

Identity Research | Full Research Article

Developing and Validation of EFL Teachers' Classroom Discipline Scale and Examining its Relationship with their Professional Identity

Sayed Khalil Sadat

Ghalib University

Abstract

Classroom discipline is reported to be one of the most worldwide and problematic issues faced by teachers. Classroom discipline is commonly portrayed as what teachers do in response to misbehavior by students. Although lots of studies in the realm of language teaching focused on the classroom discipline, there was no scale to measure this issue from teachers' perspective. Therefore, this sequential exploratory mixed-method study aims at developing and validating of EFL teachers' classroom discipline scale and examining its relationship with their professional identity. In the qualitative phase of the study, 21 EFL teachers who were selected based on purposive sampling participated in a semi-structured interview. Using an open-ended question and reviewing literature, 23 items with three sub-constructs (verbal, non-verbal, and behavioral) were developed through pre-specified coding and theme and coding. Three experts tested the designed questionnaire for face and content validity to ensure that the items measure what they are supposed to measure. Then in the quantitative phase of the study, 200 EFL teachers from various context of teaching participated and filled out two questionnaires namely Teachers' Classroom Discipline Strategies Scale, designed by the researcher and Teachers' Professional Identity Scale, developed and validated by Jung Chi (2009). Validation of the designed questionnaire was performed through Rasch Model. Although theoretically three subscales had been envisaged for the Discipline Strategies Scale, Rasch model analysis demonstrated that, excluding two items, part A of the scale with 21 items is psychometrically unidimensional and a single score can be assigned to respondents. Results of Part B of the scale revealed eleven discipline factors. One-way ANOVA, independent sample t-test, and Pearson Correlation were used to evaluate research hypotheses. Results of Pearson correlation indicated that teachers' classroom discipline strategies are correlated positively and significantly with teachers' professional identity. Finally, results of the association between different demographic information (gender, work place, and years of teaching experience) and classroom discipline exposed that there is no substantial difference between teachers' discipline use and their demographic information. These conclusions highlight the important role of teachers' discipline strategies use in teachers' professional development in identity.

Keywords: classroom discipline, developing, discipline, discipline strategies scale, EFL Teacher.

Introduction

Classroom discipline has always been and will most likely continue to be an important issue in education (Briffa, 2012). Throughout the decades, the concept of classroom discipline has been cited as a major issue for instructors (Martin, Chiodo, & Chang, 2001; Martin & Sass, 2010). According to Shupe (1998), students' achievement suffers in schools where discipline and student misbehavior are not adequately addressed (as cited in Sowell, 2013).

According to Lewis (1997a), discipline is defined as what teachers do in response to students' misbehavior. Lewis (1997b) identified three major approaches to classroom discipline, each advocating for a unique set of strategies. According to some scholars, in order to increase students' sense of responsibility, instructors must establish clear expectations for student behavior and then implement a variety of rewards for appropriate behavior as well as punishments for students' misbehavior (Swinson & Melling, 1995; Swinson & Cording, 2002). Second, other scholars have stated that the goal can only be achieved by placing less emphasis on student obedience and teacher centeredness and more emphasis on student self-regulation. This is made easier by various strategies such as negotiating, discussing, and contracting (e.g., Freiberg, 1996; Pearl & Knight, 1998; Schneider, 1996; Vitto, 2003; Wade, 2000). The third approach focuses on group participation and decision making, in which the group takes responsibility for persuading all members of the group of the appropriateness of that particular method (Edwards & Mullis, 2003; Glasser, 1984; Johnson & Johnson, 2006; Schneider, 1996).

In recent years, the global focus has shifted from achieving universal access to education to prioritizing quality education as an essential component of global sustainable improvement goals. Clearly, quality education cannot exist in the absence of quality teachers (Isotalo, 2017). One way to recognize teacher quality is to improve positive professional teacher identity (Day & Gu, 2010); this is a process that begins during professional studies and continues throughout the teacher's career as a specialist (Osgood, 2006). According to Samuel (2008), a positive professional teacher identity is one in which the teacher is viewed as a "change agent" who is willing and able to accommodate and react to curriculum change.

Classroom discipline is reported to be one of the most worldwide and problematic issues faced by teachers (Alaee, 2014; Charles & Senter, 2005; Edwards, 1997; Mahdavi Resketi, 2018; Mahmoodi, Izadi, & Dehghannezhad, 2015; Mirzaee & Rahimi, 2017). Most of teachers speak about the idea of discipline as one of their most important causes of nervousness and ambiguity (Tulley & Chiu, 2015), as the central causes of burnout and job dissatisfaction (Landau, 2009; Mahmoodi, Izadi, & Dehghannezhad, 2015), lack of creativity (Mirzaee & Rahimi, 2017) and also as a major issue in teacher success (Kizlik, 2009).

Moreover, the idea of teacher education is a deep and multifaceted idea. Language teachers require to be trained in many features like different theories, attitudes, approaches, lesson planning, syllabus designing, etc. Though, equipped with all these, teachers cannot implement their role in class perfectly (Brown, 2006). It seems beyond all these that teachers have to improve a type of identity to be effective as a language teacher.

Specifically, studies have revealed that teacher identity is strongly related to various characteristics such as change, motivation, confidence, contentment, commitment, and efficacy in becoming a teacher (Alaee, 2014). Recent issues concerning language teachers' sense of self and professional identity have increased the need for additional research into the relationships between language teacher identity and professional development. Numerous studies have found that the role of language teacher identity may be critical for language teachers to improve and continue in their teaching careers (Eick & Reed, 2002).

According to the literature, a number of issues concerning the relationship between teachers' professional identity and various factors of EFL language education have been investigated; however, to the best of the researcher's knowledge, no study on the relationship between teachers' professional identity and teachers' discipline among EFL language teachers has been conducted. The problem the current study addressed is that there is inadequate study explaining the association between these variables in a single framework. Very rare research has been carried out on this issue, so therefore, the researcher selected this topic and hopes it would pave the ground for future researchers in this field.

Based on the stated problem the researcher formulated six general questions and hypothesis. They are as follows:

RQ1: What is teacher discipline based on EFL teachers' perspectives?

RQ2: Is EFL Teacher Classroom Discipline Scale reliable and valid?

RQ3: Is there any significant differences between EFL teachers' discipline and their gender?

Hypothesis:

H1: There is not any significant difference between EFL teachers' discipline and their gender.

H2: There is not any significant difference between EFL teachers' discipline and their work place.

H3: There is not any significant difference between EFL teachers' discipline and years of experience.

The present study adds to the body of work related to English teachers in the realm of classroom discipline and teachers' professional identity. Both of these factors may be indicators of teachers' success. The present research findings may have significant implications for teachers, students, and academics.

According to Langdon (1996), among all of the activities that include the function of an instructor, classroom discipline is one of the most important, and it is clearly a source of concern for many parents and teachers. Teachers become aware of the impact of different types of teachers' classroom discipline on their own identities and implement various discipline strategies in their classes. In other words, the findings of the study may direct English teachers to look deeper into the types of their classroom discipline strategies that require some improvement, enrichment or revision. Moreover, focusing on teachers' professional identity seems very important and necessary, because teachers especially novice ones are impressionable and try to make some decisions that may influence them during their career life. Therefore, the identity they develop is a crucial factor for success in their profession.

