

A Cross-Cultural Study of English Teachers' Strategy Use for Managing Misbehavior in EFL and ESL Classrooms: The Case of Iran and the Philippines¹

Mahdieh Kor²

Marjan Vosoughi*³

Minoo Alemi⁴

Received: 2019-06-03 | Revised: 2019-07-29 | Accepted: 2019-10-01

Abstract

The present study aimed at investigating the perceptions of EFL teachers about students' misbehavior in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) and English as a Second Language (ESL) classroom contexts. Moreover, the study sought to probe what strategies EFL and ESL teachers use to deal with students' misbehavior. Participants included 10 teachers in EFL classes in Iran and 12 teachers in ESL classes in the Philippines. Qualitative data were collected through conducting interviews with the invited teachers and observing their classrooms for four sessions. Data were

¹ DOI: [10.22051/Ighor.2019.26525.1136](https://doi.org/10.22051/Ighor.2019.26525.1136)

² MSc, English Department, Tehran West Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran; mahdieh.kor@gmail.com

³ Assistant Professor of English Department, Sabzevar Branch, Islamic Azad University, Sabzevar, Iran; (Corresponding author); vosoughee@iaus.ac.ir

⁴ Associate Professor of English Department, Tehran West Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran; alemi@sharif.ac.ir

analyzed using the grounded theory (GT) method. The initial analysis of the data revealed that English language teachers in this study did not perceive misbehavior differently from the existing definitions in the literature. To them, misbehavior in all language classes could be defined as an unusual and unexpected behavior that would lead to disorder in the process of teaching and learning. The Filipino and Iranian teachers as two example cases of ESL versus EFL contexts, respectively, utilized three types of strategies to deal with students' misbehavior: 1) rule system, 2) reward system, and 3) personal encounter strategies for which clarifications were given in each context. Based on the analysis, it was found that the Filipino and Iranian teachers had more or less similar perceptions of learners' misbehavior. This article has numerous implications regarding classroom management as inspired by language learning contexts for a successful social interaction between and among language learners and their teachers in two diverse contexts (EFL vs. ESL).

Keywords: Misbehavior, Classroom management, Managerial strategies, ESL settings, EFL settings

Introduction

Students' misbehavior in classrooms is not uncommon with respect to teaching in general and second language (L2) teaching in particular. As discussed by Stone and Kidd (2011), misbehavior is concerned with those behavior types which are not compatible with the behavioral norms and rules determined either by the instructor or the school. In the same vein, Baúar (1999) maintains that the behaviors that weaken education can be labeled as undesirable behavior. Such a behavior ranges from the most to the least destructive ones. In fact, classroom misbehavior undermines the class atmosphere and the teaching process, stripping students and teachers of the opportunity to achieve their goals (Stone & Kidd, 2011). In the view of Lewis (2001), misbehavior is increasing in many school settings given the following conditions: changes in the families and communities, youth's access to new technology, and more importantly, limited school resources. In the context of the classroom, students participate in the interactions, which can result in a social paradigm/construct with a notable impact on how students behave (Kayi-Aydar, 2014). Therefore, the teachers need to be aware of these interactions as well as the way in which these interactions result in normal or out-of-norm behavior. Accordingly, they should adopt appropriate strategies to manage misbehavior.

Undoubtedly, good classroom management influences various dimensions such as coping with misbehavior in the classroom and establishing rules for ameliorating students' misbehaviors. This is regarded as a requirement for effective teaching and learning. Therefore, classroom management plays an essential role in effective instruction and teachers should be somewhat familiar with managerial skills before embarking on other areas of instruction (Berliner, 1988). Moreover, classroom management can be influenced by multiple cultural factors in educational settings (Fenning et al., 2012). According to Bear et al.

(2016), these factors include but are not limited to the social status of teachers and the students' socio-economic status.

This might necessitate the examination of misbehavior in different cultural settings. Since each cultural context is characterized by its own unique behavioral patterns, further cross-cultural studies should be conducted to shed light on how students' misbehaviors and classroom management are reflected in different L2 teaching settings. Given the first author's personal experience in the context of EFL and ESL in Iran and the Philippines, teachers would like to wield various types of management strategies to deal with students' misbehavior, with these strategies used with different frequencies.

Background of the Study

A review of the literature indicated that classroom management skills are highly valued in educational settings in general and in L2 contexts in particular (Vitto, 2006). Causing disruption in teaching may compromise learning. In fact, when learners avoid following the rules and challenge their instructor's authority, learning is undermined. When they engage in a face-off with one another and contribute to a hostile environment full of fear and uneasiness, learning is damaged (Sternberg & Williams, 2002). According to the results of previous studies (e.g., Battistich, Solomon, Kim, Watson, & Schaps, 1995; Kuperminc, Leadbeater, Emmons, & Blatt, 1997; Shochet, Dadds, Ham, & Montague, 2006; Wilson, 2004), a connection can be found between school atmosphere, academic achievement, and student misconduct, delinquencies, and behavioral conflicts. In fact, classroom management has come to be viewed as a more general concept than discipline (Martin & Baldwin, 1996). Discipline refers to teachers' reestablishment of order in class (Burden, 1995) in the face of students' misbehavior. Such inappropriate behaviors are likely to neutralize effective teaching and learning (Levin & Nolan, 2000).

The present study took account of the fact that students' misbehavior and classroom management can be considered as continuous challenges in language classroom settings. The nature of problems that might occur in two diverse contexts as ESL and EF where proficient uses of the English language differ to some degrees has however received less attention on the part of researchers. Nevertheless, some researchers such as Kalhous (as cited in Podana, 2017) acknowledged that misbehavior cannot occur on the basis of a single reason such as language incompetency, but rather on the basis of more causes, including social problems as well.

The investigations on students' misbehaviors and classroom management are scant as studies have not taken into consideration the cultural aspect of students' misbehaviors and classroom management. In fact, the majority of the studies are limited to reward and punishment as ways to cope with misbehavior. A review of the previous studies indicates that teachers use punishment and praise to cope with students' misbehavior in different school settings (e.g.,

Bear, Gaskins, Blank, & Chen, 2011; Bear et al., 2014; Fenning et al., 2012; Skiba, Horner, Chung, Rausch, May, & Tobin, 2011).

In the study conducted by Mitchell and Bradshaw (2013), it was intended to shed light on the effect of classroom students' perception of school climate and the role of classroom management and exclusionary discipline strategies. The findings showed that the greater use of exclusionary discipline strategies was associated with lower order and discipline scores, while greater use of classroom-based positive behavior supports was associated with higher scores on order and discipline, fairness, and student-teacher relationship. In contrast, in Kayi-Aydar's research (2014), which explored the links between social positioning and the language learning experiences of two talkative students in an ESL setting, Kai-Aydar drew on macro- and micro-level contexts of communication, in which he described how one of the two students became an accepted member of the class while the other was excluded. Hence, the confounding results in diverse studies could not shed more light on how one could interpret the findings across more generalized conditions. The same concept was fortified through a different interpretation by Miller (2000) who declared that when learners fail to be heard in representing themselves and doing social roles and hence not recognized by other members, they come to feel excluded from social interaction.

According to Pane (2010), the inconsistency in cultural backgrounds, or cultural mismatch, leads to discrepancies in expectations or misunderstandings regarding appropriate classroom behavior. This results in teachers' emphasis on classroom discipline. Moreover, previous research on misbehavior and managing misbehavior (e.g., Kayi-Aydar, 2014; Briesch & Chafouleas, 2009; Lewis, 2001; Noddings, 2007; Pane, 2010; Stone & Kidd, 2011) indicates that, to date, to the best knowledge of the researchers, no study has attempted to cross-culturally explore English teachers' strategies of managing misbehavior in EFL and ESL classrooms, which was the focus of the present study. In scarce cases, Atıcı's study (1999) investigated the methods employed by Turkish and English primary school instructors in taking care of learners' misbehavior, indicating that while English instructors considered misbehavior more systematically and consistently, Turkish instructors tried to treat misbehavior using their own experience.

