

Teachers' Misbehaviours in Class and Students' Reactions: A Case Study

Reem Alkurdi
University of Jordan
Jordan

Sharif Alghazo
University of Jordan
Jordan

Abstract

This study aims to investigate English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers' misbehaviours in class and their students' reactions to these misbehaviours. Towards this end, 60 classroom observations of six English language teachers (N=10 each) were conducted at a public school in Jordan. Moreover, a survey was used to elicit 201 students' reactions to their teachers' misbehaviours by gauging their satisfaction with the teachers' communication styles. Finally, the teacher participants were interviewed in order to more deeply understand why such misbehaviours occurred. Analysis of the data is grounded in the Expectancy Violation Theory. The results revealed that when the mean value of teachers' communication style was more than 3 on a 5-point Likert Scale, the students often perceived their teachers as being positive, and the students compensated most of their teachers' misbehaviours. However, when the mean value was below 3, the teachers were perceived as being negative, and the students reciprocated for most of the misbehaviours. The results also showed that the students are more tolerant towards their teachers' misbehaviours as long as the teacher is perceived to be positive. The study provides insights into understanding the student-teacher relationship in EFL classes.

Keywords: compensate misbehaviours, reactions, reciprocate

Educationists in Jordan face many challenges that negatively affect the quality of education. For example, there is the challenge of over-crowded classes where teachers must spend much of class time to maintain discipline. This implies that teachers have to double their efforts so as to both manage classes and provide good teaching. Moreover, there is the problem of poor facilities and infrastructure which makes the task of teaching more demanding. Educators in Jordan also complain about parents' coordination with school personnel despite calls to strengthen connections between schools and homes. The source of this problem is like the classic chicken-or-egg question. These challenges are attributed to both the limited resources that schools have and to social and cultural beliefs of the Jordanian people (Alhabahba et al., 2016).

Professional educators also confess that teachers themselves – though valued as they play a key role in the educational process – may represent a challenge (Asassfeh, 2015). In addition to having the responsibility of delivering classes, teachers take on other roles in society: parents, supervisors, and social workers, among other things. Teachers are usually criticised for their students' achievement both academically and socially. Thus, teachers are expected to have pedagogical skills as well as management and communication skills so that they can deal with students and their parents. Teachers are also required to examine their students' needs and styles and work towards matching their own styles to those of their students. Furthermore, teachers are expected to come to class prepared to deliver knowledge and to manage large classes in the limited time available in each lesson. They have also to respond to parents' expectations of teaching students both content and imparting morality. These and other responsibilities have made the teaching profession unfavourable sometimes by those who lack the skill and ability to work under pressure. The many responsibilities have also led to creating a dysfunctional atmosphere that is unpleasant for both teacher and students. This situation has attracted the attention of researchers who try to understand the causes of these objectionable encounters and to provide solutions to remedy the flawed environment for a better quality of instruction (Alhabahba et al., 2016).

As for the status and teaching of English, it is unquestionable that English has become an international language that is necessary for almost all professionals in the world (Jenkins, 2017). Jordanian professionals are no exception. English is taught as a foreign language to students in Jordan and learning it has become a major concern of most Jordanians. Its spread over the world has expanded the need to learn it, particularly because it is the language of technology and innovation in today's globe. However in Jordan, learning English represents a challenge to many students who find it a difficult subject. This is the perception of teachers who also find it a challenge to teach, especially as most of them usually lack a high level of proficiency to deliver classes in English.

Teaching English demands a considerable amount of effort on the part of teachers who – in addition to lacking high levels of competency in English – usually lack training in teaching methodology. This is demanding because teachers must find a teaching method that meets their students' needs and their own teaching styles. Most English language teachers in Jordan hold a degree in English language and literature, rather than in teaching methodology (Al-Hazmi, 2003). However, effective teachers are expected to have – in addition to adequate knowledge of the subject matter – knowledge of pedagogy and psychology to teach effectively and deal with students and manage classes (Baderaddin, 2015). Borich (2015) argues that teachers should have expertise in their subject matter and an ability to manage classes and maintain discipline. Moreover, the teacher-student relationship should be based on productive

interactions which, as Abrantes et al., (2007) argue, make the learning of the second language easier.

This research concerns the study of the teacher-student relationship and explores the negative side of teachers' communication styles. The study explores – through observations of the performance of EFL teachers in class – misbehaviours of teachers and their students' perception of and response to these misbehaviours. In response to their teachers' misbehaviours, students may compensate or reciprocate. When a student compensates for a teacher's misbehaviour, the student is not responding in kind with a misbehaviour. Rather, the student may be nicer or kinder and overlook the bad treatment. However, when a student reciprocates, the student responds in kind with another misbehaviour. Employing Goodboy's and Myers' (2015) scale of teachers' misbehaviours, this investigation seeks answers to the following research questions:

1. What are the types of misbehaviours that English language teachers commit in their classrooms?
2. How do students react to such misbehaviours? Do they compensate and/or reciprocate with teachers' misbehaviours?

