Understanding Misbehavior at University Level: Lecturer Perceptions from the US and Turkey

Üniversite Düzeyinde Öğrencilerin Olumsuz Davranışlarını Anlamak: Türk ve Amerikalı Öğretim Üyelerinin Algıları

Evrim ÜSTÜNLÜOĞLU*

İzmir Ekonomi Üniversitesi

Abstract

This study focuses on the misbehaviors of university students, and more specifically, it investigates university lecturers' perspectives of these problems along with their coping strategies. The study also investigates the factors associated with these behaviors and differences in cultural motives behind American and Turkish lecturers' perceptions. The data consists of interviews and classroom observations of 38 lecturers from two universities, one American and one Turkish. The results revealed that problems encountered were cell phone use, inappropriate talking, inattentiveness, lack of participation and tardiness. In general, verbal warnings and the outlining of expectations were identified as the main coping strategies by both groups. Misbehaviors were attributed to parents and students themselves by American and Turkish lecturers. However, some American lecturers emphasized these misbehaviors might have stemmed from lecturers themselves.

Keywords: Misbehaviors, coping strategies, source of misbehaviors, university level

Öz

Bu çalışmanın amacı, teknoloji ve toplumdaki değişimlerle birlikte beklentileri ve ihtiyaçları değişen üniversite düzeyindeki öğrencilerin problemli davranışlarını, bu davranışlarla başa çıkma yollarını ve bu davranışların kaynaklarına yönelik olarak öğretim üyelerinin algılamalarını araştırmaktır. Araştırmaya, bir Amerikan ve bir Türk üniversitesinden toplam 38 öğretim üyesi katılmış, veriler, mülakat ve gözlem tekniği ile toplanmıştır. Sonuçlar, öğretim üyelerinin en çok karşılaştıkları olumsuz öğrenci davranışlarının; cep telefonu kullanmak, arkadaşlarla konuşmak, derse karşı ilgisizlik, derse katılmamak ve derse geç kalmak davranışları olduğunu göstermiştir. Öğretim üyeleri, bu tür olumsuz davranışlarla başa çıkma yolu olarak genellikle sözel uyarı ve kendi beklentilerini açık şekilde belirtme stratejilerini kullandıklarını ifade etmişlerdir. Öğretim üyeleri, olumsuz davranışların kaynağının öğrenci ve aileleri olduğunu belirtmekle birlikte Amerikalı öğretim üyeleri, olumsuz davranışların, öğretim üyelerinden kaynaklanmış olabileceğini vurgulamışlardır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Problemli davranışlar, başa çıkma yolları, olumsuz davranışların kaynağı, üniversite düzeyi

Introduction

The needs, values and expectations of a new generation students have been influenced by the changes in culture, education, and technology, which have resulted in incidents of student misbehaviors, such as using cell phone, work avoidance, and lack of participation (Irving, 2003). There has been worldwide academic interest in student misbehavior, described as any activity which irritates, upsets or distresses teachers, or an indication of the displeasure that students

---

* Yrd.Doç.Dr.Evrim ÜSTÜNLÜOĞLU, İzmir Ekonomi Üniversitesi, Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu,
evrim.ustunluoglu@ieu.edu.tr

experience during their school life (Aksoy, 2000; Castello et al., 2010). Research has mainly focused on identification of misbehaviors, teachers' attributions of sources of misbehaviors, coping strategies, and cultural factors behind them in comparative studies (Akin-Little et al., 2007; Ho, 2004; Mclendon, 1990).

Studies on the identification of misbehaviors at primary level have found similar results to those at secondary level. Study conducted in Greek primary schools ranked misbehaviors in order of importance as follows: lack of concentration, talking without permission, untidiness, work avoidance, disobedience, lack of punctuality, non-verbal noise, being inappropriately out of seat, hindering other students, attention seeking, negativism, and withdrawal from common activities (Poulou & Norwich, 2000). Another study, conducted at secondary schools in Britain, indicated the most common forms of misbehaviors as talking out of turn, obstructing peers, making unnecessary non-verbal noise, work avoidance, verbal abuse of peers, rowdiness, and impertinent responses (Elton Report, 1989). Research at secondary level in Spain by Castello et al. (2010) found that socially undesirable misbehaviors such as stealing, fighting, and damaging equipment are considered as more deserving of punishment than those which are regarded as less serious in social terms, but are more closely related to teaching and learning, such as interrupting peers, unauthorized movement, and showing reluctance to carry out tasks. A study conducted in a Jordanian secondary school identified eight misbehaviors; talking out of turn, inattentiveness, lack of motivation, being out of seat, inappropriate humor, non-verbal noise, asking to leave the classroom, and bullying (Haroun & O'Hanlon, 1997). A number of studies carried out in Turkey identified the prevalence of the following misbehaviors at primary level: talking out of turn, obstructing peers, withdrawal from classroom activities, work avoidance, lack of attention, interrupting peers (Çetin, 2002; Gökduman, 2007), and at secondary level: talking out of turn, interrupting and obstructing peers, talking loudly off topic, and lack of concentration (Altınel, 2006; Baysal, 2009). Türnüklü and Galton (2001) found common misbehavior patterns between Turkish and English contexts, including excessive noise, illicit talking, inappropriate movement, and disturbing peers.

