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Abstract
This study investigated the link between each dimension of English teachers’ classroom management and the twelfth grade students’ English achievement, and the influence of each dimension of English teachers’ classroom management on the twelfth grade students’ English achievement of one Islamic senior high school in Palembang. The correlation research design was applied in this study. The population of this study was the twelfth grade students. Convenience sampling technique was used to select the sample consisting of 85 students, 42 students of science class and 43 students of social class. The result analysis indicated that there was no significant correlation between behavioral dimension of classroom management and English achievement since the r-obtained (-.012) was lower than r-table (.213). Then, there was no significant correlation between instructional dimension of classroom management and English achievement since the r-obtained (-.016) was lower than r-table (.213). From the findings, it can be concluded that each dimensions of classroom management had no correlation with English achievement. It means that the English teachers’ classroom management was not a dominant factor affecting students’ English achievement.
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Introduction

Globalization has placed English as the most important language in the world. According to Harmer (2001), English is a language that is widely used and spoken in every part of life, such as: arts, sciences, human sciences, travel, and social sciences (as cited in Astrid, 2011, p.176). Furthermore, Crystal (2003) states that English can be a priority foreign language teaching in a country (as cited in Putra & Marzulina, 2015, p.186). Moreover, Mauranen and Ranta (2009) add that English has established its position as the global lingua franca that beyond any doubt it has become one of the symbols of our time, together with globalization, networking, economic integration, and the internet. Therefore, English is one of the international languages which is widely used as an important language and should be mastered by people to communicate with others from different countries in the world (Erlina et al., 2019; Marzulina et al., 2019; Mukminin, Ali, & Ashari, 2015; Mukminin et al., 2018).

English also takes special place in educational system in Indonesia. According to Wahyuni (2006), there are three important roles of English in Indonesia. Firstly, English becomes a compulsory subject for Indonesian students start from junior high school to university level. Secondly, English is one of the main subjects in senior high school level and it is one of the subjects tested in the national examination. And thirdly, in the national examination,
graduation is determined by the students’ English scores. These statements suggest that English is essential in the field of education. Every subject taught at school including English has been determined by achievement. According to Rahmani (2011), in all educational systems, academic achievement is one of the most important indicators of learning and understanding. Furthermore, Marmoah (2012) states that learning achievement is the learning result which got by learner that is related to learner’s effort. In short, students’ achievement refers to the grades obtained by the students upon accomplishing the courses in their study. However, English achievement of Indonesian students is still not satisfying. This is based on the result of students scores in national examination of English subject. Kemendikbud mentioned that there was a decrease in the average national examination of senior high school students score 2018 in English subject averaged 1.7 points (Putra & Marzulina, 2016). Based on the data, it can be assumed that Indonesian students still have problems in mastering English.

The unsatisfying results mentioned previously might occur due to some factors, one of them is classroom management (Habibi, Razak, Yusop, & Mukminin, 2019; Muazza, Mukminin, Habibi, Hidayat, & Abidin, 2018; Mukminin, Muazza, Hustarna, & Sari, 2015). According to Cooper (2011), academic and social-emotional learning is supported and facilitated by classroom management. Effective classroom managers create an environment to foster academic achievement. Moreover, Al-Zu’bi (2013) argued that classroom management refers to all those essential activities which are highly necessary not only to create but also to maintain a supportive and orderly atmosphere. In addition, a good and efficient classroom management is important to support the students in getting their achievement (Habibi, Sofwan, & Mukminin, 2016; Marzulina, Erlina, Pitaloka, & Paramika, 2019; Marzulina, Pitaloka, Herizal, Holandyah, Erlina, & Lestari, 2018; Prasojo, Habibi, Mukminin, Muhaimin, Taridi, Ikhsan, & Saudagar, 2017). A good classroom management allows the students to be motivated and focused on enhancing their interaction with the whole class. Luz (2015) believes that a good and efficient classroom management is important to set up the rules, to manage time and space to give students all the conditions and support to be and feel engaged in the learning process. Moreover, Santrock (2011) also states that a teacher having good classroom management skills keeps students busy with active, appropriately challenging tasks; and provides activities in which students become interested and motivated to learn. Therefore, good classroom management is important to provide conducive environment in learning process.

