Macrothink Institute™

International Journal of Learning & Development
ISSN 2164-4063
2013, Vol. 3, No. 1

Techniques Used by Secondary School Teachers in Managing Classroom Disruptive Behaviour of Secondary School Students in Karak District, Pakistan

Qaiser Suleman
M.Phil (Education) Scholar, I. E. R., Kohat University of Science & Technology Kohat, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, (Pakistan)
Email: Look_for_reality@yahoo.com

Hassan Danial Aslam
(Corresponding Author)
Lecturer, Faculty of Management Sciences, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur (Pakistan)
Senior Research Consultant, Human Resource Management Academic Research Society
E-mail: Hassan.Danial@hrmars.com

Naeem Ali
Visiting Lecturer, Faculty of Management Sciences, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur (Pakistan)
E-mail: nomy83@hotmail.com

Dr. Ishtiaq Hussain
Assistant Professor, I. E. R., Kohat University of Science & Technology Kohat, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, (Pakistan)
Email: dr.ishtiaqkust@gmail.com

Zaitoon Akhtar
M.Phil (Education) Scholar, I. E. R., Kohat University of Science & Technology Kohat, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, (Pakistan)

Accepted: July 24, 2012 Published: March 19, 2013
Doi:10.5296/ijld.v3i1.3403 URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijld.v3i1.3403

ABSTRACT

Effective classroom management is playing a crucial role in strengthening teaching learning process and makes it more effective, productive and successful. Without effective classroom management, teaching learning process has no fruitful results. The purpose of the study was to explore the techniques used by secondary school teachers in managing classroom disruptive behaviors. All the secondary school teachers and students in Karak

District constituted the population of the study. Only 135 secondary school teachers and 920 students were selected as sample through simple random sampling technique. As the study was descriptive in nature therefore questionnaire was used as research instrument. Data was collected through personals visits. Statistical tools i.e., percentage and chi square were used for the analysis of data. After analysis of data, the researchers concluded that the overall performance of the secondary school teachers in managing classroom disruptive behaviour is satisfactory as they use constructive and appropriate techniques to control the classroom disruptive behaviour. However, the negative area of the secondary school teachers in managing classroom disruptive behaviour is that they do not devise any rules and regulations of classroom management at the beginning of new session. Parents are not informed through letters about the disruptive behaviour of their children. Therefore it was strongly recommended that at the beginning of new session, classroom management norms, rules and regulations should be formulated and announced so that students may understand the conduct of a teacher. A special training programme regarding management of classroom disruptive behaviour should be launched to equip the existing teachers with modern techniques to manage classroom disruptive behavior properly.

Keywords: Techniques, Secondary School Teachers, Classroom Disruptive Behaviour, Secondary School Students

INTRODUCTION

Effective and rewarding teaching learning process is directly related to the effective classroom management. Without effective classroom management, teaching learning has no fruitful and productive outcomes. Effective classroom management depends on the competencies of teachers. Good managers devise and announce classroom rules and regulations at the beginning of session in order to control classroom disruptive behaviours and make the classroom atmosphere favorable for teaching learning process. According to Sadker & Sadker, (1997), successful and effective classroom mangers are nearly always excellent planners. They habitually enter a classroom in time to avoid of the possibility of noise and disturbance. They always present at the entrance of classroom when the children enter into classroom. They take start from the very first day of school and announce the rules and regulations about appropriate student's behaviour. They carry out this enthusiastically and directly and sometimes they really formulate the procedures for getting help, leaving the room, going to the pencil sharpener, and similar to, the more important rules of classroom behaviour are noted down i.e., punishments for not following the rules of classroom.

Classroom disruption is refers to the behavior that a reasonable person would view as substantially or repeatedly obstructing and frustrating the environment of the classroom. Usually, disruptive behavior slows down and negatively affects the instructor's capability to conduct the class, or the capability of other students to profit from the instruction. According to Finn, Fish & Scott (2008), disruptive behavior within the classroom is defined in different terms associated with student's behaviour i.e., coming late, leaving seats, cutting class,

refusing to follow directions, speaking without permission, not completing assignments, and cheating. Such types of disruptive classroom behaviors are directly connected to dropping out or poor and reduced academic achievement. Research has found that non-compliance or disobedience in the classroom as well as depressed academic performance can be associated to drug and alcohol use among the disobedient and mischievous students. However, the tendency of physical aggression or violence inside the classroom can be linked to prior smaller acts of aggression happening at a younger age.

Classroom disruptive behaviour of the students is one of the main issues in the field of education. Therefore, it is imperative to pay proper attention toward this critical issue. The study under investigation was specially designed to explore the techniques used by secondary school teachers in managing classroom disruptive behaviour. The findings of the study will be useful for classroom teachers as they will be able to use appropriate strategies to control the classroom disruptive behaviours in excellent way.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

According to Lang & Hebert (1995), classroom management is a critical and important part of effective and successful instruction. Effective classroom management, which initiates with well-organized and efficient lesson planning preparation, helps a teacher to teach and students to learn. Students perform well in an optimistic classroom atmosphere and an environment in which they feel secure, safe, cared for and involved. From a student point of view, effective and successful classroom management provides students with opportunities to socialize while learning interesting content. From a teacher point of view, effective classroom management involves preventive discipline and interesting instruction.

