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Abstract

This was a comparative research project to study classroom management strategies of English language teachers (ELTs) at secondary level public and private sector schools in Lahore. The purpose of the research was to identify the strategies used by the English language teachers. A total of 200 English language teachers: 100 from public sector and 100 from private sector schools were selected using the random sampling technique. A close-ended questionnaire was designed by the researcher to collect data from the respondents. The data were entered into the spreadsheet of SPSS version 21.0. Different statistical techniques were used to analyze the data. Mean scores along with standard deviations were calculated for descriptive statistics. For inferential statistics, independent sample t-tests and one-way ANOVA were used. Two strategies like specific teaching strategies and planning and support were commonly used by the respondents. Significant differences were found in the strategies used by public sector and private sector ELTs. Policy recommendations such as organizing teacher training workshops would encourage ELTs to use classroom management strategies effectively.
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Introduction

The role of quality teaching requires qualified and effective teachers to make a significant mark on the students and the learning process. When a teacher interacts with the students through various teaching methods, the main aim is
always to impart knowledge, skills and values which are supposed to be helpful in achieving the students’ learning outcomes of the program. According to Parsonson (2012) teachers have to set the standards in their teaching for better learning process as well as the behavior modification of the learners. For that, they may use different models and practices. Teachers are known to be catalysts for change as they constantly impart learning to the students; hence, classroom management strategies is one of the tools necessary for teachers to employ effective and efficient teaching and learning. 

Classroom management in general, includes all those tools and techniques that teachers utilize and adopt during their stay in the classroom. Different classroom management strategies found in the literature are: communication skills; student management skills; content management skills; time management skills; and pedagogical skills (Ahmed, Ambreen & Hussain, 2018; Kennedy, 2011). Successful classroom management includes planning of classroom activities, establishing rules and developing ways to enforce the rules. To make the rules effective, students need to be treated with respect, which is also an essential part of classroom management. It is further felt that teachers have to spend most of the class time in handling disciplinary issues. As a result, they lack sufficient time for teaching. Since classroom management becomes an inevitable part of teaching; hence, the strategies employed by teachers to manage classrooms need to be studied. 

Pakistan is a multilingual country where Urdu holds the status of national language and English is the official language. The medium of instruction in private schools is English language as well as Urdu, whereas in public sector schools, Urdu language is used in general. English language teachers (ELTs) have to teach subjects in a second language in Pakistan. Hence, students face certain difficulties while studying in English. Teaching in a second language raises issues of classroom management. Therefore, classroom management strategies play a pivotal role for ELTs to transmit teaching learning processes effectively in such schools. 

The study of classroom management strategies helps in understanding how these strategies and different techniques associated with them work in the dynamic circumstances and conditions of a classroom. Different techniques help the students by providing them with ways that benefit their learning abilities. In teaching and classroom control, teachers face many problems and then apply strategies for good
classroom management (Budding & Zamarro, 2009).

The American society, which is a highly developed and has a strong system of education, has to face challenges in the area of classroom management (Coburn, Russell, Kaufman, & Stein, 2012). In Pakistan, teachers, especially when teaching English as a subject, face many problems in the management of classroom, such as students' failure to obey the classroom rules, noise, disrespect, poor behavior of students and lack of interest (UNESCO & USAID, 2006). This leads to poor learning of the students; therefore, there arises the need to study classroom management strategies for ELTs in the context of Pakistan.

Consequently, the present research was undertaken to study the classroom management strategies used by ELTs in public and private level schools of Lahore. The prime objective was to identify the current classroom management strategies practiced by the ELTs and to explore any significant difference in the use of these strategies in public and private sector schools. This will further identify any difference in the use of classroom management strategies of ELTs based on their different levels of experience, age and qualification. Thus, the following statistical hypotheses were developed for the study:

$H_0^1$: There are no significantly different classroom management strategies used by the ELTs at secondary level.

