



## TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS FOR PROBLEMATIC STUDENT BEHAVIORS: EXAMINATION ACCORDING TO TEACHERS' BURNOUT SITUATIONS

**Fahri Sezer<sup>i</sup>**

Balikesir University,  
Necatibey Faculty of Education,  
Guidance and Counseling Department,  
Turkey

### **Abstract:**

In this study, it was investigated the behaviors of primary and secondary school students were perceived as problematic by teachers and whether or not teachers' burnout situations are influencing this perception. 188 teachers which of 112 females (60%) and 76 males (40%) constituted the sample group. Maslach Burnout Inventory and a short questionnaire form were used for data collection. It has been shown that the decrease in the level of burnout of teachers leads them to be more sensitive to their students and to prefer more constructive and humanist methods to correct the behaviors of the students they perceive as problematic. It was also found that the increase in the burnout level of the teachers led to more disciplinary attitudes towards the students.

**Keywords:** teacher's perception, problem behavior, teacher, student, burnout

### **1. Introduction**

How teachers perceive the behaviors of students has always been one of the main curiosities. In particular, there are many studies about the perceived behavior of students as problematic or normal. (Little, 2005; Wheldall & Merrett, 1988; Englehart, 2006; Meier, 2005; Shen, et al., 2009; Borg, 1998; Giallo & Little, 2003; Siyez, 2009; Atıcı & Çekici, 2009; Hammarberg, 2003; Oyinloye, 2010; Male, 2003; Asikhia, 2010; Martin, Kraemer & Light, 1984; Poulou, & Norwich, 2000; Rivard, Missiuna, Hanna, & Wishart, 2007; Munn, Johnstone, Sharp, & Brown, 2007; Erdener, Sezer, & Tezci, 2017). One of the most important reasons why this topic is always up to date is that it maintains the importance given to the students who are always at the center in both education and guidance services. Another significant factor in the maintenance of this subject being

---

<sup>i</sup> Correspondence: email [fahrisezer23@hotmail.com](mailto:fahrisezer23@hotmail.com)

up-to-date is the fact that the student's family as well as the education system continuously seek for obtaining more efficiency from the student.

Studies carried out from past to present about the problematic behaviors of the students indicate that this issue stays up to date. In the studies carried out within this scope, the most significant problem behaviors of the students were defined by the teachers as the students' cognitive and emotional problems as well as their shyness and displaying anti-social behaviors (Wickman, 1928), being involved in dishonesty, aggressiveness and theft (Ziv, 1970), students' lack of discipline, drinking alcohol and using narcotic drugs (Martin et al., 1984), talking to other students around and distracting them (Houghton, Wheldall, & Merrett, 1988; Little, 2005; Beaman et al., 2007; Erdener, Sezer, & Tezci, 2017; Sezer, 2012) using violence, damaging school supplies and properties, violating the school rules, lying, being rude to their teacher (Romi & Freund, 1999), being inattentive and looking around in the classroom (Shen et al., 2009). In the study carried out in Turkey, such behaviors as paying no attention to the lesson, talking to each other, complaining about other students in class, engaging in activities outside the scope of the lesson, talking without first getting a permission from the teacher as well as cheating were observed among the most problematic student behaviors (Siyez, 2009).

Although many studies have been done on this topic, other subject to be dealt with is which methods are applied by teachers to prevent such student's behaviors. Teachers use various techniques to overcome such student behaviors perceived as problem behaviors displayed in their class. Some of the methods applied by the teachers for this purpose include receiving help from a more experienced teacher and training of the teachers (Arbuckle & Little, 2004), sending the student to another personnel in the school (Martin et al., 1999; Siyez, 2009), talking to the student about the reasons of such a behavior and cooperating with the family of the student (Siyez, 2009; Martin et al., 1984), giving instructions, using signs and body language, ignoring the student, making eye contact, saying out the student's name, reprimanding, asking a question, threatening, physical affection, making a joke and criticizing (Atçı, 2004), asking for help from the psychological counselor in the school (Atıcı, 2006), moving the student to another seat in class, giving a general warning in class anonymously and although rarely, talking about the failures of the student in class (Sama & Tarim, 2007; Martin et al., 1984).

One of the significant problems is the teachers' conception of the behaviors of the students in the classrooms and whether such behaviors of the students, in case they are perceived by the teachers as problematic, are related to the burnout states of the teachers. Burnout is as a syndrome that effect boredom and consumption of the energy of a person (Friedman, 1991), including emotional request and stress resulting from the teacher's encounter with physically, emotionally and cognitively challenging conditions (Hakanen, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2006) and reducing the capacity of the teacher to deal with such conditions when together with other people. It consists of three dimensions; Emotional Exhaustion (EE), Depersonalization (DP) and Personal Accomplishment (PA) (Goddard, O'Brien, & Goddard, 2006). Emotional exhaustion is defined as the

exhaustion of the emotional resources of a person and depersonalization is defined as the behavior of a person without taking into account that each individual is a distinctive human being (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000) and personal accomplishment is defined as a person's feeling adequate and successful in his or her profession (Musaoğlu, 2008).