Classroom management is a term used by teachers to explain the process of ensuring that classroom lessons run efficiently in spite of student's disruptive behaviour. The term also means to prevent disruptive behaviour of students. It is perhaps the most difficult aspect of teaching for majority of the teachers; indeed experiencing problems in this area causes some to leave teaching altogether (Online Wikipedia Encyclopedia). The term "Classroom Management" is defined as "The art of organizing the class". In other words we can say that classroom management is making the atmosphere and situation of the class as favorable for teaching as to attain the required goals and objectives without any loss of time or energy. It involves proper arrangement of working conditions including light, heat and ventilation (Katozai, 2002). According to Evertson and Weinstein (2006), classroom management has two different purposes: "It not only seeks to establish and sustain a systematic atmosphere so students can connect with meaningful academic learning, but it also aims to enhance student social and moral growth". Classroom management is "the provisions and procedures necessary to establish and maintain an atmosphere in which instruction and learning can occur" (www.teachingprofessor.com).

Classroom disruptive behaviours of the students refer to the disobedience or violence of the classroom rules and regulations and also to the creation of disturbance during teaching learning process. Student's disruptive behaviour is very destructive for the overall performance of teachers and other students. It affects the management of classroom negatively. According to Goodman (2008), through rules and regulations, a student adopts an actual and concrete direction to make sure that our expectations and hopes become a reality. Feldhusen (1995) defined disruptive behaviour as "it refers to disobedience or a violation of school expectations interfering with the orderly conduct of teaching". According to Merrett and Wheldall, behaviours like inattentiveness, making a noise, distressing or disturbing others and disobedience to the instructions of a teacher are the most frequently reported classroom disruptive behaviours. Further they explained that classroom disruptive behaviour can be any behaviour that significantly hinders or obstructs the child's own learning, other children's learning or responses, or the teacher's capability to operate effectively (Giallo & Little, 2003). Disruptive behaviour refers to an activity that causes distress for teachers, disrupts the learning process and that leads teachers to make continual comments to the student (Haroun & O'Hanlon, 1997 & Houghton et al., 1988). Certain behaviour is disruptive when it badly slows down the activities of the teacher or of several students for more than a brief time. It means that disruptive behaviour is not only the behaviour that hinders the activities of teacher or teaching act but also the behaviour that interferes with students or the learning acts (Emmer, Everston & Worsham, 2002). Shrigley (1999) presented a more comprehensive definition that any behaviour that interrupts the teaching acts, or is psychologically or physically unsafe constitutes a disruptive behaviour. This definition comprises of behaviours that would not necessarily slows down the teaching act but is definitely psychologically or physically unsafe and needs teacher's attention. In short, disruptive student behaviour is defined as any student whose behaviour is ill-mannered, annoying, disturbing or distracting, wasting class time, or creates negative attitudes toward the course work or teacher.

Good classroom management depends on the competencies of a teacher. Therefore teachers should be more competent and well trained. He should have a sound knowledge of teaching methodologies and classroom management. According to Borg & Falzon (1990), variables such as teacher training, extent of teaching experience and teacher self-confidence are important moderator variables on teachers' perceptions of disruptive behaviour, although little research has examined relationships between these variables. Instructors, who perceive classroom management problems as more severe, are more expected to leave the education system (Sokal, Smith & Mowat, 2003). Disruptive behavior is a problem that negatively affects teachers, students and administration of college or university. Disruptive behavior plays a critical role in the success or failure of teacher's teaching careers (Tom, 1998). Classroom disruption contributes to instructor's stress, dissatisfaction and eventual burnout (Morrissette, 2001). As concentration of an instructor is negatively affected so time and energy may be dedicated to design strategies to cope with rather than to focus on lecture material. The overall learning atmosphere for students who are not involved in the disruptive behavior is negatively affected. Consequently, an aggressive and hostile learning environment is generated (McKinney, 2005). In 1981 the US National Educational

Association concluded that 36% of teachers said that they would perhaps not go into teaching if they had to decide again. A principal reason "disruptive behaviour of students and discipline" was recorded (Free online wikipedia). Research shows that male students are more disruptive or aggressive as compared to the female students (Houghton et al., 1988; Kaplan, Gheen & Midgley, 2002 & Stephenson et al., 2000).

As explained by Ming (n. d.), Wickman conducted a survey in American schools to explore the disruptive behaviours. Teachers were asked to present a list of behaviour problems that they faced during their professional careers. The teachers presented a list of 428 items, although when overlapping or duplication was removed, a final list of 185 separate items of undesirable behaviour was developed. Wickman classified these different disruptive behaviours into seven different groups which are:

GROUP NO. 1 **VARIATIONS OF MORALITY AND INTEGRITY**

- Stealing
- Dishonesty
- Immorality
- Profanity (e.g. swearing)
- Smoking
- Unlawfulness

GROUP NO. 2 **TRANSGRESSIONS AGAINST AUTHORITY**

- Disobedience
- Disrespect
- Defiance
- Impertinence
- Refusal to follow instructions and commands

GROUP NO. 3 **VIOLATIONS OF SCHOOL REGULATIONS**

- Truancy
- Lateness
- Irregular attendance
- Taking school property home
- Vandalism

GROUP NO. 4 **VIOLATIONS OF CLASSROOM RULES**

- Disorderliness
- Restlessness
- Interruptions
- Too social
- Whispering

GROUP NO. 5 **VIOLATIONS OF SCHOOL WORK REQUIREMENT**

- Inattention and lack of concentration
- Lack of interest and indifference
- Carelessness
- Laziness

GROUP NO. 6 **DIFFICULTIES WITH OTHER CHILDREN**

- Annoying other children
- Telling tales
- Disregards of the rights of other children
- Getting other children into trouble
- Interfering with the work of other children

