

## Examining the Predictive Power of Pedagogical Style in Determining the Young Learners' EFL Instructors' Perception of Dynamic Assessment

Masoomah Estaji<sup>1</sup>, Sara Toosi Tehrani<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Corresponding Author*, Associate Professor, Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Persian Literature and Foreign Languages, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran, Email: [mestaji74@gmail.com](mailto:mestaji74@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup> Ph.D. Candidate, Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Persian Literature and Foreign Languages, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran, Email: [sara\\_galastarxy@yahoo.com](mailto:sara_galastarxy@yahoo.com)

### Abstract

Through a descriptive Ex Post Facto research design, the relationship between teacher reflection and classroom management, the predictive power of teacher reflection components regarding classroom management, and classroom management strategies used by high and low reflective teachers were examined. To this end, 113 EFL teachers completed the Attitudes and Beliefs on Classroom Control (ABCC) Inventory (Martin et al., 1998b) and teacher reflection inventory (Akbari et al., 2010). The results of the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient showed that there was a significant positive relationship between teachers' reflection and their sense of classroom management. Moreover, a multiple regression was run whose findings revealed that practical and critical components of reflection are the best predictors of teachers' sense of classroom management. Twenty teachers were also interviewed and the thematic analysis of the interview showed that high reflective teachers used different kinds of management strategies, for their students' social, emotional, and behavioral difficulties using proper pedagogical planning and techniques of teachers' teaching style, expertise, and experience in better assessment of the students in the classroom.

**Keywords:** assessment, dynamic assessment (DA), pedagogical style, teacher's perception, young learners' EFL instructors

**Received:** August 19, 2020

**Revised:** December 14, 2020

**Accepted:** February 18, 2021

**Article type:** Research Article

**DOI:** 10.22111/IJALS.2021.6742

**Publisher:** University of Sistan and Baluchestan

© The Author(s).



**How to cite:** Estaji, M., & Toosi Tehrani, S. (2021). Examining the predictive power of pedagogical style in determining the young learners' EFL instructors' perception of dynamic assessment. *Iranian Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 13 (2), 87-106. <https://doi.org/10.22111/IJALS.2021.6742>

## 1. Introduction

Classroom management capability is one of the salient features of a typical teacher. Brophy (2006) defines classroom management as “actions taken by the teacher to establish order, engage students or elicit their cooperation” (p. 103). In particular, management refers to the skills in the organization and presentation of lessons in such a way that all pupils are actively engaged in learning. This requires an ability to analyze different elements and phases of a lesson, for the sake of selection and presentation of appropriate materials, and to reduce sources of friction (Laslett & Smith, 2002). As stated in Jones (1996), Evertson and Weinstein (2006), and Marzano and Marzano (2003), to have an effective control of the classroom and students’ behavior, teachers should maintain a considerate relationship with the students, give appropriate instructions to improve the students’ learning and their level of engagement in the classroom, train autonomous learners through improving the students’ social skills, and intervene whenever needed to solve the behavioral problems.

Classroom management practices can be improved through studying the special strategies of conducting a class, observing other teachers in their classrooms, and noticing what others successfully do. Therefore, every teacher with every proficiency and experience level can improve his/her way of managing a classroom. Many effective teachers develop their own personal management practices and their own created strategies and not just blindly follow theories written in different books. Among many factors influencing classroom management procedure, one of the most important ones to mention is the teacher’s reflection. As stated by Pollard and Collins (2005, p. 4) “Teaching is a complex and highly skilled activity which, above all, requires classroom teachers to exercise judgment in deciding how to act”. Reflection is both a means of learning and teaching. In this regard, reflection as a current phenomenon has been focused in teacher education both in terms of improvement and devotion to the professionalism. According to Schön (1987), reflective practitioners are the ones who have artistry to react to any puzzling event in the right manner by thinking critically and generating possible outcomes. Fortunately, in recent decades, some studies have been done on the importance of teacher’s reflection and their effectiveness.

Although there are some studies on this topic in the Iranian EFL context, the studies have raised various questions for follow-up. Many factors influence the teacher’s sense of classroom management that relate to the teachers and learners (Salehizadeh et al., 2020). Considering teachers as a core element in the classroom, teacher’s reflection is an important personality factor of teachers. Although there are many studies regarding teacher’s reflection, there is not any research in Iran to see if teacher reflection can predict EFL teachers’ classroom management. Owing to the dearth of research studies on English language classroom management, this study intends to examine if the components of teacher’s reflection can predict teacher’s sense of classroom management. Further, it explores the strategies that high and low reflective teachers use to control the students’ behavior in the classroom. In other words, the purpose is to illuminate the strategies used by high and low reflective teachers in the context of Iran.

## 2. Literature Review

The notion of classroom management was not theorized in advance and there was not any peculiar ideology behind that. The researchers had just paid attention to its practical aspects in controlling the classroom (Babad, 2009). Nault (1994, p. 15) defines classroom management as “the set of planned and sequenced acts performed by the instructor in order to produce learning” (as cited in Pozo & Luisa, 2003). According to Nault (1994), classroom management revolves around three main themes: The planning of teaching-learning situations, the organization of classroom functioning, and control during the action. These topics are goals of the reflective act and happen before (pro-active phase) action, during (active phase), and after (retro-active phase) action in the classroom.

Since the beginning of the 1980s, reflection and reflective practices have been the main theme of many teacher training programs, especially in English speaking countries like the USA, England, and Canada. By a profound look at the reflection, one can detect reflection through self-analysis in the works of ancient philosophers like Aristotle, Plato, and Socrates who were the creators of “educational thinking” philosophy (Cornford, 2002). As Dewey (1933, as cited in Jay & Johnson, 2002, p. 74) defines, reflective action is “the active, persistent, and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in the light of the grounds that support it and the further conclusions to which it tends” (p. 9).