$H_0^2$: There is no significant difference in the classroom management strategies by ELTs used in public and private secondary schools.

$H_0^3$: There is no significant difference in classroom management strategies used by the ELTs based on their age levels.

$H_0^4$: There is no significant difference in classroom management strategies used by the ELTs based on their experience levels.

$H_0^5$: There is no significant difference in classroom management strategies used by the ELTs based on their qualification levels.


**Literature Review**

Classroom management is of extreme significance to everyday teachers, irrespective of gender, age, experience and the level of class. There are shreds of evidence in the literature that ELTs experience a considerable amount of difficulties in managing classrooms (Merc, 2004). Luo, Bellows, and Grady (2000) discuss the problems for new entrants in teaching profession about managing classrooms, while there are studies found in the literature that highlight the difficulties in managing classrooms for teachers having experience of 25 years and above (Kyriacou, 1997). According to Fowler and Sarapli (2010) managing classrooms become even more difficult when it involves components of a foreign or second language.

Brown (2001) classified classroom management elements into two main sections, which is quite relevant to this study: physical environment and teacher’s personal affect. Both types are required in order to have effective classroom management thus ensuring better learning. This study focuses on both of these.

**What is Classroom Management?**

The term classroom management is often interchangeably used for classroom control and classroom discipline. Classroom management (CM) is a modern term that teachers prefer referring to instead of control or discipline which might sound as authoritative (Robertson et al., 1996). CM can be summarized as all the activities and strategies that teachers employ during the classroom in order to effectively teach the lesson and ensure maximum learning (Prodromou, 1992). Therefore, it can be said that the main purpose of CM is to enable a positive environment that supports learning (Bender, 2003). This conducive and positive environment further nourishes class participation and learning abilities of students. Conversely, the classrooms that are not properly managed, effect negatively on student participation, learning and achieving outcomes (Kayikci, 2009).

**Classroom Management Strategies and English Language Teachers (ELTs)**

Gebhart (2006) reports that the main goal of CM is to maintain an environment in the classroom which supportive for interacting in English during the classroom activities. Given that all students are equal in learning abilities and other capabilities, the teacher would still require to maintain discipline. There are issues such as student absenteeism (Chaudhry, Abdullah, & Khatoon, 2017), lack
of teacher training (Abdullah & Ikram, 2019), personal factors such as family problems, domestic reasons, feelings of inadequacy and financial factors (Matus, 1999) and other factors such as time management, demographics of the students, lack of student motivation and large classroom size that create classroom management quite difficult (Sasidher, Vanaja & Parimalavenu, 2012). There are specific studies that have discussed the role of CM in English language (Davies & Pearse, 2000) and especially when English is taught as a second language (Lewis & Lovergrove, 1987; Marzano, 2003; Nunan, 1995; Nunan, 1987; Parsonson, 2012). Having said that, there is a need to study CM practices in teaching English as a second language in Pakistani context as little evidence is found in this regard.

Since this study deals with identifying classroom management strategies used by ELTs at secondary level and to know about the effects of qualification (less qualified and high qualified) and experience level (less experience and high experience); therefore, the knowledge of the strategies used and the factors of school type, qualification, age and experience need to be assessed.

**Methodology**

This research was conducted through a descriptive survey method. Quantitative research approach was used to test the null hypotheses of the study. A cross-sectional design was employed to collect the data from different sub-groups of the population at the same time. The population of this study was the ELTs in public sector and private sector secondary schools in the city of Lahore. The list of schools listed with local government was obtained from the District Education Office, Lahore.