This study is expected to contribute to mainstream literature on teacher-student relationships, class management, and student achievement in EFL classes. It is hoped that the study gives a glimpse of how EFL teachers behave or misbehave in class and raise awareness among educationalists of how students respond to their teachers' actions and behaviours. Of significance to this study is the reporting of students' voices in relation to EFL teachers' misbehaviours, particularly, from those students whose voices have often remained unheard in the past. By doing so, the study implements the maxims of student-centred methodologies which see the student as the centre of the learning process (Nunan, 2013).

Literature Review

The literature on language pedagogy abounds with studies on students' misbehaviours and solutions to manage these misbehaviours by teachers. However, little is known about teachers' misbehaviours in language classes and how students perceive and respond to these actions. As a result of the little research on teachers' misbehaviours, three main typologies emerged. The first was put forward by Kearney, Plax, Hays and Ivey (1991) who examined whether or not teachers represent a cause of instructional and motivational problems in college classes. The results revealed many misbehaviours ranging from misspelling of words to verbal abuse and that most students reported that their teachers carried out more than one misbehaviour in a lesson. The findings also showed that teachers' misbehaviours are of three types: incompetence, offensiveness, and indolence.

In a study to identify other misbehaviours that were not found in Kearney, et al. (1991), Toal (2001) asked students to evaluate their classroom experiences and their teachers' misbehaviours. The results indicated that there are three types of misbehaviours: irresponsibility, derisiveness, and apathy which are similar to those found in Kearney, et al. (1991). In a third study that aimed at investigating misbehaviours that could result from teachers' use of technology, Goodboy and Myers (2015) developed Kearney, et al.'s work and resented new categories to judge teachers' misbehaviours. In their study, in which an open-ended survey was used, the researchers found 16 misbehaviours which were categorised under three labels: antagonism (i.e., lacking interpersonal communication skills), lectures (i.e.,

lacking both procedural and teaching skills), and articulation (i.e., lacking pronunciation skills). The researchers concluded that teachers should be aware of what they do appropriately and what they do wrongly in class.

Research has also examined effects of teachers' misbehaviours on students' achievement and perception of their teachers. Kearney, et al. (1991) showed that teachers' misbehaviours can have a detrimental effect on students and their achievement and motivation. Also, Zhang (2007) conducted a study on college students from different cultural backgrounds studying at an American university. The researcher hypothesised that culture may have an impact on students' perception of teachers' misbehaviours. The findings indicated that students' motivation towards learning decreases when they take classes with misbehaving teachers and that – regardless of the cultural background – students perceived their teachers' misbehaviours as demotivating. The study also found that incompetence was found to be the most prominent type of misbehaviour and that offensiveness was the least. In a similar study, Goodboy and Bolkan (2009) studied the correlation between teachers' misbehaviours and students' motivation and found that instructors' misbehaviours resulted in demotivation, dissatisfaction, and ineffectiveness on the part of students.

Kelsey et al., (2004) distributed a questionnaire to gauge students' perceptions of their teachers' misbehaviours including immediacy, consistency, and causality. The results revealed that students are aware of teachers' misbehaviours, are able to identify what counts as misbehaviour, and can evaluate the source of misbehaviours. They view the teacher as the main cause of these misbehaviours. The findings also indicated that students attributed teachers' misbehaviours to the personality of the teacher. In a similar exploration, Banfield et al., (2006) studied the effects of teachers' misbehaviours on students' perceptions of their teachers by asking students to complete an Affect Toward Teacher Scale and a Source Credibility Scale. The results showed that teachers' misbehaviours significantly influence their students' perception of teachers and this impact varies in degree. That is, offensiveness had the greatest impact on students, followed by incompetence and indolence, respectively. The researchers concluded that teachers' misbehaviours should be rethought by educationalists because they have a serious detrimental effect on students. This conclusion was based on the finding that students were unwilling to take classes with misbehaving teachers, particularly offensive teachers because the offensiveness of teachers was found to greatly affect students' trust of the teachers.

Upon reviewing existing studies on teachers' misbehaviours and students' reactions, it is obvious that most studies were conducted on college students and most often in Western institutions. Additionally, studies explored the effect of teachers' misbehaviours on, for example, students' perceptions, effective learning, and the credibility of teachers. Moreover, a large number of studies used questionnaires and surveys to collect their data. As a result, some perspectives remain unexplored. This study fills this gap by examining – through observations, interviews and surveys – teachers' misbehaviours at the school level, and it identifies students' reactions to such misbehaviours.

