

Analyzing Disruptive Conduct among Kathmandu Valley Students: Investigating Student Behavior Patterns

Peshal Luitel

English Language Teaching

Article History: Received 1 June 2024 ; Reviewed 20 June 2024 ; Revised 20 Aug. 2024 ; Accepted 27 Sept. 2024.

Abstract:

This study investigates disruptive behavior among secondary-level students and examines teachers' perceptions of these behaviors. Using a mixed-methods approach with data triangulation, the research gathers data through interviews, teacher questionnaires, classroom observations, and focus group discussions with students. The qualitative data were thematically analyzed, while quantitative data were subjected to descriptive analysis. The findings indicate that disruptive behaviors—such as inattentiveness, talking out of turn, and classroom disturbances—create significant challenges for teachers, hindering their ability to foster a conducive learning environment. Although some disruptions are perceived as unintentional, they are recognized as a major factor contributing to student underachievement. The study highlights that disruptive behavior not only reflects student indiscipline but also negatively impacts academic performance, teacher effectiveness, and overall school operations. The research emphasizes the critical role of headmasters and teacher training in addressing these behaviors, along with the need for strategies that enhance student motivation and engagement to reduce the frequency of classroom disruptions.

Key Words: Disruptive behavior, secondary-level students, teacher perceptions, student underachievement, mixed-methods research, data triangulation, classroom disruptions

Introduction:

Disruptive behavior is behavior that consistently frightens, threatens others, or violates social norms. This type of behavior is most commonly observed in children, although it can also occur in adults. In educational situations, disruptive student behavior creates significant problems for students, peers, and faculty members, affecting the overall environment of the school and hampering effective teaching and learning. Several studies have been conducted to understand disruptive behavior, but much of the research has focused on sectors like business, airlines, and hospitals, leaving a gap in the educational sector—particularly within secondary schools. This study aims to address this gap by focusing on disruptive behaviors among students in the Kathmandu Valley, a region with unique socio-cultural dynamics that may influence classroom behavior.

Disruptive behavior can manifest in various forms, both vocal and physical. Vocal disruptions include behaviors such as crying, choking, talking out of turn, or making

inappropriate remarks. Physical disruptive behavior comprises actions like hitting, kicking, or repetitive movements that disturb the class. Urbina et al. (2011) classify disruptive behavior into two categories: verbal violence (insults, shouting, swearing, etc.) and physical violence (molesting, manhandling, and pushing). Both types of violence weaken classroom order and hinder the educational process, creating an unsafe and hostile learning environment.

Within schools, disruptive behavior among students is a significant concern. It refers to behaviors that interfere with the learning process, disrupt classroom routines, and hinder the educational experience for both teachers and students. Behaviors such as talking out of turn, physical aggression, noncompliance with rules, and refusal to participate in activities are common manifestations. Mishra (2009) defines disruptive behavior as "behavior a reasonable person would view as interfering with the code of conduct of a class" (p. 107). This emphasizes the context-dependent nature of disruptive behavior, suggesting that its interpretation may vary based on the classroom dynamics and the teacher's perspectives.

Disruptive behavior not only disrupts the lesson plan but also creates a negative learning environment, reducing students' academic achievement and impeding their social-emotional development. For example, disruptive behavior can result in lower academic performance, increased dropout rates, and strained relationships between teachers and students. While disruptive behavior often points to underlying issues such as academic difficulties, social-emotional problems, or disorders like ADHD, the impact on the classroom environment cannot be overlooked.

Numerous studies have examined the causes and consequences of disruptive behavior, highlighting factors like socioeconomic status, family dynamics, peer influence, and individual characteristics (Gifford-Smith et al., 2005). Students exhibiting disruptive behaviors often display patterns that include verbal disruptions (talking out of turn, making inappropriate comments), physical aggression (bullying, altercations), attention-seeking behavior (interrupting, calling out), and rule-breaking (noncompliance with instructions) (Sun & Shek, 2012; Noeth-Abele, 2020). Understanding these patterns helps educators identify the specific types of behavior they are dealing with and develop appropriate interventions.

