



**T.C
YEDITEPE UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**

**THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EFL INSTRUCTORS' CLASSROOM
MANAGEMENT EFFICACY AND PERSONALITY TRAITS**

by

Meltem İPEK ÖNER

**Submitted to the Graduate Institute of Social Sciences
In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of
Educational Administration and Supervision**

ISTANBUL, 2012



**T.C.
YEDİTEPE UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**

**THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EFL INSTRUCTORS' CLASSROOM
MANAGEMENT EFFICACY AND PERSONALITY TRAITS**

by

Meltem İPEK ÖNER

**Supervisor
Prof. Dr. Halil EKŞİ**

**Submitted to the Graduate Institute of Social Sciences
In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of
Educational Administration and Supervision**

ISTANBUL, 2012



YEDİTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ

YÜKSEK LİSANS
TEZ SAVUNMA TUTANAĞI

21.06.2012

Eğitim Yönetimi ve Denetimi Anabilim Dalı Yüksek Lisans Programı öğrencilerinden
Meltem İPEK ÖNER, 21 / 06 / 2012 tarihinde yapılan
"The Relationship between EFL Instructors'
Personality Traits and Classroom Management
Efficacy"

başlıklı Yüksek Lisans Tez Savunması sonucunda jürimiz tarafından oyçokluğu / oybirliği ile

- Başarılı bulunmuştur.
 Başarısız bulunmuştur.
 Düzeltmeler için adaya _____ ek süre tanınmıştır.

Jüri Üyeleri

Tez Danışmanı

Unvanı, Adı, Soyadı: Prof. Dr. Halil Eksiz

İmzası :

Jüri Üyesi

Unvanı, Adı, Soyadı: Doç. Dr. Ahmet Sirin

İmzası :

Jüri Üyesi

Unvanı, Adı, Soyadı: Doç. Dr. Levent Deniz

İmzası :

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF CONTENTS	III
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	VI
LIST OF TABLES	VII
ABSTRACT	IX
ÖZET	X

CHAPTER -I

1. PRESENTATION	1
1.1. BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY	1
1.2. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	4
1.3. RESEARCH QUESTION	4
1.4. ASSUMPTIONS	5
1.5. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	5
1.6. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS	5

CHAPTER -II

2. LITERATURE REVIEW	7
2.1. WHAT IS CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT?	7
2.1.1. Classroom Management and Teacher Efficacy	9
2.1.2. Classroom Management Models	10
2.1.2.1 The Traditional Model	11
2.1.2.2. The Responsive Model	12
2.1.2.3. The Preventive Model	13
2.1.2.4. The Developmental Model	14
2.1.2.5. The Holistic Model	15
2.1.2.6. Other Models	15
2.1.3. Classroom Management Approaches	16
2.1.4. Aspects Of Classroom Management	18
2.1.4.1. Planning and Procedures	18
2.1.4.2. Time Management	19
2.1.4.3. Relationship Management	20
2.1.4.3.1. Communication	21
2.1.4.4. Rule Making and Following	22
2.1.4.5. Behavior Management and Discipline	23
2.1.4.5.1. Disruptive Behavior	24
2.1.4.6. Classroom Environment	25
2.1.5. Classroom Management and Personality Traits	26
2.2. PERSONALITY THEORIES	27
2.2.1. Freud's Psychoanalytic Theory	28
2.2.2. Adler's Individual Psychology Theory	29
2.2.3. Jung's Analytic Theory	30
2.2.4. Fromm's Psychological Theory	30

2.3. FUNDAMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS THAT FORM PERSONALITY	31
2.4. PERSONALITY TYPES	32
2.5. FIVE-FACTOR MODEL	33
2.5.1. The Five Factor Model and Classroom Management	36

CHAPTER -III

3. METHOD	37
3.1. PRESENTATION	37
3.2. THE PARTICIPANTS OF THE STUDY	37
3.3. INSTRUMENTATION	37
3.3.1. Demographic Inventory (DI)	37
3.3.2. Classroom Management Efficacy Scale	38
3.3.3. Adjective Based Personality Test (ABPT)	38
3.4. DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE	39
3.5. DATA ANALYSES	39

CHAPTER -IV

4. FINDINGS	40
4.1. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS	40
4.1.1. Participant Demographics	40
4.1.2. Frequencies of Educational Level and Occupational Status Related Variables	42
4.1.3. Frequencies Related to Participants' Spouses Occupational Status	43
4.1.4. Frequencies Related to the Participants' Professional Development	44
4.2. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PERSONALITY TRAITS	45
4.3. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT EFFICACY SCALE (CMES) SUBSCALES AND THE TOTAL SCORE	46
4.4. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FIVE FACTOR PERSONALITY TRAITS AND CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT EFFICACY SCALE (CMES) SUBSCALES AND THE TOTAL SCORE OF CMES	48
4.5. THE EFFECT OF GENDER ON CMES SUBSCALES AND THE TOTAL SCORE	51
4.6. THE EFFECT OF UNIVERSITY TYPE (PRIVATE OR STATE) ON CMES SUBSCALES AND THE TOTAL SCORE	53
4.7. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AGE AND CMES SUBSCALE SCORES AND CMES TOTAL SCORE	55
4.8. THE EFFECT OF EMPLOYMENT TYPE ON CMES SUBSCALES AND THE TOTAL SCORE	56
4.9. THE EFFECT OF TEACHERS PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR UNIVERSITIES' FACILITIES ON CMES SUBSCALES AND THE TOTAL SCORE	57

CHAPTER -V

5. CONCLUSION	60
5.1. DISCUSSION	60
5.2. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY	66
5.3. RECOMMENDATIONS	67
APPENDIX 1	75
APPENDIX 2	77
APPENDIX 3	79
CIRRUCULUM VITAE	82

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ARIM	: Attitudes Regarding Instructional Management
ARPAC	: Attitudes Regarding the Physical Arrangement of the Classroom
ARTM	: Attitudes Regarding Time Management
CMES	: Classroom Management Efficacy Scale
DRSB	: Attitudes Regarding the Development and Regulation of Student Behavior
EFL	: English as a Foreign Language
FFM	: Five Factor Model
TSR	: Attitudes Regarding Teacher-Student Rapport

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 4.1: Descriptive Statistics of the Participants' Age and the Experience	40
Table 4.2: The Frequencies for the Participant Demographics	41
Table 4.3: Frequencies of Certification and Occupational Status Related Variables.....	42
Table 4.4: Descriptive Statistics for the Spouses of the Participants	44
Table 4.5: Frequencies Related to the Participants' Professional Development.....	45
Table 4.6: The Correlation Coefficients between Five Factor Personality Traits	46
Table 4.7: The Correlation Coefficients between Classroom Management Efficacy Scale (CMES) Subscales and the Total Score.....	47
Table 4.8: The Correlation Coefficients between Five Factor Personality Traits and CMES Subscales and the Total Score of CMES.....	50
Table 4.9: ANOVA Results for the Effect of Gender on CMES Subscales and the Total Score	52
Table 4.10: The Effect of University Type on CMES Subscales and the Total Score.....	54
Table 4.11: Correlation Coefficient between Age and CMES Subscale Scores and CMES Total Score.	55
Table 4.12: The Effect of Employment Type on CMES Subscales and the Total Score.....	57
Table 4.13: ANOVA Results for the Effect of Teachers Perceptions of Their Universities' Facilities on CMES Subscales And The Total Score	59

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people have contributed to the completion of my thesis. I am very grateful for the tremendous support, encouragement, inspiration, wisdom, guidance, and friendship from those around me during this journey.

It is with deepest gratitude that I acknowledge my supervisor, *Prof. Dr. Halil Ekşi*, for his contributions. His insights, professionalism, suggestions and constructive feedback were invaluable.

A special word of appreciation needs to be sent to the people who helped me collect the data. I am incredibly thankful for my dear colleagues *Buket Demirbüken and Müjde Cumbul (Marmara University)*, *Tülay Ateş Esin (Yıldız Technical University)*, *Mehmet Atasagun (Bahçeşehir University)*. Heartful appreciation and a very special thank you go to all of my colleagues at Yeditepe University English Preparatory School. In addition, I wish to acknowledge all the instructors were helpful in the completion of my research data. You are the ones who made this achievement possible.

I would like to take this opportunity to express my respect and thanks to my family for being very patient and supportive. But for their inspirations and help, I could not have accomplished this MA degree. I wish to give special recognition to my dear sister, *Melahat İpek Tunakan*, whose endless encouragement, guidance and belief that I can succeed have meant so much to me throughout all my educational endeavors.

The person who I owe the greatest amount of gratitude is my love, my husband, my best friend *Ufuk*. His friendship and support can never be measured. Without his unconditional love, patience and sacrifice in time, this study would have never been possible. Thank you for supporting me from the very beginning of my MA study.

Unwavering support and assistance of my professors, family, friends and colleagues made this journey possible. Thank you all so much for your support.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to explore whether there is a significant relationship between EFL instructors' personality traits and their classroom management efficacy. 189 participants from English preparatory schools of four different universities were questioned in the scope of this study. The research was conducted with a scale based on the Five Factor Model (FFM) to determine the instructors' personality traits, the Classroom Management Efficacy Scale (CMES) was used to identify the effectiveness of the instructors' classroom management. Findings prove that there is a close connection between personality and classroom management efficacy. The study also provides some general insight on classroom management effectiveness of EFL teachers.

Key Words: Personality, Personality Traits, Five Factor Personality Theory Classroom Management, Classroom Management Efficacy, Classroom Management Efficacy Scale

ÖZET

Bu araştırmanın amacı İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğreten öğretim elemanlarının sınıf yönetimi yeterlikleri ile kişilik özellikleri arasında bir bağlantı olup olmadığını saptamaktır. Bu anlamda çalışmanın kapsamında 4 farklı devlet ve özel üniversitelerinin İngilizce hazırlık okullarından 189 farklı öğretim elemanı ile görüşülmüştür. Katılımcıların kişilik özelliklerinin tespitinde Beş Faktör Modeli baz alınarak hazırlanan bir ölçek, katılımcıların sınıf yönetimi konusundaki yeterliklerini değerlendirmek için Sınıf Yönetimi Yeterlik Ölçeği (SYYÖ) kullanılmıştır. Bulgular sınıf yönetimi ile öğretim görevlilerinin kişilik özellikleri arasında anlamlı bir ilişki olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Çalışma aynı zamanda üniversitede hazırlık okullarında İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğreten öğretim görevlilerinin sınıf yönetimi yeterlilikleri hakkında bilgi sunmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kişilik, Kişilik Özellikleri, Beş Faktör Kişilik Teorisi, Sınıf yönetimi, Sınıf Yönetimi Yeterliği, Sınıf Yönetimi Yeterlik Ölçeği

CHAPTER -I

1. PRESENTATION

The background of the study in question is presented briefly in this chapter. The key terminology and people in this field of research are provided. This chapter also introduces the problem and aim of the study. The research question which is to be answered in the study is also submitted. The limitations and the assumptions for the study are decided.

1.1. BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

Increasing the quality of education and student learning are professional touchstones for universities, and it is because of this fact that professionals have been looking for the best and most effective practices. The teacher is mainly the focus and the most essential adult in the classroom for fostering the development of learning. S/he is regarded as the single most important factor playing a crucial role maximizing students' achievement. Teachers are there to help students nurture learning by addressing the intellectual, social and cognitive needs. It is their role to set the learning environment, increase the academic engaged time, bring innovations into the classroom, make decisions, and arouse interest. As stated in Erwin (2004), there is no certain limit to their responsibilities, and "teachers manage the learning space, time materials and the mental, physical, and emotional states of individuals, partners, small groups, and large groups" (p.5). Marzano & Marzano and Pickering (2003) stated that "teachers play various roles in a typical classroom, but surely one of the most important is that of classroom manager" (p. 1).

The most significant component of a teacher's job is classroom management. (Evertson & Weinstein, 2006). Classroom management is the initial step to be successful in teaching (Demirel, 2004). Teachers are exposed to a lot of challenges every day. Therefore, managing the classroom is identified as a critical change (Gordon, 2001). Classroom management is a term that not only crosses over education but also many disciplines such as psychology, sociology and anthropology. As it compasses more than one area, it is difficult to give a single definition of it. It is an umbrella term which encompasses both the

physical attributes of a classroom, student /teacher interactions and “all of the things that a teacher does for the well –functioning of the classroom and to organize students, space, time, material, rules and procedures so that student learning can take place” (Wong & Wong, 1998, p.84).

In order for teachers to fulfill their roles as providers of knowledge, good classroom management skills and strategies are of great significance. Teachers lacking classroom management efficacy will lessen the time for teaching as he/she will be utilizing it for maintaining the classroom order. However, it could be better if class time is spent for maximizing the teaching rather than coping with problems. A teacher’s classroom management efficacy is so crucial that when effective managing skills are missing, it may become impossible for learners to benefit from teaching since the teaching-learning process is minimized to be able to deal with classroom disorder. That is, the time lost to management issues may inhibit the students’ achievements, and it is therefore these teacher skills are reportedly more connected to student achievement than any other things. When compared to classroom management, teaching efficacy is not an easy term to define, it is both complex and difficult to understand, but Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk-Hoy (2001) define teacher self efficacy or personal teaching efficacy as “a judgment of his or her capabilities to bring about desired outcome of student engagement and learning” (p. 783). Teacher classroom management efficacy involves teaching the content effectively in a pre-ordered classroom environment. If the teacher lacks the competency to manage the classroom, and if it is done poorly, it can result in misbehavior of the students which can hinder learning and teaching. “The teacher’s inability to control the class opens the door to multiple evils”, hence the teachers must increase their own capacity to tackle with the problems occurring in the classroom (Shipley, 1961, p.66).

Teacher quality is the most significant factor impacting student learning and they can have any variety of qualities that makes them efficient. However, efficacy of classroom management is one of the primary characteristics of a quality teacher. Stronge (2007) highlighted the underlying key factors that constitute the qualities and behaviors of effective teachers. These are:

- 1) Prerequisites for effective teaching
- 2) The teacher as a person
- 3) Classroom management and organization
- 4) Planning and organization for instruction
- 5) Implementing instruction
- 6) Monitoring student progress and potential

Teachers who possess efficacy and adequacy of classroom management are regarded good class managers or effective teachers. To be careful enough to monitor the progress of students, to be able to identify any changes in learning and behavior and respond to these appropriately can be listed as the characteristics of competent teachers. These kinds of teachers also turn the crisis into teaching opportunities (Shea & Bauer & Walker, 2007).

Each teacher is unique in many ways, but they touch multiple lives. Hence, the teachers' personality traits should be accounted for when considering the factors that influence their teaching and classroom management. As Smith (1971) mentions most of the educators believe that "teaching behavior is so much expression of the teacher's personality that the skills he will use, how he will use them and their effects on pupils achievement are in a large measure dependent upon his personality" (p.7). If teacher personality traits are understood, it may help them to manage their classes effectively.

In Hesapçioğlu (1994) an effective teacher is depicted as the teacher who has many characteristics. The teacher's "philosophy, personality, health, academic and professional readiness, roles and teaching roles" are important factor affecting the teacher's classroom management abilities (p. 252). Several studies have been conducted exploring the relationship between teacher's personalities and related to classroom management (Çetin, 2012; Fenderson, 2011; Kotterman, 2005; Komitoğlu, 2009; Moore, 2008).

Defining whether a person has a fit personality to become an effective classroom manager is also a difficult question to answer. There have been different theories about personality traits. The most commonly accepted theory is the Five Factor Model (FFM) or known as Big Five. Personality traits, such as, extroversion, agreeableness, neuroticism, openness

and conscientiousness together form FFM. Each of these five traits has specific characteristics to identify the individuality or uniqueness. The Big Five model of personality can be used to explain the qualifications of an efficacious teacher. For instance, instructors who are extroverted and agreeable may be better at teacher-student rapport, whereas neurotic ones can face problems in generating solutions to the management problems. This study uses the Five Factor Model to explore a relationship between instructors' personalities and classroom management efficacy.

1.2. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The preliminary aim to start this study depends on the researcher's experience in teaching English preparatory schools at universities, where she had the chance to work with hundreds of instructors at different levels who had difficulties in classroom management. The problem investigated in this study is if there is a significant relationship between EFL instructors' classroom management efficacy and personality traits.

Compared with the abundance of research done on classroom management in Turkey, the field of classroom management efficacy is still largely uncharted, although it is gaining increasing attention. In addition, none were found to have probed into the relationship between classroom management efficacy and personality traits of EFL instructors at English preparatory schools. Therefore, the study was designed to add to the existing body of literature related to classroom management efficacy and personality traits. Putting the pieces together may give professionals a more scientific perspective and contribute insights to these fields.

1.3. RESEARCH QUESTION

The present study aims to seek answers to the following research question:

Is there a significant relationship between EFL instructors' classroom management efficacy and their personality traits?

1.4. ASSUMPTIONS

It is assumed that each of the instructors involved in the study replied all the items in the survey honestly. It is further assumed that the teachers interpreted the questionnaire items accurately.

1.5. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The scope of the study was limited by the use of four universities. A more extensive data base would result if instructors from more universities were included. The findings of this study are limited to 189 EFL instructors who teach at the English Preparatory Schools of four universities because of time limitations.

1.6. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

In order to provide a comprehensive framework of the materials incorporated in this study the following definitions of terms are presented.