GROUP NO. 7 **UNDESIRABLE PERSONALITY TRAITS**

- Negativisms (e.g. stubborn, sulky)
- Unacceptable social manners (e.g. impudence, rude and impolite)
- Self-indulgence (e.g. selfish, un-supporting)
- Arrogance (e.g. overbearing, boastful)
- Diffidence (e.g. bashful, too timid)
- Evasions (e.g. insincere, thoughtless)
- Interference (e.g. destructiveness, curiosity)
- Lack of emotional control (e.g. temper, crying)
- Undesirable mental states (e.g. dissatisfied, resentful)
- Unclean habits and personal appearance
- Lack of pride in self

Source: Ming (n. d)

According to Algonquin College (1995), disruptive behaviour in teaching-learning environments may contain to the following but is not limited to:

- Disruption or obstruction of teaching or learning activities in classrooms, labs, field or work placements
- Physical abuse, verbal abuse, intimidation, threats, harassment (including racial or sexual harassment) or other conduct as a result of which members of the college community feel endangered.
- Any act which causes danger to mental or physical health, safety or the rights of students or staff of the college, or clients served by the students during their field work or clinical experience.
- The possession of explosives, weapons or dangerous chemicals
- Conduct which is uncontrollable, rude or offensive
- Counseling, prompting or otherwise assisting others in undesirable or objectionable acts

According to Algonquin College (1995), some actions that are taken to minimize the occurrence of disruptive behaviour in teaching-learning environments are:

- In consultation with students, set understandable and reasonable expectations for behaviour. Explain the roles to be played by teachers and students to sustain a positive and optimistic learning environment.

- Once established, maintain and enforce expectations. Consistent expectations lessen confusion.
- Use the least intrusive measures possible to deal with minor disruptions. For example, nonverbal signals such as nods, eye contact or moving around the room to have a physical presence may be enough to sustain or maintain order. On occasion, it may be suitable to evaluate and decide to pay no attention on minor problems.
- Use humour and face-saving techniques to decrease tension and prevent the acceleration of conflict. Offering choices and acknowledging the learner's situations and feelings are examples of face-saving techniques.
- Acknowledge behaviours, moods or feeling tone of individuals and groups and allow opportunity for expression.
- Use breaks and changes of pace activities when you sense frustration or tension building in the group.

Preventative approaches to classroom management involve making a positive and optimistic classroom community with combined respect between teacher and student. Teachers using the preventative approach present warmth, acceptance, and support unconditionally not based on a student's behavior. Fair rules and consequences are established and students are given common and consistent feedback regarding their behavior (Bear, 2008). According to McKinney (2005) & Bartlett (2004), the following measures can be used to prevent disruption in classroom:

- Include course and behavioral rules and expectations for students and instructors in syllabus.
- You should discuss these rules and expectations on the first day to class. Tell students you expect that they will act properly, but that you always like to remind students of these rules or norms.
- You should act as role models and demonstrate the types of behavior which you expect from students.
- You should share control and responsibilities with your students in the classroom to ask them on the first day what the rules or norms for classroom behavior should be, and include their ideas to your list also.
- Write a "contract" on classroom behavior and ask students to read and sign it on the first week of class. In a survey, it was concluded that 57 percent of the students responded that the contract was helpful.
- You should use impression management and your position by dressing and acting professionally. Consider yourself as "doctor" or "professor" and have students do so as well (though for some faculty or in some circumstances it is more suitable to lessen the status dissimilarities between you and your students).
- You should be more rigid on all matters the first day and week to set the "tone." You can always be flexible and nurturing later.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM UNDER INVESTIGATION

The study was specially designed to explore the techniques used by secondary school teachers in managing classroom disruptive behaviour therefore the statement of the problem was designed as ***"Techniques used by Secondary School Teachers in Managing Classroom Disruptive Behaviour of Secondary School Students in Karak District, Pakistan".***

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The objectives of the study were:

(a) to investigate the techniques used by secondary school teachers in managing classroom disruptive behaviour of secondary school students;
(b) to identify the weak areas of secondary school teachers in managing classroom disruptive behaviour of secondary school students; and
(c) to suggest practicable recommendations to improve the management of secondary school teachers regarding classroom disruptive behaviour

METHOD AND PROCEDURE

1. Population

All the teachers and students at secondary school level of public sector in District Karak, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (Pakistan) constituted the population of the study.

2. Delimitations of the Study

The study was delimited to male secondary school teachers and students only. The study was further delimited to only 30 secondary schools.

3. Sample & Sampling Technique

In order to ensure adequate representation of the population, only 135 secondary school teachers and 920 students (at the rate of 75% and 30% respectively) were selected from 30 selected secondary schools through simple random sampling technique.

4. Research Instrumentation

The study was descriptive type therefore a questionnaire was used as research instrument for the collection of data. It was designed on five point likert's scale i.e., SA (Strong Agree), A (Agree), UN (Undecided), DA (Disagree) and SDA (Strong Disagree). It was composed of 20 closed ended questions.

5. Pilot Testing

Validation and authentication of the research instrument is crucial to achieve exact and precise results. For this purpose, pilot testing was conducted to eliminate the weaknesses, misconceptions and ambiguities of the questions in the questionnaire. So after pilot testing, it was revised and then its final version was developed in the light of suggestions given by the experts.