Methodology

This section describes the sample and setting of the study. It also shows the data collection tools and data analysis procedures. The study adopts a mixed-method approach to analyse the data which are collected by means of three different methods: non-participant classroom observation, a questionnaire and semi-structured interviews. This triangulation allowed the

researchers to provide an in-depth description of what exactly happens in Jordanian EFL school classrooms. The following sub-sections provide details of the methodology adopted in this study.

Participants

The participants were six EFL teachers and 201 students from a public school in Jordan. They were all females because the school is a girl-only school. Of the 201 students, 66 were in Grade 10, and 135 in Grade 9. Ninth and tenth grade classrooms were chosen for observations because of the students' ability to express thoughts and opinions without any interference from teachers or the researcher. Table 1 below shows the distribution of the sample to level and number.

Table 1

Distribution of the Sample to Level and Number

Class	Teacher Code	Number of Students
Ninth (h*)	Teacher h	33
Ninth (b)	Teacher b	34
Ninth (g)	Teacher g	34
Ninth (d)	Teacher d	34
Tenth (a)	Teacher a	33
Tenth (k)	Teacher k	33

*The letters represent the sections' names.

Data Collection

Three methods were used to collect data to provide a detailed glimpse into what exactly happened in class. The first was non-participant classroom observation. The first researcher attended 12 classes with each teacher; however, only 10 classes per teacher were used in the study. The other two classes were observed at the beginning of the study to allow both teachers and students to become accustomed to the presence of the researcher in order to minimise the observer paradox. The researcher adopted Goodboy' and Myers' (2015) Scale of Instructors Misbehaviours (IMS). The scale contains 15 items that are in three categories: "antagonism", which refers to how teachers behave in class (e.g., yell, speak politely, or listen to different ideas); "lecture", which refers to the way teachers manage class; and "articulation", which pertains to how the teachers articulate lessons (the observed classes are English classes). The researcher used the model as a checklist to assist in identifying the following: teachers' misbehaviours, the frequency of the misbehaviours, and students' reactions to their teachers' misbehaviours. After completing the observations, each teacher had 10 checklists of each class the researcher had observed. The researcher then summarised the observation checklists of all the teachers, collected the most frequent misbehaviours, and put them in one checklist. From this process, six checklists emerged. During the observation process, the researcher spotted students' reactions, both verbal and nonverbal. Verbal notes of teachers and students were transcribed and translated into English for analysis.

The second method was a questionnaire which was distributed to students. The questionnaire was also adopted from Goodboy' and Myers' (2015) Students' Communication Satisfaction Scale. The scale was in the form of a Likert scale, ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree". The scale contained eight items, each of which asked about students' perception of their teachers' communication style. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyse the collected data (Huizingh, 2007). If the mean value was more than 3.00, that

meant that the teacher had a positive attitude. On the other hand, a mean value less than 3.00 indicated that the teacher had a negative attitude.

The third method was semi-structured interviews which were conducted to give the teachers a chance to explain the most common misbehaviour(s). The interview questions were in Arabic but were later translated into English for the purpose of this research. These interviews provided a chance for the researcher to explore whether teachers were aware of their misbehaviour, and whether teachers had a valid explanation as to why they committed the misbehaviour. Each teacher was asked three or four questions about the most common misbehaviour. Two themes emerged from the interviews which are analysed below.

Data Analysis

A mixed-method approach was followed to analyse the data. In the quantitative analysis, the researcher used SPSS to analyse students' answers after completing the questionnaire about their teachers' communication style in order to determine how students perceived their teachers, either positively or negatively. In the qualitative analysis, the researchers – based on class observations and fieldnotes – focused on discerning teachers' misbehaviours and students' reactions toward the misbehaviours. The analysis of students' reactions focused on how students perceived their teachers' misbehaviours and how they reacted, either by reciprocating the misbehaviour or compensating for the misbehaviour. All examples were written in Arabic, but for the purpose of this research they were translated into English; the translation is included between brackets in the analysis below. This was applied to both categories, antagonism and lecture, as both included reactions of students. As for the articulation category (items 14-15), the researchers used "yes/no" to confirm the use of the misbehaviour by the teacher. The researchers noticed that the students' low proficiency level led all students not to reply to their teachers' misbehaviours; thus, articulation was excluded from the analysis of the results. As for the interviews, they were thematically analysed according to the most and least frequently committed misbehaviours in the two investigated categories: antagonism and lecture. Three or four questions were asked to each teacher individually, and the first researcher wrote down the answers when teachers were not comfortable with an audio-recording. After conducting the interviews, the researchers analysed each one and grouped the answers into thematic categories.