English as a Foreign Language (EFL): “abbreviation for English as a Foreign Language: the teaching of English to students whose first language is not English” (Retrieved March 13, 2012 from <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/british/efl>)

Classroom management: “refers to all the things that a teacher does to organize students, space, time, and materials so that student learning can take place” (Wong & Wong, 1998, p. 84).

Teacher efficacy: “the extent to which the teacher believes he or she has the capacity to affect student performance” (Berman, McLaughlin, Bass, Pauly, & Zellman, 1977, p. 137)

Personality: “what makes that person different from other people, perhaps even unique” (Boeree, 1997, p.6). For the purposes of this study, personality factors will be determined

using the Five Factor Model as measured by the Big Five Inventory .The trait approach suggests that there are basic traits that make up an individual's personality.

Big Five or The Five Factor: The Five Factor Model (Big Five) is a model that depicts 5 factors of personality. It encompasses a wide range of traits, in order to categorize and understand individual personality and behavior. The Five Factor Model consists of conscientiousness, agreeableness, extraversion, openness to experience and neuroticism. It is also known as OCEAN (*Openness to experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Neuroticism*).

Openness to experience defines how much a person is open to innovations, new experiences, cultures and so on. Therefore, openness encompasses risk taking, along with creativity, adventure, unusual ideas and curiosity.

Conscientiousness defines a person's commitment to order and rules. This factor encompasses traits such as integrity, honesty, trustworthiness, fairness, decidedness etc.

Extraversion is about the person's handling with social situations. It is related to traits like liveliness, positive energy, companionship, encouragement and team spirit.

Agreeableness encompasses traits like friendliness, helpfulness, amiability, compassion and tolerance.

Neuroticism is the counter-part of emotional stability. Neuroticism is related to anger, depression and anxiety rates. Neurotic people are sensitive and will easily get emotionally affected.

CHAPTER -II

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. WHAT IS CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT?

Classroom management is a set of strategies used by teachers to generate a productive, cooperative and safe learning environment by maintaining a certain behavior or set of rules (Wilson, 2006; Wong&Wong 1998; Ratzburg, 2010). Moore (2008) defines it as "the encapsulation of actions and strategies that teachers implement to involve students in learning, how efficiently they use instructional time, provide optimal learning experiences, maintain safe and orderly environments, control student behavior, and form cohesive learning relationships" (p.29). A general definition of classroom management encloses actions to create an environment that enhances academic, social and behavioral learning by high morality (Gilpatrick, 2010, 4).

Classroom management primarily aims to achieve the academic success of the student and its social and moral development. Many models and theories have been developed in the field of classroom management to increase the efficiency of the teacher in class. Ratzburg (2010) explains that the first step to effective management is that the teachers should be clear about their own ideas and beliefs regarding classroom management. Secondly, it is very important as a teacher to have a certain model and method to follow, and to be consistent about that technique. The teacher is a model and the setter of the rules, whether he/she chooses to set loose rules or to be much disciplined.

Class management should not be mistaken only for discipline and rules. It contains many aspects such as planning, using resources, time management, class events, student-teacher relationship as well as the student-student relationship etc. At any rate, the student will always have expectations to meet, and the teacher's consistency is necessary for these expectations to become reality (Gootman, 2008). According to Jackson, there are several dynamics that should be taken into account for effective classroom managing. These are:

“(a) multidimensional events and people, (b) numerous tasks occurring simultaneously, (c) immediate, fast-paced events that limit reflections, (d) unpredictable outcomes and events, (e) awareness of behaviors witnessed by all students, and (f) past and future actions” (as cited in Moore, 2008, p.29).

The traditional view of classroom management is that it is about maintaining order and control. Researches made in the following years, with the advance of psychology, classroom management techniques became more positivist. More modern classroom management techniques internalize student socialization, indoctrinating expectations and ideally a more affirmative way of teaching, underlining the importance of mutual respect between students and teachers (O'Neill & Stephenson, 2011).

Alberto & Troutman (1986) define classroom management as "the teacher's ability to cooperatively manage time, space, resources and student roles-behaviors to provide a climate that encourages learning" (p.404). Students should be encouraged to be involved in the classroom activities take part in the rule making and problem solving processes. The ultimate goal of classroom management should be create well-rounded individuals who will expect fewer difficulties in their years to follow.

Froyen and Iverson (1999) argue that classroom management focuses on three concepts which are content management, conduct management and covenant management. Content management refers to the ability to cut across subjects and activities, and to maintain the interest and cooperation of the student in teaching activities. Conduct management refers to the way the teacher understands different kinds of behavior and how he/she approaches and solves discipline problems in the classroom. Covenant management refers to the understanding that the classroom is a social system and that the teacher needs to take the features of this group into account when managing interpersonal relationships

According to Wilson (2006), the main aim of classroom management should be to create a positive climate for students, which will have a positive impact on their academic success as well as their social behaviors. When the setting, procedures, routines and behavioral management practices are positively integrated to the classroom management, the students

will be more inclined to put efforts to their school performance (Gilpatrick, 2010). Ratzburg (2010) introduces several basic principles for effective management. These are; “(a) the relationship between teacher and student; (b) the setting and enactment of rules and procedures (c) dealing with student misbehavior; (d) preventing behavior problems; (e) discipline; (f) effective instruction; (g)with-it-ness which is the involvement of the teacher with students” (p.2). Most of these principles are based on method and technique, effective instruction though is based on teacher efficacy. A delicate balance by deciding a technique for all these principles is necessary for effective classroom management.

2.1.1. Classroom Management and Teacher Efficacy

Many theoreticians have defined teacher efficacy as the teacher’s motivation and belief on its class material, and his/her capability to organize and execute actions necessary to accomplish a specific teaching task (Knobloch & Whittington, 2002; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk-Hoy, 1998). Teacher efficacy is important by means of the teacher’s perception and interpretation of teaching, influencing his/her planning, instructional decisions and interaction with students (Smylie, 1998; Borko & Putnam, 1996; Richardson & Placier, 2001).

The self-efficacy theory emerged from Bandura’s (1986) social cognitive theory. This theory is based on how people recognize process and interpret environmental influences and how they use this information to make sense of their self-beliefs. Bandura (1986) argues that human-beings use their own experience to compare and evaluate themselves to create an understanding of themselves. He claims that “most external influences operate through cognitive processing” and that motivation, affective states and actions are based on what people believe (p. 13). The teacher’s sense of efficacy is related to teacher’s behavior, effort, aspiration, innovation, organizational skills, persistence, resilience, his/her willingness and commitment to students (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998).

Self-efficacy in classroom management techniques are considered to be an important aspect in the overall performance of the teacher. Teachers with high efficacy have a greater capacity to affect students. They will have more confidence in themselves and their

students and will, thus, reflect more positive communications with their students (Payne, 1994). An efficient teacher will be more at ease in his/her classroom and will be able to manage the classroom better. Studies have proved that high efficacy is related to effective class management and high student achievements (Endo & Harpel, 1982; Glickman, 1976; Payne, 1994). Low efficacy in classroom management, however, has been linked with teacher burnout attrition, and has been associated with low student performances.

2.1.2. Classroom Management Models

Individuals are units of communities, creating their own social structures when they come together. Individuality is a necessity for socialization (Aydın, 2008). Every student is an individual with his/her own personality. Each classroom, containing different types of individuals, is a different group of community. Thus, it is impossible to set strict rules to manage classrooms, but only possible to define certain strategies and attitudes to adjust the classroom climate according to the individuals the classroom is made of.

Problems commonly occurring in classrooms like disliking certain classes, having problems absorbing class material, not being aware of their talents, not feeling useful or worthy can be easily coped with through individual and effective classroom management.

Moore (2008) explains the history of classroom management and argues that up until the twentieth century classroom management was about disciplining the classroom. Starting with the twentieth century, though, researches were done in the field of classroom management changed this attitude. It was not with a new approach, but instead several models emerged. Although these models are still considered to be better than the traditional model, new discipline problems appeared, such as physical and verbal aggression, drugs, possession of guns or knives, gang violence and vandalism. The emerging of such problems required the field of classroom management to come up with the most effective model in order to maintain peace and order in classroom.

According to Ünal & Ada (2003), there are three important features to education: “(a) creating a difference in the individual’s behavior (b) making these differences last, at least partially (c) these differences are created through interaction” (p. 28). These differences

can be social or academic. A certain order and strategy is needed in approaching students if a difference wants to be achieved.

2.1.2.1 The Traditional Model

The traditional model which was universal during the 19th until the 20th century was based on discipline and punishment in the lack. The traditional approach is a teacher-centered, single-disciplined autocratic model (De Villiers & Queiros, 2003). In this approach, the role of the teacher is active whereas the student is passive, since teaching is based on a model of direct instruction, lecture and demonstration. The relationship between student and teacher are extremely structured and rules are carried out strictly. Students do not take part in the process of rule-making and the setting of educational goals. The teacher makes all the decisions about the student (Aydın, 2008). This autocratic environment will prevent the development of the student rather than enhancing it.

The traditional approach is based on behaviorism, fixed rewards and consequences for student behavior (Freiberg & Lamb, 2009). Consequently, some students will try to “satisfy” the teacher with their “yes, sirs”, and every student will develop their own way to “cope” with the teacher who is represented as the figure of authority. Only students who are identified as compliant will have no difficulties with the teacher.

The traditional model is dominated by a system of blaming, judging, punishment and reward. Common punishments were writing names of student's on the chalkboard, time-out's, repeatedly writing sentences, copying the rules, being banned from extra-curricular classes, calling or conferencing with parents and timed placement in other classrooms. These punishments are based on annoying, labeling or alienating the student. Other discipline strategies were used to embarrass students or inflict pain to control their behavior (Moore, 2008). As the student will spend much intellectual energy on how to avoid these kinds of punishments and how to cope with the authority, the learning will be the secondary issue.

This approach takes prejudicial and pessimistic references as the base for social relationships (Aydın, 2008). It is believed that autocratic methods are necessary for

keeping discipline in the classroom. This belief also teaches students to approach other people in the same prejudicial and pessimistic way. For this reason, it is ineffective by means of teaching academic material as well as social skills.

The traditional approach started to be questioned by the 15th and 16th century and research done on students and classrooms after that created new models in classroom management.

2.1.2.2. The Responsive Model

The responsive model aims to change undesired behavior. This approach can also be explained as responding to unwanted behavior. Activities are more aimed towards the individual (Ünal & Ada, 2003).

The responsive model takes behaviorism and the action-reaction mechanism as basis. This model argues that every behavior should meet another behavior. It is inspired by the work of Ivan Pavlov and the like (Rockey, 2008). The basic idea is that a student will learn a certain way of behaving when constantly getting the same sort of response to the same sort of behavior. Thus, it functions with a reward-punishment method and can be seen as the traditional model of classroom management. Its purpose is that noncompliant behavior is sorted out and changed. Because unwanted behavior will meet negative reactions, and wanted or expected behavior positive reactions, it will not intimidate the student. As a result, all the actions will feel justified.

This model is also called the Behaviorist Model or the Skinner Model, named after Skinner's research on behaviorist psychology. Although Skinner never proposed a model on classroom management, other researchers have developed this model after this research. As Skinner (1971) argues, rewards and punishments are a legitimate way to change behavior. Humans need external motivator to shape their behavior. In this model, if the student is rewarded or punished systematically, the behavior will eventually change (Yılman, 2006).

Yet, this model is still criticized in many ways. Yılman (2006) argues that this model will after a while turn student-teacher relationships mechanic and monotonous. The teacher will seem too intrusive, so the students may get bored of this attitude. Furthermore, the reward-punishment system is also being criticized by some critics. Kohn argues that rewards that aim motivation such as golden stars, smiling faces or extra free time will serve as students' bribery. The students will act accordingly only to get the rewards and will not learn the behavior (as cited in Moore, 2008). Uçar (2004) comments that in this model, the prevention, rooting out or understanding of unwanted behavior is not seen. It can be concluded that the behavioral approach will not provide a root to the behavior and that it only offers superficial solutions.

2.1.2.3. The Preventive Model

This model aims to find the root and prevent unwanted behavior in the classroom. The preventive model adopts some basic strategies to set unwanted behavior into a minimum. Kyle & Rogien (2004) state that planning, organizing, designing the class material and how to hold students accountable is very important in classroom management, as it will turn the teacher into a proactive figure rather than a reactive figure. Being a reactor means that the student will ultimately make classroom decisions to which the teacher must react and this will widen the space for unwanted behavior.

A proactive stance though does not mean that the students should be passive. This model takes classroom events as a "cultural socialization process" and creates a social system that aims to prevent unwanted behavior (Ünal & Ada, 2003, p. 37). In-class activities are more aimed at involving the group, rather than the individual. Students are expected to learn to act as part of a group and behave according to the social system of the classroom.

This model requires detailed planning, preparation and vision. With this approach it is believed that results can be controlled and undesired behavior can be prevented, if not, at least the damage can be minimized. It is believed to be compatible with the pedagogical stance, and it requires experience and professional know-how from the teacher (Yılman,

2006). It also expects cooperation with the parents in order to see if the expected results are achieved.

2.1.2.4. The Developmental Model

The Developmental Model takes the studies on developmental psychology as basis and uses them to explain, evaluate and regulate student behavior. It is based on the teachings of psychologists like Adler and Erikson, who believe that children's thoughts and actions change as they mature (Henley, 2006). This model agrees that human behavior is based on the individual's physical, emotional, intellectual and social attributes and is shaped according to the individual's interests and needs (Yılman, 2006). The teacher takes these aspects into account while communicating with the student. The communication in the classroom is based on empathy, which means the teacher should acknowledge the student as the child or youth he/she is and act accordingly.

According to Erikson (1993), there are several steps and stages during a child's social development. During the school years the student will go through 3 different steps, starting with learning the concept of "competence", where the child ,for the first time in his/her life, has to learn formal skills like learning and following the rules, doing homework and acquiring self-discipline. About the ages 13 to 14 the student will start to investigate the answers to the question "Who am I?" and thus might experience minor delinquency, self-doubts and so on. Only after this phase will the individual start to experience true intimacy for the first time that might end up in marriage or life-long friendships. As it is seen in Erikson's structure, it can be said that it is not possible to achieve the same results with the sort of classroom management for a 7 year old as it would be with a 17 year old.

Ünal & Ada (2003) have also identified four steps of social development related to classroom management. Although these phases differ in age from Erikson's, Ünal & Ada's students enter these phases about two years earlier- it still covers the same steps. According to Ünal & Ada, in the first school years the student needs to be taught how to act as a student and as a person. As students start to mature, less priority can be given to the student's personal development. During this time, students need of praise and

admiration is higher. S/he will try to identify him/herself. The step afterwards might not even cover a time the student studies, but at any rate the adolescent will be considered matured and can be treated equally as an adult.

2.1.2.5. The Holistic Model

Individual and communal differences create the need to sometimes act outside standard procedures and to react differently towards different types of behavior. Every student has different talents and forms of thinking, thus it is important to treat every student individually. Keeping that in mind, the Holistic Model creates “general” rules and treats the classroom as a whole (Yılman, 2006, p. 42). The Holistic Model aims to find the source of unwanted behavior and then strives to create perfect conditions in the classroom to eliminate these kinds of behavior.

This system tries to raise individuals that are according to society’s needs and expectations, by being affected by outer and inner aspects, and using and shaping these aspects in accordance to the teacher’s goals (Ünal & Ada, 2003).

Redl & Wattenberg (1959) have done researches on classroom management based on the principle that people act more differently in a group than they do individually. Teachers should be aware of this and channel the classroom accordingly (Yılman, 2006). This idea fits into the Holistic Model. Redl & Wattenberg (1959) also suggest strategies and approaches on how to prevent disruptive behavior (see also: approaches).

2.1.2.6. Other Models

These are the basic classroom management models, but of course there is more to classroom management than just following basic models. Different situations may ask for different approaches. Moreover, there are different approaches and strategies that can be used in different models. Scholars on this field have addressed so many different approaches that there are no fundamental principles on managing classrooms.

Some contemporary scholars have also introduced different models. An example to that is the INCLUDE model, Novak (2009) explained. The Include Model aims student success, and argues that success builds self-confidence and self-esteem which will lead to greater motivation. As a result of this, disruptive behavior is prevented (Novak, 2009). It is based on identifying the students' needs and talents and then channelling these attributes in a way the student can reach academic success. It does not go, however, into details on how unwanted behavior or personal development will be achieved. Still it might be seen as a branch of the Developed Model.

Every teacher can figure a different way to manage the class, but basically it will be the branch of one of the main models listed previously. Some scholars might also refer to these models with different names.

2.1.3. Classroom Management Approaches

Approaches show different ways to enforce models. While models define how the classroom is managed, approaches give direction to how students shall be treated or how to act in the classroom. Researchers have proposed different approaches throughout the years. Some other scholars have studied them as classroom approaches, other have categorized them under time management or behavior management.

Kouin's Approach (Cooperation & Organization)

Kouin was the first scholar who systematically worked on classroom management, starting from the 1950's up to the 1970's. He has proposed that teachers should be aware of everything going on in the classroom (*withitness*) (Aydın, 2008). Kounin also stresses that a teacher needs to catch the attention of the audience and should use different techniques while making transitions between the activities. The teacher should also be aware when the attention of the students is slipping away and have the situation under control. A teacher that is controlling the classroom will raise the motivation of learners. If a teacher shows negative traits like anger or nervousness, the classroom will also become discordant and angry (Ünal & Ada, 2003, pp. 32-33). A teacher who always communicates negatively

with the classroom cannot expect the students' full attention. Hence, a teacher should never shout unless it is necessary and s/he should always be patient, friendly and resolved (Aydm, 2008). This idea can also be seen in the approach "*Discipline with Dignity*" (Kaliska, 2002, p.19).

