



ADAMA SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES AND LAW

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

**A STUDY ON SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS' EFL CLASSROOM
DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIORS AND TEACHERS' MANAGEMENT OF THE
BEHAVIORS: ENGIBI BEDELE SECONDARY SCHOOL IN FOCUS.**

**By
MULUNEH ONSHO GUDETA**

**ADAMA
SEPTEMBER, 2017**

ADAMA SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES AND LAW

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

**A STUDY ON SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS EFL CLASSROOM
DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIORS AND TEACHERS' MANAGEMENT OF THE
BEHAVIORS: ENGIBI BEDELE SECONDARY SCHOOL IN FOCUS.**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES AND LAW
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH**

**In Partial Fulfilments of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in
Teaching English as Foreign Language (TEFL)**

**By
Muluneh Onsho Gudeta**

**Adviser
Yeshitla Habtemariam (PhD)**

**ADAMA
September, 2017**

ADAMA SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES AND LAW

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

THESIS TITLE

A STUDY ON SECONDARY SCHOOL EFL CLASSROOM DISRUPTIVE
BEHAVIOURS AND TEACHERS' MANAGEMENT OF THE BEHAVIOURS: ENGIBI
BEDELE SECONDARY SCHOOL IN FOCUS.

BY:-

Mulunch Onsho Gudeta

APPROVAL OF THE EXAMINATION BOARD

NAME

Dr. Yeshitla Heblemariam

SIGNATURE

[Signature]

DATE

01/10/2017

ADVISOR

Daniel Tiruneh

[Signature]

01/10/2017

EXTERNAL EXAMINER

Mulach Shumye (pr.)

[Signature]

01/10/2010

INTERNAL EXAMINER

Acknowledgements

First of all, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my major advisor Dr. Yeshitila Habtemariam for his continuous, valuable and unreserved guidance, advice and critical comments throughout the course of writing the paper. Had it not been for his continuous follow up and kind encouragement, the completion of this study would not have been what it is now.

I would like to thank Dr. Alemu Dissasa for reading some of the draft and providing me with constructive comments.

My deepest gratitude also goes to Tesfaye Onsho, my brother and role model, for advice and encouragement throughout the course of the study. His consistent moral and material support is invaluable.

My thanks also go to Engibi Secondary School English teachers and Students for their willingness to take time and participate in the interviews, the focused group discussion and in filling the questionnaires.

Finally I would like to express my appreciation and gratitude to my family for their support and understanding.

Table of Contents

Topics	pages
Cover page -----	i
Approval page-----	ii
Acknowledgements-----	iii
Table of Contents-----	iv
List of Tables-----	vi
Abstract-----	vii
Chapter One –Introduction-----	1
1.1. Background of the Study-----	1
1.2. Statements of the Problem-----	4
1.3. Objectives of the Study-----	7
1.3.1 General objective-----	7
1.3.2 Specific objectives-----	7
1.4 Research Questions-----	7
1.5. Significant of the Study -----	7
1.6 Delimitation of the Study-----	8
1.7 Limitation of the Study-----	8
1.8 Organization of the paper-----	8
1. Operational Definitions of basic terms-----	9
Chapter Two- Review of the Related Literatures-----	10
2.1. Meaning of Disruptive Behavior-----	10
2.2. Types of Classroom Disruptive Behavior-----	11
2.3 Causes of Students Disruptive Behavior-----	12
2.3.1 Students Related Causes -----	12
2.3.2 Teachers Related Causes-----	15
2.3.3 Society and Parents Related Causes-----	18
2.3.4 The School and its Environment Related Causes-----	18
2.4 Effects of Students Disruptive Behavior on Instruction-----	19
2.5 Concept of Classroom Management-----	20

2.6 Classroom Management and language classes-----	21
2.7 Strategies in Classroom Management-----	22
Chapter Three -Research Design and Method of the Study-----	29
3.1 Research Design-----	29
3.2 Research Site-----	29
3.3 Participants the Study-----	30
3.4 Samples and sampling Techniques -----	30
3.5 Data Gathering Instruments-----	32
3.6 Data Collection Procedure-----	34
3.7 Methods of Data Analysis-----	35
Chapter Four-Presentation and Discussion of the Data.....	36
4.1 Introduction-----	36
4.2 Data from Questionnaire on EFL Classroom Disruptive Behaviours -----	36
4.3 Analysis of Causes of disruptive behaviour of students-----	45
4.4 Analysis of categories of more disruptive behaviour of students-----	54
4.5 Teachers' coping Strategies of Students' Disruptive Behaviour-----	57
4.5.1 Analysis of Teachers' Preventive Strategies of Disruptive Behaviour-----	57
4.5.2 Analysis of Teachers' Intervention Strategies of Disruptive Behaviours-----	59
Chapter Five - Conclusions and Recommendations -----	63
5.1 Summary-----	63
5.2 Conclusions-----	64
5.3 Recommendations-----	65
References -----	67
Appendix -A Questionnaire for students -----	71
Appendix- B An interview guide answered by Students-----	76
Appendix- C An interview guide for focused group discussion participants (teachers) -----	77
Appendix- D Classroom Observation Checklist-----	78
Appendix- E Afan Oromo Version of the Questionnaire for by the Students-----	79
Appendix- F Afan Oromo version of the interview for students-----	84
Appendix- G Transcriptions of Responses of Students' Interview-----	85
Appendix- H Classroom Observation Result-----	93
Appendix- I Transcriptions of focus group discussion-----	95

List of Tables

Tables	Pages
Table 1 Student Population and Sampling Size distribution by Grades and Sex-----	31 Table
2. The students' responses regarding moderate or least serious disruptive behaviour type of disruptive -----	37
Table 3. Students' responses concerning serious type of disruptive behaviours-----	40
Table 4. Students' responses regarding very serious and/or life threatening disruptive behaviours-----	43
Table 5. The students' responses regarding the causes of disruptive behaviour of students related to the students themselves.-----	45
Table 6. The students' responses regarding the causes of disruptive behaviour of students related to teachers.-----	47
Table 7 The students' responses regarding the causes of disruptive behaviour related to the school.-----	50
Table 8. The students' responses regarding the causes of the students' disruptive behaviour related to home and/or environmental factors.-----	53
Table 9. Students responses concerning categories of more disruptive students-----	55
Table 10. The students' responses regarding teachers' prevention strategies of disruptive behaviour-----	57
Table 11 The students' responses regarding teachers' intervention strategies of disruptive preventive -----	10

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to explore different types of students' EFL classroom disruptive behavior at Engibi Bedele Secondary school and how teachers respond to those behaviours. The study tried to answer the kinds of EFL classrooms disruptive behaviours existed in the study area and their possible causes. Furthermore attempts were made to identify the categories of more disruptive behaviours and how EFL teachers respond to those behaviours. A descriptive case study was employed to achieve this research goal. Three English language teachers and one hundred and seventy six students from grade nine and ten were considered to be the subjects of the study. Questionnaire with a set of both closed and open-ended items were used to secure relevant data from the students. In addition, a semi-structured interview was designed to elicit pertinent information from the class monitors and focused group discussion was made with three EFL teachers. Finally, the fourth instrument used for data collection was classroom observation. During classroom observation, semi-structured observation checklists were used to collect data while the teachers were teaching in the actual classroom. The data collected through the questionnaire were analyzed with descriptive statistics (frequency and percentage) and mean. But those data gathered through the interview, focused group discussion and classroom observations were qualitatively analyzed. All the data secured from different sources were collated in the discussions to arrive at conclusions regarding the major EFL classroom disruptive behaviours, category of more disruptive students, causes for the disruptive behaviours and practices of teachers coping mechanisms with the EFL classroom disruptive behaviour of students.

The results of the study generally suggested that most of the frequently observed disruptive behaviors of students are those that disrupt the learning teaching process and EFL teachers did not use a particular systematic approach in dealing with the disruptive behaviour of students in their classrooms and often ignored these behaviours. In addition, categories of more disruptive students were identified through the study. Furthermore, the students' indifference to learning, negative attitude to English language learning, lack of student- teacher rapport, absence of classroom ground rules and guidance and counselling service, parents' little follow up, the loose school rules were found to be the major causes for the behaviour of students reflected in the classroom. Finally, Recommendations were forwarded to alleviate the problems.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This chapter deals with the background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, scope of the study, significance of the study, limitation of the study, definition of operational terms and organization of the paper .

1.1 Background of the study

Disruptive behaviour in schools has been a source of concern for school systems for several years. Facing disruptive behaviour seems an avoidable part of the working environment of many educators. Dealing with student misbehavior is one of the most challenges facing today's teachers. According to Ghazi, secondary school teachers have repeatedly ranked disruptive behavior as one of the most series hurdle in effective teaching learning process in the classroom (Ghazi et.al, 2003).

Yuan and Che(2012) state that dealing with the students' misbehavior in the classroom is a tough and unavoidable task for a teacher. Luckily, this difficulty and the unavoidability do not make the problem unsolvable. The teacher, as the controller of the classroom, needs to have the confidence and skills to solve the problem. Teachers have the knowledge and understanding of the source of the problem before dealing with the unacceptable behavior. An inappropriate reaction to the student misbehavior will make the problem worse and this can further affect the teaching learning process.

Teachers must deal with disruptive students systematically. Once the behavior occurs, teachers' action should move along a continuum as per the seriousness of the misbehavior. There is not readily available to students' disruptive behavior in the classroom. In most cases, the background to the problem and the situation dictates the solution. In any case, punishment should be the last resolution to be used as a culmination of the behaviour as punishment can cause confrontations between the teacher and the students if they are not used appropriately (Yuan and Che, 2012).

In order to rebuild students' self-esteem and solve the problem of students' misbehavior from its root, using reward plays vital role in building positive classroom atmosphere. Trying to build a positive student-teacher relationship can effectively minimize the chance of happening of students' misbehavior and also it can solve the problem. After the teachers' authority has been established, teachers should try to be friends of students. To adjust the behavior of students, teachers should also judge their position in the classroom as a kind and warm person. In sum, understanding the behavior completely, thinking

about it carefully and dealing with it intelligently are the appropriate steps to deal with students' misbehavior in the classroom. The quality of the teaching and learning process can be assured when the student misbehavior is effectively controlled (Yuan and Che, 2012).

Disrupted classroom are characterized by distractions that inhibit adaptive learning as it challenges children's capacity to regulate their attention and to persist through difficult tasks. Brand (2003) states that elevated levels of misbehavior compromise perceptions of safety and support. He adds that children can become less engaged in school, less eager to learn, and less able to focus their attention on learning (Brand, 2003). Brand also adds that students' disciplinary problem significantly deters the process of learning; investigating and applying strategy is the concern of teachers, principals, parents and the students themselves (Brand 2003). Classroom discipline problem was ranked by educators as one of the most obstacles in achieving educational objectives. Moreover, it has been observed to be the most widespread cause of job fatigue, disappointment and abrasion for new teachers (Ghazi et. al, 2013).

Many researchers believe proper classroom management is one of the effective ways of tackling classroom disruptive behavior. What is classroom management? Classroom management has been defined by different scholars differently but they included similar concepts. Oliver et.al (2007) defined classroom management as "a collection of non-instructional classroom procedures implemented by teachers.... for the purpose of teaching acceptable behavior and preventing and reducing inappropriate behavior"(p12). Richard and Renanda (2007) also defined classroom management as "the way in which teachers manage a class...to make it maximally productive teaching" (p.28). Doyle (1986) cited in Stronge J.(2007) also defined classroom management as "the actions and strategies teachers use to solve the problem of order in classroom". All these definitions have the agreement that classroom management is a mechanism of controlling or minimising disruptive behavior in the classroom setting. Thus it could be concluded that classroom management is the activity by which teachers promote appropriate student behavior and eliminate inappropriate student behavior to develop good interpersonal relationship and a positive socio-emotional climate in the classroom.

Classroom management also establishes and maintains effective and productive classroom organization to enhance classroom instruction. One of the most important organizational skills an effective teacher possesses is the ability to prevent negative behaviour. Studies indicate that the majority of behaviour problems occur because students do not know or do not follow routines and procedures. This supports

the notion that proactive classroom management is the most effective deterrent to discipline problems. Praising students, reinforcing positive behaviours, and establishing trust within the classroom builds respectful relationships between teachers and students. Disciplinary actions are rare in environments where teachers and students respect and trust each other (Stronge, 2007).

Teachers should know how to support students learning through instructional techniques but also know how to create an overall conducive learning environment. Organizing a supportive learning environment requires teacher practice skills in classroom organization and management. Effective classroom instruction is one of the major classroom techniques through which teachers can manage students' classroom disruptive behaviors. But effective instruction alone is insufficient for establishing good classroom management. Therefore, effective teachers often use procedures that structure the classroom environment, encourage appropriate behavior, and reduce the occurrence of inappropriate behavior for a strong classroom management, Everton (Cited in Oliver et.al, 2011). Through classroom management teachers establish responses to common classroom issues to allow them put their maximum energy on instructional process. When the classroom experience is engaging and when good management exists, there is little time inclination for students to misbehave.

The capability of teachers to organize classroom and manage the behavior of their students is crucial to achieve positive educational outcomes. Poorly managed classroom behavior contributes to poor students' achievement as it impedes classroom instruction (Oliver and Reschly, 2007). Thus, effective classroom management are important in several ways. For example, focusing on reactive procedures establishes a positive classroom environment in which teacher focuses on their duty (Lewis and Sugai, 1999). Rules and routines are powerful preventive components to classroom management because they establish a behavioral context for the classroom that includes what is expected, what will be enforced, and what will be re taught if inappropriate behaviors occur (Colvin et.al ,1993). This prevents problem by giving students specific, appropriate behavior to engage in, monitoring students, allows teacher to acknowledge students who are engaging in appropriate behavior and prevent misbehavior from escalating (Colvin et.al, 1993, and Oliver et.al, 2011).

In summery as stated students' disruptive behavior can be approached from proper classroom management, from their ability to manage through student learning mechanisms and through the understanding of the context in which the problems occur and applying appropriate context specific solutions. Engibi Bedele high school is a young vibrant, dynamic multicultural and multi

denominational growing school in a heart of semi urban setting in Bedele town. Because of this, the school is facing students' classroom disruptive behaviors of different origin which no single solution can be applied.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Disruptive behaviour as the most common discipline problem is one of the main concerns for teachers and researches indicated that lack of discipline in the classroom is a common factor around the world (Corzo, 2011). Disruptive behaviour of students is a deep concern at all level of education. Disruption in high schools has become a great problem and teachers have complaints against behavioural problems relating to students in classroom management (Ghazi et. al, 2013).

For many teachers dealing with student misbehaviour in the classroom takes up a considerable proportion of teaching time which in turn affects the quality of the students learning experience. There are different kinds of disruptive behaviour and each one has a negative impact on classroom instruction. In a classroom where disruptive behaviour occurs frequently, students get less academic engaged time and the students in disruptive classroom stand in low category in achievement tests. In addition, attempts to control disruptive behaviour cost considerable time at the expense of academic instructions in the class (Oliver et.al, 2011). Students' disruptive behaviour is a disadvantage to the educational society it interferes. It retards the ability of teachers to teach most effectively, diverts the energy and resources of teachers and the school away from their objectives and educational mission. It may designate a significant height of personal problems on the part of the disrupter (Ghazi et al, 2013).

Student's disruptive behaviour has become the major concern of teachers, parents and school administrators and other concerned bodies in the education system. First and for most, if the behaviour of the students failed to clearly understood, defined and the necessary intervention prepared and implemented, the overall teaching learning process is considered ineffective. Teachers who face problems with classroom discipline are frequently ineffective, and they often report high level of stress and symptoms of burnout. Disruptive classroom behaviour is a significant reason why teachers leave the profession (Ingersoll &Smith, 2003) cited in (Oliver R.&Reschly, D.2007).Regarding its effects and seriousness, (Ghazi et .al, 2013) claim:

Since banning of corporal punishment in schools the teachers were found in great trouble because even the students became aware of the law against corporal punishment and they claim that they cannot be given corporal punishment at any cost, which in turn, escalated the intensity as well as the frequency of

disruptive behaviour. In such situation, there is a dire need of some laws and techniques for minimizing the disruptive behaviour and its impact on classroom management. (p.351)

English classes are composed of various communicative activities that require students' active participation, so students usually have more opportunities in an EFL class than classes of other subjects to speak, to talk, to read loud or even to argue with each other. These activities create noise, initiative, and disorder and if the class is managed inappropriately by the teacher, there is the risk of disruptive behavior and such class may appear to be in lack of order and too noisy for a normal class.

In fact, much noise in the classroom intervenes with cognitive processing of information and minimizes learning outcome and motivation(Yi, 2006,Tomlinson, 1988).Therefore, Classroom management particularly raises key issues in EFL classes and is one of the biggest challenges language teachers face while they teach (Linse & Nunan, 2005). A language teacher should be a kind and loving caregiver to let the genuine communication happen in the classroom because if the teacher over-disciplines the class, it may cause anxiety which is seriously harmful for effective EFL learning.

On the other hand, in order for the instruction to take place, the teacher should maintain order to manage language activities most effectively. It is not, therefore, easy for a language teacher to create the balance between these two, that is, a caring environment and a controlled one. Thus, to attain a class order which permits both effective discipline and active participation, a number of general ground rules must be established and maintained by the students themselves as English is one of the lessons which needs classroom management skills extensively (Williams and Burden, 1997).

Hence one can easily conclude that understanding and tackling students' misbehaviour is a prerequisite of teaching learning process. In practice, most secondary schools in Ethiopia face such problems where by teachers becoming handicapped to effectively and efficiently conduct the teaching learning process. Parents lack clear insight about their children academic stand as well as characters. Teachers also apply the old ways of managing students' disruptive behaviour that have produced little or no results. Therefore, a clear identification, definition, assessment and intervention of disruptive behaviour should be considered as the primary task of all at all time if the pre-intended teaching learning objectives to be met (Amogne, 2014).