Results

This section presents the findings obtained from the analysis of each of the three methods of data collection. As shall be shown below, the use of three methods of data collection allowed the researchers to draw a more detailed picture of the Jordanian EFL classroom in terms of the relationship between teacher and students. Indeed, the findings provide a glimpse of both teachers' and students' misbehaviours in class, a situation that is rarely explored in educational research.

Classroom Observations

It should be noted that the classroom observations resulted in a list of committed misbehaviours and a list of students' reactions. The analysis of observations was based on the researcher's field notes and checklists as consent to video-record classes was not possible. Table 2 below shows the number of occurrences of the teachers' committed misbehaviours and students' reactions to their teachers' misbehaviours. Table 3 shows some authentic examples from the researcher's notes on teachers' misbehaviours and students' reactions.

Table 2*Types and Number of Occurrences of Teachers' Misbehaviours and Students' Reactions*

Misbehaviour criteria	Item of misbehaviour	Reciprocation	Compensation	Occurrences of the misbehaviour	No reaction	Repeated misbehaviour with reciprocated reaction
Antagonism	Discriminates against certain students	28	26	54	in one class	
	Yells at students when they ask for help	47	5	52		
	Screams or yells at students	44	4	48	in two classes	
	Belittle students	31	15	46		
	Criticizes students' responses to instructor comments or questions	28	16	44		
	Goes over the material so quickly so it is difficult to take notes	31	4	35		
	Lectures in a dry manner	16	15	31		
Lecture	Argues with students during class	28	1	29	in three classes	
	Gives boring lectures	16	11	27		in one class
	Teaches in a confusing manner	16	9	25	in one class	
	Lectures in a monotone voice	12	7	19		in one class
	Tells students their opinions are wrong because his/her opinion is right	16	—	16		
Tells students their opinions are wrong	—	15	15		in one class	

Table 3*Authentic Examples of Teachers' Misbehaviours and Students' Reactions*

Teachers' misbehaviours		Students' Reactions		
		Class G	Class H	Class A
Students' Reactions		Reciprocated all misbehaviours	Compensated all misbehaviours	Varied in their reactions
1	<p>Belittle students: Is not it enough that your answers are wrong. <i>Mush bekafi e'no Ajabatkom ghalat:</i> you are the only class that I do not like to come in <i>E'nto el shoubeh el wahedeh e'lle bahebeh a'dkhulha.</i> A teacher to astudent:” you are going to stay the way you are; you will never step forward: <i>Hadalek zai ma Enti</i> “</p>	<p>Verbal: A- student to a teacher: “do not talk to me like that: <i>Thikeesh Maiee Zay Haiek</i> B- you are the stupid one (in a hush, but the surroundings of the student's mates usually hear the student. Nonverbal: A- students deviates from the class by moving their head away from the teacher in a manner of not accepting what happened nor wanting to hear the teacher anymore.</p>	<p>Nonverbal: A- looking out of the window B- drawing and flipping the book pages.</p>	<p>Compensated Verbal: <i>Bahsha majnoneh: mrat mneha o mrat belmara</i> sometimes, I feel that she is mad, sometimes a good person, but other times very bad. Nonverbal: Leaving the class</p>

2	<p>Yells at students when they ask for help:</p> <p><i>I-Ma baaraf</i> <i>A'sa'li elli konti thkei maaha</i> Ask the one you were talking to</p> <p>A teacher to students: I have already explained it!! <i>Ana sharahto A'bl shoui</i></p> <p>Aren't you listening!!? <i>E'nto btesmaoush</i></p> <p><i>A'na A'bel shoui haketo, ma rah</i> <i>A'rjaa Aeedou</i> I have just finished saying it, I will not repeat it.</p>	<p>Verbal reactions:</p> <p>A- students threatening the teacher saying they will tell their parents to come to the principal.</p> <p>B- A student to the teacher: "I already can't understand what you are saying." <i>Ana Aslan bafhamsh alieke</i></p> <p>C- A student to the teacher: "do not yell at me". <i>Tsarkhesh 3lie</i></p> <p>Nonverbal:</p> <p>A- Gazing, playing with personal things</p>	<p>Verbal: Students in the two times apologized for not paying attention</p>	<p>Compensated Verbal:</p> <p><i>Miss, Wllaha kont bsa'lha la'nee ma smetek</i> I swear to God, I was asking because I could not hear you.</p> <p>Nonverbal:</p> <p>The same student, who was asking, dropped the pen.</p>
10	<p>Goes over the material so quickly so it is difficult to take notes</p>	<p>Verbal:</p> <p>we do not understand: <i>mesh fahmeen</i> slow down: <i>shwai shwai!</i> I can't follow up, where are you? <i>Mush am Balahe'a</i></p> <p>Nonverbal: pretend to write, stop writing, play, draw, chat</p>	<p>The Teacher usually gave students time to discuss the answers of the question together and then they go back to do it.</p>	<p>reciprocated</p> <p>Verbal:</p> <p>I am not following (while laughing)</p> <p>Nonverbal:</p> <p>Sleeping</p>