Jones & Jones' Approach (Body Language, Effective Motivation and Assistance)

Jones & Jones have done research on preventing disruptive behavior since their research showed that 50% of the time in class gets wasted while trying to prevent unwanted behavior (see also: Time Management). Jones & Jones propose that eye contact, mimic, appearance and self confidence have greater control over the classroom (as cited in Ünal & Ada, 2003, p. 34). Similarly, Redl & Wattenberg also proposed that body language, such as standing near to the student and nodding approvingly may raise the motivation of the class (as cited in Yılman, p., 2006, p. 110). Jones & Jones also argued that creating the need to learn in students will raise motivation, as well as being interested in the student individually.

Ginott Approach

Ginott comments on the way students and teachers communicate. According to Ginott, the teacher should never put labels on the students and should prefer giving "I" messages that explain the situation (e.g. "I get distracted when you talk during class") rather than "You" messages that will make the student feel hurt and attacked (e.g. "You are wrong") (Yılman, 2006, pp. 112-113). Under no circumstances should the teacher call students names or be sarcastic with the student. The student should be taken seriously so that the teacher-student relationship can be based on mutual respect.

Dreikurs Approach (Democratic Classrooms)

Dreikurs comments on that people want to feel as part of a community, and the democratic way is satisfying this need the best way. According to Dreikurs, students should be actively

engaged in class and should be made part of the rule-making process (as cited in Ünal & Ada, 2003, p. 35).

Glasser's Approach

Glasser bases his approach on the assumption that humans are rational beings. If the student is always provided with a logical explanation when commented on its behavior, the student will understand what is right or wrong and will act accordingly. Teachers should also acknowledge that students are people with needs and expectations, and should listen to the students suggestions, and have conversations with students where matters on classroom management or intellectual matters (Glasser, 1977).

As it is seen, various approaches on classroom management approach the matter differently and generally comment on teacher-student relationships, behavior management and rule-making in the classroom.

2.1.4. Aspects Of Classroom Management

Managing a classroom has several different aspects to consider for the teacher. The relationship between the teacher and the student and the student's interactions with each other, the carrying out of rules and the classroom environment all create the classroom climate. To keep a positive classroom climate is very important to build a fruitful learning environment.

2.1.4.1. Planning and Procedures

The lesson plan is an important part of classroom management. The lesson plan is the written draft of what will be done for what reason and at which stage of the lesson. Many scholars have pointed out that all effective teachers must have a management plan and that the following of the plan will determine the success and effectiveness of the teacher (Emmer, Evertson, Sanford, Clements, & Worsham, 1989; Ratzburg 2010). The plan not only gives a simple outline about what will happen in class, but it helps the teacher to

determine details beforehand, so that the teacher may save time. The class materials, examples, alternative ways of teaching, exam dates and such will be predetermined. This will also make the teacher be more confident about the class material, and will raise the efficacy of the teacher.

Not all students learn the same way or at the same pace (Cano, Garton & Raven, 1992). A teacher that can make a generalization on the class' learning style and pace can be prepared by making a plan individually designed according to the class.

Procedures are other key elements to effective classroom management. Procedures are the set of rules and routines in class in which certain routine activities are done. These procedures and rules will be predetermined and communicated to the students. Unlike rules procedures explain how "things are done" in the classroom, and they can be defined individually according to the classes needs. Researches show that teachers, who established routines and procedures at the beginning of the year were more engaging in classroom activities, more organized and were more self-regulating (Marzano et. al. 2003).

2.1.4.2. Time Management

Time management is using a limited amount of time to accomplish all tasks and goals, and using the given time span effectively. Teachers generally have 40-50 minutes of time to put the classroom into order and convey the class subject to the student. Jones & Jones claimed that 50% of that time is wasted trying to prevent misbehavior in the classroom. Besides trying to manage the student behavior, time management includes managing the tools and class material (Yılman, 2006). Thus, the keyword for time management is order. Teachers who are prepared for their class will lose less time starting the class.

Time management in the classroom is not very different from time management of any other work field. In his book Bliss (1993) sums up the main ideas that cause effective time management. According to Bliss, a manager should set his/her goals and be prepared accordingly. Moreover, Bliss emphasizes the importance of the cooperation of the coworkers in effective time management in a working place. If the coworkers feel they do

not have the authority to handle a problem, they will hand the problem to the manager¹. This can also be adapted to classroom management. The teacher should not be the highest authority to which the students will look up to for every tiny problem. The students should be aware of the fact that they can accomplish some tasks themselves. If the teacher establishes a climate where the students come prepared to class, be prepared for the teacher to enter the classroom and know that the teacher will not tolerate distractions such as a bathroom break every five minutes, the lesson will go smoothly without having lost precious time. This can be achieved through effective management. Aydın (2008) also claimed that if disruptive behaviors in the classroom are eliminated, time will be managed effectively.

Boynton and Boynton (2005) also argue that if the classroom is managed ineffectively, the teacher will waste instructional time, reduce time-on-task, and create an interruptive environment (as cited in Moore, 2008, p.1). The teacher needs to establish and follow the rules of the class, and needs to have self-discipline in order to manage time effectively. Distractions should be prevented, the teacher should have control over the class at all times, not letting social interaction interrupt the flow of the class.

2.1.4.3. Relationship Management

Establishing good relations with students is very important to teach students efficiently. According to Marzano et. al. (2003), teachers who have high quality relationships with their students have %31 fewer behavior problems, fewer students who break rules, and fewer related problems over the school year than the teachers who have low quality relationships. Students are more willing to accept and follow rules, procedures and possible consequences that follow their violation with positive teacher-student relationships.

Researches on classroom management show that low efficacious teachers were easier to give up when students could not answer questions quickly and criticized students for their failures. Teachers with high efficacy spent more time on the academic success of the

¹ Getting Things Done: The ABCs of Time Management by Edwin C. Bliss (New York, Scribner: 1976; 1993)

student and guided unsuccessful students. In doing this, they were less critical (Gibson & Dembo, 1984 as cited in Abu-Tineh, Khasawneh & Khalaileh, 2011).

2.1.4.3.1. Communication

The ability to communicate effectively is of vital importance for a teacher. Both the teacher-student rapport and the communication with other teachers, the parents are essential. A teacher who can explain him/herself fluently and without hesitation will leave a good impression and have higher efficacy.

Communication in the classroom starts with the meeting of the students. A first impression is always significant. Learning the names of the students as fast as possible contributes the classroom climate in a positive way. Additionally, addressing students with their names is the key to make the relationship between the teacher and the student more personal (Yilman, 2006) and enhance the quality of the relationship.

Nielsen (2008) explains the basic skills needed for effective communication as: (a) being aware of the context of the delivered message and accordingly not speaking too long or too short; (b) having a pleasant tone of voice. The teacher should not sound aggressive or impatient. Friendly speaking and smiling will make the listener feel more open to what is said. (c) having a clear diction and speaking accent free

Taking the student seriously, understanding and responding to the student are necessities of in-class communication. To be a good communicator, the teacher should also be a good listener. Not only listening, but also showing the student that he/she is being listened to is also part of this process. Facing the student and looking interested will make the student feel important. When students experience communicating with their teacher as honest, fair and sincere they will be more receptive to what is said (Gilpatrick, 2010). Effective communication will raise the student's self-respect, and will also be a model behavior.

Communication is not limited to words and verbal expressions. Body language and mimic are a major part of communication. According to Mehrabian (1971), only 7% of

communication consists of words. The way words are said creates 38% of the communication, and body language 55%.

Yılman (2006) emphasizes the importance of body language in classroom communication. Having eye contact with the students to raise class participation (*withitness*), standing firm and straight while communicating with the classroom will cause more effective communication. Hand and arm gestures are to be used during conversations, but hiding hands in pockets or crossing the arms will signify introversion, which the student will sense. The teacher should be aware of his/her posture and movements and use them for direct communication when needed. Hand and head gestures can be used for non-verbal communication to signify approval or disapproval.

In many classroom management approaches (e.g. Discipline with Dignity) the importance of multitasking is stressed (Kaliska, 2002). The advantage of non-verbal messages is that they can be given during verbal communication. That is, a teacher can gesture students to be quiet while lecturing. This way the lecture will not be interrupted, and the teacher will still be showing *withitness*. Also, giving approving nods and smiling can be a good way to praise a student without interrupting the class. In some situations expressing contentment with gestures rather than words can be more effective, since repeating words like “good” or “excellent” too often might make them lose their meaning and effectiveness (Kaliska, 2002; Aydın, 2008).

2.1.4.4. Rule Making and Following

Rule-making is one of the most strategic aspects in classroom management. Rules are set according to certain needs and goals in the classroom. Classroom management models have also touched upon the aspects of rule-making. Whereas the traditional way of setting rules was based on unquestionable obedience, classroom management studies now have accepted that students do not want to be treated as robots. Rules should be applicable and make sense for the student. Rules that are coherent and based on reason will be easier for the student to follow.

Purkey & Smith confirm the values of rules in creating productive learning environments. Many evidences exist indicating that clear, reasonable rules, fairly and consistently enforced, not only can reduce behavior problems that interfere with learning, but also can promote a feeling of pride and responsibility in the school community (Purkey & Smith, as cited Allen 2005). Another modern approach to rule-making is asking the students' opinion on the matter. In democratic societies, it should be natural to ask for the students' participation when it comes to rule-making, since this kind of approach will also become a model for the student (Ünal & Ada, 2003).

Researches done on rules propose six principles to promote an understanding of rules. These are; (a) limiting the number of rules to make it easier for students to remember them, (b) soliciting student ideas and suggestions in the process of rule-making, (c) designing rules that will enhance learning, (d) stating the rules in a clear and simple language that students can understand, (e) determining in advance what the consequences are to break the rules and to make sure the students are aware of these consequences, (f) displaying and distributing the contracted rules (Allen, 2005).

Rules are sentences that are meant to be followed under every circumstance. They are designed to preserve a certain kind of order in the classroom, and thus not following them must have consequences. If the teacher wants the rules to be acknowledged (Ünal & Ada, 2003) consistency is necessary. It must be stressed that discipline does not mean cruelty or tyranny, but simply strictness.

2.1.4.5. Behavior Management and Discipline

Behavior management is the process of controlling and regulating a person's behavior in accordance to with the rules of society and school. The purpose of behavior management is to teach the ability to control one-self (Ünal & Ada, 2003). According to Adler, personality and behavior are shaped in childhood years. Thus, behavior management starts in the family. As the child goes to school and starts spending most of his/her time with the teacher, behavior management becomes the teachers' duty. This can be done with careful and consistent planning and following the rules. When the class order is set, behavior is

likely to change according to this social routine. A good classroom order will make the students “(a) feel responsible of their own behavior; (b) minimalize disruptive behavior; (c) establish good and desired behavior “ (Ünal & Ada, 2003, p. 189).

There can be several reasons considering someone’s behavior: family relations, school administration, classroom climate, biological or psychological conditions, friendships and peer pressure, external influences etc. When there is no problem with these, the student will have no reason to act in a discomforting way. For instance, a student who experiences discomfort in one or more of these aspects might engage in undesired behavior in class. The teacher, however, always keeps in mind that there is a reason to behave in that way. In order to be able to manage behavior of the students effectively, the teacher must be aware of these reasons.

Behaviors can be consolidated and become habits. Generally speaking, behaviors are things learned throughout life. They establish and become habits. Due to this fact, behavior management is not something that can be expected to change in a day. It needs consistency and discipline. The teacher is never expected to fail to react positively or negatively towards a behavior which s/he wants to establish or get rid of.

Discipline is simply teaching the individual what kind of behavior is right and wrong. It should not be confused with autocracy. Ünal & Ada (2003) distinguish the old idea of discipline with the modern idea of discipline. According to the old approach, a quiet classroom was a disciplined classroom. However, the modern classroom is not like that, whereas the old way was to keep students under control with fear, modern classrooms do not use this approach (see also: Classroom Management Models & Classroom Management Approaches) Generally, disciplined means to be strict about the rules, but it doesn’t mean being unfriendly or hateful.

2.1.4.5.1. Disruptive Behavior

Disruptive and noncompliant behavior in the classroom harms the classroom climate, by not only preventing students’ own learning, but also preventing their classmates’ in the

learning process. According to Cook, it even has the potential to drive teachers from their profession (as cited in Gilpatrick, 2010).

As mentioned above, all behaviors have a reason. There are four main reasons for disruptive behavior in the classroom:

- 1) The student want to draw attention
- 2) The student wants power.
- 3) The student is looking for ways to get revenge.
- 4) The student is hopeless. (Dreikurs (1968) as cited in Ünal & Ada, 2003 p. 191).

Dreikurs' (1968) idea is that disruptive behavior can be managed by not giving the student what he/she wants. If the student who seeks attention gets attention, the disruptive attitude will continue. Hence, not showing any interest will be the right way to prevent this behavior. The student may not stop right away, since it is habitual, that is, why behavioral management needs consistency. Dreikurs (1968) proposes cooperating with power seeking students and being kind and understanding towards avenging and desperate students. Most of the time the causes of these kinds of behaviors are rooted elsewhere, and the teacher should not encourage, but try to change them.

2.1.4.6. Classroom Environment

The physical environment, that is, the placement of the objects, the empty spaces, the heat, light and color of the classroom affects the classroom climate. The number of students in a classroom is also part of the physical environment of the class, and it is generally not wished that there are more than 30 students in a room. An ideal number, however, does not exist and might also differ according to the class subject (Aydın, 2008). The placement of the students will also affect the learning. The traditional way of placing the students is the teacher-centered order, where the teacher stands or sits in front of all the students, which is more fit to the Traditional Model. But modern research suggests that placing the students in circles or in a way that they can face each other will enhance interaction and the students' interest in the lesson (Aydın, 2008).

The sitting order in the classroom will affect many things. First of all, it regulates the students' interaction with each other. In a circular order, every student faces the teacher and the students sit far enough from each other so that they can't chat with each other. As a result, there will be less distraction among students and this will make the classroom quieter. An unusual sitting order will also make students feel refreshed.

Color, light and the general appearance of the classroom is also of major importance when it comes to the climate in the classroom. The classroom should be light enough for students to read comfortably. The classroom is preferably neither too hot, nor too cold. Students who will be cold or sweat will experience difficulties in concentration and feel physical exhaustion. A classroom that is dark and decorated with dark colors is likely to make students feel sleepy. The colors can be lively, yet not so bright as to distract.

Other kinds of decorations, decided and made by students wishes may raise motivation and make feel them like they belong. An environment that is decorated according to their taste will make them feel happy and special because they will be able to express their individuality. Changing the decoration will also raise the students' devotion and a different working environment will make students feel fresh.

2.1.5. Classroom Management and Personality Traits

Personality implies the mental existence of a living being, originating in the individual, consisting of thoughts, feelings, desires, intentions, goals and action tendencies as well as behaviors (Brody & Ehrlichman, 1998). Since the personality of a person can offer an explanation to why and how one behaves, it is an important part of educational psychology and classroom management efficacy.

There are several ways to approach personality and traits, and these approaches define where behavior originates from and why. The psychoanalytical approach argues that behavior originates largely from the unconsciousness. The trait approach identifies various personality characteristics and categorizes the individual according to these characteristics.

The biological approach argues that a large part of the individual's personality consists of inherited predispositions and physiological processes and thus explains differences in personality. The humanistic approach, on the other hand, takes the sense of personal responsibility and self-acceptance as the key of personality differences. The cognitive approach explores the differences the way people process information to explain personality and behavior (Burger, 2008).

Behavioral/social learning theorists take conditioning and expectations base as an explanation to consistent behavior patterns (Burger, 2008). Bandura (1986) uses this theory to explore the relation between inside/outside factors to individual's behaviors. According to Bandura (1986) "people function as contributors to their own motivation, behavior and development within a network of reciprocally interacting influences" (p. 6).

Bandura gives several aspects of how behavior can affect individuals:

- Behavior can affect cognition, feelings and even neurobiology
- Environments and beliefs may affect neurobiological functioning
- Behavior affects environment and vice versa
- Cognition and feeling influence behavior and environments (as cited in Allen, 2005, p. 302-303).

Thus, according to Bandura (1986), behavior is not only affected by outer elements but affects it as well. This must be taken into account when managing a classroom. Teachers' ways of behaving result from their personality traits. Traits are the underlying elements which define how the person behaves. Therefore, understanding the relationship between the personality traits and classroom management efficacy is essential.

2.2. PERSONALITY THEORIES

The different approaches towards personality have developed with the rise of psychology and the developing of new theories considering human behavior.

2.2.1. Freud's Psychoanalytic Theory

Freud, who is considered to be one of the most important theorists in the field of psychology, has argued that the subconscious defines human behavior and personality. According to Freud, everything people perceive and remember are in their conscious, but some information they might not choose to remember is stored in their subconscious. The parts they forgot of their childhood, traumatic happenings and feelings and conclusions they might not be fully aware of are all part of their subconscious and these direct their behavior more than their conscious (Wollheim, 1971).

