

Students' Resistance Behaviors: What Do Turkish Primary Teachers Face?

*Mediha Sarı - Ece Yolcu**

Received: December 6, 2019; received in revised form: April 2, 2020;
accepted: April 13, 2020

Abstract:

Introduction: Students could react to the learning activities, teachers, or administrators knowingly and willfully, many times intentionally by resisting in various ways. A detailed analysis of this definition indicates that unlike naughty behaviors, resistance behaviors do not develop suddenly, they are often planned beforehand by the student, and they contain some messages to the person or institution they are directed at. These kinds of behaviors could have negative effects not only on students' academic, social, and psychological development but also on teachers' professional satisfaction. Therefore, these issues should be elaborated carefully. However, despite the importance indicated in the literature, students' resistance behaviors are one of the neglected issues that are not investigated adequately. With reference to this need, the presented study aims to identify perceptions of primary school teachers about students' resistance behaviors.

Methods: The participants were 152 primary school teachers. Data were collected through the Student Resistance Behaviors Scale for Teachers (SRBS-T) and Teacher Interview Form. In addition to descriptive statistics, data were analyzed using t-test and one-way ANOVA. Also, a qualitative descriptive analysis was conducted regarding qualitative data of the study.

Results: Results show that the mean scores for SRBS were "medium" on a 5-point Likert scale. While teachers' perceptions about resistance behaviors showed no significant differences according to gender and the type of school they graduated from, scores showed significant differences in terms of teachers' years of seniority. According to the teachers, the most encountered resistant behaviors were gathered under the themes of

* Mediha Sarı, Çukurova University, Department of Educational Sciences, Turkey; msari@cu.edu.tr
Ece Yolcu, Çukurova University, Department of Educational Sciences, Turkey; ece_duser@hotmail.com

resistance to teacher authority and hostile attitudes towards the teacher/peers.

Discussion: Through discussion, the results obtained by the scale and interviews were discussed. All the findings showed that teachers are important receivers of resistance behaviors and they are facing with different types of resistance in the classroom.

Limitations: It is obvious that these results were limited to the reached primary school teachers. Another limitation was that the data within the study collected via SRBS-T and interviews.

Conclusions: The study showed that teachers and students are the key components of the educational process and students could show resistance to both the process and teachers in different ways. As this study only focused on primary teachers' experiences, more studies could be organized through understanding the resistance middle and high school teachers face with as well. Further research could be conducted with students to see how they feel and behave when they feel resistance as well as with other teachers working at various levels of education and in various institutions.

Key words: resistance, resistance behaviors, primary school, learning environment.

Introduction

By nature, an educational environment is a social environment where conflicts and cooperation relationships between students themselves and their teachers are a never ending process. When the occurring conflicts bring about discussions and reconciliations within a democratic environment, it implies a higher educational value. However, if the conflict results in resistance to various dimensions of educational process then it should be reconsidered.

1 Resistance

Sarı (2018) described resistance behaviors as intentional and sometimes viciously planned behaviors that concentrate to derail, and sabotage the flow of a lecture or active the learning-teaching process. Seidel and Tanner (2013) stated that "resistance in a classroom may be defined as deconstructive student behavior(s) that could be triggered when students are angry with the school or teacher policies, and when they are disappointed with the existing procedures or when they are left behind and blocked out of the decision making process." According to Yüksel (2004) students react to situations that do not comply with their own thoughts, lifestyles, and expectations in the school, and despite these reactions, if there is no change in these situations, they can turn their reactions into resistance. Alpert (1991) stated that resistance is used to explain and interpret various behaviors that are indicative of tensions and conflicts between the society and the school to which the students belong. Supportively,

Brookfield (2006) emphasized that this resistance is normal, natural, and inevitable, and should be properly analyzed and correctly understood.

Literature testifies that both teachers and school authorities nurture a general perception that all student resistances or revolts are deconstructive (Field & Olafson, 1999). However, it is also revealed by literature that student resistance and revolt could be both constructive and deconstructive (Kearney, Plax, & Burroughs et al., 1991; Seidel & Tanner, 2013; Sever, 2012; Zhang, 2011). The study conducted by Burroughs, Kearney, and Plax (1989) clearly supports the view that student resistance could be both constructive and deconstructive. Kearney et al. (1991) warns that student resistance should not be confused and misinterpreted with student's ordinary misbehaviors. While deconstructive resistance aims to derail the learning process, constructive resistance, if handled properly, could support the overall quality of the learning process and the learning environment. Kearney et al. highlighted that constructive resistance occurs when students are in complaints about the assigned tasks or procedures, ask questions or challenge the teacher's ideas and credibility. They also emphasized that although sometimes such student resistances irritate and demoralize the teacher, the feedback could add a healthy and productive learning progression which could help the teacher to re-evaluate his/her teaching style or teaching techniques to become a more effective teacher. According to Brookfield (2006), in educational surroundings, student resistance should be viewed as a natural course, and students should have the right to demonstrate resistance, and when teachers accept this fact they can have a better chance to constructively deal with student resistance.

Based on available literature, we can assume that students' resistance behavior is not a casual misbehavior or disorder, and it does not develop or occur suddenly. Rather, the process of resistance is a developing one. Generally, it is a planned action which carries certain messages about the person or situation at which it is directed. According to Argon and Sezen-Gultekin (2016) these types of behaviors are not developed without any reason or are unwanted behaviors, and so, they should not be misinterpreted and confused with undisciplined, bad behaviors. In the case of bad or undisciplined behavior, student's behavior is reactionary and specific to the situation whereas resistance or revolt is not subject specific, it is planned, has a history, and matured over time and can be repeated (Yüksel & Şahin, 2005). To deal with resistance issues, the teacher and the school authority should read and analyze the resisting behavior properly, to do so they need to develop working strategies that could include peaceful resolution of the problem between the student and the teacher.