Studies have also investigated teachers' attribution of sources of misbehaviors and coping strategies, since it has been revealed that teacher thinking is a significant antecedent to teacher practice (Mcclendon, 1990; Montgomery, 1989; Westerman, 1991). The three main sources of student misbehavior have been identified as teacher-based, student-based and school-based (Mcclendon, 1990). Teacher-based factors include over-expectation, over-tolerance, lack of experience and qualifications, the subject taught, personal characteristics, age and gender. Student-based factors include age, sex, social class, academic achievement, and personal characteristics; whereas school-based factors include individual school environment, style of administration, rules, and the school's expectations from teachers and students (Mcclendon, 1990; Montgomery, 1989). In addition to these factors, Ayers and Meyer (1992) identified other major causes of misbehavior as inappropriate curriculum, students' inability to understand the concepts taught, the physical arrangement of the classroom, lack of positive feedback and praise, and lack of self management.   Recently, there has been more interest in cultural factors behind teacher attribution, and coping strategies, as it is believed that teacher thinking can not be fully understood without examining cultural context (Artiles, 1996). Therefore, cross-cultural comparisons of teachers' attribution styles have focused on different cultural beliefs and values. Many studies have revealed that teachers tend to assume that, rather than teacher factors, problems are caused by the students themselves, or related to family issues (Bibou-Nakou et al., 2000; Goyette et al., 2000; Soodak & Podell, 1994). However, recent studies indicate links between teachers' attributions regarding themselves and discipline-related practices (Bibou-Nakou et al., 2000; Poulou & Norwich, 2000). Ding et al., (2010) investigated Chinese teachers' attributions and coping strategies for misbehaviors across grade levels, finding that misbehavior was attributed to student characteristic, such as laziness, lack of motivation, and inappropriate learning habits. The coping strategies included discussion with individual students outside of class time, especially for older students (Mavropoulou & Padeliadu, 2002). Ho (2004) investigated Chinese and Australian

teachers' rating of four different causes of misbehavior: student ability, student effort, family, and teacher factors. Teachers from both countries attributed student misbehaviors most to lack of student effort, and least to teacher related factors. Chinese teachers emphasized family factors more while Australian teachers placed greater importance on ability, with effort attribution being equally emphasized across cultural contexts. Ho (2004) interprets this difference as a reflection of culture, indicating that Australian teachers' student-related attributions (effort and ability) is a possible reflection of individualistic values, whereas Chinese teachers' effort and family attributions seems to reveal their collectivist values. Shin and Koh (2007) investigated American and Korean teachers' beliefs and strategies on behavior management and found statistically significant cross-cultural differences between instructional and behavioral management styles and strategies. Americans were found to be more dependent upon administrative interventions and parent engagement, whereas Koreans had a tendency for a direct intervention with positive and punitive management strategies, independent of third part assistance, demonstrating their authoritarian behavior. Related studies showed that Greek teachers attributed misbehaviors mainly to students, and used coping strategies such as reprimanding, eye contact, relocating students in the classroom, or even expelling them (Akin-Little et al., 2007; Koutrouba, 2011).

Small numbers of studies on attributions and coping strategies have also been conducted at primary and secondary level in Turkey. Erdoğan et al. (2010) investigated Information Technology teachers' attributions and found that misbehaviors were associated with classroom environment, classroom size, deficiencies in school regulations, the home environment and parent attitudes, and teachers' lack of management skills. Regarding coping strategies, research conducted mainly at primary and secondary level suggest that preferred strategies are personal discussion with offenders, use of body language, verbal warning, restating the rules, nominating students to answer questions, and ignoring behaviors (Aksoy, 2000; Celep, 2002). Sadık (2006) investigated the opinions of students and teachers regarding teachers' coping strategies at a low socio-economic level school. He found that teachers regarded their strategies as preventive and improving in contrast to students, who considered them relatively punitive, unjust and intimidating. Atıcı and Çekici (2009) investigated the views of teachers and students in dealing with misbehavior at secondary school, finding discrepancies between them. Although the teachers in the study reported using mainly positive strategies, the majority of students reported a greater use of negative strategies by teachers.