Freud divides the human mind into three: the id, ego and super-ego. The id is the part that is acting according to pure instincts and pleasures. The id wants its wishes met no matter what the conditions are, it does not want to wait and it does not have a concept of morality or justice. According to Freud (1991), the id is the source of dreams and is a means to satisfy id. The ego is the decision-making mechanism and tries to satisfy the id in a realistic way and creates a balance between the id and the super-ego. The ego is the control and judgment mechanism of the self. It works to satisfy the id's primitive drives while trying to keep the person safe. The super-ego, on the other hand, tries to create the perfect individual who is socially acceptable. It will try to repress the id's sexual and aggressive drives and provide the ego with feelings of guilt, anxiety or inferiority. The super-ego strives perfection and wants to reach the ego's ideals by clearing every other drive that is on the way. This is why the ego is the balance keeper (Freud, 2010).

The personality acts as a whole of these three parts. The id is the biological, the ego the psychological and the super-ego the social part of the personality. While the id accepts the pleasure principle, the ego accepts the reality principle. Freud's very complex theory of psychoanalysis is based on these two principles. Every individual will try to run away from pain and gain pleasure and even the smallest rupture will cause pain to the individual. The person who hates pain will try every way possible to get rid of this pain and find peace again. The human-beings may do this discharging in some other way. Once the negative energy is discharged the individual will find peace again and continue to strive for their pleasure (Freud, 2010).

It is seen that Freud's theory is based on very primitive principles. Freud is attempting to explain very core qualities of the human nature. His generalizations are valid for everyone and understanding these simple principles may help us to understand people's behaviors better.

2.2.2. Adler's Individual Psychology Theory

Adler who is the creator of individual psychology has put forth a much simpler and limited theory of main ideas. Individual psychology mainly explores the relationship between the individual and society and their balance. According to Adler (2002), social signs are keys to the forming of the individual's personality. A person can only become an individual by merging with society. The human is a social being and it is abnormal or wrong if s/he acts against society.

Adler takes Freud's ideas on the subconscious and argues that a person cannot be defined only by his actions, but also his subconscious feelings. Following the traces of Freud's idea of the id and the ego, Adler came up with the terms superiority, perfection and inferiority. People, who feel superior to others and see themselves as heroes or better than people, are alienated from the society. According to Adler, people who might have experiences of past traumas or negative incidents with their families feel that way. The treatment of this kind of behavior is being friendly, and explaining them the situation with indulgence and compassion. People with an inferiority complex, on the other hand, will react towards behaviors or actions that will make the individual feel inferior and will try to prove themselves. The urge to compensate will torment the person and most probably end up with antisocial behavior. Perfectionism can also be a problematic behavior. The perfectionist individual will never be satisfied with anything and will thus experience problems engaging in social behavior (Carlson&Heth 2010).

One of the main ideas of Adler is that an individual's personality starts to form in the early years of childhood. According to Adler (2002), the personality of an individual is shaped by the age of five and after that it does not show great differences. This idea may be argued since there are many different aspects that affect the personality, and that some researchers argue that the process of forming a personality does always continue. Still, it can be said

that the main features of the personality are set from childhood. (Adler, 2002) If Adler's theory is taken into account, pre-school teachers or primary school teachers will have the chance to have a greater impact on a students' personality.

2.2.3. Jung's Analytic Theory

Another psychological theorist who based his theories on Freud's research was Jung, who argues that the personality is created by the ego. Jung was also the first person who used the terms introvert and extravert. According to him, a person must keep the balance between introversion and extroversion. The instability of these two aspects will create personality issues (Cüceloğlu,1998).

2.2.4. Fromm's Psychological Theory

Fromm who was also a sociologist and philosopher approached personality from the social-psychological perspective. He related personality to a person's economic and cultural roots. As opposed to Adler, Fromm argued that personality is formed through social impact and life experience. The permanent personality is a whole consisting of physical and inherited aspects and social and cultural impacts.

Fromm proposes eight basic needs for human's that have an impact on the individual's personality. These are (a) Relatedness, (b) Transcendence, (c) Rootedness, (d) Sense of identity, (e) Frame of orientation, (f) Excitation and Stimulation, (g) Unity, (h) Effectiveness (Engler, 2008). According to Fromm, a person has the need to feel related to people, has to have a sense of belonging somewhere, a need to understand and be one with everything around them, to create and be excited and stimulated about the things around them and needs a sense of the self and accomplishment. To sum up, Fromm argues that the person needs to be in harmony with their social community and surroundings, be in peace with them and be productive. It is also important to satisfy these needs for children in order for them to be happy and motivated. A teacher should take these into account to feed the sense of accomplishment in the student and to prevent disruptive behavior (Engler, 2008).

2.3. FUNDAMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS THAT FORM PERSONALITY

Not only there are several approaches to personality but also there are several aspects that form a personality on which these approaches are based upon. Stagner (1937) has established some determinants affecting the personality development:

Physiological Aspects: There is a close connection between the physiological features of a person and their personality. The age, gender, physical structure of the individual can define certain aspects of their personality. Another aspect belonging to the physiological factors is inheritance. Researches show that %15 to %50 percentage of the personality is inherited from the biological parents (Komitoğlu, 2009). Freud's idea of the id also takes physiological needs as base. The instinct to survive will affect the individual's behavior to a great extent.

Socio-Cultural Characteristics: Values learned from family, school and society will also define an individual's behavior. The cultural structure the individual lives in affects the individual, so the personality is shaped. Related to the physiological aspects of a person, these characteristics can be connected to the culture and society the individual belongs to. The expectations of society determine how an individual is expected to behave. Adler defined normal behavior as the sort of behavior that will be in harmony with society, thus the person will work to adapt their behavior according to society (Cosner, 2002). The balance relationship between the ego and super-ego strives for the same. Freud (2010), Thus, there are many theories that argue that society affects personalities.

Social Class: The social class the individual belongs to determine the financial possibilities and opportunities in life, lifestyle, consumption habits etc. Social class may have many affects like religion, way of thinking and so on.

Geographical Conditions: Conditions such as weather and natural habitat may also have its effect on an individual's personality. According to weather and flora, people's needs and personalities will differ. It is a general belief that people from different nations will have different personalities. This might also be related to the weather and natural conditions. A

person growing up on a farm and a person growing up in the city will also have different personalities (Stagner, 1937).

Other Factors: Besides these factors, there are other aspects that effect the forming of a personality. The media, future goals, literature, art, ideology and similar things may affect one's personality.

2.4. PERSONALITY TYPES

Throughout the years people have tried to categorize people and their personalities. Basically, these theories are very similar and are an attempt to understand human nature. One of the first attempts was by Hippocrates who divided personalities into Four Temperaments: (1) Sanguine; artisan, (2) Choleric; idealist, (3) Melancholic; guardian, (4) Phlegmatic; rational. This very simple and in many ways very limited understanding of the human was popular throughout Ancient Greece until the Renaissance. According to Hippocrates' Humorism, *sanguine* people are generally impulsive, pleasure-seeking, and extroverted, and they take joy in making new friends. They are self-confident and "people persons". *Choleric* people on the other hand are ambitious and dominative. They are highly disorganized, assertive and can easily be caught in mood swings. *Melancholic* people are introverted, thoughtful and tend to be creative. They can get so involved in their art that they tend to forget everything else around them. *Phlegmatic* people are relaxed, quiet, calm and rational. Sometimes, they tend to be overly lazy or sluggish (retrieved on April 22, 2012 from "The Four Temperaments" fisheaters.com).

The Four Temperaments were not based on anything scientific and are simple generalizations. However, they were very popular and generally accepted for many centuries. Many other personality categorizations afterwards were made in a similar fashion. Kretschmer, for example, has divided people into three categories according to physical aspects of people. These types were (a) tall, muscular, athletic types who are fit for leadership; (b) the tall, thin, asthenic type who is stubborn, cool, touchy and vindictive; (c) middle-tall, fat and soft muscled people who are open to the world, open-hearted and optimistic (Komitoğlu, 2009).

Another personality categorization that is widely accepted today is the A-type, B-type personality type by Friedman and Rosenman. People who have an A type personality are animate, impatient and they eat and talk fast. Individuals with a B type personality are patient, modest, relaxed and sweet-tempered. These personality types can be categorized as introverted and extroverted people (Komitoğlu, 2009).

One of the widely accepted and most popular models that attempt to categorize personalities is the Five Factor Model (FFM). The Five-Factor Model offers a more flexible variation of personalities, proposing that there are five factors an individual's personality has or lacks. This model is widely used when categorizing employers or entrepreneurs as it explores the working habits of an individual.

2.5. FIVE-FACTOR MODEL

A widely accepted model on personality and behavior that is influential for classroom management is based on the *trait approach*. Allport explains a trait as "a generalized and focalized neuro-psyche system unique to the individual, that initiates consistent forms of adaptive and expressive behavior" (as cited in Ryckman, 1985, p.269). The Five-Factor Model is a widely acknowledged model that is based on different traits of the individuals and explains individual differences through the presence or lack of these traits.

According to John & Strivastava (1999) the Five-Model Approach -sometimes also called The Big Five- have started with the *lexical approach*. The lexical approach states that "most of the socially relevant and salient personality characteristics will be encoded in the natural language. Thus, the personality vocabulary contained in the dictionaries of a natural language provides an extensive, yet finite, set of attributes that the people speaking that language have found important and useful in their daily interactions" (John & Strivastava, 1999, p.103). A semantic and empirical research on people's most commonly described traits have identified major personality descriptions which finally lead to the discovery of the Big Five. Cartell (1943) has identified 35 variables, from which Norman (1963), Borgatta (1964) and Digman and Takemoto-Chock (1984) replicated five structures (as cited in John & Strivastava, 1999, pp.103-105). These five core categories are; (1)

Conscientiousness, (2) Extraversion, (3) Neuroticism (versus Emotional Stability), (4) Agreeableness, (5) Openness to Experience.

Each of the five factors encompasses a wide range of traits. Hartman (2006) explains that the Big Five create individual differences in psychological functioning. For instance, whereas extraverts are especially sensitive to positive mood, those who have emotional imbalances (neuroticism) are more vulnerable to negative moods. In addition to these traits, conscientious people are predicted to have a higher job performance. It can be seen that the understanding of each trait will lead to different conclusions about the individual, since the combination of the different aspects will create individual differences.

Conscientiousness: Conscientious people can be defined as hardworking, responsible, organized, ambitious people with self-discipline. They are dependable, structured, unrelenting and detailed in their decision making (Thompson, 2006). Conscientiousness is specifically associated with higher levels of job performance and this type of personality is believed to have fewer problematic behaviors regarding work. Hartman (2006) presents several studies where conscientious people are rated more dependable, productive and less prone to absenteeism. Judge & Ilies, for example, have identified conscientious employees as “achievement-oriented and dependable, orderly and deliberate” (as cited in Bentley, 2005).

Extraversion: Extraversion is related to gregariousness, positive energy and a tendency to search for other people's encouragement and partnership. Extraversion is related to the individual engagement of with the environment and the community, thus it is related to the team work spirit, as well as cognitive clarity, decidedness and goal stability (Simms, 2009). According to Hartman (2006), however, extraverted people can be associated with certain negative behaviors, unlike conscientious people. They can be associated with absenteeism or lack of motivation if they are not where they want to be. Compared to conscientiousness, extraversion is less straightforward and more circumscribed to interpersonal work and may sometimes breed egocentric or ethically questionable behavior. Extraverted people will be energetic, confident and optimistic and thus they shouldn't be discouraged or intimidated by other people. A broken ego will result is lack of

motivation. Keep the balance between over confidence and discouragement may help the teachers in effective management.

Neuroticism: Neuroticism sometimes is also referred to as "emotional stability", is related to negative emotional tendencies like anger, depression and anxiety. Emotionally stable personalities on the other hand are secure, attuned and self-confident individuals who have composure and make rational and mature decisions (Thompson, 2006). People who are more rated as neurotic tend to believe that their school or career interferes with their personal relationships. However, research implies that this is because neurotic people are more sensitive to negative elements and because of this reason they experience a faster decrease in job satisfaction. Therefore, for neurotic people it is possible to say that their mental states affect their satisfaction and success more than environmental elements (Hartman, 2006).

Agreeableness: Being of pro-social, altruistic and helpful nature rather than suspicious and unfriendly, agreeable people are easy to handle and good to have in a community. Agreeable people are good with team-based work. In a classroom, these teachers will spread positive energy. However, agreeable people are also associated with being not ambitious enough, and sometime not assertive enough. According to Hartman (2006) agreeable people are more likely to be exploited and less likely to take credit, deny blame or promote themselves.

Openness to experience: Openness to experience can be explained as a general interest to new stimuli and perspectives, an interest and appreciation for art, adventure, unusual ideas and experience. Simms (2009) simply describes it as the trait related to culture and intellect which measures the complexity and extensiveness of the individuals' physical and mental world. Intellectual curiosity, ambiguity tolerance and non-authoritarianism are related to this trait. Researchers showed that people with high openness will prefer unstructured, essentially satisfying and self-improvement oriented work (Hartman, 2006). Moreover, people who are open to experience might get bored of typical and mundane work. Hence, they will always be in search for new possibilities. Taking these into account, Ören and Biçkes (2011) associates openness to experience directly with the risk taking factor. These

people can have problematic career choices. The wrong channelling of this kind of personality might conclude in being whimsy and lethargy.

2.5.1. The Five Factor Model and Classroom Management

The Big Five has been applied on many fields to study personality traits and how well people will perform at different tasks. Katz (2010), for example, has explored the relationship between personality traits and job satisfaction. Conscientiousness and emotional stability were major predictor's regarding job satisfaction. This can also be adapted to classroom management. Loveland et. al (2004) explored the relationship between personality traits and academic success. This research shows that agreeable and conscientious people will aim higher academic success, whereas extraversion will have a greater impact on success. On the other hand, openness and emotional stability has not shown any significant impact on academic success (Loveland et. al, 2004). But it should be kept in mind that Loveland et.al investigated academic success and not academic satisfaction or disruptive behavior. Looking back at Katz's work on job satisfaction it can be said that, although agreeable and conscientious characters are likely to achieve in classroom management. The disruption of conscientiousness in the classroom climate might cause these instructors to get unsatisfied. Similarly, it shows that neurotic personalities will get easily affected by other aspects in their jobs and will lose their interest or motivation.

Burkett (2011) used the Big Five Index to measure the relationship between classroom management efficacy and the personality traits of the teachers. This research found out that there were small but significant relationships between the personality factors for openness and conscientiousness and classroom management efficacy. Whereas no statistical relationship has been found with efficacy and the extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism factors (Burkett, 2011).

CHAPTER -III

3. METHOD

3.1. PRESENTATION

In this chapter, methodological procedures of the study are described. It presents background of the methodology, participants, instruments, data collection and analysis procedure.

3.2. THE PARTICIPANTS OF THE STUDY

The population of the study consists of 189 EFL instructors working at Yeditepe University Preparatory School, Bahçeşehir University English Preparatory School, Yıldız Technical University School of Languages, Marmara University the Department of Basic English Subjects participated in the study were randomly selected based. In order not to put pressure on them, teachers were not asked to write their names questionnaire.

3.3. INSTRUMENTATION

The data were collected by 3 instruments, namely demographic inventory (DI) (*see Appendix 1*), Classroom Management Efficacy Scale (*see Appendix 2*), Adjective Based Personality Test (ABPT) (*see Appendix 3*).

3.3.1. Demographic Inventory (DI)

It consists of 16 questions aimed to gather basic personal data about the participants. This instrument provides information about the participants' gender, age, marital status, residence, income, education, in-service training program in ELT, and certificate programs attended. It also explores subgroups like part-time and full-time staff, whether the participants teach at a state or private university and how long they have been experienced in their field or in that particular institution, and how much they keep up with the literature related to their field. How satisfied they are of their institution or if they have possibilities

of improving themselves as educators in that particular institution is also questioned. The occupational status of the participants' spouses and their parental status are included as well. The DI will form a categorization that will enable to compare subgroups and variations herewith in.

3.3.2. Classroom Management Efficacy Scale

In the study, Classroom Management Efficacy Scale invented by Çetin (2009) was used to gather data. The scale consists of five subscales which analyze the efficacy of the teacher's classroom management in detail. These subscales consist of (a) Attitudes Regarding the Physical Arrangement of the Classroom (ARPAC); (b) Attitudes Regarding Instructional Management (ARIM); (c) Attitudes Regarding Time Management (ARTM); (d) Attitudes Regarding Teacher-Student Rapport (ARTSR); and (e) Attitudes Regarding the Development and Regulation of Student Behavior (ARDRSB). The items in the scale were written in Turkish; however, they were not translated into target language, not to observe any anxiety, ambiguity and misunderstanding. To test the reliability of this scale, pilot tests were made with 300 participants. The subject experts' opinions determined both scope and validity of the scale and appropriateness of articles. In order to determine the structural validity of the scale, factor analysis was used. Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient was calculated as .94 for its reliability. The scale was composed of 47 articles and total variance explanation rate of the five factor scale was found as 58% (Çetin, 2009).

3.3.3. Adjective Based Personality Test (ABPT)

To obtain data on the personality traits of EFL instructors' The 40-item Adjective Based Personality Test (ABPT) developed by Bacanlı & İlhan & Aslan (2009) was administrated. This test was developed based on the Five Factor Model and its lexical approach. Bacanlı et. al. (2009) used adjectives used for describing personalities based on Turkish language to create a scale of 40 adjective pairs based on Five Factor Theory. Bacanlı et. al. has revised the NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) by Costa&McCrae and the 5-Factor Personality Inventory (5FPI) and created a Turkish adaptation of it: Openness (8 items), Conscientiousness (7 items), Extroversion (9 items), Agreeableness (9 items), Neuroticism (7 items). Several valid and reliable scales have been used in the development process of

the ABPT. Opposing adjectives have been used to achieve a sparingly composed set of items. Although in the previous tests 30 pairs of adjectives were used, these turned out to be insufficient and the items were raised to 50 pairs of adjective. Three specialists on the Turkish language worked on the identification of the proper adjectives which were used to define people. A principal component analysis has been consorted and the Direct Oblique rotation method has been used in order to test the reliability of the ABPT. Bacanlı et. al. (2009) have also made reliability and validity tests by using the ABPT on a wide range of different university students. Cronbach's alpha coefficients of .80 for Openness, .80 for Conscientiousness, .89 for Extroversion, .87 for Agreeableness and .73 for Neuroticism provided evidence for the reliability of the scale.