In order to analyze students' resistance behavior, priority should be given to understanding of the nature of resistance behavior and how it is demonstrated to the authority. Burroughs et al. (1989) postulated 19 resistance behaviors:

1. advising the teacher;
2. blaming the teacher;

3. avoidance;
4. reluctant acceptance of the authority;
5. demonstrating active resistance;
6. deceiving and lying;
7. attempting to develop an open relationship with the teacher;
8. attempting to create a chaotic classroom environment;
9. creating excuses;
10. ignoring the teacher;
11. following his/her priorities;
12. challenging the authority of the teacher;
13. attempting to form a supportive riot group;
14. making a complaint about the teacher;
15. imitating the teacher's behaviors (talks, and bodily moves, etc.);
16. imitating the teacher's attitudes;
17. making a hostile defense;
18. refusing assigned tasks by showing evidence;
19. revenge.

Miles (2007) points out that in order to define and determine a student's resistance behavior(s), the teacher or the school authority should follow a strategy that includes the following steps:

1. communicate with the student's close environment (friends, relatives etc.) to collect valuable information about the student;
2. communicate with the student to gather information about him/her;
3. make sure and understand the issue if the student has lost a family member of another close person;
4. develop strategies that attract the student to cooperate and motivate him/her to modify his/her behavior;
5. form a support group based on relationships with on and off campus students and the beloved ones;
6. develop and finalize an action plan and follow it properly and effectively.

1.1 Reasons for resistance

Once resistance behaviors demonstrated by students have been identified, the reasons of these behaviors need to be examined. It has been noticed that in some cases of student resistance, instead of listening and cooperating with students, some teachers and administrators chose to punish students (Kim, 2010). According to Kim (2010), in order to contribute to providing equal opportunities in educational settings, both the school administrators and the teacher must pay sincere attention to students' resistance. Argon and Sezen-Gultekin (2016) argued that although in some circumstances, the resistance behavior could be related to the collision between student's childhood background and the school policies, some resistance cases can be owned by the student and the teacher

themselves. There are many factors making students feel stressed and teachers are both among the sources of this stress and can also contribute to its elimination (Hanuliaková, Hasajová & Porubčanová, 2016).

The study of Kearney et al. (1991) revealed two categories of students' resistance behaviors, the teacher-owned resistance and the student-owned resistance, and both are formed based on the student's personal preferences. Students who associate their resistance with the teacher's inappropriate behaviors are likely to place the blame on the teacher for their resistance (teacher-owned resistance). Students mostly perceive these teachers as inconsistent, boring, unenthusiastic, unprepared, and careless. On the other hand, if students perceive the teacher as competent, enthusiastic, concerned, warm and trustworthy, they are likely to associate their resistance with students' inappropriate behaviors (student-owned resistance). Brookfield (2006, pp. 217-224) stated that without identifying the sources of students' resistance behavior teachers may not be able to cultivate effective solutions that could encourage students to take part in active learning. He listed following factors that could be the causes of resistance behavior:

- poor self-image as learners;
- fear of the unknown;
- the normal rhythm of learning;
- disjunction of learning and teaching styles;
- apparent irrelevance of the learning activity;
- level of required learning's being inappropriate;
- fear of looking foolish in public;
- cultural suicide (losing their values, fear of being assimilated);
- lack of clarity in teachers' instructions;
- students' dislike of teachers.

1.2 Solutions and recommendations for student resistance

To address and effectively deal with student resistance in the classroom or in school environment, Gjesfjeld (2014) emphasized the notion of empathic education. Empathic education emphasizes the choice of specific strategies for specific resistance types while trying to understand and communicate with students demonstrating resistance behaviors. Backing up this proposal Brookfield (2006, pp. 225-233) stated that students should be well-versed about the consequences of deconstructive resistance behavior that they demonstrate. He goes on to suggest some useful and effective strategies for the teachers to be able to constructively handle deconstructive student resistances such as:

- try to sort out the causes of resistance;
- ask yourself if the resistance is justified;
- research your students' backgrounds;
- involve former resisters;
- model;

- when appropriate, involve students in educational planning;
- use a variety of teaching methods and approaches;
- assess learning incrementally;
- check that your intentions are clearly understood;
- build a case for learning;
- create situations in which students succeed;
- do not push too fast;
- admit resistance is normal;
- acknowledge the right to resist.

1.3 Importance and purpose of the study

Observable, irritating and deconstructive students' resistance behavior(s) has/have the potential to distress the entire classroom, can block and derail the educational process, and can be a negative invitation for other students to mimic the behavior (Furrer, Akiner, & Pitzer, 2014). While deconstructive resistance behaviors have a potential adverse effect on the academic, social, and psychological development of students, it may also restrain the professional job satisfaction of the teachers. For this reason, this issue deserves a keen attention. Yet, the review of literature validates that in Turkey, a very low attention has been given to students' resistance behaviors, the issue is mostly ignored or neglected and very few scholarly scientific studies have been conducted (Eroğlu, 2012; Gencel & Saracaloğlu, 2013; Sever, 2012; Sever & Güven, 2014; Yüksel, 2004; Yüksel & Şahin, 2005). Hence, no research has been conducted on primary school students' resistance behaviors. To close the gap, this study is designed to investigate the primary school teachers' perceptions of their students' resistance behaviors. In the direction of this purpose, the following questions were sought to be investigated:

1. What are the teachers' perceptions of students' resistance behaviors in their classes?
2. Do teachers' perceptions of student's resistance behaviors differ significantly according to their gender, years of experience, and the type of school they graduated from?
3. What types of students' resistance behaviors are teachers confronted with in their classes?
4. According to teachers' opinions, what are the causes of students' resistance behaviors?
5. What strategies do teachers use for resistance behavior?
6. What are the teachers' recommendations for reducing students' destructive resistance behaviors?

2 Methods

2.1 Research design

This study was conducted to investigate primary school teachers' perceptions of primary school students' resistance behaviors. To achieve this aim, a mixed data collection model was used to gather and analyze data. Both qualitative and quantitative methods were used in the process of data collection and analysis.