Single analyses over EFL contexts without cross-culturally investigating the issues on misbehavior had been already carried out in some contexts such as secondary schools by Mohammed (2014) who confirmed that the Ministry of Education in Sudan - as an EFL context - and school administrations should be alarmed with classroom environment in which the environment is not suitable for learning at all for some reasons such as "the teacher's character, lack of attractive teaching aids, teachers' negligence of their talents and class crowdedness" (p. 7).

In the surveyed literature, teachers' critical role over how they define class management in language learning classrooms was conspicuous. Namely, Mahmoodi, Izadi, and Dehghan Nezhad (2014) confirmed how problems relat-

ed to classroom management can be among the dominant causes of burnout and job dissatisfaction for most teachers.

Rahimi and Asadollahi (2012) carried out a research to inquire about Iranian EFL teachers' strategies in controlling their classes. With respect to controlling misbehavior, they found out that most Iranian EFL teachers were interventionist and not interactionalist and tended to activate learners by involving them in doing language practices to keep them tuned in class rhythms.

To be more specific in line with the overall purposes of this research, the researchers made an attempt to understand how the sampled EFL (Iranian) and ESL (Pilipino) teachers defined misbehavior in language learning classrooms and made use of praise and punishment elements to deal with such behavior in their classrooms. In line with the purposes as such, the following research questions were stated:

Q1: What are English teachers' perceptions of misbehavior in ESL and EFL classrooms?

Q2: What are English teachers' strategies for managing misbehavior in ESL and EFL classrooms?

Method

The design of the present study was qualitative in which findings were obtained through grounded theory (GT) theorems (Charmaz, 2000). Accordingly, data were collected through qualitative data collection methods (interviews and observations) and analysis of data included content analysis techniques after initial, axial, and selective coding.

Participants

The participants consisted of 22 English language teachers teaching in various language classes within two educational backgrounds (10 teachers in EFL classes in Iran and 12 teachers in ESL classes in the Philippines). These teachers were selected based on convenience sampling; that is, only those teachers who were most accessible to the researcher were included in the study. Teachers were both male and female and had similar teaching experience of three to five years to control the effect of experience. From among the 10 Iranian teachers, three had M.A. degrees, six held B.A. degrees, and one had a B.S. degree. As for the Pilipino teachers, two held M.A. degrees, seven had B.A. degrees, and three held college level degrees unrelated to ELT. Iranian teachers were sought within three foreign language institutes in Tehran - the capital city of Iran - to control teacher/institute effects. The Pilipino participants of the study were found via searching the Internet and contacting the language institutes in the Philippines. In total, 12 teachers with teaching experience of three to five years in the Philippines were invited to participate in the study. Table 1 displays the demographic information of the participants.

Table 1.
Participants' Demographic Information

	Male	Female	Total	Range of teaching experience	Mean of teaching experience	Age range	Age mean (years)
Pilipino Teachers	1 (8.5%)	11 (91.5%)	12 (100%)	3-5	4	20-45	34
Iranian Teachers	2 (20%)	8 (80%)	10 (100%)	3-5	4.5	25-40	32.5

The classes in the Philippines were observed by the first researcher. Another teacher as a participant-observer was asked to help with the observations in Iran. The observer (in Iran) was an experienced teacher and had already been involved in performing classroom observations and supervision tasks.

The observed classes in both ESL and EFL contexts in this study involved both male and female students whose language proficiency had been defined as pre-intermediate and intermediate. Students' age ranged from 12 to 16 years (mainly teenagers) in the Philippines, but in the Iranian classes, the age range was stretched out sporadically involving adults in their thirtieth or higher as well.

Instruments

The data were qualitatively collected through in-depth interviews and class observations mapped on GT protocols (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Below a brief description is given for each procedure in line with the protocols utilized in GT. The purpose behind using interviews was eliciting data on teachers' perceptions of students' behavior and also on teachers' use of strategies to manage learners' misbehavior. Iranian and Pilipino teachers were individually interviewed. In the interviews, teachers were asked about their perceptions of students' misbehavior. To put it another way, teachers were asked to explain what actions and behaviors on the part of learners were considered a misbehavior that might threaten the discipline and educational atmosphere of the classroom. Since the method of analysis was based on theoretical coding via GT, there were no predetermined sets of questions to be answered by the teachers. The interview started with the introduction of the teacher and some greetings. Then, teachers were asked if they had experienced such misbehaviors and how they felt about such events. For instance, if they felt negative or positive about such behaviors, this could help reach some inferences. However, for easier and more fruitful interactions between teachers and the interviewer, a set of general guiding questions, including seven questions, was used for conducting the interviews (Appendix A), and each interview lasted for about 45 minutes. The suggested questions constituted the body of the interviews and had nothing to do with an in-depth account of teachers' perceptions of their learners' misbehavior cases, which might have led to a faulty/skewed categorization of learners' misbehavior.

In the next round, within interview sessions with teachers, they were asked to talk about the actions that they usually considered as misbehavior. At the same time, they were asked to explain how they had usually dealt with such misbehavior cases. They were asked to talk about the specific strategies they would use to reduce and/or prevent learners' misbehaviors. In the process of the interviews, the first researcher was an active participant who would eagerly follow the interviewees' explanations so that teachers would feel the rapport for an easy and friendly talk. In other words, the first researcher was engaged in the talk about misbehavior in a way that research was considered as coming from an insider rather than an outsider view. This may have aided the collection of the most authentic and accurate data. All the data were recorded using a smartphone to be later used for codification phases.

Class observation was the next method used for gathering the data on the actual strategies used by Iranian vs. Philippine teachers for managing students' misbehavior. The observation protocol consisted of three rounds performed at the beginning, middle, and end of the classrooms. The first round consisted of 10 items to be checked, the second one consisted of 16 items, and the last one 7 items. Each teacher was observed four times while teaching. The observation was performed using a checklist of strategies (Appendix B) whose items were obtained through in-depth reviewing of the existing literature in a study by Karimvand, Hesamy, and Hemmati (2016). In their study, observation protocols were corroborated for teacher educational aims. The observation of teachers in the Philippines and Iran was carried out by the same researcher based on the checklist for early, halfway through, and late teacher practicum. For the purposes of the present project, the goals were reconsidered, and tailored for classroom management skills among English language teachers.

Data Collection

The data collection was initiated by asking EFL teachers in the two countries to participate in the project. Formal consent was initially granted by their institute managers. Then, after seeking the approval of the teachers as well, a schedule was arranged for interviewing each teacher individually. Based on the theoretical framework of the literature, the researchers came up with a number of questions and then the interviews were conducted. In each interview session, each teacher was interviewed about his/her perceptions of students' misbehavior and his/her strategies for managing students' misbehavior. All the dialogues were recorded for the analysis for discovering the teachers' perceptions of students' misbehavior events and teachers' strategies to manage such misbehavior. The analysis was thematically analyzed and data were reduced to find teachers' perceptions of students' misbehavior and teachers' strategies to manage such behavior. In the next stage of data collection, an observation schedule was set. In the observation sessions, teachers were monitored for the strategies to deal with misbehavior cases using the checklist. It was observed how frequently each strategy was used and in case a strategy was not in the list, it was added to the list and its frequency of use was checked and reported. To observe

ethical considerations in the present study, the participation of the learners in this research was voluntary and consent was sought from the schools and teachers involved in this research study prior to the data collection. Moreover, the participants were assured that all the data collected were used for research purposes and stayed confidential with the researcher.