As Pozo and Luisa (2003, p. 74) asserted, “reflective thought in classroom management is a reflection about the set of demands which lead to precise actions in the classroom.” In other words, reflective thought refers to all practices in the classroom situation which aims to enhance awareness of past and future acts through reactive or simultaneous reflection. In a comprehensive study, Pozo and Luisa (2003) proposed an instrument for classroom management that encouraged reflective practice through the work of Nault and Leveille (1997). Nault (1994; as cited in Pozo & Luisa, 2003) selected a reflective model for classroom management for Nault believed it may lead to the teachers’ professional development in classroom management. In his opinion, observing the professional gestures used in the classroom and a guided reflection are two means of improving a peculiar teaching situation.

By practicing classroom management, the teacher can benefit from “reflective thought”. Hence, analyzing the situation and the practices through reflective thought assists the development and mastery of classroom management. Pozo and Luisa (2003) designed a questionnaire on classroom management in Early Childhood Education (QCME) based on Nault’s (1994) suggestion that an effect inventory of classroom management should encompass reflective practices and guidelines for representing a set of acts that a teacher should control to have efficient teaching-learning situations. This questionnaire has different subscales referring to various management variables like planning, organization, intervention and evaluation. This questionnaire provides detailed retroactive information based on reflection, analysis, and discussion about teaching and learning situations and processes.

In a seminal study, Sammaknejad and Marzban (2015) examined the impact of teachers’ self-reflection on classroom management. Data were gathered using two questionnaires administered to all

participants and the diaries of two teachers. The diaries included teachers' feelings, experiences, and practices concerning teachers' self-reflection and classroom management. The findings showed that Iranian University EFL teachers have had a high awareness of self-reflection. Comparing the cases, the female novice and experienced teachers were found to be different in their self-reflection on classroom management, however; not in self-reflection itself.

In some other studies, regarding the effect of teacher reflection on self-efficacy and classroom management, reflective teachers showed high self-efficacy in managing the classroom and giving appropriate instructions (Ansarin et al., 2015; Babaei & Abednia, 2016; Malmir & Mohammadi, 2018; Moradkhani et al., 2017). Reflecting on his own practice as an EFL teacher, Saylag (2012) also found that reflection affected his classroom management positively. According to Pozo and Luisa (2003), reflective thought mechanisms can be used in teacher development programs and both experienced and novice teachers may have equal opportunities to solve their pedagogical problems.

Considering the purpose of the study and the studies reviewed, this study addresses the following research questions.

1. Do the components of teacher's reflection (cognitive, metacognitive, critical, affective, and practical) predict teacher's sense of classroom management?
2. What are the most frequent classroom management strategies used by high and low reflective teachers?

### 3. Method

#### *3.1. Participants and Research Setting*

The participants in the quantitative phase of the study were selected through snowball sampling or in other terms, chain referral sampling which is a kind of purposive sampling (Mack et al., 2005). Purposive sampling is a criterion-based selection method in which some determined criteria are set before the sampling procedure is run. In this study, the criteria for sample selection were as follows:

1. Holding B.A., M.A., or PhD in English or Applied Linguistics
2. Having at least one year of experience in teaching English in private institutes or public schools

Altogether, 113 teachers, who had met the aforementioned criteria, took part in this study. Out of 113 EFL teachers, 56 (50%) were male and 55 (50%) were female. Their age varied between 22 and 42 but most of them were between the ages of 23 and 28. They had teaching experience of 1 year to 11 years and over. Most of the teachers had an MA degree in TEFL (87%) and some had a PhD degree (13%) and had taught in various English language institutes in Tehran.

After reaching the results in the quantitative phase of the study, in the qualitative phase, to conduct interviews, 20 teachers were selected based on their scores in the teacher reflection questionnaire through convenience sampling. They were 10 male teachers and 10 females. Before that, to determine high and low reflective teachers, their scores on the teacher reflection questionnaire were calculated and they were

ranked from high to low according to their level of reflection. Then ten teachers (five male, five female) were selected from high reflective teachers and ten teachers (five male, five female) were chosen from low reflective teachers through convenience sampling.

### **3.2. Instrumentation**

#### **3.2.1. Attitudes and Beliefs on Classroom Control (ABCC Inventory)**

To determine the instructors' perception of classroom management, the Attitudes and Beliefs on Classroom Control (ABCC) Inventory, which was developed by Martin, Yin, and Baldwin et al. (1998a), was used in this study. This questionnaire has 26 questions in a four-point Likert scale format (describes me very well, describes me usually, describes me somewhat, describes me not at all). According to Martin et al. (1998b), the ABCC Inventory is composed of three subcomponents: a) *Instructional management* which is intended to measure how the teachers set specific rules and regulations in the classroom and ask the students to respect them. This sub-component includes fourteen items: Items 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 18, 20, 21, 24, and 26; b) *People management* refers to the ways the teacher controls the students in the classroom. This sub-component includes eight items: Items 3, 4, 12, 15, 17, 19, 23, and 25; c) *Behavior management* which is the teacher's rules for appropriate behavior not the teacher's response to misbehavior. This subcomponent includes four items: Items 2, 9, 16, and 22.

Several studies have been conducted to measure the reliability and validity of the ABCC Inventory to assess classroom management (Martin et al., 1998b; Martin & Shoho, 2000; Martin et al., 2007). The reliability coefficient for each subscale were .82, .69, and .69 for instructional management, people management, and behavior management, respectively (as cited in Ritter & Hancock, 2007). Besides, in this study, the construct validity and reliability of the questionnaire were calculated and it was found that it was both valid and reliable (using Cronbach's alpha,  $\alpha=.72$ ).