2.2 Sampling and study group

For a better demographic representation, Yuregir, Seyhan and Cukurova districts of Adana city were carefully chosen to conduct the study. A total of 152 teachers from six primary schools were non-randomly selected to administer the scale. Distributions of teachers according to their gender, years of seniority, and the type of school they graduated from are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Descriptive characteristics of the participants

		<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
<i>Gender</i>	Female	69	46.3
	Male	80	53.0
<i>Years of seniority</i>	0-5	3	2.1
	6-10	5	3.4
	11-15	10	6.9
	16-20	29	20.0
	21 +	98	67.0
<i>Type of school they graduated from</i>	Educational Institution	30	20.4
	Bachelor Completion	45	30.6
	Faculty of Education	46	31.3
	Faculty of Science-Lit.	7	4.8
	Other Faculties	19	12.9

As seen in Table 1, the distribution of the participants according to gender was 69 females, 80 males, and 3 participants preferred not to indicate their genders. As for the participants' years of seniority, 3 teachers had 0-5, 5 teachers had 6-10, 10 teachers had 11-15, 29 teachers had 16-20, and 98 teachers had 21- more years of teaching experience. In terms of the type of school the institution the participants' graduated from, 30 teachers graduated from educational institutions; 45 teachers graduated from bachelor completion programs; 46 teachers graduated from a faculty of education; 7 teachers graduated from the

faculty of science and literature; and 19 teachers graduated from other (not specified) faculties.

After the of questionnaires (scales), 16 participants (10 females and 6 males) volunteered to participate in a semi-structured (open ended) interview. The seniority level of the 16 volunteer participants was as follows: 1 participant with 6-10 years, 1 participant with 11-15 years, 4 participants with 16-20 years, and 10 participants with 21 + years of teaching experience; 2 were first-grade, 6 were second-grade, 4 were third-grade, and 4 were fourth-grade teachers.

2.3 Data collection methods and tools

Sari's (2018) Student Resistance Behavior Scale - Teacher Form (SRBS-T), Teacher Interview Form (TIF), and Personal Information Form (PIF) were used as data collection tools in the study. The SRBS-T is a 5.0 Likert Scale (1 for never, 2 for seldom, 3 for sometimes, 4 for most of the time, and 5 for always), which is used to analyze and interpret teachers' perception of students' resistance behaviors. The SRBS-T consists of 25 items that each item refers to a students' resistance behavior, and the participants are required to report the frequencies of their observations of student resistance in their classrooms. With this scale, the highest recordable score is 125, while the lowest score is 25. The higher the score is, the greater the observed frequency of students' resistance behavior would be, in other words high scores represent a high frequency of students' resistance behaviors in the classrooms.

As a result of an explanatory and confirmatory factor analysis done by Sari, a four-factor structure was obtained (Resistance to teacher authority, Hostile attitudes towards the teacher, Continuous anger, and Passive resistance). The Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficients for these four factors, which account for 62.97% of the total explained variance, were: .93, .90, .86, .78, respectively and .95 for the whole scale. The Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficients examined in this study were: .90 for "Resistance to teacher authority," .88 for "Hostile attitudes towards the teacher," .85 for "Continuous anger", .74 for "Passive resistance", and .94 for the total scores of the SRBS-T.

The PIF (Personal Information Form) was used to outline the personal demographics of each participant and was located on the top of the SRBS-T. The TIF (Teacher Interview Form) is a semi-structured four-item instrument that aims to identify and define various types of students' resistance behaviors (SRB) in the classrooms. Teachers were instructed to use the TIF to identify and describe students' resistance behaviors (SRBs), the reasons behind these behaviors, and the strategies that the teachers use to tackle with and to bring peaceful resolutions to classroom SRBs.

2.4 Data analysis

A mixed method was used to collect and analyze data. Together with descriptive statistics, Mann Whitney U, and Kruskal-Wallis tests were used to analyze the gathered data. Before the analysis of the final test results, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used as a pretest to determine whether the test scores were distributed normally or not. Results of this test were found to be .002 ($p < .05$) for the "Resistance to Teacher Authority" subscale; .000 ($p < .05$) for the "Hostility against Teachers" subscale; .000 ($p < .05$) for the "Continuing Anger" subscale; .015 ($p < .05$) for the "Passive Resistance" subscale, and .000 ($p < .05$) for the SRBS-T total scores. Since the scores obtained from SRBS-T and the subscales did not show normal distribution, non-parametric tests were preferred to analyze the data.

In interpreting the scores obtained from the scale, the group width value was recorded as $4/5 = 0.80$, assuming that the scale is based on 5.0 Likert type. Accordingly; the width between 1.00-1.80 represents "Never"; the width between 1.80-2.60 represent "Seldom"; the width between 2.60-3.40 represents "Sometimes"; the width between 3.40-4.20 represents "Most of the Time"; and the width between 4.20-5.00 represents "Always." The significance level of .05 was interpreted as the criterion for evaluating the significance of the statistical findings.

A qualitative descriptive analysis was performed for the qualitative data that were obtained from the semi-structured interviews with 16 volunteer participants. The frame of this analysis was defined by four questions that were asked in the direction of the research purpose. To code the obtained data, the responses of all participants were printed in sub-alta coding. In this coding system, similar responses provided by the teachers were grouped under common themes and their frequencies were determined and tabulated.

3 Findings

In this section, both quantitative and qualitative findings obtained from the participating teachers are presented.

3.1 Findings from the Student Resistance Behavior Scale - Teacher Form

3.1.1 Teachers' perceptions about the resistance behaviors of their students

Table 2 demonstrates the arithmetic means and standard deviation distributions regarding the teachers' SRBS-T scores.

Table 2

Means and standard deviation values of the teachers' SRBS-T scores (N=152)

<u>Subscales</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
Resistance to Teacher Authority	2.01	.77
Hostile Attitudes towards the Teacher	1.46	.58
Continuous Anger	1.98	.82
Passive Resistance	2.24	.66
SRBS-T Total scores	1.88	.60

An analysis of Table 2 shows that the mean scores were quite low, below three, both in total scores and in the subscales.