3.4. DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE

The data was gathered after the subjects agreed to take part in the study. Data collection process started in February and lasted towards to the beginning of March at the spring term of 2011-2012 academic year.

3.5. DATA ANALYSES

In this study, in order to find the descriptive statistics of variables, means, frequencies, standard deviances, kurtosis values and minimum-maximum values of the variables were computed. To determine the relationship between two continuous variables, Pearson's r correlation coefficient was computed. Likewise, in order to determine group differences on relevant dependent variable One Way Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) was applied. All the statistical analyses were applied by using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences). The results of the analyses could be found in "Findings" chapter.

CHAPTER -IV

4. FINDINGS

4.1. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

4.1.1. Participant Demographics

The age of the participants ranged between 22 and 65 (N=176, \bar{X} =36.93, sd=9.61) and the years of experience of the participants participated in this study ranged between 1 and 28 (N=165, \bar{X} =7.17, sd=5.17) (see Table 4.1). Additionally, if we look at the same statistics by gender, it could be seen that the ages of the female participants varied between 22 and 65 (N=154, \bar{X} =36.92, sd=9.67) while the male participants' varied between 24 and 59 (N=34, \bar{X} =36.97, sd=9.50). On the other hand, years of experience for female participants differed between 1 and 28 (N=155, \bar{X} =7.18, sd=5.12) whereas for male participants it differed between 1 and 20 (N=34, \bar{X} =7.09, sd=5.49).

Table 4.1: Descriptive Statistics of the Participants' Age and the Experience

	N	Min.	Max.	\bar{X}	sd	Skewness
Age	176	22	65	36,93	9,61	0,44
Experience	165	1	28	7,17	5,17	0,93

Of the total participants (N=189), %82 of them (N=155) were female and %18 of them (N=34) were male. As to the marital status of the participants, %55.6 of them were married (N=105) while %41.3 of them were single (N= 78).

As to the incomes of the participants, the researcher included a self-report question in the questionnaire so as to learn incomes of the participants. In this question, the options were as follows; low, below average, average, above average and high. The results were

presented in Table 4.2. According to self reports of the participants, it was seen that %3.2 of the participants (N=6) reported their income as low; %8.5 of the participants (N=16) reported their income as below average; %54.5 of the participants (N=103) reported their income as average; %28.6 of the participants (N=54) reported their income as above average and %2.6 of the participants (N=5) reported their income as high.

Table 4.2: The Frequencies for the Participant Demographics

		N	%	Cum. %
Gender	Woman	155	82	82
	Man	34	18	100
	Total	189	100	
Marital Status	Married	105	55,6	57,4
	Single	78	41,3	100
	Total	183	96,8	
Income	Low	6	3,2	3,3
	Below Aver.	16	8,5	12
	Average	103	54,5	67,9
	Above Average	54	28,6	97,3
	High	5	2,6	100
	Total	184	97,4	
Home	Faculty housing	3	1,6	1,6
	Rental	78	41,3	43,1
	Owned	73	38,6	81,9
	Family members'	34	18	100
	Total	188	99,5	

The participants were asked about their residence type with four options, which were, namely, faculty housing, rental, owned and a house which belongs to family members or relatives. According to their answers, it was seen that %1.6 of the participants (N=3) were living in faculty housing; %41.3 of them (N=78) were living in rental houses; %38.6 of them (N=73) were living in their own houses and %18 of them (N=34) were living in a

house which belongs to family members/relatives. As seen in the Table 4.2, most of the participants were living in either rental houses or their own houses.

4.1.2. Frequencies of Educational Level and Occupational Status Related Variables

The frequencies and percentiles of educational level of the participants were reported in Table 4.2. According to the results, %1.1 of the participants (N=2) graduated from junior college; %54 of the participants (N=102) have Bachelor degree; %41.3 of the participants (N=78) have Masters degree and %1.1 of the participants (N=2) have Doctorate degree (see Table 4.3).

Table 4.3: Frequencies of Certification and Occupational Status Related Variables

		N	%	Cum. %
Certification	Junior College	2	1,1	1,1
	BA	102	54	56,5
	Master	78	41,3	98,9
	Doctorate	2	1,1	100
	Total	184	97,4	
Last Institution Graduated	Higher Teacher Training School	2	1,1	1,1
	Institute of Education	5	2,6	3,7
	Faculty of Education	85	45	49,2
	Faculty of Arts and Sciences	78	41,3	90,9
	Others	17	9	100
	Total	187	98,9	
Type of Employment	Full-time	142	75,1	75,9
	Part-time	45	23,8	100
	Total	187	98,9	
Type of University	State	73	38,6	38,6
	Private	116	61,4	100
	Total	189	100	

The last institution graduated from is presented in Table 4.3. The results show that %1.1 of the participants (N=2) graduated from Higher Teacher Training School; %2.6 of the participants (N=5) graduated from Institute of Education; %45 of the participants (N=85) graduated from Faculty of Education; %41.3 of the participants (N=78) graduated from Faculty of Arts and Sciences, and Faculty %9 of the participants (N=17) graduated from other kinds of schools. In another question, the participants were asked to report their employment type. The results show that %75.1 of the participants (N=142) worked with full-time status while %23.8 of them (N=45) worked with part-time status. Another question asks the type of university they were employed. According to the results, %38.6 of the participants (N=73) were working at state university and %62.4 of them (N=116) were working at a private university.

4.1.3. Frequencies Related to Participants' Spouses Occupational Status

The results related to variables for spouses' occupation were presented in Table 4.5. According to the results, %49.7 of them (N=94) were employed while 12 of them (N=12) were unemployed. On the other hand, of the working spouses, %10.6 (N=20) were working at a state owned institution; %30.2 (N=57) were working at a private sector; %0.5 (N=1) were working as tradesman; %7.4 (N=14) were self-employed; %0.5 (N=1) were housewives.

Table 4.4: Descriptive Statistics for the Spouses of the Participants

		N	%	Cum.%
Spouses Status	Occupational			
	Employed	94	49,7	93,7
	Unemployed	12	6,3	100
	Total	106	100	
Spouses Occupation	State	20	10,6	56,6
	Private Sector	57	30,2	86,8
	Tradesman	1	0,5	87,3
	Self Employed	14	7,4	94,7
	Housewife	1	0,5	95,2
	Retired	8	4,2	99,5
	Unemployed	1	0,5	100
	Total	102	100	

4.1.4. Frequencies Related to the Participants' Professional Development

The frequencies and the relevant percentile ranks related to the participants' professional development were presented in Table 4.5. When asked to the participants to rate the facilities of the universities' they have been working, %2.6 of them (N=5) evaluated the facilities as low level; %10.6 of them (N=20) evaluated the facilities as below-average level; %45 of them (N=85) evaluated the facilities as average level; %34.9 of them (N=66) evaluated the facilities as above average level and, finally, %6.9 of them (N=13) evaluated the facilities as high level. Based on results it can be concluded that most of the participants found the facilities of their university as average or above average.

In another question, the participants were asked about to what extent they could keep up with the literature related to their profession. The results of that question were summarized in Table 4.5. According to the results, % 17.5 of the total participants (N=33) stated that they could keep up with the literature regularly; % 68.3 of them (N=129) stated that they could sometimes keep up with the literature and % 14.3 of the total participants (N=27) stated that they do not keep up with the literature.

Finally, when the participants were asked about to what extent they are given in-service training programs, % 7.4 of them (N=14) stated that they are regularly given; % 48.7 of them (N=92) stated that they are sometimes given and % 14.3 of the total participants (N=27) stated that they are not given in service training.

Table 4.5: Frequencies Related to the Participants' Professional Development

		N	%	Cum. %
Facilities	Low	5	2,6	2,6
	Below-Average	20	10,6	13,2
	Average	85	45	58,2
	Above-Average	66	34,9	93,1
	High	13	6,9	100
	Total	189	100	
Literature	Regularly	33	17,5	17,5
	Sometimes	129	68,3	85,7
	Don't Keep up with	27	14,3	100
	Total	189	100	
In-service Training	Yes	14	7,4	7,4
	Sometimes	92	48,7	56,4
	No	82	43,4	100
	Total	188	99,5	

4.2. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PERSONALITY TRAITS

Pearson's r correlation coefficient was computed between Five Factor personality traits' total scores. The results were presented in Table 4.6. According to the results, it was found that there was a statistically significant negative relationship between Neuroticism and Extraversion ($r = -0.246$, $n = 172$, $p = < 0.01$); there was a statistically significant negative relationship between Neuroticism and Openness ($r = -0.270$, $n = 176$, $p = < 0.01$); there was a statistically significant negative relationship between Neuroticism and

Table 4.6: The Correlation Coefficients between Five Factor Personality Traits

	Neuro.	Extrav.	Open.	Agree.	Conscien.
Neuro.	1	-,246**	-,270**	-,367**	-,226**
Extrav.		1	,682**	,439**	,591**
Open.			1	,441**	,603**
Agree.				1	,435**
Conscien.					1

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Agreeableness ($r = -0.367$, $n = 179$, $p = < 0.01$); there was a statistically significant negative relationship between Neuroticism and Conscientiousness ($r = -0.226$, $n = 179$, $p = < 0.01$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between Extraversion and Openness ($r = 0.682$, $n = 171$, $p = < 0.01$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between Extraversion and Agreeableness ($r = 0.439$, $n = 174$, $p = < 0.01$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between Extraversion and Conscientiousness ($r = 0.591$, $n = 173$, $p = < 0.01$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between Openness and Agreeableness ($r = 0.441$, $n = 177$, $p = < 0.01$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between Openness and Conscientiousness ($r = 0.603$, $n = 176$, $p = < 0.01$) and, finally, there was a statistically significant positive relationship between Agreeableness and Conscientiousness ($r = 0.435$, $n = 179$, $p = < 0.01$).

4.3. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT EFFICACY SCALE (CMES) SUBSCALES AND THE TOTAL SCORE

Pearson's r correlation coefficient was computed between Classroom Management Efficacy Scale (CMES) subscales Attitudes Regarding the Physical Arrangement of the Classroom

Table 4.7: The Correlation Coefficients between Classroom Management Efficacy Scale (CMES) Subscales and the Total Score

	ARPAC	ARIM	ARTM	TSR	DRSB	Total Score
ARPAC	1	,637**	,598**	,627**	,617**	,790**
ARIM		1	,826**	,776**	,766**	,904**
ARTM			1	,769**	,737**	,862**
TSR				1	,820**	,938**
DRSB					1	,899**
Total Score						1

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

(ARPAC), Attitudes Regarding Instructional Management (ARIM), Attitudes Regarding Time Management (ARTM), Attitudes Regarding Teacher-Student Rapport (TSR), Attitudes Regarding the Development and Regulation of Student Behavior (DRSB) and the total scores of the scale .The results were presented in Table 4.7. According to the results, it was found that there was a statistically significant positive relationship between ARPAC subscale and ARIM subscale ($r = 0.637$, $n = 159$, $p = < 0.01$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between ARPAC subscale and ARTM subscale ($r = 0.598$, $n = 162$, $p = < 0.01$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between ARPAC subscale and TSR subscale ($r = 0.627$, $n = 158$, $p = < 0.01$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between ARPAC subscale and DRSB subscale ($r = 0.617$, $n = 158$, $p = < 0.01$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between ARIM subscale and ARTM subscale ($r = 0.826$, $n = 183$, $p = < 0.01$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between ARIM subscale and TSR subscale ($r = 0.776$, $n = 179$, $p = < 0.01$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between ARIM subscale and DRSB subscale ($r = 0.766$, $n = 179$, $p = < 0.01$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between ARTM subscale and TSR subscale ($r = 0.769$, $n = 182$, $p = < 0.01$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between ARTM subscale and DRSB subscale ($r = 0.737$, $n = 180$, $p = < 0.01$)

and, finally, there was a statistically significant positive relationship between TSR subscale and DRSB subscale ($r = 0.820$, $n = 176$, $p = < 0.01$).

As to the relationship between Classroom Management Efficacy Scale (CMES) subscales and the total score, the results were as follows (see Table 4.7);

There was a statistically significant positive relationship between ARPAC subscale and Total Scale Score ($r = 0.790$, $n = 150$, $p = < 0.01$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between ARIM subscale and Total Scale Score ($r = 0.904$, $n = 150$, $p = < 0.01$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between ARTM subscale and Total Scale Score ($r = 0.862$, $n = 150$, $p = < 0.01$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between TSR subscale and Total Scale Score ($r = 0.938$, $n = 150$, $p = < 0.01$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between DRSB subscale and Total Scale Score ($r = 0.899$, $n = 150$, $p = < 0.01$);

4.4. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FIVE FACTOR PERSONALITY TRAITS AND CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT EFFICACY SCALE (CMES) SUBSCALES AND THE TOTAL SCORE OF CMES

Pearson's r correlation coefficient was computed between five factor personality traits and subscales and total score of Classroom Management Efficacy Scale in order to see the relationship between personality traits and Classroom Management Efficacy perceptions of the teachers. The results were summarized in Table 4.8.

According to the results, there was no statistically significant relationship between ARPAC subscale and Neuroticism ($r = -0.151$, $n = 150$, $p = > 0.05$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between ARPAC subscale and Extraversion ($r = 0.339$, $n = 150$, $p = < 0.01$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between ARPAC subscale and Openness ($r = 0.336$, $n = 156$, $p = < 0.05$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between ARPAC subscale and Agreeableness ($r = 0.182$, $n = 150$, $p = < 0.05$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between ARPAC subscale and Conscientiousness ($r = 0.277$, $n = 150$, $p = < 0.01$).

As to ARIM subscores, there was a statistically significant negative relationship between ARIM subscale and Neuroticism ($r = -0.168$, $n = 178$, $p = < 0.05$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between ARIM subscale and Extraversion ($r = 0.368$, $n = 174$, $p = < 0.01$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between ARIM subscale and Openness ($r = 0.309$, $n = 177$, $p = < 0.01$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between ARIM subscale and Agreeableness ($r = 0.276$, $n = 178$, $p = < 0.01$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between ARIM subscale and Conscientiousness ($r = 0.473$, $n = 179$, $p = < 0.01$).

For ARTM scores, there was no statistically significant relationship between ARTM subscale and Neuroticism ($r = -0.137$, $n = 180$, $p = > 0.05$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between ARTM subscale and Extraversion ($r = 0.384$, $n = 175$, $p = < 0.01$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between ARTM subscale and Openness ($r = 0.316$, $n = 177$, $p = < 0.01$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between ARTM subscale and Agreeableness ($r = 0.253$, $n = 181$, $p = < 0.01$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between ARTM subscale and Conscientiousness ($r = 0.481$, $n = 181$, $p = < 0.01$).

The results for the relationship between TSR subscale and big five traits were as follows; there was a statistically significant negative relationship between TSR subscale and Neuroticism ($r = -0.177$, $n = 178$, $p = < 0.05$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between TSR subscale and Extraversion ($r = 0.403$, $n = 173$, $p = < 0.01$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between TSR subscale and Openness ($r = 0.373$, $n = 174$, $p = < 0.01$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between TSR subscale and Agreeableness ($r = 0.255$, $n = 180$, $p = < 0.01$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between TSR subscale and Conscientiousness ($r = 0.388$, $n = 180$, $p = < 0.01$).

The results for the relationship between DRSB subscale and big five traits were as follows; there was a statistically significant negative relationship between DRSB subscale and Neuroticism ($r = -0.237$, $n = 175$, $p = < 0.01$); there was a statistically significant positive

relationship between DRSB subscale and Extraversion ($r = 0.344$, $n = 171$, $p = < 0.01$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between DRSB subscale and Openness ($r = 0.316$, $n = 175$, $p = < 0.01$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between DRSB subscale and Agreeableness ($r = 0.243$, $n = 175$, $p = < 0.01$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between DRSB subscale and Conscientiousness ($r = 0.380$, $n = 176$, $p = < 0.01$).

The results for the relationship between CMES total score and big five traits were as follows; there was no statistically significant relationship between CMES total score and Neuroticism ($r = -0.153$, $n = 144$, $p = > 0.05$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between CMES total score and Extraversion ($r = 0.418$, $n = 143$, $p = < 0.01$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between CMES total score and Openness ($r = 0.350$, $n = 145$, $p = < 0.01$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between CMES total score and Agreeableness ($r = 0.236$, $n = 145$, $p = < 0.01$); there was a statistically significant positive relationship between CMES total score and Conscientiousness ($r = 0.396$, $n = 145$, $p = < 0.01$).