6. Validity and Reliability

It is essential to ensure the trustworthiness of the research and its findings by addressing the issues of validity and reliability. Validity is the degree to which study assess the same concept that the researcher is trying to measure. Validity of the questionnaire was checked by three experts. Reliability is the degree of consistency that an instrument or data collection procedure demonstrates, while validity is the quality of the collection procedure of the data that enables it to measure what it intends to measure (Best and Kahn, 1998; Gay, 2005; Masrur, 2003). Cronbach's alpha reliability test was used to calculate the reliability of questionnaire through S.P.S.S (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) version 16. The reliability coefficient was found to be 0.89 for the questionnaire. The following formula was applied:

$$\alpha = \frac{N.\overline{C}}{\overline{V} + (N-1).\overline{C}}$$

Where

N = Total number of respondents

$\overline{C}$ = Average inter-item covariance

$\overline{V}$ = Average variance

7. Data Collection

In order to collect data, the researchers personally went to the respective secondary schools and distributed the questionnaires among the participants. First the items of the questionnaire were explained to the students and teachers and then they were told to give appropriate responses free of bias. A total of 1055 questionnaires were administered and 1055 responses were received i.e., 100% responses. In this way data was collected.

8. Data Analysis

After the collection of data, it was organized, tabulated, analyzed and interpreted. The statitical tools i.e., percentage and chi squre were used for the statistical analysis of the data. The following formulae were used for the statistical analysis of data:

Percentage Formula

$$\text{Percentage} = \frac{\text{No.of Responses}}{\text{No.of Total Responses}} \times 100\%$$

Chi-Square Formula

$$X^2 = \sum \frac{\left[(f_o - f_e)^2\right]}{f_e}$$

Where $\sum$ = Sum of

f_o = Frequency of occurrence of observed
f_e = Expected frequency

INTERPRETATION OF DATA AND RESULTS

The study was conducted to explore the techniques used by secondary school teachers in managing disruptive behaviour of the secondary school students in District Karak. It was a descriptive study and questionnaire was used as research instrument. Data was collected through personal visits. Statistical tools like percentage and chi square were used for the analysis of the data. The whole process is explained below:

Table 01: At the beginning of the session, teachers formulate and announce classroom rules and regulations to ensure a favorable environment in side the classroom.

Respondents	SA	A	UD	DA	SDA	TOTAL	χ^2	p-value
TEACHERS	015 (11.1%)	024 (17.8%)	006 (04.4%)	049 (36.3%)	041 (30.3%)	**135**	**2.27**	**.687**
STUDENTS	096 (10.4%)	136 (14.8%)	026 (02.8%)	368 (40.0%)	294 (32.0%)	**920**		
TOTAL	**111**	**160**	**032**	**417**	**335**	**1055**		

Non-Significant (p> 0.05) df = 4 table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level = 9.488

Table 1 illustrates that the calculated value of χ^2 was found to be 2.27 which is statistically non-significant because it is less than the table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level. It shows that both teachers and students have the same views about the statement. They both disagreed to the statement "At the beginning of the session, teachers formulate and announce classroom rules and regulations to ensure a favorable environment in side the classroom".

Table 02: Students are prevented from disruptive behavior through moral, religious and motivational directions.

Respondents	SA	A	UD	DA	SDA	TOTAL	χ^2	p-value
TEACHERS	036 (26.6%)	059 (43.7%)	005 (03.7%)	019 (14.1%)	016 (11.8%)	**135**	**4.64**	**.326**
STUDENTS	273 (29.7%)	358 (38.9%)	016 (01.8%)	126 (13.7%)	147 (16.0%)	**920**		
TOTAL	**309**	**417**	**021**	**145**	**163**	**1055**		

Non-Significant (p>0.05) df = 4 table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level = 9.488

Table 2 indicates that the calculated value of χ^2 was found to be 4.64 which is statistically non-significant because it is less than the table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level. It shows that both teachers and students possess the same views about the statement. They both agreed to the statement "Students are prevented from disruptive behavior through moral, religious and motivational directions".

Table 03: Undesired and offensive activities of the disruptive students are constantly and properly monitored in the classroom.

Respondents	SA	A	UD	DA	SDA	TOTAL	χ^2	p-value
TEACHERS	039 (28.9%)	064 (47.4%)	06 (04.4%)	014 (10.4%)	012 (08.9%)	**135**	**5.67**	**.225**
STUDENTS	248 (27.0%)	396 (43.0%)	022 (02.4%)	142 (15.4%)	112 (12.2%)	**920**		
TOTAL	**287**	**460**	**028**	**156**	**124**	**1055**		

Non-Significant (p> 0.05) df = 4 table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level = 9.488

Table 3 depicts that the calculated value of χ^2 was found to be 5.67 which is statistically non-significant because it is less than the table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level. It shows that both teachers and students have the same views about the statement. They both agreed to the statement "Undesired and offensive activities of the disruptive students are constantly and properly monitored in the classroom".

Table 04: Disruptive Students are directed courteously rather than harshly.

Respondents	SA	A	UD	DA	SDA	TOTAL	χ^2	p-value
TEACHERS	038 (28.1%)	046 (34.1%)	008 (06.0%)	024 (17.8%)	019 (14.1%)	**135**	**2.85**	**.584**
STUDENTS	262 (28.5%)	312 (33.9%)	029 (03.2%)	181 (19.7%)	136 (14.8%)	**920**		
TOTAL	**300**	**358**	**037**	**205**	**155**	**1055**		

Non-Significant (p> 0.05) df = 4 table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level = 9.488

Table 4 shows that the calculated value of χ^2 was found to be 2.85 which is statistically non-significant because it is less than the table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level. It indicates that both teachers and students possess the same views about the statement. They both agreed to the statement "Disruptive Students are directed courteously rather than harshly".

Table 05: Parents are informed through letters about the disruptive behaviour of their children.