Several studies have been conducted in Ethiopian on classroom misbehaviours and classroom management techniques. For instance, a local study has been conducted by Zufan (2014) who dealt with the topic entitled "Assessment of Classroom Management Practices in Gulele Sub-City

Government secondary schools”. Another researcher Tiruneh (2015) studied similar topic as “Students Disciplinary Problems in One Government and Three Private Preparatory Schools of Addis Ketema sub-city of Addis Ababa city administration”. Both came up with the result that disruptive behaviour of students in the studied area is a major hindrance to the teaching learning process. They also identified the major types of students’ disciplinary problems and made recommendations of their own. Thus, the present study is different from the above researchers in the sense that it focuses on the study on EFL classroom disruptive behaviour of students and teachers management of the problem.

There were no similar studies undertaken in schools in Oromia region in general, and Engibi Bedele Secondary School, in particular. Disruptive students’ behaviors are context specific and thus have contextual solutions. They occur in different classroom, context, language context, subject matter context, and cultural context and age and gender context. To be effective the solution must clearly address these contexts. Thus, it is not possible to expect the same type of disruptive behavior to occur in all schools and subject matter contexts. Even though the same or similar types of behaviors occur, there is a huge difference in the ways they can be handled.

Engibi Bedele high school was established five years ago in Bedele town, West Oromia in its own unique context. Students’ misbehaviours have been reported multiple times at Engibi Bedele high school. There have been situations where teachers and school managers hold discussions with parents and students to search for the solutions for the growing student misconduct. But students’ misconduct in classroom has never ceased to exist not reduced in intensity. The situation at the school calls for a proper handling of students’ disruptive behavior so that the problems could be solved from its root. But this is only possible when the causes and intensity of the problems are well researched and known. Students’ disruptive behaviours have a negative effect on classroom learning and thus students’ achievement. It can lead to students’ dropout, staff turnover and over all poor school performance. Therefore, there is a high need to undertake a comprehensive study of the Engibi Bedele high School’s students’ EFL classroom disruptive behaviors and how teachers manage them to support school managers, teachers and parent to separately or collectively tackle the issues surrounding students’ misconduct both at classroom and at school level.

This research is aimed at finding possible solutions to the school EFL classroom based students’ disruptive behavior by identifying the root causes of such problems and by suggesting workable solutions. In line with this the, research has the following objectives.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

1.3.1 General Objective

The main objective of the study was to explore different types of students' disruptive behaviours in EFL classrooms and how teachers respond to those behaviors at Engibi Bedele Secondary school.

1. 3.2 Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of the study were to:

- Identify the major EFL classroom disruptive behavior of students in Engibi Bedele Secondary School.
- Find out the dominant factors that contribute to the students' EFL classroom disruptive behavior in Ingibi Bedele Secondary School.
- Identify groups or categories of students that were more disruptive in Engibi Bedele Secondary School's EFL classrooms.
- Find out the coping mechanisms that EFL teachers employ to deal with the disruptive behaviours of the students.

1.4. Research questions

In line with the specific objectives set above, the study attempted to answer the following research questions.

- What were the major EFL classroom disruptive behaviours of students in Engibi Bedele Secondary School?
- What were the major sources of students' EFL classroom disruptive behavior in Engibi Bedele Secondary School?
- Which groups or categories of students were more disruptive in Engibi Bedele Secondary School's
- What were the coping mechanisms that the EFL teachers employ to deal with the classroom disruptive behaviour the students?

1.5 Significance of the Study

This study was aimed at exploring different types of students' EFL classroom disruptive behavior in Engibi Bedele Secondary School. It was also set to find workable solutions to context specific students' EFL classroom based disruptive in a Secondary school based in multi context settings. Therefore, the findings of this study were providing the following contributions. First, it may help Engibi Bedele Secondary School EFL teachers to clearly establish types and causes of classroom disruptive behaviors and apply workable solutions to maintain classroom environment in which diverse students can learn. Second, the study also is hoped to help school principals, supervisors and educational administrators as a reference to handle students' disruptive behavior at similar situations. Finally, the study could contribute to further studies related to the problems associated to students' disruptive behavior and teachers' EFL classroom management practice.

1.6 Delimitation of the Study

To make the study manageable, the research was limited to Engibi Bedele High School that is located in Buno Bedele Administrative Zone, Oromia. The study focused only on EFL classroom based students' disruptive behavior manifestations and teachers coping mechanisms of such behaviors. Therefore, the results of the study cannot be generalized to all secondary schools in Buno Bedele Zone.

1.7 Limitation of the study

This study was not free from limitations. Different factors limited its validity. Even though attempts were made to achieve its fullest status, some constraints influenced the achievement of the intended result. The researcher initially intended to incorporate parents of the students, who were believed to have some important information on the causes of disruptive behaviour of students, as additional source of data but excluded them due to its inconvenience in data gathering and time constraints. Hence, this contributed to the limitation of the study in data source area. In addition, there are limitations in gathering relevant information from online sources because of connection problems and lack of access to the internet. The researcher believes these may limit the study to some degree.

1.8 Organization of the Paper

This thesis paper has five chapters that discuss a Study on EFL Classroom Disruptive Behaviors and Teachers' Management of the Behaviors. To this end, Chapter One presents the background of the research, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, its significance and spells out what the research intends to achieve. Chapter Two provides review of literary works with respect to behavior

and behavior management strategies. Therefore, attempts were made to include theories and concepts related to major EFL classroom disruptive behaviors reflected, their possible causes, category of more disruptive students and classroom management strategies to review previously made research studies. Chapter Three discusses the research design, the sampling procedure, the research instruments, the data collection procedure and the data analysis methods together with the reasons for employing them. It is followed by Chapter Four, which is dedicated to the data analysis and the discussion of the results. The last chapter, Chapter Five, presents a brief summary of the whole study, draws conclusion from the investigation carried out and provides recommendations to possibly show ways to avoid the problem raised.

1.9 Definition of technical terms

Behaviour-The way somebody acts or functions in particular situation.

Disrupt- To make it difficult for something to proceed.

Disruptive student- A student whose behavior or conduct disrupts the learning environment or is directly or indirectly threatening to self or others.

Management- The process of dealing with controlling people or things.

Misbehave- To act or behave in an inappropriate, improper, incorrect or unexpected manner

Source- Ali and Gracey (2013), Kyriacou(1997), Richard and Renanda (2007)

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this part of the thesis, brief review of the literature related to issues and concepts regarding the topic a study on high school students' classroom behaviors and teachers' management of the behaviors will be discussed. Accordingly, meaning of disruptive behaviour, types of students' disruptive behaviours, causes of students' disruptive behaviour, effects of students' disruptive on instruction, concept of classroom management, importance of classroom management, techniques in classroom management and factors affecting classroom management are presented.

2.1 Meaning of Disruptive Behaviour

There is no universally accepted definition of disruptive behaviour because behaviour is defined as acceptable or not in a social context, and is also shaped by the broader environment in which people interact with each other (Carr, 2004). Charles (1999:2) defines disruptive behaviour as "behaviour that is considered inappropriate for the setting or situation in which it occurs". Disruptive behaviour is also defined as a conduct that interrupts the normal educational process, such as teaching or giving exam, and is often repeated with the intention of interruption (Ali and Gracey, 2013). Kyriacou(1997:121) as cited in Yuan (2012) defines students classroom behavior as "any behavior that undermines the teachers ability to establish and maintain effective learning experience in the classroom". Students' disruptive behaviour is be defined as any behavior that interferes with the effectiveness of the teacher's instructional plan to teach or a student's ability to learn (Stebbins, 1971).

Disruptive is not merely a naughty behavior of student but it goes beyond the normal the routine disturbance in the classroom. Sometimes a single child disturbs the whole classroom so much that neither the child who creates disruption nor the other children sitting beside him/her can learn. Disruptive behavior directly put teachers, children and parents in embarrassing situations. Therefore, it has become a matter of great concern for the educators. They put their heads down and think an effective treatment that how a teacher may cope with such behavior and how the child and the other children can be protected (Ghazi et.al2013).

2.2 Types of Students' Disruptive Behaviours

Even though there is no universally accepted uniform classification of student disruptive behaviour, different scholars try to classify the disruptive behaviour of students depending on its level of seriousness of the behaviour exhibited. Student disruptive behaviour ranges from those most salient acts and behaviour to the least serious. These are briefly discussed as follow along with the specific disruptive behaviour types and corresponding corrective actions.

A) Harmful and Life Threatening Behaviour Acts

These types of students' disruptive behaviours are very serious and life threatening and these may include carrying weapon to schools, hitting or/and injuring others, using drugs or alcohol, insulting and an attempt to rape female students and deliberately damaging school property, attacking others are categorized under threatening behaviours. The measures that should be taken such on such students should be removed from the school immediately, present at a hearing and recommended for expulsion from the School System.

B) Serious Type of Disruptive Behaviours

These are aggressive behavior and are means of outward reaction or the acting-out of an inward emotional state. Aggressive behavior refers to behaviour that is still illegal and/ or serious misconduct, but not life or health threatening. Langa states aggressive behavior manifests in bullying, vandalism, arguing with the teacher, disrespecting others, cheating on exams, shouting, leaving the classroom, engaging in conversation with other class members or on their cell phones, text messaging, playing video games and insulting others. According to him, children acquire an attitude of aggression in order to express their deep-seated feelings of dissatisfaction. Parents are usually upset when they discover that their child has stolen something. Often they need guidance or the help of a counselor on how to handle the matter objectively and effectively (Langa, 1999).

C) Moderate or Least serious Type of Behavior

These types of behaviors represent moderately serious disruptive behaviors that mostly disrupt the teaching-learning environment. Hubell and Hubell, identify these as behaviors such as excessive disruptive talking, coming late to class, inattentiveness, performing a repetitive act that is annoying, tapping fingers, chewing gum, or making a comment in a rude or crude manner, sleeping in class,

reading a newspaper, disobedience, verbal disruption, teasing others, being out of one's seat, taking others property, not doing assigned tasks, and even in rare cases becoming hostile. Hubell and Hubell, also suggest the mechanisms through which these behaviours can be handled. When these behavior occur sin a learning environment, , according to these scholars, the school and staff members must be prepared to cope with the immediacy of the problem as well as be involved in the procedures to be followed to hold the student accountable for his/her behavior. This could be addressed generally through conventional classroom management techniques and/or by speaking with a student privately after class. Disciplinary actions short of suspension to correct such behaviour include but are not limited to: Verbal reprimand; Special assignments; Schedule changes; Notifying parent by phone or letter of student's misbehavior; Conference with parents; Transfer to another class; Temporary separation from peers; In-house suspension and Loss of class or school privileges.

2.3 Causes of Students' Disruptive `Behavior

There are many reasons for the source of students' disruptive behavior in the classroom. Whatever form problem behaviour takes, teachers need to know why it occurs, how to prevent it and what to do if it arises (Harmer, 1991). In order to solve the student behavioral problems in the classroom, it is essential to discuss the causes first, just where does it come from? Some social scientists argue that student misbehavior has less to do with the characteristics of students and more to do with the behavior of teachers (Stephens and Crawley, 1994). In order to solve a problem, the root of the problem is the key to the solution. That is to say if the reasons why students misbehave are better understood, they will be in a better position to create conditions in which there is less need or fewer opportunities for such behaviour (Robertson, 1996). Even though there are many reasons for problem behavior, it can stem from students' reaction to their teachers' behavior' the students themselves, from other factors inside the classroom, or from outside factors (Harmer, 1991). The factors contribute to occurrence of students' disciplinary problem is discussed as follows as suggested by different scholars.

2.3.1 Students Related Causes

There are reasons why students behave in a challenging manner. In order to analyze students' misbehaviours and their reasons, teachers first need to understand the reason behind problem behaviours since misbehaviour causes loss of attention and interest, and even disturb the peace in the classroom, which may hinder learning (Turanlı ,1999). The following are cases related the students' misbehavior and the context in which it occurs.

A) Attention Seeking

Attention-seeking is often identified as a cause of challenging behaviour. The need to gain and hold the attention of others appears to be a general human characteristic. This raises the question as to why the child needs to seek attention in this way. Some children may be unable to manage a particular task and may be frustrated or bored. However, attention-seeking behaviour can also be a learned behaviour, which has been effective in the past in ensuring that children get what they want. Even negative attention can be motivating for some children especially if they feel that this is the only attention they receive (Carr, 2004). Some students try to gain the attention of others, such as parents, teachers, by being natural and friendly when they grow up in positive environments. On the other hand, some students find they can gain the attention of others by anti-social behavior (e.g. being impatient or angry) rather than by social behavior. Attention-seeking can take many forms: eating problems, constant interruptions, showing-off and humming (Fontana, 1993).

Fontana also states that as a child grows older and starts school, the situation is made worse by the fact that he or she may have anti-social behaviour patterns further reinforced rather than discouraged. This is because the teacher may have little time to watch carefully and respond with attention and praise for the students who produces correct behaviour. Instead of praising the student's good behaviour, the teacher will spend most of his time catching the student's behaving badly, and attempt to instruct him or her against unacceptable behaviour. The reactions of the teacher will probably, 'encourage' a large amount of misbehaviour in the classroom that is only because of students' attention-seeking. Therefore, the teacher must try to give the student attention when he or she is engaged in acceptable behaviour, otherwise unacceptable behaviour must be ignored or given minimal attention (Fontana, 1993).

B) Boredom

In a classroom where learners are bored, disruptive behaviour is likely to happen. Harmer (1991) claims that when students are engaged with a task, they are unlikely to behave disruptively and when pair or group finish early and left unattended, boredom may lead to disruption. Students sometimes show their lack of interest by behaving badly when the chosen topic or activity is inappropriate. Walters and Frei also hold similar idea by asserting that students may feel bored at one time or another and it can be a challenge to have the attention of every single student even in the most engaging lessons. Therefore, the teacher needs to examine commonly used teaching strategies and instructional

practices. Trying to manipulate his/her lessons or changing teaching strategies every ten minutes and engaging students in a group activity, breaking up the students further into pairs to share what they are learning with their partners before sharing with the entire class can minimize the frequency of occurrences of disruptive behavior in the classroom. A well-planned, engaging learning environment will motivate many of our typically bored students to participate and keep up with new and exciting activities in your classroom (Walters and Frei, 2007).

C) Self –esteem

Harmer (1991) points out that lack of respect from teachers or peers or being asked to do something where they are almost certainly bound to fail can make students feel frustrated and upset. In such cases, disruptive behavior is an attractive option. Walters and Frei advise how to build the self –esteem of such students as follows. For those who feel completely inadequate, the teacher will need to teach them that even if they can't do everything perfectly, they can at least try different things. Often, these students assume the role of the helpless one, and others will notice and constantly come to their aid. To break this cycle, the teacher needs to break down tasks into small steps, give no criticism while they are working on something, and encourage every positive step forward, set up opportunities for their success. If the teachers refuse to give in to their helplessness, they will in time find something they enjoy and can be good at (Walters and Frei, 2007).

D) Learning Difficulties

Learning difficulties and behavior problems can have strong association between them. Kyriacou argues that the most common cause for student disruptive behaviour seems to be encountering learning difficulties which damage the student's self-esteem. Students who have some behavior problems are often identified as low achievers in their basic academic skills. Students who are found performing well in the classroom and get praise and rewards from the teacher frequently, they will have a positive feeling about school and themselves and will be willing to work hard and cooperate with teachers. However, students who have difficulties with their work will be probably unsatisfied with them and will have a negative feeling about school and the classroom work. Thus, constant failures of attainment will definitely threaten their self-esteem and they easily doubt their ability to master the new work. Being unable to manage any formal work in the classroom, they might easily turn their efforts to other activities, such as talking with other students, which would be called disruptive behaviour in the classroom (Kyriacou, 1

2.3.2 Teachers Related Causes

The second most factor that contributes to the disruptive behavior of students lies to teachers. For the disruptive events, teachers' behaviours may sometimes be the cause. This might be linked with the way teachers discipline their students-especially when they appear to be unfair, the relationship they have with the students, teacher's ability to exercise the necessary classroom control and the teacher's personality (Harmer 1991). Kyriacou also holds a similar idea and asserts that students' disruptive behaviour in the classroom is a reaction to the teachers' behaviour towards them, which is unacceptable to the students. He highlighted four types of teacher behavior which student's particularly felt "provoked" them into disciplinary problems. These are teachers who are boring to teach, who could not teach, whose discipline was weak and teachers who made unfair comparisons (Kyriacou, 1997).

To be a truly effective teacher requires a combination of effective teaching skills and effective behaviour management skills. In reality, the two are so interlinked that they can never be truly separated. Poor behaviour management will inevitably undermine effective teaching and effective behaviour management is of little purpose unless accompanied by effective teaching. If teachers manage their classroom properly, they can reduce the likelihood of difficult or challenging behaviour and increase the chances of effective teaching and learning occurring (Information Document, 2010). Accordingly, good classroom management is negatively influenced by teachers' management styles, teachers' personality and Poor lesson planning and teachers' unpreparedness as pointed out below by different scholars.

A) Teachers' Management Styles

Besides the disruptive behavior manifested due to the problem on the side of the students, teachers' management styles contribute a lot inappropriate behavior to escalate in the classroom. In this regard, Dunbar Ch. (2004) pointed out the four types of teachers' management styles namely authoritarian, authoritative, indifferent, and laissez-faire. Therefore, teachers' understanding of their profile increases their ability to address inappropriate behavior before it escalates into something more serious. Knowing their limitations i.e. their level of tolerance of certain behaviors and their students facilitates their capacity to de-escalate potentially problematic situations. Dunbar described the four management profiles are listed below.

