantly when it was ensured that students understood why they should not undertake certain behaviours in the classroom, the problem of student misbehaviour could be reduced.

4.2.2. No punishment

One of the most popular answers given by the teachers in response to strategies to avoid student misbehaviour was to not punish the students (n = 43). Interestingly, this was the most common theme during interviews. Perhaps this can be related to students’ culture. On the other hand, the teachers tended to firmly believe that punishing students would often result in “the entire class becoming more aggressive”, and that “it created more disruptive behaviour”. Instead of punishing the students, the majority of the teachers advocated the use of a variety of techniques, which are outlined in the following sections. T20, for example, stated that punishing often resulted in a conflict with the entire class. Furthermore, T34 stated that following the punishment, the level of students’ bullying and disturbance would often increase, thus exacerbating the challenge of managing the classroom. The development of a rebellious student attitude towards the teacher was another issue raised by T26 following a punishment. For these reasons, the majority of the teachers in the study rejected the idea of punishment, and instead claimed to favour a constructive manner when dealing with student misbehaviour. T41’s comment in this regard was representative:

Punishing the students does not solve the behavioural problems in the classrooms I guess. Whenever I opt for that option, I usually fail because there is always a reaction for that … The students often become obstinate or they become sentimental. It is always one way or the other.

4.2.3. Body language

When suggesting means of coping with student misbehaviour, a considerable number of teachers (n = 34) raised the strategy of non-verbal cues. That is to say, they believed that instead of punishing the students, teachers should use non-verbal language to make students understand
that they were behaving inappropriately. According to the majority, non-verbal forms of communication, such as creating eye contact and effective use of body language, was effective in transmitting messages that could be understood without relying on words. They believed that non-verbal cues were more effective than verbal communication in terms of avoiding the creation of tension between teacher and students. Some also believed that gestures could leave a more long-term impact on students’ minds. As T8 argued:

If a student has a tendency to chat with the student next to him, I often annoy him with my look, like I follow him with my eyes. This is an effective way of stopping him. In the other way [using words], he responds to me, and pushes me into a discussion, which again causes a class disruption.

4.2.4. Increasing volume
Teachers regularly referred to the idea of changing their intonation when confronted with student misbehaviour. Intonation refers to teachers increasing the volume of their voice, often as a means of indicating to students that their actions are inappropriate. According to the majority (n = 29), this was their “weapon” to tackle noise in the classroom. This is explained by T17 and T31:

I often raise my intonation and go beyond students’ level of noise. I do this to make a point that they should stop it and I also get their attention. (T17)

I never stop my lesson and ask students what they are doing. I always continue with a raised tone of voice so that they can understand that I am annoyed. In this way, I indicate to them that they should stop it. (T31)

In the interviews, teachers’ increase of their volume seemed to be one of the most common strategies to avoid or stop student misbehaviour. They viewed this as an effective strategy, as it does not require the lesson to be paused or cause conflict between the teacher and students.

4.2.5. Being positive
A considerable number of teachers (n = 28) in the study mentioned that being positive was the key to solving behavioural problems in their classrooms. This issue, however, should not be confused with the category “no punishment”, as one refers to the disruptive behaviour that is being exhibited and an action (e.g. penalty) to be taken against it, whereas the other refers to the general positive attitude of the teachers towards the students, which may diminish disruptive behaviour. According to the teachers, instead of using anger, being positive solves problems much more quickly and effectively, as well as providing “respect” to the teacher. This was explained by T5:

When I enter the classroom, I go there as a daughter, a young mother, as a wife and also as an English teacher. Although I play my role as an English teacher, I keep my other identities on hand. I never forget that they are teenagers. I never forget that they are similar to my children at home who also sometimes do things that I do not approve. But I always try to approach them positively, as I believe this solves problems softly.

However, the teachers in the study also attended to not confusing being positive and being less able to handle disruptive behaviour in the classroom. T12, for example, mentioned that although she was positive at all times, this did not mean that anyone could break her rules.