In order to create good classroom management, teachers play two important roles in managing a classroom. First, according to Tauber (2007), the role of the teachers is to help facilitate the natural growth motivation in children. Teachers will have to give away some of their power to empower students. Secondly, Al-Zu’bi (2013) reveals that the role of teachers is to create supportive and friendly environment in the classroom where students feel safe, respected, cared and secured. Indeed, the effective classroom management can make students feel more motivated and engaged in the learning process. There are some goals of classroom management. Santrock (2011) states that effective classroom management has two main goals: to help students spend more time on learning and less time on non-goal-directed activity, and to prevent students from developing academic and emotional problems. Furthermore, Erden, Aytac, and Erden (2016) also reveal that classroom management has aimed at creating cooperative work among learners and teachers as well as effective realization of teaching and learning process. In brief, the application of classroom management has an important role in managing the teachers and learners in teaching and learning activity. Many teachers assumed that managing a classroom in teaching and learning process has many difficulties. The problems encountered by teachers in
managing the classes are: (1) organizing the classroom, (2) planning and teaching rules and procedures, (3) managing students’ work and improving students’ accountability, (4) maintaining good student behavior, and (5) conducting instruction and maintaining momentum. In short, managing the classroom is the major problem in some schools faced by teachers in teaching and learning process (Erlina et al., 2020; Mukminin, Muazza, Hustarna, & Šari, 2015).

A preliminary study was conducted by interviewing the teacher of English and the twelfth grade students of one Islamic senior high school in Palembang to see the overview about English teaching and learning activity. Based on the interview with the students, it was found that most of the students could not concentrate well during the process of teaching learning English. They also had difficulties in understanding the teachers’ instructions in English. The students also said that they were dissatisfied with their academic achievement because the class sometime seemed boring so they did not participate well in the class. Furthermore, the teacher stated that she had some problems when teaching English in the class. The problems were: 1) the students were lazy to do the assignments; 2) the students in the class did not really pay attention to the teacher’s explanation, and 3) some of them were not active in learning English. Those problems above showed that there were some problems of classroom management in teaching and learning process.

There have been some studies concerning the issues in preliminary study. First, a study conducted by Obwoya (2013) on the relationship between classroom management and learners’ achievement. It was found that there was a significant positive relationship between classroom management and learners’ achievement. Furthermore, a study conducted by Rana and Akbar (2010) on the relationship between classroom learning environment and students’ achievement in higher education which focused on classroom learning environment in Mathematics class. The study showed that classroom learning environment affected students’ academic achievement. Finally, another study conducted by Mahmoodi, Izadi and Dehghannezhad (2015) by using one hundred and five Iranian EFL teachers (50 males and 55 females) in Shiraz and Hamadan district. They found that there was no correlation between classroom management and students’ achievement. Since there has been inconsistency among the results mentioned above, I conducted a research which investigated the link between each dimension of English teachers’ classroom management and the twelfth grade students’ English achievement, and the influence of each dimension of English teachers’ classroom management on the twelfth grade students’ English achievement of one Islamic senior high school in Palembang.

Literature review: Classroom management, styles, Goals, and English achievement

Classroom management plays an important role in student’s achievement (Habibi et al., 2018; Muazza et al., 2019; Muazza et al., 2018). Djigic and Stojiljkovic (2011) stated that classroom management refers to creating safe and stimulating learning environment. Erden, Aytac, and Erden (2016) argued that classroom management for teachers and students is not a state, but it is a process. Moreover, according to Borden (2013) management will help the day run more smoothly, along with lessons. Furthermore, Luz (2015) stated that the teacher’s role is to create learning conditions and gives students the chance to produce language, interact and make mistakes and errors to facilitate language learning. In addition, classroom management has aimed at creating cooperative work among learners and teachers as well as effective realization of teaching and learning process.
Success in classroom management has closer relation to teacher’s sensitivity on human relationships and teacher’s knowledge about classroom management. According to Marzano and Marzano (2003) teacher-student relationships provide an important foundation for effective classroom management and classroom management is a key to increase student’s achievement. In order to manage a successfully physical and psychological environment, teachers need to excite greater interest in students. Classroom management has several dimensions and styles. According to Martin and Sass (2010), there are two important dimensions of classroom management: 1) Behavioral Management (BM) is a form of discipline that includes pre-planned efforts to prevent misbehavior as well as the teacher’s response to the behavior and 2) Instructional Management (IM) addresses teachers’ instructional aims and methodologies and includes aspects such as monitoring seat-work and structuring daily routines.