The use of best discipline strategies by teachers can also help students learn better because class discipline protects students from disruption as well as emotional and cognitive problems (Lewis, 2001). Furthermore, a review of the literature revealed that teacher discipline strategies improve students' academic performance and encourage them to complete their tasks successfully (Altinel, 2006), engage them in the learning process, and increase their motivation

to learn in order to achieve higher grades (Freiberg, Stein, & Huang, 1995). In this process, “the more that students perceive their teacher cares about them, the more the students will care about the class, and the more likely they will be to pay attention in class and consequently learn more course material” (Teven & McCroskey, 1997, p. 167).

The present study is also significant for other researchers because it proposes a new scale of classroom discipline from teachers’ perspective. Further studies can use the designed questionnaire and find new approaches in this area.

Review of Literature

This study's theoretical framework is based on Newton's discipline models or theories (1980). Table 2 summarizes some of these points for these discipline theories.

Table 2

Conceptions of Discipline in Four Theories

Theories	Aim of Discipline	Basic Principle	Type of Rules	Punishment/ Reward System	Attitude toward Students
Individual Fulfillment	the development of student self-direction	the right to be responsible for his/her behavior	guidelines which permit freedom, encourage responsibility	self-imposed; students allowed to suffer consequences of misbehavior and learn from mistakes	trust in the ability of the student to regulate self
Scholarly Discipline	demonstration of the importance of right order to the attainment of organizational societal goals	legitimate, hierarchical authority as the key to any society/ organization	regulations derived from organizational values /principles	traditional punishments specified for offenses	expectation of cooperation with legitimate authority
Educational Technology	establishment of the most efficient disciplinary patterns to achieve the desired learning outcomes	behavior shaped by the appropriate rewards	behaviors/outcomes which are most effective in producing an efficient learning environment	emphasis on positive reinforcement rather than punishment	capable of developing appropriate social behaviors given proper reinforcement
Social Reconstruction	participation in the generation of a just society	life in the society of the school; social rules/norms determined through a responsible political process	principles/ regulations for good order determined by participants	group influence/ pressure; group determination of punishments and their mode of imposition	responsible participant of a social group

As Table 2 shows, Newton (1980) presented four theories of discipline which are Individual Fulfillment, Scholarly Discipline, Educational Technology, and Social Reconstruction. Each of these models of discipline has its own aim of learning, principle, types of rules, source of rules, etc. The primary goal of this study is to create a Teachers' Classroom Discipline Strategies Scale based on these four theories and interviews with teachers. In fact, in the qualitative part of the study teachers' views towards these models were asked and then based on their responses for each of these theories items were developed and validated. According to Newton (1980) each of these models has its strengths. For example, The Individual Fulfillment model from the very beginning concentrates on students' self-development in an atmosphere of freedom and risk-taking. However, The Scholarly Discipline, as a traditional model focuses attention on natural order of man in society and allows students to find their way in so many aspects of life through depending on adult authority and guidance. Moreover, The Educational Technology model as a scientific approach to discipline, states that students' behavior is shaped by the reinforcement they receive from adults and the environment. Finally, the Social Reconstruction model offers an approach in which students learn to be a member of a group and to see their behavior in the larger group through which they find identity (Newton, 1980).

In this section the term discipline is defined and then causes of discipline problems are explained. It continues with the explanation of the topic of classroom discipline and different types of discipline strategies used in the classrooms.

The term "discipline" comes from the Latin word "discipulus," which means "education and learning" (Rahimi & Hosseini Karkami, 2015). This concept contains the essence of control and denotes "teaching someone to obey rules and control their behavior or punishing someone in order to maintain order and control" (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 2005, p. 443).

According to Lopes and Oliveira (2017), classroom discipline is not a well-defined concept. The concept is poorly defined because it is subject to numerous and subjective interpretations (Espelage & Lopes, 2013). Classroom indiscipline appears to be more easily defined than classroom discipline, but it is rarely used in the context of the overall task of classroom teaching (Lopes & Oliveira, 2017). "The primary goal of discipline is to help children become aware of and own their behavior." McPherson and Rogers (2008), p4. Discipline, according to McPherson and Rogers (2008), should never be an end in itself. They also stated that the goal of discipline is to make children aware of their behavior and responsibility to others. Furthermore, Abrell (1976) contends that discipline, particularly self-discipline, is required in the classroom for effective learning. He also states that it is the responsibility of educators to explain the importance of discipline, assist students in developing self-discipline, and identify low levels of performance and unacceptable behavior.

Some studies use the term control instead of discipline. Wilson (1971) emphasized that there is a difference between the concepts of 'control' and 'discipline'. He stated that, while both are types of order, the order in each situation is of a different kind. Wilson (1971) defines control as "a way of ordering things that is considered necessary for getting something done." Wilson (1971, p77). On the contrary, he defines discipline as "the type of logical and evaluative order that must be learned if one is to understand what is involved in doing something." Classroom discipline, according to Bossone (1964), is "training in self-control and orderly social conduct brought about by desirable, effective classroom management." (Bossone, 1964, p. 218) He

contends that if such a definition is to assist instructors in achieving discipline in the classroom, it must be clarified how they can successfully manage their classroom and create a positive classroom environment. "By assisting teachers in becoming more effective classroom managers, the central problem of disruption could be significantly reduced." p. 12 (Department of Education and Science, 1989)

Furthermore, McPherson and Rogers (2008) stated that good discipline includes five functions. According to them, good classroom discipline includes the following:

1. Provides a safe, relational environment – an effective instructor clarifies and examines right and wrong behaviors with the students. Responsible behavior must also be "instructed, recognized, affirmed, and encouraged."
2. Instructs behavior – children become aware of what is sensible and reasonable, as well as what is correct or incorrect. They also learn the significance of reasonable rules and responsibilities.
3. Is preventive – the establishment of fair guidelines and routines, the use of positive corrective language, and the establishment of fair consequences all help to prevent indiscipline.
4. Protects – When a teacher disciplines students who are misbehaving, he or she is protecting the rights of those students whose learning is being disrupted.
5. Promotes a sense of equity – when an educator uses fair and appropriate correction and consequences to deal with misbehavior issues, it demonstrates that s/he is creating a just learning environment.

The present paper, to improve the discipline questionnaire, different views towards the concept of classroom discipline were analyzed using review of literature and interview. Finally, three main factors of discipline were used namely, verbal, non-verbal and behavioral.

Various models, theories, and explanations for classroom indiscipline/misbehavior have been developed (e.g. Hagenauer, Hascher, & Volet, 2015; Mitchell & Bradshaw, 2013; Riley, 2011), and the issue extends beyond academic approaches by a variety of scientific fields (e.g. psychology, sociology, education, politics, historical sciences, economics, social psychiatry). Discipline issues in schools are also receiving attention from the general public and the media (Kupchik & Bracy, 2009; Mills & Keddie, 2010).