Although the experienced teachers perceive students 'problematic behaviors as less problematic (Borg, 1998) than novice teacher, problem behaviors is one of the factors effecting both experienced and novice teachers burnout levels (Giallo & Little, 2003; Arbuckle & Little, 2004; Shen et al. 2009; Blankenship, 1988; Griffith, Steptoe, & Croyley, 1999; Martin, Linfoot, & Stephenson, 1999; Parkay, Greenwood, Olejnik, & Proller, 1988; Sezer 2012). The fact that teachers have stated that they spend more time to overcome the problem behaviors displayed by the students in their classes than the time to teach such students (Wheldall & Merrett, 1988; Little, 2005) is an indication that the problem behaviors of the students may result in burnout among such teachers. Not only the problematic student behavior, but also their not rely teachers to cope with stressful classroom environments (Evans & Tribble, 1986; Parkay et al., 1988), unhealthy communication between the teacher and the student (Ben-Chaim & Zoller, 2001), lack of a positive classroom atmosphere (Brouwers & Tomic 2000) are also among the factors that may lead to the occurrence of the state of burnout among teachers.

As a result, in this study, it was examined whether the behaviors exhibited by the students were perceived as problematic behaviors by the teachers and whether this perception style differed in terms of the burnout status of the teachers. Especially, the fact that there is no analysis in the literature about whether the burnout states of the teachers are a crucial factor in their perception of the behavior of the students as problematic has increased the significance of this study. The data to be obtained from this study will be helpful to gain a different point of view to overcome the behaviors of the students perceived as problem behaviors. In this regard, answers to the following questions were sought for:

1. Does the level of burnout of teachers cause students to perceive their behavior as problematic?
2. What are the most problematic student behaviors faced by teachers?
3. What are the methods that teachers use to deal with problematic student behaviors?

## **2. Material and Methods**

### **2.1. Participants**

The research sample is composed of a total of 188 teachers as 112 female teachers (60%) and 76 male teachers (40%), working in various branches in different primary and secondary schools in the city center of Balıkesir, Turkey. Availability sampling was used as the sampling method.

## 2.2. Materials

In the study, a questionnaire composed of open-ended questions was applied to determine how the teachers perceive the students. The questionnaire applied in this study is the Turkish version of the questionnaire used as a data collection tool in the study carried out by Wheldall & Merrett (1988) and Little (2005). The following questions were asked to the teachers in the questionnaire form provided: "In general terms do you think that you spend more time on problems of order and control than you ought?" Following this, the teachers were asked: "Write down the behavior you find most problematic with your classes as a whole"; "Write down the problem behavior you find most frequent with your classes as a whole"; and lastly it was asked that "What kind of precautions do you take to deal with the behavioral problems of the students?" Teachers were instructed only to fill in the questions for the year levels they currently taught. These items were derived from past research that identified these approaches as being the ones most commonly used by teachers. In addition to the questionnaire form, the burnout inventory developed by Maslach and Jackson (1981) was also applied to determine the burnout states of the teachers.

## 2.3. Data Collection Tools

Maslach Burnout Inventory developed by Maslach and Jackson (1981) has been used in this study. Translated by Ergin (1992), it has been decided to make some changes to the inventory originally using a 7-point scale by devising it in such a form to use a 5-point scale as "0 never", and "4 always" for answer choices and this 5-point scale is also used in the instructor form. For scoring, three different burnout scores as Emotional Exhaustion (EE), Depersonalization (DP), and Personal Accomplishment (PA) are calculated for each person (Çapri, 2006). Reliability coefficient of the inventory is 0.88 for emotional exhaustion, 0.83 for personal accomplishment and 0.72 for depersonalization (Yavuz, 2009). In the present study, the corresponding coefficient alpha scores were .87 for emotional exhaustion, .72 for depersonalization, and .75 for personal accomplishment.

Scores obtained from Maslach Burnout Inventory were grouped together as the following and the burnout states of the teachers were classified as low, medium and high. This classification is based on previous studies contained in the literature and carried out by using burnout inventory (Musaoğlu, 2008).

Emotional Exhaustion (EE): Scores of 27 and above are high, scores between 17 and 26 are average, and scores between 0 and 16 are low.

Depersonalization (DP): Scores of 13 and above are high, scores between 7 and 12 are average, and scores between 0 and 16 are low.