3.1.2 Teachers' perceptions about students' resistance behaviors according to gender

According to the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test results, since the data did not show normal distribution, in comparison of teacher's SRBS-T scores according to gender, the non-parametric Mann-Whitney U test was used. The Mann Whitney-U test results of teachers' SRBS-T scores according to gender are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Mann Whitney-U test results of teachers' SRBS-T scores according to gender

<u>Dimensions</u>	<u>Gender</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean rank</u>	<u>Sum of ranks</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>p</u>
Resistance to teacher authority	Female	69	78.96	5448.50	2486.500	.297
	Male	80	71.58	5726.50		
Hostile attitudes towards the teacher	Female	69	71.64	4943.00	2528.000	.371
	Male	80	77.90	6232.00		
Continuous anger	Female	69	81.71	5638.00	2297.000	.076
	Male	80	69.21	5537.00		
Passive resistance	Female	69	77.18	5325.50	2609.500	.565
	Male	80	73.12	5849.50		
SRBS-T total scores	Female	69	78.86	5441.00	2494.000	.311
	Male	80	71.68	5734.00		

p > .05

An analysis of the values in Table 3 indicates that there were not any significant differences in the views of male and female teachers in SRBS-T subscales and total scores ($U = 2486.500; 2528.000; 2297.000; 2609.500; 2494.000; p > .05$). However, when we look at the mean ranks of the groups, we can see that female teachers achieved higher scores in all dimensions except for "Hostile attitudes towards the teacher."

3.1.3 Teachers' perceptions of students' resistance behaviors according to years of seniority

In the comparison of teacher's SRBS-T scores according to the years of seniority, the Kruskal Wallis-H test was performed. The results of this test are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Kruskal Wallis-H test results of teachers' SRBS-T scores according to years of seniority

	<u>Years of seniority</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Mean rank</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>X²</u>	<u>p</u>
Resistance to teacher authority	0-5	3	79.33	4	2.448	.654
	6-10	5	71.30			
	11-15	10	68.85			
	16-20	29	62.95			
	21 +	98	76.29			
Hostile attitudes towards the teacher	0-5	3	64.83	4	.492	.974
	6-10	5	62.80			
	11-15	10	75.85			
	16-20	29	74.22			
	21 +	98	73.12			
Continuous anger	0-5	3	98.00	4	1.239	.872
	6-10	5	67.90			
	11-15	10	75.60			
	16-20	29	71.31			
	21+	98	72.73			

Passive resistance	0-5	3	61.50	4	3.653	.455
	6-10	5	95.40			
	11-15	10	55.55			
	16-20	29	70.60			
	21+	98	74.70			
SRBS-T total scores	0-5	3	78.83	4	1.173	.882
	6-10	5	78.50			
	11-15	10	68.50			
	16-20	29	66.45			
	21+	98	74.94			

As it can be seen in Table 3, no significant differences between the mean scores according to years of seniority were detected ($p>.05$).

3.1.4 Teachers' perceptions about students' resistance behaviors according to the type of school they graduated from

To compare the teacher's SRBS-T scores according to the type of school they graduated from, the Kruskal Wallis-H test was performed and the results of this test are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Kruskal Wallis-H test results of SRBS-T scores according to the type of school the teachers graduated from

	<u>Type of school</u>	<u>Mean rank</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>X²</u>	<u>p</u>
Resistance to Teacher Authority	Education inst. (n:30)	75.60	4	3.740	.442
	Bachelor compl. (n:45)	75.27			
	Fac. of education (n:46)	78.17			
	Fac. of science-lit. (n:7)	78.43			
	Other faculties (n:19)	56.74			
Hostile attitudes towards the teacher	Education inst. (n:30)	60.67	4	5.210	.266
	Bachelor compl. (n:45)	79.69			
	Fac. of education (n:46)	80.09			
	Fac. of science-lit. (n:7)	67.64			

Continuous anger	Other faculties (n:19)	69.18	4	7.307	.121
	Education inst. (n:30)	64.47			
	Bachelor compl. (n:45)	73.40			
	Fac. of education (n:46)	74.25			
	Fac. of science-lit. (n:7)	112.36			
Passive resistance	Other faculties (n:19)	75.74	4	1.478	.831
	Education inst. (n:30)	68.25			
	Bachelor compl. (n:45)	78.08			
	Fac. of education (n:46)	73.00			
	Fac. of science-lit. (n:7)	84.64			
SRBS-T total scores	Other faculties (n:19)	71.92	4	2.887	.577
	Education inst. (n:30)	67.43			
	Bachelor compl. (n:45)	76.39			
	Fac. of education (n:46)	77.79			
	Fac. of science-lit. (n:7)	87.64			
	Other faculties (n:19)	64.50			

The results of the Kruskal Wallis test performed to analyze the significance of the differences between the mean scores of teachers according to the school they graduated from showed that there were no statistically significant differences between the subscale scores or the total scores ($p > .05$).

3.2 Qualitative findings about the teacher's views on students' resistance behaviors

Following the scale applications, 16 teachers were interviewed. The participants were asked four open-ended questions during these interviews. The findings obtained from the analysis of the answers given to these four questions are presented one by one below.

3.2.1 Resistance behaviors that teachers are confronted with in their classrooms

The first question in the interviews was related to the kind of resistance behaviors teachers encounter in their classes. The findings obtained from the analysis of the responses to this question are presented in Table 6.