Table 2 shows the types of misbehaviours the teachers committed in the two categories of antagonism and lecture. Antagonism was the highest committed misbehaviour category and figured in practices such as *screaming or yelling at students* which was committed 48 times. To this misbehaviour, students reacted by verbally matching what the teacher did by means of asking unrelated questions, making noise, and talking to disturb the teacher. For example, when a teacher yelled at one of the students who was asking for help, the student answered her by saying "*ana aslan bafhamish 3alayki* (I do not even understand you)". At another time, a student said to the teacher "*la ts?arkhi 3alay* (do not shout out at me)". Some students nonverbally responded to this misbehaviour by gazing at the teacher or by closing the book. The least often committed misbehaviour was *arguing with students during class*. The reactions to this misbehaviour were both verbal and non-verbal.

As for the other misbehaviour category, Lecture, the most frequently noted negative practice was *giving boring lectures* which was checked 27 times. Boredom and monotony characterized the overall atmosphere of classes: The teacher was observed sitting on the chair most of class time. To this misbehaviour, the students reacted by matching it. For example, some students flipped the pages while others slept in the class. The least regularly observed misbehaviour was *going over the material so quickly* that it was difficult to take notes. Students responded by saying “*mis, shwai shwai, mo mla7geen* (slow down, we cannot follow)”. One student intentionally made disruptive during the class. In this category, students mostly non-verbally matched the misbehaviours because when they told the teacher, for instance, to slow down, she did not listen to them. Therefore, it was easier to react non-verbally.

Face-to-face interviews

After coding and analysing the teachers’ face-to-face interviews, two major themes emerged. The themes of classroom management and teacher preparedness surfaced repeatedly.

Classroom management. Analysis of the teachers’ answers to the interviewer’s questions about classroom management revealed that there are two types of management styles: strict and lenient. Strict teachers showed preference for applying rules and restrictions only while lenient or soft teachers favoured both strictness and openness. For example, three of the teachers (G, D, A) said that they favour teaching in classes where rules have been previously set so that – in their opinions – students do not misbehave. Teacher G said that “if you go easy on students, you will lose them, and then you won’t be able to re-impose order on students.” The interviewer asked the teacher what behaving properly meant to her, and she replied that “it means that students should not argue with teachers and should pay attention during the whole class.” Teacher A said, “if you spoil students then you cannot control their behaviour.” This shows that some teachers considered strictness much more important than building relationships with students.

The other three teachers (K, B, H) said that they favour a soft style of classroom management, strongly believing that students need to be heard, respected, and valued. They were of the view that students in the teenage years are difficult to manage by means of rules, and that they may face many problems outside of school. Therefore, they believed that too much dissonance will certainly backfire in their way of dealing with students at this age. These teachers also believed that establishing relationships with students is important in causing students to comply with what the teachers expect. Teacher B, for example, said “I make them do what I want, but in the end, they made the choice.” Teachers in this category believed in de-centralizing classes; Teacher H said, “I am no longer the centre of the class, and I let them have a role in preparing the lessons and explaining lessons to the class.” Teacher K said, “I give them the freedom to do everything as long as it helps me achieve the end goal of the lesson; that can be by changing seats or playing a little game before starting the class.”

There emerged aspects on which all teachers shared similar views. These aspects related to struggles the teachers face in classroom management. They were all of the view that the large responsibilities they have in terms of teaching loads and syllabus design decreases the chance of being close to their students and establishing good relationships with them. Some of the responsibilities the teachers shared included preparing, designing syllabi, teaching, conducting activities, assessing, marking, and providing feedback to students, in addition to their own personal and familial responsibilities. Moreover, the teachers said that these struggles are intensified by a lack of tools – including technology – that would ease their task of conducting classes while maintaining the quality of teaching. For these reasons, the interviewer asked the

teachers if they believe they have the capacity to be a role model. The teachers replied that they did, but that capacity is inhibited by the above-mentioned circumstances, which are out of their control.