Personal Accomplishment (PA): Scores up to 31 are high, scores between 32 and 38 are average, and scores between 39 and above are low (Musaoğlu, 2008).

Based on this classification, the answers of the teachers given to the open ended questions in the questionnaire form were categorized as low, medium and high. Thus, the frequency and the burnout level of the indicated condition were determined.

## 2.4. Procedure

First of all, the research form prepared was sent to the teachers instructing in different primary and secondary schools randomly chosen in the province of Balıkesir in Turkey. The questionnaire composed of open ended questions and Maslach Burnout Inventory was applied to the teachers who wanted to participate in the study. After the questionnaire forms had been completed by the teachers, the data obtained were transferred to the computer environment and analyzed. Average, frequency, percent values and Chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) were used in the analysis of the data.

## 3. Results

The answers given by the teachers to the question "Do you think that the you spend more time to control the students you perceive as problematic in your class than the time to educate them?" were analyzed by comparing to the burnout states of the teachers and these results are given in Table 1 below.

**Table 1:** Difficulty experienced by teachers to control students perceived as problematic

	EE			PA			DP		
	High	Med	Low	High	Med	Low	High	Med	Low
Yes	%7	%43	%50	%33.3	%45.6	%21.1	%0	%14	%86
No	%0	%11.5	%88.5	%59	%30.8	%10.3	%2.6	%2.6	%94.9
$\chi^2$		31.07			12.77			9.83	
p		.000*			.002*			.007*	

The teachers' answers to this question was found a relationship with between the states EE ( $\chi^2_{(2)} = 31.07$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), and PA ( $\chi^2_{(2)} = 12.77$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) and DP ( $\chi^2_{(2)} = 9.83$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). It was found that among the teachers who answered "yes" to the question, EE levels of were low (% 50;  $f=57$ ) and were medium (%43;  $f=49$ ), whereas PA levels of were medium (% 45,6;  $f=52$ ), and were high (%33,3;  $f=38$ ), and DP levels of mostly were low (% 86;  $f=98$ ). It was found that the teacher who answered "no" to this questions, EE levels of were low (%88,5;  $f=69$ ), PA levels of were high ( %59;  $f=24$ ) and DP levels of were low (% 94,9;  $f=74$ ).

For the purpose of the determination of the teachers' perception about the negative classroom environment arising from the behaviors displayed by the students in the classrooms were analyzed by comparing to the burnout states of the teachers and these results are given in Table 2 below.

**Table 2:** Teachers' opinions about the most inconvenient class environment

	EE%			PA %			DP %		
	High	Med	Low	High	Med	Low	High	Med	Low
1. Talking and 2. making noises	3.2	25.8	71	41.9	48.4	9.7	0	6.5	93.5
3. Students do not study their lessons	0	12.5	87.5	50	50	0	0	12.5	87.5
4. Students' complaining about each other	0	33.3	66.7	33.3	33.3	33.3	0	0	100
5. Teaching abstract concepts to students	0	100	0	50	50	0	0	0	100
6. Students' being 7. selfish	0	66.7	33.3	66.7	33.3	0	33.3	0	66.7
8. Students' being mean to each other	0	25	75	75	0	25	0	0	100
9. Students do not do their homework	0	16.7	83.3	83.3	16.7	0	0	0	100
10. Students do not listen to - do not understand the teacher	10	60	30	15	45	40	0	0	100
11. Motivating the students for the lessons	5.9	38.2	55.9	35.3	35.3	29.4	0	29.4	70.6
12. Students do not bring the required classroom materials with them	0	0	100	25	50	25	0	0	100
13. Attention 14. deficit	5.6	44.4	50	22.2	50	27.8	0	5.6	94.4
15. Having difficulty in teaching students how to play a musical instrument	0	100	0	50	50	0	0	0	100
16. Students' disobeying the rules	0	42.9	57.1	42.9	42.9	14.3	14.3	0	85.7
17. Students' being frivolous or lack of attention	13.3	26.7	60	20	53.3	26.7	0	20	80
18. Students' fighting each other	0	0	100	66.7	22.2	11.1	0	11.1	88.9
19. Problems attributed to the student's family	0	33.3	66.7	100	0	0	0	0	100
20. Students' being disrespectful	0	50	50	50	37.5	12.5	0	12.5	87.5
21. Students' low socioeconomic level	0	33.3	66.7	50	50	0	0	0	100
22. Physical deficiency of the school	0	0	100	66.7	0	33.3	0	0	100
23. No 24. answer	14.3	14.3	71.4	57.1	28.6	14.3	0	14.3	85.7