Furthermore, Martin and Sass (2010) categorize both dimensions into three categories: 1) Interventionists are the most controlling classroom teachers; 2) Noninterventionist teachers are those who handle classroom management with the slightest monitoring and directive means of intervention. Teachers can be more proactive and more constructive and 3) Interactionalists teachers are those who work to find solutions acceptable to both the teacher and students and use some of the same techniques as both non-interventionists and interventionists. Meanwhile, Sowell (2013) adds that: 1) Interventionist classroom managers seek to manage the classroom by intervening to shape student behavior with consequences. Student’s behavior drives the classroom and the teacher can become a full time disciplinarian rather than a teacher; 2) The noninterventionist approach to classroom management focuses on proactive rather than the reactive strategies of the Interventionists. The noninterventionist may post rules in the classroom, discuss correct ways to act in the classroom, and praise good behavior; and 3) The interactionalist classroom management style is a combination of noninterventionist and interventionist styles.

There are several goals of classroom management in teaching and learning activity. Classroom has two goals that elaborate as follows, first, to create and maintain a highly supportive learning environment. This goal is not meant for absolute control or creating an inert, docile, and totally compliant classroom. An effective classroom management is to maintain students’ interest, motivation and involvement. Thus, the focus is on activities that create positive, productive and facilitative learning environment. Secondly, to support and foster a safe classroom community. It means that students are allowed to make the connections needed for learning to take place. Each student needs to feel comfortable enough to discuss their previous understanding without fear of being ridiculed for their misconceptions. Hence, the students’ interest, motivation and involvement in the learning process is maintained (as cited in Asmarita, 2016, p.18).

Achievement refers to the good result from learning. Lawrence and Vimala (2012) stated that academic achievement is a measure of knowledge gained in formal education that indicated by test scores, grade points, average and degrees. An achievement is something done successfully, typically by effort, courage or skill. According to Yulia (2017), achievement in English learning could be seen from the students’ mastery of English subject. Moreover, Arib (2017) argues that the points in measuring the students’ performance or achievement is by knowing the indicators which are related to kind of achievement to be measured. Achievement of learning English usually focus in term of mastering those four skills and language component as well. There are four skills in learning English, listening, speaking, reading and writing. Those
skills are completed by mastering the language components namely vocabulary pronunciation, and grammar.

**Methods**

**Research design, research site, and participants**

A correlational research was applied in this study in terms of explanatory and prediction research design to find out the link between variables and explain and interpret the results that may appear. The procedures were, first, the questionnaire was used to identify the teachers’ classroom management. Second, the English test was administered to know students’ English achievement. Then the link between variables was analyzed through Statistical Package for Social and Science (SPSS) based on the result of the test. Finally, the explanation and interpretation of the results were discussed. The population of this study was the twelfth grade students of one Islamic senior high school in Palembang. The distribution of population of the study can be seen in Table 1.

**Table 1. The distribution of population**

| No | Population | Gender | Number of Population |
|----|------------|--------|----------------------|
|    |            | Male   | Female   |                      |
| 1  | XII IPA 1  | 17     | 25       | 42                   |
| 2  | XII IPA 2  | 10     | 30       | 40                   |
| 3  | XII IPA 3  | 17     | 24       | 41                   |
| 4  | XII IPS 1  | 20     | 23       | 43                   |
| 5  | XII IPS 2  | 19     | 24       | 43                   |
| 6  | XII IPS 3  | 20     | 22       | 42                   |
| 7  | XII IPS 4  | 18     | 25       | 43                   |
| 8  | XII IPS 5  | 20     | 22       | 42                   |
|    | Total      | 141    | 195      | 336                  |

To decide the number students as the sample in this study, convenience sampling techniques was used. One class from science class and one class from social class were taken based on the recommendation from the English teacher and the headmaster. The distribution of the sample is as follows;

**Table 2. The distribution of the sample**

| No | Group Class | Number of Population |
|----|-------------|----------------------|
|    |             | Male | Female |
| 1  | XII IPA 1   | 17   | 25     |
| 2  | XII IPS 1   | 20   | 23     |
|    | Total       | 37   | 48     |