#### **3.2.2. Teacher Reflection Questionnaire**

In this study, the "reflective teaching instrument", developed by Akbari et al. (2010), was also used. This instrument has 29 items and assesses the teacher's reflection through a 5-point Likert scale (Never, rarely, sometimes, often, always). This instrument had 42 items on six different sub-scales: practical, metacognitive, cognitive, critical, affective, and moral with seven items for each sub-scale. However, the items were reduced to 29 as a result of piloting the questionnaire with 300 ESL teachers. Removing the moral sub-scale, five factors remained: (a) Practical reflection which refers to the practice of teaching and how it can be improved through reflection (Six items measure this facet: Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6); (b) Cognitive reflection is related to thinking processes and activities that teachers do (This sub-scale consists of six items: Items 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12); (c) Affective reflection is paying attention to and exploring the students' feelings (This sub-component includes three items: Items 13, 14, and 15); (d). The metacognitive

reflection refers to thinking about teaching philosophy and practice (This sub-scale consists of seven items: Items 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22), and (e) Critical reflection is to motivate the students' critical thinking through the inclusion of more controversial topics like poverty, gender bias, politics (This sub-scale includes seven items: Items 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, and 29). The measured reliability for this instrument in the study was found .90. Factor analysis was also run to ensure the validity of the instrument.

### ***3.2.3. Teacher Interview***

A semi-structured interview was conducted with 20 teachers. Every interview on the teacher's perceptions and beliefs about classroom management strategies took at least 15 minutes. The researcher used Marin et al.'s (1998) interview questions on the teacher's sense of classroom management, which had nine questions regarding instructional management, people, and behavior management.

### ***3.3. Data Collection Procedure***

In order to carry out this study, the following steps were taken. Primarily, all the instruments employed in this study were pilot tested. To this end, the reliability of the questionnaires was calculated through Cronbach's Alpha, with classroom management questionnaire  $r=0.72$  and teacher reflection questionnaire  $r=0.90$ , which all represented good and high reliability indices. Afterwards, a set of three questionnaires consisting of demographic information of the teachers, teachers' classroom management (ABCC Inventory), and teacher's reflection were put online using Google drive. Through email, the participants were given enough information about the questionnaire topic and how to fill them out. By requesting through email, the participants were ensured about the confidentiality of their answers and motivated to do the task. Overall, 113 respondents filled out the questionnaires online. After the set of questionnaires was collected online, they were fed into SPSS and the scores were calculated.

Following the quantitative data analysis, 20 teachers were selected for the interview. All the interviews were done face to face. Before asking the main questions regarding classroom management issues which were based on Martin et al.'s (1998a) interview guide, the researcher called the participants to have their consent. The interview had a semi-structured format. Accordingly, there was a fixed order in asking the questions, but there was not any pre-determined answer and wherever required, more elaboration on the question was given to increase comprehensibility. During the interviews, the participants could answer the questions at their own pace and of course, they could ask for clarification, if they did not understand the question, to solve the ambiguities (Flick, 1998). Every interview lasted about 15 to 25 minutes for each participant. The interviews were all recorded by a Digital Voice Recorder (DVR), transcribed by the researcher, typed in Microsoft word 2010, and 35 pages were yielded.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Research Results for the Quantitative Phase

The first research question investigated the extent to which the components of teacher's reflection (cognitive, metacognitive, affective, critical, and practical) can predict the teacher's sense of classroom management. Hence, a linear regression through the backward method was run to predict the teachers' sense of classroom management by using the components of teachers' reflection. The findings revealed that the components of teachers' reflection predict 24.1 percent of teachers' sense of classroom management ( $R = .49$ ,  $R^2 = .24$ ) (see Table 1).

Table 1  
*Model Summary*

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.49 <sup>a</sup>	.24	.20	3.19	
2	.48 <sup>b</sup>	.23	.20	3.18	
3	.48 <sup>c</sup>	.23	.21	3.18	
4	.47 <sup>d</sup>	.22	.20	3.18	2.07

After excluding the non-significant predictors in the second, third, and fourth steps, two components of teachers' reflection remained in the model as the best predictors of sense of classroom management. Critical and Practical components of teachers' reflection predicted 22.1 percent of teachers' sense of classroom management ( $R = .470$ ,  $R^2 = .221$ ). The values of R-square and adjusted R-square were fairly close at all four steps, indicating the generalizability power of the regression model.

The results of the ANOVA test ( $F(2, 109) = 15.44$ ,  $P < .05$ ,  $\omega^2 = .20$  representing a large effect size) also indicated that the components of teachers' reflection significantly predict the teachers' sense of classroom management (see Table 2).

Table 2  
*ANOVA Test of Significance of Regression Model*

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	342.94	5	68.58	6.73	.00 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	1079.61	106	10.18		
	Total	1422.55	111			
2	Regression	338.29	4	84.57	8.34	.00 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	1084.25	107	10.13		
	Total	1422.55	111			
3	Regression	329.65	3	109.88	10.85	.00 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	1092.89	108	10.11		
	Total	1422.55	111			
4	Regression	314.07	2	157.03	15.44	.00 <sup>e</sup>
	Residual	1108.48	109	10.17		
	Total	1422.55	111			



The results of the regression coefficients (displayed in Table 3) revealed the reasons why most of the predictors were excluded from the regression model ( $P > .05$ ). Any variable with a significance value higher than .05 was excluded at each level. The critical and practical components of reflection remained in the model due to their significant contributions to the regression model ( $P < .05$ ).