Teachers' preparedness. The interviewer asked the teachers whether they feel prepared to give a class or even to enter the classroom. Most teachers agreed that when they started teaching, they felt lost because there were no training programs to train them on how to manage a class. For example, Teacher K said "I remember the first class I gave. I entered the class hesitantly, and I could tell that students sensed that I was hesitant. I was not ready so I asked for help, but the common cliché is you will get used to them." Teacher D said it is not only that there was no training on class management, but there was also no program for how to teach: "Most of us graduated from universities without any training or a course to prepare us to teach," Teacher H said, "we might have problems with teaching, but the main problem is that none of us was trained to be a teacher."

The interviewer asked the teachers whether there is any way for them to access new literature, research, and scholarly articles on managing classes and teaching methods that would keep them updated with the best techniques and strategies to employ in making their classes better. The teachers responded that they do not have access to such resources, and even if they did, such new methodologies would not suit their classes and their students. For example, Teacher G said, "I do not care about the new research; this research is not for our classes where 50 students are in one class." Teacher K said, "I would like to try new things in my class, but I do not have time as I have to finish the book within the allotted time." The interviewer then asked the teachers whether or not training about class management and new teaching methodologies would help them run classes more positively. In general, the teachers agreed, but noted that there were other factors that also cause difficulty in the classroom. For example, when students behave badly in class, and teachers call their parents to come to school to discuss their children's situation, the teachers find that the parents are often indifferent, and usually do not show up for such meetings. Fathers usually go to work, and mothers have to stay at home to take care of the house and the younger children.

Discussion

This study focused on teachers' misbehaviours in EFL classes and how students reacted to them. It should be recollected that the main purpose of the present investigation is to examine the relationship between teachers' communication styles and students' reactions towards their teachers' misbehaviours. The interpretation of the results draws on the Expectancy Violation Theory (EVT) (Burgoon & Jones, 1976) which provides an insight into understanding why students matched some of their teachers' misbehaviours in some classes and mismatched other misbehaviours in other classes. The EVT stipulates that when people misbehave, their misbehaviour is either compensated for or reciprocated depending on how positive or negative the communication style of the person is. The EVT assumes that when the communication style is positive, the reaction is most likely a compensation, and when the communication style is negative, the reaction is most likely a reciprocation.

Drawing upon the EVT premises, the researchers interpreted the reasons behind students' matching of some misbehaviours and mismatching of others. One thing that should be noted here is that the researchers used matching and mismatching (in place of the EVT's terms of compensating and reciprocating) because both imply the meaning of acting towards the misbehaviour in the same sense of the misbehaviour. For example, shouting out could be

matched by slamming the door. Both display negative attitudes and one of them was a reaction to the other. Hence, it was best proposed to use these two words to describe students' reactions towards their teachers' misbehaviours. The results presented in the previous section show that the students of Teachers D and G were seen to reciprocate all teachers' misbehaviours; some misbehaviours were reciprocated more than 10 times. According to the EVT, Teachers D and G's communication styles were perceived as negative. The results also show that the students of Teachers H and B were seen to compensate all teachers' misbehaviours and at other times students did not react. Teachers H and B communication styles were both perceived as positive. The results have also demonstrated that the students of Teachers K and A varied in their reactions toward their teachers' misbehaviours. Teachers K and A's communication styles were perceived as positive, but low positive, hence the students' variance in their reactions towards the teachers.

This interpretation clarifies why students reciprocate some misbehaviours and compensate for others, and why they sometimes compensate for and reciprocate the same misbehaviours. This can be attributed to more than one reason. For instance, the teachers with positive communication styles were seen to imply a good classroom management strategy (Lane et al., 2012). They raised discussions and respected their students' views and counterviews. They rarely yelled at students and only used rules of management if discussions failed and they felt the need to control the students' actions (Varga et al., 2011). For example, Teacher K yelled at one of the students when she asked for help saying that "*lama t7'als?i 7aki, ra7 ajawbik* (when you stop talking, I will answer you)." Here, although it was a misbehaviour, the students compensated for the misbehaviour explaining why she was talking to her friend. Moreover, positive teachers treat students equally; teachers have the authority to decide on who should participate and when and where they could do so (Briscoe et al., 2009). One teacher was accused by students to favour one student over others. Teacher H's students compensated for that by admitting that the favoured student is one of the best among all other students.

For students, when teachers misbehaved by being biased or not listening to their complaints, they felt undermined and disappointed which may have led them to cause problems in class (Boynton & Boynton, 2005). On the other hand, when the teacher was perceived to be positive, students compensated for the act of discrimination by giving the teacher the benefit of the doubt as occurred in Teacher H's class. It should be noted that teachers who were perceived as positive were teachers who may have still committed misbehaviours. However, the manner in which the teachers conducted their classes on a regular basis and the good relationships that they maintained with their students lead the students to compensate for their teachers' misbehaviours (Varga, 2017). Negative teachers, on the other hand, may have used strict strategies inside the class and might have been biased. When teachers called on the same students repetitively to participate, they did not pay attention to other students (Boynton & Boynton, 2005). As a consequence of teachers' lacking a positive communication style, students' behaviours were affected negatively.