Table 4.8: The Correlation Coefficients between Five Factor Personality Traits and CMES Subscales and the Total Score of CMES

	ARPAC	ARIM	ARTM	TSR	DRSB	Total Score
Neuro.	-0,151	-,168*	-0,137	-,172*	-,237**	-0,153
Extrav.	,339**	,368**	,384**	,403**	,344**	,418**
Open.	,336**	,309**	,316**	,373**	,316**	,350**
Agree.	,182*	,276**	,253**	,255**	,243**	,236**
Conscien.	,277**	,473**	,481**	,388**	,380**	,396**

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

4.5. THE EFFECT OF GENDER ON CMES SUBSCALES AND THE TOTAL SCORE

One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied in order to see whether the CMES Subscales and the Total Score of CMES were significantly differed by gender factor. The results were presented in the Table 4.9. According to the results, there was a statistically significant effect of gender on ARPAC subscale scores for the participants ($F(1,161) = 4.781, p = 0.030, p < .05$); there was a statistically significant effect of the gender on ARIM subscale scores for the participants ($F(1,183) = 25,556, p = 0.001, p < .001$); there was a statistically significant effect of the gender on ARTM subscale scores for the participants ($F(1,185) = 34.602, p = 0.001, p < .001$); there was a statistically significant effect of the gender on TSR subscale scores for the participants ($F(1,181) = 21,718, p = 0.001, p < .001$); there was a statistically significant effect of the gender on DRSB subscale scores for the participants ($F(1,180) = 14.073, p = 0.001, p < .001$) and there was a statistically significant effect of the gender on CMES total scores for the participants ($F(1,148) = 14.753, p = 0.001, p > .001$).

Table 4.9: ANOVA Results for the Effect of Gender on CMES Subscales and the Total Score

		SS	df	MS	F	P
ARPAC	Between Groups	107,54	1	107,54	4,781	0,030*
	Within Groups	3621,22	161	22,49		
	Total	3728,76	162			
ARIM	Between Groups	717,65	1	717,65	25,556	0.001***
	Within Groups	5138,82	183	28,08		
	Total	5856,47	184			
ARTM	Between Groups	221,85	1	221,85	34,602	0.001***
	Within Groups	1186,13	185	6,41		
	Total	1407,98	186			
TSR	Between Groups	1360,84	1	1360,84	21,718	0.001***
	Within Groups	11341,2	181	62,66		
	Total	12702,1	182			
DRSB	Between Groups	372,25	1	372,25	14,073	0.001***
	Within Groups	4761,26	180	26,45		
	Total	5133,52	181			
Total Score	Between Groups	7938,89	1	7938,89	14,753	0.001***
	Within Groups	79643,1	148	538,129		
	Total	87582	149			

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

According to the results, ARPAC subscale scores for women (N=133, \bar{X} =27.73, sd=4.10) were significantly higher than men's scores (N=30, \bar{X} =25.63, sd=6.94); for ARIM subscale scores for women (N=152, \bar{X} =44.23, sd=4.03) were significantly higher than men's scores (N=33, \bar{X} =40.00, sd=9.14); ARTM subscale scores for women (N=154, \bar{X} =22.49, sd=1.92) were significantly higher than men's scores (N=33, \bar{X} =19.64, sd=3.40); TSR subscale scores for women (N=151, \bar{X} =72.96, sd=5.12) were significantly higher than men's scores (N=32, \bar{X} =65.78, sd=15.45); DRSB subscale scores for women (N=148,

\bar{X} =39.08, sd=4.18) were significantly higher than men's scores (N=34, \bar{X} =35.41, sd=8.15) and CMES total scores for women (N=122, \bar{X} =207.88, sd=14.96) were significantly higher than men's scores (N=28, \bar{X} =189.21, sd=44.12).

4.6. THE EFFECT OF UNIVERSITY TYPE (PRIVATE OR STATE) ON CMES SUBSCALES AND THE TOTAL SCORE

One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied in order to see whether the CMES Subscales and the Total Score of CMES were significantly differed by the university type factor. In order to apply these analyses, the institutions were divided in two sub-categories as private/foundation and state universities. The results were presented in the Table 4.10. According to the results, there was a statistically significant effect of the school type on ARPAC subscale scores for the participants ($F(1,132) = 5.034, p = 0.027, p < .05$); there was no statistically significant effect of the university type on ARIM subscale scores for the participants ($F(1,150) = 1.317, p = 0.253, p > .05$); there was no statistically significant effect of the university type on ARTM subscale scores for the participants ($F(1,152) = 3.609, p = 0.059, p > .05$); there was a statistically significant effect of university type on TSR subscale scores for the participants ($F(1,148) = 9.517, p = 0.002, p < .01$); there was a statistically significant effect of the school type on DRSB subscale scores for the participants ($F(1,180) = 6.918, p = 0.009, p < .01$) and there was a statistically significant effect of the university type on CMES total scores for the participants ($F(1,120) = 4.782, p = 0.031, p < .05$).

Table 4.10: The Effect of University Type on CMES Subscales and the Total Score

		SS	df	MS	F	P
ARPAC	Between Groups	99,38	1	99,38	5,034	0,027*
	Within Groups	2605,75	132	19,74		
	Total	2705,13	133			
ARIM	Between Groups	34,37	1	34,38	1,317	0,253
	Within Groups	3916,72	150	26,11		
	Total	3951,1	151			
ARTM	Between Groups	22,194	1	22,19	3,609	0,059
	Within Groups	934,85	152	6,15		
	Total	957,04	153			
TSR	Between Groups	525,33	1	525,33	9,517	0,002**
	Within Groups	8169,84	148	55,2		
	Total	8695,17	149			
DRSB	Between Groups	165,447	1	165,45	6,918	0,009**
	Within Groups	3539,39	148	23,92		
	Total	3704,83	149			
Total Score	Between Groups	2214,28	1	2214,3	4,782	0,031*
	Within Groups	55559,6	120	463		
	Total	57773,9	121			

According to the results, ARPAC subscale scores for private universities ($N=38$, $\bar{X}=28.92$, $sd=4.39$) were significantly higher than state universities' scores ($N=96$, $\bar{X}=25.63$, $sd=6.94$); TSR subscale, scores for private universities ($N=42$, $\bar{X}=74.55$, $sd=4.57$) were significantly higher than state universities' scores ($N=108$, $\bar{X}=70.38$, $sd=8.27$); DRSB subscale scores for private universities ($N=39$, $\bar{X}=40.20$, $sd=4.31$) were significantly higher than state universities' scores ($N=111$, $\bar{X}=37.81$, $sd=5.07$) and CMES total scores for private universities ($N=34$, $\bar{X}=212.06$, $sd=17.03$) were significantly higher than state universities' scores ($N=88$, $\bar{X}=202.56$, $sd=22.99$).

4.7. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AGE AND CMES SUBSCALE SCORES AND CMES TOTAL SCORE

Pearson's r correlation coefficient was computed between the age of the participants and CMES subscale scores and CMES total score. The results were presented in Table 4.11. According to the results, it was found that there was a statistically significant negative relationship between age and ARPAC subscore ($r = -0.181$, $n = 154$, $p < 0.05$); there was no statistically significant relationship between age and ARIM subscore ($r = 0.080$, $n = 176$, $p > 0.05$); there was no statistically significant relationship between age and ARTM subscore ($r = 0.123$, $n = 176$, $p > 0.05$); there was no statistically significant relationship between age and TSR subscore ($r = 0.030$, $n = 176$, $p > 0.05$); there was no statistically significant relationship between age and DRSB subscore ($r = 0.125$, $n = 171$, $p > 0.05$) and there was no statistically significant relationship between age and CMES total score ($r = -0.009$, $n = 171$, $p > 0.05$).

Table 4.11: Correlation Coefficient between Age and CMES Subscale Scores and CMES Total Score.

	ARPAC	ARIM	ARTM	TSR	DRSB	Total Score
Age	-,181*	0,080	0,123	0,030	0,125	-0,009

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

4.8. THE EFFECT OF EMPLOYMENT TYPE ON CMES SUBSCALES AND THE TOTAL SCORE

One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied in order to see whether the CMES Subscales and the Total Score of CMES were significantly differed by the employment type factor. In order to apply this analysis, the teachers were divided in two sub-categories as full-time and part-time. The results were presented in the Table 4.12. According to the results, there was a statistically significant effect of the employment type on ARPAC subscale scores for the participants ($F(1,159) = 4.806, p = 0.030, p < .05$); there was no statistically significant effect of the employment type on ARIM subscale scores for the participants ($F(1,181) = 0,061, p = 0.805, p > .05$); there was no statistically significant effect of the employment type on ARTM subscale scores for the participants ($F(1,183) = 0.023, p = 0.879, p > .05$); there was no statistically significant effect of the employment type on TSR subscale scores for the participants ($F(1,180) = 0.097, p = 0.756, p > .05$); there was no statistically significant effect of the employment type on DRSB subscale scores for the participants ($F(1,178) = 0.365, p = 0.546, p > .05$) and there was no statistically significant effect of the employment type on CMES total scores for the participants ($F(1,146) = 0.046, p = 0.831, p > .05$).According to the results, for ARPAC subscale scores for part-time instructors' (N=38, $\bar{X}=28.76, sd=4.99$) were significantly higher than full-time instructors' scores (N=123, $\bar{X}=26.83, sd=4.85$).

Table 4.12: The Effect of Employment Type on CMES Subscales and the Total Score

		SS	df	MS	F	P
ARPAC	Between Groups	107,66	1	107,66	4,806	0,030*
	Within Groups	3561,62	159	22,4		
	Total	3669,28	160			
ARIM	Between Groups	1,956	1	1,956	0,061	0,805
	Within Groups	5820,96	181	32,16		
	Total	5822,92	182			
ARTM	Between Groups	0,178	1	0,18	0,023	0,879
	Within Groups	1397,63	183	7,64		
	Total	1397,81	184			
TSR	Between Groups	6,79	1	6,79	0,097	0,756
	Within Groups	12571,9	179	70,23		
	Total	12578,7	180			
DRSB	Between Groups	10,42	1	10,42	0,365	0,546
	Within Groups	5079,11	178	28,53		
	Total	5089,53	179			
Total Score	Between Groups	26,99	1	26,99	0,046	0,831
	Within Groups	86551	146	592,82		
	Total	86578	147			

4.9. THE EFFECT OF TEACHERS PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR UNIVERSITIES' FACILITIES ON CMES SUBSCALES AND THE TOTAL SCORE

One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied in order to see whether the CMES Subscales and the Total Score of CMES were significantly differed by the “perception on the facilities of the employer universities” factor. In order to apply these analyses, the participants were divided into two groups; ones who perceive the facilities as low or below average and the ones who perceive the facilities as high or above average. The results were presented in the Table 4.13. According to the results, there was a statistically significant effect of the “perception on facilities of the employer universities” on ARPAC subscale

scores for the participants ($F(1,91) = 7.44, p = 0.008, p < .01$); there was no statistically significant effect of the “perception on facilities of the employer universities” on ARIM subscale scores for the participants ($F(1,100) = 3.573, p = 0.062, p > .05$); there was no statistically significant effect of the “perception on facilities of the employer universities” on ARTM subscale scores for the participants ($F(1,101) = 1.13, p = 0.290, p > .05$); there was no statistically significant effect of the “perception on facilities of the employer universities” on TSR subscale scores for the participants ($F(1,99) = 3.209, p = 0.076, p > .05$); there was no statistically significant effect of the “perception on facilities of the employer universities” on DRSB subscale scores for the participants ($F(1,99) = 2.371, p = 0.127, p > .01$) and there was a statistically significant effect of the “perception on facilities of the employer universities” on CMES total scores for the participants ($F(1,83) = 4.677, p = 0.033, p < .05$).

According to the results, for ARPAC subscale scores for the teachers with high perceptions ($N=71, \bar{X}=28.54, sd=3.97$) were significantly higher than the teachers with low perceptions scores ($N=22, \bar{X}=25.45, sd=6.35$) and for CMES total scores of the teachers with high perceptions ($N=20, \bar{X}=208.83, sd=16.23$) were significantly higher than the teachers with low perceptions scores ($N=65, \bar{X}=196.05, sd=38.02$).

Table 4.13: ANOVA Results for the Effect of Teachers Perceptions of Their Universities' Facilities on CMES Subscales And The Total Score

		SS	df	MS	F	P
ARPAC	Between Groups	159,4	1	159,4	7,44	0,008**
	Within Groups	1949,12	91	21,42		
	Total	2108,52	92			
ARIM	Between Groups	100,17	1	100,2	3,573	0,062
	Within Groups	2804,01	100	28,04		
	Total	2904,21	101			
ARTM	Between Groups	7,93	1	7,93	1,13	0,290
	Within Groups	708,85	101	7,018		
	Total	716,78	102			
TSR	Between Groups	187,23	1	187,23	3,209	0,076
	Within Groups	5717,28	98	58,34		
	Total	5904,51	99			
DRSB	Between Groups	62,85	1	62,85	2,371	0,127
	Within Groups	2624,48	99	26,51		
	Total	2687,33	100			
Total Score	Between Groups	2498,26	1	2498,3	4,677	0,033*
	Within Groups	44336,1	83	534,17		
	Total	46834,4	84			

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

CHAPTER -V

5. CONCLUSION

5.1. DISCUSSION

This study researches the relationship between the personality traits according to the Five Factor Model and the classroom management abilities of EFL instructors. Additionally, the overall effectiveness of classroom management was measured through the Classroom Management Efficacy Scale (CMES). This study not only attempts to create a connection between personality traits and classroom management behavior, but also provides a general insight on the classroom management efficacy of English preparatory school instructors.

When the demographics of the participants were analyzed it was seen that most of the participants were women (n=155); married (n=105); BA graduates (n=102); from Faculty of Education (n=85) or Faculty of Arts and Science (n=78); work in full-time status (n=142); work at private/foundation universities (n=116). Most of the instructor defined their income as average (n=103) and they either live in rental houses (n=78); or of their own (n=73). As to their spouses, majority of the instructors have working spouses (n=94) and more than half of the spouses work at private sector (n=57). Regarding the information related to professional development, most of the instructors regarded the institutions' facilities as average (n=85) or above average (n=66) and these instructors responded that they sometimes keep up with the literature and are sometimes given in-service trainings. The age of the subjects change between 22 and 65 whereas years of experience change between 1 and 28. This implies us that even teachers with the least experience and most experience took part in the study.

The findings of Table 4.6 show us that there is a relationship between different personality traits. A positive significant relationship has been found between all personality traits except neuroticism, which had a negative relation with all the other traits. Out of the five personality factors, the highest significant relationship was found between extraversion and openness. These relations will prove to be significant when analyzing the relationship

between classroom management efficacy and personality traits. Çevik's (2011) study, related to the efficacy of music teachers also showed a significant interrelationship between all the personality traits, except neuroticism. It is possible to generalize that most of the teachers have not one of these traits but most of them, except those related to emotional instability. As neuroticism is related instable behaviors, the high score in neuroticism may cause problems in efficient classroom management. Students are most of the time likely to reject the teacher behavior which is not stable. As Funder (2006) highlights “people who score high in this trait are more likely to be unhappy and to cope with the stresses of life, to be dissatisfied by their jobs” (p. 205).

When comparing the subscales of the CMES, findings indicated that there was a close and significant relationship between Attitudes Regarding Instructional Management (ARIM) and Attitudes Regarding Time Management (ARTM). This can be related to the fact that ineffective time management prevents the teacher to maintain and conduct the lesson, as a result of this ineffectiveness, instructional time will be wasted (Moore, 2008). Secondly, a significant relationship was found between Attitudes Regarding Teacher-Student Rapport (TSR) and Attitudes Regarding the Development and Regulation of Student Behavior (DRSB). As mentioned in the literature review, behavioral management is necessary in preventing disruptive behavior. Modern findings on classroom management and pedagogical psychology have revealed that children almost all the time conduct in disruptive behavior in order to compensate for attention, love or appreciation that he/she has not found in the family or in the social environment (Ünal & Ada,2003; Dreikurs,1968; Johnson,2011). Therefore, maintaining good relationships with the students, communicating effectively and understanding their needs will be effective by means of regulating and developing student behavior. The interrelation between the subscales TSR and DRSB proves this. The findings also showed that the subscale most related to effective classroom management was TSR and the next one was ARIM. DRSB was also almost equally important. TSR scored the highest and this may be due the fact that daily interaction between the teachers and students is at the center of the educational process.

This study also exposed a significant relationship between teacher personality traits and their classroom management ability skills. Kotterman (2005) and Fenderson (2011) also

found a significant correlation between management effectiveness scores and the Five Factor Model. According to Garcia (2010), openness to experience and extraversion were good predictors for the training and proficiency criteria. The study, however, showed that when searching for a relationship between personality traits and classroom management, out of the Big Five, extraversion, openness, conscientiousness and agreeableness created a positively significant relationship in ARPAC, ARIM, BRTM, TSR and DRSB scores. Neuroticism has shown to have negative or no impact on classroom management abilities. The total CMES score of the participants were also not affected by neuroticism, but extraversion, openness, conscientiousness and agreeableness showed to have a positive significant relationship with teachers' overall classroom management abilities. Çevik's (2011) study on music teachers also showed that pre-service teachers scored high in extroversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness and openness, but low in neuroticism. Consequently, it can be argued that agreeable, conscientious, extraverted and open-minded personalities are fit to become effective classroom managers, whereas personalities who are not emotionally stable will be not so effective.

Out of the subscales of CMES, neuroticism had the most negative impact on DRSB. Therefore, it can be argued that neurotic behavior will prevent behavioral development and regulation of the pupils. The study shows that neuroticism also has a significant negative effect on time management and in-class relationships. Literature shows us though that encountering disruptive behavior in class too often will prevent the teacher to communicate the class material in the given time (Aydın 2008; Boynton & Boynton, 2005; Moore, 2008).