The authoritarian teacher. The teacher who exhibits such management style places firm limits and controls on the students and assigns students where to sit for the entire semester. Students will often have assigned seats for the entire term. Students must be in their seats at the beginning of class and they frequently remain there throughout the period. This teacher hardly gives hall passes or recognizes excused absences. The classroom is often, it is quiet and Students know they should not interrupt the teacher. In his classroom, verbal exchange and discussion are discouraged, the authoritarian's students do not have the opportunity to learn and/or practice communication skills. This teacher prefers strong discipline and expects quick obedience. If the students fail to obey, the teacher usually results in detention or will be taken to the principal's office. In this classroom, students need to follow directions and not ask why.

The authoritative teacher. This teacher still controls and place limits on his student; however, at the same time encourages independence. He/she often explains the reasons behind the rules and decisions. If a student is disruptive, the teacher offers a polite, but firm, reprimand. This teacher sometimes meets out discipline, but only after careful consideration of the circumstances. The authoritative teacher is also open to considerable verbal interaction, including critical debates. The students know that they can interrupt the teacher if they have a relevant question or comment. This environment offers students the opportunity to learn and practice communication skills.

The indifferent teacher. This teacher places few demands, if any, on the students and appears generally uninterested and is not very involved in the classroom. The indifferent teacher just doesn't want to impose on the students and often feels that class preparation is not worth the effort. The indifferent teacher lacks preparation time and may use the same materials throughout the year. In this classroom, discipline is lacking and this teacher may lack the skills, confidence, or courage to discipline students.

The laissez-faire teacher. This teacher places few demand and hardly controls on the students. In his/her classroom the students do whatever they wish to do and the teacher is less likely to monitor their behavior. He does not enforce rules and tries not to hurt the students' feelings. If a student disrupts the class, the teacher may assume that the student is not getting enough attention. When a student interrupts a lecture, the teacher accepts the interruption with the belief that the student must surely have something valuable to add. This teacher does not offer consistent discipline to his students (Dunbar 2004).

B) Teachers Personality

In addition to teacher's management styles, his/her personality characteristics play an important role in the classroom control that definitely influences the student behaviour in the classroom. A teacher can easily earn the respect from the students and build a positive relationship with the children if he/she is kind and warm. Otherwise, a teacher's unfair or inappropriate action can provoke students' disciplinary problems. Studies indicate that students are sensitive to how teachers behave to them, and students may see their own disciplinary problems simply as a fair and reasonable reaction to the teacher's teaching. Teachers who play significant roles in the teaching learning process in the classroom among other thing should be aware of how their behaviour can serve to hinder rather than facilitate good discipline in the classroom (Kyriacou 1997).

Charles also holds similar view that presenting poor models of behavior is the main factor for the cause of disruptive behavior to occur in the classroom. When teachers are inconsistent, irresponsible, and short on self-control, and sometimes treat students with discourtesy or disregard, they not only damage relationships but also encourage students to imitate their poor behavior. Therefore, teachers should always try to be the best model as they can for their students (Charles, 2008).

According to Charles, ineffective personal communication can also ruin the relationship between students and teachers and may provoke the disruptive behavior. Some teachers are not skilled at communicating with students on a personal level and their shortcoming may cause students to become uneasy and reserved. Therefore, speaking regularly with students in a friendly way helps them build a positive relationship. Students want the teachers to know their names and exchange pleasantries with them. They sometimes want to know their views on various matters and want to tell them theirs, which can provide them with a measure of personal validation. However, teachers should avoid comments that hurt feelings of their students and say things that increase optimism and encourage confidence (Charles 2008).

C) Poor Lesson planning and Teachers' Unpreparedness

Failure to plan proactively may results in poor classroom management and likely subjects to face discipline problem occur in a classroom. Many teachers do not plan ahead sufficiently to foresee potential problems and when unexpected events occur, they are not prepared to respond effectively (Charles, 2008). However, as Stronge suggests an effective teacher plans and prepares for the organization of the classroom with the same care and precision used to design a high-quality lesson.

Components of the organizational plan of a classroom include room arrangement, discipline, creating routines, and a plan to teach students how their learning environment is organized. The effective teacher is not just only someone who knows how to support students' learning through instructional techniques but also creates an overall environment conducive to learning. There is little time or inclination for students to misbehave when the classroom experience is engaging (Stronge 2007).

Stronge also adds research into classroom management demonstrates that effective teachers are proactive about student behavior; effective classroom managers are thoroughly prepared and keep their students actively involved in the teaching and learning process. Effective teachers are prepared for students on a daily basis, from the very first day of school to the very last. Teachers need to think carefully about problems that might arise in class and about possible student reactions to topics, lessons, requests, and unexpected events. By anticipating potential difficulties, they can avoid most problems and prepare themselves to deal with whatever might happen (Stronge 2007).

2.3.3 Society and parents Related Causes

Personal problems cannot be entirely separated from social ones. Hence, disruptive behaviour of students reflected in the classroom cannot be isolated from the factors that it originates from society. Children who have not formed a proper judgment about right behaviour because of their age and social experience normally tend to imitate the behaviour around them. Social learning theory proposes that much behaviour develop as a result of our observing what other people do, which is a key concept in understanding how children develop their knowledge of social role and their sense of identity in school. Community related factors included unemployment, low living standard, illegal video house, camping life, undermining unskilled labour (Long, 2000). Harmer and Carr also adds causes related to the society as, difficult home situation like low income, large family size, lack of offering love to children and little value to education, home attitude to English language and frequent conflicts and divorce can predispose the students to reflect disruptive behaviours in a classroom (Harmer 1991 and Carr 2004).

2.3.4) The school and its Environment Factors

As Harmer suggests some external factors may affect students' behaviour. For instance, if students are tired, they will not able to concentrate and discomfort then leads to disengagement. Children may react negatively to noise, heat, and cold or to invasion of their space. Some children, particularly children with autistic spectrum disorders may be over sensitive to certain stimuli such as noise, and may

therefore react by displaying challenging behaviour (Harmer 1991 and Carr 2004). In addition, Grossman also adds schools may cause students' disruptive behavior through factors such as under financing, keeping too many students in a classroom, poor school and colleague support systems, insufficient physical environments and/or bad teaching rooms (Grossman, 2004)

2.4 Effects of Students' Disruptive Behaviours on Instruction

Students' classroom disruptive behaviors significantly affect the teaching learning process in the classroom. Therefore, recognizing the seriousness of behavior in the classroom is an essential part of teaching. When students' disciplinary problems reach certain point, instruction fails to have its intended purpose on the students learning outcomes (Moore & Camp, 1979). Ali & Gracey also hold similar position that students' disruptive behavior in the classroom inhibits learning and impacts retention and students' comprehension of the course content is impacted by what is going around them in the classroom. When students engage in irrelevant conversation during class, they and others around them are distracted from the lecture or class activities. Hence, the disruption of the flow of the class may affect student satisfaction with the instructor and the general performance of students in the class (Ali and Gracey, 2013).

Oliver et.al state that there are different kinds of disruptive behavior and each one has a negative impact on classroom instruction. In a classroom where disruptive behavior occurs frequently get less academic engaged time and the students in disruptive classroom stand in low category in achievement tests. In addition, attempts to control disruptive behaviour cost considerable time at the expense of academic instructions in the class (Oliver et.al 2011). Ghazi et.al also have expressed a similar view and note Students' disruptive behaviour as one of the disadvantages to the educational society it interferes with the learning process for other students, retards the ability of teachers to teach most effectively, diverts the energy and resources of teachers and the school away from their objectives and educational mission, and may designate a significant height of personal problems or anguish on the part of the disrupter (Ghazi et.al 2013). According to Oluremi, it is difficult to teach most effectively in schools where a disruptive behavior classroom disruptive behaviour frequently happens. When much time is spent on discipline cases, little teaching takes place, and this means that the contents are not completed. Hence, this may result in the students' inadequate preparation for examination and learning. In addition, Students' behavioral problems are also thought to be a leading contributor to school dropout, teachers' stress and attrition. Disciplinary problems are a major cause for teachers to

feel insecure, subjected to abuse or intimidation and experiencing fears for their safety (Oluremi, 2013 cited in Amogne, 2014).

2.5 Concept of Classroom Management

Classroom management defined and also explained by different scholars, researchers or professionals in different or similar ways. For example, Oliver R. and et.al (2011) defined it as “classroom management is a collection of non-instructional classroom procedures implemented by teachers in classroom setting with all students for the purpose of teaching acceptable behavior and preventing and reducing inappropriate behaviour (p.7)”. Richard and Renanda (2007:28) on their part defined classroom management as “classroom management refers to the way in which teachers manage a class in order to make it maximally productive teaching”. Doyle (1986) cited in Stronge (2007) also defined classroom management as “the actions and strategies teachers use to solve the problem of order in classroom (p. 397)”. The definitions seem to indicate that classroom management is the activity by which the teacher promotes appropriate student behaviour and eliminates inappropriate behaviour to develop good interpersonal relationship. In addition, it is the activity by which the teacher establishes a positive socio-emotional climate in the classroom, maintains an effective and productive classroom organization so as to enhance classroom instruction (Oliver R. and et.al, 2011 ,Richard and Renanda 2007& Stronge 2007).

Studies indicate that classroom management is one of the crucial factors that influence learning. Effective classroom management prepares the classroom for an effective instruction which is crucial for the progress of learning. Rather than responses to misbehaviours situations, effective teachers establish responses to common classroom issues of order that allow them to focus maximum and energy on instructional process. When the classroom experience is engaging and good management exists, there is little time inclination for students to misbehave (Richard and Renanda ,2007). Classroom management is an important concern of every teacher; experienced or novice, man or woman, old or young. For an effective teaching learning process, classroom management is vital. Some classroom management problems are inevitable for even the best teacher and teachers should be made aware of the possible obstacles they are likely to face during teaching and learning process. Teachers with effective teaching and management activities are one of the most significant variables on the teaching and learning process. Hence, classroom management directly influences the learning environment and even creates necessary impetus for the student to learn the teaching point. When the

component of a foreign language classroom is added to the setting, the situation becomes even more problematic and insecure (Merc, 2015).

2.6 Classroom Management and Language classes

Disruptive behavior of students is more problematic in English classes as they are composed of various communicative activities that require students' active participation and Yin (2006) explains the problem as "students usually have more opportunities in an EFL class than classes of other subjects to speak, to talk, to read loud or even to argue with each other" (Yin, 2006, p. 132). If the class is managed inappropriately by the teacher, these activities encourage noise, initiative, and disorder and there is the risk of chaos and disruptive behavior in the classroom (Tomlinson, 1988). This intervenes with cognitive processing of information and minimizes learning outcome and motivation. Many students associate the noise produced by group work with a lack of classroom management skill on teacher's side and this raises doubt about the value of language learning activity and/or teacher's ability to manage and direct learning and thus some students may fail to participate in class activities (Butler, 2011) cited in (Rahimi and Karkami ,2015).

Disciplining English classes seems to be a more problematic issue. Oral pair or group work increase the risk of noise and indiscipline in the EFL classroom and teachers do not welcome these activities and prefer traditional methods such as presentations, practice and production because they believe these enable them to maintain and control over the lesson content, text book coverage and classroom discipline. Accordingly, they are not willing to shift to methods that create classroom management and discipline problems (Carless, 2009). Thus, the belief in the importance of discipline seems to discourage the implementation of communicative activities in which the teacher is required to release some control. This makes EFL teachers be more interventionist and controlling in their classroom management orientations (Rahimi & Asadollahi, 2012).

To facilitate effective teaching and learning, EFL teachers should aim at establishing a climate appropriate rather than focusing discipline, order or control over the class. Discipline, order and control can only be used as secondary means to achieve a wanted learning environment. Therefore, the teacher should not lay too much emphasis on controlling over the class as this very much likely to cause anxiety and tension in the class. A well-managed EFL class is not the one in which all the students sit still at their desks and copy all the instructions down. It should be a learning environment with a relaxed atmosphere and many opportunities for students to act as communicators, practicing on the

teacher's instruction and expressing their own ideas. Thus, the major task of the EFL teacher is to manage time and materials, create communicative needs and involve the students into classroom activities. Discipline problems should be prevented before they appear rather than be solved after they come to the class. The teacher, as the manager or facilitator of the class, should be aware of his/her role to create and maintain a positive climate for students to speak, to act, to play their role so that effective learning takes place in the classroom Yi (n.d).

2.7 Strategies in Classroom Management

When a students' unacceptable behavior become persistent, there may be the need to work with him/her in a focused way to change his/ her behavior. It should be noted that there are no simple solution or answer for dealing with difficult or challenging behavior and working with students for change. Whatever the cause of the individual behavior problem, successful intervention requires intelligent, caring action on behalf of teachers, the school and external support agencies and which relates to the individual need. Once the teacher has pinpointed the goal of the misbehavior, he/she can use strategies over time to help students find positive outlets for the needs they had been trying to fulfil through distractive means (Carr, 2004). Carr also adds, the most effective strategy that teachers need to develop when attempting to manage disruptive behavior is to prevent it occurring in the first place. To this end, schools have to developed strategies to promote positive behavior. This is based on the assumption that all behavior (negative and positive) is learned and, therefore, that acceptable behavior can be learned. It is also predicated on the belief that behavior is contextual, so children can be taught to behave in a certain way in the school context. Acceptable behavior is then reinforced in a school and classroom climate which is supportive of positive behavior (Carr, 2004).

Disruptive student behavior in the classroom is a major concern in school systems today. Students in classrooms with frequent disruptive behavior experience less academic engagement and lower academic outcomes. Teachers who experience difficulty controlling classroom behavior have higher stress and burnout (Smith & Smith, 2006) and find it difficult to meet the instructional demands of the classroom (Emmer & Stough, 2001). Lack of effective classroom management may also worsen the progression of aggressive behavior for children in classrooms with higher levels of disruption. Effective approaches to managing the classroom environment are necessary to establish environments that support student behavior and the learning process as well as to reduce teacher stress and burnout (Oliver et.al, 2011).

Because of its harmful physical, educational, psychological and social effects on students, corporal punishment is rarely administered and promoted against any of the misbehaviour these days. Corporal punishment contributes to the cycle of child abuse and pro-violence attitudes of youth in that children learn that violence is an acceptable way of controlling the behaviours (NASP, 2006). Even though discipline is important, there are other effective alternative strategies available to help students develop self-discipline. These alternative strategies should be instructional rather than punitive. Effective discipline includes prevention and intervention strategies changing school or class room environment, and geared toward effective implementation of the teaching learning process. School psychologists suggest many direct services to improve discipline of individual student as well as service that improve class room and school wide discipline (Michael, 2005). The most widely suggested alternative disciplinary measures by different scholars are briefly outlined in the following subsection.

A) Creating positive Relationship with Students

Positive teacher-student relationships provide the foundation for effective instruction and constructive classroom management. The behaviour of students can be affected by the relationships that exist between teachers and students, and teachers' general behavior can attract students' attitude towards learning. Teachers' behavior can be seen by respect in their students and the teaching activities they do in classrooms. Students are eager to behave in a good manner if they know that their teachers respect them (Ndagi, 1985). Similarly, teachers need to be patient by reacting to their students in a calm, friendly and helpful manner. Researches indicate that a close, warm relationship between students who are at risk for behavioral problems and their teachers diminishes the chances of aggressive behavior in the future. However, the teachers' goal should not be to become their students' friend, although many students may attempt to craft such a connection. There is a boundary and teachers need to use common sense in maintaining appropriate boundaries and avoiding compromising situations with students (Partin, 2009).

Partin also emphasises the importance of laying foundation on the first day of school for a successful school year. The first day of school is likely the single most important day of the school year. Everything the teacher does on that day sets the tone for the rest of the year. One of the most valuable investments a teacher can make is spending time planning and organizing the first day's activities. On this special day, expectations are created, the foundations of routines and procedures are established,

and first impressions are formed. The teacher should be better organized and better prepared for the first day than any other of the year because recovering from a bad start will take a long time. He also advises spending time getting to know students is one of the most valuable investments teachers can make.

Establishing rapport helps teachers build mutual respect and minimize classroom behavior problems. A deeper understanding of their students' needs, problems, and interests will enable them to plan instruction that succeeds (Partin, 2009). In addition, one of the best ways teachers can show respect for their students and earn their respect and trust is to learn their names. Lowman (1984) has asserted that "the easiest way to begin forming personal relationships with students is to learn their names." (p. 47). He has argued that learning each student's name is effective in promoting rapport. Teachers need to make special effort to use students' name any time they address a specific individual the first week. Many effective teachers use name tags or name tents to help learn students' names (Lowman, 1984).

B) Establishing Classroom Rules and Routines

Effective use of classroom management techniques can dramatically decrease the disruptions in classrooms. Students in classes where effective management techniques are employed have achievement higher than students in classes where effective management techniques are not employed. It is not possible for a teacher to conduct instruction or for students to work productively if they have no guidelines for how to behave or when to move about the room, or if they frequently interrupt teacher and one another (Oliver and Reschly, 2007).

There are a number of techniques that teachers can use to avoid the problem of disruptive behavior that occur in the classroom. Creating a code of conduct is an important part of classroom management that helps younger learners know where they stand (Harmer, 1991). Students in the class where rules and procedures were implemented might have been less disruptive by their very nature than students in the class that did not implement rules and procedures.

Effective classroom management focuses on preventive rather than reactive procedures and establishes a positive classroom environment in which the teacher focuses on students who behave appropriately (Lewis & Sugai, 1999). Rules and routines are powerful preventative components to classroom organization and management plans because they establish the behavioral context of the classroom by

specifying what is expected, what will be reinforced, and what will be re taught if inappropriate behavior occurs. Monitoring student behavior allows the teacher to acknowledge students who are engaging in appropriate behavior and prevent misbehavior from escalating (Colvin et al., 1993) Cited in (Oliver et.al, 2011).