The causes of disruptive behavior are varied. Research has identified home environment, peer relationships, and individual traits as key factors. Children raised in environments characterized by inconsistent discipline or harsh parenting are more likely to engage in disruptive behavior (Stormshak et al., 2000). Similarly, students who associate with peers who exhibit disruptive behavior may imitate these behaviors (Tomé et al., 2012). Classroom factors, such as teacher-student relationships and classroom management techniques, also play a critical role in influencing student behavior (Jennings & Greenberg, 2009).

Addressing disruptive behavior requires a comprehensive approach that includes prevention, intervention, and consistent classroom management. Effective strategies include fostering positive teacher-student relationships, implementing evidence-based behavior management programs, and creating a supportive and inclusive learning environment (Ching & Jaffri, 2015; Ferreira et al., 2020). Consistent discipline practices, such as clear expectations

and fair consequences, are essential for mitigating disruptive behavior and maintaining a positive learning atmosphere (Cartledge et al., 2014). Moreover, the role of headmasters and the importance of teacher training are crucial in equipping educators with the skills necessary to manage these behaviors effectively.

Statement of Problem

Disruptive behavior among secondary-level students presents a significant challenge to effective teaching and learning in educational situations. Such behavior, which includes both verbal and physical disruptions, negatively impacts the academic environment by diverting attention, interrupting instructional flow, and diminishing overall classroom management. Teachers often struggle to manage these behaviors, leading to decreased teaching efficacy and adverse outcomes for both the disruptive students and their peers. While previous studies have explored disruptive behavior across various domains, such as business, healthcare, and public sectors, there remains a critical gap in research focusing on the educational context, particularly in secondary schools.

In the Kathmandu Valley, disruptive behavior among students has been reported to contribute to academic underachievement and poor classroom dynamics. Despite the recognition of this issue, limited research has specifically examined the nature and impact of such behaviors within the classroom environment from the perspective of educators. Moreover, there is a lack of comprehensive studies that combine both qualitative and quantitative methods to thoroughly investigate the problem and provide actionable insights for classroom behavior management.

This study seeks to address this gap by investigating the patterns of disruptive behavior among secondary-level students, understanding teachers' perceptions of these behaviors, and evaluating the effectiveness of current classroom management strategies. By employing a mixed-methods approach that includes questionnaires, observation checklists, and focus-group interviews, the study aims to provide a holistic understanding of the problem and offer recommendations for improving classroom management practices in the Kathmandu Valley.

The objectives of the study:

- i. To explore the disruptive behavior of secondary-level students.
- ii. To find out the teachers' perception towards disruptive behavior of the students.

Methodology

The study utilized a mixed-methods research design. This approach combined quantitative measures and qualitative questionnaires to provide a comprehensive understanding of the relationship between disruptive behavior patterns in students. Data acquired through a qualitative measure is a type of information that describes traits or characteristics. (Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. K., 1997). In addition to quantitative measures, the study was conducted by providing a questionnaire to the teachers. The questionnaires were semi-structured, allowing for open-ended questions and in-depth discussions to gather rich qualitative data. Quantitative

data is the value of data in the form of counts or numbers where each data set has a unique numerical value. (Hellerstein, J. M. 2008). Data is any quantifiable information that may be used by academics for statistical analysis and mathematical computations so that they can derive practical conclusions. (Glass, G. V. 1977). The research has employed quantitative measures to assess disruptive behavior patterns among the teachers. This involved the use of behavior checklists designed to capture different aspects of disruptive behaviors. That provided objective data which helped to analyze data statistically to identify patterns and associations. Data collection involved administering quantitative measures to assess disruptive behavior patterns among students. It included distributing behavior checklists or surveys in a classroom or education pattern. (Ben-Sasson, A., Carter, A. S., & Briggs-Gowan, M. J. 2009). Qualitative questionnaires were conducted individually following a questionnaire guide that explored teachers' perspectives on their behavior. Quantitative data obtained from behavior checklists were analyzed using appropriate statistical techniques.

In this study, a mixed-method approach was employed to gain a more comprehensive understanding of disruptive behavior in secondary classrooms. The use of quantitative methods, such as behavior checklists and closed-ended questionnaires, provided measurable data on the frequency and types of disruptive behavior observed in classrooms. This allowed for an objective analysis of the patterns and associations across different educational environments. At the same time, the qualitative data collected through open-ended questionnaires, interviews, and classroom observations enriched the study by offering insights into teachers' personal experiences, interpretations, and strategies for managing disruptive behavior. This contextualized understanding was critical for interpreting the statistical findings, adding depth to the data by exploring the underlying reasons and attitudes behind the behaviors.