According to Edwards (1997), instructors face a variety of discipline issues that are not always easy to manage. Although some of these discipline issues stem from the family or society at large, others are brought on by school policies and procedures as well as the educators themselves. "If teachers are to respond effectively to unproductive student behavior, they must understand the causes of this behavior and develop solutions that are congruent with their personal styles and professional goals," write Jones and Jones (1981) (p.9). Following interviews with several instructors on the causes of indiscipline, Robertson (1981) devised three causes: 1) Causes of Unwanted Behavior, 2) Pay-offs or Rewards for Unwanted Behavior, and 3) Contexts for Unwanted Behavior.

English classes include different communicative exercises that need students' active cooperation, therefore, "students usually have more opportunities in an EFL class than classes of other subjects to speak, to talk, to read loud or even to argue with each other" (Yi, 2006, p. 132). These exercises encourage noise, initiative, and indiscipline (Tomlinson, 1988), and as a result, if the instructor fails to control the class properly, there is a risk of chaos and problematic behavior (Rahimi & Hosseini Karkami, 2015). The presence of noise in the classroom

environment interferes with cognitive processing of information, lowering motivation and achievement scores (Rahimi & Hosseini Karkami, 2015). Most students associate the noise produced by group work activities with a lack of teachers' skill in classroom management. As a result, language learning activities and/or teachers' skill in classroom management may lose their value, and some students may fail to cooperate in classroom exercises (Butler, 2011).

Another aspect of classroom discipline focuses on how to instruct under 'adverse conditions,' which may be related to various management concerns such as teaching large classes, teaching different language proficiency levels in the same class, compromising with the institution, and cheating (Brown, 2001). Finally, in language classes, a wide range of negative class participation examples such as disruptive talk. Negative class participation "appears to contradict the prevalent notion of the EFL/ESL teacher as a beneficent 'facilitator,' guiding highly motivated students on the path to language fluency" (Wadden & McGovern, 1991, p. 126). As a result, dealing with classroom discipline becomes one of the most important aspects of interactive language teaching (Brown, 2001).

Managing English classes in Asia appears to be a more difficult issue (Rahimi & Hosseini Karkami, 2015). In this context, most teachers avoid using oral pair or group work activities because they increase the risk of noise and indiscipline in the classroom, which is insufficient in the context of secondary schooling (Carless, 2007). They believe that traditional techniques such as Presentation, Practice, and Production (PPP) allow them to "maintain control over lesson content, textbook coverage, and classroom discipline" (Carless, 2009, p. 61), and they are unwilling to shift to techniques that cause problems with classroom management and discipline. As a result, the belief in the importance of discipline appears to impede the implementation of communicative exercises in which the instructor is required to discharge some management responsibilities (Carless, 2003). Despite the fact that they continue to use various exercises in language classes, this causes EFL educators to be more interventionist and controlling in their classroom management orientations (Rahimi & Asadollahi, 2012a) (Rahimi & Asadollahi, 2012b).

Furthermore, despite educators' negative attitudes toward learner-centered methodologies, EFL curriculum change in many Asian countries has encouraged EFL educators to use more learner-centered methodologies (Kang, 2013) to language teaching (Adams & Newton, 2009). Using the new methodology without first informing educators about their role in managing learner-centered classes may result in the use of inappropriate discipline strategies, creating a double burden for educators (Carless, 2002). While teachers want to engage students actively in exercises, they find it difficult to maintain appropriate discipline due to noise and interruptions caused by specific oral or group tasks (Carless, 2002). This results in conflicting management behavior, which may cause confusion among students and have a negative impact on their learning (Kang, 2013).

Research Method

Participants and Setting

Two groups of teachers participated in this research from various contexts of teaching (private and public contexts) from Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan, and United States. The first group includes 21

EFL teachers who were chosen based on purposive sampling and the second group were 200 EFL teachers from various context of teaching for the quantitative phase of the study. Their participation was entirely voluntary, and their selection was based on convenience sampling. Table 3 shows the demographic information of participants in quantitative phase. However this is not an exact number for saturation purposes. These participants participated in qualitative part of the study through interview to find the best and most frequent strategies for classroom discipline based on teachers’ perspective. Purposive sampling was employed to choose individuals of the professional community based on four key characteristics: standing in various teaching contexts, academic degree, major, and years of teaching experience (M=10.73 SD=3.14). The demographic information of participants in the qualitative phase is shown in Table 3.

Table 3
Demographic Information of Participants in Qualitative Phase

		Frequency	Percentage
Years of teaching experience	5-10	9	42.85
	11-15	7	33.33
	16-20	3	14.28
	Above 20	2	9.52
Gender	Male	8	38.09
	Female	13	61.90
Age	20-30	8	38.09
	31-40	11	52.38
	41-50	2	9.52
Educational status	MA	18	85.71
	PhD	3	14.28
Major	Teaching	15	71.42
	Literature	4	19.04
	Translation	2	9.52
Total participants		21	100%

Instrumentation

The main instruments used in this study contained of qualitative measure and quantitative measures. In order for the participants to be more directly involved in the process of constructing the aforementioned scale along with aiming at developing a more complete and comprehensive inventory about the issue under investigation, 21 teachers participated in a semi-structured interview to assess their views towards different dimensions of the discipline strategies used by them in their classroom. Interviews were held through different modes” face-to face, recording voice, and Telegram. They took about 10 to 20 minutes. Results of the interview phase of the study was analyzed and coded by the researcher subjectively and discipline strategy use and discipline factors were found.

The main quantitative instruments used in the current study are two questionnaires: 1) Teachers' Classroom Discipline Strategies Scale, designed and validated by the researcher and 2) Teachers' Professional Identity Scale, developed by Jung Chi (2009) and adapted in EFL context by Alaei (2014).

The Teachers' Classroom Discipline Strategies Scale is a questionnaire which was developed and authorized by the researcher. The main components of this scale were determined by a detailed review of the literature in theoretical framework and interview answers. The questionnaire includes two main parts. In part A of the questionnaire, Teachers' Classroom Discipline Strategies use were assessed using 23 items with three main sub-constructs namely, verbal, nonverbal, and behavioral factors. The replies are based on a 5-point Likert Scale with answers ranging from "always" to "never." Three experts tested the questionnaire's face and content validity to ensure that the items measured what they were supposed to assess. The Rasch model was used to test the construct validity of the developed questionnaire. After validation of the questionnaire, two items (4 and 19) which do not fit with Rasch model were removed and 21 items were remained. Therefore, part A of the scale is unidimensional and fits the Rasch model after deleting two items. The Cronbach's alpha reliability was 0.80 for part A.

In addition, 11 discipline criteria were constructed in section B of the proposed questionnaire. The responses were given on a five-point Likert scale (Not at all important, Slightly important, important, Fairly important, Very important). The Discipline Factors Scale's Rasch rating scale research revealed that all 11 items fit the Rasch model. The scale's Cronbach's alpha dependability is 0.52, which is rather low due to the tiny number of elements.

Teacher's professional identity questionnaire was used which was developed by Jung Chi (2009) and adapted in EFL context by Alaei (2014). The initial questionnaire was designed to determine a teacher's professional identity. There are 48 questions on the questionnaire. 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (neutral), 4 (agree), and 5 (strongly agree) on a 5-point Likert scale from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree" (strongly agree). The participants were asked to circle the appropriate responses to express their view on each statement. The questionnaire includes instructions.