Studies on identification of misbehaviors, teachers' attributions of sources of misbehaviors and coping strategies have in general been conducted at primary and secondary level all over the world. However, in contrast to the widespread research into the various aspects of student misbehavior at primary and secondary level, the amount of research at university level is minimal. Considering the potential for these behaviors and responses to affect college/university education, more studies are needed at this level (Hernandez & Fister, 2001; Seidman, 2005). In addition, studies on cultural factors emphasize that teacher thinking can not be fully understood without examining the cultural context and comprehensive examination of perceptions, attributions, and coping strategies on such problems in different countries and settings (Artiles, 1996). Turkey and the US have been chosen because these provide an interesting comparison in terms of differences in their geographical location, culture, level of economic development, and the role of university education in society. Thus, the purpose of this study is not only to identify the misbehaviors themselves, but to explore the cultural motives that influence the perception of these behaviors, including attribution and coping strategies. The research addresses the following questions;

- What are the main forms of misbehaviors faced by Turkish and American lecturers at university level?
- What are the different strategies used by Turkish and American lecturers to cope with misbehaviors at university level?
- What are the sources to which misbehaviors are attributed?

Method

This study was conducted in one American and one Turkish university. Approval for the research was obtained from both university administrations and ethics committees in order to ensure responsible and ethical conduct of research. In addition, the researcher was asked to complete an online research ethics program on "Human Research Curriculum" and to submit the report to the ethics committee of the American university. The data were collected from classroom observations and interviews with the lecturers from five departments in the American university, and their corresponding departments in the Turkish university. In order to ensure a variety of views, efforts were made to collect data that reflected the variety of participants and differences in teaching environment. Care was taken to represent the balance of gender, different experience levels, departments and programs, class sizes, and session lengths. The data from the American university were collected in the fall semester over a period of four weeks during the researcher's visit as a guest lecturer. The data from Turkey were collected in a corresponding Turkish context during spring semester, over a period of six weeks.

Interviews: Interviews were based on three research questions designed by the researcher after a relevant literature review (Balay & Sağlam, 2008; Bibou-Nakou et al., 2000; Ding et al., 2010; Ho, 2004). To allow maximum freedom of expression, interviews consisted of these simple, direct questions: what are the main forms of student misbehaviors?, what are lecturers' coping strategies?, to which sources do lecturers attribute these behaviors?. 30 minute interviews with the lecturers were conducted during office hours in both institutions, in an atmosphere that was intended to encourage honest and open responses. Out of 38 interviews with lecturers, 7 interviews lasted nearly 20 minutes. The researcher gave advanced notice of the interview structure to the lecturers (interview duration, where, when, how). Of the 38 participants, only five agreed to be recorded. Notes were taken for the other 33 interviews. While taking notes during the interviews, the researcher occasionally asked the lecturers to speak at a slower pace than normal to avoid losing data whenever the need arose. Each interview produced approximately 400 words of notes.

Observations: Observations were scheduled and conducted in both universities after the interviews with the lecturers. The purpose was to ascertain the extent to which the misbehavior and strategies indentified in the interviews corresponded with the observed classroom behaviors and strategies. Of the 38 participants, 8 American and 8 Turkish lecturers agreed to be observed. For each lecturer, observations were carried out on two separate occasions with the class. Thus, a total of 32 observations were carried out. Observations were scheduled to reflect the range of course content, departments, students (first to final year), time of day (morning/afternoon), and class size (ranging from 16 to 43). Observations of 50 minute lesson were conducted by the researcher, and mainly focused on the misbehaviors and coping strategies reported by the lecturer concerned during the interviews. However, the researcher also noted details of any instances of misbehavior related activity even though not mentioned in the interviews The researcher was careful to choose a position in the class that would allow a clear view.

Participants

The participants of the study were 19 volunteer American and 19 volunteer Turkish lecturers from the Departments of Computer Sciences, Psychology, Mathematics, Communication, and Language Education at both universities. The lecturers' teaching experience varied from 6 to over 15 year, and ages ranged from 29 to 55 (Table 1). Students' ages ranged from 18 to 28, and the grades from 1st to 4th. The participating lecturers volunteered for the study and signed an informed consent form before taking part. AL and TL stated in Table 1. stands for American and Turkish lecturers, and individual lecturers were identified by numbers.

Table 1

Demographic Information of Participants

	American Lect. Interview	American Lect. Observation	Turkish Lect. Interview	Turkish Lect. Observation
Gender				
Female	8	3 AL5,AL9,AL12	6	4 TL1,TL7,TL9,TL11
Male	11	5 AL2,AL6,AL8, AL15, AL17	13	4 TL4,TL8,TL15,TL17
Teaching experience				
6-10				
11-15	2	2 AL8,AL12	9	4 TL4,TL7,TL8,TL15,
Over 15	3	2 AL9,AL15	3	2 TL1,TL17
	14	4 AL2,AL5, AL6,AL17	7	2 TL9,TL11
Departments				
Computer Sciences				
Psychology	7	3 AL9,AL15,AL17	6	3 TL7,TL9,TL15
Mathematics	3	1 AL5	2	1 TL1
Communication	3	1 AL2	3	1 TL11
Lang. Education	2	1 AL8	3	1 TL17
	4	2 AL6,AL12	5	2 TL4,TL8