By integrating both quantitative and qualitative data, the study not only identified prevalent disruptive behaviors but also illuminated the fine distinction of how these behaviors impact classroom dynamics and teachers' professional effectiveness. This mixed-method approach provided a holistic view of the issue, ensuring that both the measurable aspects and the lived experiences of teachers were adequately represented in the analysis.

Data Presentation: Discussion and Findings

The study was focused on four schools in the Kathmandu district using purposive sampling procedures. Being near these selected schools, the researcher selected four teachers and twenty students with four headmasters from 40 teachers of selected schools. The researcher also selected 20 students out of 200 students at the secondary level from the selected school. This means the primary sources of my research were 20 students including 8 teachers. The selection of teachers was the center of the process. To obtain my intended objectives, the researcher selected 8 teachers out of 40 teachers who teach in secondary level four schools of Kathmandu district using random sampling procedures. Each teacher's classes were observed using an observation checklist. The questionnaire to the selected teacher is to be filled up. There was one Headmaster in each school. All the headmasters were selected from the sample schools.

Tools of the study

The researcher used questionnaires, observation checklists, and interviews as the tools for data collection. I used both open-ended and closed-ended questionnaires to collect data and an observation checklist for classroom observation. The study also used focus-group interviews to explore the experiences and understandings of the teachers about disruptive classroom behavior management.

Patton (1990) claims that observation is the best method "To understand fully the complexities of many situations"(p.25). I employed focused observation in my study. During the observation, my attention was directed particularly toward the form of disruption and the student's disruptive behavior. I employed direct and participatory observation in the natural environment. I observed the three classes of each teacher the total observed classes were twelve. I focused on students' misbehavior while observing the students to collect the intended data, and to observe the student's behavior in the classroom. I prepared an observation checklist as the tool for behavior observation. I used a checklist while observing in the classroom. Data are collected through questionnaires and observation observed the classes with the help of a classroom observation checklist.

Data analysis procedure

The gathered data underwent a thorough process of transcription, followed by both descriptive and analytical analysis through a data triangulation approach. Interview data were diligently transcribed into written form, ensuring a comprehensive record. All collected data were subsequently presented, with a focus on organizing them according to their alignment with specific research objectives. Qualitative analysis techniques were applied to these data. Conversely, observed data were presented and subjected to quantitative analysis, which involved the use of tables to illustrate and dissect the findings. This comprehensive approach was employed to leverage data triangulation methods in the analysis of the acquired data, ultimately contributing to the achievement of the study's objectives.

The disruptive behavior of secondary level student

To achieve the objectives of the research, there had been the use of questionnaires as the primary data collection tool. A total of eight participants, comprising four teachers and four administrative personnel (specifically, headmasters), were provided with questionnaire forms. These individuals were selected from four different schools situated within the Kathmandu district.

According to the responses gathered, all the teachers reported that students generally exhibited discipline and obedience towards them. However, it became evident that the majority of teachers were actively striving to foster a positive classroom environment, primarily due to instances of disruptive behavior among students. These disruptive behaviors were identified as the key factors causing interruptions in their instructional processes. Consequently, these behaviors had a detrimental impact on the overall teaching and learning atmosphere. Notably, teachers indicated that their primary challenge was managing the classroom effectively.

In response to these disruptive behaviors, teachers expressed feelings of boredom, irritation, and dissatisfaction, highlighting the adverse effects of such behaviors on the academic learning experience.

Headmaster's response

"What kind of student-related problem are you facing during your school hours?" The responses to these questions vary from headmaster to headmaster. The nature of student-related issues encountered during school hours varied among different headmasters. Their responses were centered on problems occurring within the classroom, as well as the actions taken by teachers to address them. These issues primarily revolved around various forms of student misbehavior, including personal fights and quarrels among students, inattentiveness in class, the unauthorized possession of prohibited materials, instances of disrespect towards teachers, and disruptions that affected other students. Notably, a recurring challenge was the pressure exerted on headmasters toward the end of the academic year to pass students despite their disruptive behavior. These were the prominent challenges faced by the school headmasters. Regarding the question, "How could you explain your experience with students' behavior throughout your professional life?" When asked about their experiences with students' behavior throughout their professional lives, the headmasters provided diverse perspectives. Many of them did not perceive these experiences as problems; rather, they saw them as challenges inherent in their roles. They found it intriguing to cross these challenges, recognizing that doing so contributed to their growth and development as professionals. These experiences were seen as opportunities to enhance their ability to address similar challenges in the future.