Data Analysis

Data analysis was carried out based on GT principles on the recorded data from interviews and the data found in the observation protocols. Based on GT, the analysis included initial coding, axial coding, and selective coding (Charmaz, 2000). In the initial coding, all the instances of the misbehavior (disruptive behavior as typical in language classes) as quoted by teachers were identified using initial codes containing students' actions, e.g. when a student ..., when some students do not In axial coding, misbehavior case events as mentioned by teachers were connected through other codes, which were common between and among them. For instance, misbehavior related to the code of disobedience was categorized in one group and the process continued. In the selective coding, all the categories were integrated and interpreted to come with a theory of misbehaviors in ESL/EFL classrooms. This theory explained what misbehavior happened in diverse classroom contexts such as ESL vs. EFL, and their types and specific instances. In the same vein, teachers' strategies to deal with learners' misbehavior were identified using codes containing the actions on the part of teachers when facing misconduct. Such codes included phrases, when teachers said "I try to...", "I will", "I ask him/her", etc. In axial coding, the strategies were categorized through connecting the specific strategies. For instance, when strategies were about dealing with learners' disobedience -- an instance of misbehavior -- they were categorized in one group. Finally, in selective coding, all the categories were explained under one umbrella term: *teachers' management of misbehavior*. In other words, integration and theorizing (Charmaz, 2000) were carried out through which the relationship between the codes and between categories and their contribution to the management of misbehaviors were explained and discussed. Finally, a frequency count/rate of teachers' strategies to deal with misbehavior was performed on the data collected in the observation stage. The frequency counts told the researchers to what extent each strategy had been used by teachers in the two contexts.

Findings

The first research question aimed to investigate the teachers' perceptions of misbehavior in EFL and ESL classrooms. In order to find a probable response to this question, GT procedures were followed. Accordingly, no assumption was initially made about teachers' thought patterns to be verified (Lingard, Albert, & Levinson, 2008).

Phase One: Codification of Misbehavior Perceptions

The first step of the analysis included understanding the data before doing the actual coding and subsequent analysis in the interview sessions.

Misbehavior in the General Plane

After the open coding, the themes were identified in relation to the axial coding step. With regard to the first research question, the themes were initially identified to reach a definition of general misbehavior as perceived by the Filipino and Iranian teachers and then specific cases of misbehavior within language classrooms were spotted. Various perceptions were identified with regard to students' misbehavior in the classroom on two planes: general and specific. On the general plane, misbehavior cases were perceived as actions such as 'disobedience', 'frequent disruptions caused by students', and 'rudeness'. Teachers perceived some cases of misbehavior as:

Filipino teacher: *When a student fails to follow behavior codes in the classroom setting, even when most students can easily follow them*

Filipino teacher: *An act of not following what someone is told to do, only because one doesn't want to follow it*

Iranian teacher: *Breaking some important rules in the class!*

Iranian teacher: *Anything that makes other students uncomfortable, such as making fun of them, anything that sabotages the discipline of the class!*

The above examples clearly conveyed that Iranian and Filipino teachers perceived misbehavior in the general plane in no different ways since all contained the elements of unexpected behavior on the part of students. Evidently, the actual acts of misbehavior according to teachers' perceptions included simple acts such as moving around and yawning to uncooperativeness and not following teachers' directions. What follows includes further perceptions of the teachers about misbehavior:

Filipino teacher: *When a student runs or moves around even when I told him/her to stay still/sit still; when a student keeps on making noises when I told them to keep quiet*

Filipino teacher: *Talking unnecessarily during the lesson*

Iranian teacher: *Not paying attention to grammar and presentations*

Iranian teacher: *Speaking with others during teaching, speaking Persian, not respecting the teacher or other students*

Misbehavior in the Specific Plane

On the specific plane, cases of disruptive behavior were noted on language grounds, as in the following:

Filipino teacher: Usually, when they can't concentrate at all or can't understand what's going on in the classroom

Filipino teacher: Some students are not interested in learning English. They don't want to learn but their parents enroll them.

Filipino teacher: (The student is) tired from previous engagement, doesn't understand English.

Iranian teacher: Sometimes, it is related to their family and the way that their parents behave with them, or maybe they are tired of school and can't bear the class.

Iranian teacher: Sometimes they don't know the rules, sometimes the class is boring to them.

Iranian teacher: They don't understand the value of learning, and wasting time has become a habit for them.

Specific Misbehavior as Detected in Observation Protocols

Another step was the identification of misbehavior as perceived by teachers during observations. In this stage, based on observation protocols, the acts of misbehaviors as perceived by teachers were observed and noted. Table 2 shows how misbehavior cases were perceived by teachers.

Table 2.

A Sample Misbehavior Observation Sheet as Perceived by Teachers

Evidence from observations in the classrooms	Assigned labels
...acting against the rules of the class	Disobedience and ignoring
...breaking some important rules in the class	Disobedience
...when a student does something very unusual, e.g. when they argue or fight in the middle of the class	Disruption
refusal to use the pencil instead of pen/a student keeps on going to the toilet/shouts or tries to run around	Ignoring, frequent leaving, disruption

Based on the data collected from observation protocols, similar perceptions of students' misbehaviors were also identified. As seen in Table 2, the acts of misbehaviors included disruptions such as ignoring, leaving, and disobedience. Accordingly, teachers perceived misbehaviors as behaviors that are considered unacceptable inside the classroom because they cause disorder, which could hinder learning. In other words, any unusual and unexpected behavior that deviated the class from its pedagogical goals was considered misbehavior. It should be noted that both Filipino and Iranian teachers had similar perceptions of misbehavior, the above analysis was performed on both groups, and the examples above also included statements from both Filipino and Iranian teachers.

Phase Two: Strategies for Tackling Misbehaviors as Verified by ESL vs. EFL Teachers

After the initial coding in the first phase, in line with the second research ques-

tion, three themes emerged: 1) rule system, 2) reward system, and 3) personal encounter. Each of these themes is described below and tested against the actual data, this time from interview sessions.

Rule system

Rule system is a deliberate and systemic plan for managing students' behaviors, including misbehavior. In this system, teachers used their previous experiences to set certain rules mainly at the beginning of the course to warn about students' misbehavior both in negative and positive ways. In the negative way, teachers warned the students that any misbehavior would have negative consequences such as receiving low scores, having to do more assignments, or calling their parents. In the positive way, students had been encouraged to have sound behavior and, in return, they would receive rewards such as better scores, more flexibility in using teaching materials, and more free discussions. What follows shows some of the rules teachers had set for controlling students' misbehaviors:

- 1) *English-only policy (speak only in English)*
- 2) *Accomplishing exercises on time*
- 3) *No use of phones and gadgets*
- 4) *Being quiet during teaching*
- 5) *Respecting the teacher and other students*
- 6) *Studying at home and being ready in the classroom*
- 7) *Managing the time for coming and leaving the classroom*

Reward system

Teachers had encouraged the students to act properly in the classroom by promising certain rewards in return. Teachers had mainly used their experience to predict disrupting behavior and encouraged the students to avoid such behavior by offering them rewards. Rewards could be better scores, more free dialogues, more interesting discussions, etc. The following statements verify the existence of a reward system in the interviewed teachers' strategies to deal with students' misbehavior:

- 1) *If you keep quiet and orderly, I will give you a reward.*
- 2) *If you make noise, I will take away from your accumulated points (If you keep still and sit down, I will give you a reward.)*
- 3) *Good behavior or good performance will be rewarded.*
- 4) *The classroom is a happy place, so you must come here with a good attitude.*
- 5) *Unruly behavior will have consequences.*
- 6) *Learn how to control yourself in the class. Anyone who misbehaves will lose benefits or will be excluded from games.*