Data Analysis

This study was carried out qualitatively and the data were analyzed in the light of questions stated in the research. First, each participant's interview was coded separately and the handwritten records of interviews were carefully read and reviewed in order to obtain the frequencies of misbehaviors, types of coping strategies and sources attributed to misbehaviors. Second, an analysis was carried out based on the observation notes to compare observed misbehaviors and strategies with those reported in the interviews. Misbehaviors and coping strategies not mentioned during the interviews but observed in the classrooms are presented in the findings and analyzed in the discussion section. Any contradictory statements were identified. Also, in accordance with Creswell's (2007) emphasis on the value of participants' ideas, some extracts from the interviews were incorporated into the discussion to highlight aspects of the findings. The extracts are coded as follows: AL=American lecturer and TL=Turkish lecturer. Numbers are used to identify individual lecturers, and the abbreviations *int* and *obs* refer to interviews and observations.

Findings and Discussion

The findings are presented so as to address each research question in turn. The general findings are presented, followed by an analysis for each of the two nationalities. This is followed by the discussion. Table 2 shows the main forms of misbehavior reported in the interviews.

Table 2

Main Forms of Misbehaviors American and Turkish Lecturers Encounter in Classroom

Misbehavior	American (n=19)	%	Turkish (n=19)	%	Total (n=38)	%
Inappropriate use of devices	12	63%	15	79%	27	71%
Inappropriate talking	10	53%	13	68%	23	61%
Lack of preparation/participation	8	42%	2	11%	10	26%
Late assignments	7	37%	2	11%	9	24%
Not bringing material	6	32%	4	21%	10	26%
Plagiarism	5	26%	-	0%	5	13%
Tardiness/Late for class	4	21%	9	47%	13	34%
Inattentiveness/sleeping/daydreaming	4	21%	10	53%	14	37%
Leaving without permission	1	5%	2	11%	3	8%
Having unrelated materials (magazines etc.)	-	0%	3	16%	3	8%
Eating/drinking in class	-	0%	5	26%	5	13%
Inappropriate sitting	-	0%	3	16%	3	8%

Interviews on Misbehaviors: Main misbehaviors at university level were identified as "*inappropriate use of cell phone, inappropriate talking, lack of preparation/participation, late assignments, tardiness, inattentiveness/sleeping/day dreaming, plagiarism, not bringing material, leaving without permission, reading unrelated materials, eating/drinking and inappropriate posture*" (Table 2). The results indicated that both American and Turkish lecturers placed considerable emphasis on *cell phones* (71%) and *inappropriate talking* (61%). However, there were differences between the two groups. Americans emphasized more problems with lecture participation, preparation, assignments and bringing material. In contrast, Turkish lecturers highlighted tardiness and inattentiveness/daydreaming. Some behaviors were considered as issue by one group but not mentioned by the other group at all: eating/ drinking, reading unrelated materials, and posture for the Turkish group, and plagiarism by the Americans. One American lecturer pointed out to the connection between cell phone, inappropriate talking and participation: "*A lack of participation among students can lead to obvious behaviors such as texting and internet usage on their web-enabled phones. These students can later be disruptive with inappropriate comments directed to other in the class or towards the professor*" [Int.: AL8].

Observations on Misbehaviors: The following behaviors were observed in 16 observations: inappropriate cell phone use, inappropriate talking, lack of participation, late assignments, tardiness, inattentiveness, and not bringing material. Plagiarism was not observed because the classes did not present any opportunities for this. However, some contradictory statements were noticed as a result of observations. AL5 emphasized that students use cell phones to text and they do not participate in the lesson in his interview. However, while lack of participation was evident in both observations conducted in his lectures, a relatively limited amount of phone use was observed [obs.: AL5, 1st grade, Psychology, afternoon session]. Furthermore, incidents of inattentiveness and tardiness was observed in three American lecturers' classes although these misbehaviors were not mentioned by the lecturers during interviews [Int.: AL2;AL6;AL15]. All the misbehaviors stated by Turkish lecturers were observed in classes, but similar contradictory statements were also noticed in Turkish setting; for example, TL9 did not mention cell phone usage during her interview, but evidence of distraction caused by texting and sharing messages

was observed in both lessons [obs.: TL9, 2st grade, Communication, morning session]. It is noteworthy that frequent incidences of misbehaviors relating to materials, assignments, and participation were noted in both observations with five Turkish Lecturers who failed to mention these misbehaviors in interviews [Int.: TL1; TL4; TL8; TL14; TL17].