**Sampling Design**

Stratified random sampling technique was used in this research. Two strata were made: one stratum of public sector schools and second stratum of private sector schools. From those two strata, the ELTs were randomly selected. In the first step, 20 schools were selected randomly for the stratum of public sector schools and 20 schools were selected randomly for the stratum of private sector schools. From the two stratum, the researcher randomly selected 5 ELTs. Hence, the sample size of this study eventually was 200 ELTs of secondary schools with 100 from public sector and 100 from private sector schools.
Research Tool

A close ended questionnaire to measure the classroom management strategies quantified at Likert scale was developed by the researcher for this specific research. The items related to classroom management and ELTs in the literature were reviewed and statements were designed to ascertain the use of different classroom management strategies by the ELTs. Different factors found in the recent relevant literature were incorporated in the tool. The questionnaire items were the validated by taking five expert opinions of ELTs serving at various positions and few items of the tool were revised in the light of the expert opinion.

Along with the validity, the reliability of the tool was also ensured. A pilot study was done on a separate sample of 30 ELTs to analyze internal consistency of items. Cronbach alpha reported 0.831, which is considered as good reliability value in descriptive survey studies (Abdullah & Chaudhry, 2018). The results of the pilot study were also viewed in order to make any changes in the tool. Once the tool was finalized, the actual data were collected and analyzed using SPSS version 21.0.

Findings

Table 1 displayed that the data was equally divided in 100 public and 100 private sector school teachers. In the category of age, the highest frequency of 98 was for 26-30 years category. Next highest category in the age was 20-25 with 83 respondents. The category of 31-35 years had nine respondents and the category of 36-40 years had 10 respondents only. As far as academic qualification was concerned, the majority (138) of sample had master’s qualification. Only 36 teachers had a bachelor’s degree, whereas 28 teachers had M.Phil or MS qualification.
Table 1

Demographic Analysis of the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.Phil/ MS</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

Factor wise Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing Classroom Behavior (MCB)</td>
<td>13.56</td>
<td>.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Teaching Strategies (STS)</td>
<td>23.44</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working With Parents (WWP)</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Support (PS)</td>
<td>19.93</td>
<td>5.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Table 2, the items were grouped under four factors of classroom management strategies. It was noted that the mean score of the factor STS was significantly higher than the rest of the factors \((M= 23.44, SD= 3.82)\) the next significant factor in the classroom management strategies was PS \((M= 19.93, SD= 5.35)\), followed by MCB \((M= 13.56, SD= .837)\) and the least significant factor was WWP \((M= 10.67, SD= 2.89)\). It meant that the most significant factor while making classroom management strategies was STS. It further informed that there were different classroom management strategies used by the teachers. To understand that difference, inferential statistical analysis was carried.
Table 3

*T-test on the Factors with Reference to School Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing Classroom Behaviour (MCB)</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>13.87</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>13.25</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Teaching Strategies (STS)</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>23.02</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>-0.429</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>23.86</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working With Parents (WWP)</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>10.65</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>-0.073</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>10.68</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Support (P&amp;S)</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>18.94</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>-2.65</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>20.92</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On applying t-test to the MCB factor, significant mean differences were revealed in public and private sector schools. The mean score of public sector school teachers ($M = 13.87$) was significantly more than that of the private school teachers ($M = 13.25, p < 0.05$).

When independent sample t-test was applied on STS and WWP factors, insignificant mean differences were revealed. While P&S factor showed significant mean differences in public sector and private sector schools. The mean score of private sector school teachers was ($M = 20.92$) which was significantly more than the mean score of public school teachers ($M = 18.94, p < 0.05$).

Table 4

*One-Way ANOVA with Reference to Qualification*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing Classroom Behaviour (MCB)</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>128.28</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>139.28</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Teaching Strategies (STS)</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>995.71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>37033.57</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38029.28</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working With Parents (WWP)</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1670.503</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1670.555</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Support (P&amp;S)</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>5699.82</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5703.02</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 illustrated the one-way ANOVA analysis with the factors MCB, STS, WWP and P&S taking qualification as independent variable. The test revealed insignificant differences in the opinions of the respondents on STS, WWP, and P&S factors. It meant that the teachers having different qualifications showed no significant differences in the specific teaching strategies, working with parents and planning and support factors. Whereas MCB factor revealed significant differences in the opinions of the respondents. It meant that the teachers having different qualifications showed different levels of MCBs. The level of significance was (p< 0.05). There were three categories in the qualification of ELTs. Further analysis was applied to reveal the differences in detail.