From the analysis above, it is obvious that when teachers who were perceived to be positive committed a misbehaviour related to how the lecture was progressing, the students were usually more forgiving. For negative teachers, it was found that classes were dull and direct; it was also found that they taught in a dry manner and covered the material too quickly. Students reciprocated these misbehaviours as some began not to bring their books to the class. They stated that they did not understand or follow what the teacher was doing, so why should they bother with the book (Rimm-Kaufman & Sandilos, 2011). It is important for teachers to understand that students come to learn, and that if teachers do not do their job properly, the

students would not be interested in studying. It is easy to spot the reactions of teachers whom students have reciprocated all misbehaviours or compensated for them. However, it was difficult to analyse those whose reactions varied in the class between reciprocating and compensating, as was the situation with Teachers K and A. For Teacher K, the students have reciprocated two items of the scale in the lecturing category and compensated for the rest. For Teacher A, the students have reciprocated two items and compensated for the rest. From students' reactions, it was concluded that teachers should have both language competency and a positive attitude toward students (Varga, 2017).

The students' reactions toward their teachers' misbehaviours show that having both a positive communication style and competency in the subject matter has a great impact on the students regarding their attitudes towards learning in general. The students get motivated when their teachers create a safe and non-threatening environment (Luz, 2015). The methods and strategies that teachers use make students feel engaged and stimulated to participate in the learning process. Research on good language teachers reveals that effective teachers are attentive, open to change, and have the potential to face the challenging circumstances of teaching (Gibbs, 2002). They should be models for their students, providing them with quality teaching while at the same time maintaining good behaviours and practices.

Conclusion

This study has focused on EFL teachers' misbehaviours in class and students' reactions to these misbehaviours. In so doing, the study contributes to the field of English language and teaching by giving insights into the enhancement of teachers' styles and roles in EFL classes. It has shown that successful teaching is a joint task where teachers and students are affected by each other's actions and misbehaviours. The study provides teachers with ideas for providing the kind of quality teaching that every professional would want to implement. Two questions were raised in this study: What are the types of misbehaviours that English language teachers commit in their classes and how do students react to such misbehaviours? Do they compensate for and/or reciprocate teachers' misbehaviours? The results have revealed that teachers who were perceived to be positive were considered to be the best while teachers who were thought to be negative were disliked and even dishonoured by some students. The findings have also shown that the majority of students value a positive communication style on the part of their teachers. This communication style motivates students to become more interested in studying the language. As Collier (2005) argued "caring facilitates a sense of connection from which spring countless opportunities for learning" (p. 353). Students feel active and motivated in classes run by positive teachers who allow them to express their opinions.

Limitations and Recommendations

This study is limited in the number of observations conducted. With more observations, the researchers could have found more misbehaviours that would give a more nuanced picture of EFL teachers' (mis)behaviours and consequently their students' reactions. As the time of observations was only a month, the researchers did not manage to attend all classes the teachers gave. Moreover, if a second-hand observer were possible where both could combine the data collected and compare their findings, the study would have been more reliable. Also, the resistance for video-recording classes is also a limitation. Videoed instances of how teachers committed misbehaviours and how students reacted to them would have given a more authentic view of the matter under investigation. The other limitation is related to the interviews. This study requires an investigation into why teachers act or speak inappropriately in the EFL classroom. It would have been better if the students' points of view were taken into account.

However, that was restricted as the teachers and the school principal did not allow the researcher to interview students alone without the presence of the teachers. Importantly, future research may examine how unacceptable teacher practices affect second language learning. As Brown (2014) argues, individual learners possess a fragile language ego that, if faced with teachers' misbehaviours, will become a detriment to successful learning. Krashen (1982) argues that many factors, including teachers' misbehaviours, cause the affective filter to raise which ultimately affects success of the learning process. This is reminiscent of Schumann's (1986) Acculturation Model which shows how social distance negatively influences the outcomes of the learning process.