The results indicate that "*inappropriate talking*", which was identified in previous studies as a common misbehavior at primary and secondary level (Haroun & O'Hanlon, 1997; Poulou & Norwich, 2000) continues to be a disruptive influence at university level. This study also reveals the significance of the problem of cell phone usage for lecturers regardless of cultural background. It is likely that this common issue stems from the needs, values, and expectations of new generation students born into a technological environment (Irving, 2003). However, in other respects, Turkish and American lecturers highlight different misbehaviors, as seen in Table 2. Turkish lecturers reported that they encountered "*inattentiveness*" and "*tardiness*", whereas few American lecturers mentioned these, in spite of being evident in their classes. The reason that American lecturers overlook "*inattentiveness/daydreaming*" could be that it affects only individual students, and does not cause wider disruption as found in the study by Atıcı and Merry (2001). Another interesting difference can be seen in lecturers' attitude towards what constitute misbehavior. Turkish lecturers reported issues with "*eating/drinking*" and "*posture*". In contrast, Americans were more concerned with issues of preparation/participation, assignments and materials. This distinction can be interpreted as showing a difference between Turkish lecturers' focus on physical disruption, and the Americans' focus on the obstruction of the learning process. Previously conducted studies at primary and secondary level schools in Turkey provided evidence that tardiness and inappropriate posture were identified as misbehaviors, while bringing unrelated material to class was found to be the least frequently reported negative behavior (Aksoy, 2000; Balya & Sağlam, 2008). This emphasis on punctuality and posture may be due to the more authoritarian attitudes of teachers and a more teacher centered approaches in Turkish primary and secondary schools (Yıldız, 2006). This tendency seems to continue at university level. The differences between the statements by lecturers and observations on misbehaviors may be interpreted as revealing a mismatch between the lecturers' perception of misbehavior and those which actually occurred. The study by Atıcı and Çekici (2009) provided evidence of this distinction between perceived and actual misbehaviors and coping strategies.

The second purpose of the study was to gain an understanding of coping strategies.

Interviews on Coping Strategies: Main coping strategies were identified as "clearly defining expectations in the syllabus, using CPG, ignoring misbehavior, strong verbal warning, expelling students from class, including technology in teaching, using body language, talking to student outside class time, and prohibiting electronic device use" (Table 3). The results indicated that American lecturers coped with misbehaviors mainly by clearly defining expectations in the syllabus, using CPG –Classroom Participation Grade, ignoring misbehaviors, verbal warnings, not taking attendance, talking to student individually, using body language and including technology in teaching. Two American lecturers expressed their opinions as follows: "I decided to take no attendance, because I can't tolerate the students who are not interested in the lesson" [Int.: AL3]; "I just ignore their misbehaviors as long as they do not disturb me, because I believe that this is their choice to listen or not to listen to the lesson" [Int.: AL16]. AL12 emphasizes the importance of highlighting the behavior expectations in the syllabus: "The rules were stated on the syllabus at the beginning of the term and they know what they will have in return if they do not obey the rules. I create clear expectations of acceptable behaviors and what will not be tolerated, be firm and assertive in dealing with disruptive elements, consistency in the professor's response to disruptive incidents is important, and I never take it personally". In contrast, the most frequent strategies of the Turkish lecturers are strong verbal warning, using body language, defining expectations in the syllabus, patrolling the classroom, expelling students from class, prohibiting the use electronic devices, and including technology in teaching. When asked to give examples of strong warning, TL6 stated, "I usually shout at and tell them not to repeat that

behavior and occasionally, I may have to threaten them by giving low grade. The biggest problem in the classroom is cell phone usage. I ask them to turn off cell phones, if they don't, I take them away" [Int.: TL6]. It is striking that American and Turkish lectures have different attitude towards the CPG. One American lecturer stated, "I give extra credits for attendance, participation and homework. They love to have extra credits here" [Int.: AL3] whereas one Turkish lecturer said, "I never use CPG as a coping strategy because of its subjective nature" [Int.: TL13].

Table 3

Strategies American and Turkish Lecturers Use to Cope with Misbehaviors

Sources	Amer (n=19)	%	Turk (n=19)	%	Total (n=38)	%
Clearly defining expectations in the syllabus	12	53%	9	47%	21	55%
Using CPG- class participation grade (giving bonus when they participate)	11	58%	4	21%	15	39%
Ignoring misbehaviors	11	58%	3	16%	14	37%
Verbal warning	9	47%	13	68%	22	58%
Not taking attendance	7	37%	-	0%	7	18%
Including technology into teaching	6	32%	5	26%	11	29%
Talking to student individually	6	32%	4	21%	10	26%
Using body language	5	26%	12	53%	17	45%
Expelling students from class if they continue misbehaving	3	16%	8	42%	11	29%
Severe/strong warning	2	11%	9	47%	11	29%
Color coding misbehavior and warning	2	11%	-	0%	2	5%
Recording the frequency of misbehaviors and warning	1	5%	-	0%	1	3%
Prohibiting electronic device use (cell phone, laptop etc.)	1	5%	7	37%	8	21%
Praise and encouragement	1	5%	3	16%	4	11%
Walking around/patrolling the classroom	-	-	5	26	5	13%
Allowing short unofficial breaks	-	-	1	5	1	3%