However, it's worth noting that some headmasters, specifically H2 and H4, believed that student-related problems could be attributed to factors such as students' age and the environment in which they were raised. They emphasized that both teachers and headmasters shared responsibilities in managing and addressing these challenges effectively. From the responses of the headmasters, it becomes clear to me that the headmasters were surrounded by tension about how to manage the disruption of the school and classrooms. This is also clear that student-related problems were the causes of disruptive behavior that occurred in every school.

In response to the question, "What do you think about disruptive students in your school?" the headmasters shared their perspectives on this matter. They overwhelmingly regarded disruptive student behavior as harming the learning environment. Most headmasters acknowledged that managing disruptive behavior was indeed a significant challenge. They described their approach to handling such situations, which often involved persuasion and discreet private communication with the students. One headmaster, H1, emphasized that every school faces disruptive behavior from students, but it is the headmaster's role to minimize these disruptions and foster a constructive learning environment.

When asked about the impact of disruptive behavior on teaching and learning activities, the majority of headmasters confirmed that it had a negative effect. However, one headmaster,

H3, held a differing view and did not perceive any noticeable impact from disruption. In contrast, H4 recognized the importance of responsibility, stating that both teachers and the school's leadership should work to minimize disruptions and maximize the learning experience. Other headmasters concurred, with one noting that disruptive behavior could impede the smooth progress of teaching and learning activities, ultimately affecting the overall performance of the school. From these responses of the headmasters, it is clear that they faced many disruptive behaviors or disruptive students in their professional lives. Generally, the Headmaster took them negatively and their impacts on teaching and learning were always negative to minimize these negative responses teacher and headmaster of the school should be more accountable.

The majority of the headmasters believed that disruptive behaviors stemmed from factors such as home environment, educational background, and peer pressure. On the contrary, some headmasters thought that friends, school rules and regulations, and teacher accountability had a significant influence on student behavior. Nevertheless, all of them acknowledged that these behaviors were influenced by their environmental factors and the reinforcement they received.

One headmaster encapsulated this by saying, "Home environment, peer group, teacher management, nature and age of students, and the overall environment, along with other responsible factors, play a role in shaping these behaviors."

Regarding how they managed disruptive students, all the headmasters agreed that communication was a key tool in their management approach. For instance, H4 emphasized that they did not resort to punishment but instead documented such behavior and held private conversations with the students to provide feedback. Two of them mentioned that they guided students to adhere to school rules and regulations while also engaging in private communication. The remaining headmaster highlighted the importance of focusing on the students themselves rather than just their behaviors. From the response of the headmasters, I come to conclude that environment and peer pressure are responsible for such behaviors. These behaviors should be managed well. Otherwise, they may hurt students learning. The proper way to manage these behaviors was private communication and feedback to them.

Regarding the issue, "their role as a headmaster of the school towards such behavior", their responses were preparing rules and regulations and making them accountable to the teachers towards them. They could make their school's classroom more conducive. All headmasters agreed that they have a code of conduct but these codes of conduct were related to the national code of conduct prepared by the government of Nepal.

In short, students were found disruptive in school. The headmaster faced many challenges with this issue and I found that they were trying to make a conducive classroom by minimizing the behaviors with various strategies.

Teachers Response

When I posed the same question to class teachers, "What kinds of student-related problems do you face during your school hours?" their experiences and responses varied from those of the headmasters. Teacher T2 pointed out issues such as students insulting teachers, inattentiveness attempts at blackmail within the classroom, and excessive showiness as problem behaviors among students. Similarly, T3 expressed concern about students being seriously disruptive and not paying attention to their instructions, even after consulting with senior colleagues. Two other teachers expressed similar sentiments, highlighting that all student behaviors, if disruptive, had serious consequences as they not only affected the individual teacher but also disrupted the learning process for others. Furthermore, they noted that many students were neglecting their homework and classwork.