It was observed that the teachers whose DP level (% 93.5; f=58) and EE level (% 71; f=58) were low mostly stated students' "talking and making noises". The teachers whose EE

and DP levels were low stated as a troublesome situation that “Students do not study their lessons” (% 87.5; f=14) and “Students do not bring the required classroom materials with them” (% 100; f=8). The teachers whose DP level low stated as a troublesome situation that “Students’ complaining about each other” (% 100; f=6) whereas of the teachers whose EE levels were medium and DP levels were low “Teaching abstract concepts to students” (% 100; f=2). The teachers whose EE levels are medium, PA levels were high, and DP levels were low (%66.7; f=4) stated as a troublesome situation that “Students’ being selfish”. DP level low teachers stated as a troublesome situation that “Students’ being mean to each other” (%100; f=8), “Students do not do their homework” (%100; f=12), “Students do not listen to - do not understand the teacher” (%100; f=20) and “Motivating the students for the lessons” (%70.6; f= 24).

It was found out that of the teachers whose DP levels were low stated “Attention deficit” (% 94,4; f= 34), “students’ disobeying the rules” (%85,7; f=12), “Students’ being frivolous or lack of attention” (% 80; f=24), “Students’ being disrespectful” (% 87,5; f=12) and “Students’ low socioeconomic level” (% 100; f=12) as the factors leading to the most inconvenient classroom environment. Furthermore, teachers stated they were “having difficulty in teaching students how to play a musical instrument”, “Physical deficiency of the school” and “Students’ fighting each other” and “Problems attributed to the student’s family” as inconvenient situations. As much as the ratio of those who did not answer this question was concerned, it was found out that the teachers whose DP levels were low constituted the majority (85.7%, f=12).

In Table 3 was given, the findings about which behaviors displayed by the students in classroom were perceived by teachers as the most inconvenient behavior to deal with have been compared with the burnout states of the teachers.

**Table 3:** The most challenging student behaviors faced by teachers

	EE%			PA%			DP%		
	High	Med	Low	High	Med	Low	High	Med	Low
1. Talking-making noises	3.3	41.7	55	36.7	33.3	30	0	3.3	96.7
2. Family problems of the student	0	66.7	33.3	33.3	66.7	0	0	0	100
3. Physical assault-fighting	0	16.7	83.3	50	33.3	16.7	0	8.3	91.7
4. Students’ being selfish	0	66.7	33.3	66.7	33.3	0	33.3	0	66.7
5. Lack of attention to the lessons and being frivolous	7.1	46.4	46.4	42.9	28.6	28.6	0	14.3	85.7
6. Students use slangs	0	25	75	25	75	0	0	25	75
7. Low level of student success in class	0	50	50	50	50	0	0	50	50
8. Students come to class unprepared, do not do their homework	0	0	100	40	60	0	0	0	100
9. Attention deficit	0	23.1	76.9	46.2	46.2	7.7	0	7.7	92.3
10. Running around the classroom	0	25	75	62.5	12.5	25	0	0	100
11. Disobeying the rules-behavior disorder	5.9	52.9	41.2	38.2	14.7	47.1	5.9	11.9	82.4
12. No answer	11.8	5.9	82.4	47.1	47.1	5.9	0	11.8	88.2

Teachers whose DP levels were low (% 96,7; f=58) stated students' "Talking-making noises", "Physical assault and fighting" (%91,7; f=22), "Lack of attention to the lessons and being frivolous" (% 85,7; f=24), "Attention deficit" " (%92,3; f=24) and 82.4% (f=28) stated "Disobeying the rules-behavior disorder" (% 82,4; f=28) as the most inconvenient student behavior to deal with in the classroom in general.

The teacher whose DP levels were low, PA levels were high and EE levels were medium stated as the most inconvenient student behavior to deal with in the classroom that "Students' being selfish" (% 66,7; f=12). The teachers whose DP levels were low, PA levels were medium and EE levels were low stated "Students use slangs" (% 75; f=18), teachers whose DP levels were low and medium, PA levels were medium and high, and EE levels were low and medium stated "Low level of student success in class" (% 50; f=24) and teachers whose DP and EE levels were low stated "Students come to class unprepared and do not do their homework" (% 100; f=20) as the most inconvenient student behavior to deal with in the classroom in general. Moreover, it was observed that the majority of those who did not answer this question were composed of a total of 30 teachers whose DP levels were low (88.2%).

In Table 4 was given, the methods used by the teachers to assist the students perceived as problematic in their classes and whether such methods were associated with the burnout states of the teachers were analyzed.