Effective classroom management needs good rules and procedures and rules and procedures vary from one teacher to another and from one classroom to another. The most effective classroom managers don't simply impose rules and procedures on students. An effective way of establishing a code of conduct is to include the students' opinions in the code to reach an agreement on what is acceptable and what is not. However, the teacher has to be firm about what he or she is prepared to accept. A Well-articulated rules and procedures that are negotiated with students are a critical aspect of classroom management, affecting not only the behavior of students but also their academic achievement (Harmer, 1991). Mandel (2011) also suggests three general guidelines when crafting classroom rules as follows. First, rules should be in the form of a positive statement; avoid rules framed as negative statements. Second, rules need to be stated clearly; avoid rules that are vague unless you intend to discuss the rule extensively with students. Third, rules should be few; minimize your list of rules (most teachers have 3-5 rules).

In addition, Kyriacou suggests establishing clear rules and expectations in regard to classroom behaviour, which is a crucial aspect of pre-empting misbehaviour. Teachers should be very clear about the classroom rules when they first meet their new class, which can be easily made if the teacher's authority can be established and accepted. This also can help new teachers, especially student teachers, establish their authority as well. A proper teacher-student relationship can be easily developed with students accepting teachers' authority; meanwhile, the frequency of misbehaviour in the classroom can be avoided before it happens. Pre-empting misbehaviour can make the teaching and learning progress smoothly and effectively and also help to establish an appropriate relationship between teacher and students (Kyriacou, 1997).

C) Effective Instruction

To achieve positive educational outcomes, the ability of teachers to organize classroom and manage the behavior of their students is crucial. Although sound behavior management does not guarantee effective instruction, it establishes the environmental context that makes good instruction reduces, but

does not eliminate classroom behavior problems (Emmer and Stough, 2001) cited in (Oliver and Reschly, 2007). In addition to having the ability to manage the disruptive behavior of students in classrooms, teachers' academic competence has a great contribution in minimizing the problem behavior occurring in classrooms. In harmony with this point, Harmer (1991) asserts "Students generally respect teachers who show that they know what they are doing. This can be demonstrated not only by our knowledge of our subject, but also by evidence that we have invested time in thinking about and planning our lesson. Hence, teachers are expected have the knowledge of the subject and the technique of presentation they apply during actual teaching" (P, 128).

For create proper disciplining situations in the school, the teacher has to know his subject thoroughly to create interest and inspire the supplies in their academic pursuits. The methods of teaching have to be such as affording individualized instruction and individual attention so that the pupil is not lost in the crowd and is able to find his interest and to work according to his capacity. In this sense, teachers will easily handle their students and teach the subject matter with confidence if they are qualified enough. Not only knowing the subject and its methodology, but also believing in the subject they teach and appreciating it, is very essential to attract and convince students. Although highly effective instruction does not completely eliminate problem behaviour, it will reduce such behaviours and effective instruction makes classroom organization and behaviour management significantly easier (Oliver, 2007).

There is little time or inclination for students to misbehave when the classroom experience is engaging and effective classroom managers are able to increase student engagement in learning and make good use of every instructional moment (Good & Brophy, 1997) cited in (Stronge, 2007). Effective teachers also establish responses to common classroom issues of order that allow them to focus maximum time and energy on the instructional process. In addition, effective classroom managers are carefully prepared and keep their students actively involved in the teaching and learning process. The primary component here for teacher effectiveness is readiness. Effective teachers are prepared for students on a daily basis, from the very first day of school to the very last. Creating a productive classroom environment includes practical planning, Such as developing functional floor plans with teacher and student work areas, wall spaces, and furniture placed within the classroom for optimal benefit. (Stronge, 2007).

D) Using School Guidance and Counselling

A positive approach to the promotion of good behaviour benefits all the students, including those with special educational needs. However, approaches must be modified to ensure that they are developmentally appropriate to the students with special educational needs. In this case, support teachers (teacher counsellors), who are available in some disadvantaged schools, can play a significant role in guiding children towards positive behaviour. The problem of the misbehaving student can be studied by school guidance officer by creating different techniques and suggest constructive solutions to such students (Carr, 2004).

Regarding this point, Brearley suggests that counsellors should discuss with the misbehaving students to recognize their feelings, to define their problems and then to help them find their own solutions, to begin to resolve their dilemmas. Generally, a guidance officer can do a lot to maintain discipline in a school cooperatively with teachers and administrators. Therefore, the existence of the service of guidance and counselling plays a vital role in addressing and solving or minimizing the disruptive behaviour of students in school (Brearley,1986).

E) Using Reward

In building positive relationship with students reward plays a vital role. Using reward is the other alternative to maintain class room discipline. If properly used, reward can facilitate learning of new behavior and maintaining the previously learnt ones. Clarzio advises teachers to use rewards until the cooperative behavior is attained. Rewards are various kinds: material, psychological moral etc. for example, approval and recognition of students is a reward. Giving a smile, encouragement, verbal and written praise is also another reward. Such rewards can initiate the students to strengthen their involvement in learning activities (Clarzio, 1980).

F) Staff to Support each Other

In order to manage the disruptive behavior of students the collaboration of the school staff is a key strategy. A whole school approach to the promotion of positive behavior enables staff to support each other. Collaboration involves staff in discussions about behavior without the danger that individuals may feel that their classroom management skills are being questioned. Staff support has also been identified as one of the major factors in coping effectively with incidents relating to challenging behavior. In schools where there are particular problems, staff may have a system of calling another

member of staff to assist by removing a pupil, or the class group, where necessary, to calm a difficult situation (Information document, 2010).

G) Communicating and Working with Parent

According to Walters and Frei (2007) Parents are an important part of the child's learning, and every teacher needs their help. Parents play a crucial role in shaping the attitudes which produce good behavior in school. Parents can also cooperate with schools by encouraging their children to abide by the school rules, by visiting the school when requested to do so by the principal or other member of the staff. Therefore, the relationship between teachers and the parents of their students is vital in the overall education of students. Teachers and parents of the students need to communicate regularly starting from the very beginning of the year.

If a teacher talks to parents only when there is a problem, then that teacher is working with strangers, not partners. In relationship to discipline and classroom management, parental support from the beginning is an important component of the success of school wide conflict resolution management plans. Parents are genuinely interested in the well being of their child, so teachers have to establish rapport with parents by using effective communicative skills so as to enlist the help of parents in order to teach students make responsible decisions and contribute to the overall goal of a positive learning environment (Walters and Frei, 2007).

Parents should be made aware of the school rules and regulations so that they can assist their children to obey. They should take full advantage of all formal and informal channels of communication made available by schools. Parent-teacher associations should ensure that their activities are accessible and rewarding to as many parents as possible. Bearing in mind that communication between home and school should be frequent, open and positive, boards in consultation with the principal and staff of the school should promote good practice for the conduct of communication between home and school. Some parents do not fully appreciate the need to provide their children with firm guidance and positive models of behavior. Parents should be kept fully informed from the outset of instances of serious disruptive behavior on the part of their children. It is better to involve parents at an early stage than as a last resort. They should be informed of their right to come to the school and be invited to do so in order to discuss the misbehaviour with the principal and/or the class teacher (Henderson & Mapp, 2002) cited in (Walters and Frei, 2007)

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the research methodology used to conduct the study. The chapter presents research design and sampling techniques, data gathering instruments and procedure, research participants sampling and selection. The chapter also highlights the data analysis methods and result reporting.

3.1. Design of the Study

This study was designed to explore the different types of high school students' EFL classroom disruptive behaviours and teachers' management of the behaviors. Moreover, the dominant factors that contributed to the disruptive behavior of students in classrooms, and the relevance and effectiveness of measures taken by teachers in handling the students' EFL classroom behaviors was examined.

The study was a descriptive type as it tried to explore the nature and type of student's misbehavior. Therefore, descriptive design was used to conduct the study. Descriptive study is useful when a researcher wants to look into a phenomenon or a process in its natural context in order to get its overall picture. Moreover, the study adopted a survey study approach because surveys are useful for collecting data from large group of subjects and aim at describing the characteristics of a population by examining a sample of that group (Seliger and Shohamy ,1989, Dornyei, 2007). In view of this, a descriptive survey was appropriate to answer the research questions raised in this study.

To the selected research problem, the researcher used a mixed method approach in which both quantitative and qualitative method were used to answer the research questions. This research design was used since social phenomena are very complex and different kind of methods are needed to understand best such complexities and to get comprehensive information in studying the proposed problems than using quantitative and qualitative method alone. Moreover, it helped the researcher to freely use different research methods in order to get through data in studying the proposed problem (Best and Khan, 1999).

3.2. The Research Site

This research was conducted in Engibi Bedele Secondary School which is found in South West of Oromia Regional State, Buno Bedele Zone, Bedele town. Bedele town, the centre of Buno Bedele

administrative Zone is located 480 km west of Addis Ababa, the nation's capital. There are two Secondary Schools in Bedele town and Engibi Bedele high School is the second public Secondary School in the town. It was established in 2003 E.C by the help of 'Menschen Fur Menschen', a non-governmental organization operating in the zone. This school is purposefully selected because of some reasons. The school as a young but dynamic high school has been undergoing a dramatic growth in student population, and teaching staff. This could contribute to the deterioration of student discipline. In addition, the school is where researcher works and it was easier for the researcher to understand the students' behaviours, to collect data and make a good analysis of the situation and suggest relevant solutions to the problems.

3.3 The Participant of the Study

Engibi Bedele High School serves 945 students of grade 9 and 10. The number of students in Grade nine was 250 males and 220 females total 470 students while the number of students in Grade ten 231 males and 244 females total 475 students were being served. There were total number of 4 EFL teachers; all are males, teaching these students. This study was conducted on both groups, both teachers and students. The entire EFL teacher population was included in the study as their number was manageable. This also helped improve the outcome of the research.

It is practically impossible to undertake the research on all of the population, and it is not necessary as far as a correct representation is achieved. In most cases, however, investigating the whole population is not necessary and would in fact be a waste of resources. A considerable amount of time, cost and effort can be saved by adopting appropriate sampling to select a small of people to be investigated and we can still come up with accurate results (Dornyei, 2007). Thus, out of 945 students 170 were subjected to this study. There were 481 male and 464 females in the school. These students were categorized by gender, place of residence, grade level, age and place of residence. Appropriate sampling techniques were employed to extract the right mix of samples.

3.4 Samples and Sampling Techniques

In order to gather data from respondents, both probability and non- probability techniques were employed. Probability sampling is based on the concept of random selection where every member of the population has a non-zero probability of being selected. In other words, all members of the

population have an equal chance of being included in the sample (Kothari 2004). Accordingly, Probability sampling was employed to obtain information through questionnaire. But stratified sampling technique was used to extract 18% of each stratum. In stratified sampling the population is divided in groups or strata and a random sampling of a proportionate size is selected from each group (Dornyei, 2007). Therefore, Students were stratified along gender, grade level, and place of residence, and then, 18% of members of each stratum were randomly selected. To achieve this, every n^{th} value was selected from each stratum using systematic random sampling. This presented equal chance for all groups of students, males or females, place of residence and grade level.

Different approaches were used for sampling to include for interview and participants of focused group discussion. A non-probability sampling technique was used to select interviewees from the students and participants of focus group discussion from teachers. The main goal of such sampling technique was to find individuals who can provide rich and varied insights into the phenomenon under investigation to maximize what we can learn and this is best achieved by means of some sort of purposive sampling (Dornyei). Therefore, to gather pertinent information from students, 6 classroom monitors in school were purposefully interviewed. In employing purposive sampling, convenience sampling was used. This technique was convenient for the researcher as the monitors were easily accessible and are believed to give genuine information from the point of view of their close relationship both with teachers and students. For focussed group discussion, however, all the teachers were included in the discussion as their number was manageable. This also avoids the possible effects of heterogeneity in the academic rank, level of qualification and years of experience of the teachers.

Table 1 Student Population and Sampling Size distribution by Grades and Sex

		Population			Sample Size		
Grade		M	F	Total	M	F	Total
9 th	Number	250	220	470	53	46	99
	%	26.45%	23.28%	49.73%	18%	18%	18%
10 th	Number	231	244	475	35	36	71
	%	24.24%	25.82%	50.27%	18%	18%	18%
Total	Number	481	464	945	88	82	170
	%	50.90%	49.10%	100%	51.77%	48.23%	100%

3.5 The Data Gathering Instruments

The following data collection tools were used to gather data for this study. The classroom observations, an interview, focus group discussion and a questionnaire. The collected data was validated through triangulation techniques for consistency and validity.

3.5.1 The Classroom Observation

Responses may not correctly represent what the respondents do in actual situation. To substantiate and strengthen the data gathered through questionnaire and interview, classroom observation was used as a vital data collection tool. Classroom observation is important in descriptive qualitative research for collecting genuine and pertinent data from the participants' behavior in their actual setting (Seliger and Shohamy, 1989 and Cresswell, 1994). Relevant information was collected using observation on types of students' classroom disruptive behaviours and teachers' intervention strategies. For this purpose, three teachers were randomly selected out of the total five teachers and each was observed three times to gather information which enabled the researcher to identify the main classroom behavior manifestations and the ways the teachers handled the behaviours.

This technique was used to observe and collect relevant data on actual practical behaviour of students at the actual setting during teaching learning process in the classroom. For this purpose, the researcher used classroom observation checklist with the alternative given (teachers observed, behaviours reflected, teachers' reactions towards the behaviours and comments). The checklists were originally designed by Alejandra and Miguel (2015) but were adopted to suit the purpose of the study (See Appendix D). The observation was conducted manually in each section for forty minutes and a total of three hundred and sixty (360) minutes observation was made.

3.5.2 The Interview

Interview method was used to collect a closer and deep data collection and as a way of checking and validating the information solicited via questionnaire. It also allows the researcher to probe respondents' response more deeply (Dornyei, 2007). An interview was designed for students. The interview was used to collect more information on the students' classroom behaviours and teachers' management of the behaviors. Therefore, a semi- structured interview was used to collect pertinent information from 6 students. A semi-structured interview was employed as it allows a wider freedom to

ask further questions. It also helps control the direction of the interview to elicit the desired data. Moreover, it enables the interviewees to express their ideas and yet its semi –structured nature saves them being off the point (Nunan, 1992).

In order to gather relevant data, seven interview guides were prepared to interview six (6) students that were purposefully selected. In addition, the interview was conducted after the classroom observations were over to avoid the risk of sensitizing the teachers and students and tempting them to show behaviors different from the usual ones. The contents of the interview were similar to that of the questionnaire and thus are used to crosscheck the responses of the students drawn through the questionnaire.

3.5.3 The Focus Group discussion

Focus group discussion was used to gather large amount of qualitative data from teachers and principals. A focus group discussion is an economical way of gathering a relatively large amount of qualitative data. Group interaction was employed as it can yield high-quality data as it creates a synergistic environment that results in a deep and insightful discussion (Dornyei, 2007). The focus group discussion was conducted with EFL teacher only based on the guideline. The discussion was audio taped and later transcribed as it is difficult to do the latter because of the number of people involved. Audio taping assisted the researcher to identify who is speaking what at any time when the data analysis was made.

3.5.4 The Questionnaire

Questionnaire was one of the data elicitation techniques used for securing pertinent information for the study. The questionnaire was used for the fact that it allows the researcher collect data on a variety of issues in a relatively short time, less cost and wide coverage (Dornyei, 2007). It was used to collect data only from students. Students' questionnaire items was designed in the way it can elicit information that helps to explore the students' classroom behaviors and teachers' management of such behaviours. To collect data on major classroom disruptive behaviours and teachers' copying strategies, the respondents were asked to rate themselves in a questionnaire developed on five point Likert -Scale ranging from always (5) to never (1) whereas to gather data on the causes of disruptive a 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree (5) to strongly disagree (1) was used.

Questionnaire was employed to collect data from hundred and seventy students regarding students' disruptive behaviours in EFL. The questionnaire comprises four sections. The first section has four close ended parts dealing with eliciting data on category of more disruptive students along with the justification why each was chosen. The second part has twenty-nine closed-ended and one open-ended items dealing with the main EFL classroom disruptive behaviour of students reflected in the classroom. The third section consists of twenty close-ended and one open-ended items used for securing data on the main causes for the disruptive behaviour of the students reflected in the classroom.

The last section contains fifteen close-ended items which is followed by one open-ended question. The item was used for eliciting information on the practice of EFL teachers copying strategies of disruptive behaviour of students they encountered in their actual classroom. The questionnaire was piloted on twenty students before the final dispatch. The pilot study helped in testing the appropriateness of the questionnaire for collecting pertinent data for the study. Moreover, it provided the researcher a good opportunity to identify and correct faulty items to render them appropriate for the purpose it was intended. To avoid language barriers the students' questionnaire was translated to Oromo language.

3.6 The Data Collection Procedures

The data was collected using classroom observation, interview and questionnaire and focused group discussion. The classroom observation was made before the interview and dispatch of the questionnaire. The reason why observation was conducted first was that I, as a researcher, might influence participants when asking questions during the interviews conducted initially. Thus participants might try to control their behaviour while I observed them. To collect the required data through the questionnaire, first a brief orientation on the purpose of this study was given to students. The researcher identified and acquired the willingness of the respondents to take part in the study. Next, questionnaires were distributed to the selected sample.

The administration of the questionnaires took place in students' class under the researcher supervision to clear up any possible misunderstanding the respondents may face in the filling in the questionnaire and to ensure 100% return. Then, the researcher made the necessary arrangements with students selected for the interview and the interviewees were interviewed on the bases of guidelines agreed. In addition, the researcher arranged setting for the focused group discussion which was designed for teachers only. The group discussion was facilitated by the researcher in a way that everyone can freely express their views so that maximum was collected.