Observations on Coping Strategies: All the strategies mentioned by American and Turkish lecturers during the interviews were observed in classrooms, although there were some discrepancies between the behaviors mentioned in interviews, and those observed in lectures. One example is TL7, who stated that because students aware of the expectations, which were fully described in the syllabus, students were generally well behaved. However, in observations it was noted that she relied on a range of coping strategies to maintain discipline, including body language, praise, encouragement, and personalization [obs.: TL7, 2st grade, Computer Sciences, morning session]. A similar case was observed in one Psychology class taught by AL12, who used a number of coping strategies not mentioned in the interview, such as encouragement, praise, opportunities for peer interaction, and pointing out that lecture content could be tested in the exam [obs.: AL12, 3st grade, Language Education, afternoon session].

While both groups of lecturers favor clearly defining expectations and verbal warnings, in other respects they use different strategies. Americans tend to rely on CPG, and ignoring the attendance requirement, while Turkish lecturers use body language, expulsion from the room, patrolling the class, and more positively, try to engage students by using technology. The differences in coping strategies may reflect cultural background. An authoritarian perspective of Turkish lecturers, noted in previous studies (Çankaya & Çanakçı, 2011; Kazu, 2007), can be seen in the strategies of verbal warning, expelling student from class, defining expectations and prohibition of devices. American lecturers share same strategies with their Turkish counterparts, e.g defining expectations and using verbal warnings, but other strategies such as using CPG, ignoring misbehavior, talking to disruptive students outside class time and ignoring attendance requirements suggest a more liberal approach. It might be also important to note that a number of lecturers from both contexts seemed unaware of the strategies they employed in the classroom, such as praising, encouraging, pair/group work, as these were not mentioned during interviews but observed in classrooms (TL1; TL7; TL17; AL12, AL6). In fact, greater awareness of these strategies could be important because their absence has been found to lead to increased misbehavior (Ayer & Meyer, 1992).

The third purpose of the research was to discover lecturers' attributions. Both American and Turkish lecturers mainly placed emphasis on "*parents*" and "*students*" as sources of misbehaviors (Table 4.) However, some American lecturers suggested that the teachers themselves may be a source of misbehavior, while Turkish lecturers placed more emphasis on society. In general, both groups placed less emphasis on course itself. Two American lecturers explained how teachers were potential sources of misbehavior as follows: *"I am sorry but some teachers, unfortunately, do not know how to get student attention; they should use more technology and make the lesson interesting [Int.: AL4). "Inconsistencies among teachers, uneven expectations of teachers from students cause misbehaviors in classrooms" [Int.: AL8].* As seen in Table 4., 17 Turkish lecturers attribute misbehaviors to the students themselves. This is justified by one Turkish lecturer as follows: *"I teach the same course to three different groups, I use the same approach, the course is the same, but students make a difference because I meet misbehaviors only in one classroom" [Int.: TL1].* TL3 attributes source of misbehaviors to parents and society, stating that *"students are not mature enough because of the way they are brought up by their parents; they have no respect, no values, responsibilities. Students influence each other badly* ". Three Turkish lecturers claim that the difficulty of the course itself could be the source of the misbehavior. In the words of one Turkish lecturer, *"I teach Maths to the 1st grade students and usually I have no misbehavior problem because I think the course itself is very difficult , so students listen to me carefully, take notes" [Int.: TL11].*

Table 4

Sources of Attributions American and Turkish lecturers Use to Explain the Occurrences of Misbehaviors

Sources	America (n=19)	%	Turkish (n=19)	%	Total (n=38)	%
Parents/Trouble at home	12	63%	11	58%	23	61%
Students themselves (lack of patience, laziness etc.)	9	47%	16	84%	25	66%
Teachers themselves (inconsistent expectations from students, learning style etc.)	8	42%	2	11%	10	26%
The Course itself (difficulty level, material, the size of the class)	4	21%	3	16%	7	18%
Society	3	16%	9	47%	12	32%