Personal encounters

As the name suggests, it is the personal treatment of misbehaviors by the teachers. In this category, the teacher's actions were idiosyncratic. In other words, the teachers' strategies were unique and could not be grouped into a meaningful category. Most of the strategies were unsystematic because teachers did not have any particular plans for student's misbehaviors. These strategies were mainly reflections of teachers' personality which made such strategies unique. For instance, one teacher claimed that he shouted *be quite* or *leave the class* when encountering misbehavior. Some examples of such strategies to deal with students' misbehaviors are as follows:

1. *Mentioning his/her name; sometimes asking him/her to stay after the class and talking to her/him in private*
2. *Stopping the class and asking the student how he/she feels about it*
3. *Stopping teaching, waiting until it finishes and they become calm (I ignore that student to make him/her understand his/her misbehavior and try to make up for it.)*
4. *Sometimes I talk about that issue and try to solve it (I call it out immediately.)*

Strategies within Observation Protocols

In order to differentiate exactly how the two teachers from ESL vs. EFL contexts behaved, in the observations, teachers were closely monitored and it was documented how various types of misbehavior management strategies in line with the rule system, reward system, and personal encounter were employed in the two contexts. Table 3 below shows how teachers' strategies were in line with the rule system, reward system, and personal encounter categories.

Table 3.
Observation Analysis for Misbehavior Strategies Adopted by Iranian and Filipino Teachers

Excerpts	Incident label	Assigned category
Class activity contains learner's performance and codes of conduct, and both of them are considered in their score.	Rule	Rule system
Offering learners extra points and responsibilities	Reward	Reward system
No use of phone and gadgets/be quiet during teaching/don't make noises	Personal	Personal encounter

Table 4 shows the comparative frequencies of misbehavior strategies by Iranian and Filipino teachers.

Table 4.
Observation Analysis for Frequency of Misbehavior Strategies Adopted by Iranian and Filipino Teachers

Case evidence of management behaviors	Frequency counts/rates in EFL classroom (Iranian teachers)	Frequency counts/rates in ESL classroom (Filipino teachers)
At the beginning of the term it is indicated how many sessions and hours the term would last.	10 (15.10%)	10 (18.50%)
Topics and material are predetermined.	7 (10.57%)	4 (7.40%)
At the beginning of each course teacher indicates expectations (rule system).	4 (6.04%)	7 (12.95%)
The teacher clearly indicates some rules and a punishment procedure such as negative scores, calling parents, and reporting to the manager (rule system).	6 (9.06%)	6 (11.10%)
The teacher tells the students that the more they well behave, the more bonus such as better scores, and more open discussions they will receive (reward system).	7 (10.57%)	4 (7.40%)
The teacher repeatedly encourages them to control their actions and behave properly (reward system).	6 (9.06%)	4 (7.40%)
The teacher reminds students that they should act properly (rule system).	7 (10.57%)	3 (5.55%)
The teacher punishes those who misbehave so that everybody knows that he/she is serious (rule system).	6 (9.06%)	3 (5.55%)
The teacher sometimes shouts or talks loudly to stop those who misbehave (personal encounter).	3 (4.53%)	2 (3.70%)
The teacher asks those who misbehave to leave the classroom (personal encounter).	1 (1.51%)	0 (0%)
The teacher calls the names of those who misbehave and asks them to well behave (personal encounter).	1 (1.51%)	3 (5.55%)
Sometimes the teacher stops the class for a while to signal that they are not behaving properly (personal encounter).	1(1.51%)	3 (5.55%)
Teachers usually try to ignore the student who misbehaves, or use mimics and gestures, and rarely stop the class. (personal encounter).	3 (4.53%)	1 (1.85%)
The teacher repeatedly reminds the students about the rules of the classroom during the term (rule system).	3(4.53%)	1 (1.85%)
The teacher gives quizzes as a way to control students' misbehavior (rule system).	1 (1.51%)	3 (5.55%)

As indicated in Table 4, both Iranian and Filipino teachers used a certain rule system to manage classroom behaviors. For instance, the teachers expressed the classroom rules (18.50% and 15.10%, respectively) and warned about the possible consequences of students' violations, although more Filipino teachers just expressed their expectations (12.95% by Filipino teachers vs.

6.04% by Iranian teachers). On the other hand, more Iranian teachers (1.85% by Filipino teachers vs. 4.53% by Iranian teachers) reminded about the classroom rules during the term which may indicate that there were more misbehavior cases as perceived by Iranian teachers in the classrooms. This turned them into more authoritative teachers as compared with Filipino teachers. One interesting finding was that although both Iranian and Filipino teachers were seen to set some rules, it was the Iranian teachers who punished their students for misbehavior more than Filipino teachers (9.06% by Iranian teachers vs. 5.55% by Filipino teachers). Another piece of evidence for this finding was that more Iranian teachers reminded the students to act properly (10.57% by Iranian teachers vs. 5.55% by Filipino teachers) and more Iranian teachers reminded the students about the classroom rules (4.53% by Iranian teachers vs. 1.85% by a Filipino teacher).

With regard to the reward system, it seemed that more Iranian teachers preferred the reward system compared to Filipino teachers. For instance, 10.57% of Iranian teachers were seen to tell the students that "*the more they well behave, the more bonus such as better scores they would receive, etc.*" while Filipino teachers were seen using this strategy for 7.40%. Similarly, more Iranian teachers were seen to repeatedly encourage their students to act properly (9.06% by Iranian teachers vs. 7.40% by Filipino teachers).

The last category of misbehavior management was personal encounter of the teachers which was seen to be harsher among the Iranian teachers. Iranian teachers were seen to shout for controlling the classroom more than Filipino teachers. One Iranian teacher (1.51%) asked a student to leave the class while no Filipino teacher did that. Both Iranian and Filipino teachers called the names of those who misbehaved and asked them to behave well (1.51% by an Iranian teacher and 5.55% by Filipino teachers). One more strategy was trying to ignore the students who misbehaved, or using mimics and gestures and rarely stopping the class which was done by Iranian teachers three times (4.53%) while the Filipino teachers did it only once (1.85%). Another strategy was that Iranian and Filipino teachers stopped the class for a while to signal that they were not behaving properly (1.51% by an Iranian teacher and 5.55% by Filipino teachers). The last strategy was giving quizzes as a way to control students' misbehaviors which was performed only once (1.51%) by an Iranian teacher and three times (5.55%) by Filipino teachers.

Seeking the Reasons for Teachers' Strategies after Observation Analysis

In this section, the researchers have described their attempts to observe some actual classes within the two targeted contexts of Iran and the Philippines. All elements that to the researchers' views might directly or indirectly have an effect on discipline factors in language classes have been mentioned for close scrutiny.

Observation Line 1: Time Settings in Iran and the Philippines

Based on the observation analysis, the number of sessions and instruction hours were more varied in the Philippines than Iran. In Iran, most of the classes included 20 to 25 sessions, each lasting 90 minutes, but in the Philippines, courses can last 12 sessions each containing two hours of instructions, eight sessions each containing two hours and half of instruction, or 30 sessions of 90 minutes. In both contexts, sessions are predetermined by a supervisor while teachers and learners have no part in setting the number and hours of sessions.

Observation Line 2: Topics Chosen for Discussion

It was observed that in Iran, the topics of discussions are based on textbooks and syllabuses whereas it is different in the Philippines all the time because classes for adults are sometimes without any course books. In other words, in the Philippines, there was a general outline and all the skills were covered in each session in accordance with the needs of the learners. In the Philippines, teachers used topics from coursebooks in most classes for adolescents.

Observation Line 3: Criteria for Evaluation

The observation of classes indicated that both in Iran and the Philippines, evaluations were carried out based on the policies set by language institutes.