Table 6

<i>Resistance behaviors that teachers are confronted with in their classrooms</i>	
<u><i>Theme 1: Resistance to teacher authority (n:17)</i></u>	<u><i>n</i></u>
Stubbornly not caring for teacher's warnings.	4
Not fulfilling the given duties intentionally.	3
Turning the deaf ear when teacher calls out someone.	2
Not being able to accept the authority of a female teacher.	2
Insisting on not going outside during the breaks.	1
Speaking up when s/he doesn't want to do assignments.	1
Skipping class just to spite the teacher.	1
Openly challenging, standing up to the teacher.	1
Insistently not listening during the lesson.	1
Perceive breaking the rules as a virtue and being proud of it.	1
<u><i>Theme 2: Hostile attitudes towards the teacher/peers (n:13)</i></u>	
Intentionally trying to make teacher get angry and shout.	3
Swearing at friends, pulling their hair or kicking them as if wishing to be noticed by teacher.	3
Looking into the teacher's eyes while behaving badly.	2
Seeming to have a grudge against the teacher expressed by his/her glances, gestures and facial expressions.	2
Showing the teacher that he/she is getting bored (huffing and puffing, pretending snoozing).	1
Doing the opposite of what the teacher says just to spite him/her.	1
Making jarring, redundant noise in the class.	1
<u><i>Theme 3: Being continuously angry / distressed / complaining (n:9)</i></u>	
Continuously complaining about something.	3
Continuously being angry against the teacher and friends.	3
Constantly being ready to fight and starting a fight with lame excuses.	2
Damaging his/her own stuff (scribbling, tearing).	1
<u><i>Theme 4: Passive resistance (n:10)</i></u>	
Insistently not participating in class activities or games.	3
Intentionally not doing any activity or work.	2
Intentionally doing worse than s/he can do.	2
Wasting time during the work on purpose.	1
Showing reluctance to duties.	1
Showing that s/he doesn't listen to the teacher.	1

As seen in Table 6, students' resistance behaviors that teachers encounter in class were divided into four themes consistent with the subscales of SRBS-T. The resistance behaviors indicated most frequently under the resistance to teacher authority theme were "Stubbornly not caring for teacher's warnings.", "Intentionally not fulfilling the given duties." and "Turning the deaf ear when teacher calls out."; while regarding hostile attitudes towards the teacher/peers theme were "Intentionally trying to make the teacher get angry and shout.", "Swearing at friends, pulling their hair or kicking them as if wishing to be noticed by teacher.", "Looking into the teacher's eyes while behaving badly.", and "Seeming to have a grudge against the teacher expressed by his/her glances, gestures and facial expressions.". Within continuously being angry / distressed / complaining theme, the participants pointed out behaviors such as "Continuously complaining about something.", "Continuously being angry against the teacher and friends.", and "Constantly being ready to fight and starting a fight with lame excuses."; while most frequently indicated behaviors concerning the passive resistance theme were "Insistently not taking part in class activities or games.", "Intentionally not doing any activity or work.", and "Intentionally doing worse than s/he can do". Some quotations from teachers' views are presented below.

"These are mostly children from authoritarian and patriarchal families. As I am a woman, they cannot accept a woman's authority. Besides, the father of one of my students is in prison. He is very reactive.... Seems like he takes his revenge on me and his friends... he is always ready for fight. He starts to fight with lame excuses." T3.F

"There are several students turning sometimes the deaf ear to me. They pretend like they do not hear. I know that what they want is to piss me off. Because I do not let them play football during the breaks. But if I let them, they get dirty or fight with each other. Then, I cannot cope with their mothers. 'Why did you let them!' They get revenge on me by doing this in their way." T5. M

"There is a student obstinating with me, doing the opposite of what I say. S/he does it especially when I say 'don't!' I say don't put your foot on the desk, he does and even if I stare at him, he doesn't put it down. He exactly waits for me to shout." T9.F

3.2.2 The causes of resistance behaviors according to the teachers' views
During the interviews, the second question was asked with the aim to determine the causes of resistance behaviors they encounter according to the teachers' views. The findings of the analyses of the answers for this question are shown in Table 7.

Table 7

<i>The causes of resistance behaviors according to the teachers' views</i>	
<u>Theme 1: Family (n:16)</u>	<u><i>n</i></u>
Domestic violence.	4
Fragmented family structure.	3
Showing excessive attention or indifference to the child.	3
Authoritarian family structure.	2
Traditional gender roles in the family (females being overwhelmed).	2
Poor school-family cooperation.	1
Inconsistent parent behaviors towards the child.	1
<u>Theme 2: Student (n:16)</u>	
Students' physical and mental problems.	4
Expecting the excessive attention by the family also in the class.	3
Not being able to have healthy communication with the teacher.	2
Wishing to take revenge on teacher for punishment.	1
The wish for finishing before everyone - sense of competition.	1
Not liking the school/Not wishing to come to the school.	1
Being raised up lovelessly and indifferently.	1
Having different interests and abilities.	1
Being in preadolescence.	1
Indifference to authoritarian behaviors.	1
<u>Theme 3: Teacher (n:7)</u>	
Giving too much homework.	1
Not being able to work enough on rules.	1
Not being able to show the necessary love and care for children.	1
Teaching in a way not suitable for students.	1
The teacher's insufficient professional competency.	1
Not letting students to go outside for physical education classes.	1
Not being patient enough and being able to control his/her anger.	1
<u>Theme 4: Classroom and school (n:3)</u>	
Crowded classrooms.	1
Inadequate conditions in the classroom.	1
Lack of equipment and sources.	1

As can be seen in Table 7, the sources teachers mostly mentioned while explaining the causes of resistance behaviors, were in the family and the student. Within the 'Family' theme, teachers most frequently stated domestic violence, fragmented family structure and showing excessive attention or indifference to the child, whereas they indicated students' physical and mental problems, and

students' expectations of the same excessive attention in classroom as they experience at home as the causes in the 'Student' theme. The third reason participants presented as a source of resistance behaviors, was the teacher. Under this theme, each of the following cases was mentioned by one participant: giving too much homework, not being able to work enough on rules, not being able to show the necessary love and care for children, etc. The classroom and the school environment were the least mentioned dimension by teachers as the causes of students' resistance. There are two quotations below:

"It could be trying to get the teacher's attention thinking that the excessive attention within the family is decreased in the school and classroom. I know that s/he does this to get my attention. This student had an open-heart surgery. It could be also this illness effect." T7.F

"But probably it is because they were grown up in an authoritarian family. The funny part is that authority does not work with these children. Indeed, I am known as a very authoritarian teacher. Though, they do the same to me as well. Especially there is an English teacher, a thin and short woman...they drive her totally crazy. In their families, women have no power, so they do not listen to a female teacher." T15.M

3.2.3 The strategies teachers use against resistance behaviors

The strategies teachers use against resistance behaviors are presented in Table 8.