The fact that neuroticism showed a different effect on classroom management than the other traits is related to that neuroticism is inversely correlated to the other personal traits, as is proven by the statistical findings of this study. According to the research, the most important traits necessary for effective management are agreeableness, conscientiousness and extraversion. Openness to experience scored average points while it turned out to be more effective when it comes to in-class relationships. As lots of things go on each class every day, instructors need to be open to any challenge and experience. However, extraversion proved to be the most effective trait for in-class relationships.

Conscientiousness, on the other hand, proved to be most effective on behavior about time management. Out of the five traits extraversion achieved the highest score on CMES, but conscientiousness had the highest score amongst the subscales because of its vital importance in ARIM and ARTM. According to Schmidt & Hunter, conscientiousness has a good predictor of job and performance and it may be a cause for excellence. (as cited in Funder, 2006) It can be concluded that in order to be efficient in classroom management, one has to possess high social skills, combined with order and thoroughness. A study by Çetin (2012) also proved that teachers believe that skills related to conscientiousness and extraversions are the most important ones when it comes to classroom management. Therefore, this study also provides an order of importance by means of classroom management.

It is interesting that all traits except neuroticism have showed a significant positive relationship with all the CMES subscales. The ARPAC score was lower with the agreeableness trait, actually, the relationship between ARPAC and agreeableness was the least significant. The ARPAC subscale is related to classroom arrangement, the setting of rules and procedures, whereas agreeableness is related to traits like tolerance, conformity and not being demanding, but “agreeableness has its limits” (Funder, 2006, p. 206). The reason for the low significance may be related to the fact that rules are inflexible and have to be carried out strictly and that the teacher should not tolerate or be conforming in the arrangements related to the classroom. However, procedures can be adapted as needed and this may be the cause why ARPAC and agreeableness scored only ,182.

Compared to the investigations by Fenderson (2011) on the personality traits of "2009 National Teacher of the Year" candidates, Fenderson found that high extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness could be found, whereas openness to experience was average and neuroticism was notably low. Fenderson defined the "Teacher of the Year" candidates generally to be "rather stable, very outgoing, and mildly willing to take risks, very friendly and understanding and strongly detail oriented" (p. 40). In that sense, it can be seen that what was defined as effective classroom management was related to similar personality traits as in Turkish EFL instructors, except that Fenderson's (2011) study gave agreeableness a greater importance than openness, whereas EFL instructors found

openness to be more important than agreeableness. However, it may be better to have the score of openness more as people high in openness are known as imaginative, creative, open-minded and clever (Funder, 2006) which are necessary traits in efficient classroom management.

Similarly, Hamilton (2010) also found extraversion and conscientiousness to be important by means of classroom management, along with agreeableness. It is argued that agreeableness was especially important by means of relations with student families. This study did not explore the relationship with student families since it is no part of classroom management.

Whereas the findings of this study, Fenderson's (2011), Kotterman's (2005) and Hamilton's (2010) found conscientiousness and extraversion to be the most effective traits in this field, Garcia's (2010) findings reported conscientiousness to contribute to academic performance the most (7 points) along with openness (4 points). Interestingly, extraversion was scaled to be as important as neuroticism (each 1 point). Garcia's (2010) research, however, also took students' perceptions of the teacher into account who also accounted conscientiousness to be most effective when it comes to achieve high academic performance.

The study showed that women's scores were significantly higher than men's in arrangement of the classroom ARPAC, ARIM, ARTM, TSR, DRSB and the CMES. Whether this is related to the social view towards gender could not be identified. However, the scores for the ARPAC subscale showed a lesser difference between the genders, although women scored still higher on this matter as well.

Komitoğlu (2009) found out in a study that male teachers tend to be more inclined to agreeableness, extraversion and emotional stability rather than female teachers, whereas female teachers tend to be more conscientious, less open and less agreeable. According to this study, women scored higher especially in ARIM and ARTM, subscales that were previously related to conscientiousness. A relation between the findings of these two

studies could be seen, although this study has found a significant positive relationship between female teachers and their CMES scores on all subscales.

A significantly higher score on all CMES subscales could be found in private universities, compared to state universities. Findings showed that among private universities the highest scores were achieved in the ARPAC subscale. Maybe, the reason for this, private universities have better facilities compared to state universities which will make the task of classroom arrangement simpler. Whether these were related to the private universities' choice of employees or the environment cannot be generalized and could be subject to further study.

According to the findings indicated on Table 4.11, the ARPAC and age showed a negative relationship. No other significant relation has been found related to age. Other studies also do not show a significant relationship between age and classroom management efficacy (Burç, 2006), while some studies found the age factor only significant by means of controlling student behavior (Komitoğlu,2009;Köyalan,2004). The reason for the negative relationship between age and physical arrangement of the class may be related to older instructors. They may be tired of doing the same things for years, so they may not label physical arrangement as a necessity of the classroom. Or the novice/young instructors may have scored higher in this scale and as they are new to the profession, they may not be able to deal with the physical arrangement of their classrooms.

ARPAC scales showed higher scores for part-time instructors than full-time instructors. The occupational status type did not show any significance in other scales. The reason to this might be connected to instructors' job satisfaction and motivation; however, it does require further research. Part-time teachers may not feel themselves as the part of their institutions whereas full-time teachers feel that sense of belonging.

The instructors' perception of their universities' facilities has also been found significant according to ARPAC and CMES. Instructors with higher perception may be considered significantly more effective in the arrangement of the class and other aspects of classroom management than teachers with lower perceptions. As the statics prove, the instructors who

regard the facilities of their universities as high level are more efficient in classroom management. Whether this was related to the teacher's personality and his/her perception or if the teacher was affected by the external environment could not be determined with this study.

It can be concluded that a teacher's personality along with other factors such as school or employment types affect the way the teacher will manage the class. A significant connection between personality traits and the other elements that affect classroom management however could not be found in the current study.

5.2. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

This study attempted to show a pattern to the relationship between EFL instructors' personality traits and classroom management efficacy. Any other element that affects their classroom management abilities has not been explored. But it can be further investigated whether the teachers' personality have an effect on their job satisfaction or the way they perceive the external environment, and how the external environment such as the university ambiance, facilities, overall quality or their working hours affect their classroom management abilities. For example, the study showed that teachers working at private universities or who work as part-time employees had higher scores. As this cannot be connected to the instructors' personality traits this could be subject to further research.

Furthermore, it can be investigated how students perceive teachers and their personality and how the classroom management effectiveness of a teacher, based on their personality traits, affects students' academic and social success. According to Çetin (2012), teachers and students tend to have different point of views about classroom management. Since the subjects have evaluated themselves, research on how others perceive their skills might prove to be insightful.

5.3. RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of the current study imply that in order to be successful instructors individuals have to have certain personality traits. Therefore, the ABPT could also be applied to student's who do wish to pursue an academic career as instructors or teachers to test if they are fit for the job. In fact the ABPT could be applied to any field, if the necessary personality traits can be identified.

The information gathered by this study can also be used to train teachers in effective classroom management strategies and to create an education program in classroom management. Teacher training programs should place more emphasis on training teachers in classroom management skills so that teachers are ready handle all the facets of teaching. Since a person's personality and habit can change, it can be taught to teachers how to behave towards students in order to manage the classroom efficiently. Additionally, this study may help the professionals for early identification of potential teachers for prospective employment. Understanding the relationship between classroom management efficacy and personality traits provides opportunities for improvements in recruiting and training. Deeper understanding of personality's role can provide educators with necessary information to improve the standards of classroom environment.

REFERENCES

- Abu-Tineh, Abdullah M., Khasawneh, Samar A., Khalaileh, Huda A. Teacher self-efficacy and classroom management styles. in Jordanian schools *Management in Education*, 25(4) 175–181.
- Adler, A. (2002) *The Collected Clinical Works of Alfred Adler, Volume 1 – The Neurotic Character*. Alfred Adler Institut.
- Alberto, P.A., Troutman, A.C. (1986) *Applied Behavior Analysis For Teachers* , 8th ed. K.T. Henson & B.F.Eller (1999;404), *Educational Psychology For Effective Teaching*., Wadsworth Publishing Company, USA.
- Allen, B.P. (2005) *Personality theories, development, growth, and diversity*.5th edition. Asia e-University, Classroom Management Chapter 9, 244. Retrieved March 13 2012 from http://peoplelearn.homestead.com/BEduc/Chapter_9.pdf.
- Aydın, A.(2008). *Sınıf Yönetimi*. Pegem Akademi, 9. Baskı, Ankara.
- Bacanlı, H., İlhan, T., Aslan, S. (2009). Beş Faktör Kuramına Dayalı Bir Kişilik Ölçeğinin Geliştirilmesi: Sıfatlara Dayalı Kişilik Testi (Sdkt) *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi Bahar*, 7(2), 261-279.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W. H. Freeman.
- Bentley Reed, Lora L. (2005). The Big Five Personality Traits As Tools For Retention Of Florida E 9-1-1 Telecommunicators. ProQuest LLC, Ed.D. Doctoral Dissertation, Capella University.
- Berman, P., McLaughlin, M., Bass, G., Pauly, E., & Zellman, G. (1977). Federal programs supporting educational change. *Vol. VII: Factors affecting implementation and continuation*. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation.
- Boeree, George C. (1997) *Personality Theories*. Retrieved on May, 2012 from <http://www.ship.edu/%7Ecgboree/perscontents.html>.
- Borko, H., & Putnam, R. T. (1996). *Learning to Teach*. In D. C. Berlinger & R. C. Calfee (Eds.), *Handbook of Educational Psychology*, New York: Simon & Schuster
- Boynton, M., & Boynton, C. (2005). *Educator's guide to preventing and solving discipline problems*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

- Brody, N., & Ehrlichman H. (1998), *Personality Psychology: The Science of Individuality*, Prentice-Hall.
- Burç, E. D. (2006). *İlk Öğretim Okulu Öğretmenlerinin Sınıf Yönetimi Yeterlilikleri (Hatay İli Örneği)*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi.
- Burger, J. M. (2008) *Personality*. 7th Edition, Wadsworth Thomson, California.
- Burkett, M.C. (2011). *Relationships Among Teachers' Personality, Leadership Style, and Efficacy of Classroom Management*. ProQuest LLC, Ed.D. Dissertation, Walden University.
- Cano, J., Garton, B.L., & Raven, M.R. (1992). Learning styles, teaching styles and personality styles of preservice teachers of agricultural education. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 33(1), 46-52
- Canter, L., & Canter, M. (1993). *Succeeding with Difficult Students*. Los Angeles, CA: Canter & Associates, Inc.
- Carlson, N.R. & Heth, C.D (2010). *Psychology the science of behaviour* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, USA: Pearson Education
- Cosner, L. (2002). Psychography: Alfred Adler. Retrieved May 2 2012 from <http://faculty.frostburg.edu/mbradley/psychography/alfredadler.html>.
- Cüceloğlu, D. (2011) *İnsan ve Davranış*. Remzi Kitapevi, 7. Basım, İstanbul
- Çetin, F. (2009). *Eğitim Fakültelerinde Görev Yapan Öğretim Elemanlarının Sınıf Yönetimi İle İlgili Davranışlarının İncelenmesi*, Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi.
- Çetin, F. (2012). Eğitim Fakültelerinde Görev Yapan Öğretim Elemanlarının Sınıf Yönetimi İle İlgili Davranışlarının İncelenmesi. *Gazi Üniversitesi Endüstriyel Sanatlar Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*: 29,42-58
- Demirel,Ö. (2004) *Öğretimde Planlama ve Değerlendirme: Öğretme Sanatı*. 7.Baskı Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık
- De Villiers M.R. & Queiros, D.R. (2003). Real-world problem-based learning: a case study evaluated. *South African Journal of Higher Education*: 17 (1), 112-122
- Dreikurs, R. (1968). *Psychology in the classroom* (2nd ed.). Harper&Row, New York.
- Endo, J. J., & Harpel, R. L. (1982). The effect of student-faculty interaction on students' educational outcomes. *Research in Higher Education*, 16, 115-135

- Engler, B. (2008). *Personality Theories: An Introduction* (8th ed.). Boston, Houghton-Mifflin
- Emmer, E.T., Evertson, C.M., Sanford, J.P., Clements, B.S., Worsham, M.E. (1984). *Classroom Management for Secondary Teachers*. Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc
- Evertson, C. M., Emmer, E. T., Clements, B. S., Sanford, J. P., & Worsham, M. E. (1989). *Classroom Management for Elementary Teachers*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon
- 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). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Erikson, E.H. (1993). *Childhood and society*, Norton, New York
- Erwin, J.C (2004). *The Classroom of Choice: Giving Students What They Need and Getting What You Want*. Alexandria,VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Fenderson, P. R. (2011) *Personality Characteristics of 2009 National Teacher of the Year Candidates*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Walden University.
- Freiberg, H. J.& Lamb, S.M. (2009)Dimensions of Person-Centered Classroom Management. *Theory Into Practice*, 48, 99–105. Ohio State University.
- Freud, S (1991) *Düşlerin Yorumu I*. İstanbul: Payel Yayınları, Freud Kitaplığı Dizisi.
- Freud, S (2010) *The Ego and the Id, US*: CreateSpace.
- Froyen L.A. & Iverson A.M., (1999) *Schoolwide and Classroom Management: The Reflective Educator-Leader*, Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Funder, D.C. (2007). *The personality puzzle* (fourth edition). Norton, New York.
- Garcia, P.L.S. (2010). *The impact of teacher personality styles on academic excellence of secondary students*. Retrieved March 12 2012 from <http://udini.proquest.com/view/the-impact-of-teacher-personality-goid:900302419/>
- Gilpatrick, R. (2010). *Classroom Management Strategies and Behavioral Interventions to Support Academic Achievement*. ProQuest LLC, Ed.D. Dissertation, Walden University.
- Glasser, W. (1977). *Schools Without Failure-1977. Glasser's Approach to Discipline--Pealistic and Working*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of School Administrators 109th, Las Vegas, Nevada.

Gootman, M.E. (2008) *The caring teacher's guide to discipline : helping students learn self-control, responsibility, and respect*, K–6 (3rd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin

Gordon, D. G. (2001). *Classroom management*. Music Educators Journal, 88(2),17-24.

John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2nd ed., pp. 102-138). New York: Guilford.

Hamilton, A. R. (2010). *Exploring the Relationship between Teacher Personality Traits and Teachers' Attitudes and Practices towards Family-School Partnerships*. ProQuest LLC, Ph.D. Dissertation, Chicago: Loyola University.

Hartman, Robert Owen (2006) *The Five-Factor Model And Career Self-Efficacy: General And Domain-Specific Relationships*. Doctoral Dissertation, Ohio State University Retrieved February 7, 2012 from <http://etd.ohiolink.edu/send-pdf.cgi/Hartman%20Robert%20Owen.pdf?osu1147867278>

Henley, Martin R. (2006) *Classroom Management: A Proactive Approach*. Westfield State College: Merrill.

Hesapçioğlu, M. (1994) *Öğretim İlke ve Yöntemleri: Eğitim Programları ve Öğretim*. (4. Baskı). İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayım Dağıtım A.Ş

Johnson, L (2011). *Teaching outside the box: How to grab your students' attention by their brains*. (second edition). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kaliska, P. (2002). *A comprehensive study identifying the most effective classroom management techniques and practices*. Unpublished manuscript, Graduate School of Education, University of Wisconsin-Stout. Retrieved March 20 2012 from <http://www2.uwstout.edu/content/lib/thesis/2002/2002kaliskap.pdf>.

Katz, M. H. (2011). *Job satisfaction as influenced by the Big Five personality traits*. Retrieved April 12 2012 from gradworks.umi.com.

Knobloch, N. A., & Whittington, M. S. (2002). Novice Teachers' Perceptions of Support, Teacher Preparation Quality, and Student Teaching Experience Related to Teacher Efficacy, *Journal of Vocational Education Research*, 27(3), 1-2.

Komitoğlu, D. (2009) *Sınıf Öğretmenlerinin Sınıf Yönetimi Becerileri İle Kişilik Özellikleri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Yeditepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

Kotterman, J.R. (2005). *The Relationship Subordinates Make Between Management Effectiveness And The Five-Factor Model Of Personality*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Capella University.

Köyalan, A. (2004). *Mirror Mirror In The Classroom Who Is The 'Openest' Of Them All?*, The 5th International INGED - Anadolu University Conference Proceedings: Eskişehir, 163-165.

Kyle, P. & Rogien, L. (2004). *Opportunities and options in classroom management*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Lounsbury, J.W., Gibson, L.W., Sundstrom, E., Wilburn, D., & Loveland, J.M. (2004). An empirical investigation of the proposition that 'school is work': A comparison of personality-performance correlations in school and work settings. *Journal of Education and Work, 17*, 119-131.

Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. (1984). Teacher-efficacy: A Construct Validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 76*, 569-582.

Martin, N.K, Yin, Z. & Baldwin, B (1998). Construct validation of the attitudes and beliefs on classroom control inventor. *Journal of Classroom Interaction, 33* (2), 6-15.

Marzano, R.J., Marzano, J.S., & Pickering, D. (2003). *Classroom management that works: research-based strategies for every teacher*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

Mehrabian, A. (1971). *Silent Messages* (1st ed.). Wadsworth, Belmont.

McCrae, Robert R. (2011). Personality Theories for the 21st Century. *Teaching of Psychology 38*: 209.

Millon, T (1981) *Disorders on DSM III: Axis II*. John Wiley & Sons, New York

Moore, D. (2008). Analyzing Relationships Between Classroom Management Strategies, Student Achievement Scores, And Teachers' Attitudes And Beliefs In Diverse Elementary Settings. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Capella University.