**Table 3**  
*Regression Coefficients*

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	25.05	2.12		11.77	.00		
	Practical	.09	.04	.21	1.98	.04	.59	1.68
	Cognitive	.05	.04	.11	1.12	.26	.68	1.46
	Affective	.03	.04	.08	.75	.45	.56	1.77
	Metacognitive	.03	.05	.07	.67	.50	.62	1.60
	Critical	.07	.04	.17	1.68	.09	.64	1.56
2	(Constant)	25.69	1.90		13.47	.00		
	Practical	.09	.04	.22	2.05	.04	.59	1.67
	Cognitive	.05	.04	.12	1.26	.20	.70	1.41
	Affective	.04	.04	.10	.92	.35	.59	1.68
	Critical	.08	.04	.20	2.03	.04	.72	1.38
3	(Constant)	26.17	1.83		14.28	.00		
	Practical	.11	.04	.26	2.73	.00	.73	1.35
	Cognitive	.05	.04	.12	1.24	.21	.70	1.41
	Critical	.10	.03	.24	2.68	.00	.88	1.13
4	(Constant)	27.04	1.69		15.95	.00		
	Practical	.14	.03	.32	3.70	.00	.93	1.07
	Critical	.11	.03	.26	3.05	.00	.93	1.07

a. Dependent Variable: TotalCM

The Tolerance ( $> .10$ ) and VIF ( $< .10$ ) indicated that the correlation matrix used to build the regression model did not suffer from collinearity.

**4.2. Discussion of the Quantitative Phase**

The main purpose of this study was to examine the predictive power of teacher reflection components considering classroom management, and the classroom management strategies of high and low reflective teachers. In order to answer the first research question, regarding whether the five components of teacher reflection (practical, cognitive, metacognitive, affective, and critical reflection) predict the teacher’s sense of classroom management, the results of a linear regression through the backward method showed that the components of reflection can significantly predict the teacher’s sense of classroom management. Two teacher reflection components were mentioned to be the best predictors of teacher’s sense of classroom management: Practical and critical reflection. According to Akbari et al. (2010), practical reflection refers to both tools of reflection as well as the actual practice of reflection like



journal writing, lesson reports, audio and video recordings, doing observation, making teaching portfolios, having group discussions with peers, and analyzing critical incidents which happen in the classroom. The possible explanation for the predictive power of practical reflection may be its practical aspects. As teachers practice reflection through using tools, their sense of classroom control may be improved. By the same token, Vidmar, (2005) and Eby et al. (2002) contended that a reflective teacher continuously observes conditions and gathers information in order to be able to find solutions for any possible difficulty or problem.

The next reflection component which predicted classroom management greatly is critical reflection. Akbari et al. (2010) asserted that this component points to “the socio-political aspects of pedagogy and reflections upon those” (p. 214). Teachers can practice critical reflection through reflecting on the political significance of their practice and discussing controversial topics like social class, gender bias, race, and raising students’ awareness toward these issues.

This finding is also concurrent with the results of Reynolds’ (1998) study which focused on the difference between reflection and critical reflection. Reynolds argues that critical reflection improves managing practices through considering the educational context, curriculum, and educational processes (e.g., methods and structures). Likewise, Liou (2001) stated that critical reflection leads to the improvement in teaching, awareness of teaching-related variables, and has positive influences on the teachers’ classroom practices. Therefore, critical reflection also plays a major role in the teachers’ classroom management.

4.3. Results and Discussions for the Qualitative Phase

In this section after mentioning the participants’ answers regarding each interview question, the frequencies of the answers are presented and discussed. It should be noted that among 20 teachers responding to every question, there were 10 high reflective (HR) and 10 low reflective (LR) instructors. The highest teacher reflection score in the questionnaire was 145; hence based on their observed mean scores, 10 of the accessible teachers from the top and bottom 25% of the scores were chosen to be interviewed. The first interview question focused on the person who has the primary responsibility for controlling the students’ behavior in the classroom. The answers of high and low reflective ones are presented in Table 4 as follows:

Table 4  
HR And LR Teachers’ Answers Concerning the Main Authority in the Classroom

Themes	HR Group Responses (f)	LR Group Responses (f)
Teacher is the authority.	4	3
Teacher and students	4	0
Teacher and management	2	0
Manager and supervisor	0	6
Parents	0	1

As can be seen, most of the teachers (40%) in high reflective group believed in teacher’ authority in the classroom which is in line with the findings of Martin, Yin, and Mayall (2006) and Eslami and Fatahi (2008) because they stated that teachers have a primary role in detecting what is necessary and beneficial for their students. Similarly, high reflective teachers preferred a collaborative type of management in which the students and the teacher help each other to deal with the classroom issues which represents the interactionist type of classroom management according to Martin et al. (1998a) and concurs with Doyle’s (1986) findings for he favors this kind of management because of its effective results. Brown (2005, p. 15) mentioned that in a caring classroom atmosphere, “students choose to engage in a mutually respectful relationship and congruent communication” because teacher-student relationship may lead to a caring relationship between them.

In the low reflective group, in contrast, most of the low reflective teachers (60%) thought that it is the duty of the manager and the supervisor to set rules for classroom management because each student has different teachers in the institutes. Therefore, to assimilate the condition, the manager or the supervisor should set equal rules. They believed that the manager should set the rules and the teachers should act accordingly. In this condition, when a student misbehaves, the teacher can refer him/her to the manager because they believe in the manager’s authority.

The second interview question asked about the one who should develop the rules and standards for appropriate classroom behavior. The answers along with their frequencies are presented in table 5.