Table 8

The strategies teachers use against resistance behaviors

<i>Theme 1: Teacher interventions towards students (n:30)</i>	<i>n</i>
Talking with students and looking for common solutions.	4
Warning - scolding at each mistake - depriving of something (negative reinforcer) .	4
Showing more interest in resisting students - showing that they are valued.	4
Giving duties/responsibilities.	3
Rewarding frequently.	3
Watching closely during the tasks.	2
Ignoring resistance behaviors.	2
Asking the student to redo the assignment that is done badly on purpose.	2
Giving tasks which could help empathize with teachers and friends.	2
Showing positive example behaviors.	1
Avoiding punishments.	1
Guiding to the counseling service.	1
Cooperating with other teachers.	1

<u>Theme 2: Regulating the learning process (n:8)</u>	
Taking them out to the garden and setting them free when they become very tired and start to get angry.	1
Holding classroom meetings.	1
Making the course interesting.	1
Updating the plans.	1
Adapting the attainments to daily life.	1
Making instruction appropriate to exploration and creativity.	1
Carrying out different activities	1
Giving priority to students' fundamental needs and problems (hunger, toilet, etc.)	1
 <u>Theme 3: Teacher-Family Cooperation (n:6)</u>	
Meeting with parents frequently.	5
Meeting and talking with fathers more than mothers.	1

As can be seen in Table 8, strategies that teachers used when dealing with resistance behaviors that they encountered in their classes included three main themes: "Teacher interventions towards students" (n:30); "Regulating the learning process" (f:8), and "Teacher-family cooperation" (f:6). The most frequently used interventions included "speaking with students and looking for common solutions", "warning - scolding at each mistake - depriving of something (negative reinforcer)", "giving duties and responsibilities", and "rewarding frequently." Some of the coping strategies that are used for regulating the learning-teaching process included "holding classroom meetings", "making the course interesting", and "updating the plans". The teacher-family cooperation theme included six strategies which involved "meeting with parents frequently" mentioned by three participants and, "meeting and talking with fathers more than mothers" by one participant. There are several quotations below:

"I sometimes hold classroom meetings. Everyone tells their views, criticisms about the processes in the classroom. We are learning to trust each other during these meetings. I recommend this practice to everyone. It takes time, but when the problems decrease, you win many times more than you spend." T4. M

"I believe these kinds of children can be integrated either with rewards or by depriving them of something. My student was exposed to violence by his mother and too much tolerance from his father. He lost balance. He was satisfied by material things. I forbade him to go out during breaks until he learned not to harm his friends." T10.F

“In fact, I do nothing special. I asked their fathers to come to school for a few times. I talked to their fathers because I guess the problem was caused rather by the father than the mother. I mean, these children have problems with authorities. I told them not to commit violence at home, but then I learned that fathers got even angrier. Children got even worse when their father got angry. That’s why I decided to leave them alone.” T15. M

3.2.4 Teachers’ suggestions for decreasing the occurrence of destructive resistance behaviors

The teachers were finally asked about decreasing the occurrence of destructive resistance behaviors in classrooms. Findings obtained from the responses given to this question were divided into two main groups as suggestions for schools and the Ministry of National Education (MONE) and suggestions for teachers; and are presented in Table 9.

Table 9

Teachers’ suggestions for decreasing the occurrence of destructive resistance behaviors

<u>Theme 1: Suggestions for schools and MONE (n:20)</u>	<u>N</u>
Families should be provided with training.	4
Teachers should be given training on patience and anger control.	3
School facilities should be improved.	2
All schools should be provided with equal opportunities.	1
Classroom sizes should be decreased.	1
Conferences and training increasing the awareness of women’s value should be organized.	1
Children from fragmented families should be provided with special support (guidance).	1
Students demonstrating resistance behaviors should be provided with counseling services.	1
Social and sports activities should be organized.	1
Workshops should be organized for the applied training.	1
Schools should be designed according to the students’ needs and characteristics.	1
Mothers should be provided with training on becoming more conscious as a woman.	1
Teacher training for resistance behaviors should be conducted.	1
Teachers should be trained to increase their qualifications.	1
<u>Theme 2: Suggestions for teachers (n:14)</u>	
Parents’ meetings should be held more frequently.	3
The classroom environment should enhance love and trust.	2

Classroom meetings should be held.	1
Students should be given information about the effects of their resistance behaviors.	1
Teachers should give importance to affective development.	1
Students showing resistance behaviors should be given duties and responsibilities.	1
Students' areas of interest should be identified and guided correctly.	1
Students should be directed to higher-order attainments.	1
Fathers should be encouraged to participate in parents' meetings.	1
Efforts should be made to get to know students' families.	1
Rules should be applied in a determined manner.	1

As it can be seen in Table 9, the most frequently indicated suggestions in both themes included “Families should be provided with training.”, “Teachers should be given training on patience and anger control.”, “School facilities should be improved”, “Parents’ meetings should be hold more frequently”, and “The classroom environment should enhance love and trust.”