Observation Line 3: Inquiring after Students' Opinions on Class Management

It was observed that, in Iran, students' opinions about the ways classes can be run are usually not asked. Only in one case were students' opinions sought and teachers said their opinions were taken into account, while it did not happen in reality. In the Philippines, the instruction procedure is explained and students' opinions are also sought but no different opinion was heard from students. However, in adult courses, students wanted that real-life situation topics be covered for speaking skill and teachers stated that the topics are actually real-life topics. Teachers said that if they wanted particular topics they could change the topics.

Observation Line 4: Inquiring after Students' Opinions on Teaching Materials

It was observed that neither in Iran nor in the Philippines were students asked about the course materials. In both contexts, only extra materials such as watching films or reading storybooks were suggested. The only difference was that in classes in the Philippines, students were encouraged to watch films from

American or Canadian contexts which contained different accents because they would encounter people with different accents in international contexts.

Observation Line 5: Class Logistics/Layouts

Regarding seating arrangements in Iran, the chairs were U-shaped/horseshoe-like and students could see each other, while in the Philippines, chairs were mainly arranged in a way that only the teacher was in front of the students and students faced their instructors with their backs to other students. Filipino teachers believed that when students have eye contact they may start to misbehave. In the Philippines, only adult students can sit in U-shaped arrangements. It was also revealed that, in the Philippines, each student sat on the same seat in each session unless the teacher asked them to change their seats.

Observation Line 6: Class Rules

In the Iranian context of ELT, the emphasis was on managing the time for coming and leaving (punctuality), no use of cellphones, no speaking during teaching, respecting each other, always being ready for quizzes, speaking English, and doing the homework. On the other hand, in the Filipino context of ELT, the emphasis was on respecting each other, being quiet during teaching new subjects, speaking English, and enjoying the class.

Observation Line 7: Calling Students with their Names

In both Iranian and Filipino contexts, teachers try to learn the names of the students so that they can call them by their names. The only difference was that Filipino teachers were more concerned about the names of students and sometimes used some titles before their names to express more respect. In one case, one Filipino teacher drew the arrangement of the seats on a paper and wrote the names of the students on their seats to recall their names better.

Observation Line 8: Keeping Track of Students' Behavior

In the Iranian context of language teaching, it was observed that Iranian teachers may ask other teachers about students' behaviors. In the Philippines, language institutes usually gave a report about students' behaviors and their achievement and in case there was no such report, teachers asked other teachers.

Observation Line 9: Students' Remarks on Teachers' Performance

In the Filipino context of language teaching, teachers did not reject different opinions and in case a teacher made a mistake, students could remind the

teacher and the teacher accepted it. In adolescent classes, students did not question teachers' language knowledge neither in negative or positive ways and usually did not have any opposing opinions.

In Iran, teachers usually determined the topics for the next session so that students came to class with full preparation. It should be noted that, in Iranian classes, students sometimes questioned teachers' knowledge and in case they failed to answer or made a mistake, students might make humiliating and unpleasant comments.

Observation Line 10: Teachers' Encounters with Misbehaving Students

In the Iranian context, teachers dealt with students' misbehaviors through mimics and gestures. Sometimes, teachers simply ignored that some students did not attend to the lessons or talked with others. Rarely did teachers stop the classes and most of the time they dealt with misbehaviors through knocking on the board or through mimics and gestures.

In contrast, in Filipino contexts, in case there was misbehavior, teachers usually stopped the class and asked the students to pay attention to the lessons and respected other students. In case the misbehaviors persisted, teachers asked the students to wait after the class and then privately talked with them.

Observation Line 11: Teaching Fixed vs. Changing Plans

In the Filipino context, teachers usually followed a routine and standard procedure for instructing the students. They might make some minor changes in their techniques especially when students were bored, but on the whole, they rarely made changes in the methods and techniques. On the other hand, Iranian teachers changed the techniques and methods more frequently to draw students' attention to the lessons. For instance, in one case, a teacher did not ask the students to give a summary of the reading which was a routine technique, and instead expressed the gist of the reading and then asked the students to read.

Observation Line 12: Students' Behavior and Grades

In the Iranian context of language teaching, part of students' final scores is determined by their behaviors and discipline. For instance, punctuality and having desirable behaviors in the classroom positively affect the final scores of the students. Conversely, in the Philippines, students' behaviors are not taken into account in the final scores of the students. However, it was found that students' good behavior was important for the educational system of the Philippines and in case students had bad records, they might fail to be admitted to international schools.

Discussion

The present study aimed at investigating the perceptions of EFL and ESL teachers of students' misbehavior in EFL and ESL classroom contexts. Moreover, the study sought to probe what strategies EFL and ESL teachers used to deal with students' misbehavior. The results revealed that both groups of teachers perceived misbehavior as an unusual and unexpected action by the students that might cause disorder in the process of teaching and learning. It was also shown that both Filipino and Iranian teachers used three types of strategies to deal with students' misbehavior: 1) rule system, 2) reward system, and 3) personal encounters.

The results of the present study with regard to teachers' perceptions of misbehavior are in keeping with previous definitions. In the view of Stone and Kidd (2011), misbehavior is concerned with those behavior types which are not congruent with the behavioral norms and rules set either by the teacher or the school. In fact, all teachers encounter some types of misbehavior. As pointed out by Baúar (1999), all types of behavior that weaken education can be characterized as undesirable behavior. These behaviors range from the most to the least destructive ones, causing disruptions and disorder in class.

Fowler and Sarapli (2010) are adamant that L2 learners should know the expectations of their teachers in terms of behavior. Cabaroğlu and Altinel (2010) conducted a study on student and teacher perceptions of misbehavior. The collected data indicated that misbehaving students' explanations and interpretations of misbehavior, their causes, and the interventions strategies used did not always share similar attributes with those of their teachers. As pointed out by Trussell (2008), to create a classroom environment in which transparent and consistent rules and expectations are administered, the first step is to assure that all learners are aware of the rules in the classroom and they are crystal clear for all students.

The data analyses showed that there was no critical difference between teachers' views of how disruption occurred in the classroom. They thought that such a disorder can be caused by ignoring teachers' authority and rules, students not observing their duties, and creating an unsafe environment for other students. Ignoring teachers' authority and rules happened when students did not obey the rules and did not comply with teachers' expectations; not observing duties happened when students were not attentive, not listening, and not following the classroom activities; and creating an unsafe environment occurred when students challenged the teacher, made noises, and had a clash with other classmates. Such misbehaviors have been observed in the classroom as indicated by management literature.

In the view of Sternberg and Williams (2002), learners' ignorance of the rules and challenging their teacher's authority lead to the marginalization of learning. Misbehaviors can pave the way for disorder in the classroom, negatively influencing learning. Thus, such behavior cases can be characterized as 'misbehavior'. The investigation carried out by Leung and Ho (2012) yielded

similar findings regarding students' misbehaviors and how teachers perceive students' misbehaviors. Their investigation involved interviews with 12 teachers. The results showed the following as the most common and disruptive behaviors:

- a) talking without observing ones' turn (out of turn)
- b) non-attentiveness
- c) daydreaming
- d) idleness

Lack of respect for teachers, disobedience, and rudeness were found to be the most disruptive problem behavior followed by talking without observing the turn as well as verbal aggression. The findings indicated that learner problem behaviors were perceived by teachers as those behaviors involving rule-evading, infringing on the implicit norms or expectations, and conducting inappropriately in the classroom. The study conducted by Aliakbari, Mirzaee, Tarlani and Aliabadi (2013) focused on the secondary school teachers' perceptions of student misbehavior. To this end, a questionnaire was distributed among 164 secondary school teachers, who reported that those families that did not impart pro-school values to their children were the most prominent cause of pupil misbehavior.