The reliability coefficient of this scale in the current study was calculated using Cronbach Alpha. Table 4 shows the reliability of the questionnaire in original study and present study.

Table 4
Reliability of the Teachers' Professional Identity Scale

Scale	Number of Items	Reliability in the Original Study	Reliability in the Present Study
Professional Identity Scale	48	.85	.92

As Table 4 shows, Professional Identity Scale with 48 items enjoys high reliability ($\alpha=.92$) in the present study.

Procedures

As noted previously, the present mixed-method study had two main phases. Initially, in the qualitative phase of the study, 21 Iranian EFL teacher who finished their M.A. and taught in different contexts of teaching were chosen intentionally to be the memberships of the professional community to find main classroom disciplines strategies in EFL context. Then, based on the interview answers and theoretical background Teachers' Classroom Discipline Strategies Scale was designed. After designing the scale, the next step was the validation of the scale. Three experts tested the questionnaire's face and content validity to ensure that the items measured what they were supposed to assess. The Rasch model was used to test the construct validity of the developed questionnaire. 200 EFL teachers took part in the quantitative component of the study via a Google link and paper and pencil questionnaires. All participants were informed that their responses would remain anonymous prior to the delivery of the surveys. It took roughly 20-30 minutes to complete the questionnaires. There was no time constraint when it came to doing. They had to enter demographic information such their age, city, gender, years of teaching experience, types of employers, and major.

Study Design and Analysis

This research used a mixed-methods approach. The layout was self-explanatory in nature. It's a two-step process. Quantitative and qualitative data were collected at different times according to this design. The qualitative portion of the research involved a literature review and an interview. The goal of this phase was to determine the underlying components of the discipline scale used by teachers. Following the interviews, the researcher coded the information and categorized comparable responses.

In the second part of the study (quantitative phase), the designed questionnaire was distributed among EFL teachers. Finally, the designed questionnaire went through a pilot study in order to examine 1) the content and the face validity, and 2) the psychometric characteristics of the questionnaires including reliability and validity. The data analysis of these draft questionnaire provided evidence for the construct validity of the questionnaire to see whether this instrument really measured the constructs they claimed they are measuring. Validation of the designed questionnaire was performed through Rasch Model.

SPSS 24.00 was used to analyze study hypotheses using One-Way ANOVA, independent sample t-test, and Pearson Correlation.

Results

Qualitative Data Analysis

This research study comprised of two parts, qualitative and quantitative. In part A of the qualitative section, the researcher concentrated on the review of the related literature to find any constructs for measuring classroom discipline factors. In the affluent literature, three constructs were found based on different scholars which were verbal, nonverbal, and behavioral. Verbal and nonverbal strategies were based on Altinel (2006) and the interviews and behavioral strategies were based on Newton (1980) and the interviews. There was also one question in the

interview out of which new items for each of the constructs emerged “Q3: How do you try to be fair enough with your students?”.

The pre-specified and emergent themes and coding were used to elicit the sub-themes of the construct.

For the question number three, out of the 21 respondents, 4 interviewees (19.04%) referred to this fact that they try to be fair in sharing activities among all of the students equally, 5 of them (23.80%) mentioned that they try to be fair with all the students through learning their names and 4 of them (19.04%) addressed gender difference is not important. Therefore, these three sub-themes were added to the behavioral construct.

Also the same procedure was taken to find any other themes. The categorization of the themes and sub-themes and their frequency with percentages are shortened in Table 5.

Table 5

Pre-Specified and Emergent Strategies

Part A : Discipline Strategy					
N	Items	Construct	References	F	p
1	I clearly state classroom discipline expectations at the beginning of the course.	Verbal	Mcpherson & Rogers (2008)	3	14.28
2	I usually hint to the problematic behavior in the class.	Verbal	Lewis et al (2005)	13	61.90
3	I discuss the misbehavior in the class.	Verbal	Lewis et al (2005)	9	42.85
4	I blame / reprimand misbehaving students verbally in the class.	Verbal	Lewis et al (2005), Newton(1980)	3	14.28
5	I explain about misbehavior and its consequences.	Verbal	Chiu(1995)	5	23.80
6	I try to reward students verbally for their good behavior in the class.	Verbal	Chiu(1995), Newton (1980)	9	42.85
7	I ignore the students’ misbehavior.	Non-verbal	Altinel(2006)	6	28.57
8	I stare at impolite students when I see some misbehavior.	Non-verbal	Altinel(2006)	5	23.80
9	I frown when I see some misbehavior.	Non-verbal	Altinel(2006)	2	9.52
10	I reward students nonverbally for their good behavior in the class.	Non-verbal	Chiu(1995), Newton(1980)	9	42.85
11	I try to have a friendly relationship with all students.	Behavioral	Roache & Lewis(2011)	6	28.57
12	I try to be fair with all students through sharing activities among all of them equally.	Behavioral	Interview	10	47.61
13	I am fair with all students through sharing attention among them equally.	Behavioral	Interview	4	19.04
14	I usually try to be fair with all students through learning all the students' names.	Behavioral	Interview	5	23.80
15	I try to be fair with both genders.	Behavioral	Interview	4	19.04
16	I try to motivate all students.	Behavioral	Wadden & McGovern (1991)	18	85.71
17	I usually try to adapt the difficulty level of the lessons.	Behavioral	Brown (2001)	3	14.28
18	I involve all of the students in decision making.	Behavioral	Lewis et al (2005)	17	80.95

19	In case of a very rude misbehavior, I send that student out of the class.	Behavioral	Lewis(2001), Newton (1980)	3	14.28
20	I instruct students how to take over responsibility.	Behavioral	Roache & Lewis(2011), Newton (1980)	19	90.47
21	I arrange the classroom structure or setting to maximize the proximity and minimize crowd and distraction.	Behavioral	Carless (2007)	9	42.85
22	I actively supervise students like moving in the class, walking, interacting and reinforcing.	Behavioral	Chin (1995)	7	33.33
23	I acknowledge students for following the rule.	Behavioral	Lewis(2001)	6	28.57

In part B, the questionnaire which was about discipline factors, five new factors appeared based on the interview questions and six were found from the literature. There was one question and out of which these new items emerged in part B.

Q1: What is classroom discipline to you?

For this question, out of 21 respondents ,7 interviewees referred to the student’s punctuality, and 14 of them (66.66%) noticed teachers’ punctuality as an important factor. 3 of them (14.28%) referred to teasing others, one of them to Chewing gum (4.76%) and 9 of them (42.85%) to using cell phones as noticeable factors.

As mentioned before in part A, the pre-specified and new discipline factors were found and they were reported in the below table. Also, the references of related literature were clarified in the Table 6.