Teachers generally had a negative attitude toward disruptive student behavior, with some expressing frustration. However, they recognized the importance of effective management to prevent these issues from becoming a significant crisis for students' academic paths and the national investment in education. T3 emphasized that proactive measures, such as active listening and communication, could mitigate these problems in the future, provided students were determined to avoid such behavior.

Regarding the impact of disruptive behavior on teaching and learning, all the teachers unanimously agreed that such behavior had negative consequences, as it was incompatible with effective teaching and learning. These behaviors hindered the teaching and learning process and had several adverse effects, including:

1. Difficulty in reaching educational goals.
2. Lower levels of learning achievement.
3. Hindrance to teachers' and parents' guidance.
4. Decline in students' academic performance.
5. Lowering of school overall results.
6. Negative effects on the learning experience of other students.
7. Interference with teachers' instructions and pacing.

When asked about the factors responsible for students' misbehavior, teachers primarily pointed to students' age and environmental factors, often influenced by peer groups. For example, T1 emphasized, "Home environment, age factor, and school environment are responsible for this issue." Teachers perceived their role as that of managers or facilitators in managing these behaviors. They universally agreed that students' age, environment, and peer groups played a significant role in shaping their behavior.

Overall, the data collected from both teachers and headmasters highlighted the prevalence of disruptive student behavior in secondary schools. While some teachers considered these behaviors burdensome, others saw them as challenges. Teachers and headmasters shared a negative perception of disruptive behavior and recognized the need

to manage it effectively. They consulted with students and used private communication as a strategy for managing these behaviors. Furthermore, they believed that failing to address these issues could lead to decreased academic performance and school results due to disruptions in the classroom. To enhance students' performance, these hindrances, such as disruptive behavior, need to be minimized, and students should be adequately prepared for their studies.

Table no. 1
Disruptive behavior in the classroom

S.N	Categories	Responses				Total
		A	B	C	D	
1.	How disruptive were your students to others?	0	50%	50%	0	100%
2.	What types of behavior are found in your student?	20%	0	20%	60%	100%
3.	What will be the main cause of disruptive behavior?	40%	10%	10%	40%	100%
4.	How does the teacher deal with the disruptive behavior of the students?	0	50%	0	50%	100%
5.	Who will participate in modifying the misbehavior of the students?	40%	0	20%	40%	100%
6.	Why do students' learning achievement become low?	80%	0	10%	10%	100%

Source: Field Visit 2023

The table illustrates responses related to disruptive student behavior, revealing that 50% of respondents perceived their students as disruptive to some extent, while 60% acknowledged the presence of disruptive behaviors in their students. The main causes of disruptive behavior were attributed to various factors by 40% of respondents, with 10% each mentioning student age, environmental factors, and a combination of factors. Half of the respondents indicated that teachers took measures to address disruptive behavior, while the other half did not specify the strategies employed. When it came to who participated in modifying student misbehavior, 40% believed it involved various stakeholders, with 20% not specifying. Finally, 80% of respondents attributed low learning achievements to disruptive behavior, while 10% considered other factors, and 10% did not provide a clear reason for the decline in learning achievements, reflecting diverse perspectives on this issue.

The school observed disruptive behaviors

Those behaviors of students were listed to be observed in the classroom. I observed 3 classes of four teachers i.e. 12 classes as a whole. I observed 11 types of disruptive behaviors in all schools. Out of them, the most frequent disruptive behaviors were listed as 83 but in other schools 46, 41 and 41