**Table 5**  
*HR and LR Teachers’ Answers Concerning the Development of Rules and Standards*

Themes	HR Group Responses (f)	LR Group Responses (f)
Teacher	4	3
Teacher, manager, and the supervisor	3	4
Educational authorities and theory makers	2	2
Teacher and students	1	0
Manager and supervisor	0	1

Although in LR group teachers believed that it is better to obey the supervisors’ guidelines regarding classroom management, based on the results, again both HR and LR teachers believed in teacher’s responsibility to set rules. They felt that teacher is the leading person and in charge of setting rules based on the psychology of the students, the classroom’s special condition, and needs analysis because the teacher has the maximum contact with the students. Other teachers believed in the cooperation of the teacher with the manager and supervisor in order to set some rules because in this regard they can share their ideas and experiences to reach more logical and comprehensive rules. 40% of the teachers maintained that developing rules and standards for appropriate classroom behavior is the responsibility of educational authorities and theory makers because they are more aware of the standards and have sufficient knowledge to set general rules and guidelines.

The third question was on the significance of the way a student acts, or what a student feels that causes him/her to act that way. Table 6 reveals the results pertaining to this research question.

Table 6

*HR and LR Teachers' Answers Concerning the Importance of Students' Feelings and Actions*

Themes	HR Group Responses (f)	LR Group Responses (f)
Feelings are important	9	5
Feelings and actions are important.	1	3
Actions are important.	0	2

As it is evident, 90% of high reflective teachers and 50% of low reflective teachers believed that considering the learners' feelings is important for it gives direction to the method of classroom management, may assist in improving learning and solving management issues easily, and that the feelings are determiners of the students' actions. The teachers believed that good feelings lead to good actions. Therefore, it is better to create good feelings in the students first. Feelings are related to motivation. By increasing motivation, the students would act more effectively. These findings confirmed the results of the study conducted by Wolk (2003) who stated that to get inside the students' heads, teachers need to get into their hearts first and this sentence indicates the importance of considering the students' feelings as it plays a significant role in their learning. Amazingly two LR teachers cited that emotions are not related to us because we act according to the syllabus and what the observers expect us. How a student feels is not related to us, it is the parent's business.

The next interview question concentrated on the role of individual differences among the students in dealing with classroom management issues. The results are presented in the following table.

Table 7

*HR And LR Teachers' Answers Concerning the Importance of Individual Differences*

Themes	HR Group Responses (f)	LR Group Responses (f)
Individual differences are important.	9	9
Individual differences are not important	1	1

Both high and low reflective groups had similar ideas regarding the leading role of individual differences. They believed that paying attention to individual differences is important because it gives them cues for selecting suitable methods for teaching to maximize learning, showing better reactions in the face of behavioral problems, and taking smart and conscious actions. This finding concurs with the results of Kuyt et al. (2001) and Vidmar (2005) who asserted that reflective teachers can predict well. This is their prediction capability that equips them with appropriate tools and strategies to address any potential problems.

However, 20% of the teachers disagreed. One of them told that teachers who are powerful create a united class and make everyone behave in the same way. Hence, paying attention to individual differences

is not that much challenging. The other declared that paying attention to individual differences is not the teachers' concern.

The fifth question centered on the discipline problems and in case of their occurrence whether it is more important to help the disruptive student solve the problem or to protect the rights of the group to learn. The following table presents the results of this question.

**Table 8**  
*HR and LR Teachers' Answers Concerning the Importance of Showing Appropriate Reactions*

Themes	HR Group Responses (f)	LR Group Responses (f)
It depends on the situation	4	7
Solving the problem and protecting group right	6	3

In response to this question, some teachers claimed that it is important to both control the students' disruptive behavior and not let it create interference in the classroom in the process of learning. However, some others mentioned that the priority is the group's right to learn not solving the disruptive student's problems. Most of the teachers in the two groups believed that the teacher's reaction to the students' disruptive behavior depends on the situation, the severity of the problem, and the misbehaved student's characteristics to solve the problem. If the disruptive behavior does not interrupt the learning process, the problem may be ignored or just a quick look or calling the student by name and warning is enough to solve the problem. Otherwise, the teacher should show reactions and solve the problem. 30% of the low reflective teachers and 60% of the high reflective ones mentioned that it is better to first protect the right of the group to learn because the teacher should not sacrifice the others' rights to learn for one person and the teacher must protect the group's rights and encourage the students to behave appropriately or if there is a problem, it is better to talk to the disruptive student after the class.

This result is consistent with Emmer and Stough's (2001) result that stopping the students' misbehavior is at the heart of classroom management because by the persistence of misbehavior, the student's engagement rate decreases and it may result in distraction and inhibition of the students' achievement. Similarly, the results of another study revealed that the teacher's failure to control misbehavior results in an interruption in doing academic activities, undermining teacher authority, and lessening the students' achievements and learning (Little & Hudson, 1998; Martin et al., 1999).

Another question was also raised to examine the ways or how quickly the teacher should intervene when management problems occur. The results are presented in Table 9 as follows.

**Table 9**  
*HR and LR Teachers' Answers Concerning the Speed of Teacher's Intervention*

Themes	HR Group Responses (f)	LR Group Responses (f)
The teacher should intervene as quickly as possible	7	1
It depends on the situation	3	9

Regarding this question, the responses of HR and LR teachers were diverse. 70% of high reflective teachers believed that the teacher should intervene as quickly as possible when management problems occur. One of the LR teachers stated that

*The problem should be solved as quickly as possible otherwise you may lose control and create a negative environment.*

They commented that although quick reactions are needed, the teacher should be respectful and solve the problem in a polite way. This finding is in line with Emmer et al. (1980) findings, asserting that the most effective teachers are the ones who establish themselves as classroom leaders for the students' appropriate behavior and misbehavior, show quick reactions in the case of misbehavior, and have both perfect instructional and behavioral management.