4.3 Correspondence between teachers’ proposed strategies to avoid student misbehaviour and those used in the classroom (research question 3)
The data from the observations suggested that teachers on some occasions were unable to execute their proposed strategies to challenge disruptive behaviour. This included the evaluation of the themes they raised as given in section 4.2 (using classroom rules, no punishment, body language, increasing volume, and being positive). Analysis of the observation data revealed that most often they did not react to the disruptive behaviour occurring in their classrooms, and
remained “positive”, which corresponds to what they initially proposed. “Being positive” here refers to teachers’ constructive reactions to the students such as explaining what they did was not appropriate and how they ought to behave, and using gestures to indicate that something in students’ behavior was wrong and expecting for the appropriate behavior (from what had been observed). One reason for this could be that, as raised in the interviews, teachers believed that being positive or staying positive would solve their problems, or that it would preclude disruptive behavior. Indeed, as they initially stated in the interviews, punishing students can provoke greater aggression, whereas being positive might improve the classroom climate. Another explanation might be that the teachers did not want to cause their students to become demotivated, as also suggested during interviews. As an example, the theme that was perceived to be paramount by the majority of the teachers (n = 28) in interviews seemed to be the least common in the classroom. Only two of the teachers in the study were observed referring to the classroom rules they had set to avoid student misbehaviour in their classrooms. Twenty-six teachers, however, did not act in all the ways they had proposed during interviews. Even more surprising was that none of these teachers had prepared a list of classroom rules to be displayed in their classrooms. T18 and T41, for example, clearly mentioned in the interviews that they would set or remind the students of their classroom rules during their lessons or whenever misbehaviour occurred. However, during all three of their classroom observation sessions, it was observed that instances of students chatting in their mother tongue and consistently using their mobile phones occurred. In spite of the fact that these teachers clearly mentioned in the interviews that they perceived these actions as forms of misbehaviour, they did not seem to set or remind students of any classroom rules, and instead simply ignored them. This issue also applied to thirteen more teachers who referred to classroom rules in interviews but ignored them in the classroom. An instance from T28’s classroom was observed and noted as:

... during the group-work activity, a group of students were having a loud chat and laughing. It was obvious that their focus was not on the activity. This continued for eight minutes and the teacher was going around the classroom without warning them.

In the interviews, however, T28 raised the issue of interfering with the students when they go off-task and reminding them of classroom expectations. This, however, was not the case in reality.

In regard to the theme of no punishment, it was observed that except one, none of the teachers in the study preferred punishing students in the classrooms, thus corresponding with their proposed strategies. Since the theme punishment was not clarified by the teachers with regard to what it actually included, but was regarded as a kind of penalty which would affect the students, during the observations, only the issues which would have sanctions on students such as asking to leave the classroom, not giving participation points to the students, sending students to school administration for further disciplinary procedures, and writing a disciplinary report about the student were considered as punishments. However, teachers mostly exhibited a positive attitude towards the students and attempted to avoid student misbehaviour by being positive in such a way. This approach seemed to be successful in all classrooms on most occasions. Nevertheless, one teacher failed to act according to her claims in the interview by punishing a student by asking him to leave the classroom. This, however, probably does not apply to the overall cohort; therefore, on the whole teachers seemed to be using the strategy of “no punishment”. This issue was noted in the observations as:

A student has been distracting the classroom since we went into the classroom (15 minutes). He has been asking irrelevant questions to the teacher and he was responding to every question asked to the others without waiting his turn. Teacher’s anger was very clear from her face. Finally, he suddenly stood up and walked to the other side of the classroom to give something to his friend. And the teacher asked him to leave the classroom and ticked his attendance record as absent.
Thus the use of body language and increasing volume, strategies that can be used to prevent student misbehaviour (as raised by the majority of teachers in interviews) were scarcely observed in the classroom. In the majority of the classrooms observed, these strategies were not noted at all, or when employed, failed to work as intended (when saying body language, for example, issues such as confident posture of the teacher, showing interest, facial expressions (positive or negative), eye-contact, adopting different poses, not standing behind a desk and so on were looked at while observing). For example, when teachers increased their volume to attain students’ attention, they simply failed. Despite chaos was not the case in these classrooms; teachers simply did not prefer to employ them, perhaps to remain positive. Perhaps the biggest issue observed, and as raised by all of the teachers in the interviews, was the use of one’s mother tongue. Given that the teachers claimed to be very strict about the use of the mother tongue and possessed useful strategies, it was surprising to see that this was not, or could not, be prevented. Again, being positive or avoiding punishment in order not to break students’ enthusiasm helped account for why teachers did not react to this behaviour, which they perceived as disruptive in the interviews. Some of the instances that were noted during the observations pertained to teachers being passive towards L1 use, in spite of their strong claims in interviews:

... teacher was asking questions to the students in a row according to their seating arrangement. The first three students who have been asked questions replied in Turkish. There was no reaction by the teacher. She accepted the answers and continued asking the next student. (T41-observation session 2)

... a student was talking about the benefits of technology upon the question asked by the teacher. The aim was to encourage the students to explain themselves orally in the target language. The student suddenly shifted to the Turkish language and concluded her comments in the Turkish language. There was no reaction by the teacher at all. (T13- observation session 1)

5. Discussion of the findings
This study has attempted to investigate the types of student misbehaviour that are common in foreign language classrooms as a unique domain of enquiry, and to explore EFL teachers’ strategies to avoid student misbehaviour. Furthermore, the study has compared teachers’ proposed strategies to avoid student misbehaviour with their actual actions in the classroom.

As regards the first category, “foreign language student misbehaviour types”, the study noted some important findings. In spite of the fact that many of the themes that emerged from this study pertaining to this category were similar to those in the area of general teaching (Charles, 2007; Elias & Schwab, 2006; Reagan & Osborn, 2002; Watzke, 2007; Zuckerman, 2007), issues such as asking irrelevant questions, lack of willingness to study as part of low motivation, and most importantly, use of mother tongue in the classroom, were identified as specific issues in foreign language classrooms (from the emphasis put by the teachers to these themes). Akin to general teaching, chatting, making noise and using mobile phones were also common themes. Themes such as asking irrelevant questions and lack of willingness to study, however, should not imply that they are the characteristics of a foreign language classroom only, but they perhaps have not emerged in earlier studies in the area of general teaching may be owing to their methodological constraints, different focus points and education levels. This might also mean that these themes are applicable to any type of classroom.

In terms of comparing findings of the present study to the other findings from different levels of education noted in the literature, some differences have been noticed. Based on these, it might not be wrong to claim that primary level classrooms are more prone to have different characteristics when it comes to misbehaving, whereas secondary and higher education levels show more similarities (i.e. using mobile phones, non-attentiveness, and lack of willingness due to external
Factors and so on). In primary level, for example, teachers are often noted to face unconscious pupil behaviour, noise, pupils dealing with other things and daydreaming (Çabaroğlu & Altinel, 2010). On the other hand, there is some convincing evidence that higher education classrooms are more likely to face non-attentiveness, and lack of concentration and motivation (Gökduman, 2007; Poulu & Norwich, 2000; Üstünolğa, 2013), which is also what was perceived by the teachers who participated in the present study. This similarity between secondary and higher education levels, on the other hand, might be something expected, as a senior year student in secondary education is actually months away from higher education, therefore similarities are likely to be present in both levels.

Misbehavior types such as lack of willingness to study emerging from the source demotivation, on the other hand, as noted in Aydin and Bahce (2001), Kerdikoshvili (2012) and Korukcu’s (1996) studies, was considered an influential factor in increasing students’ interest in tasks in foreign language classrooms. The issue of students being less willing to participate in lessons, staying passive towards the lessons, and even not attending the lessons which were perceived to be misbehavior types by the teachers seem to emerge from their low motivation caused by other external factors, as claimed by the teachers. This perhaps may require separate attention, as the theme of motivation as raised by the teachers’ stands to be a psychological construct compared to the other themes, which are rather physical. One reason for students’ lack of motivation in the present study was related by teachers to students’ busy timetable, which would create routine and boredom. Another reason was that the language courses attended by students did not represent their true interest or motivation, but rather were obligatory in order to start studying in their faculties. This might be linked to a broader issue cited in the literature of students perceiving negligible value in a course, and perhaps also in its content (Renninger, 2009). Other reasons, although not mentioned by teachers in the present study, might be that students simply did not believe that their efforts would improve their performance, or that they had other activities that competed for their time and attention (e.g. their faculty). Moreover, not having a positive classroom climate, and lack of positive reinforcement and acceptance by the teachers, could also represent factors behind their lack of motivation (Brophy, 2008; Dönayei, 2005).