4 Discussion

This study aims to identify the perceptions of primary school teachers about students’ resistance behaviors. The findings obtained from the SRBS-T scale administered for this purpose showed that the teachers’ perceptions were between “never” and “rarely” on the five-point Likert scale. Based on these results, teachers seemed to encounter a few manifestations of resistance behaviors in their classrooms. On the other hand, the interview results showed that teachers mentioned totally 47 resistance behaviors in the four different themes. However, considering that the interviews were conducted with 16 teachers - which means that there are two or three resistance behaviors on average per teacher - the findings obtained from the scale and the interviews were found to be parallel. Despite not being high in number, resistance behaviors mentioned by the teachers were in line with the resistance behaviors reported in literature (Burroughs et al., 1989; Sever, 2012). Here, it is important to note that the teachers were primary school teachers and the students were still young. Hence, although the resistance behaviors did not have a full equivalence; for instance, Kılıç-Özmen (2012) reported that classroom teachers working with younger students encountered unwanted behaviors less frequently than secondary school teachers working with older students. In a similar vein, results of the study conducted by Alkaş (2010) also reported that the rate of unwanted behaviors increased with the age of students. Considering that these unwanted behaviors could naturally involve some resistance behaviors, encountering a lower frequency of resistance behaviors by teachers could be related to students’ younger age - a higher occurrence of these behaviors can be expected during adolescence.

Comparisons performed on the teachers' SRBS-T scores according to gender indicated no differences between the groups. This finding indicates that female and male teachers encounter similar amounts of resistance behaviors. Studies conducted by Kılıç-Özmen (2012) and Ekici and Ekici (2014) reported no significant differences between teachers' gender as for encountering resistance behaviors. On the other hand, female teachers' rates for encountering resistance behaviors were generally higher in comparison to male teachers. Although this result is not statistically significant, it indicates that female teachers encounter a little bit more resistance behaviors in comparison to male teachers. Kılıç-Özmen (2012) and Ekici and Ekici (2014) also reported similar results in their studies. The Hostile attitudes towards the teacher sub-scale demonstrated higher mean scores for male teachers. These findings might be associated with the traditional gender roles. Students might have found female teachers less authoritative and thus demonstrated more resistance behaviors. On the other hand, students might have found male teachers more authoritative, thus secretly felt anger and hatred against them. As a result, they might have demonstrated more hostile behaviors towards male teachers.

The comparisons performed in the field of teachers' perceptions according to years of experience and the type of school they graduated from indicated no differences between the groups of teachers. In this regard, years of seniority in profession and the type of school indicated no significant differences in terms of encountering resistance behaviors, and all the teachers working in the schools where the study was conducted were found to face with resistance behaviors at similar rates. Teachers who graduated from faculties of education did not show a significant difference; moreover, fell behind except for those who graduated from the faculty of arts and sciences, which is quite sad and needs to be considered. This case might have been caused by two potential reasons. First, teachers who graduated from faculties of education might analyze resistance behaviors better because they might become aware of and be more sensitive towards student behaviors throughout their four-year education at the faculty. Therefore, they might seem to encounter resistance behaviors more frequently. Second reason could be just the opposite of this case. One would tend to assume that each individual who graduated from a faculty of education becomes a more effective teacher than teachers who graduated from other faculties. But unfortunately studies do not seem to support this assumption. Various studies in available literature show that there are no differences between individuals who graduated from faculties of education and the graduates of other faculties in terms of the investigated variables; in fact, they even achieved lower mean scores. For instance, in some studies, the graduates of faculties of education did not achieve better scores compared to the graduates of other faculties regarding different variables such as classroom management (Denizel-Güven & Cevher, 2005); attitudes towards the teaching profession (Korkmaz & Sadık, 2011); and problem solving skills (Sesli & Bozgeyikli, 2015). All these findings can be

regarded as factors that indicate the need for serious revisions in the education provided by faculties of education.

The results of interviews indicate that the resistance behaviors encountered by teachers were most frequently included among the themes of resistance to teacher authority, hostile attitudes towards the teacher/friends, being always angry, problematic or complainant, and passive resistance behaviors. Examples of resistance behaviors listed under these themes are in line with the ones mentioned in literature (Burroughs et al., 1989; Sever, 2012). Teachers referred to the family, the student and the teacher as the causes of these behaviors. All these sources were reported among the reasons that cause resistance behaviors also in similar studies (Argon et al., 2016; Kearney et al., 1991; Seidel & Tanner, 2013; Sever, 2012). Showing the teacher as the third cause of resistance behaviors might partly be associated with the concern of social likeability. While individuals respond to data collection tools that require to express their own attitudes, these individuals might avoid indicating the truth and respond in a way, which is expected to be liked or appreciated by others. A number of studies that investigated into the impact of teachers on resistance behaviors also support this assumption. For instance, in their study focused on resistance behaviors, Chory-Assad (2002), Chory-Assad and Paulsel (2004), and Paulsel and Chory-Assad (2005) dealt with teacher qualities and reported a negative relationship between positive teacher qualities and the frequency of students' resistance behaviors. Teachers establishing relationships with students based on love, respect and especially justice might experience resistance behaviors less frequently (Chory-Assad & Paulsel, 2004). Paulsel and Chory-Assad (2005) investigated findings in related literature and reported that students demonstrated less resistance behaviors to teachers who established warm relationships with them, who used social strategies in behavior management, whom they liked, who used a language based on dialogues, who were fair, and who did not legalize strict teacher authority and punishment based on the problem behavior. In a similar vein, Kearney, Plax and Smith (1986) also highlighted that students worked with teachers they liked in a more compatible manner. As a matter of fact, according to Furrer, Akiner and Pitzer (2014), the most common indicator of a problem in the teacher-student relationship is students' resistance to participate in classroom activities and becoming challengers and opponents. Based on all of these research findings, there seems to be a consensus about the fact that the teacher is one of the important sources of student resistance.

Conclusions and recommendations

A number of recommendations might be presented based on the findings of this study. First of all, studies on resistance behaviors, which were not encountered very frequently at primary school level, should be conducted during secondary and high school periods, which coincides with students' adolescence period. The second recommendation is based on the fact that faculty of education graduates

belong to one of the two groups that encounter resistance behaviors more frequently. In this regard, it could be recommended that study programs at faculties of education should be enriched in a way to encompass the topics regarding the sources and management of resistance behaviors. Another recommendation is related to the limitation to be caused by the fact that the data were collected through scales that required teachers' self-report. Studies to be conducted in the future might increase the objectivity of the results by investigating students' resistance behaviors in a multidimensional manner using various data collection tools (longitudinal observations, crosswise teacher-student-family interviews, action research, etc.).