90% of LR teachers and 30% of HR teachers contended that the teacher's intervention to solve management problems depends on many factors like the severity of the problem, the personality of the student, and the teacher himself/herself. One teacher mentioned that

*The age of the student is a determining factor in the time of reactions. For younger learners, it is better to intervene quickly but for the adults it may be postponed so the problem may be solved otherwise it is suitable to talk to that person after the class.*

Further, the teachers were asked about the time required to intervene when behavioral problems arise. Although this question was a little like the previous question, interesting answers were extracted and presented in the following table.

**Table 10**  
*HR and LR Teachers' Answers Concerning the Duration of Teacher's Intervention*

Themes	HR Group Responses (f)	LR Group Responses (f)
10-15 seconds (very fast).	8	3
It depends on the situation.	2	7

In the reflective teachers' opinions (80%), showing fast and tacit reactions were effective. The fast reactions are needed not to waste the class time but to respect the rights of other students. The reactions may be through eye contact, starring at the student, giving warnings through giving negative marks, changing seats, changing teaching strategies to catch their attention, and trying to engage them more in the classroom activities. Likewise, 30% of LR teachers asserted that the reactions should be fast in order to maintain order and avoid chaos in the classroom.

Contrary to HR teachers, 70% of low reflective teachers contended that the reaction time is related to other factors like the teacher's mood, class size, the age of the students, their personality, and the level of disruption. 20% of the HR teachers mentioned that it depends on the situation and the nature of the problem and it is better to put it aside until the end of the classroom. Although HR teachers were in favor of fast reactions regarding classroom management problems, LR teachers rather considered the role of

contextual factors as significant. Studies have revealed that the time of intervention when misbehavior occurs is a factor which makes a distinction between more and less successful managers. Some investigations like Emmer et al. (1980) and Evertson et al. (1983) found that most the successful managers can predict the causes of misbehavior; hence, they present some rules and react to misbehaviors as fast as they occur.

In the next interview question the types of interventions, which should be used when management problems arise, were discussed. There are several management strategies to pacify the disruptive students in the classroom, which were also used by high and low reflective teachers as presented in the following table.

**Table 11**

*HR and LR teachers' answers regarding Types of Interventions*

Themes	HR Group Responses (f)	LR Group Responses (f)
Look at the student and eye contact	6	2
<i>Warn by giving negative marks</i>	4	3
Talk to the student within or after class	4	7
<i>Remind rules and punishments</i>	2	0
Engage them in the activity	2	0
<i>Encourage student to behave in an appropriate way</i>	0	2
Use creativity and psychology to solve the problem	2	0
<i>Threat them to suspend from class</i>	1	0
Kick him out of class	0	1
<i>Put them in different groups</i>	0	1
Refer to the management	4	2
<i>Call their names to aware them of the problem</i>	1	0
<i>Talk to the parents</i>	2	6
<i>Telling stories or experiences to make them aware of their behavior</i>	0	1

Most of the high reflective teachers agreed that in case of a threatening act or even punishment, it should be in a way to save the students' face and respect them. It should not be so harsh that the students become demotivated or annoyed. In fact, the teachers asserted that using multiple strategies to control the students' behavior in the classroom is more effective. In particular, the results showed that high and low reflective teachers use somehow similar strategies to manage the classroom. However, there were some strategies which were not used in the groups. For example, high reflective teachers used strategies like reminding the rules and punishments, engaging the students in activities, using creativity and psychology to solve the problem. In contrast, low reflective teachers considered other strategies such as encouraging the students to behave in an appropriate way, kicking them out of the class, and telling them stories to notify them of their inappropriate behavior. In the same vein, Tauber (2007) showed that the teachers may select

a special method of classroom management which is more suitable to their context, student characteristics (age, level of students), teacher personality, and philosophy of discipline and education.

The use of nonverbal communication for classroom management was also highlighted in this study. Hence, the results are consistent with the outcome of Zeki’s (2009) study in using non-verbal communication (eye contact, mimics, and gestures) in classroom management that showed its positive effects on the students’ attitudes toward classroom management, being a great source of motivation and concentration for students’ learning, and a tool for catching and maintaining attention. Similarly, it has been claimed that the use of eye contact and facial expressions has a disciplinary function and they may show power of the teachers over students (Ledbury et al., 2004).

As a final question, the teachers were asked about the number of times they have sent their students to the office or suspended a child for behavior-related issues this year. The frequencies are provided in the following table.

**Table 12**  
*HR and LR Teachers’ Answers Regarding Referring the Students to Managers*

Themes	HR Group Responses (f)	LR Group Responses (f)
Three or four times	1	0
Two times	2	4
Once	0	1
Never	7	5

High reflective teachers asserted that they try to solve the problems in the classroom because they have to control the students, not the other ones. However, in serious cases in which the teacher cannot control the misbehavior of the students, as a last resort, s/he refers them to the supervisor. Similarly, half of the low reflective group believed in solving the problem in the classroom by talking to the student in a friendly way about disciplinary issues because sending the students to the manager has bad effects on the students. However, five teachers mentioned cases when they had to send the student to the supervisor’s office. The reasons for referring the students to the managers were as follow: talking with the cellphone in the classroom in the state school while it is forbidden, making noise especially the noise of animals, being so difficult to control, and being disrespectful to the teacher.