Respondents	SA	A	UD	DA	SDA	TOTAL	χ^2	p-value
TEACHERS	022 (16.3%)	026 (19.3%)	004 (03.0%)	058 (43.0%)	025 (18.5%)	**135**	**5.56**	**.235**
STUDENTS	138 (15.0%)	149 (16.2%)	026 (02.8%)	349 (37.9%)	258 (28.0%)	**920**		
TOTAL	**160**	**175**	**030**	**407**	**283**	**1055**		

Non-Significant (p> 0.05) df = 4 table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level = 9.488

Table 5 illustrates that the calculated value of χ^2 was found to be 5.56 which is statistically non-significant because it is less than the table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level. It depicts that both teachers and students have the same views about the statement. They both disagreed to the statement "Parents are informed through letters about the disruptive behaviour of their children".

Table 06: Disruptive students are first given chance before taking any drastic action.

Respondents	SA	A	UD	DA	SDA	TOTAL	χ^2	p-value
TEACHERS	032 (23.7%)	064 (47.4%)	006 (04.4%)	022 (16.3%)	011 (08.1%)	**135**	**2.60**	**.627**
STUDENTS	192 (20.9%)	426 (46.3%)	034 (03.7%)	152 (16.5%)	116 (12.6%)	**920**		
TOTAL	**224**	**490**	**040**	**174**	**127**	**1055**		

Non-Significant (p> 0.05) df = 4 table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level = 9.488

Table 6 depicts that the calculated value of χ^2 was found to be 2.60 which is statistically non-significant because it is less than the table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level. It clearly shows that both teachers and students have the same views about the statement. They both agreed to the statement "Disruptive students are first given chance before taking any drastic action".

Table 07: The disruptive and disturbing behaviour of the students are rectified on the spot.

Respondents	SA	A	UD	DA	SDA	TOTAL	χ^2	p-value
TEACHERS	021 (15.6%)	024 (17.8%)	006 (04.4%)	053 (39.3%)	031 (23.0%)	**135**	**0.67**	**.955**
STUDENTS	152 (16.5%)	161 (17.5%)	029 (03.2%)	365 (39.7%)	213 (23.2%)	**920**		
TOTAL	**173**	**185**	**035**	**418**	**244**	**1055**		

Non-Significant (p> 0.05) df = 4 table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level = 9.488

Table 7 shows that the calculated value of χ^2 was found to be 0.67 which is statistically non-significant because it is less than the table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level. It clearly indicates that both teachers and students possess the same views about the statement. They both disagreed to the statement "The disruptive and disturbing behaviour of the students are rectified on the spot".

Table 08: Disruptive and misbehaving students are given corporal punishment.

Respondents	SA	A	UD	DA	SDA	TOTAL	χ^2	p-value
TEACHERS	036 (26.7%)	049 (36.3%)	007 (05.2%)	025 (18.5%)	018 (13.3%)	135	4.33	.363
STUDENTS	246 (26.8%)	362 (39.3%)	021 (02.3%)	156 (17.0%)	135 (14.7%)	920		
TOTAL	282	411	028	181	153	1055		

Non-Significant (p> 0.05) df = 4 table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level = 9.488

Table 8 indicates that the calculated value of χ^2 was found to be 4.33 which is statistically non-significant because it is less than the table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level. It clearly depicts that both teachers and students possess the same views about the statement. They both agreed to the statement "Disruptive and misbehaving students are given corporal punishment".

Table 09: Extremely mischievous students are expelled from the classroom.

Respondents	SA	A	UD	DA	SDA	TOTAL	χ^2	p-value
TEACHERS	037 (27.4%)	052 (38.5%)	005 (03.7%)	023 (17.0%)	018 (13.3%)	135	4.75	.314
STUDENTS	264 (28.7%0	396 (43.0%)	024 (02.6%)	161 (17.5%)	075 (08.2%)	920		
TOTAL	301	448	029	184	093	1055		

Non-Significant (p>0.05) df = 4 table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level = 9.488

Table 9 illustrates that the calculated value of χ^2 was found to be 4.75 which is statistically non-significant because it is less than the table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level. It clearly shows that both teachers and students have the same views about the statement. They both agreed to the statement "Extremely mischievous students are expelled from the classroom".

Table 10: Undesired and objectionable materials are seized and confiscated from the students.

Respondents	SA	A	UD	DA	SDA	TOTAL	χ^2	p-value
TEACHERS	022 (16.3%)	030 (22.2%)	006 (04.4%)	042 (31.1%)	035 (26.0%)	135	1.47	.832
STUDENTS	138 (15.0%)	191 (20.7%)	032 (03.5%)	277 (30.1%)	282 (30.7%)	920		
TOTAL	160	221	038	319	317	1055		

Non-Significant (p> 0.05) df = 4 table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level = 9.488

Table 10 shows that the calculated value of χ^2 was found to be 1.47 which is statistically non-significant because it is less than the table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level. It clearly depicts that both teachers and students possess the same opinions about the statement. They both

disagreed to the statement "Undesired and objectionable materials are seized and confiscated from the students".

Table 11: Special fine is imposed on the disruptive and aggressive students in case of extremely misbehaving.

Respondents	SA	A	UD	DA	SDA	TOTAL	χ^2	p-value
TEACHERS	032 (23.7%)	042 (31.1%)	006 (04.4%)	028 (20.7%)	027 (20.0%)	**135**	**4.13**	**.388**
STUDENTS	188 (20.4%)	264 (28.7%)	027 (02.9%)	189 (20.5%)	252 (27.4%)	**920**		
TOTAL	**220**	**306**	**033**	**217**	**279**	**1055**		

Non-Significant (p> 0.05) df = 4 table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level = 9.488

Table 11 indicates that the calculated value of χ^2 was found to be 4.13 which is statistically non-significant because it is less than the table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level. It clearly shows that both teachers and students have similar views about the statement. They both agreed to the statement "Special fine is imposed on the disruptive and aggressive students in case of extremely misbehaving".