When analyzing the sources lecturers attributed to misbehaviors, it is clear that both groups mainly hold students and parents responsible. However, they have different viewpoints on the role of the teacher, course, and society. The findings of this study seem to be consistent with previous cross- cultural studies, which provided evidence that teachers generally attributed source of misbehaviors to students and families (Bibou-Nakou et al., 2000; Goyette et al., 2000). The present study also indicates that more American than Turkish lecturers attribute misbehaviors to lecturers themselves, in regard to failure to hold students' attention, unrealistic expectations and inconsistencies in approaches, techniques and assessment. Factors relating to teachers, such as unrealistic expectations, and lack of experience and qualifications were also found as source of misbehaviors in earlier findings (Montgomery, 1989). Moreover, the findings of this study, which highlight issues such as cell phones and lack of participation, show that both groups of lecturers mainly attribute misbehavior to sources external; in particular, parents and society in general. This may mean that lecturers consider that they themselves do not have a significant role in causing misbehaviors (Soodak & Podell; 1994). This finding has implications for coping strategies. If lecturers attribute misbehavior to outside causes, they are less likely to consider their own strategies as important. In fact, the lack of encouragement and praise, and lack of technology, or to talk to students individually found in this study may reflect a reluctance by lecturers to make the changes required to improve behavior. These findings could also have cultural roots regarding Turkish lecturers, who prefer a teacher centered approach (Yıldız, 2006). Turkish lecturers' tendency to hold student responsible might have resulted in the use of punitive strategies such as expulsion from the class and strong warning, rather than student centered management strategies. Similar findings were also found in a study conducted in a neighbor country, Greece (Akin-Little et al., 2007), which indicated that Greek teachers attributed misbehaviors to students and used coping strategies such as reprimanding and expulsion from the classroom.

Conclusion

This study has attempted to identify lecturers' perceptions regarding the main misbehaviors encountered in classroom, coping strategies used and the attributed sources of misbehaviors. Results revealed that some misbehaviors encountered at the primary and secondary level continue at university level. The main sources of classroom distraction appear to be inappropriate cell phone use, inappropriate talking, inattentiveness/daydreaming, tardiness, lack of preparation/ participation and not bringing material. This study suggests that technology should be more integrated in teaching, in general mobile applications such as moodle, blogs, videoing, and movie maker since the new generation of students are digital natives and using technology in classroom could be a suitable strategy for preventing misbehaviors. The results reflect the tendency of lecturers to attribute misbehaviors to others, particularly students and parents, rather than to themselves. Such a view leads to coping strategies such as expulsion from class, ignoring student attendance requirement and ignoring misbehavior. However, a greater understanding of misbehavior by teachers, a need suggested by this research, could encourage teachers to employ alternative techniques to enhance participation, and using coping strategies based on benefits for students rather than punishments.

As with all studies, this study has limitations. The participants were restricted to 38 university lecturers with at least 6 years experience from two countries. Participants from five departments at university level participated in the research. Further studies could have a more representative sample from different countries, departments, and less experienced participants. Future research also need to focus on the integration of technology into classroom, especially using cell phones as a teaching/learning device, considering the needs of a new generation of students.

References

Aksoy, N. (2000). Sınıf İçi Disiplin Sorunlarını Azaltmada Izlenebilecek Temel Yaklaşımlar. *Eğitim Araştırmaları*, 2, 5-9.

Akin-Little, K. A., Little, S. G. & Laniti, M. (2007). Teachers' use of classroom management procedures in the United States and Greece: A cross-cultural comparison. *School Psychology International, 28* (1), 53-62.

Altınel, Z. (2006). ''Öğretmenler ve Öğrencilerin Bakış Açılarından Ingilizce Yabancı Dil Sınıflarında Öğrenci Istenmeyen Davranışları.''Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Çukurova Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Adana.

Artiles, A. J. (1996). Teacher thinking in urban schools: The need for a contextualized research agenda. In F. A. Rios (Ed.) *Teacher thinking in cultural contexts* (pp. 23-52; 3553-363). Albany, NY: State University of New York.

Atıcı, M. & Çekici, F. (2009). Comparison of teachers and students' ideas about dealing with misbehavior in secondary schools. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice, 15*(60), 495-522.

Atıcı, M. & Merry. R. (2001). Misbehavior in British and Turkish primary classrooms. *Pastoral Care, 19* (2), 32-39.

Ayers, B. & Meyer, L. H. (1992). Helping teachers manage the inclusive classroom: Staff development and teaming star among management strategies. *The School Administrator, 49*(2), 30-37.

Balay, R. & Sağlam, M. (2008). The opinions of teachers concerning the negative behaviors in class. *Yüzüncü Yıl* Üniversitesi *Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 11*, 1-24.

Baysal, N. (2009). İlköğretim 2. Kademede Görevli Öğretmenlerin Sınıfta Karşılaştıkları Disiplin Sorunlarına, Bunların Nedenlerine ve Çözüm Yollarına Ilişkin Görüşleri: Diyarbakır Il Örneği. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Dicle Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Diyarbakır.

Bibou-Nakou, L., Kiosseoglou, G. & Stogiannidou, A. (2000). Elementary teachers' perceptions regarding school behavior problems: Implications for school psychological services. *Psychology in the Schools, 37*, 123-137.