In summary, the results showed that high reflective teachers are more in control of their classroom and choose to solve their management problems in the classroom while their low reflective counterparts may refer the ill-mannered and rude students to the manager because they do not consider themselves as mere leaders of the classroom. Accordingly, this study partly revealed similar results regarding classroom management in that teacher with lower self-efficacy are more probable to become angry in the face of students’ misbehaviors, not using effective management strategies and referring the students to the manager or other school personnel when problems arise (Martin et al., 1999).



## 5. Conclusions and Implications

In this study, by running a multiple regression on the quantitative data, the predictive power of teacher reflection became remarkable as it was found that teacher's reflection and its components could predict the teacher's sense of classroom management. Moreover, it was found that except for cognitive, meta-cognitive, and affective sub-components of reflection, critical and practical sub-component of reflection are the best predictors of teacher's sense of classroom management.

Second, in the qualitative phase of the study, the classroom management strategies used by Iranian high and low reflective EFL teachers were investigated. Summarizing the results of the qualitative phase, it can be inferred that high reflective teachers enjoy higher confidence and self-efficacy in classroom management and controlling the students' misbehaviors while low reflective teachers suffer from class chaos and students' disruptive behavior more than their high reflective counterparts. According to these findings, high reflective teachers consider themselves as the authorities in the classroom, are more confident to deal with the students' behavioral problems, and use more appropriate strategies to cope with such students. In contrast, low reflective teachers stated that managers and supervisors are the most significant figures who should control the classroom, they are less confident in dealing with the disruptive behavior of the students, and use different kinds of strategies to face the misbehavior like warning the students, talking to the learners' parents, or referring them to the manager, which all imply their weaknesses in classroom management. The findings of this phase can be conducive and highly significant for teacher educators and institutes to train effective teachers who are also adept managers in coping with problematic students and difficult situations in the classroom.

Overall, the results of the present study demonstrated that if the teachers become reflective, they can efficiently and effectively manage their students' and classroom problems without using reactive strategies. As a result, education authorities should make use of strategies to encourage the teachers to reflect more on classroom management and teaching-related issues. Education authorities can promote teacher's reflection through requesting teachers to keep journals, think critically, and write their classroom management problems and the probable solutions. For language teachers to become more reflective, many useful tools such as teaching diaries, peer observation, students' feedback, and audio recording have been suggested (Fatemipour, 2013). Moreover, according to Goldstein and Brooks (2007), one of the five classes of techniques available to the teachers to effectively manage their behavior is monitoring their own behavior and making necessary changes. Hence, teachers' understanding of their teaching profile enables them to address the inappropriate behavior prior to leading to something more serious (Dunbar, 2004).

A number of limitations need to be noted regarding the present study. First, classroom management is context-dependent and the same teacher may take advantage of various strategies while teaching in a language institute, a public school, or a university. Second, the type of sampling in this study was purposive sampling and a limited number of EFL teachers who met the determined criteria were selected to take part. For instance, teachers with MA and PhD in TEFL or applied linguistics took part in this study and

---

teachers teaching English with degrees in other majors were excluded. Hence, the results should be considered carefully as they may not be generalizable to other contexts and teachers. Further studies are recommended considering different factors like teacher resilience, the knowledge base of teaching, teacher burnout, teacher creativity, and teacher's emotional intelligence which may affect the teacher's sense of classroom management in a positive or negative way.

## References

- Akbari, R., Behzadpoor, F., & Dadvand, B. (2010). Development of English language teaching reflection inventory. *System*, 38(2), 211-222.
- Ansarin, A. A., Farrokhi, F., & Rahmani, M. (2015). Iranian EFL teachers' reflection levels: The role of gender, experience, and qualifications. *The Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 2(2), 140-155.
- Babad, E. (2009). *The social psychology of the classroom*. Routledge.
- Babaei, M., & Abednia, A. (2016). Reflective teaching and self-efficacy beliefs: Exploring relationships in the context of teaching EFL in Iran. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(9), 1-17.
- Brophy, J. (2006). History of research on classroom management. In C. M. Evertson & C. S. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues* (pp. 17-46). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Brown, D., F. (2005). The significance of congruent communication in effective classroom management. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues, and Ideas*, 79(1), 12-15.
- Cornford, I. R. (2002). Reflective teaching: empirical findings and some implications for teacher education. *Journal of Vocational Education and Training*, 54(2), 219-235.
- Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think: A re-statement of the relation of reflective thinking in the educative process*. Chicago: Henry Regnery.
- Doyle, W. (1986). Classroom organization and management. In M. C. Wittrock, (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 392-431). MacMillan.
- Dunbar, C. (2004). *Best practices in classroom management*. Informally published manuscript, College of Education, Michigan State University, Michigan.
- Eby, J. W., Herrell, A. L., & Hicks, J. (2002). *Reflective planning, teaching, and evaluation*. Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Emmer, E., T., Evertson, C., M., & Anderson, L. (1980). Effective classroom management at the beginning of the school year. *Elementary School Journal*, 80(5), 219-231.
- Emmer, E. T., & Stough, L. M. (2001). Classroom management: A critical part of educational psychology, with implications for teacher education. *Educational Psychologist*, 36(2), 103-112.
- Eslami, Z. R., & Fatahi, A. (2008). Teachers' sense of self-efficacy, English proficiency, and instructional strategies: A study of nonnative EFL teachers in Iran. *TESL EJ*, 11(4), 1-19.
- Evertson, C., M., Emmer, E., T., Sanford, J., & Clements, B. (1983). Improving classroom management: An experiment in elementary classrooms. *Elementary School Journal*, 84(2), 173-188.
- Evertson, C. M., & Weinstein, C. S. (2006). Classroom management as a field of inquiry. In C. M. Evertson & C. S. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues* (pp. 3-16). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Fatemipour, H. (2013). The efficiency of the tools used for reflective teaching in ESL contexts. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 93, 1398-1403.
- Flick, U. (1998). *An introduction to qualitative research*. Sage.