TableNo.2

School-wise observe disruptive behaviours

S.N	Students Behavior	School A		School B		School C		School D		Total	
		Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1.	Interrupting others while talking	5	6.02	1	2.17	0	0	0	0	6	2.84
2.	Moving frequently	9	10.84	9	19.56	8	19.51	9	21.95	35	16.58
3.	Tiredness and poor attentive	8	9.52	3	6.52	4	9.75	3	7.31	18	8.53
4.	Looking outside through the window	11	13.09	6	13.04	8	19.51	8	19.51	33	15.63
5.	Drinking water, brushing hair, eating, gum-chewing	8	9.52	6	13.04	6	14.63	2	4.87	22	10.42
6.	Turning back frequently	14	16.86	8	17.39	5	12.19	8	19.51	37	17.53
7.	Tapping foot, pen, etc.	6	7.22	6	13.04	2	4.87	2	4.87	16	7.58
8.	Side talk, noisy talk, and irrelevant Talk	6	7.22	5	10.86	5	12.19	7	17.07	23	10.90
9.	Sleeping	3	3.61	1	2.17	0	0	0	0	4	1.89
10.	Passing paper/notes	3	3.61	0	0	1	2.43	2	4.87	5	2.36
11.	Spitting/making dust/ throng Rubbishing in the classroom.	4	4.81	1	3.57	1	2.43	1	2.43	7	3.31
	Total	83	100%	46	100%	41	100%	41	100%	211	100%

Source: Field Visit 2023

If we observe Table No. 6, the total misbehavior I observed from 12 classes of the selected schools was 211 misbehaviors. Out of them, the mode behavior turns back frequently (i.e., 37, 17.33%) followed (by 35, 16.58%) and looking outside through the window (i.e., 33, 15.63%). Similarly, irrelevant talk, brushing hair/ gum chewing, tapping foot/ pen, etc., and poor attention were i.e. (23, 10.90%), (22, 10.42%), (18, 8.53%) and (16, 7.58%) of the total 41 respectively. On the other hand, the least frequent misbehaviors were making rubbish in the classroom, passing papers/notes, sleeping, and interrupting others while talking. They were 3.31%, 2.36%, 1.89%, and 2.84% respectively.

From Table No. 6, it is clear that the most frequent disruptive behavior was turning back frequently and the least frequent misbehavior was sleeping in the classroom. From the collected data from these four schools, I concluded the more frequent to least frequent misbehaviors were as follows:

1. Turning back frequently
2. Moving frequently
3. Looking outside through the window
4. Side talk, noisy talk, and irrelevant talk
5. Drinking water, brushing hair, eating, gum chewing
6. Tiredness and poor attentive
7. Tapping foot, pen, etc.
8. Spitting/making dust/throwing rubbish in the classroom
9. Interrupting others while talking
10. Passing paper/notes
11. Sleeping

Findings

Disruptive behavior among secondary-level students manifests in several forms, as reported by headmasters. Common issues include discipline problems, gossiping, late arrivals, irregular attendance, and excessive use of mobile phones. Additionally, students frequently exhibited behaviors such as moving around the classroom, gazing outside through windows, and turning away from the front of the classroom. These disruptions were consistently observed across various schools, indicating a widespread challenge within the educational environment. Headmasters and teachers provided valuable insights into the underlying causes of disruptive behavior. They identified factors such as negative peer influences, age-related issues, and the impact of teacher, principal, and parental influences as significant contributors to these behaviors. Teachers reported a range of emotional reactions when managing disruptive students, including feelings of boredom, irritation, and disgust. While some teachers viewed these behaviors as burdensome, others saw them as challenges to be managed within their educational roles.

The negative impact of disruptive behavior on the teaching-learning process was evident in the findings. Disruptions adversely affected the academic progress of individual students and the overall performance of teachers and schools. Both teachers and headmasters acknowledged that ineffective management of these behaviors could lead to a decline in school performance.

Disruptive behavior was perceived as a major impediment to achieving optimal educational outcomes and maintaining a productive learning environment.

To combat disruptive behaviors, headmasters implemented various strategies aimed at minimizing their impact. These strategies underscored the importance of effective management in sustaining a positive educational environment. Establishing a conducive teaching-learning environment was recognized as a collaborative effort requiring the involvement of students, teachers, principals, and parents. This collective approach is essential for addressing and mitigating disruptive behaviors effectively.

The findings also highlighted the significant role of the home environment in shaping students' behavior. It was noted that disruptive behaviors might be learned from home, indicating that the home environment plays a crucial role in influencing students' conduct in school. This underscores the need for a holistic approach involving family support to address and manage disruptive behaviors effectively.

Conclusion

Disruptive behavior remains a persistent issue within Nepalese schools, causing significant distress among teachers and hindering the learning process. Recent surveys focusing on student learning have underscored disruptive behavior as a major obstacle to effective education. The manifestations of such behaviors are diverse, including students falling asleep in class, creating excessive noise, talking during lessons, gazing out of windows, frequently turning away from the front, and engaging in irrelevant conversations.