Castello, A., Gotzens, C., Badia, M., & Genovard, C. (2010). Beliefs and attitudes regarding classroom management. *European Journal of Education and Psychology*, 3(1), 117-128.

Celep, C. (2002). *Sınıf yönetimi ve Disiplini* (2. Baskı). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Çetin, Y. (2002). İlköğretim Birinci Aşama Sınıf Öğretmenlerinin Sınıfta Gözlemledikleri Disiplin Problemleri. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Çukurova Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Adana.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications

Çankaya İ.ve Çanakçı, H. (2011). Sınıf Öğretmenlerinin Karşılaştıkları İstenmeyen Öğrenci Davranışları ve Bu Davranışlarla Başa Çıkma Yolları. Turkish Studies, 6(2), 307-316.

Ding, M., Li, Y., Li, X., & Kulm G. (2010). Chinese teachers' attributions and coping strategies for student classroom misbehavior. Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 30(3), 321-337.

Elton Report. (1989). Discipline in schools. Report of the committee of enquiry. [Online]: Retrieved on 5-January-2012 at URL: http:www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/elton/elton00.html.

Erdoğan, M., Kurşun, E., Şişman, G., Saltan, F., Gök, A., & Yıldız, İ. (2010). A qualitative study on classroom management and classroom discipline problems, reasons, and solutions: A case of information technologies class. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, *10*(2), 881-891.

Goyette, R., Doré, R., & Dion, E. (2000). Pupil's misbehaviors and the reactions and causal

attributions of physical education student teachers: A sequential analysis. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 20,* 3–14.

Gökduman, G. (2007). Sınıf Yönetiminde İstenmeyen Öğrenci Davranışlarının Resmi ve Özel İlköğretim Okullarında Mukayeseli İncelenmesi: Kayseri İli Örneği. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Erciyes Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kayseri.

Haroun, R. & O'Hanlon, C. (1997). Teachers' perceptions of discipline problems in a Jordanian secondary school. *Pastoral Care in Education*, 15 (2), 29-36.

Hernández, T.J., & Fister, D.L. (2001). Dealing with disruptive and emotional college students: A systems model. *Journal of College Counseling, 4*(1), 49-62.

Ho, T. I. (2004). A Comparison of Australian and Chinese teachers' attributions for student problem behaviors. *Educational Psychology*, *24*(3), 371-391.

Irving, K. E. (2003). Preservice science teachers' use of educational technology during student teaching. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI

Kazu, H. (2007). Öğretmenlerin Sınıfta Istenmeyen Davranışların Önlenmesi ve Değiştirilmesine Yönelik Stratejileri Uygulama Durumları. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, *36*(175), 57-65.

Koutrouba, K. (2011). Students misbehavior in secondary education: Greek teachers' views and attitudes. *Educational Review*, 1(19). No page.

Mavropoulou, S. & Padeliadu, S. (2002). Teachers' casual attributions for behavior problems in relation to perceptions of control. *Educational Psychology*, 22, 191-202.

Mcclendon, E. (1990). Teachers' percepitons of distruptive behaviors in the classroom. Unpublished thesis, University of Rochester. NY, USA.

Montgomery, D. (1989). *Managing behavior problems*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Poulou, M. & Norwich, B. (2000). Teachers' perceptions of students with emotional and behavioral difficulties: severity and prevalence. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, *15*(2), 171-187.

Sadık, F. (2006). Öğrencilerin Istenmeyen Davranışları ve Bu Davranışlarla Baş Edilme Stratejilerinin Öğretmen, Öğrenci ve Veli Görüşlerine Göre Incelenmesi ve Güvengen Disiplin Modeli Temele Alınarak Uygulanan Eğitim Programının Öğretmenlerin Baş Etme Stratejilerine Etkisi. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Çukurova Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Adana.

Seidman, A (2005). The leaning killer: Disruptive student behavior in the classroom. *Reading Improvement, 42 ,*40-46.

Shin, S. & Koh, M. (2007). A cross-cultural study of teachers' beliefs and strategies on classroom behavior management in urban American and Korean school system. *Education and Urban Society*, *39*(2), 286-309.

Soodak, I. & Podell, D.M. (1994). Teachers' thinking about difficult-to-teach students. *Journal of Educational Research*, 88, 44-51.

Türmüklü, A. & Galton, M (2001). Students' misbehaviors in Turkish and English primary classrooms. *Educational Studies*, *27*(3), 291-305.

Westerman, D. A. (1991). Expert and novice teacher decision making. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *42*(4), 292–305.

Yıldız, B. (2006). Sınıf Öğretmenlerinin İstenmeyen Davranışlarda Kullandıkları Önleyici Yaklaşımlar ve Bu Yaklaşımların Etkililiğine İlişkin Öğrenci Görüşleri. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Bolu.