3.7 Method of Data Analysis

The collected data were analysed and interpreted. Both qualitative and quantitative data analysis methods were employed. Data gathered through close-ended questionnaire were analyzed with the aid of descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage) and mean. Conclusion was drawn from the analysis and insights. The data obtained from the open-ended questionnaire items, interview, observation and focus group discussion were analysed qualitatively. Finally, the findings obtained from each analysis were integrated to provide a holistic view of the problem. Towards this end, themes that capture similar issues were identified and extracted from all instruments to be organized under major themes for further analysis. This was done to properly identify and present the finding in a harmonized manner.

The interview was conducted with six students. Their responses were sorted out and organized. The classroom observations were conducted nine times at the school while the teachers were teaching. The observations (three times each teacher) helped gather a lot of raw data, which were organized into separate chart. On top of this, data collected on students' disruptive behaviours and how EFL teachers responded to these behaviours in all sessions were collated, presented in a separate chart and appended to the paper along with other charts. Here, the intention was to vividly present the data for better understanding

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE DATA

4.1. Introduction

The chapter is divided into different sections. The first section focuses on the major EFL classroom disruptive behaviors of students reflected in Engibi Bedele Secondary School. This section was further divided into three main categories namely moderate or least serious disruptive behaviours, serious disruptive behaviours and harmful or threatening disruptive behaviours. The second deals with the presentation and discussion of the major causes of disruptive behaviour of students reflected in EFL classes in Engibi Secondary School as viewed by students and teachers of the school. This section also contains factors related to teachers, students, the school and home or/and the community. The third section discusses the categories of students that are more disruptive in EFL classes in Engibi Secondary School as perceived by student and teachers of the school. The last discussion is based on the practice of copying strategies of EFL teachers to the students' disruptive behaviour. In addition to the presentation of data gathered through questionnaire, the results of data obtained through interview, observation, and focus group discussion were also incorporated for triangulation or for crosschecking in the discussion.

4.2 Data from Questionnaire on EFL Classroom Disruptive Behaviours

The students were asked twenty-nine questions in the questionnaire to indicate the disruptive behaviour of students reflected in EFL classrooms at Engibi Secondary School. The information elicited through the questionnaire and other instruments categorized into three sections and presented as follows.

Table 2. Students' Response Regarding Moderate Type of Disruptive Behaviours

No	Item	Responses												Mean	Label
		Always		Often		Sometimes		Rarely		Never		Total			
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%		
1	Murmuring	61	35.5	77	45.2	15	8.8	10	5.8	7	4.1	170	100	4.0	Often
2	Not bringing text book	63	37	66	38.8	28	16.4	13	7.6	-	-	170	100	4.0	Often
3	Whispering	49	28.8	79	46.4	23	13.5	16	9.4	3	1.7	170	100	3.9	Often
4	Not being punctual	49	28.8	75	44.1	22	12.9	15	8.8	9	5.2	170	100	3.8	Often
5	Not doing assigned tasks	54	31.7	70	40.1	24	14.1	16	9.4	6	3.5	170	100	3.8	Often
6	Laughing at classmates	70	41.1	47	27.6	21	12.	17	10	15	8.8	170	100	3.8	Often
7	Changing seats without permission	51	30	57	33.5	37	21.7	18	10.5	7	4.1	170	100	3.5	Often
8	Mocking	44	25.8	64	37.6	20	11.7	19	11.1	23	13.5	170	100	3.5	Often
9	Inattentiveness	67	39.4	33	19.4	23	13.5	37	21.7	10	4.1	170	100	3.5	Often
10	Working on a different subject other than English	23	13.6	40	23.6	70	41.4	30	17.7	6	3.5	169	100	3.2	Sometimes
11	Not being responsive	24	14.1	67	39.4	32	18.8	24	14.1	23	13.5	170	100	3.2	Sometimes
12	Moving seats	18	10.5	25	14.7	67	39.4	35	20.5	25	14.7	170	100	2.8	Sometimes
13	Not wearing school uniform	18	10.5	19	11.1	68	40	34	20	31	18.2	170	100	2.7	Sometimes
14	Not keeping turn	16	9.4	17	10	58	34.1	48	28.2	31	18.2	170	100	2.6	Sometimes
15	Jostling	6	3.5	18	10.7	72	42.3	42	24.7	30	17.8	168	100	2.5	Sometimes
16	Sleeping in class	6	3.5	14	8.2	34	20	53	31.1	63	37	170	100	2.1	Rarely

As Table 2 shows, the majority (79.9%) of the subjects said that the students always or usually murmur in the classroom during lesson presentation. However, a few (8.8%) of the respondents reported that the students sometimes murmur. The rest (9.9%) of the subjects reported that the students rarely or never murmur. Furthermore, a sizeable number (75.8%) of the respondents indicated that the students always or often fail to bring their text book. The remainder (16.4%) of the respondents replied that the students sometimes do not bring their text book while 7.65% of them said they rarely bring their text book. But none of the respondents said that students do not bring their text book. The Table also shows 28.8% and 46.4% of the respondents respectively indicated that the students always and often whisper during lesson presentation. The remainder (13.5%) replied that the students sometimes whisper and a few (11.1%) of them said the students rarely or never whisper. Moreover, a substantial number (72.9%) of the respondent replied that the students were always or often come to school late. On the other hand, 12.9% of the subjects responded the students are sometimes not punctual. But 21.7 % of the respondents said the students are almost punctual or they are punctual.

The table Still reads the majority (71.8%) of the respondents said that the students always or often fail to do the assigned tasks. 14.1% of them, however, said the students sometimes fail do the assigned tasks. But only 12.9% of the respondents said that students often or always do the assigned tasks. In addition, concerning whether the students laugh at classmates when they try to speak in English or not, a large proportion (68.7%) of the respondents indicated that the students always or often laugh at classmates when they try to speak in English. Furthermore, almost a quarter (24.1%) of the subjects replied that the students sometimes laugh at classmates. The remainder (18.8%) of the respondents respectively reported that the students do not laugh at their classmates when they try to speak in English. Moreover, a large number (63.5%) of the respondents responded that the students always or often change seats without permission. On the other hand, 21.7% of the subjects said that the students sometimes change seats without permission. The remainder (14.6) of the respondents replied that the students do not change seats.

As can be seen from the table, 63.4% of the respondents indicated that the students always or often mock or repeat what others say to make fun out of it. Almost the same number (11.7% and 11.1 %) of the respondents respectively responded that the students sometimes and rarely mock. The remainder (13.5 %) of the respondents replied that the students never mock. In addition, as the table shows, a large proportion (58.4%) of the respondents responded that the students are always or often inattentive. But more than a quarter (25.8%) of the respondents reported that the students are attentive. The table still reads 37.3 % of the respondents reported the students always or often engage themselves working on other subjects other than working on the one being taught. A large proportion (41.4%) of the respondents indicated that the students sometimes work on a different subject other than the one being taught. The rest (21.2%) of the respondents replied that the students do not work on a different subject other than the one being taught. The same Table shows a sizeable number (53.5%) of the respondents indicated that the students are not always or often responsive and 18.8% of them said the students are not sometimes responsive. However, more than a quarter (27.6%) of the respondents responded that the students are responsive.

Regarding whether the students move seat or not, a quarter (25.2%) of the respondents respectively said the students always or often move seats. The majority (39.4%) of the respondents indicated that the students sometimes move seats. The remainder (20.5% and 14.7%) of the subjects respectively replied that the students rarely and never move seats. The respondents were also asked if the students exhibit

behaviour problem by not wearing school uniform and 21.6% of them replied that the students always or often fail to wear school uniforms. The majority (40%) of the respondents indicated that the students sometimes fail to wear school uniforms. The remainder (38.2%) of the respondents respectively replied that the students almost to wear school uniforms. Furthermore, as the table still reads, a sizable number (34.1%) of the subjects indicated that the students sometimes speak out of turn. In addition, 19.4% of them replied that the students always or often speak out of turn. However, 28.2% of the respondents replied that the students almost keep turn when they speak and 18.2% said they keep turn. The table also shows a few (14.2%) of the subjects respectively said the students always or often jostle with each other. Nonetheless, the majority (42.3%) of the respondents indicated that the students sometimes jostle with each other. About a quarter (24.7%) of the respondents also replied that the students rarely jostle with each other. The rest (17.8%) said that the students never jostle with each other. Furthermore, the data in the table reveal, a small number (11.7%) of the respondents responded that the students always or often sleep in class and 20% of the respondents said that students sometime sleep in class. However, the majority (68.1%) of the respondents respectively indicated that the students do not sleep in class.

Taken together the data presented in the above table seem to show that the top nine behaviours were the most often reflected disruptive behaviours in EFL classroom. In addition, the next six consecutive behaviours were identified as the ones sometimes occur in the classroom. However, sleeping in class during lesson presentation was rarely reflected in EFL classroom. Similarly, the responses of the students and the teachers, in the interview and focused group discussion, strengthen the responses obtained through the questionnaire. When interviewed, most of the participants' responses confirmed that the same problem behaviour existed. For instance, one of the students (S1) said:

In our classroom, the kind of disruptive behaviour reflected in English language period are murmuring, talking to friends continuously, leaving the classroom, moving seats, not bringing their textbook and leaving the classroom to borrow textbook from other classes are the major ones. In addition, laughing to students when they try to speak in English, using cell phones during class, not coming to school on time and changing seat are also reflected in our classroom during lesson presentation. These problems are more serious when two or more classroom students are mixed.

Another participant student (S3) also raised similar problems and said:

The kind of disruptive behaviours reflected in our classroom during English classroom lesson presentation are inattentiveness, undermining teachers, moving in the classroom, laughter, whispering, murmuring, not bringing their text book, and not doing home works and class works are reflected. In addition, the students sometimes leave the class for no reason and stay outside. They also come to school late and copy others assignments.

In the focus group discussion, the participant teachers also pinpointed similar misbehaviours indicated by their students. For example, the following extract is the explanation of the problem behaviour one of the teachers (T1) said he encountered during conducting the lesson.

Well, the problem of disruptive behaviour of students, now days, has been increasing especially in the actual classroom setting. From the fact that it is ongoing event, its power to distract the peaceful learning teaching process is profound. As English is a foreign language for the students, they need to be secured and feel freedom when they learn it. Second, the disruption also comes not only from the classroom but reflected from outside the classroom by other classes of students. When we consider the disruption that arise from within the classroom, not bringing their exercise book, inattentiveness, lack of targeted goal, not brining their textbook, not wearing their uniform, murmuring at large and imitating female or males sound are some to mention.

Another teacher (T2) also confirmed the problem raised by the previous teacher when he described the problem as follows:

When there is a pair and group work, the students make noise to borrow things from their classmates. Others move out of the class to borrow textbooks because many of them do not bring their textbook with them. When I tell them it would be checked, those students who do not have the text book, moves to the other students to share the book him/her. Thus, it is hard to maintain the classroom discipline. This will affect the teaching learning process in advance. When the students move from their seat, they even do not ask permission. In addition, as their interest is very little for learning, they usually copy others students work and they do not do their own.

As can be seen in the extracts above the most common students disruptive behaviours reflected in EFL classrooms are those disrupt the smooth flow of the lesson and are impediment to the teaching learning process. (For details of interview and focus group discussions results, see appendixes G and I). Before arriving at conclusion regarding less serious type of disruptive behaviour, it seems a good idea to see what the actual practice looks like. The results of the classroom observation also agreed with the responses of the students and teachers in the questionnaire and interview. The students were most often heard, in most periods, murmuring at their desk, excessively talking to their friends, and also seen coming late to class, moving in the classroom to share books with their classmates, leaving the classroom to borrow text book from other neighbouring classes. Furthermore, some other students simply sat at their desk when a pair or a group work was given as they did not have text books to work on. However, few (two to four) students were usually seen jostling each other, moving seat and violated the school's dressing code. Finally, none of the students was seen sleeping in the classroom (see appendix H).

From the above discussion it looks tenable to conclude that murmuring, changing seat without asking permission, being late to class and not doing assigned tasks, not bringing text book, working on different other subjects other than the one being taught were the major serious disruptive behaviours

reflected in EFL classrooms. On the other hand, moving seat, jostling each other, not keeping turn and not being responsive were identified as the least occurring disruptive behaviours in EFL classroom. The disruptive behaviours reported by participant students and teachers through this study were in line with a number of studies (e.g. Altinel, 2006, Merc, 2015, Omotes, 2011). The result of their studies indicated that the most common reflected behaviours in a classroom were which hindered the flow of the lesson and disturbed the peace teaching -learning process.

Table 3. Students responses concerning serious type of disruptive behaviours

No	Item	Responses												Mean	Label
		Always		Often		Sometimes		Rarely		Never		Total			
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%		
1	Cheating on tests and exams	68	40	53	31.1	20	11.7	18	10.5	11	6.4	170	100	3.8	Often
2	Excessive chat with friend	41	24.1	71	41.4	34	20	21	12.3	3	1.7	170	100	3.7	Often
3	Shouting at friends	31	18.2	51	30	44	25.8	19	11.1	23	13.5	168	100	3.2	Sometimes
4	using cell phones during class	20	11.7	28	16.4	82	48.2	31	18.2	9	5.2	170	100	3.1	Sometimes
5	Calling out	20	11.7	32	18.8	53	31.1	46	27	18	10.5	169	100	2.9	Sometimes
6	Leaving or entering classroom without permission	10	5.8	30	17.6	62	36.4	43	25.2	25	14.7	170	100	2.7	Sometimes
7	Disrespecting others	12	7	16	9.4	53	31.1	43	25.2	44	25.8	168	100	2.4	Rarely
8	Arguing with the teacher	8	4.7	22	12.9	40	23.5	47	27.6	53	31.1	170	100	2.3	Rarely

Table 3 shows that, the majority (71.1%) of the respondents indicated that the students always or often cheat on tests and exams. On the other hand, 22.2% of the subjects responded that the students sometimes or rarely cheat on tests and exams while only 6.4% of them reported they never cheat on tests and exams. In addition, as the data from the table reveals, a substantial number of respondents (65.5%) said excessive chatting of students with their friends is always often reflected in classroom while 20% of the subjects replied excessive chatting of students with their friends is sometimes reflected in classroom. The table further shows nearly half (48.2%) of the subjects said the students always or often shout at their friends. Moreover, a quarter (25.8%) of the respondents indicated that the students sometimes shout at their friends. However, about a quarter (24.6%) of the respondents reported that the students rarely or never shout at their friends.

Regarding whether the students use cell phone during class or not, the majority (48.2%) of the subjects indicated that the students sometimes use cell phones during class. In addition, more than a quarter (28.1%) of the respondents replied that the students always or often use cell phones during class. The remainder (23.4%) of the respondents reported the students rarely or never use cell phones during class. Moreover, about one third (30.5%) of the respondents said that the students always or often call out. In addition, almost an equal number (31.1%) of the respondents also indicated the students sometimes call out. The remainder (27% and 10.5%) of the respondents said the students rarely and never shout in the classroom respectively. The table still reads, a substantial number (54 %) of the respondents replied that the students often/sometimes leave or enter the classroom without asking permission while a quarter (25.2 %) of them indicated that the students rarely leave or enter the classroom without asking permission. Only 14.7% of the subjects reported that the students never leave or enter the classroom without asking permission.

It is still evident from the table that a small number (16.4% of the respondents responded that the students always or often show the lack of respect to others. On the other hand, 31.1% of the respondents replied that the students sometimes show lack of respect to others while more than half (51%) of them indicated that the students rarely or never show lack of respect to others respectively. Regarding the last, as it is apparent from the table, a few (17.6%) of the respondents said that the students always or often argue with the teacher while nearly a quarter (23.5%) of the subjects responded the students sometimes argue with the teacher. However, the majority (58.7%) of the respondents said that the students rarely or do not argue with the teacher.

It looks evident from the description of the data in the above table and the discussion that the two top behaviours were the most frequently reflected serious disruptive behaviors in EFL classrooms. In addition, the next four consecutive behaviors were identified as serious behaviours sometimes reflected in EFL classrooms. Nonetheless, disrespecting others and arguing with the teacher were rarely reflected in EFL class rooms of the target schools. In the interview and focus group discussion, the participant students and the teachers respectively noted that the students excessive chatting and cheating on tests and final exams as the major disruptive behaviour reflected in their classroom. One of the teachers (T3) explained this idea as, “The disruptive behaviour that mostly reflected in EFL classroom is that, the students usually whisper, excessively talk to each other and murmur at their desk.” Another teacher (T2) also added “... as their interest is very little for learning, they usually copy others students work,

for example, cheat on tests and final exams and they do not do their own. Some students also bring their cell phone to classroom and use it during lesson presentation. They watch videos or photos and the like.” Furthermore, as it was evident from the classroom observation, the students were most often seen entering the classroom without asking permission and leave the classroom as well to borrow text book from other classes. However, responses of the students in the interview regarding the use of mobile phone during the lesson and cheating on tests and final exams seemed to run contrary to the responses of the teachers and agree with the responses to the questionnaire. The student respondents did not mention, in the interview, that the students used phone during the lesson and cheated on tests and final exams. Nonetheless, the teachers complained, in their focused group discussion, that the students usually cheat on tests and exams, copy assignments from their classmates and use their cell phone especially to watch photos or videos. None of the key informants mentioned calling out, disrespecting others and arguing with the teacher as one of the disruptive behaviours in EFL classroom (see appendix G and I).

Hence, it appears plausible to arrive at the conclusion that cheating on test and exams, excessive chatting of students with their friends, shouting, using cell phones during class, Calling out, and entering and leaving classroom without asking permission were the major type of serious misbehaviours reflected in EFL classroom. However, disrespecting others and arguing with the teacher were identified as less frequently happening misbehaviours.