85
Data collection and analysis

Questionnaire and English test were used as instruments in this study to get the information about teacher’s classroom management and students’ English achievement. I used the ready-made questionnaire taken from a study conducted by Martin and Sass (2010). The BIMS consists of 24 questions with 12 questions pertaining to the behavior management perceptions of teachers and 12 questions pertaining to the instructional management perceptions of teachers. The time allocation to answer the questionnaire was 20 minutes. The score for each domain is ranging from 1 to 6 point of Likert-scale (1= disagree; 6= strongly agree). The sample students were asked to answer an English test. The test was based on the curriculum. In this case, they were asked to answer the test which consists of 25 multiple choice questions and they had 45 minutes to do the English test. Since I used the ready-made Behavior and Instructional classroom management questionnaire which was taken from a study conducted by Martin and Sass in 2010, thus, the BIMS questionnaire was considered valid. To find out the validity of English test, I asked some lecturers in English Education Study Program of State Islamic University in Palembang to validate the English test questions whether each component of the instrument is valid or not to be applied in research activities. The result showed that the instruments were good and appropriate to be used in this study.

In addition, in order to judge whether or not a test has the content validity, I checked the syllabus from school and then matched the item into test specification. Then, the result of the analysis in constructing the content validity was presented in the test specifications table including, objectives of the test, test materials, test indicators, total of test, type of test, and answer key. A good test should be reliable. The questionnaire has been checked for its reliability by Kazemi and Solemani (2016). The reliability for behavior management was 0.75 and for instructional management was 0.78. It means that the questionnaire showed acceptable consistency reliability. In order to find out the correlation between teacher’s classroom management and students’ academic achievement, I used inferential statistics analysis. Pearson Product Moment correlation analysis was employed in order to analyze the data.

Findings

The results of teachers’ classroom management

The total number of active students were 336 students. 85 students participated in this study. The 24 items of Behavioral and Instructional Management Scale (BIMS) were used to investigate the teachers’ classroom management. The BIMS questionnaire used Likert-scale 1-6. In answering the statement in the questionnaire, the students chose number 1-6, (1) disagree, (2) disagree strongly, (3) slightly disagree, (4) agree, (5) agree slightly, and (6) strongly agree. The students chose which number that was appropriate for them. The descriptive statistical analysis of BIMS questionnaire for the participants is shown in Table 3. First, for behavioral management, the maximum score was 66, and the lowest score was 47. The mean of the behavioral classroom management scores was 55.80 and the standard deviation was 3.251. Second, for instructional management, the maximum score was 65, and the lowest score was 50. The mean of the instructional classroom management score was 55.62 and the standard deviation was 3.240.
Table 3. The descriptive statistics of teachers’ classroom management

|                                | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|--------------------------------|---|---------|---------|------|----------------|
| Behavioral CM                 | 85| 47      | 66      | 55.80| 3.251          |
| Instructional CM              | 85| 50      | 65      | 55.62| 3.240          |
| Valid N (listwise)            | 85|         |         |      |                |

Furthermore, from the interval of teachers’ behavioral classroom management, it was found that out of 85 students, 78 students were in interactionalist category (97.5%), 2 students were in noninterventionist category (2.5%), and no student was in interventionist category. The distribution of teachers’ classroom management scores can be seen in Table 4.

Table 4. The distribution of teachers’ behavioral classroom management

| Category            | Range Scores | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------------|--------------|-----------|------------|
| Noninterventionist  | 24 – 48      | 2         | 2.5%       |
| Interactionalist    | 50 – 96      | 83        | 97.5%      |
| Interventionist     | 98 – 144     | -         | -          |
| Total               | 85           | 100%      |            |

Moreover, from the interval of teachers’ instructional classroom management, it was found that all of 85 students were in interactionalist category (100%), no student was in noninterventionist category, and no student was in interventionist category. The distribution of teachers’ classroom management can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5. The distribution of teachers’ instructional classroom management

| Category            | Range Scores | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------------|--------------|-----------|------------|
| Noninterventionist  | 24 – 48      | -         | -          |
| Interactionalist    | 50 – 96      | 85        | 100%       |
| Interventionist     | 98 – 144     | -         | -          |
| Total               | 85           | 100%      |            |