Table 5
Post hoc Analysis of Tukey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.Phil</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post hoc analysis of Tukey was used to analyze the differences in the categories of qualification for MCB factor. The mean difference of M. Phil and bachelors was 0.80 and between M. Phil and masters was 0.60. It meant that the highest levels of MCBs were used by the M. Phil teachers, then by the ELTs with master and the least by the ELTs with bachelor qualification.

Table 6
One-Way ANOVA with Reference to Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing Classroom Behaviors (MCB)</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>134.36</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>139.28</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Teaching Strategies (STS)</td>
<td>866.026</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>37163.254</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>38029.280</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working With Parents (WWP)</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>23.945</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1646.610</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1670.555</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Support (P&amp;S)</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>70.47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>5632.55</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5703.02</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 refers to one-way ANOVA analysis with the factors taking age as an independent variable. The test revealed insignificant differences in the opinions of the respondents. It meant that the teachers who had different years of age did not show different levels of classroom management behaviors, specific teaching strategies, working with parents and planning and support factors. The level of significance was measured at \((p< 0.05)\).

Table 7

*One-Way ANOVA with Reference to Experience*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing Classroom Behaviours (MCB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>11.98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>127.30</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>139.28</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Teaching Strategies (STS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>312.55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>.654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>37716.732</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38029.28</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working With Parents (WWP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1666.327</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1670.56</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Support (P&amp;S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>84.18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td>.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>5618.84</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5703.02</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 displayed results from one-way ANOVA analysis with the factors MCB, STS, WWP and P&S taking experience in years as independent variable. The test revealed insignificant differences in the opinion of the respondents for STS, WWP, and P&S factors. It meant that the teachers having different experience duration did not show different levels of specific teaching strategies, working with parents and planning and support factors. Whereas, with MCB factor, there was a significant difference in the opinion of the respondents. The level of significance was \((p< 0.05)\). Further analysis was carried out to analyze the differences in detail.

Table 8

*Post hoc Analysis of Tukey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>-.532</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On applying Tukey post hoc analysis to reveal significant differences based on the experience categories on MCB factors, it was observed that the ELTs who had a range of experience from 4-7 years showed significantly more mean score as compared to the ELTs with the experience ranging from 0-3 years. The level of significance was (p< 0.05).

**Discussion**

This section research discusses the findings under each hypothesis.

**H0**1: There are no significantly different classroom management strategies being used by the ELTs at secondary level.

Statistical data analysis techniques were used to test this hypothesis which revealed that this null hypothesis was rejected and it was found that the ELTs were using significantly different classroom management strategies at secondary level schools. The results of this research may vary elsewhere, as the present research comprised a limited sample. A limitation of the research was that it could not explore the reasons of these levels of significances in using classroom management strategies. The items of the questionnaire were pooled in four factors which were explained in detail in the data analysis (Table 2). The most significant factor was specific teaching strategies, then planning and support factor, followed by managing classroom behavior factor and the least factor was working with parents.

**H0**2: There is no significant difference in the classroom management strategies by ELTs used in public and private secondary schools.

After testing this hypothesis, it was rejected. There was a significant difference in the classroom management strategies used by ELTs on the basis of public and private schools. The mean score of private sector ELTs was significantly more than that of public sector ELTs which is consistent with the findings of (Parsonson, 2012). It was concluded that private sector ELTs were using more appropriate classroom management strategies as compared to public school ELTs.

To establish whether the level of qualification, age and experience of ELTs have any effect on the use of the classroom management strategies, the researcher developed the following three null hypotheses.
H₀₃: There is no significant difference in classroom management strategies used by the ELTs based on their age levels.

H₀₄: There is no significant difference in classroom management strategies used by the ELTs based on their experience levels.