References

- Alkaş, B. (2010). *İlköğretim öğrencileri arasındaki istenmeyen öğrenci davranışlarının incelenmesi* (Master's thesis), Ankara: Ankara University, Institute of Educational Sciences.
- Alpert, B. (1991). Students' resistance in the classroom. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 22(4), 350-366.
- Argon, T., & Sezen-Gültekin, G. (2016). Pedagogical formation students' resistance behaviors towards teaching-learning processes and their moral maturity. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 4(12A), 16-21. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2016.041303>
- Brookfield, S. D. (2006). *The Skillful Teacher: On Technique, Trust, and Responsiveness in the Classroom* (2nd Ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Burroughs, N. F., Kearney, P., & Plax, T. G. (1989). Compliance resistance in the college classroom. *Communication Education*, 38, 214-229.
- Chory-Assad, R. M. (2002). Classroom justice: Perceptions of fairness as a predictor of student motivation, learning, and aggression. *Communication Quarterly*, 50(1), 58-77. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01463370209385646>
- Chory-Assad, R. M., & Paulsel, M. L. (2004). Classroom justice: Student aggression and resistance as reactions to perceived unfairness. *Communication Education*, 53(3), 253-273. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0363452042000265189>
- Denizel-Güven, E., & Cevher, F. N. (2005). Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin sınıf yönetimi becerilerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 18, 1-22.
- Ekici, R., & Ekici, A. (2014). Sınıf yönetiminde istenmeyen öğrenci davranışlarının ilköğretim ve ortaokullarda karşılaştırmalı incelenmesi. *EKEV Akademi Dergisi*, 18(59), 107-118.
- Eroğlu, M. (2012). *Öğretmen adaylarının öğretmenlik meslek bilgisi derslerine yönelik direnç davranışları* (Master's thesis). Elazığ: Fırat University Institute of Educational Sciences.

- Field, J. C., & Olafson, L. J. (1999). Understanding resistance in students at risk. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 24(1), 70-75.
- Furrer, C. J., Akiner, E. A., & Pitzer, J. P. (2014). The influence of teacher and peer relationships on students' classroom engagement and everyday motivational resilience. *National Society for the Study of Education*, 113(1), 101-123.
- Gencil, I. E., & Saracaloglu, A. S. (2013). An investigation of resistant behaviors of the teacher candidates toward the teaching certificate courses. *Çukurova University Faculty of Education Journal*, 42(2), 87-98.
- Gjesfjeld, C. D. (2014). Meeting student resistance with emphatic teaching in the college classroom. *Gausis*, 2, 1-8.
- Hanuliaková, J., Hasajová, L., & Porubčanová, D. (2016). Stress of students and social-pathological phenomena. *Acta Technologica Dubnicae*, 6(3), 114-123. <https://doi.org/10.1515/atd-2016-0023>
- Kearney, P., Plax, T. G., & Burroughs, N. F. (1991). An attributional analysis of college students' resistance decisions. *Communication Education*, 40, 325-342.
- Kearney, P., Plax, T. G., & Smith, V. R. (1986). *Effects of teacher immediacy and strategy type on college student resistance*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL, November 13-16, 1986.
- Kılıç-Özmen, Z. (2012). Primary school teachers' perception level of their students' unwanted behaviors. *Turkish International Journal of Special Education and Guidance & Counseling*, 1(1), 35-43.
- Kim, J. H. (2010). Understanding student resistance as a communicative act. *Ethnography and Education*, 5(3), 261-276. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17457823.2010.511349>
- Korkmaz, G., & Sadık, F. (2011). İlköğretim okullarında görev yapan öğretmenlerin mesleki tutumlarının sosyo-demografik özellikler açısından incelenmesi. *Ç.Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 20(1), 121-138.
- Miles, R. D. (2007). *Student resistance in the classroom*. Chapin: YouthLigth, Inc.
- Paulsel, M. L., & Chory-Assad, R. M. (2005). Perceptions of instructor interactional justice as a predictor of student resistance. *Communication Research Reports*, 22(4), 283-291.
- Sarı, M. (2018). Development of a teacher scale to measure presence and frequency of students' resistance behaviors. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 6(2), 226-234. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2018.060203>
- Sesli, S., & Bozgeyikli, H. (2015). Okulöncesi öğretmenlerinin problem çözme becerileri ile disiplin anlayışlarının incelenmesi. *OPUS - Türkiye Sosyal Politika ve Çalışma Hayatı Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5(8), 82-111.

- Sever, D. (2012). *İlköğretim fen ve teknoloji dersinde araştırma temelli öğrenme yaklaşımının öğrenci dirençlerine etkisi* (Doctoral dissertation). Eskişehir: Anadolu University Graduate School of Educational Sciences.
- Sever, D., & Güven, M. (2014), İlköğretim fen ve teknoloji dersinde araştırma temelli öğrenme yaklaşımının öğrenci dirençlerine etkisi. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 14(4), 1583-1605.
- Seidel, S. B., & Tanner, K. D. (2013). “What if students revolt?” Considering student resistance: Origins, options, and opportunities for investigation. *CBE Life Sciences Education*, 12, 586-595.
- Yüksel, S. (2004). Eğitim fakültesi öğrencilerinin öğretme-öğrenme süreçlerine yönelik direnç davranışları. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2(3), 323-340.
- Yüksel, S., & Şahin E. (2005). Alt sosyo-ekonomik düzeyden gelen lise öğrencilerinin öğrenme-öğretme faaliyetlerine ilişkin direnç davranışları. *Education and Science*, 30(138), 52-62.
- Zhang, Q. (2011). Teacher request politeness: Effects on student positive emotions and compliance intention. *Human Communication*, 14(4), 347-356.