Table 12: Misbehaving students are first warned before taking any drastic action.

Respondents	SA	A	UD	DA	SDA	TOTAL	χ^2	p-value
TEACHERS	041 (30.3%)	039 (28.9%)	004 (03.0%)	029 (21.5%)	022 (16.3%)	**135**	**0.13**	**.998**
STUDENTS	276 (30.0%)	268 (29.1%)	023 (02.5%)	198 (21.5%)	155 (16.8%)	**920**		
TOTAL	**317**	**307**	**027**	**227**	**177**	**1055**		

Non-Significant (p> 0.05) df = 4 table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level = 9.488

Table 12 illustrates that the calculated value of χ^2 was found to be 0.13 which is statistically non-significant because it is less than the table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level. It clearly indicates that both teachers and students have the same opinions about the statement. They both agreed to the statement "Misbehaving students are first warned before taking any drastic action"

Table 13: Late comers' students are permitted to attend classes on showing authentic and valid reasons.

Respondents	SA	A	UD	DA	SDA	TOTAL	χ^2	p-value
TEACHERS	036 (26.7%)	051 (37.8%)	003 (02.2%)	024 (17.8%)	021 (15.6%)	**135**	**0.78**	**.942**
STUDENTS	258 (28.0%)	337 (36.6%)	032 (03.5%)	159 (17.3%)	134 (15.6%)	**920**		
TOTAL	**294**	**388**	**035**	**183**	**155**	**1055**		

Non-Significant (p> 0.05) df = 4 table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level = 9.488

Table 13 depicts that the calculated value of χ^2 was found to be 0.78 which is statistically non-significant because it is less than the table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level. It explicitly shows that both teachers and students possess the same views about the statement. They both agreed to the statement "Late comers' students are permitted to attend classes on showing authentic and valid reasons".

Table 14: Students are satisfied on asking irrelevant questions during teaching learning process.

Respondents	SA	A	UD	DA	SDA	TOTAL	χ^2	p-value
TEACHERS	036 (26.7%)	042 (31.1%)	008 (06.0%)	024 (17.8%)	025 (18.5%)	**135**	**4.69**	**.321**
STUDENTS	249 (27.1%)	272 (29.6%)	026 (02.8%)	161 (17.5%)	212 (23.0%)	**920**		
TOTAL	**285**	**314**	**034**	**185**	**237**	**1055**		

Non-Significant (p>0.05) df = 4 table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level = 9.488

Table 14 indicates that the calculated value of χ^2 was found to be 4.69 which is statistically non-significant because it is less than the table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level. It obviously depicts that both teachers and students have similar views about the statement. They both agreed to the statement "Students are satisfied on asking irrelevant questions during teaching learning process".

Table 15: The chairs of the mischievous students are changed on creating disturbance.

Respondents	SA	A	UD	DA	SDA	TOTAL	χ^2	p-value
TEACHERS	039 (28.9%)	046 (34.1%)	005 (03.7%)	025 (18.5%)	020 (14.8%)	**135**	**0.29**	**.991**
STUDENTS	266 (28.9%)	306 (33.3%)	034 (03.7%)	162 (17.6%)	152 (16.5%)	**920**		
TOTAL	**305**	**352**	**039**	**187**	**172**	**1055**		

Non-Significant (p> 0.05) df = 4 table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level = 9.488

Table 15 illustrates that the calculated value of χ^2 was found to be 0.29 which is statistically non-significant because it is less than the table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level. It clearly shows that both teachers and students possess the same opinions about the statement. They both agreed to the statement "The chairs of the mischievous students are changed on creating disturbance".

Table 16: Teachers investigate the causes of disruptive behaviour of the students.

Respondents	SA	A	UD	DA	SDA	TOTAL	χ^2	p-value
TEACHERS	032 (23.7%)	047 (34.8%)	004 (03.0%)	028 (20.7%)	024 (17.8%)	**135**	**3.33**	**.504**
STUDENTS	197 (21.4%)	326 (35.4%)	025 (02.7%)	246 (26.8%)	126 (13.7%)	**920**		
TOTAL	**229**	**373**	**029**	**274**	**150**	**1055**		

Non-Significant (p>0.05) df = 4 table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level = 9.488

Table 16 depicts that the calculated value of χ^2 was found to be 3.33 which is statistically non-significant because it is less than the table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level. It plainly indicates that both teachers and students possess the same views about the statement. They both agreed to the statement "Teachers investigate the causes of disruptive behaviour of the students".

Table 17: Disruptive students are degraded in the front of whole class.

Respondents	SA	A	UD	DA	SDA	TOTAL	χ^2	p-value
TEACHERS	032 (23.7%)	048 (35.6%)	006 (04.4%)	026 (19.3%)	023 (17.0%)	**135**	**1.60**	**.809**
STUDENTS	184 (20.0%)	369 (40.1%)	034 (03.7%)	180 (19.6%)	153 (16.6%)	**920**		
TOTAL	**216**	**417**	**040**	**206**	**176**	**1055**		

Non-Significant (p> 0.05) df = 4 table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level = 9.488

Table 17 shows that the calculated value of χ^2 was found to be 1.60 which is statistically non-significant because it is less than the table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level. It clearly depicts that both teachers and students have the same views about the statement. They both agreed to the statement "Disruptive students are degraded in the front of whole class".