H₀₅: There is no significant difference in classroom management strategies used by the ELTs based on their qualification levels.

The analysis and interpretation of testing the three above mentioned hypotheses are given below separately.

**Age**

To answer research hypothesis H₀₃, both descriptive and inferential statistical techniques were used. There were no significant differences revealed in the classroom management strategies used by ELTs in their respective schools, based on the demographic variable age. There were no significant differences in the opinions of ELTs to manage classroom behaviors on the basis of different age categories. There were no significant differences in the teachers to use specific teaching strategies, on the basis of their age. There were no significant differences in the teachers working with parents’ factor nor on the basis of their age. There were no significant differences in the teachers to use planning and support factor on the basis of their age. Therefore, it was concluded that null hypothesis H₃, was accepted. However, the findings of Sasidher, Vanaja and Parimalavenu (2012) are contrary to this. They gave high weight to the age of teachers in determining their CM. The reason of this incongruence could be the contextual factors of the sample subjects under study.

**Experience**

To answer research hypothesis H₀₄, both descriptive and inferential statistical techniques were used. There were significant differences revealed in the classroom management strategies used by ELTs in their respective schools, based on the demographic variable experience.
Experience in years was used as a demographic variable to test this hypothesis. There were significant differences in the teachers when managing classroom behaviors on the basis of their years of experience. The ELTs with the experience of 4-7 years showed more appropriate management of classroom behaviors than the ELTs with the experience of 0-3 years. Based on this finding, it was said that the null hypothesis was rejected. This result has been aligned with the findings of Habibi, Mukminin, Najwan, Haswindy, and Marzulina (2018). There were insignificant differences in the opinions of teachers to use specific teaching strategies, working with parents and planning and support factors on the basis of their different experience years. Although only one factor of the overall classroom management strategies showed significant differences with the levels of experience, it was concluded that the null hypothesis was rejected.

**Qualification**

To answer research hypothesis 5, both descriptive and inferential statistical techniques were used. Significant differences were revealed in the classroom management strategies used by ELTs in their respective schools based on the demographic variable qualification.

The qualification had significant differences in the ELTs’ classroom management strategies and these findings are in line with the results of Fowler and Şaraplı (2010). MPhil teachers showed more appropriate classroom strategies than those who had a master’s degree in ELT. MPhil teachers also showed more appropriate classroom strategies than those with a bachelor’s degree. There were no significant differences in the teachers for using specific teaching strategies, planning and support and working with parents on the basis of their qualification, although only one factor showed significant differences in the classroom management strategies used by ELTs. It was therefore, concluded that the null hypothesis H5 was rejected.

**Conclusion and Recommendations**

Based on the discussions of the research findings, it was concluded that the private sector ELTs were using appropriate and significant classroom management strategies as compared to public sector teachers. Classroom management strategies were summed up into four salient factors which were: managing classroom behavior
(MCB); specific teaching strategies (STS); planning and support (PS); and working with parents (WWP). It was concluded that experience as a demographic variable had a significant effect on the factors of classroom management strategies used by ELTs. It was also established that the qualification as a demographic variable had significant effect on the factors of classroom management strategies used by ELTs. It was also inferred that more the qualification, the better and significant classroom management strategies were used by ELTs. It was determined that the age as a demographic variable had no significant effect on the factors of classroom management strategies used by ELTs.

The following recommendations have been made:

1. Private sector teachers showed more appropriate classroom management strategies; therefore, especial impetus should be given to ELT training in public schools. Similar training sessions and seminars for public sector ELTs should be arranged.

2. Special training on classroom management strategies should be conducted by school administration in order to equip ELTs with appropriate classroom management strategies.

3. Sample size could be increased for further research. The same research design can be used in further research including college and university level ELTs, especially in rural areas of the Punjab province to explore different classroom management strategies used by ELTs.

4. Further research may be conducted using mixed methods research as it will include qualitative aspects as well.
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