The misbehavior type 'talking out of turn' was described as the most common kind of misbehavior. Moreover, the teachers claimed that examining the misbehavior in a sympathetic manner could be the most effective strategy in coping with the teacher's misbehavior. Based on the results of the present study, both Filipino and Iranian teachers made use of three kinds of strategies, with the aim of coping with students' misbehaviors. Despite the fact that Filipino and Iranian teachers employed these strategies in different forms and frequencies, they used all three kinds of strategies in their classroom:

- rule system strategies
- reward system strategies
- personal encounters

In accordance with the rule system, teachers drew on their past experiences to lay out certain rules essentially at the outset of the course in order to warn about students' misbehavior both negatively and positively. Within the contexts of the reward system, teachers pushed the students to act appropriately in the classroom by promising certain rewards in return. In their personal encounter, the strategies used by teachers were unsystematic since they lacked any specific plans for student's misbehaviors. A review of the literature on students' misbehaviors also indicated that similar strategies had been discussed regarding misbehavior management. For instance, Soares (2007) conducted an action research in Brazil on L2 teaching, with the results showing that building rapport and building awareness-raising activities can reduce misbehavior. Findings of the study conducted by Rahimi and Hosseini (2012) also showed that the incorporation of reward and recognition by EFL teachers yield more effective results than punishment and aggression with respect to reducing the students' misbehaviors.

In accordance with the control model of classroom management by Gordon (1974), one can manage classroom by laying out transparent rules, taking into account a series of rewards, highlighting the right behavior, and creating a set of increasingly severe punishments for misbehavior. Brophy (2006) notes that classroom management whose aim is to correct misbehavior has to do with actions to establish and keep on a learning environment which contribute to effective teaching. This setting is characterized by arranging the physical environment, developing the rules and procedures, focusing the learners' attention on lessons and involvement in activities.

It should be noted that with regard to the use of rewards and setting rules in EFL contexts, literature has proposed similar suggestions for dealing with misbehavior and controlling the classroom. Some educationalists insisted that to enhance responsibility in children, instructors could develop clear expectations for their behaviors. Then, they should judiciously use a range of rewards and recognitions for good behaviors and punishments for bad behaviors (McCaslin & Good, 1992; Swinson & Melling, 1995). Some other educationists believed that the same aim could only be obtained by putting emphasis on less student obedience and teacher coercion. They put emphasis on more use of techniques such as negotiating, brainstorming, and group participation as well as discussions (for instance, Freiberg, 1996; Kohn, 1996; Pearl & Knight, 1998; Schneider, 1996). According to Canter and Canter (1992), teachers could maintain discipline in their classroom by the application of techniques including 'listening to' and 'making clear the learners' perspective', 'saying to them about the effects their misbehavior has on others', 'dealing with their illogical justifications', and 'talking for any problematic behavior', a one-to-one solution that meets the needs of both the instructor and the individual students.

Glasser (1969) has put forth some ideas for managing the classroom that are in keeping with the results of the present study. The model of classroom management presented by him focused on clear rules, a series of rewards, accepting the right behavior, and a set of increasingly severe punishments for misbehavior. Overall, the results of the study on misbehavior strategies were consistent with psychological theories related to positive and negative reinforcement. Despite the fact that theories such as conditioning and stimulus-response seem obsolete with respect to human cognitive learning, they can be helpful in reinforcing certain good classroom habits in L2 learners. The teachers can make use of positive reinforcement very effectively in various classrooms, with the aim of building and improving behaviors and learning (Catania, 2001; Dinsmoor, 1992; Waller & Higbee, 2010). Such a reinforcement can also improve classroom management (Dragoi & Staddon, 1999; Gardner, Wacker & Boelter, 2009). In accordance with the principles of positive reinforcement, the negative dimensions of an individual's behavior must not be highlighted, but the positive aspects must be emphasized. Negative reinforcement occurs by deleting a specific unpleasant stimulus following a behavior which leads to the re-occurrence of the behavior. Regarding education, this case of behavior modification might be of great importance for students who suffer from behavior problems, although not as an ultimate strategy.

In their study, Vosoughi and Nafisi (2018) sought to examine the strategies employed by English language teachers in order to discipline unauthorized behavior (misbehavior) in both state-owned high schools and private language institutes. The results showed that out of 20 strategies identified among Iranian L2 teachers for correcting disruptive behavior, only seven strategies significantly distinguished strategy adoption by L2 teachers in the two diverse educational sectors, including:

- 1) to warn or threat,
- 2) to send the student to the principal's office,
- 3) to keep late students out of class,
- 4) to prepare students for tasks,
- 5) to use nonverbal language for warning,
- 6) to bring syllabi to inform students of class procedures, which was mostly practiced by public language school teachers, and finally
- 7) to use the target language for reprimanding bad behavior, as more common among English institute teachers.

Quintero and Ramírez's (2011) investigation on foreign language learners revealed that talking with the students, employment of various activities and exercises, focusing students' attention, giving clear explanations and instructions, and effective management of time are some of the most helpful techniques teachers can use to manage misbehavior in foreign language classroom contexts.

Conclusion

There is a scarcity of studies on classroom management and students' misbehaviors in foreign language contexts, and in the majority of cases, the studies have focused on effective instruction of a second language by ideas coming from linguistics and psychology (Macías, 2018). More qualitative studies should be conducted on the variables influencing the classroom context, especially with respect to L2 teaching and learning in the context of Iran. As evidenced by the researcher's observations, the majority of the studies conducted in or over Iranian contexts of L2 instruction and learning are quantitative, mainly using questionnaires and surveys (Ahmadian & Vahid Dastjerdi, 2010; Rahimi & Kar-kami, 2015, etc.).

This study aimed at cross-culturally examining L2 teachers' strategies of managing misbehavior in EFL and ESL classrooms. Classroom management in foreign language contexts has mainly relied on findings from general education research and practice (Macías, 2018). In effect, few suggestions have been made with regard to classroom management in foreign language contexts in which first language strategies are used for controlling class context. However, some researchers have raised concerns about the use of the first language in foreign language classrooms. Bateman (2008) found that the use of the first language for controlling the classes can significantly lead to the avoidance of

target language use in the classroom. Evans (2012) reported that teachers can effectively use the target language for controlling their classes.

One interesting finding of the present study which might have contributed to the way Iranian and Filipino teachers managed misbehavior is related to classroom ecology. Classroom ecology refers to the way the arrangement of the objects in the classroom may affect the processes and interactions in the classroom (Guerrettaz & Johnston, 2013). Similarly, and more relevant to the aims of the present study, Doyle (2006) maintains that classroom ecology refers to all possible interactions and decisions resulting from the physical setting of the classroom objects which may possibly alter learners' learning behaviors and teachers' teaching behaviors. As it was noted, in Iran, the chairs were placed in a U-shaped/horseshoe arrangement, while in the Philippines chairs were mainly placed so that only the teacher was in front and students faced their instructors with their backs to one another. The results of the interviews indicated that Filipino teachers believed that frequent eye contact with the students reduced the chances of misbehavior. In terms of classroom ecology, it was also revealed that in the Philippines, each student sat on the same seat in each session unless the teacher asked them to change their seats. The differences in seating arrangements might be related to the cultural differences between the two countries in terms of private education delivered to the learners. In the Iranian language institutes, learners are almost always given choices to select the position of their seats, whereas in the Philippines teachers seem to have more authority in terms of seating arrangements.

The present study revealed valuable information about misbehavior and how misbehaviors are dealt with by EFL and ESL teachers. However, more can be done to understand students' concepts of misbehavior and their desired strategies in the case of mischievous students. First of all, it is suggested that more replications of the present study be conducted with participants from various contexts of language teaching and learning. For instance, comparisons can be made between Iranian teachers and ESL teachers from Pakistan or India. The results of these studies can help us have more conclusive findings about misbehaviors and misbehavior strategies.