Table 4. Students’ responses regarding very serious and/or life threatening disruptive behaviours

N o	Item	Responses												Mean	Label
		Always		Often		Sometimes		Rarely		Never		Total			
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%		
1	Using verbal abuse	10	5.8	15	8.8	40	23.5	47	27.6	58	34.1	170	100	2.2	Rarely
2	Quarrelling each other	4	2.3	3	1.7	42	24.7	48	28.2	73	42.9	170	100	1.9	Rarely
3	Destroying school's property	7	4.1	15	8.5	31	18.2	33	25.2	84	43.5	170	100	1.9	Rarely
4	Hitting/ injuring other students	-	-	8	4.7	34	20	61	35.8	56	32.9	170	100	1.8	Rarely
5	Carrying weapon to school	-	-	-	-	8	4.7	13	7.6	149	87.6	170	100	1.1	Rarely

As can be seen from table 4, a small number (14.6 %) of the respondents replied that the students always or often use verbal abuse. But 23.5% of the respondents replied that the students sometimes use verbal abuse. The majority (61.7%) of the respondents indicated the students do not use verbal abuse. In addition, the table reveals that few (4%) of the respondents said that the students ‘always’ or ‘often’ quarrel each other. On the other hand, almost a quarter (24.7%) of the subjects reported that the students sometimes quarrel each other while the majority (71.1%) of the respondents indicated the students rarely or never quarrel each other. Furthermore, the table reveals that 12.6 % of the respondents said the students always or often destroy school’s property. The rest (18.2%) replied that the students sometimes destroy school’s property. Nonetheless, a great number (68.7%) of the respondents indicated that the students rarely or never destroy school’s property respectively.

The table further shows, a great majority (68.7%) of the subjects indicated that the students rarely or never hit or injure other students. However, 20% of the respondents replied that the students sometimes hit or injure other students. few (4.7%) of the subjects responded that the students often hit or injure other students but no respondent said the students always hit or injure other students. Moreover, as the data in the table show, a great majority (87.6%) of the respondents indicated that the students never carry weapon to school. Only 4.7% and 7.6% of the respondents respectively responded that the students sometimes and rarely carry weapon to school.

It looks apparent from the responses of the subjects described above quarrelling each other, destroying school’s property, using verbal abuse, hitting/ injuring other students and carrying weapon to school were identified as disruptive behaviours rarely reflected in EFL classroom. In the interview and the focus group discussion, none of the key participants mentioned the preceding disruptive behaviours as one of the major disruptive behaviours reflected in the classroom. So the responses of the key informants in the interview and focused group discussion concerning very serious and/or life threatening misbehaviours agreed with the students’ responses to the questionnaire. Furthermore, the results of the classroom observation also showed that one of these behaviours was seen being reflected in the actual classroom (see appendix F and G). This indicates that very serious and/or life threatening misbehaviours were not the major misbehaviours manifested in EFL classroom.

In addition to the data obtained through close-ended questions, the students were asked, in open-ended questions, to write the major disruptive behaviour of students reflected in EFL classrooms. Accordingly, chewing gum during the lesson, absenteeism, repeating what the teacher said after him to

make fun out of it, undermining teachers, taking images of the teacher with their phone cell, stealing writing materials and textbooks, exchanging materials through the window and giggling were the major disruptive behaviours repeatedly noted by the students.

In general, regarding the major types of EFL classroom disruptive behaviours, the results obtained from the participant through different tools seem to show that moderate and serious types of disruptive behaviours were most frequently reflected behaviours in the classroom. Regarding the major types of EFL classroom disruptive behaviours, the results obtained from the participant is congruent with the result of the research findings by Altinel (2006) and Merc(2015). Altinel and Merc in their studies entitled ‘Students Misbehaviour in EFL Classes’ and ‘Classroom Management Problems and Coping Strategies of Turkish EFL Teachers’ respectively disclosed that disruptive behaviour of students is a problematic in EFL classes and the most frequently occurring behaviours are those disrupt the smooth flow of teaching learning and are impediment to the students’ academic achievement.

4.3 Analysis of Causes of disruptive behaviour of students

There are reasons why children are behaving in a challenging manner. Therefore, identifying why they exhibit the behaviour is the key to find a solution to the problems caused by the behaviour. Under this section, the presentation and discussion of the possible causes of the students’ disruptive behaviours related to the students themselves, the teachers , the school environment and home or/and community related cause as perceived by the students and teachers were made.

A) Students Related Factors

Student factor can be defined as the happening of disruptive behaviour as the result of individual students’ own behaviour with the purpose to gain extra attention, escape or avoid demanding situations, exert control and to communicate with others(Fontana 1993,Walters J. and Frei , 2007 and Kyriacou, 1997).

In view of this, relevant data were collected to find out the cause of disruptive behaviour of students reflected in classroom. The next part of the paper is devoted to the presentation and discussion of the data.

Table 5. The students' responses regarding the causes of disruptive behaviour of students related to the students themselves

No	Item	Responses												Mean	Label
		SA		A		UD		DA		SDA		total			
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%		
1	Indifference	99	58.2	49	28.8	5	2.9	14	8.2	3	1.7	170	100	4.3	Agree
2	Seeking attention	46	27	96	56.4	15	8.8	10	5.8	3	1.7	170	100	4	Agree
4	Attitude towards English lesson	59	34.7	70	40.1	9	5.2	20	11.7	12	7	170	100	3.8	Agree
3	Ignorance of classroom rules	65	38.2	53	31.1	6	3.5	28	16.4	18	10.5	170	100	3.7	Agree
5	Boredom	61	35.8	52	30.5	10	5.8	18	10.5	28	16.4	169	100	3.5	Agree

As the data portrayed in the table show, 87% % of the respondents strongly agreed or agreed that the students' indifference was the cause for the disruptive behaviour reflected in the classroom. However, 9.9% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed to the idea. Only 2.9 % of the respondents said they could not decide what the causes of students' disruptive behaviours are. The respondents were also asked whether the students disrupt for seeking attention and the majority (83.4%) of them strongly agreed or agreed that the students disrupt for attention seeking. However, 8.8% of the respondents said that they could not decide if the students disrupted for attention seeking. Furthermore, 7.5% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that the students disrupt for seeking attention.

The table still reads, 62.4% of the respondents strongly agreed or agreed that the students' negative attitude towards English language is the cause for the disruptive behaviour of students. However, 5.2% of the respondents said they could not decide if the students' attitude is the cause. On the other hand, 17.6% and 13.5% of the respondents respectively said they disagree and strongly disagree that the students' negative attitude towards English language is the cause for the disruptive behaviour of students. The table further shows, a substantial number (69.3%) of the respondents strongly agreed or agreed that ignorance of classroom rules was the cause for the disruptive behaviour of students. Nonetheless, 3.5% of the respondents said they could not decide if ignorance of classroom was the cause for the disruptive behaviour. However, more than a quarter (26.9%) of the respondents indicated

they disagree or strongly disagree that ignorance of classroom was the cause for the disruptive behaviour. Finally, the students were also asked if boredom was the cause for the disruptive behaviour of students and the majority (66.3%) of them strongly agreed or agreed that boredom was the cause for the disruptive behaviour of the students.

Hence, according to the discussion in the preceding paragraph, all the items were identified as causes related to the students. The results of the key informants obtained through interview and focused group discussion seem to confirm the students' responses to the questionnaire. Both the students and teachers disclosed that most students who exhibit disruptive behaviour were careless ones and did not have vision and bright future. One of the participant students (S1) mentioned the cause as, "Most students do not like learning English because they said that it is difficult to learn and it is not their mother tongue. Some other students exhibit disruptive behaviour because they are careless and do not have bright future." Another student (S2) also added, "The students exhibit disruptive behaviour because, I think, they developed the sense of 'I can't'. They do not try to pass through different challenges and they easily loss hope." In the focused group discussion, one of the participant teachers (code 02) underlined the students' indifference and lack of motivation to learn the language as the major cause and said, "The disruptive students are those do not have goals and bright future to go to preparatory schools, universities and the like"(see appendixes G and I).

In general, the data portrayed in the above table discloses that the students misbehave as a result of their indifference to education and lack of ambition, their attitude towards learning English language. In addition, not being informed of classroom rules; boredom and seeking attention were found to be the major students' related factors for disruptive behaviour reflected in EFL classrooms.

B) Teachers' Related causes

According to Harmer (1991) teacher factor refers to the result of disruptive behaviour due to the inappropriate selection of the topic or activity which causes boredom in the individual students, or teachers way of disciplining the students such as unfairness that the teacher places upon the students. In connection with this, relevant data were gathered from students, teachers and classroom practice to explore the causes related to teachers for disruptive behaviours reflected in EFL classrooms. This section was concerned with the presentation and discussion of these data.

Table 6. The students' responses regarding the causes of disruptive behaviour related to teachers.

No	Item	Responses												Mean	Label
		SA		A		UD		DA		SDA		total			
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%		
1	High level of lesson presented	76	44.7	59	34.7	-	-	16	9.4	19	11.1	170	100	3.9	Agree
2	Teacher-student rapport	66	38.8	54	31.7	2	1.1	26	15.2	20	11.7	170	100	3.6	Agree
3	Teachers' inconsistency in taking corrective measures	58	43.1	56	32.9	7	4.1	27	15.8	21	12.3	169	100	3.6	Agree
4	Teacher's unfair treatment	57	33.5	61	35.8	-	-	31	18.2	21	12.3	170	100	3.6	Agree
5	Teachers loss of temper	18	10.5	30	17.6	13	7.6	71	41.7	38	22.3	170	100	2.5	Undecided
6	Teachers repeating the same class	17	10	21	12.3	-	-	76	44.7	56	32.9	170	100	2.2	Disagree
7	Low level of lesson presented	16	9.4	17	10	-	-	60	35.2	77	45.2	170	100	2	Disagree

It is evident from Table 6, that the majority (79.4%) of the respondents strongly agreed or agreed that high level of lesson presented was the cause for the disruptive behaviour of students. Nonetheless, none of the respondents said they were unable to decide on the idea. On the other hand, 20.5% of the subjects respectively disagreed or strongly disagreed that high level of lesson presented was the cause for the disruptive behaviour of students. The table further shows, a sizable number (70.5%) of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed that teacher -student rapport was the main cause for the disruptive behaviour of students reflected in the classroom. Nevertheless, very few (1.1%) of the subjects replied they could not decide if teacher-student rapport was the cause for the disruptive behaviour of students. On the other hand, 26.9 % of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that the teacher -student rapport was the main cause for the disruptive behaviour of students.

Regarding whether teachers' inconsistency in taking corrective measures was a cause for the disruptive behaviour of students, a large portion (77.8%) of the respondents strongly agreed or agreed that teachers' inconsistency in taking corrective measures was the cause for the disruptive behaviour of students. However, only few (4.1%) of the respondents said that they could not decide on the idea. The remainder (15.8% and 12.3%) of the subjects respectively disagreed and strongly disagreed that

teachers' inconsistency in taking corrective measures was the cause for the disruptive behaviour of students. The table still reads, a substantiate number (70.8 %) of the respondents strongly agreed or agreed that teacher's unfair treatment was the main cause for the disruptive behaviour of students. Nevertheless, no respondents responded they could not decide if teachers' unfair treatment is main cause. The rest (18.2% and 12.3%) of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively that teacher's unfair treatment was the cause for the main cause for the disruptive behaviour of students.

Regarding whether teachers' loss of temper was the cause for the students to disrupt and 28.1% of them strongly agreed or agreed on the idea. But 7.6% of the subjects said they could not decide on the same issue. The majority (63.4%) of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that teachers' loss of temper was the cause for the disruptive behaviour of students. The same table shows, 22.3% of the respondents strongly agreed or agreed that teachers' repeating the same class was the main cause for the disruptive behaviour of students reflected in the classroom. However, the majority (77.6%) of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that teachers' repeating the same class was the cause for students' disruptive behaviour. Finally, as the table shows, 19.4% of the respondents strongly agreed or agreed that the students misbehave as a result of low level of lesson presented. However, the majority (80.4%) of the respondents responded they disagree or strongly disagree that the students misbehave as a result of low level of lesson presented.

Taken together the data presented in the above table seem to show that the four top items were considered as the causes related to EFL teachers for the disruptive behaviours of students reflected in the classroom. Furthermore, the result obtained from the students, through the interview, also agreed with the responses to the questionnaire. When interviewed, the student participant complained that the teachers did not maintain the classroom discipline, did not take consistent and corrective measures on those who disrupt the teaching learning process. One of the student interviewee (S1) explained the cause as:

I think the students exhibit disruptive behaviour for different reasons. In our classroom, the students exhibit disruptive behaviours when they hate the teacher and the lesson for several reasons.On our teacher's side, for example, when the he does not teach well and does not take corrective measures to maintain classroom discipline the students begin acting differently

Similarly, another student (S3) also mentioned problems related to teachers as the cause for the misbehaviour of students as follows:

Students disrupt when the teacher does not teach well because of lack of knowledge on what he is teaching. Our English teacher sound is inaudible, so the students rarely listen to him and usually talk private issues rather than listening to him. Moreover, our English teacher does not teach us additional lesson other than what is on the text book. He usually directly copy from the text book to the blackboard and explain it. This makes the lesson boring and the students begin to misbehave.

The participants also complained that their teachers did not want to understand the students' academic standard and present the lesson accordingly (see appendix G and I). Nevertheless, the responses of the teachers obtained from the focus group discussion seem to discord with their students' response and agreed with the result of classroom observation. In the focus group discussion, none of the teachers mentioned that they were likely the cause for the disruptive behaviour of students reflected in the classroom. This may show that the teachers seem to externalize the cause and dissociate themselves from the problems.

In sum, with data available, it is possible to infer that high level of lesson presented, lack of teacher-student rapport, teachers' inconsistency in taking corrective measures, teachers' unfair treatment among the students, teachers repeating the same class were the major causes related to teachers for the disruptive behaviour of students reflected in EFL classroom.

C) Causes of disruptive behaviour related to the school.

According to Grossman (2004), schools may cause students' disruptive behaviour through factors such as under financing, keeping too many students in a classroom, poor school and colleague support systems, insufficient physical environments and/or bad teaching rooms. The following part of the paper was dealt with the presentation and discussion of data collected on whether the school contributed to the disruptive behaviour of students in the classroom.

Table 7 The students' responses regarding the causes of disruptive behaviour related to the school.

N o	Item	Responses												Mean	Label
		SA		A		UD		DA		SDA		total			
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%		
1	The school’s rules are loose	57	33.5	93	54.7	-	-	13	7.6	7	4.1	170	100	4	Agree
2	Absence of guidance and counselling service	81	47.6	51	30	5	2.9	20	11.7	13	7.6	170	100	3.9	Agree
3	Large class	16	9.4	20	11.7	3	1.7	56	32.9	75	44.1	170	100	2	Disagree
4	Unattractive classrooms	10	5.8	11	6.4	2	1.1	49	28.8	98	57.8	170	100	1.7	Disagree

As table 7 reveals, (33.5%) of the respondents said they strongly agree that loose school rules were the cause for the students' disruptive behaviours. Similarly, large proportions (54.7%) of the respondents agreed on the idea. But only 11.7% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that the loose school rules were the cause for the same issue. Furthermore, a substantial number (77.6 %) of the respondents said that absence of guidance and counselling at the school is the cause for the disruptive behaviour of students. However, the remaining (19.3%) of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that absence of guidance and counselling at the school was the cause for the disruptive behaviour of the students.

It is further apparent from the table that 21.1% of the respondents strongly agreed or disagreed that large number of student in the classroom was the cause for the disruptive behaviour of students. On the other hand, the majority (77%) of the subjects said they disagree or strongly disagree that the large number of student in the classroom was the cause for the disruptive behaviour of students. In addition, as the table reveals, a small number (12.2%) of the respondents replied they strongly agreed or agreed that the physical condition of the classroom was the cause for the disruptive behaviour of the students in their classroom. Nonetheless, a large number (86.6%) of the respondents said they disagree or strongly disagreed that the physical condition of the classroom was the cause for the disruptive behaviour of the students in their classroom.

It looks evident from the description of the data in the above table and the discussion that the loose school's rules and absence of guidance and counselling were identified as the cause for the disruptive behaviour of students reflected in the classroom. However, large class size and unattractive classrooms were identified as the least cause for the disruptive behaviours reflected in EFL classroom. Similarly, the respondent students and the teachers, in the interview and focused group discussion, mentioned that the school administration did not take measures against serious misconducts. One of the focus group discussion participant teachers (T2) said:

The school administration is not taking corrective measures on the undisciplined students. Whenever the teachers had conflicts with these students, the school administration usually tries to arbitrate between the teachers and the misbehaving student rather than taking corrective measures. The school makes the student sign five to six times not to repeat his bad behaviour and this does not bring change.

Regarding the absence of guidance and counselling at the school, the idea forwarded by one of the participant of focused group discussion (T1) seem to confirm the responses of the students to the questionnaire. The participant said it was difficult to build the students' self-esteem in the absence of a

professional counsellor because the students come to school with different backgrounds and problems. The same teacher (T1) also added factors related to the school for the disruptive behaviour of students as follows:

The school rules and measures being taken are powerless and not stringent to maintain discipline. The school administration usually identifies the low income standard students to support but in practice nothing existed. Generally, the school seems to ignore the problem because no measures are being taken when the students habitually come to school late and jump over the fence of the school.

Hence, it appears plausible to arrive at the conclusion that the loose school's rule and absence of guidance and counselling at the school, lack of material or financial support to the economically disadvantaged students were the main school related factors contributed to the disruptive behaviour of students in the classroom.

D) Home and/or environmental factors.

According to walker, and Gresham (1995), home factors refers to the result from Social and personal factors that put great stress on family life (e.g. poverty, divorce, alcohol problems and physical abuse) and these disrupt normal parenting practice. In addition, according to Harmer (1991), home factors refer to the individual student's experiences in family which have a deep influence on the student's attitudes towards learning. The occurrences of disruptive behaviour in the classroom can be due to the difficult home situation, home attitudes towards English or to learning in general can influence the students to involve in disruptive behaviours. The next part of the paper is concerned with the discussion of data related to the home and/or environmental factors.