The results of students’ English achievement

The descriptive statistical analysis of English achievement test for the participants is shown below. The maximum score was 96, and the lowest score was 52. The mean of the classroom management score for the participants was 77.69 and the standard deviation was 9.708.
Table 6. The descriptive statistics of students’ English achievement

| Descriptive Statistics | N  | Minimum | Maximum | Mean  | Std. Deviation |
|------------------------|----|---------|---------|-------|----------------|
| English Achievement    | 85 | 52      | 96      | 77.69 | 9.708          |
| Valid N (listwise)     | 85 |         |         |       |                |

It revealed that from English achievement test from 85 students, 42 students were in very good category (49.4%), 27 students were in good category (31.7%), 14 students were in average category (17.5%), 2 students were in poor category (2.5%), and there was no student on very poor category. The distribution of students’ English achievement can be seen in table 7.

Table 7. The distribution of students’ English achievement

| Score range | Category    | Frequency | Percentage |
|-------------|-------------|-----------|------------|
| 80-100      | Very good   | 42        | 49.4%      |
| 70-79       | Good        | 27        | 31.7%      |
| 60-69       | Average     | 14        | 17.5%      |
| 50-59       | Poor        | 2         | 2.5%       |
| 0-49        | Very poor   | -         | -          |
| Total       |             | 85        | 100%       |

The result of normality and linearity tests

The data are interpreted normal if p> 0.05. If p< 0.05, it means the data are not normal. Kolmogorov-smirnov was used to see the normality. The result of normality test from each variable was normal and appropriate for further data analysis with coefficient 0.157 for behavioral management, 0.033 for instructional management and 0.062 for English achievement. For linearity test, the deviation of linearity was obtained. If probability is more than .05, the two variables are linear. The result showed that the deviation from linearity between behavioral classroom management and English achievement was 0.675. To sum up, all of the data were linear for each correlation and regression analyses.

The correlation between English teachers classroom management and student English achievement

This part answered the first research problem by analyzing the result of descriptive statistics for the questionnaire and English achievement test. Based on Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient, the result indicated that there was no correlation between behavioral classroom management and English achievement. The correlation coefficient or the r-obtained (-0.012) was lower than r-table (0.213). Then, the level of probability (p) significance (sig.2-tailed) was .915. It means that p (0.915) was higher than 0.05. In other words, Ho was accepted and Ha was rejected. Thus, there was no significant correlation between behavioral classroom management and English achievement.
Table 8. The correlation between behavioral classroom management and English achievement.

| Correlations | Behavioral CM | English Achievement |
|--------------|---------------|---------------------|
| Behavioral CM Pearson Correlation | 1 | -.012 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .915 | .886 |
| N | 85 | 85 |

Based on Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient, the result indicated that there was no correlation between instructional classroom management and English achievement. The correlation coefficient or the r-obtained (-0.016) was lower than r-table (0.213). Then the level of probability (p) significance (sig.2-tailed) was .886. It means that p (0.886) was higher than 0.05. In other words, Ho was accepted and Ha was rejected. Thus, there was no significant correlation between instructional classroom management and English achievement.

Table 9. The correlation between instructional classroom management and English achievement.

| Correlations | Instructional CM | English Achievement |
|--------------|------------------|---------------------|
| Instructional CM Pearson Correlation | 1 | -.016 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .886 | .886 |
| N | 85 | 85 |

Since there was no significant correlation between two variables, it means that classroom management did not influence students’ English achievement. It was not necessary to do regression analysis because Ha was rejected.

Discussion

In order to strengthen the value of this study, the interpretations were made based on the result of data analysis. The aims of this study were to find out: (1) the correlation between each dimension of classroom management and English achievement, and (2) the influence of each dimension of classroom management over their English achievement. According to the findings,
there was no significant correlation between each dimension of classroom management and English achievement of the eleventh grade of Islamic senior high school in Palembang. Further, there was no significant influence of each dimension of classroom management on English achievement of the twelfth grade students of SMA YPI Tunas Bangsa Palembang.