**Table 4:** The methods teachers use to cope with problematic students

	EE %			PA %			DP %		
	High	Med	Low	High	Med	Low	High	Med	Low
1. Friendly approach-private conversation	4	38	58	32	52	16	0	8	92
2. Trying to persuade	25	25	40	75	25	0	0	0	100
3. Lowering the student's grades	0	100	0	0	0	100	0	0	100
4. Not letting the student go out during the break	0	100	0	50	50	0	0	0	100
5. Conversation with the student's parents	7.7	23.1	69.2	61.5	23.1	15.4	7.7	15.4	76.9
6. Verbal warning-explaining about the negative outcomes caused by the student	4.5	20.5	75	50	31.8	18.2	0	9.1	90.9
7. Rewarding	0	0	100	50	0	50	0	0	100
8. Keeping the student under control-raising voice	0	44.4	55.6	33.3	22.2	44.4	0	11.1	88.9
9. Reporting to the school administration	0	0	100	100	0	0	0	0	100
10. Reading an exemplary story and making suggestions	0	50	50	16.7	83.3	0	0	16.7	83.3
11. Ensuring students' being attentive during the lesson	0	25	75	12.5	87.5	0	0	0	100
12. Assigning a responsibility or a task	0	50	50	0	100	0	0	0	100
13. No answer	0	0	100	83.3	16.7	0	0	16.7	83.3

It was observed the teacher whose DP levels (92%, f=46) and EE levels (58%, f=29) were low was used the method "Friendly approach-private conversation" mostly. The method "Trying to persuade" was more used by the teachers whose DP levels were low (100%, f=8) and PA levels were high (75%, f=6). It was found out that the methods "Conversation with the student's parents" (76.9%, f=20), "Verbal warning-explaining about the negative outcomes caused by the student" (90.9%, f=40), "Keeping the student under control-raising voice" (88.9%, f=16) and "Ensuring students' being attentive during the lesson" (100%, f=10) were more used by the teachers whose DP levels were low. It was found out that the majority of the teachers who did not answer to this question comprised of the teachers whose EE levels were low (100%, f=12).

#### 4. Discussion and Conclusion

The primary objective of this study is to determine which behaviors of the students were perceived by teachers as problematic and whether the burnout states of the teachers diversified this perception. For this purpose, the teachers were primarily asked whether they spent more time to control the problematic students than the time for teaching such students. It was found out that the majority of the teachers who EE and DP level were low and PA level high were not perception this situation as troublesome.

The teachers' presence in a stressful classroom environment where they would have difficulty in dealing with such challenges as well as the lack of a positive classroom atmosphere are the most significant determinants having an impact on the emergence of the burnout states among the teachers (Evans & Tribble, 1986; Parkay et al., 1988; Brouwers & Tomic 2000; Byrne, 1991). From these findings, it is said that EE and DP level of teachers is lover contributed to see themselves enough and don't perceive to this situation as a problem. Similarly, it said that PA level of teachers is lover contributed successful to see themselves and don't perceive to this situation as a problem.

The teachers mainly stated such factors as the students' talking and making noises, not studying their lessons and not bringing the required classroom materials with them as the conditions causing an inconvenient classroom environment. Moreover, when the findings acquired from this study and the results of other studies were compared, it was ascertained that such types of behaviors were perceived by the teachers as the most problematic behaviors (Wragg & Dooley, 1996; Maya, 2004; Siyez, 2009; Balay & Sağlam, 2008; Çankay, 2011). The problem behaviors of the students are among the significant factors leading to an increase in the burnout states of the teachers (Giallo & Little, 2003; Arbuckle & Little, 2004; Shen et al., 2009; Blankenship, 1988; Griffith, Steptoe, & Cropley, 1999; Martin, Linfoot, & Stephenson, 1999; Parkay, Greenwood, Olejnik, & Proller, 1988). In order to deal with such problem behaviors, the burnout states of the teachers are required to be low and such teachers are required to feel the responsibility to carry out their duties.

It was found out that the majority of the teachers, whose burnout states were high, did not recognize their students, did not spend time with them other than the

class hours, did not mention about the current affairs during the class due to the thought that they would be unable to have control over the class and a considerable number of teachers did not establish a friendly relationship with their students (Karakelle & Canpolat, 2008). The fact that low levels of EE and DP of the teachers included in our sample can be considered as an indication that the teachers did not remain insensitive to the problem behaviors of the students. On the other hand, the fact that the majority of the teachers with high levels of PA perceived "students' being selfish" and "problems attributed to the student's family" as the most inconvenient conditions may be attributed to the fact that it is difficult to interfere in such circumstances that are beyond the control of the teachers.

It was ascertained that the teachers stated such factors as the students' talking-making noises, family problems of the students, physical assault and fighting, lack of attention to the lessons and being frivolous, having attention deficits problems, running around the classroom, and disobeying the rules as the most inconvenient student behaviors to deal with during the class. These findings provided similar results to the findings of a number of research conducted about this subject (Ziv, 1970; Houghton et al., 1988; Romi & Freund, 1999; Little, 2005; Beaman et al., 2007; Shen et al., 2009; Siyez, 2009).