The present study showed how EFL and ESL teachers use different strategies to deal with students' acting up. Nevertheless, the present study does not tell us which strategies are more effective. Future studies can be conducted on effective strategies by investigating the effect of various types of misbehavior strategies on classroom management and success. Another suggestion is to study learners' perceptions of misbehaviors. What teachers perceive of misbehaviors may not agree with what learners perceive of misbehaviors. In other words, matches or mismatches on learners' and teachers' perceptions of misbehaviors need to be made clear. For instance, what is perceived as questioning a teacher's authority may be simply a critical position about a particular topic by a student. Any ambiguity in this regard may lead to ineffective techniques and strategies to deal with disruptive behavior among students. Another investigation can be carried out exploring misbehavior management strategies em-

ployed by Iranian male teachers teaching female learners or Iranian female teachers teaching male learners across students' various age groups and teachers' teaching experience.

References

- Ahmadian, M. J., & Vahid Dastjerdi, H. (2010). A comparative study of perception of politeness of American reprimands by Iranian EFL learners and Americans. *The Social Sciences*, 5(4), 359-363.
- Aliakbari, M., Mirzaee, A., & Tarlani Aliabadi, H. (2013). On the secondary school teachers' perceptions of students' misbehavior: The case of Iranian male and female teachers. *International Journal of Psychology and Behavioral Research*, 5(2), 240-249.
- Atıcı, M. (1999). *An exploration of the relationships between classroom management strategies and teacher efficacy in English and Turkish primary school teachers* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Leicester University, England.
- Battistich, V., Solomon, D., Kim, D., Watson, M., & Schaps, E. (1995). Schools as communities, poverty levels of student populations, and students' attitudes, motives, and performance: A multilevel analysis. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 627-658.
- Baúar, H. (1999). *Classroom management*. [In Turkish: SÖnÖf yönetimi]. Istanbul, Turkey: National Education Ministry Publications.
- Bear, G. G., Gaskins, C., Blank, J., & Chen, F. F. (2011). Delaware school climate survey – student: Its factor structure, concurrent validity, and reliability. *Journal of School Psychology*, 49, 157-174.
- Bear, G. G., Yang, C., Mantz, L., Pasipanodya, E., Hearn, S., & Boyer, D. (2014). *Technical manual for Delaware school survey: Scales of school climate, bullying victimization, student engagement, and positive, punitive, and social emotional learning techniques*. Newark, DE: University of Delaware and Delaware Department of Education.
- Bear, G., Chen, D., Mantz, L., Yang, h., Huang, X., & Shiomi, K. (2016). Differences in classroom removals and use of praise and rewards in American, Chinese and Japanese schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 53, 41-50.
- Berliner, D. C. (1988). *The development of expertise in pedagogy*. New Orleans, LA: AACTE.
- Bradshaw, C. P., Sawyer, A. L., & O'Brennan, L. M. (2009). A social disorganization perspective on bullying-related attitudes and behaviors: The influence of school context. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 43(3-4), 204-220.
- Briesch, A. M., & Chafouleas, S. (2009). Review and analysis of literature on self-management interventions to promote appropriate classroom behaviors. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 24(2), 106-118.
- Brophy, J. (2006). History of research on classroom management. In C. M. Evertson & C. S. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management*. Philadelphia, PA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cabaroglu, N., & Altinel, Z. (2010). Misbehavior in EFL classes: Teachers' and students' perspectives. *Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 19(2), 99-119.
- Catania, A. (2001). Positive psychology and positive reinforcement. *American Psychologist*, 56(1), 86-87.
- Charmaz, K. (2000). Grounded Theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln, (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 509-535). London, England: Sage Publications.

- Chastain, K. (1989). *Developing second language skills: Theory and practice* (3rd ed.). Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. London, England: Sage.
- Dinsmoor, J. A. (1992). Setting the record straight: The social views of B. F. Skinner. *American Psychologist*, 47(11), 1454.
- Doyle, W. (2006). Ecological approaches to classroom management. In C. Evertson & C. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues* (pp. 97-125). New York: Erlbaum.
- Dragoi, V., & Staddon, J. R. (1999). The dynamics of operant conditioning. *Psychological Review*, 106(1), 20-61.
- Emmer, E. (1997). Teacher emotions and classroom management. *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA*.
- Evans, M. (2012). The sociolinguistics of schooling: the relevance of Derrida's *Monolingualism of the Other* or *The Prosthesis of Origin*. In E. Esch & M. Solly (Eds.), *The sociolinguistics of language education in international contexts* (pp. 31-46). Berne, Switzerland: Peter Lang.
- Fenning, P. A., Pulaski, S., Gomez, M., Morello, M., Maciel, L., Maroney, E., Maltese, R., et al. (2012). Call to action: A critical need for designing alternatives to suspension and expulsion. *Journal of School Violence*, 11(2), 105-117.
- Fowler, J., & Sarapli, O. (2010). Classroom management: What ELT students expect. *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 3, 94-97.
- Freiberg, H. J. (1996). From tourists to citizens in the classroom. *Educational Leadership*, 54(1), 32-36.
- Gardner, A., Wacker, D., & Boelter, E. (2009). An evaluation of the interaction between quality of attention and negative reinforcement with children who display escape-maintained problem behavior. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 42(2), 343-8.
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. New York: de Gruyter.
- Glasser, W. (1969). *Schools without failure*. Oxford, England: Harper & Row.
- Gordon, R. (1974). A tutorial on ART (algebraic reconstruction techniques). *IEEE Transactions on Nuclear Science*, 21(3), 78-93.
- Guerrettaz, A. M., & Johnston, B. (2013). Materials in the classroom ecology. *Modern Language Journal*, 97, 779-796.
- Kayi-Aydar, H. (2014). Social positioning, participation, and second language learning: Talkative students in an academic ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48(4), 686-714.
- Kohn, A. (1996). *Beyond discipline: From compliance to community*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Kuperminc, G., Leadbeater, B., Emmons, C., & Blatt, S. (1997). Perceived school climate and difficulties in the social adjustment of middle school students. *Applied Developmental Science*, 1(2), 76-88.
- Levin, J., & Nolan, J. F. (2000). *Principles of classroom management: A professional decision-making model* (3rd ed.). London, England: Allyn & Bacon.
- Lewis, R. (2001). Classroom discipline and student responsibility: The students' view. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 307-319.
- Lingard, L., Albert, M., & Levinson, W. (2008). Qualitative research: Grounded theory, mixed methods, and action research. *BMJ*, 337, 459-461.
- Macías, D. F. (2018). Classroom management in foreign language education: An exploratory review. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 20(1), 153-166.