“Use of mother tongue” in foreign language classrooms, on the other hand, would appear to be one of the most important findings of the present study, which seem to be an original theme in the area of foreign language classroom management research. In the study, almost all of the teachers displayed negative reactions to the use of L1 in foreign language classrooms. The main reason for this reaction might be the institutions’ strict L2-only policies which perhaps have played a strong role in their negative responses towards L1 use while responding the researchers, even if they did not agree with such top-down ideology. In some cases, for example, teachers acknowledged that L1 has a place in classrooms, and that it is indispensable. The reason for this thought might be owing to the popular perception existing in the area of foreign language teaching. Recent trends in the area of foreign language teaching place a high level of importance on communicative proficiency, whereas traditional methods, which extensively focus on reading and writing through memorisation and translation (e.g. grammar translation method), have become relatively less significant. In this respect, a popular perception today is that foreign language education should use the target language when presenting content. That is to say, foreign language education is now seen as a “vehicle for communicating content” (Tedick & Walker, 1994, p. 301), rather than merely the delivery of the content (Appel, 2007). It is often suggested that language educators and students should be exposed or encouraged to use the target language as much as possible (at least 90 per cent) in the classroom, as well as even outside the classroom (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 2010). On the other hand, this paves a way to an understanding of teachers who use L1 or who allow their students to use L1 in the classroom are less effective educators (Bateman, 2008; Putman, 2009). Previous studies also seem to confirm this idea, as it was reported earlier that teachers often feel ashamed when permitting the use of L1 owing to the popular perception that this should be avoided or diminished, in spite of its usefulness in some situations (Debreli, 2016; Debreli & Oyman, 2016). However, it is also known that although teachers are often
concerned about the effectiveness of L1 in the classroom, their pedagogical reasoning sometimes instigates them to use it, especially as a means of managing the class (Littlewood & Yu, 2009).

Interestingly, many of the misbehavior types reported in the literature in general education such as annoying others, lying, stealing, cheating, sexual harassment, malicious mischief, defiance of authority did not appear in the present study. One reason for this could be the cultural differences between the present context and those reported in the literature, where lying and defiance of authority is often viewed as something serious. Similarly, sexual harassment or stealing are viewed as something seriously to be ashamed of as part of the culture, and may be they are non-existent in school settings. Another reason for the non-existence of these behaviors might be that the student group in higher education dealt in the present study may be more mature individuals compared to those findings in the literature where data from younger groups of students were collected.

In terms of the strategies used by the teachers to avoid student misbehaviour (those proposed in the interviews), issues identified in areas of general teaching also emerged in this study (e.g. setting classroom rules). This finding aligns with those of Corzo and Contreras (2011), Stoughton (2007), and Zuckerman (2007). On the other hand, foreign language teachers in the present study were distinctive in regularly referring to affective strategies of handling student misbehaviour, such as being positive, increasing the volume to get attention and giving no punishment. Such findings have not been noted in previous research, and unlike past findings that often reflect task-based or physical changes within the classroom (e.g. planning lessons effectively, changing the seating arrangement, dealing with off-task students, and so on), the teachers in the present study claimed to prefer rather affective strategies when handling student misbehaviour. One reason could be that the teachers in the present study believed in the importance of developing good relationships with the students, and since language teaching requires consistent interaction (Littlewood & Yu, 2009), they preferred to maintain good relationships rather than setting severe rules. Another reason could be that they spoke from a solely theoretical perspective (because they actually did or could not employ these strategies in the classrooms—see the following paragraph), and mentioned issues of how it should be, rather than what they actually do.

When the participants were observed in action, it was noted that they preferred to use strategies which were less direct (i.e. being positive and giving no punishment), compared to their strong strategies (i.e. referring to already established classroom rules), as mentioned in the interviews. However, it is relatively difficult to comment on this dynamic especially to understand the reasons, as post-interviews were not used to ask the participants why they were less direct when it came to execute their clearly proposed direct strategies during the interviews. One reason for this could be that they avoided disrupting the class, as well as established a good rapport between the students and themselves. As an example, L1 was used in classrooms in spite of objections by teachers in interviews. One reason for these strong reactions towards L1 use could be owing to the institutions’ top-down policy on banning L1, thus teachers exerted a reaction towards it and allowed its use to some extent. Or, this might also show that they simply did not entirely agree with this ideology in practice and avoided its consequences. On the other hand, more direct strategies, such as the setting of classroom rules, were not employed following an occurrence of misbehaviour. A possible reason could be that teachers described merely idealised or hypothetical actions. That is to say, although their initial views sounded pragmatic, their classroom practice was dogmatic.