Table 6

The Pre-Specified and New Discipline Factors

Part B: Discipline factors				
N	Discipline factors	References	f	p
1	Disruption	Wadden & McGovern (1991)	6	28.57
2	Defiance (disobedience)	Chiu (1995)	6	28.57
3	Students in attention	Chiu (1995)	9	42.85
4	Students not being punctual	Interview	7	33.33
5	Teachers are not being punctual	Interview	14	66.66
6	Not doing homework	Wadden & McGovern (1991)	7	33.33
7	Inaudible responses	Wadden & McGovern (1991)	5	23.80
8	Teasing others	Interview	3	14.28
9	Chewing gum	Interview	1	4.76
10	Using cell phone	Interview	9	42.85
11	Reluctance to speak in L2	Wadden & McGovern (1991)	4	19.04

The primary questionnaire developed with two separate sections; that is 23 items and three constructs on a Likert type scale (from always to never) for part A and 11 factors for part B on a

Likert scale (from not at all important to very important). Then, the questionnaire was sent to three experts of the field who were among the associate and assistant professors of the university to check face and content validity. After receiving their ideas on the questionnaire the scale which was categorized for part A as applied and not applied changed to Likert type ranging from always, usually, sometimes, Rarely to Never. Moreover, part B changed from very important and not important to not at all important, slightly important, important, fairly important, very important. Furthermore, grammatical edits were suggested. The experts all agreed on the constructs and all items.

Quantitative Data Analysis

After developing the questionnaire in the qualitative phase, the second phase of the research dealt with the quantitative data analysis to validate the scale and explore its relationship with professional identity, gender, work place, and years of teaching experiences. For validation steps, the primary developed questionnaire was sent to 200 EFL teachers. Then responses were analyzed by using WINSTEPS Rasch measurement programme (Linacre, 2017a).

Preliminary Analysis

This section presents both Normality and descriptive statistics.

Normality

Table 7 shows the results of a check on the normality of the distributions of all the tests utilized in the research. The distributions' skewness and kurtosis values were computed. Skewness is a measure that shows how far a distribution deviates from symmetry around the mean, whereas Kurtosis shows how "peaked" or "flat" a distribution is. Skewness and Kurtosis values of zero indicate that the data is perfectly normal. However, values between 1 and 2 are considered excellent, and values between 3 and 4 are considered adequate (West, Finch, & Curran, 1995).

Table 7

Normality Test for the Variables

	DIS	IDEN	Disc_Factors
Skewness	-1.94	-.45	-.18
SE of Skewness	.172	.17	.17
Kurtosis	1.98	-.56	1.20
SE of Kurtosis	.342	.34	.34

As Table 7 shows, all values are acceptable. As a result, we can assume that the distributions for all of the tests in the study are normal.

Descriptive Statistics

The descriptive statistics for the discipline strategies scale, identity, and discipline factors are presented in Table 8, Mean, Median, Mode, Standard Deviation, Variance, Range, Minimum, and Maximum are all included.

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics for the Discipline Strategies Scale, Identity, and Discipline Factors

	Discipline Strategies	Identity	Discipline Factors
Mean	90.54	186.02	39.16
Median	92.00	189.50	39.00
Mode	92.00	202.00	38.00
Std. Deviation	7.44	20.99	4.04
Variance	55.36	440.93	16.32
Range	44.00	90.00	29.00
Minimum	58.00	135.00	25.00
Maximum	102.00	225.00	54.00

As Table 8 indicates, minimum and maximum scores for total Teacher Discipline Scale are 58 and 102 and the mean score is 90.54. Moreover, minimum and maximum scores for total professional identity Scale are 135 and 225 and the mean score is 186.02.

Main Data Analysis

This section presents the validation procedure for the designed scale using WINSTEPS Rasch measurement programme (Linacre, 2017a). Also the One-Way ANOVA tests and Pearson correlation which were used to verify the rest of the hypotheses are discussed.

Data Analysis for Validity of the Scale

The Rasch model (Rasch, 1960/1980) was used to provide validity evidence for the discipline factors scale. Using the Winsteps Rasch measurement program, the Rasch rating scale model (Andrich, 1978) was fitted to the discipline strategies scale (Linacre, 2017a). The fit of the data to the Rasch model indicates that the covariation among the items is caused by a latent trait and that there is a causal relationship between variations in the construct and test scores (Baghaei & Tabatabaei, 2016, Baghaei & Shoahosseini, 2019, Borsboom, Mellenbergh, & van Heerden, 2004).

Results of Rasch rating scale analysis of the discipline strategies scale are reported in Table 9. 'Measure' indicates item difficulty or agreeability. The higher the values of 'Measure' the harder the item is to agree with or, in this case, it is less frequently used by the teachers. The lower the

item measure the easier it is. In this case, it means that the strategy is used more often by the teachers.

Table 9

Item measures and fit statistics for the Discipline Strategies scale

Item	TOTAL	TOTAL		INFIT	OUTFIT	PT-MEASURE	EXACT MATCH							
NUMBER	SCORE	COUNT	MEASURE	S.E.	MNSQ	ZSTD	MNSQ	ZSTD	CORR.	EXP.	OBS%	EXP%	ITEM	
1	835	200	-.32	.09	.89	-1.2	.93	-.8	.49	.40	47.5	42.6	D1	
2	818	200	-.17	.09	1.19	2.0	1.16	1.7	.46	.40	37.5	42.9	D2	
3	699	200	.73	.08	.96	-.4	.95	-.5	.28	.40	38.5	42.4	D3	
4	572	200	1.61	.08	1.39	3.6	1.44	4.0	-.06	.39	42.5	46.1	D4	
5	775	200	.18	.09	1.15	1.6	1.14	1.5	.41	.40	45.0	43.5	D5	
6	754	200	.33	.09	.95	-.5	.95	-.6	.49	.40	41.5	43.3	D6	
7	679	200	.87	.08	.64	-4.4	.64	-4.4	.40	.40	54.0	42.7	D7	
8	669	200	.94	.08	.68	-3.8	.69	-3.7	.27	.40	52.5	43.0	D8	
9	610	200	1.35	.08	.76	-2.6	.77	-2.6	.25	.40	53.0	45.7	D9	
10	792	200	.04	.09	1.34	3.4	1.30	3.1	.57	.40	35.5	43.5	D10	
11	906	200	-1.08	.12	1.01	.1	.93	-.6	.57	.37	56.5	61.0	D11	
12	878	200	-.75	.10	.88	-1.2	.89	-1.1	.48	.38	46.5	48.6	D12	
13	867	200	-.63	.10	.89	-1.1	.91	-.9	.46	.39	48.5	46.6	D13	
14	869	200	-.65	.10	1.17	1.7	1.11	1.1	.55	.39	36.5	46.5	D14	
15	859	200	-.55	.10	.91	-.9	.92	-.8	.45	.39	45.5	45.1	D15	
16	874	200	-.70	.10	.92	-.8	.90	-.9	.30	.39	47.5	48.5	D16	
17	876	200	-.72	.10	.78	-2.2	.78	-2.2	.52	.39	51.0	48.6	D17	
18	846	200	-.42	.10	1.02	.2	1.06	.7	.37	.39	49.0	42.9	D18	
19	487	200	2.20	.08	1.94	7.9	2.02	8.4	.04	.37	27.0	43.1	D19	
20	857	200	-.53	.10	.59	-4.9	.59	-4.9	.61	.39	56.0	43.6	D20	
21	855	200	-.51	.10	.86	-1.5	.86	-1.5	.47	.39	47.5	43.7	D21	
22	875	200	-.71	.10	.96	-.3	.97	-.2	.49	.39	48.0	48.5	D22	
23	856	200	-.52	.10	.79	-2.2	.80	-2.1	.44	.39	53.5	43.6	D23	

As Table 9 shows, Item 19 (*In case of a very rude misbehavior, I send the student out of the class*) is the hardest item with a measure of 2.20. That is, this strategy is used less often by the teachers. Item 11 (*I try to have a friendly relationship with all the students*) with a measure of -1.08 is the easiest item. It means that the strategy is used by many teachers. 'SE' is the standard error of the estimation of item difficulty or measure. The smaller the SE, the more accurate the estimation of item difficulties are.