References

- Abrantes, J., Seabra, C., & Lages, L. (2007). Pedagogical affect, student interest, and learning performance. *Journal of Business Research*, 60(9), 960–964. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2006.10.026>
- Alhabahba, M., Pandian, A. & Mahfoodh, O. (2016). English language education in Jordan: Some recent trends and challenges. *Cogent Education*, 3(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2016.1156809>
- Al-Hazmi, S. (2003). EFL teacher preparation programs in Saudi Arabia: Trends and challenges. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(2), 341–344. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588509>
- Asassfeh, S. M. (2015). Prospective EFL teachers: What language learning beliefs do they hold? *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 24, 13–26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-013-0154-1>
- Banfield, S., Richmond, V. & McCroskey, J. (2006). The effect of teacher misbehaviours on teacher credibility and affect for the teacher. *Communication Education*, 55(1), 63–72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520500343400>
- Borich, G. (2015). *Observation skills for effective learning: Research-based practice*, (7th ed.). New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315633206>
- Boynton, M. & Boynton, C. (2005). *The educator's guide to preventing and solving discipline problems*. Alexandria: ASCD.
- Briscoe, F., Arriaza, G. & Henze, R. (2009). *The power of talk: How words change our lives*. California: Corwin Press.
- Brophy, J. (2011). History of research on classroom management. In C. Evertson & C. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues* (pp. 17–43). New York: Routledge.
- Brown, H. D. (2014). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (6th ed.). New York: Longman.
- Burgoon, J. K., & Jones, S. B. (1976). Toward a theory of personal space expectations and their violations. *Human Communication Research*, 2, 131–146. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1976.tb00706.x>
- Collier, M. (2005). An ethic of caring: The fuel for high teacher efficacy. *The Urban Review*, 37(4), 351–359. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-005-0012-4>
- Creswell, J. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). California: Sage Publications.
- Evertson, C. & Weinstein, C. (2011) (Eds.). *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues*. New York: Routledge.
- Gibbs, C. (2002). Effective teaching exercising self-efficacy and thought control of action. *Paper Presented at the Annual Conference of the British Educational Research Association*. New Zealand: Auckland University of Technology.
- Goodboy, A. & Bolkan, S. (2009). College teacher misbehaviors: Direct and indirect effects on student communication behaviour and traditional learning outcomes. *Western Journal of Communication*, 73(2), 204–219. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10570310902856089>

- Goodboy, A. & Myers, S. (2015). Revisiting instructor misbehaviors: A revised typology and development of a measure. *Communication Education*, 64(2), 133–153.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2014.978798>
- Huizingh, E. (2007). *Applied statistics with SPSS*. London: Sage Publications.
<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446249390>
- Jenkins, J. (2017). An ELF perspective on English in the post-Brexit EU. *World Englishes*, 36(3), 343–346. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12269>
- Kearney, P., Plax, T., Hays, E. & Ivey, M. (1991). College teacher misbehaviors: What students don't like about what teachers say and do. *Communication Quarterly*, 39(4), 309–324. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01463379109369808>
- Kelsey, D., Kearney, P., Plax, T., Allen, T. & Ritter, K. (2004). College students' attributions of teacher misbehaviors. *Communication Education*, 53(1), 40–55.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0363452032000135760>
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Lane, K., Lynne, H., Menzies, H., Oakes, W., & Kalberg, J. (2012). *Systematic screenings of behaviour to support instruction: From preschool to high school*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Luz, R. (2015). *The relationship between teachers and students in the classroom: Communicative language teaching approach and cooperative learning strategy to improve learning*. Unpublished masters' thesis, Bridgewater State University, Massachusetts, USA.
- Nunan, D. (2013). *Learner-Centered English language education: The selected works of David Nunan*. New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203096888>
- Pressley, M., Almasi, J., Schuder, T., Bergman, J., Hite, S., El-Dinary, P. & Brown, R. (1994). Transactional instruction of comprehension strategies: The Montgomery County, Maryland, SAIL program. *Reading & Writing Quarterly: Overcoming Learning Difficulties*, 10(1), 5–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1057356940100102>
- Rimm-Kaufman, S. & Sandilos, L. (2011). Improving students' relationships with teachers to provide essential supports for learning. American Psychological Association, Accessed August 24, 2020 at <https://www.apa.org/education/k12/relationships>
- Schumann, J. H. (1986). Research on the acculturation model for second language acquisition. *Journal of multilingual & multicultural development*, 7(5), 379–392.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.1986.9994254>
- Toale, M. C. (2001). *Teacher clarity and teacher misbehaviors: Relationships with students' affective learning and teacher credibility*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Morgantown: West Virginia University.
- Varga, M. (2017). *The effect of teacher-student relationships on the academic engagement of students*. Unpublished master's thesis, Goucher College.
- Yassin, B. (2015). Challenges of teaching English language to English language learners at private universities in Jordan. *Arab World English Journal*, 6(2), 265–274.
<https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2834395>

Zhang, Q. (2007). Teacher misbehaviors as learning demotivators in college classrooms: A cross-cultural investigation in China, Germany, Japan, and the United States. *Communication Education*, 56(2), 209–227.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520601110104>

Corresponding Author: Sharif Alghazo

Email: s.alghazo@gmail.com