It was observed that such conditions stated by the teachers as the most inconvenient were more pronounced by the teachers whose DP levels were low. The teachers whose DP levels were low perceived the students' "talking-making noises" as the most inconvenient condition whereas those with low EE levels stated the students' coming to class unprepared and not doing their homework as the most inconvenient condition. The performance of a teacher who experienced burnout would decrease and this condition would have a negative reflection on the student (Cunningham, 1983). The fact that the EE and DP of the teachers were low can be said to result in their being insensitive to the behaviors displayed by the students. Thus, the teachers will want to intervene to the student's problematic behavior and perceive it as a problem.

On the other hand, the majority of the teachers whose PA levels were high perceived low level of student success in class as the most inconvenient condition. The fact that the personal accomplishments of the teachers were high was an indication that the general burnout states of the teachers were low. In such a circumstance, the more the teachers perceived themselves as accomplished, the more they would want to contemplate on the negative behaviors of the students in class. Low levels of burnout states have a positive influence on the teachers to continue to teach more effectively in class without having a teaching phobia (Jaoul, Kovess, & FSP-MGEN, 2004).

The method "friendly approach-private conversation" was more used by the teachers whose DP levels and EE levels were low whereas the method "trying to persuade" was more used by those whose DP levels were low and PA levels were high. It was found that the methods "conversation with the student's parents", "verbal warning-explaining about the negative outcomes caused by the student", "Keeping the student under control-raising voice" and "ensuring students' being attentive during the lesson" were more used by the teachers whose DP levels were low. The teachers who

experienced a burnout defined themselves as physically exhausted and they reached the end of the road (Schwab, Jackson & Schuler, 1986) and such teachers were known as they had a tendency to impose more disciplinary rules on their students (Tümkiye, 2005). The methods used by the teachers to help the students suggest that the majority of such methods include a positive attitude in favor of the students. This indicates that these teachers have assumed a positive attitude towards their duties as well as their profession and they tend to become more optimistic to their students as their burnout states decrease. The fact that the teachers with a medium level of EE resorted to more negative methods such as “lowering the student’s grades” and “not letting the student go out during the break” was also an indication that as the burnout increases, the teachers tend to impose disciplinary rules. When keeping the order was considered as the most significant source of stress (Gordon, 2001), an increase in the burnout states of the teachers was an expected result.

Based on the findings obtained from the study, it can be said that the teachers become more sensitive towards their students and prefer to make use of more positive and humanist methods in order to change the behaviors of the students perceived as problematic as the level of the teachers’ burnout states decreases. On the other hand, it was observed that an increase in the burnout states resulted in such teachers to have an attitude to impose more disciplinary rules on the students.

As a result, it should not be forgotten that it would be beneficial to provide psychological counseling services to teachers who are at risk of burnout or who are living with guidance services. However, when the factors affecting the burnout status of teachers are examined, it appears that some responsibilities must be fulfilled by the students' parents, school administrators and bureaucrats. The duty of these persons, who are responsible for the burnout experienced by the teacher, will contribute positively to making the profession of the teacher more compassionate and enthusiastic. In addition, continuing professional life away from the burnout of the teachers will contribute to the maximum efficiency of the education and training activities of the students.

## References

1. Arbuckle, C. & Little, E. (2004). Teachers’ perceptions and management of disruptive classroom behaviour during the middle years (years five to nine). *Australian Journal of Educational and Developmental Psychology*, 4, 59–70.
2. Asikhia, O.A. (2010). Students and teachers’ perception of the causes of poor academic performance in Ogun state secondary schools [Nigeria]: Implications for counseling for national development. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 13(2), 229-242.
3. Atçıl, A. (2004). An investigation of teachers' intervention strategies for misbehaviour in primary schools. (Master’s dissertation Thesis, Adana: Çukurova University). Retrieved from: <http://tez2.yok.gov.tr/>.