These disruptions present considerable challenges for classroom teachers, making it difficult to maintain a productive learning environment. Although teachers, parents, headmasters, and other stakeholders may sometimes perceive these disruptions as incidental, they are recognized as significant contributors to educational underachievement. Disruptive behaviors are deemed inappropriate in educational settings and are often seen as indicators of a lack of discipline.

Interviews with headmasters and surveys of teachers reveal that disruptive behavior is a prevalent issue in classrooms, with the potential to negatively impact both students' academic performance and overall school effectiveness. Observational data highlight that common disruptive behaviors include frequent talking, gazing out of windows, and a lack of attention to the teacher.

It is crucial to acknowledge that disruptive tendencies are not inherent in students but are influenced by various factors, including family backgrounds, teacher interactions, headmaster leadership, and negative peer influences. Teachers and headmasters, with their firsthand experience, recognize the detrimental effects of disruptive behaviors on students' academic achievements, the effectiveness of instruction, and overall school performance. Addressing these behaviors requires a comprehensive approach involving all stakeholders to create a more conducive learning environment.

Works Cited

- Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. K. (1997). *Qualitative Research for Education*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Finn, J. D., Pannozzo, G. M., & Voelkl, K. E. (1995). Disruptive and inattentive-withdrawn behavior and achievement among fourth graders. *The Elementary School Journal*, 95(5), 421-434.
- Gifford-Smith, M., Dodge, K. A., Dishion, T. J., & McCord, J. (2005). Peer influence in children and adolescents: Crossing the bridge from developmental to intervention science. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 33(3), 255-265.
- Glass, G. V. (1977). Integrating findings: The meta-analysis of research. *Review of Research in Education*, 5(1), 351-379.
- Hampson, S. E. (2008). Mechanisms by which childhood personality traits influence adult well being. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 17(4), 264-268.
- Hampson, S. E. (2008). Temperament and disruptive behavior problems in childhood: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 36(3), 299-309.
- Hellerstein, J. M. (2008). Quantitative data cleaning for large databases. *United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE)*, 25, 1-42.
- Jennings, P. A., & Greenberg, M. T. (2009). The prosocial classroom: Teacher social and emotional competence about student and classroom outcomes. *Review of Educational Research*, 79(1), 491-525.
- Nisar, H., Elgin, D., Bradshaw, C., Dolan, V., Frey, A., Horner, R., ... & Sutherland, K. (2022). A systematic review of positive behavior interventions and supports (PBIS) for students with disabilities in elementary and secondary schools. *Remedial and Special Education*, 43(3), 151-168.
- Nisar, H., Elgin, D., Bradshaw, C., Dolan, V., Frey, A., Horner, R., & Sutherland, K. (2022). Promoting Social and Behavioral Success for Learning in Elementary Schools: Practice Recommendations for Elementary School Educators, School and District Administrators, and Parents. *2M Research*.
- Noeth-Abele, C. (2020). Disruptive Student Behavior: The effects on various constituent groups in large suburban school communities. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 112(4), 711-727
- Stormshak EA, Bierman KL, McMahon RJ, & Lengua L.J.(2019). *Parenting practice and child disruptive behavior problems in early elementary school. Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group*. J Clin Child Psychol. 2000 Mar;29(1):17-29. doi: 10.1207/S15374424jccp2901_3. PMID: 10693029; PMCID: PMC2764296.
- Sun, R. C., Shek, D. T. (2012). The impact of child behavior problem on family functioning in Hong Kong families: The mediating role of parental self-efficacy. *The American Journal of Family Therapy*, 40(3), 255-267.
- Tomé G, Matos M, Simões C, Diniz JA, & Camacho I. *How can peer group influence the behavior of adolescents: explanatory model*. Glob J Health Sci. 2012 Feb 29;4(2):26-35. doi: 10.5539/gjhs.v4n2p26. PMID: 22980148; PMCID: PMC4777050.
- Tomé, G., Matos, M., Simões, C., Diniz, J. A., & Camacho, I. (2012). Disruptive behavior and its association with peer relationships among adolescents. *School Psychology International*, 33(5), 531-546.