First, based on the classroom management questionnaire, it was found that 78 students were in interactionalist category (97.5%), 2 students were in noninterventionist category (2.5%), and no student was in interventionist category. In other words, in behavioral management, most of the teachers used interactionalist approach, it means that the students and the teachers shared responsibility for controlling the classroom to prevent students’ misbehavior. Moreover, from the interval of teachers’ instructional classroom management, it was found that 85 students were in interactionalist category (100%), no student was in non interventionist category, and no student was in interventionist category. It means that in instructional management, all of the teachers used interactionalist approach. Thus, the teachers developed the methodologies with some students’ input such as in selecting teaching materials. From the result, it can be concluded that both of behavioral and instructional management were in interactionalist category. It means that the teacher could make modifications and adjustments in classroom by determining how students desire to be treated. Second, for the students’ English achievement, 42 students were in very good category (49.4%), 27 students were in good category (31.7%), 14 students were in average category (17.5%), 2 students were in poor category (2.5%), and there was no student on very poor category. It means that the students could understand all the lessons correctly. However, the writer also found that there were two students in poor level. It means that students who got this level should increase their English achievement. Based on the result of Pearson Product Moment Correlations, it was found that first there was no correlation between behavioral classroom management and English achievement. The correlation coefficient or the r-obtained (-0.012). Second, the result indicated that there was no correlation between instructional classroom management and English achievement. The correlation coefficient or the r-obtained (-0.016). Indeed, the result can also happen since classroom management was not the only one factor that affected English achievement.

The result of this present study is in line to the study of Marmoah (2012). The study indicated that there was no significant relationship between classroom management and English achievement. Moreover, Sumardi and Juhridin (2013) indicated that there was no significant correlation between classroom management and academic achievement. Furthermore, Mwaniki (2012) indicated that there was negative correlation between classroom management and academic performance. Moreover, this finding was in consistence with the result of a study conducted by Mahmoodi, Izadi and Dehghannezhad (2015) by using one hundred and five iranian EFL teachers (50 males and 55 females) in Shiraz and Hamadan district. They found that classroom management orientations have a negative relationship with students’ achievement. The study conducted by Al-Zu’bi (2013) also revealed that there was no significant correlation on the classroom management problem among the respondents when they were grouped according to gender, academic performance. Another study conducted by Yilmaz (2014) which focused to find out the influence of teachers’ orientations to classroom management on their classroom behaviors, students’ responses to these behaviors, and learning environment in ELT classrooms showed that there was no correlation among the variables. Moreover, Lawer, Isaac, Seth, and Nashiru (2016) indicated that there was no correlation between classroom management and academic performance.
This finding was also similar with the result of Asmarita (2016) who found that there was no significant correlation between classroom management, language anxiety, and ninth grade students’ English achievement all together. Furthermore, Diaz (2013) found that there was no significant correlation between students’ perceptions of classroom management, motivation in learning English and their English achievement, but in this chance I only focused with classroom management and English achievement. Last, Momani, Allouh, and Homran (2012) in their study about relationship between classroom management and learners’ achievement found that there was a significant negative relationship between classroom management and learners’ achievement. Finally, this study failed in investigating the correlation and influence between each dimension of classroom management and English achievement of the twelfth grade students of Islamic senior high school in Palembang. However, each dimension of classroom management was not significantly correlated with English achievement but from the result of this study, it showed that most of teachers of the school was in interactionalist scale, that was the most dominant scale that they used in classroom management.

**Conclusion**

Based on the findings and interpretations of the study, it can be concluded that, there was no significant correlation between each dimension of classroom management and English achievement. First, the result indicated that there was no correlation between behavioral classroom management and English achievement. The correlation coefficient or the r-obtained (-.012) was lower than r-table (0.213). Then, the level of probability (p) significance (sig.2-tailed) was .915. The findings showed that the null hypothesis (H0) was accepted and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) was rejected. Second, the result indicated that there was no correlation between instructional classroom management and English achievement. The correlation coefficient or the r-obtained (-.016) was lower than r-table (0.213). Then, the level of probability (p) significance (sig.2-tailed) was .886. The findings showed that the null hypothesis (H0) was accepted and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) was rejected.

It can be concluded that each dimension of the teachers’ classroom management did not give dominant effect to students’ English achievement. It can be assumed that the higher this classroom management possessed by the teachers, the better the result of English achievement. It also means that the teachers who have good understanding and using their classroom management effectively will make students have good achievement in English and the teachers with bad understanding and using their classroom management ineffectively will make students have bad achievement in English.
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