4. Atıcı, M. & Çekici, F. (2009). Comparison of teachers and students' ideas about dealing with misbehavior in secondary schools. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 15(60), 495-522
5. Atıcı, M. (2006). Comparison of teachers and counselors' ideas about collaboration in dealing with students' behavior problems in primary schools. *Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Journal*, 25, 55-65.
6. Balay, R. & Sağlam, M. (2008). The opinions of teachers concerning the negative behaviors in class. *Yüziüncü Yıl University Journal of Education Faculty*. 5(2), 1-24.
7. Beaman, R., Wheldall, K., & Kemp, C. (2007). Recent research on troublesome classroom behaviour: A review. *Australian Journal of Special Education*, 6, 45–60. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1030011200025586>
8. Ben-Chaim, D., & Zoller, U. (2001). Self-perception versus students' perception of teacher personal style in college science and mathematics courses. *Research in Science Education*, 31, 437-454. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:101317232>
9. Blankenship, C. (1988). Structuring the classroom for success. *Australasian Journal of Special Education*, 12, 25-30. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1030011200021904>
10. Borg, M. G. (1998). Secondary school teachers' perception of pupils' undesirable behaviors. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 68, 67-79. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8279.1998.tb01275.x>
11. Brouwers, A.H., & Tomic, W. (2000) A longitudinal study of teacher burnout and perceived self-efficacy in classroom management. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16, 239-253.
12. Byrne, B.M. (1991). Burnout: Investigating the impact of background variables for elementary, intermediate, secondary, and university educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 7(2), 197-209. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(99\)00057-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(99)00057-8)
13. Çankay, İ. (2011). Undesirable student behaviors faced by classroom teachers and ways of coping with this behavior. *Turkish Studies*, 6(2), 307-316.
14. Çapri, B. (2006). Burnout Turkish version of the scale: validity and reliability. *Mersin University Journal of Education Faculty*, 2(1), 62-77.
15. Cooper, H.M. (1989). Does a reducing student-to-instructor ratio affect achievement? *Educational Psychologist*, 24(1), 79–98. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2401\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2401_3)
16. Cunningham, W. J. (1983). Teacher burnout – solutions for the 1980's: A review of the literature. *The Urban Review*, 15(1), 37- 49. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01112341>
17. Englehart, J.M. (2006). Teacher perceptions of student behavior as a function of class size. *Social Psychology Of Education*, 9, 245–272. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-006-0007-3>
18. Erdener M.A., Sezer F., & Tezci E. (2017). Determination of frequent student problems in high schools, *Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 12(14), 151-166., Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies>.

19. Erdener M.A., Sezer F., & Tezci E. (2017). Determination of Frequent Student Problems Areas in Middle Schools. *Erzincan Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 19(2), 303-320. Doi: 10.17556/erziefd.304220
20. Ergin, C. (1992). Doctor and nurse burnout and adaptation of the Maslach Burnout Inventory. VII. National Congress of psychology scientific studies. Ankara, Turkish Psychological Association publication, 143-154.
21. Evans, E., & Tribble, M. (1986). Perceived teaching problems, self-efficacy, and commitment to teaching among preservice teachers. *Journal of Educational Research*, 80, 81-85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.1986.10885728>
22. Friedman, I.A. (1991). High and low-burnout schools: school culture aspects of teacher burnout. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 84(6), 325- 333. DOI: 10.1080/00220671.1991.9941813
23. Giallo, R., & Little E. (2003). Classroom behaviour problems: the relationship between preparedness, classroom experiences, and self-efficacy in graduate and student teachers. *Australian Journal of Educational & Developmental Psychology*. 3, 21-34.
24. Goddard, R., O'Brien, P., & Goddard, M. (2006). Work environment predictors of beginning teacher burnout. *British Educational Research Journal*, 32(6), 857-874.
25. Gordon, D.G. (2001). Classroom management: problems and solutions. *Music Educators Journal*, 88 (2), 17-23.
26. Griffith, J., Steptoe, A., & Cropley, M. (1999). An investigation of coping strategies associated with job stress in teachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 69, 517-531. <https://doi.org/10.1348/000709999157879>
27. Hakanen, J.J., Bakker, A.B., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2006). Burnout and work engagement among teachers. *Journal of School Psychology*, 43, 495-513. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2005.11.001>
28. Hammarberg, A. (2003). Pre-school Teachers' Perceived Control and Problem Behaviors in Children. (Comprehensive Summaries of Uppsala Dissertations from the Faculty of Social Sciences, Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis). Retrieved from: <http://uu.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:162425/FULLTEXT01>
29. Houghton, S., Wheldall, K., & Merrett, F. (1988). Classroom behaviour problems which secondary school teachers say they find most troublesome. *British Educational Research Journal*, 14, 297-312. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0141192880140306>
30. Jaoul, G., Kovess, V., & FSP-MGEN (2004). Teacher's burnout. *Annales Medico Psychologiques, Revue Psychiatrique*, 162(1), 26-35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amp.2003.03.002>
31. Karakelle, S., & Canpolat, S. (2008). Analyzing the student relationship styles of the primary school teachers with high burnout level. *Education and Science*, 33(147), 106-120.
32. Little, E. (2005). Secondary school teachers' perceptions of students' problem behaviours. *Educational Psychology*, 25(4), 369-377. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410500041516>