The following columns display 'Infit MNSQ' and 'Outfit MNSQ.' In a nutshell, Infit and outfit mean square (MNSQ) values are residual summaries (usually mean). The residuals are the differences between Rasch model predictions and observed item responses. The less difference there is between Rasch model predictions and actual people's responses, the better the data fits the model. One is the ideal value for infit and outfit mean square statistics. However, values ranging from .60 to .40 are acceptable (Linacre, 2017b). Misfitting items are not part of the construct being measured by the other items and should be removed. They, in fact, introduce construct-irrelevant variance into the data (Baghaei, 2008). Item 4 and Item 19 do not fit the Rasch model and should be removed. The Chronbach's alphas reliability of the scale is 0.75.

For conditional independence to hold, the residuals are expected to be uncorrelated. If the residuals are independent, it is evidence that the items are related only through the target dimension and no nuisance dimension exists. To check the independence of the residuals they are subjected to principal components analysis. If the data is unidimensional, we should expect no discernible factor to be extracted from the residuals. If, on the other hand, a factor is extracted from the residuals, it indicates that the data are not unidimensional and that the Rasch model does not fit (Baghaei & Cassady, 2014; Linacre, 2017b).

Principal components analysis of standardized residuals (PCASR) for the Discipline Strategies Scale showed that the eigenvalue of the first construct is 2.4 which is above the maximum value of 2, indicating that the scale is not unidimensional (Linacre, 2017b). In the reanalysis, Item 4 and 11 were deleted and PCASR was run again. After deleting the two misfitting items, the eigenvalue of the first construct dropped to 2, supporting unidimensionality and fit of the data to the Rasch model. Therefore, the scale is unidimensional and fits the Rasch model after deleting two items. The Cronbach's alpha reliability was .80 after deleting the two misfitting items.

Thresholds are the points on the rating scale where the likelihood of selecting either of two adjacent categories is equal. Because there is no preceding category in the first category, there is no threshold. Estimated thresholds show how difficult it is to observe each category. We anticipate that threshold estimates will rise as category values rise. Threshold estimates that are disordered, i.e., thresholds that do not advance with category values, indicate that the category is rarely marked and has a narrow interval on the variable, or the definition of categories is problematic (Linacre, 2017b). The threshold parameters for the scale were ordered with values of -2.39, -0.80, 1.00, and 2.18.

Although theoretically three subscales had been envisaged for the Discipline Strategies Scale, Rasch model analysis demonstrated that, excluding two items, the scale is psychometrically unidimensional and a single score can be assigned to respondents. Assigning separate scores on the subscales is also possible, however, the reliability of the subscales are rather low. The Cronbach's alpha reliability for the verbal, nonverbal, and behavioral subscales are .43, .39, and .71, respectively.

Discussion & Conclusions

The study results, which were explained in the previous section, are discussed and interpreted in this section. As previously stated, the current mixed method study had three goals. First, in the qualitative phase of the study, the current study designed and validated a new questionnaire to assess teachers' classroom discipline. The relationships between classroom discipline strategies and teachers' professional identities were then investigated in the quantitative phase of the study. Finally, the current study investigated the relationships between some demographic information (gender, place of employment, and years of teaching experience) and teacher classroom discipline strategies. In this section, all of the current study's findings are discussed in relation to previous research.

Although theoretically three subscales had been envisaged for the Discipline Strategies Scale, Rasch model analysis demonstrated that, excluding two items, the scale is psychometrically unidimensional and a single score can be assigned to respondents. Assigning separate scores on

the subscales is also possible, however, the reliability of the subscales are rather low. The Cronbach's alpha reliability for the verbal, nonverbal, and behavioral subscales are .43, .39, and .71, respectively.

The reliability of the total instrument without considering the sub-scales yielded a coefficient of 0.80. Therefore, the newly designed and validated teachers' classroom discipline strategies questionnaire may be utilized in different fields of study to fill the gaps in the area of English language teaching and learning.

Therefore, it is suggested to use a total score for the scale. However, the discussion of the findings discussed below concentrates on the three sub-scales to present more detailed support from the literature to compare and construct the findings.

Analyzing qualitative data of the study revealed three sub-constructs for teacher discipline concept naming verbal, non-verbal and behavioral. This finding is supported by previous studies (Altinel, 2006, Lewis, 2001; Newtown, 1980, Roache & Lewis, 2011).

The findings are consistent with Altinel's (2006) study in terms of verbal and nonverbal strategies. Altinel (2006) investigated Turkish EFL teachers' and students' perceptions of the concept of misbehaviors, different causes of misbehaviors, types of misbehaviors among high-school students, and the strategies their teachers used to discipline the class. The findings revealed that the most common discipline strategies used by teachers were verbal strategies such as verbal warning, threatening, and communicating with parents, as well as nonverbal strategies such as eye contact and ignoring misbehavior.

In addition, regarding behavioral strategies found in the qualitative study, the result is supported by Newtown' (1980) study. In his Educational Technology model as a scientific approach to discipline, states that students' behavior is shaped by the reinforcement they receive from adults and the environment. The results of another study done by Lewis (2001) uncovered the importance of behavioral discipline strategies. Lewis (2001) mentioned that learners "who receive more relationship-based discipline are less disrupted when teachers deal with misbehavior and generally act more responsibly in that teacher's class" (p.315).

Furthermore, results of the frequency of the qualitative answers revealed that item 20 "I instruct students how to take over responsibility" had the highest frequency (f=19, p=90.47%) and majority of the teachers selected it as the most important discipline strategy. This result is in line with Roache and Lewis (2011) and Newton (1980). They also insisted on the significance of the learner responsibility in classroom discipline.

Furthermore, the first hypothesis was accepted, and no statistically significant difference was found between the discipline of EFL teachers and their gender. This finding is consistent with previous research that has found no evidence of gender differences in teachers' disciplinary strategies. Similar findings were obtained by Salvano-Pardieu, Fontaine, Bouazzaoui, and Florer (2009). Their findings revealed that both male and female teachers judged disobedient students in the same way. Gilligan (1982) discovered no statistically significant differences in teacher discipline. Indeed, his findings on male and female teachers' discipline were very similar, indicating the same pattern of strategies. Furthermore, Walker (1991) failed to find a significant difference in gender for the vast majority of participants (85.5 percent). However, the result is inconsistent with Uthman' s (2012) study which found out significant gender differences between teachers and students' discipline, in some gender-related variables.