Table 18: Disruptive and disturbing students are forgiven if they excuse.

Respondents	SA	A	UD	DA	SDA	TOTAL	χ^2	p-value
TEACHERS	031 (23.0%)	046 (34.1%)	006 (04.4%)	029 (21.5%)	023 (17.0%)	**135**	**0.32**	**.988**
STUDENTS	199 (21.6%)	326 (35.4%)	036 (03.9%)	193 (21.0%)	166 (18.0%)	**920**		
TOTAL	**230**	**372**	**042**	**222**	**189**	**1055**		

Non-Significant (p>0.05) df = 4 table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level = 9.488

Table 18 illustrates that the calculated value of χ^2 was found to be 0.32 which is statistically non-significant because it is less than the table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level. It explicitly shows that both teachers and students have similar opinions about the statement. They both agreed to the statement "Disruptive and disturbing students are forgiven if they excuse".

Table 19: Students are compelled to complete their home work/assignment in time.

Respondents	SA	A	UD	DA	SDA	TOTAL	χ^2	p-value
TEACHERS	034 (25.2%)	045 (33.3%)	006 (04.4%)	028 (20.7%)	022 (16.3%)	135	1.36	.851
STUDENTS	206 (22.4%)	319 (34.7%)	029 (03.2%)	197 (21.4%)	169 (18.4%)	920		
TOTAL	240	364	035	225	191	1055		

Non-Significant (p> 0.05) df = 4 table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level = 9.488

Table 19 indicates that the calculated value of χ^2 was found to be 1.36 which is statistically non-significant because it is less than the table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level. It clearly depicts that both teachers and students have the same views about the statement. They both agreed to the statement "Students are compelled to complete their home work/assignment in time".

Table 20: Teaching is made interesting to manage student's disruptive behaviour properly.

Respondents	SA	A	UD	DA	SDA	TOTAL	χ^2	p-value
TEACHERS	039 (28.9%)	048 (35.6%)	007 (05.2%)	021 (15.6%)	020 (14.8%)	135	3.27	.514
STUDENTS	263 (28.6%)	324 (35.2%)	027 (02.9%)	184 (20.0%)	122 (13.3%)	920		
TOTAL	302	372	034	205	142	1055		

Non-Significant (p> 0.05) df = 4 table value of X^2 at 0.05 level = 9.488

Table 20 depicts that the calculated value of χ^2 was found to be 3.27 which is statistically non-significant because it is less than the table value of χ^2 at 0.05 level. It clearly indicates that both teachers and students have similar views about the statement. They both agreed to the statement "Teaching is made interesting to manage student's disruptive behaviour properly".

CONCLUSIONS

In the light of statistical analysis and findings of the study, the researchers arrived at the following conclusions:

1. The study revealed that the overall performance of the secondary school teachers in managing disruptive classroom behaviour is satisfactory as they use constructive and appropriate techniques to control the classroom disruptive behaviour. They prevent students from disruptive and aggressive behaviour through moral, religious and motivational lectures in polite way rather than in harsh way. Offensive activities of the students are constantly monitored. Late comers' students are permitted to attend classes on showing authentic and valid reasons. Teaching is made interesting to manage student's disruptive behaviour properly.

2. The study also exposed that disruptive and aggressive students are given corporal punishment in case of extremely misbehaving and also imposed special fine on them. Students are compelled to complete their home work/assignment in time. In some cases students are expelled out from the classroom and are degraded in the front of whole class.
3. The study also revealed the negative areas of the secondary school teachers in managing classroom disruptive behaviour. Rules and regulations of classroom management are not formulated and announced at the beginning of new session. The disruptive and disturbing behaviour of the students are not rectified on the spot. Objectionable materials are not seized; parents are not informed through letters about the disruptive behaviour of their children.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In the light of the results, findings, interpretations and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are made:

1. At the beginning of new session or class, classroom management rules and regulations should be devised and announced so that students may understand the behaviour of a teacher.
2. As it was exposed that teachers use corporal punishment for behaviour modification in classroom in case of extremely disruption. But it is also recommended that they should also practice alternative behaviour modification approaches for behaviour modification.
3. Special training programmes regarding management of classroom disruptive behavior should be introduced for teachers at all levels so that they may be able to perform their teaching activities in excellent and beneficial way.
4. Modern teaching techniques concerning the behaviour modification should be introduced in teacher training programmes. Corporal punishment should not be practiced as behaviour modification technique as it creates sense of aversion in them. Student should be appreciated and rewarded for excellent performance.
5. Teachers should keep and maintain record of disruptive and aggressive students and it should be sent to their parents. In addition, a special meeting programme should be launched inside the schools to discuss on the same issues.

SOME SUGGESTED TECHNIQUES TO BE USED

- At the beginning of the new session, teachers should devise and announce classroom rules and regulations in order to ensure a favorable environment in side the classroom.
- Students should be prevented from disruptive and disturbing behavior through moral, religious and motivational directions.
- Undesired and offensive activities of the disruptive students should be constantly and properly monitored in the classroom.
- Disruptive Students should be directed courteously rather than harshly. In case of extreme disruption of the students, they should be pressurized.