Table 8. The students' responses regarding the causes of the students' disruptive behaviour related to home and/or environmental factors.

N o	Item	Responses												Mean	Label
		SA		A		UD		DA		SDA		total			
		N o	%	N o	%	N o	%	N o	%	N o	%	No	%		
1	Poor parents’ follow up	81	47.6	71	41.7	5	2.9	7	4.1	6	3.5	170	100	4.2	Agree
2	Influence of Media	72	42.3	53	31.1	1	0.5	17	10	27	15.8	170	100	3.7	Agree
3	Prevalence of ‘Chat’ chewing habit	51	30	74	43.5	10	5.8	14	8.2	21	12.3	170	100	3.7	Agree
4	Prevalence of illegal video homes	50	29.4	68	40	7	4.1	18	10.5	27	15.8	170	100	3.5	Agree

As indicated in Table 8, 47.6% of the respondents strongly agreed that poor parents' follow up was the cause for the disruptive behaviour of the students. Similarly, a good number (41.7%) of them also agreed with this idea. The remainder (7.7%) of the respondents disagreed and strongly agreed that poor follow up of parents was the cause for the students' disruptive behaviour reflected in their classroom. It is further apparent from the table that, a great number (73.4%) of the respondents said they strongly agreed or agreed that influence of media was the main cause. However, more than a quarter (25.8%) of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the idea.

The same table further reveals, a large proportion (73.5%) of the respondents strongly agreed or agreed that the prevalence of 'Chat' chewing habit was the cause for the disruptive behaviour of students. Nonetheless, 20.5% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the idea. Concerning whether the Prevalence of illegal video homes was the cause for the disruptive behaviour or not, the majority (69.4%) of the respondents strongly agree and agreed on the cause. The remainder (26.3%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that the Prevalence of illegal video homes was the cause for the disruptive behaviour.

From the discussion in the preceding paragraphs it seems to indicate that all the items were found as the causes of disruptive behaviour related to home or/and environmental factors. Furthermore, the results obtained from the student participants and the teachers through the interview and focused group discussion seem to agree with the responses to the questionnaire. For example, one of the teachers (T1) emphasised and said, "There is a little follow up of parents about their children. Parents do not know where their children spent most of their time. They are also indifferent about their children's learning and this can be taken as the major cause for the students to disrupt". Another teacher (T2) added, "The parents of the students rarely come to school to follow their children's behaviour and academic status. They left the problem to be maintained and solved only by the teachers". In addition, as teacher (T3) noted that the community in which the students live contributed to misbehaviours and he explained, "Some students dared to bring 'chat' with them hiding in their pocket to chew in the classroom. I think this is the negative influence of what is being prevalent in the community." But the prevalence of illegal video homes was neither raised by the students nor the teachers as the main cause of disruptive behaviours in EFL classes (for details see appendix G and I). Hence, it looks reasonable to conclude that parents' little follow up and indifference about their children, the prevalence of 'chat' chewing

habit, and the negative influence of media were the major home and/or environmental factors for disruptive behaviours of students reflected in the classroom.

Regarding the causes of disruptive behaviour of students at the school, the students were asked, in the open ended questionnaire, to indicate the causes of students' disruptive behaviour. The most common causes rated by the students were the students' lack of ambition, peer pressure, lack of understanding the lesson being taught, negative attitude to English language and mixing two or more classes of students to conduct the lesson. In line with the related literature, the variables contributing to misbehaviour as perceived by teacher and student participants of the present study were student related factors(Harmer, 1991, Carr, 2004, Fontana, 1993) teacher related factors(Danbar, 2004, Charles,2008, Strong,2007), school related factors(Grossman, 2004) societal related factors(Long,2000).

4.4 Analysis of categories of more disruptive students

Table 9. Students responses concerning categories of more disruptive students

No	Item	Responses	
1	Whether male or female students are more disruptive	No	%
	a) male	120	70.5
	b) female	11	6.4
	c) both equally disruptive	32	18.8
	D) I don't know	7	4.1
	total	170	100
2	Whether urban or rural students are more disruptive	No	%
	a) urban	109	64.1
	b) rural	9	5.2
	c) both equally disruptive	42	24.7
	D) I do not know	10	5.8
		170	100
3	Whether clever or slow learner students are more disruptive	No	%
	a) clever	12	7
	b) slow learner	118	69.4
	c) both equally disruptive	40	23.5
	D) I do not know	-	-
	total	170	100
4	Whether students who have both parents or single parental/orphans are more disruptive	No	%
	a) students who have both parents	22	12.9
	b) single parental/orphans students	77	45.2

	c) both equally disruptive	43	25.2
	D) I do not know	29	17
	total	170	100

As the data presented in the table show, the majority (70.5%) of the respondents said that male students are more disruptive than female ones. On the other hand, 6.4% the subjects replied that female students are more disruptive than male students while 18.8% responded both male and female students are equally disruptive. However, 4.1% of the respondents replied that they did not know which group is more disruptive. Regarding whether urban or rural students are more disruptive, a large proportion (64.1%) of the respondents indicated that urban students are more disruptive than rural ones whereas only few (5.2%) of them responded rural students are more disruptive than urban students. The remainder (24.7%) of the subjects reported both urban and rural students are equally disruptive and 5.8% of them said they do not know whether urban or rural students are more disruptive.

It is still evident from the table the majority (69.4%) of them indicated slow learners are more disruptive than clever students. However, about a quarter (23.5%) of the respondents replied that both clever and slow learner students are equally disruptive and none of the respondents said they did not know if clever or slow learners are more disruptive. Finally the same table shows, 12.9% of the respondents said that students who have both parents are more disruptive than those who do not have one or both parents but a 45.2% of them responded that students who do not have one or both parents are more disruptive than students who have both parents and 25.2% of them said both are equally disruptive and 17% of them replied that they do not know which of the two groups is more disruptive.

As the whole, the data portrayed in the above table show that male students are more disruptive than female students and urban students are more disruptive than rural students. Likewise, likewise slow learners are more disruptive than clever ones and single parental/orphans are more disruptive than students who have both parents.

In addition to the data obtained from the students through questionnaire, the data obtained from the students and the teacher through the interview and focused group discussion disclosed that male, urban, slow learners and single parental/orphan students were identified as more disruptive than their female, rural, clever and dual parental students. For instance, student interviewee (S1) observes as, “In our classroom, male students are more disruptive than male students.... In addition urban students reflect behaviours than rural ones. I think urban students consider themselves as all knower and try to boast over the rural ones. Furthermore, urban students are near to different media and are influenced by

them”. On the other hand, the idea forwarded by student interviewee (T2) also strengthens the preceding one. He explained:

Male students are more disruptive than female students in our classroom because males usually rely on their strength. In addition, in my opinion, urban students are more disruptive than their rural counterparts. Urban students seem to dominate the rural ones because they consider themselves as if they are more civilized than rural students. As to whether clever students or slow learners are more disruptive, as I observed, slow learners are more disruptive than clever ones. The reason, in my opinion, is that slow learners do not have vision, and they wrongly convinced themselves that they could not understand the lesson being taught. None of the students’ interviewee mentioned about disruptive students family background.

Regarding the category of students liable to disruptive behaviour, the results of data obtained from participants of focus group discussion seem to agree with that of the students. In their responses the teachers that male, urban, slow learner and single parental students are more disruptive in their behaviour. For instance, one of the teachers (T3) explained this idea in his words as follows:

Male urban students were more disruptive in their classroom because they are courageous, exposed to different media/violent films. In addition, they noted that slow learners are more disruptive than clever ones as they usually do not have targeted goal and single parental/orphans are more disruptive as they are economically unsecured.

In sum, from the discussion in the preceding paragraph, it seems reasonable to arrive at the conclusion that male students were more disruptive than females; urban students were more disruptive than rural students. In addition, low achievers are more disruptive than clever ones and single parental students/orphans were more than those who have both parents. These results are in line with the findings of Omoteso (2011) who discovered there existed a significant difference between the classroom misbehaviours of male and female secondary school students. According to him, the cases of classroom misbehaviour were prevalent among male students than the female ones. This might have been as a result of the nature of the two sexes. Girls at times exercise some sort of fear for their teachers and parents, while male students are daring especially if their teacher is a female. In his study Omoteso also observed that there was a significant difference between the classroom misbehaviour of students from urban and rural secondary schools because in the urban centres, students are exposed to various violent films, horror films, boxing, wrestling and other different kinds of exposure to corruption and indiscipline through the internet thus making classroom misbehaviour to be on the increase. In addition, the results on the fact that low achievers are more disruptive than clever students are in line with the results of existing literature. For example, Oliver (2011) observes low achievers are usually more disruptive than clever students as they are economically disadvantaged ones.

4.5 Teachers' coping Strategies of Students' Disruptive Behaviour

EFL classroom management should aim at establishing conducive environment for effective teaching and learning rather than discipline, order or control over the class. A well-managed EFL class is not the one in which all the students sit still at their desks and copy all the instructions down. It should be a learning environment with a relaxed atmosphere and many opportunities for students to act as communicators, practicing on the teacher's instruction and expressing their own ideas. Thus, the major task of the teacher is to manage time and materials, create communicative needs and involve the students into classroom activities. The next part of the paper focuses on the analysis and discussion of teachers' preventive strategies of disruptive behaviour of students.

4.5.1 Analysis of Teachers' Preventive Strategies of Disruptive Behaviours

The most effective strategy that teachers need to develop when attempting to manage disruptive behavior is to prevent it occurring in the first place. Discipline problems should be prevented before they appear rather than be solved after they come to the class. Therefore, the teacher should be aware of his role in the class, he is the manager or facilitator of the class who creates and maintains a positive climate for students to speak, to act, to play his role and thus to learn actively and effectively in it (Carr J., 2004). In view of this, the students were asked five questions in the questionnaire to indicate how EFL teachers cope with the disruptive behaviour of students so as to reduce its occurrence in the classrooms. The discussion of the information elicited through the questionnaire and other instruments is presented as follows.

Table 10. The students' responses regarding teachers' preventive strategies of disruptive behaviours.

No	Item	Responses												Mean	Label
		Always		Often		Sometimes		Rarely		Never		Total			
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%		
1	Establish and post ground rules	2	1.1	5	2.9	-	-	55	32.3	108	63.5	170	100	1.4	Never
2	Create rapport with the students	15	8.8	17	10	13	7.6	68	40	46	27	169	100	2.1	Rarely
3	Praise for good behaviour	10	5.8	15	8.8	32	18.8	66	38.8	47	27.6	170	100	2.2	Rarely
4	Monitor pair and group work	13	7.6	17	10	55	32.3	61	35.8	24	14.1	170	100	2.6	Sometimes
5	Know & call students by name	11	6.4	25	14.7	72	42.3	32	18.8	30	17.6	170	100	2.7	Sometimes

As the above table indicates, very small number (4%) of the respondents said that their English teachers always or often establish and posts ground rules. On the other hand, 32.3% of the subjects responded their English teacher rarely establishes and post ground rules. The majority (63.5%) of the respondents indicated that their English teachers fail to establish and post ground rules. In addition, almost equal number (18.8% and) of respondents respectively responded that their English teacher always or often creates rapport with the students. Moreover, 7.6% of the respondents said their teacher sometimes creates rapport with the students. On the other hand, a substantial (67%) of the respondents indicated their English teacher fail to create rapport with the students. Furthermore, 14.6% of the respondents replied that their English teacher always or often praises the students for their good behaviour the remainder (18.8%) of the subjects said their teacher sometimes praises the students while a large portion (66.4%) of the respondents indicated that their English teacher rarely or never praises the students for their good behaviour.

The table further shows 17.6% of the respondents responded that their English teacher always or often monitors pair and group work. The majority (32.3%) of the respondents, however, said their teacher sometimes monitors pair and group work whereas almost half (49.9%) of the respondents indicated that their English teachers fail to monitor pair and group work. The same table still reads, 6.4% and 14.7% of the respondents respectively responded that their English teacher always and often knows and calls students by their names. However, a large proportion (42.3%) of the respondents replied their English teacher sometimes knows and calls students by their names. Furthermore, 36.4% of the subjects said their English teachers fail to study their students' names.

It looks apparent from the responses of the subjects described above that, EFL teachers sometimes monitor group works and know & call students by their name. However, the EFL teachers rarely create rapport with the teachers and praise the students for their good behaviour and they almost never establish and post ground rules. Furthermore, the data obtained from the student respondents, in the interview, seem to agree with the responses to the questionnaire. In the interview, the students also confirmed that they did not have classroom ground rules and their teacher never created rapport with them. One of the participants (S1) complained, "Our English teacher sometimes advices disruptive students when they reflect the behaviours. However, most of the time, he becomes angry and shouts at the students. We do not have classroom ground rules for English lesson but as a school, there are several rules we are expected to follow". The same student also complained, "There is no good

relationship between the teacher and the students. Our teacher does not want to understand the students' problems and why they reflect the disruptive behaviours. He does not personally ask the disruptive student and advice him/her''

The conclusion draw from the responses of the students to the questionnaire and interview, however, seem to discord with their teachers' replies in the focused group discussion and agreed with the result of classroom observation. The teachers claimed that they reacted and maintained classroom discipline during their lesson presentation and had good relationship with their students. Despite their claim, the teachers were not seen, in the classroom observation, monitoring pair and group works. In most s observed periods, they simply told them to do the group works and stayed at their desk and finally asked the students to tell them the correct answer (see appendix H).

Regarding establishing code of conduct for English lesson, the data obtained from both the students and teachers seem to have agreed with the responses of students to the questionnaire. The student participants were asked if their English teacher established and posted the classroom rules and none of the respondents replied their English teacher had established the ground rules. All the teachers also replied, in the focus group discussion, they did not establish the ground rules for their students. None of the teachers mentioned they studied and used calling students by their names and praising the students as preventive strategies of students' disruptive behaviours reflected in the classroom (see appendixes G and I).

In sum, from the above discussion, it looks tenable to infer that EFL teachers did not establish and use classroom ground rules for English lesson, rarely supervise pair and group works, had little rapport with their students. Besides, the teachers seem to seldom use studying students' names and praising them for their good behaviour.

4.5.2 Analysis of Teachers' Intervention Strategies of Disruptive Behaviours

Carr (2004) points out that whatever the cause of the individual behaviour problem, successful intervention requires intelligent, caring action on behalf of teachers, the school and external support agencies. Once the teacher has identified the goal of the misbehaviour, he/she can use strategies over time to help students find positive outlets for the needs they had been trying to fulfil through distractive means. However, it should be noted that there are no simple solution or answer for dealing with

difficult or challenging behaviour and working with students for change. To investigate the practice of teachers selected for the study, different data were secured from different sources. The presentation and discussion of these data was taken up in the next part of the paper.

Table 11. The students' responses regarding teachers' preventive strategies of disruptive behaviours

No	Item	Responses												Mean	Label
		Always		Often		Sometimes		Rarely		Never		Total			
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%		
1	Ignores every misbehaviour	78	46.1	49	28.9	19	11.2	10	5.9	13	7.6	169	100	4	Often
2	Makes the student leave the class	30	17.6	38	22.3	66	38.8	22	12.9	14	8.2	170	100	3.2	Sometimes
3	Shouts at the students	9	5.2	30	17.6	81	47.6	35	20.5	15	8.8	170	100	2.8	Sometimes
4	Sends the students to the principals	15	8.9	34	20.2	32	19	41	24.4	46	27.3	168	100	2.5	Sometimes
5	Reacts to every misbehaviour	21	12.3	25	14.7	20	11.9	35	20.5	67	39.8	168	100	2.3	Rarely
6	Insults and ridicules students	7	4.1	15	8.8	22	12.9	18	10.5	108	63.5	170	100	1.7	Rarely
7	Reminds us classroom ground rules	-	-	1	0.5	13	7.6	61	35.8	95	55.8	170	100	1.5	Rarely
8	Applies physical punishment	-	-	-	-	10	5.8	30	17.6	130	75.5	170	100	1.2	Rarely

As the data portrayed in the above table indicates, a large number (75%) of the respondents indicated their English teachers always or often ignore 'every' disruptive behaviour. But only 13.5% of them responded their English teachers rarely or never ignore every misbehaviour. Furthermore, the table shows 39.9 % of the respondents said their English teachers always or often make the students leave the class. In addition, 38.8% of the subjects replied that their English teacher sometimes makes the students leave the class but 21.1 % of the respondents responded that their English teacher rarely or never makes the students leave the class when they disrupt. Regarding whether the teacher shout at the students or not, 22.8 % of the respondents said their English teachers always or often shout at them. In addition, the majority (47.6%) of the subjects responded their English teachers sometimes shout at the students and 29.3% of them reported their teachers rarely or never shout at them. The table further shows, 29.1% of the respondents responded that their English teacher always or often send the disruptive students to the principals. On the other hand, 19% of the subjects replied that the teachers sometimes send the disruptive students to the principals. However, more than half (51.7%) of the subjects replied that their English teacher rarely or never send the disruptive students to the principals.

The table still reads, 27% of the respondents said their English teachers always or often react to ‘every’ misbehaviour reflected in the classroom while a sizable number (60.3 %) of them replied their teachers rarely or never react to every misbehaviour. It is further apparent from the table that 12.9% of the respondents said their English teachers always or often insult and ridicule the students. However, 12.9% of them responded that their English teachers sometimes insult and ridicule the students. A great number (74. %) of the respondents, however, indicated that their English teacher sometimes and rarely insults and ridicules the students. Furthermore, as the data presented in the table depicts, none of the students responded that their English teacher reminds them classroom ground rules but very few (0.5%) of them said their teacher often remind them. The rest (7.6%) of the subjects replied that their English teachers sometimes remind them classroom ground rules. However, the majority (91.6%) of the respondents indicated that their English teachers fail to remind them classroom ground rules. Finally, it is still evident from the table that no respondents replied their English teacher always and often apply physical punishment. But a few (5.8%) of the subjects responded their teacher sometimes apply physical punishment. Nonetheless, the majority (93.1%) of them indicated their English teacher rarely or never apply physical punishment when the students reflect disruptive behaviour in the classroom.