Regarding the second hypothesis, results of ANOVA showed that the null hypothesis which there is no noteworthy change between EFL teachers' discipline and their work places was accepted. In other words, there was no statistically substantial modification between the means of the four work places (Private School, Public School, Institute, and University). This shows that discipline strategies use is similarly important in each work place. Results of descriptive statistics showed among four work places, teachers reported the highest mean score of discipline strategies use in public school. This means that in EFL context, public school language teachers use more discipline strategies in their classroom. Bushaw and Gallup (2008) also reported that classroom organization is one of the main issue that public school teachers face with.

Furthermore, based on the findings of the study, the third hypothesis was accepted, and no statistically significant difference was found between the discipline of EFL teachers and their years of teaching experience. Thompson (1994) supports this finding by stating that the concept of discipline is one of the primary concerns of both novice and professional experienced teachers. The finding is also consistent with the findings of Ünal and Ünal (2012). They investigated and compared novice (zero to seven years of experience) and experienced (eight years and more) teachers' attitudes toward classroom discipline. They discovered that there is no significant difference in classroom discipline beliefs on behavior and management between male and female teachers. Besides, Green (2006) cautioned that "years of experience in the classroom do not guarantee exemplary results with regards to classroom management" (P. 88).

Finally, based on the results of the present study, the last hypothesis was rejected and a medium positive significant relationship was found between teachers' EFL teachers' discipline and their professional identity. This result is supported by Landau's (2001) statement about Professionalism and management which stated classroom management strategies are the most valuable skills set a professional teacher can have. Previous findings also continuously have revealed that one of the keys to professional success in teaching is the teacher's ability to discipline the classroom and to manage instruction (Brophy, 1988; Cakmak, 2008; Emmer, Evertson, & Worsham, 2000; as cited in Ünal & Ünal, 2012).

According to the basis of the present research, it was concluded that the designed questionnaire is a valid and reliable unidimensional scale for assessing teachers' classroom discipline strategies. Moreover, it could be concluded that teachers' classroom discipline strategies use is correlated positively with teachers' professional identity. In other words, teachers with high level of professional identity use more classroom discipline strategies. Finally, results of the association between different demographic information (gender, work place, years of teaching experience) and classroom discipline yield this conclusion that there is no significant difference between teachers' discipline use and their demographic information.

This can be justified that discipline seems to be a factor related to ones' personality. In other words, it is not affected by any biological or situational factors like age, work place, etc. Also these results highlight the significant role of teachers' discipline strategies use in teachers' professional development identity.

Pedagogical Implications

This research contains a number of implications for teachers, supervisors, students, policy makers and researchers. First, the outcomes of the current research are helpful for the teachers

by giving them additional classroom discipline strategies and a clearer understanding of the classroom discipline factors. If teachers can acquire these knowledge and strategies, they will be able to improve their professional identity and as a result, students could potentially achieve more. Moreover, focusing on teachers' professional identity seems very important and necessary, because teachers especially novice ones are impressionable and try to make some decisions that may influence them during their career life. Therefore, the identity they develop is a crucial factor for success in their profession.

Supervisors also can use from the outcomes of the research. They can measure their newly employed teachers' use of discipline strategies to ensure the quality of their staff. Besides they can add it to the teachers' training courses to exactly and explicitly point to discipline strategies.

Besides, the findings of this study are also helpful for policy makers in designing teacher training programs or workshops which provide teachers with opportunities to promote different discipline strategies and positive identities and familiarize them with these important concepts to improve their students' achievement.

Finally, the present study is helpful for other researchers. This study added new information to literature by presenting a new questionnaire for teachers' discipline strategies. This knowledge can aware other researchers to work on further analysis with this new questionnaire and find its relationship with different variables.

Funding

The author received no direct funding for this research.

References

- Abrell, R.L. (1976). Classroom discipline without punishment. *The Clearing House*, 50(4), 171- 173.
- Adams, R., & Newton, J. (2009). TBLT in Asia: Constraints and opportunities. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 19, 1-17.
- Alaee, M. (2014). Investigating the relationship between multiple intelligence and Teachers' professional identity. *Association of Applied Linguistics*, 19(2), 1-21.
- Altinel, Z. (2006). *Student misbehavior in EFL classes: Teachers and students' perspectives*. (Unpublished M.A. thesis). Cukurova University: Adana, Turkey.
- Altinel, Z. (2006). *Student misbehavior in EFL classes: Teachers and students' perspectives*. (Unpublished M.A. thesis). Cukurova University: Adana, Turkey.
- Baghaei, P., & Cassady, J. (2014). Validation of the Persian translation of the Cognitive Test Anxiety Scale. *Sage Open*, 4, 1-11.
- Baghaei, P., & Shoahosseini, R. (2019). A note on the Rasch model and the instrument-based account of validity. *Rasch Measurement Transactions*, 32, 1705-1708.
- Baghaei, P., & Tabatabaee-Yazdi, M. (2016). The logic of latent variable analysis as validity evidence in psychological measurement. *The Open Psychology Journal*, 9, 168-175.
- Borsboom, D., Mellenbergh, G. J., & van Heerden, J. (2004). The concept of validity. *Psychological Review*, 111, 1061–1071.
- Bossone, R.M. (1964). What is Classroom Discipline? *The Clearing House*, 39(4), 218 – 221.

- Briffa, A. (2012). *Responsible Classroom Discipline in Early Schooling* (unpublished thesis). University of Malta Library.
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles*. White Plains, NY: Pearson Education LTD.
- Brown, J. J. (2006). *The Teacher-Self: The Role of Identity in Teaching* (Ph.D. dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses.
- Butler, Y.G. (2011). The implementation of communicative and task-based language teaching in the Asia-Pacific region? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 36-57.
- Carless, D. (2007). The suitability of task-based approaches for secondary schools: Perspectives from Hong Kong. *System*, 35, 595-608.
- Charles, C.M., & Senter, G.W. (2005). *Building Classroom Discipline*. (8th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Chiu, L. H. (1995). Student teachers and classroom discipline. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 88(3), 164-171.
- Day, C. & Gu, Q. (2010). *The New Lives of Teachers (Teacher Quality and School Development)*. London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Edwards, C.H. (1997). *Classroom Discipline and Management* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.
- Edwards, D., & Mullis, F. (2003). Classroom meetings: Encouraging a climate of cooperation. *Professional School Counseling*, 7, 20-28.
- Eick, C., & Reed, C. (2001). What makes an inquiry-oriented science teacher? the influence of learning histories on student teacher role identity and practice. *Science Teacher Education*, 86(3), 401-416.
- Espelage, D., & Lopes, J. (2013). *Indisciplina na escola*. Lisboa, Portugal: Fundação Francisco Manuel dos Santos.
- Freiberg, H. J. (1996). From tourists to citizens in the classroom. *Educational Leadership*, 54(1), 32-36.
- Freiberg, H. J., Stein, T. A., & Huang, S. (1995). Effects of a classroom management intervention on student achievement in inner-city elementary schools. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 1, 36-66.
- Glasser, W. (1984). *Control Theory: A New Explanation of How We Control Our Lives*. New York: Perennial Library/Harper and Row.
- Green, P. P. (2001, February). *Prevention, Intervention, and Remediation: A Model for Behavioral Change*. Paper presented at the National Conference of American Association of School Administrators, San Diego, CA.
- Hagenauer, G., Hascher, T., & Volet, S. E. (2015). Teacher emotions in the classroom: associations with students' engagement, classroom discipline and the interpersonal teacher-student relationship. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 30, 385-403.
- Isotalo, S. (2017). *Teacher Educators' Professional Identity Formation in a Challenging Context: Experience from Eritrea* (MA Thesis), University of Jyväskylä.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, F. (2006). *Joining together: Group theory and group skills*. Boston: Allyn & Baco.
- Jones, L.S., & Jones, V.F. (1981). *Responsible Classroom Discipline: Creating Positive Learning Environments and Solving Problems*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Jung Chi, H. (2009). *Development and Examination of a Model of Science Teacher Identity (STI)*, Unpublished Thesis, Ohio State University, Columbus campus.