- Parents should be informed through letters about the disruptive behaviour of their children.
- Disruptive students should be given chance first before taking any drastic action.
- The disruptive and disturbing behaviour of the students should be rectified on the spot.
- Reward system should be institutionalized instead of corporal punishment. But as we know that "A rod is the logic of fool" therefore, in some cases corporal punishment should be put into practice. However, extremely mischievous students should be expelled from the classroom so that other students may not be affected.
- Undesirable and objectionable materials should be seized and confiscated from the students. In addition, they should be fined. In this way, they will not bring undesirable things to classroom.
- Sometimes special fine should be imposed on the disruptive and aggressive students in case of extreme misbehaving so that their parent should come to know about their children misbehaviour.
- Teachers should keep and maintain record of disruptive and aggressive students and it should be sent to their parents for information.
- Late comers' students should be permitted to attend classes on showing authentic and valid reasons.
- Students should be satisfied on asking irrelevant questions during teaching learning process.
- The chairs of the mischievous students should be changed on creating disturbance to break up their peer group.
- Causes of disruptive behaviour of the students should be investigated and then necessary actions should be taken accordingly.
- Disruptive and disturbing students should be forgiven if they excuse.
- Students should be compelled to complete their home work/assignment in time otherwise they will be habitual of not doing homework in time.
- Teaching should be made interesting through the utilization of educational technologies in order to manage student's disruptive behaviour properly.

REFERENCES

Algonquin College. (1995). *Handling Disruptive Behaviour in Teaching-Learning Environments*. Faculty Guidelines. Algonquin College. P.4

Bartlett, T. (2004). *Taking Control of the Classroom*. Chronicle of Higher Education (9/17): A8-A9.

Bear, G. G. (2008). *Best practices in classroom discipline*. In Thomas, A. & Grimes, J. (Eds.), Best Practices in School Psychology V (1403-1420). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Best, J., and Kahn, J. (1998). *Research in education (8th ed.).* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Borg, M. G., & Falzon, J. M. (1990). Teachers' Perceptions of Primary School Children's' Undesirable Behaviours: The Effects of Teaching Experience, Pupil's Age, Sex and Ability Stream. *British Journal of Educational Psychology,* 60, 220-226.

Evertson, C. M., & Weinstein, C. S. (2006). *Classroom management as a field of inquiry.* In C. M. Evertson & C. S. Weinstein (Eds.), Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues. (p. 4) Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

Feldhusen, J. F. (1995). Talent Development during the High School Years. *Gifted Education International,* 10 (2), 60-64.

Finn, J. Fish, R. Scott, L. (2008). Educational Sequelae of High School Misbehavior. *Journal of Educational Research.* 101, 259.

Gay, L. R. (2005). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application.* Islamabad: National Book Foundation.

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

.

Goodman, M. E. (2008). *The Caring Teacher's Guide to Discipline: Helping students Learn Self-Control, Responsibility, and Respect,* K-6. 2008, p.36

Haroun, R., & O'Hanlon, C. (1997). *Teachers' Perceptions of Discipline Problems in a Jordanian Secondary School, Pastoral Care*, June, 29-36.

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.

Ingersoll, R. M. (2001). Turnover and Teacher Shortages: An Organizational Analysis. *American Educational Research Journal, 38*, 499-534.

Kaplan, A., Gheen, M., & Midgley, C. (2002). Classroom Goal Structure and Student Disruptive Behaviour. *The British Journal of Educational*, 72, 191-212

Katozai, M. A. (2002). *Preparation for the PCS screening Test of Senior English Teacher.* University Publishers Shop # 8 – A Afghan Market, Qissa Khwani Peshawar. p. 119

Lang, R. H. & Hebert, J. (1995). Teaching Strategies and Methods for Students Centered Instruction, America: Whiney, H.M.

Malone, B. G., Bonitz, D. A., & Rickett, M. M. (1998). *Teacher Perceptions of Disruptive Behaviour: Maintaining Instructional Focus.* Educational Horizons, Summer, 189-194.

Masrur, R. (2003). *Thesis writing: A systematic approach. Islamabad*: Allama Iqbal Open University.

McKinney, K. (2005). *Dealing with Disruptive Behavior in the Classroom.* http://www.cat.ilstu.edu/teaching_tips/handouts/dealingb.shtml

Ming, C. K. (n. d.). *A Comparison of the Strategies Adopted by Experienced And Novice Teachers in Handling Discipline Problems in A Secondary School in Hong Kong.* Master of Education Thesis Submitted at The University of Hong Kong. Retrieved June 15, 2007 from HKU Scholars Hub.Htm pp.9-10

Morrissette, P. J. (2001). Reducing Incivility in the University/College Classroom. International *Electronic Journal for Leadership in Learning* (5/14). http://www.ucalgary.ca/%7Eiejll/volume5/morrissette.html

Poulou, M., & Norwich, B. (2000). Teachers' Causal Attributions, Cognitive, Emotional and Behavioural Responses to Students with Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties. *The British Journal of Educational Psychology,* 70, 559-582.

Sadker, P. M. & Sadker D. M. (1997). *Teachers School and Society.* The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc., New York, USA.

Shrigley, R. L. (1999). *Strategies in Classroom Management.* The National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 63, 428, 1-9.

Sokol, L., Smith, D. G., & Mowat, H. (2003). Alternative Certification Teachers' Attitudes toward Classroom Management. *The High School Journal*, 86, 8-15.

Stephenson, J., Martin, A. J., & Linfoot, K. (2000). Behaviours of Concern to Teachers in the Early Years of School. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 47, 225-235.

Traynor, P. (2003). *Factors Contributing to Teacher Choice of Classroom Order Strategy. Education*, 123, 586-563

Tom, G. (1998). Faculty and Student Perceptions of Classroom Etiquette. *Journal of College Student Development* (September/October). http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3752/is_199809/ai_n8816872/print

Website Used:
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Classroom_management
http://www.apa.org/education/k12/classroom-mgmt.aspx?item
http://www.teachingprofessor.com/articles/teaching-and-learning/classroom-management-to-promote-learning