Nielsen, J. (2008). *Effective Communication Skills*. Xlibris Corporation.

Novak, R. (2009) *Examining the efficacy of the INCLUDE model within the general classroom*. M.A.E., Pacific Lutheran University. Retrieved February 25, 2012 from <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdlink?Ver=1&Exp=06-18-2017&FMT=7&DID=1883663311&RQT=309&attempt=1&cfc=1>

O'Neill, S., & Stephenson, J. (2011). The measurement of classroom management self efficacy: A review of measurement instrument development and influences. *Educational Psychology, 31*, 261-299.

Ören, K & Biçkes, M (2011). Kişilik Özelliklerinin Girişimcilik Potansiyeli Üzerindeki Etkileri (Nevşehir'deki Yüksek Öğrenim Öğrencileri Üzerinde Yapılan Bir Araştırma. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi* 16 (3) ,67-86.

Payne, R. S. (1994). The Relationship between Teachers' Beliefs and Sense of Efficacy and Their Significance to Urban LSES Minority Students., *Journal of Negro Education*, 63(2),181-96

Purkey, S., & Smith, M. (1983). Effective schools: a review. *The Elementary School Journal*, 83(4), 427-452.

Ratzburg, S.A. (2010) Classroom Management and Students' Perceptions of Classroom Climate. Doctoral Dissertation, Walden University. Retrieved March 2012 from <http://gradworks.umi.com/34/28/3428452.html>

Redl, F., & Wattenberg, W. (1959). Mental hygiene in teaching. Harcourt, Bruce and World, New York.

Ryckman, R. (1985). *Theories of personality*. Brooks / Cole Publishing Co., Monterey.

Richardson, V. & Placier, P. (2001). *Teacher change*. In V. Richardson, *Handbook of research on teaching* (4th ed.) (pp. 905-950). Washington, D. C.: American Education Research Association.

Rockey, R.D. (2008) *An Observational Study Of Pre-Service Teachers' Classroom Management Strategies*. Doctoral Dissertation, Indiana University of Pennsylvania. Retrieved May 1, 2012 from <http://gradworks.umi.com/33/03/3303545.html>

Shipley, J.T. (1961). *The Mentally Disturbed Teacher*. Chilton Company, Philadelphia and New York .

Skinner, B.F. (1971). *Beyond freedom and dignity*. Knopf, New York.

Simms, E.E (2009). Assessment of the Facets of the Five Factor Model: Further Development and Validation of A New Personality Measure. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Iowa. Retrieved March 11, 2012 from <http://gradworks.umi.com/33/83/3383172.html>

Smith, B.O. (1971). *Research in Teacher Education*. Englewood Cliffs: NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Smylie, M. (1988). The Enhancement Function of Staff Development: Organizational and Psychological Antecedents to Individual Teacher Change. *American Educational Research Journal*, 25 (1), 1-30.

Stagner, R. (1937). *Psychology of personality*. New York, NY, US: McGraw-Hill. Retrieved May 5, 2012 from <http://www.fisheaters.com/fourtemperaments.html>.

Stronge, J. H. (2002). *Qualities of effective teachers*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development [ASCD]

Stronge, J. H. (2007). *Qualities of effective teachers (2nd Edition)*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development [ASCD]

Thompson, M. (2006). Leadership trait development: a new approach is assessing student's leadership potential. *E-Journal of Organizational Learning and Leadership*, 5 (2). Retrieved March 12, 2012 from http://www.leadingtoday.org/weleadinglearning/volume_5.htm.

Threeton, M.D. (2008) *The Relationship between Personality Type and Learning Style: A Study of Automotive Technology Students*. Doctoral Dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University. . Retrieved May 5, 2012 from <https://etda.libraries.psu.edu/paper/9202/4246>

Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk-Hoy, A., (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive concept. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 783.

Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk-Hoy, A., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher Efficacy: Its Meaning and Measure. *Review of Educational Research*, 68, 202-248.

Uçar, R. (2004). *İlköğretim Okulları II.Kademedeki Din Kültürü ve Ahlak Bilgisi Öğretmenlerinin Sınıf Yönetimi Yeterlikleri*. Kayseri İl Merkezi Örneği. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimleri Enstitüsü,

Ünal, S.& Ada, S. (2003).*Sınıf Yönetimi*. (2. Baskı) İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi Yayını.

Walker, E.J & Shea, T.M & Bauer, M.A. (2007). *Behavior Management: A Practical Approach for Educators*. (9th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Wilson, K.S. (2006). *Teacher Perceptions Of Classroom Management Practices In Public Elementary Schools*. Doctoral Dissertation, University Of Southern California. Retrieved on April 1 from <http://digitalibrary.usc.edu/assetserver/controller/item/etd-Wilson-20061117.pdf>

Wollheim, R. (1971). *Freud*. Fontana Press, London.

Wong, H.K & R, T. Wong .(1998) *The First Days of School: How to be an Effective Teacher*. Sunnyvale, CA: Harry K Wong Publications.

Yılman, M. vd (2006). *Sınıf Yönetimi*. (1. Baskı) Ankara: Nobel Yayın.

APPENDIX 1

Değerli Öğretim Elemanı ,

Hazırlık Okullarında Görev Yapan Öğretim Elemanlarının Sınıf Yönetimi Yeterlikleri ile Kişilik Özellikleri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi konulu yüksek lisans çalışmam ile ilgili olarak katınıza ihtiyaç duymaktayım. Soruların, samimi ve objektif, tarafsız olarak cevap vermeniz araştırma bulgularının geçerli olması için gereklidir. Lütfen hiçbir soruyu cevapsız bırakmayınız. Sonuçlar toplu olarak değerlendirileceğinden isim yazmanıza gerek yoktur.

Katınız ve zaman ayırdığınız için teşekkür eder, saygılar sunarım.

Meltem İPEK ÖNER
moner.yeditepe@gmail.com

KİŞİSEL BİLGİ FORMU

Cinsiyetiniz: <input type="radio"/> Erkek <input type="radio"/> Kadın	Yaşınız:
Medeni Durumunuz: <input type="radio"/> Evli <input type="radio"/> Bekâr <input type="radio"/> Diğer (lütfen belirtiniz)	
En Son Mezun Olduğunuz Okul: <input type="radio"/> Yüksek Okul <input type="radio"/> Üniversite <input type="radio"/> Yüksek Lisans <input type="radio"/> Doktora <input type="radio"/> Diğer	
En Son Mezun Olduğunuz Fakülte ve Bölüm:	
<input type="radio"/> Yüksek Öğretmen Okulu	
<input type="radio"/> Eğitim Enstitüsü	
<input type="radio"/> Eğitim Fakültesi	Bölüm (lütfen belirtiniz)
).....	
<input type="radio"/> Edebiyat/ Fen- Edebiyat Fakültesi	Bölüm: (lütfen belirtiniz)
.....	
<input type="radio"/> Diğer	(lütfen belirtiniz)
.....	

<p>Çalışma Şekli: <input type="radio"/> Kadrolu/ Sözleşmeli <input type="radio"/> Dışarıdan Ücretli</p>	<p>Meslekteki Kıdeminiz <input type="radio"/> 1 - 5 yıl <input type="radio"/> 6 – 10 yıl <input type="radio"/> 11 – 20 yıl <input type="radio"/> 21 yıl ve üzeri</p>
<p>Çalıştığınız Üniversite Türü : <input type="radio"/> Özel/Vakıf <input type="radio"/> Devlet</p>	<p>Kaç yıldır bu kurumda çalışıyorsunuz ?:</p>
<p>Eşiniz Çalışıyor mu?: <input type="radio"/> Çalışıyor (Kurumu) <input type="radio"/> Kamu <input type="radio"/> Özel Sektör <input type="radio"/> Esnaf <input type="radio"/> Serbest</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Çalışmıyor <input type="radio"/> Ev Hanımı <input type="radio"/> Emekli <input type="radio"/> İşsiz</p>
<p>Oturduğunuz Ev: <input type="radio"/> Lojman <input type="radio"/> Kira <input type="radio"/> Kendimin <input type="radio"/> Çocuğunuz Varsa Adedi:..... Aile Bireylerinin</p>	
<p>Gelir Düzeyi : <input type="radio"/> Düşük <input type="radio"/> Ortanın Altı <input type="radio"/> Orta <input type="radio"/> Ortanın üstü <input type="radio"/> Üst</p>	
<p>Çalıştığınız okulu bir bütün olarak düşündüğünüzde imkânlarını nasıl tanımlarsınız?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> İleri <input type="radio"/> Ortanın Üstü <input type="radio"/> Orta <input type="radio"/> Ortanın Altı <input type="radio"/> Zayıf</p>	
<p>Mesleki Yayın Takip Ediyormusunuz?: <input type="radio"/> Düzenli Takip Ediyorum <input type="radio"/> Bazen Takip Ediyorum <input type="radio"/> Takip Etmiyorum</p>	
<p>Okulunuzda öğretim elemanlarının kendilerini geliştirmeleri için özel eğitimler verilmekte midir? <input type="radio"/> Evet <input type="radio"/> Çok az <input type="radio"/> Hayır</p>	

APPENDIX 2

Sınıf yönetiminin farklı boyutlarını yansıtan her ifadeyi okuduktan sonra, size uygun seçeneklerden **yalnızca bir tanesini (X) şeklinde işaretleyerek, belirtiniz.**

Lütfen işaretsiz ifade bırakmayınız.

Öğretim Elemanlarının Sınıfın Fiziksel Düzenini Sağlamaya İlişkin Davranışları	Her zaman	Sık sık	Ara sıra	Nadiren	Hiçbir zaman
1.Gerektiğinde öğrenci sayısına ve sınıf yapısına uygun düzenlemeleri yaparım.					
2.Sınıfta ısı, gürültü, aydınlatma vb. özelliklere duyarlı olup gerekli düzenlemelerde bulunurum.					
3.Sınıfta yer alan eğitsel araçları en verimli şekilde kullanırım.					
4.Sınıftaki her türlü fiziksel düzenlemeyi öğrencilerle birlikte yaparım.					
5.Sınıftaki her boş alandan öğretimsel bir amaç için yararlanırım.					
6.Sınıfı, öğrenme etkinlikleri için en uygun şekilde düzenlerim.					
7.Sınıfta fiziksel ve ergonomik eksikliklerden kaynaklanan (kişisel-özel alan eksikliği, kalabalıklık vb.) istenmeyen öğrenci davranışlarına nedenine uygun tepkide bulunurum.					
8.Dersi bir plan dahilinde sistematik bir şekilde yürütürüm.					
9.Dersin amacı, işlevi ve sağlayacağı kazanımlar hakkında yönergeler veririm.					
10.Ders kapsamında işlenecek konuları ve süreci açıklarım.					
11.Ders kapsamında yararlanılacak kaynak ve materyalleri belirtirim.					
12.Konuya ilişkin etkili sorular sorarım.					
13.Uygun ipuçları vererek öğrencilerin derse katılımını sağlarım.					
14.Konuya ilişkin anlaşılır düzeltmeler yaparım.					
15.Öğretimin planlanmasında sosyo-kültürel farklılıkları dikkate alırım.					
16.Sınıfta kurallara uyulmasını sağlarım.					
17.Sınıfta öğrenmeye uygun olumlu bir hava oluştururum.					
18.Ders süresince zamanı iyi kullanırım.					
19.Derse hazırlıklı girerim.					
20.Derste kullanılacak araç ve gereçleri ders öncesinde kullanıma hazır hale getirir veya getirilmesini sağlarım.					
21.Öğrencilerin dikkatlerinin dağıldığı, motivasyonlarının					

azaldığı anı zamanında tespit eder ve gerekli önlemleri alırım.					
22.Önemsiz konu ve ayrıntılardan kaçınırım.					
23.Dili etkin kullanırım.					
24.Öğrencileri dinlemeye - anlamaya çalışırım.					
25.Beden dilini etkili kullanırım.					
26.Öğrencileri karşılıklı iletişim konusunda cesaretlendiririm.					
27.Sınıf kurallarını öğrencilerle birlikte belirlerim.					
28.Öğrencilerin bireysel özelliklerini bilir ve ilişkilerde göz önünde bulundururum.					
29.Sınıf kurallarını uygulamada eşit davranırım.					
30.Öğrencilerin olumlu davranışlarını pekiştiririm.					
31.Öğrencilere isimleri ile hitap ederim.					
32.Öğrencilere samimi ve içten davranırım.					
33.Öğrenciye iletişime açık olduğumu sezdiririm.					
34.Sınıfta güvene dayalı bir ortam oluştururum.					
35.İlişkilerde empatik davranırım.					
36.Ben dilinden çok biz dilini kullanırım.					
37.Öğrencilerin görüşlerine karşı hoş görülme ve saygılı olurum.					
38.Gerektiğinde öğrencilerin takım halinde çalışmalarına uygun ortam hazırlarım.					
39.Kazandırılmak istenen davranışı tanımlarım.					
Öğretim Elemanlarının Sınıfın Fiziksel Düzenini Sağlamaya İlişkin Davranışları	Her zaman	Sık sık	Ara sıra	Nadiren	Hiçbir zaman
40.Kazandırılmak istenen davranışın amacını açıklarım.					
41.Davranışın öğrenme açısından önemini vurgularım.					
42.Öğrencilerde doğru davranış geliştirebilmek için duruma en uygun tepkiyi veririm.					
43.Öğrencilerin yeteneklerine uygun istek ve beklentiler içerisinde olurum.					
44.Öğrencilerin bireyselliklerine karşı yeterince hoşgörülü davranırım.					
45.Öğrencilere karşı olumlu ifadeler kullanırım.					
46.İstenmeyen davranışı, ortaya çıkmadan tahmin eder, gerekli önlemleri alırım.					
47.İstenmeyen davranış ortaya çıktığında öğrenciye değil davranışa odaklanırım.					

APPENDIX 3

Aşağıda bireyleri tanımak için kullanılan sıfat çiftleri verilmektedir. Sizden istenen, her bir sıfat çiftini okuyarak size uygunluk derecesine karar vermenizdir. Her sıfat çifti için bir tek daireyi doldurunuz. Doğru cevap yoktur, size uygun cevap vardır. Bunu dikkate alarak cevaplamaya çalışınız. Cevaplarınızı aşağıdaki örneklere göre belirtiniz.

	Çok uygun	Oldukça uygun	Biraz uygun	uygun, ne uygun	Biraz uygun	Oldukça uygun	Çok uygun	
İçedönük	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Dışadönük
İçedönük	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Dışadönük
İçedönük	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Dışadönük

Bu örneklerde,

1. Örnek kişi kendini oldukça içedönük olarak görmektedir,
2. Örnek ise kişi kendini çok dışadönük olarak görmektedir,
3. Örnek ise kişi bu boyutlarda kararsızdır veya her iki sıfatı da kendine uzak veya yakın görmektedir, anlamına gelmektedir.

		Çok uygun	kça uygun	Biraz uygun	n, ne uygun	Biraz uygun	kça uygun	Çok uygun	
1	Sakin	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Sinirli
2	Yalnızlığı tercih eden	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Sosyal (topluluğu seven)
3	Sanata ilgisiz	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Sanata ilgili
4	Kindar	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Affedici
5	Düzensiz	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Düzenli
6	Sabırlı	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Sabırsız
7	Silik	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Atak
8	Hayal gücü zayıf	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Hayal gücü kuvvetli
9	(Başkalarına) kayıtsız	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Yardımsız
10	Sorumsuz	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Sorumluluk sahibi
11	Rahat	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Tedirgin
12	Uyuşuk, eliağır	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Canlı
13	Dargörüşlü	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Geniş görüşlü
14	Rekabetçi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	İşbirliği yapan
15	Hırslı değil	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Hırslı
16	Tutarlı	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Tutarsız
17	Durgun	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Delidolu

18	Alışılmış	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Yenilikçi
19	Kibirli	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Alçakgönüllü
20	Dikkatsiz	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Dikkatli
21	İyimser	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Karamsar
22	Neşesiz	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Neşeli
23	Meraksız	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Meraklı
24	Asi	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Uysal, yumuşak başlı
25	Gayretsiz	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Gayretli
26	Huzurlu	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Huzursuz
27	Arka planda kalan	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Öne çıkan
28	Tutucu	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Liberal
29	Acımasız	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Merhametli
30	Hazırlıksız	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Hazırlıklı
31	Kaygısız	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Kaygılı
32	Dikkat çekmeyen	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Baskın, belirgin
33	İlgileri dar	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	İlgileri geniş
34	Bencil	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Fedakâr (diğergam)
35	Disiplinsiz	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Disiplinli
36	Yeni ilişkilere kapalı	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Yeni ilişkilere açık
37	Etkisiz	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Etkili
38	Hoşgörüsüz	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Hoşgörülü
39	Donuk	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Coşkulu
40	İnatçı	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Uzlaşmacı

CIRRUCULUM VITAE

Meltem İpek Öner

Personal Info:

Date of Birth: 28.05.1984

Place of Birth: Manisa

Marital Status: Married

Education:

High School

1999-2002 Aydın Ortaklar Anatolian Teacher
Training High School

Undergraduate

2002-2005 Hacettepe University, Faculty of
Education, English Language Education (transfer)
2005-2007 Middle East Technical University, Faculty
of Education, Foreign Language Education

Employment:

2009-

Yeditepe University English Preparatory School - Instructor

2007-2009

Bilkent University School of English Language – Instructor