- Jung Chi, H. (2009). *Development and Examination of a Model of Science Teacher Identity (STI)*, Unpublished Thesis, Ohio State University, Columbus campus.
- Kang, D. M. (2013). EFL teachers' language use for classroom discipline: A look at complex interplay of variables. *System*, 41(1), 149-163.
- Landau, B.M. (2001, April). *Teaching Classroom management: A stand-alone necessity for preparing new teachers*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA.
- Landau, B.M. (2001, April). *Teaching Classroom management: A stand-alone necessity for preparing new teachers*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA.
- Langdon, Carol A. (1996). The Third Phi Delta Kappan Poll of Teachers' Attitudes Towards the Public Schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 78(3), 244–250.
- Lewis, R. (1997a). *The Discipline Dilemma* (2nd ed.). Melbourne: The Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Lewis, R. (1997b). Discipline in schools. In L. J. Saha (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of the sociology in education* (pp. 404–411). Oxford: Pergamon,
- Lewis, R. (1999). Teachers coping with the stress of classroom discipline. *Social Psychology of Education*, 3, 155–171.
- Lewis, R. (2001). Classroom discipline and student responsibility: The students' view. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 307-319.
- Lopes, J., & Oliveira, C. (2017). Classroom discipline: Theory and practice. In J. P. Bakken (Ed.), *Classrooms: Academic content and behavior strategy instruction for students with and without disabilities* (Vol. 2, pp. 231-253). New York, NY: Nova Science Publishers.
- Mahmoodi, M., Izadi, N., & Dehghannezhad, M. (2015). An investigation into the relationship among EFL teachers' reflection, classroom management orientations, and perceptions of language learning strategies and students' L2 achievement. *Applied Research On English Language*, 4(2) 25-42.
- Martin, L. A., Chiodo, J. J., & Chang, L. (2001). First year teachers: Looking back after three years. *Action in Teacher Education*, 23, (1), 55-61.
- Martin, N. K. & Sass, D. (2010). *Construct Validation of the Behavior and Instructional Management Scale*. Teacher and Teacher Education. University of Texas, San Antonio.
- McPherson, E., & Rogers, B. (2008). *Behaviour Management with Young Children: Crucial First Steps with Children 3-7 Years*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Mirzaee, A. & Rahimi, M. (2017). An Investigation on Relationship between Iranian EFL Teachers' Creativity and Classroom Management strategies and Learners' Improvement. *Journal of Advances in English Language Teaching*, 5(4), 31-45.
- Mitchell, M., & Bradshaw, C. (2013). Examining classroom influences on student perceptions of school climate: The role of classroom management and exclusionary discipline strategies. *Journal of School Psychology*, 51(5), 599-610.
- Newton, R. R. (1980). Models of schooling and theories of discipline. *High School Journal*, 63(5), 183-190.
- Newton, R. R. (1980). Models of schooling and theories of discipline. *High School Journal*, 63(5), 183-190.

- Osgood, J. (2006). Professionalism and performativity: the feminist challenge facing early years' practitioners. *Early Years*, 26(2), 187-199.
- Pearl, A., & Knight, A. (1998). *Democratic Schooling: Theory to Guide Educational Practice*. New Jersey: Hampton Press.
- Rahimi, M., & Asadollahi, F. (2012a). EFL teachers' classroom management orientations: investigating the role of individual differences and contextual variables. *Procedia-Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 31, 43-48.
- Rahimi, M., & Hoseini Karkami, F. (2015). The role of teachers' classroom discipline in their teaching effectiveness and students' language learning motivation and achievement: A path method. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 3(1), 57-82.
- Rahimi, M., & Hosseini, F. (2012). EFL teachers' classroom discipline strategies: the students' perspective. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 31, 309 – 314.
- Riley, P. (2011). *Attachment theory and the teacher–student relationship: A practical guide for teachers, teacher educators and school leaders*. London: Routledge.
- Roache, J., & Lewis, R. (2011). The carrot, the stick, or the relationship: what are the effective discipline strategies? *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 34(2), 231-246.
- Robertson, J. (1981). *Effective Classroom Control*. Kent: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Rodgers, C. R., & Scott, K. H. (2008). The development of the personal self and professional identity in learning to teach. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman- Nemser, D. J. McIntyre, & K. E. Demers (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (3rd ed., pp.855- 885). New York, NY: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group & the Association of Teacher Educators.
- Samuel, M. (2008). Accountability to whom? For what? Teacher identity and the Force Field Module of teacher development. *Perspectives in Education*, 26(2), 1-148.
- Schneider, E. (1996). Giving students a voice in the classroom. *Educational Leadership*, 54(1), 22–26.
- Shupe, J. (1998). Prescriptive discipline: Just what the doctor ordered. *NASSP Bulletin*, 82(596), 25-30.
- Sowell, H. K. (2013). *Classroom management strategies: The impact on student achievement* (unpublished thesis). Liberty University.
- Swinson, J. & Cording, M. (2002) Assertive Discipline in a school for pupils with emotional and behavioral difficulties. *British Journal of Special Education*, 29(2), 72-75.
- Swinson, J., & Melling, R. (1995). Assertive discipline: Four wheels on this wagon-Areply to Robinson and Maines. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 11(3), 3-8.
- Teven, J., & McCroskey, J. (1997). The relationship of perceived teacher caring with student learning and teacher evaluation. *Communication Education*, 46, 167-177.
- Tomlinson, B. (1988). Conflicts in TEFL: Reasons for failure in secondary schools. *Institute of Language in Education Journal*, 4, 103-110.
- Vitto, J. M. (2003). *Relationship-driven classroom management: Strategies that promote student motivation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Wadden, P., & McGovern, S. (1991). The quandary of negative class participation: Coming to terms with misbehavior in the language classroom. *ELT Journal*, 45, 119-127.
- Wadden, P., & McGovern, S. (1991). The quandary of negative class participation: Coming to terms with misbehavior in the language classroom. *ELT Journal*, 45, 119-127.

Sadat (2021)

Wilson, P.S. (1971). *Interest and Discipline in Education*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Yi, F. (2006). *EFL classroom management: Creating a positive climate for learning*. Retrieved January 2011.