- Giovannelli, M. (2003). Relationship between reflective disposition toward teaching and effective teaching. *Journal of Educational Research*, 96(5), 293-309.
- Goldstein, S., & Brooks, R. (2007). *Understanding and managing children's classroom behavior* (2nd ed.). Wiley.
- Jay, J. K., & Johnson, K. L. (2002). Capturing complexity: A typology of reflective practice for teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18(1), 73-85.
- Jones, V. (1996). Classroom management. In G. Sikula (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed., pp.503-521). MacMillan.
- Kuyt, J. A., Reay, G., & Freeman, R. (2001). Experiences of reflective teaching. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 2(2), 128-142.
- Laslett, R., & Smith, C. (2002). *Effective classroom management: A teacher's guide* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Ledbury, R., White, I., & Darn, S. (2004). The importance of eye contact in the classroom. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 10(8), 11-21.
- Liou, H. C. (2001). Reflective practice in a pre-service teacher education program for high school English teachers in Taiwan, ROC. *System*, 29(2), 197-208.
- Little, E., & Hudson, A. (1998). Conduct problems and treatment across home and school: A review of the literature. *Behaviour Change*, 15(4), 213-227.
- Mack, N., Woodsong, C. M., MacQueen, K. M., Guest, G., & Namey, E. (2005). *Qualitative research methods: A data collector's field guide*. Research Triangle Park, NC: Family Health International.
- Malmir, A., & Mohammadi, P. (2018). Teachers' reflective teaching and self-efficacy as predictors of their professional success: A case of Iranian EFL teachers. *Research in English Language Pedagogy (RELP)*, 6(1), 117-138.
- Martin, A. J., Linfoot, K., & Stephenson, J. (1999). How teachers respond to concerns about misbehavior in their classroom. *Psychology in the Schools*, 36(4), 347-358.  
[http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1520-6807\(199907\)36:4%3C347::AID-PITS7%3E3.0.CO;2-G](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1520-6807(199907)36:4%3C347::AID-PITS7%3E3.0.CO;2-G)
- Martin, N., & Shoho, A.R. (2000, January). *Teacher experience, training, & age: The influence of teacher characteristics on classroom management style*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, Dallas, TX. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 440 963)
- Martin, N. K., & Yin, Z. (1999). Beliefs regarding classroom management style: Differences between urban and rural secondary level teachers. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 15(2), 101-5.
- Martin, N., Yin, Z., & Baldwin, B. (1998a, April). *Classroom management training, class size and graduate study: Do these variables impact teachers' beliefs regarding classroom management style?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 420671).
- Martin, N., Yin, Z., & Baldwin, B. (1998b). Construct validation of the Attitudes and Beliefs on Classroom Control Inventory (ABCCI). *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 33(2), 6-15.
- Martin, N., Yin, Z., & Mayall, H. (2006, February). *Classroom management training, teaching experience and gender: Do these variables impact teachers' attitudes and beliefs toward classroom management style?* Paper presented at the annual conference of the Southwest Educational Research Association. Austin, TX.

- Martin, N., Yin, Z., & Mayall, H. (2007). The attitudes and beliefs on classroom control inventory-revised and revisited: A continuation of construct validation. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 42(2), 11-20.
- Marzano, R. J., & Marzano, J. S. (2003). The key to classroom management. *Educational leadership*, 61(1), 6-13.
- Moradkhani, S., Raygan, A., & Moein, M. S. (2017). Iranian EFL teachers' reflective practices and self-efficacy: Exploring possible relationships. *System*, 65, 1-14.
- Nault, T. (1994). L'enseignant et la gestion de la classe. Comment se donner la liberté d'enseigner. [The instructor and classroom management. How to take the liberty to teach]. Montréal: Les Éditions Logiques.
- Nault, T. & Léveillé C-J. (1997). Manuel d'utilisation du questionnaire en gestion de classe. (QGC) [Manual for using the classroom management questionnaire]. Université du Québec à Montréal. Montréal: Logiques.
- Pollard, A., & Collins, J. (2005). *Reflective teaching*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Pozo, M. L. M., & Luisa, M. (2003). An instrument for evaluating classroom management (QCME). *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology and Psychopedagogy*, 1(1), 67-94.
- Reynolds, M. (1998). Reflection and critical reflection in management learning. *Management learning*, 29(2), 183-200.
- Ritter, J. T., & Hancock, D. R. (2007). Exploring the relationship between certification sources, experience levels, and classroom management orientations of classroom teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(7), 1206-1216.
- Salehizadeh, S., Shabani, M., & Malmir, A. (2020). Professionalism: The perceptions of Iranian English teachers of competence and performance in language teaching. *Iranian Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 9(1), 1-14.
- Sammaknejad, A., & Marzban, A. (2016). An analysis of teachers' self-reflection on classroom management. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 6(1), 84-89.
- Saylag, R. (2012). Self-reflection on the teaching practice of English as a second language: Becoming the critically reflective teacher. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 3847-3851.
- Schön, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions*. Jossey-Bass.
- Tauber, R. T. (2007). *Classroom management: Sound theory and effective practice* (4th ed.). Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Vidmar, D. J. (2005). Reflective peer coaching: Crafting collaborative self-assessment in teaching. *Research Strategies*, 20(3), 135-148.
- Wolk, S. (2003). Hearts and minds. *Educational Leadership*, 61(1), 14-18.
- Zeki, C. P. (2009). The importance of non-verbal communication in classroom management. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1(1), 1443-1449.