- Mahmoodi, M. H., Izadi, N., & Dehghan Nezhad, M. (2014). An investigation into the relationship among EFL teachers' reflection, classroom management orientations, and perceptions of language learning strategies and students' L2 achievement. *Applied Research on English Language*, 4(2), 25-42.
- Martin, N. K., & Baldwin, B. (1996). Beliefs regarding classroom management style: Differences between novice and experienced, elementary and secondary level teachers. *Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY.*
- Marzano, R. J., Marzano, J. S., & Pickering, D. J. (2003). *Classroom management that works*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- McGarity, J. R., & Butts, D. P. (2006). The relationship among teacher classroom management behaviour, student engagement, and student achievement of middle and high school science students of varying aptitude. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 21(1), 55-61.
- McCaslin, M., & Good, T. L. (1992). Compliant cognition: The misalliance of management and instructional goals in current school reform. *Educational Researcher*, 21(3), 4-17.
- Miller, A. (2000). *Creating learning communities: Models, resources, and new ways of thinking about teaching and learning*. Brandon, VT: Foundation for Educational Renewal.
- Mitchell, M. M., & Bradshaw, C. P. (2013). Examining classroom influences on student perceptions of school climate: The role of classroom management and exclusionary discipline strategies. *Journal of School Psychology*, 51(5), 599-610.
- Mohammed, R. M. Z. A. A. (2014). *The effect of classroom optimal management on developing EFL teachers' performance: A case study of secondary schools, Gezira State, Sudan* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Gezira, Sudan.
- Naseri, K. P., Hesamy, G. R., & Hemmati, F. (2016). Dynamics of EFL teacher education in Iran: A qualitative enquiry. *Teaching English Language (Teaching English Language and Literature Society of Iran)*, 10(1), 109-131.
- Noddings, N. (2007). *When school reform goes wrong*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Pane, D. M. (2010). Viewing classroom discipline as negotiable social interaction: A communities of practice perspective. *Teaching and teacher education*, 26(1), 87-97.
- Pearl, A., & Knight, A. (1998). *Democratic schooling: Theory to guide educational practice*. New Jersey: Hampton Press.
- Podaná, E. (2017). *Teacher's use of English and mother tongue when solving discipline problems* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Pardubice, The Czech Republic.
- Quintero, J., & Ramírez, O. (2011). Understanding and facing discipline-related challenges in the English as a foreign language classroom at public schools. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 13(2), 59-72.
- Rahimi, M., & Hosseini, F. K. (2012). EFL teachers' classroom discipline strategies: The students' perspective. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 31, 309-314.
- Rahimi, M., & Asadollahi, F. (2012). On the relationship between Iranian EFL teachers' classroom management orientations and teaching style. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 31, 49-55.
- Rahimi, M., & Karkami, F. H. (2015). The role of teachers' classroom discipline in their teaching effectiveness and students' language learning motivation and achievement: A path method. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 3(1), 57-82.
- Sanford, J. P., Emmer, E. T., & Clements, B. S. (1983). Improving classroom management [Electronic version]. *Educational Leadership*, 40(7), 56-61.

- Schneider, S. H. (1996). *Don't bet all environmental changes will be beneficial*. American Physical Society News Online. Retrieved June 27, 2008 from http://stephenschneider.stanford.edu/Publications/PDF_Papers/APS.pdf
- Shochet, I. M., Dadds, M. R., Ham, D., & Montague, R. (2006). School connectedness is an underemphasized parameter in adolescent mental health: Results of a community prediction study. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 35*, 170-179.
- Skiba, R. J., Horner, R. H., Chung, C., Rausch, M. K., May, S. L., & Tobin, T. (2011). Race is not neutral: A national investigation of African American and Latino disproportionality in school discipline. *School Psychology Review, 40*(1), 85-107.
- Sternberg, R. J., & Williams, W. M. (2002). *Educational psychology*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Stone, P., & Kidd, A. (2011). Students' social positioning in the language classroom: Implications for interaction. *RELC Journal, 42*(3), 325-343.
- Soares, D. (2007). Discipline problems in the EFL class: Is there a cure? *Issues in Teachers' Professional Development, 8*(1), 41-58.
- Swinson, J., & Melling, R. (1995). Assertive discipline: Four wheels on this wagon: A reply to Robinson and Maines. *Educational Psychology in Practice, 11*(3), 3-8.
- Trussell, R. (2008). Classroom universals to prevent problem behaviors. *Intervention in School & Clinic, 43*(3), 179-185.
- Tse, M., Leung, R., & Ho, S. (2012). Pain and psychological well-being of older persons living in nursing homes: an exploratory study in planning patient-centered intervention. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 68*(2), 312-321.
- Vitto, C. L. (2006). *Grammar by diagram: Understanding English grammar through traditional sentence diagramming*. Ontario, Canada: Broadview Press.
- Vosough, M., & Nafissi, Z. (2018). An exploration of english language teachers' strategies for disciplining unauthorized behavior in iranian public and private language schools. *AJELP: The Asian Journal of English Language and Pedagogy, 6*, 65-84.
- Waller, R., & Higbee, T. (2010). The effectiveness of fixed-time escapes on inappropriate and appropriate classroom behavior. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 43*(1), 149-53.
- Wilson, D. (2004). The interface of school climate and school connectedness and relationships with aggression and victimization. *Journal of School Health, 74*(7), 293-299.

Appendix A

Interview Questions

Teachers: Sex Education First language Years of experience

Students: Grade/level of proficiency

1. What is your perception of misbehavior?
2. What kind of misbehavior is the most common in your classrooms?
3. What behaviors are the most disruptive in teaching and learning/in your classrooms?
4. Why do you think some students misbehave in your classrooms?
5. What kind of rewards do you think students should receive to encourage them to behave well in the classrooms?
6. If you had only three rules in your classrooms about behavior, what three do you think would be the most important rules to have?
7. What do you do when misbehavior occurs in your classrooms?

Appendix B

Observation Checklist Protocol

Teacher evaluation early in the course

1. How preplanned and fixed is the number of sessions is?
2. How predetermined and fixed are the topics of discussion and materials (for each session)?
3. Does the teacher ask learners' opinions about the way(s) they would like to be assessed, and how does this happen?
4. Does the teacher ask learners' opinions about how to run the course and in what ways does this happens?
5. Does the teacher involve learners in the selection of the course materials through negotiation?
6. How is the seating arrangement? Can students freely move around?
7. Are learners informed of classroom rules at the beginning of the course?
8. Does the teacher try to learn the names of the students in order to call them with their names and thus be able to establish rapport to help her/him manage misbehavior?
9. Does the teacher try to obtain information about any previous misbehavior record the learners had in other classes prior to the current course?
10. Does the teacher try to obtain information about any specific behavior problems learners may have had out of school?

Teacher evaluation in the middle of the course

1. Are learners encouraged to challenge the teacher's expertise and their classmates' ideas and how?
2. Does the teacher encourage learners to share ideas in group or class discussions? Can they argue in case they have mismatching ideas? How does the teacher control students' chaos in this regard?
3. Does the teacher put the major focus on teaching the language skills and components or is this done haphazardly?
4. Are social, cultural, political, and psychological aspects of teaching EFL/ESL classes focused on?
5. Does the lesson move on or stop if a student shows misbehavior (arrives late, laughs, talks loudly, etc.)?
6. Does the teacher speak to the students disdainfully?
7. Does the teacher treat the students who have difficulty learning English understandingly and patiently?
8. When the teacher is tired, does s/he reflect this to the class?
9. Does the teacher have a smiling face throughout the sessions?
10. Does the teacher speak English at a level the students do not have difficulty understanding?

11. Does the teacher adjust the transitions between exercises so that the students do not have difficulty following them?
12. Does the teacher try various teaching techniques in order to attract the students to the lesson?
13. When the students are distracted, does the teacher make changes in the lesson flow that can attract the students?
14. Does the teacher keep monitoring the class while s/he is giving explanations related to the lesson?
15. Does the teacher spend most of the time at his/her desk?
16. Does the teacher try to solve discipline problems using his/her mimics and gestures instead of interrupting the lesson flow?

Teacher evaluation at the end of the course

1. Does the teacher assess learners in a formative or summative manner or uses both approaches? In case students mind either way, how does the teacher respond?
2. Are learners encouraged to observe and criticize their classmates' misconduct in class?
3. Are learners encouraged to give feedback on their classmates' practices? If clashes occur, how is the teachers' reaction?
4. Is the assessment conducted merely based on learners' performance and their theoretical knowledge, or codes of conducts are also included in the students' scores?
5. Does the teacher ask different students various questions related to the subject in order to check whether the subject has been understood?
6. Are the learners asked if their expectations regarding the course were met?
7. Does the teacher talk to other colleagues about how to deal with particular misbehavior which took place during the course in order to have more insight for the future courses?