6. Conclusion
This study has explored the types of student misbehaviour that can surface in foreign language classrooms. It has also investigated foreign language teachers’ preferred strategies to handle student misbehaviour, and whether these correspond with their practices in the classroom. The findings have revealed several types of student misbehaviour in foreign language classrooms, some of which align with previous findings in general teaching and others that are new to the
The issue of students using their mother tongue in English lessons seems to be a finding specific to foreign language classroom management research, as this has not been identified in earlier studies. The findings regarding teachers’ preferred strategies to tackle student misbehaviour may also reflect new issues in the area, as unlike previous findings, teachers’ preferences here were rather affirmative. Another important finding was that teachers’ proposed strategies to handling student misbehaviour did not correspond with their actual classroom practices. The reason for this issue, however, remains unanswered, and further research is needed to explore the phenomenon.

The findings have important implications for the field of foreign language teaching. It is clear that foreign language classroom management is different from general classroom management, as it requires intensive interaction and communication between the students and also between the teacher and the students. This very issue seems to greatly affect the classroom management of the teachers. It seems that many of the theoretical ideas, techniques and approaches to classroom management that are considered effective often lack practicality in foreign language classrooms. One reason is that the realities of foreign language classrooms seem to be disregarded by the relevant literature, and the views proposed by the majority of the teachers reflect a rather naive and black and white understanding of the issues that exist in classrooms in this subject. Teachers should be given greater practical freedom, or be supported by self-assessing reflective activities in order to evaluate their own perceptions and skills, related to certain issues. Only in this way may they be enabled to develop the critical stance in evaluating the realities of the foreign language classroom, and adapt their techniques or upgrade their views of effective classroom management.
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Appendices

Appendix A

Interview Questions

1. In the classroom, what kinds of student misbehaviour do you face? Can you give examples?

2. When you face student misbehaviour in your classroom, what kind of classroom management strategies do you employ?

3. How do you deal with disruptive and challenging behaviours?

4. In general, do you think there is a specific way of avoiding student's misbehaviour? Why?

5. Do you have a classroom management plan? If yes, can you provide any details?

6. What is the most shocking misbehaviour situation that you have ever dealt with?

7. In your opinion, what is/are the main cause(s) of misbehaviour in the classroom?

8. Do you want to add any information about students' misbehaviour from your own classroom?

Appendix B

Classroom Misbehavior Observation Checklist

This checklist is designed based on the responses teachers' gave to the interview questions asked to them. Three sections are included into the checklist. First section lists the types of misbehavior that teachers proposed as the most common in their classrooms. You are asked to comment if the given behavior type(s) appeared in the classroom and comment on how it took place. Second section lists the types of strategies that teachers proposed in the interviews as their preferred strategy to avoid student misbehavior. You are asked to comment on whether and how the teacher adapted the given strategies. Final section asks you to give examples of related issues that are not prelisted in the former sections and comment on the classroom instances where a type of misbehavior occurred and what the teacher did.
Observed Teacher:________________ Observation Date:____________________
Observer:________________ Number of Observations:______________
Classroom and Level:_______________________________________________

**Type of Student Misbehavior Occurred**

Using Mobile Phone:
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

Using Mother Tongue:
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

Demotivated Students:
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

Excessive Talking:
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

Asking Irrelevant Questions:
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

**Type of Strategy Adapted by the Teacher When Dealing with the Misbehavior**

Using Classroom Rules:
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

No Punishment:
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

Body Language:
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

Using Intonation:
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

Being Positive:
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
Other Occasions When Misbehavior Occurred and What Teacher Did

Instance I:

____________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________

Instance II:

____________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________

Instance III:

____________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________

- END OF THE CHECKLIST -