33. Male, D. (2003). Challenging Behaviour: The perceptions of teachers of children and young people with severe learning disabilities. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 3(3), 162–171. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.00011>
34. Martin R.E., Kraemer, P.W., & Light, H.K. (1984). Teacher perceptions of behavior problems in small and large schools. *Research in Rural Education*, 2(3), 105-107.
35. Martin, A., Linfoot, K., & Stephenson, J. (1999). How teachers respond to concerns about misbehaviour in their classroom. *Psychology in the Schools*, 36, 347-358. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1520-6807\(199907\)36:4<347::AID-PITS7>3.0.CO;2-G](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1520-6807(199907)36:4<347::AID-PITS7>3.0.CO;2-G)
36. Maya, İ. Ç. (2004). The teacher reactions against undesired student behaviours in the occupational and technical schools. 8. National Educational Sciences Conference, Malatya, Turkey.
37. Meier, C. (2005). Addressing problems in integrated schools: student teachers' perceptions regarding viable solutions for learners' academic problems. *South African Journal of Education*, 25(3), 170–177.
38. Munn, P., Johnstone, M., Sharp S. & Brown, J. (2007). Violence in schools: Perceptions of secondary teachers and head teachers over time. *International Journal on Violence and Schools*, 3, 51-80.
39. Musaoğlu, Z. (2008). Health related quality of life among academic staff working at Trakya University. Master's dissertation Thesis, Edirne: Trakya University.
40. Oyinloye, G.O. (2010). Primary school teachers' perception of classroom management and its influence on pupils' activities. *European Journal of Educational Studies*, 2(3), 305-312.
41. Parkay, F., Greenwood, G., Olejnik, S., & Proller, N. (1988). A study of the relationships among teacher efficacy, locus of control, and stress. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 21, 13-22.
42. Poulou, M. & Norwich, B. (2000). Teachers' perceptions of students with emotional and behavioural difficulties: severity and prevalence. *European Journal Of Special Needs Education*, 15(2), 171–187. <https://doi.org/10.1080/088562500361600>
43. Rivard, L.M., Missiuna, C., Hanna, S., & Wishart, L. (2007). Understanding teachers' perceptions of the motor difficulties of children with developmental coordination disorder (DCD). *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 77, 633–648. <https://doi.org/10.1348/000709906X159879>
44. Romi, S. & Freund, M. (1999). Teachers', students' and parents' attitudes towards disruptive behaviour problems in high school: A case study. *Educational Study*, 19, 153-70. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0144341990190104>
45. Sama, E. & Tarim K. (2007). Teachers' attitudes and behaviors towards Students perceived as unsuccessful. *Journal of Turkish Education Science*, 5(1), 135-154.
46. Sezer, F. (2012). Examining of teacher burnout level in terms of some variables. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 4(3), 617-631.

47. Sezer, F. (2012). The assessment of the problem areas of the students and solution recommendations. *Turkish International Journal of Special Education and Guidance & Counseling*, 1(2), 27-36.
48. Shen, J., Zhang, N., Zhang, C., Caldarella, P., Richardson, M.J., & Shatzer, R.H. (2009). Chinese elementary school teachers' perceptions of students' classroom behaviour problems. *Educational Psychology*, 29(2), 187-201. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410802654909>
49. Siyez, D.M. (2009). High School Teachers' Perceptions of and Reactions towards the Unwanted Student Behaviors. *Pamukkale University Journal of Education Faculty*, 1(25), 67-80.
50. Tümkaya, S. (2005). Classroom Discipline Approaches and Its Relation with Teacher Burnout. *Education Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 11(44), 549-568.
51. Wheldall, K., & Merrett, F. (1988). Which classroom behaviours do primary school teachers say they find most troublesome? *Educational Review*, 40, 13-27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0013191880400102>
52. Wickman, E. K. (1928). Teachers' list of undesirable forms of behaviour. In children's behaviour and teachers' attitudes (New York, Commonwealth Fund). Reprinted in P. Williams (Ed) (1974), *Behaviour Problems in School*. London: University of London Press.
53. Wragg, E. C. & Dooley, P. A. (1996). *Class management during teaching practice, Classroom teaching skills*, (Ed. by E. C. Wragg), London: Routledge.
54. Yavuz, M. (2009). An investigation of burn-out levels of teachers working in elementary and secondary educational institutions and their attitudes to classroom management. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 4 (12), 642-649.
55. Ziv, A. (1970). Children's behaviour problems as viewed by teachers, psychologists and children. *Child Development*, 41,871-879 Reprinted in P. Williams (Ed) (1974), *Behavior Problems in School*. London, University of London Press.

Creative Commons licensing terms

Author(s) will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of Education Studies shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflicts of interest, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated into the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).