Hence it looks from the discussion of the data presented in the Table 11 that the EFL teachers most often ignore ‘every’ misbehaviour reflected in the classroom. The discussion of the data still discloses that the teachers sometimes make the disruptive students leave the class, shout at the disruptive students and send them to the principals but the students were never reminded the classroom ground rules. Furthermore, the EFL teachers rarely react to ‘every’ misbehaviour, insults and ridicules student and applies physical punishment.

In addition to the results of data obtained through questionnaire, the interviewed students also disclosed that EFL teachers most often ignore misbehaviour reflected in the classroom. For example, in the interview, the students complained that the teachers rarely react to the disruptive behaviour of students and had a good relationship with the students. To quote an example, one of the participant students (S3) said, “Our English teacher does not care whatever behaviour the student exhibit. He does not try to maintain peace and orderly classroom. When there is a group work, large number of students gathers at one place to share books with others because many of them usually do not bring their text book with them. As a result of this, the students make much noise and we could not do our tasks properly.” Similarly, another student (S1) also complained about his teacher’s reaction towards the misbehaving

students. For example, in the extract below, the student explained how his teacher intervened and what he did not like about it.

Our English teacher seems to ignore the disruptive behaviour of students reflected in the classroom. The students do whatever they wish. We were not told what to do and what not to do. Our teacher sometimes shouts at the students and forces them to leave the class. He also sometimes leaves the class without conducting the lesson when he becomes angry at the students. We do not have a classroom ground rule for English period but we were told the school rules only once at the beginning of the academic year.

However, these responses of the students seem to disagree with that of their teachers' responses elicited through focus group discussion and agreed with that of classroom observation. For instance, in the focused group discussion, all the teachers replied that they most often maintain classroom discipline by reacting to wards the reflected behaviours. Despite their claim, the teachers were not seen reacting to the misbehaving student, rather seemed to ignore and focused on giving short notes or doing other tasks. They also claimed that they most often advised their students and took corrective measures. However, when they were asked to explain the sort of measures they used, the teachers did not mention any workable solution other than making the students sign not to repeat again which less likely to bring behavioural change. The teachers were not seen, during classroom observations, applying what they claimed they had done. Almost all the teachers seem to rush to cover the portion on time neglecting the disruptive behaviour reflected in the classroom (for details, see appendix G, H and I).

On the other hand, the students indicated, in the interview, that the teachers sometimes shouted at the students, made them leave the class and sent them to the principals when they misbehave. Nonetheless, the teachers' reply confirmed the fact that they sometimes sent the disruptive student to the principals. But in the classroom observation the teachers were not seen shouting at the students and making them leave the class (see appendix H). Finally, neither the students nor the teacher raised the teachers reminded the classroom ground rules when the students misbehave and none of the teachers mentioned they shouted and made the students leave the class.

Hence, from the above discussion, it appears plausible to arrive at the conclusion that EFL teachers most often ignored disruptive behaviours reflected in the classroom. Moreover, the teachers sometimes shouted at the students and made them leave the class when they misbehave or disrupt. It is interesting that none of the teachers used physical punishment and ridiculed the students by insulting them as these spoil the good relationship between the teachers and the students and even worsen the problem.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter deals with the overall summary of the thesis. It presents the summary of major tasks carried out, the conclusions drawn and possible recommendations.

5.1 Summary

The study was carried out to explore different types of students' EFL classroom disruptive behaviour at Engibi Bedele secondary school and how teachers respond to those behaviours so that a workable and effective solution may be found and recommended.

In particular, the purposes of the study were to:

- Identify the major EFL classroom disruptive behaviours of students.
- Find out the dominant factors that contribute to the students' EFL classroom disruptive behaviour.
- Identify groups or categories of students that are more disruptive.
- Find out the practice of teachers coping mechanisms with the EFL classroom disruptive behaviour of students.

In order to attain the above research objectives, relevant data were gathered through questionnaire, interview, and classroom observation and focused group discussion from one hundred seventy six students and four teachers. The quantitative data obtained through questionnaire were analyzed with the aid of descriptive statistics such as frequency, percentage and mean. The data obtained from the open-ended questionnaires' item, interviews, observation and focus group discussion were analysed qualitatively.

The results of the study revealed that murmuring, not bringing text book, whispering, mocking, changing seat without asking permission, being late for class, not doing assigned tasks, laughing at classmates when they try to speak in English, cheating on test and exams and excessive chatting of students with their friends were the ten major disruptive behaviours observed in EFL classrooms. The research also found out that moving seat, jostling, working on different subjects than the one being taught, not keeping turn while talking, using cell phone during lesson, entering and leaving classroom without asking permission as frequently happening disruptive behaviours among students of EFL classrooms.

The findings of the study also indicated that the students' indifference to learning in general, and to learning English language in particular, their attitude towards English Language, attention seeking, ignorance to classroom rules, boredom, peer pressure, high level of lesson presentation, lack of teacher-student rapport, teachers' inconsistencies in taking corrective measures as the major factors contributing to the students disruptive behaviours in EFL classrooms. Furthermore, loose school's rules, absence of guidance and counselling, lack of parents little follow up of their child's learning, and negative influence from mass media were also noted as important factors causing disruptive behaviour among students.

The study also showed what categories of students are more disruptive. Accordingly, male students, urban residents, slow learners and single parental/orphans were identified as more disruptive than female students, rural residents, fast learner and students who live with both parents.

The results of the study further indicated that the EFL teachers did not use classroom disruptive behaviours preventive and curative strategies effectively. They did not usually act properly on the misbehaviours reflected in the classroom. The teachers also sometimes used ineffective measures such as shouting at the students, making the disruptive students leave the class and sending them to the principals. Furthermore, the teachers did not try to establish classroom code of conduct, did not try to memorise students' name, and rarely monitored pair and group work which could have contributed a lot to maintain classroom discipline, if applied. This implies that little attention was given to the management of classroom disruptive behaviours as a result of which the teaching learning process suffered from misbehaviours of students and teachers' indifference to the problem.

5.2 Conclusions

Based on the discussion of the data, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. The findings on the types of disruptive behaviors revealed that most of the frequently observed misbehavior are those that are highly disruptive the learning teaching process, hence are the major impediments to students' performance.
2. The student's disruptive behaviour in the study area occurs as the related of the students' indifference to learning and lack of ambition, poor school management, poor school-parent

coordination in child learning, and lack of commitment on the side of teachers to take risk in correcting the undesired behaviours.

3. Males, urban, slow learners and single parental or (and) orphans students were identified as more disruptive students than the other category. This indicates that there is a difference with regard to students' disruptive behaviour reflected across sex, place of residence, academic standard and family backgrounds.

4. The results of the study showed that EFL teachers did not use any systematic approach in dealing with the disruptive behaviour of students in their classrooms and often ignored these behaviours. This eventually made them to rely more on their intuition than on strategies and techniques that may have been identified as being helpful in minimizing classroom disruptions.

5.3 Recommendations

Based on the above conclusions, the following recommendations are forwarded to teachers, the school administration, parents, educators and researchers.

1. The results of the study showed that most of the frequently observed disruptive behaviors of students are those that disrupt the learning teaching process. EFL teachers did not use any systematic approach in dealing with the disruptive behaviour of students in their classrooms. This might indicate that teachers were inadequately trained in handling classroom behaviour problems. Therefore,

- In-service training on classroom management strategies is recommended to be provided for teachers.

2. The results of the study also identified the root causes of disruptive behaviours of students in the classroom are absence of guidance and counselling service in the school and the loose school rules and code of conducts. Thus,

- The Municipal Education Office, together with Oromiya Education Bureau, should employ a trained psychological counsellor working in the school so that she/he may play a positive role in guiding the students towards good behaviour.

3. The results of the study indicated that EFL teachers did not use any systematic approach in dealing with the disruptive behaviour of students in their classrooms and often ignored these behaviours. Hence,

- EFL teachers should give time to study their students' disruptive behaviours in order to keep them adjusted to school environment. Teachers should adopt democratic approach towards their students as this enhances good relationship and establishes a working code of conduct.

4. The study also showed that the students' problem behaviours occurred as a result little measures taken on the misbehaving students and poor coordination among concerned bodies. So,

- The school administration, as expected, has to update the regulations of the school regularly and enforce the application of the rules. Moreover, with the combined efforts of all Stakeholders, the appropriate policies and incentives practice can be put into place. Thus, the school, district education office and parent- teachers' association (PTA) committee ought to collaboratively work and hold strong stand against taking corrective measures on students who are impediment to the smooth teaching learning process.
- Educational seminars for parents, teachers and students should be provided on the topics on how to deal with disruptive behaviour highlighting its impacts, remedies and consequences

5. Further research needs to be carried out on disruptive behaviour of students on a large scale to get a wider and deeper understanding of its prevalence, its impact on the teaching learning process and ways in which the behaviours can be handled.

References

- Ali, A. and Gracey, D.(2013).Dealing with Disruptive behaviour in the Classroom: A Case Example of the Coordination between Faculty and Assistant Dean for Academics; *Issues in Information Science Information Technology. Volume 1*, 9-10.
- Amogne A. (2014) Indiscipline Problems of High School Students: the Case of Ethio-Japan Hidassee Secondary School. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 5, 37.
- Best,JW. & Kahn .JV. (1993).*Research in education*. (3rd ed.).New York: Allyn & acon.
- Borg&Gall,(1989) Borg&Gall,(1989) *Educational Research : an introduction* 5th ed. White Plains, NY:Longman
- Carri, J. (2004). *Managing Challenging Behavior: Guidelines for Teachers*: Dublin :Irish National Teachers Organization.
- Charles, C. (2008). *Building classroom discipline (9thed.)*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Clarzio(1980). *Leading the Instructional program: School Leadership*: Eugene: Oregon.
- Cresswell, W.J. (1994). *Research Design: Qualitative and Quantitative Approach*. Thousand Oaks. SAG Publication, Inc.
- Corzo J. (2011) *Understanding and facing Discipline related Challenges in EFL Classroom at Public Schools*, Vol. 13, 62.
- Dornyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistic: Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Methodologies*. Oxford University Press. New Work.
- Emmer, E.T. (1994). *Classroom management for secondary teachers (3rd ed.)*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Fontana, D. (1994). *Managing Classroom Behavior* (2nd ed.). London: Rout ledge.

- Ghazi, S., Shahzada, G. ,Tariq, M. , Khan, A.(2013) .Types and causes of Disruptive Behavior in Classroom at Secondary level in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Pakistan :*American Journal of Educational Research*, 2013, Vol.1, 250-252.
- Grossman, H. (2004). *Classroom behavior management for diverse and inclusive schools*. (3.ed.) Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Harmer, J.(1991). *The Practice of English Language Teaching (3ed.)*. New York. Longman: UK Ltd.
- Information document (2010). *Practical Approach to Behavior Management in the Class: A Handbook for Classroom Teachers in Secondary Schools*. No:086/2010.
- Kothari, C.(2004). *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques*. New Age International(p) limited. Delhi.
- Kyriacou, C. (1997). *Effective Teaching in Schools*. (2nd ed.). Cheltenham: Nelson Thornes.
- Hyman, IA. & Snook,p (2000). *Dangerous school and what you can do about them*. Phi Delta kappan,81:448-501.
- Lewis, CC. (1999). *Beyond the Pendulum: Creating Challenging and Caring Schools*. Phi Delt Kappan.
- Long, M. (2000). *The Psychology of Education*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Michael Sh. (2005). *Risk Factors for Delinquency: An Overview*.
- Moore, G.E. & Camp, W.G. (1979). Why Vocational Agriculture Teachers Leave the Profession: A comparison of perceptions. *The Journal of the American Association Teacher Educators in Agriculture*, 20 (3), 11-18.
- NASP .(2006).*National association of school psychologist: Corporal Punishment (Position statement)* Bethesda MD author.

Ndagi(1985). *Alternative strategies for education London and basic stock*. London: Macmillan

Education

Nunan, D. (1992). *Research Methods in Language Learning*. Cambridge. CUP.

Oliver, R. and Reschly,D. (2007).*Effective Classroom Management: Teacher Preparation and Professional Development*. Washington: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.

Partin, R.(2009). *The Classroom Teaccher'sSurvival Guide (3rd ed.)*. San Francisco:JOSSEY-BASS.

Rahimi, M., & Asadollahi, F. (2012). EFL teachers' classroom management orientations: Investigating the role of individual differences and contextual variables. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*,31, 43-42

Rahimi M. And Karami F. (2015). The role of teachers' classroom discipline in their teaching effectiveness and students' language learning motivation and achievement: *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 3, 57-60.

Rechard, J and Renanda, W.(2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice*. Cambridge:CUP.

Robertson, J. (1996). *Effective Classroom Control*. (3rd ed.). London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Seliger, W.H. and Schohamy, E.(1989). *Second Language Research Methods*. Oxford.OUP

Stephens, P., & Crawley, T. (1994).*Becoming an Effective Teacher*. Cheltenham: Nelson Thornes.

Stronge, J.(2004). *Qualities of effective teachers*. Alexandria: ASCD.

Turanlı, A. S. (1999). *Influence of Teachers' Orientations to Classroom Management on their Classroom Behaviours, Students' Responses to these Behaviours, and Learning Environment in ELT*

Classrooms. Unpublished MA Thesis, Middle East Technical University, Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara, Turkey.

Vaughn, S., & Roberts, G. (2007). Secondary Interventions in Reading: *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 39, 40.

Walters, J. and Frei, S. (2007). *Managing Classroom Behaviour and Discipline*. Corinne Burton: Huntington.

Yuan, X . and Che L. (2012). How to Deal with Student Misbehaviour in the Classroom: *Journal of Education and Developmental Psychology*, Vol. 2, 145-148.

Walker, H. & Ramsey, E. (1995). *Antisocial behavior in school: Strategies and best practices*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Appendix -A

1. Questionnaire filled in by students

Dear students,

I am an MA in TEFL candidate at Adama Science and Technology University and I am conducting research for my thesis. The aim of this study is to find out the major disruptive behavior of students in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Classrooms and teachers' management of the behaviors in Engibi Bedele Secondary School. The study aims at investigating the types and causes of EFL classrooms problems and suggests their possible solutions and recommendations. Hence, your cooperation in giving genuine information will be of great value for the success of the study. Therefore, read each item carefully and consider the overall climate in your classroom as you choose your response.

N.B-All your responses will be kept confidential. No need of writing your name.

Part One- General Information on Personal Data

1. Sex A. male ☐ B. Female ☐
2. Grade level A. 9th ☐ B. 10th ☐
3. Place of residence A. Urban ☐ B. Rural ☐

Part Two- Topical Questions

6. Which groups or categories of students do you think are more disruptive in your classroom?

Compare the groups and tick the correct answer and, justify why?

- A. male students ☐ B. female students ☐ C. equally disruptive ☐ D. I do not know ☐

If your answer is male or female, why-----

- 6.2 A. Urban students ☐ B. Rural students ☐ C equally disruptive ☐ D. I do not know ☐

If your answer is urban or rural, why-----

- 6.3A. Clever students ☐ B. weak students ☐ C. equally disruptive ☐ D. I do not know ☐

If your answer is clever or lazy, why-----

- 6.4 A. Students who have both parents ☐ B. Students lost one or both parents ☐

- C. equally disruptive ☐ D. I don't know ☐

If your answer is A or B, why-----

7. The following ideas are believed to be the main **types of students' misbehavior** manifested in EFL classrooms. Which of the following behaviours are reflected during lesson presentation? Indicate their frequency by putting a “√” in one of the boxes:

No	Behaviours	Frequency (How often they occur)				
		Always	Often	Sometime s	Rarely	never
7.1	Whispering					
7.2	Jostling					
7.3	Mocking					
7.4	Moving seats					
7.5	Changing seats without permission					
7.6	Quarrelling each other					
7.7	Working on a different subject other than the one being taught					
7.8	Not keeping turn					
7.9	Not being responsive					
7.10	Shouting at friends					
7.11	Laughing at classmates when they try to speak in English					
7.12	Calling out					
7.13	Murmuring					
7.14	Disrespecting others					
7.15	Not doing assigned tasks					
7.16	Inattentiveness /daydreaming					
7.17	Not bringing text book					
7.18	Destroying school's property					
7.19	Not being punctual					
7.20	using cell phones during class					

7.21	Using verbal abuse					
7.22	Excessive chatting with friend					
7.23	Leaving or entering classroom without permission					
7.24	Cheating on tests and exams					
7.25	Hitting/ injuring other students					
7.26	Not wearing school uniform					
7.27	Sleeping in class					
7.28	Arguing with the teacher					
7.29	Carrying weapon to school					

Please, I would appreciate any thing you would like to add regarding types of students' misbehaviour manifested in EFL classrooms.

-----8. The following ideas are believed to be the **causes of students' disruptive behavior** in English classrooms. Read each statement carefully and mark your degree of agreement or disagreement to each. The numbers 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 on the scale represent 5= Strongly agree, 4= Agree, 3=undecided, 2=Disagree, 1= Strongly disagree

No	Causes	Respondents' agreement or disagreement with respect to the causes				
		5	4	3	2	1
8.1	Indifference					
8.2	Seeking attention					
8.3	Teacher-student rapport					
8.4	Low level of lesson presented					
8.5	High level of lesson presented					
8.6	Ignorance of classroom rules					
8.7	Large class					

8.8	Attitude towards English lesson					
8.9	Influence of Media					
8.10	Poor parents' follow up					
8.11	Teachers' inconsistency in taking corrective measures					
8.12	Teachers loss of temper					
8.13	Teacher's unfair treatment					
8.14	Boredom					
8.15	Unattractive classrooms					
8.16	Repeating the same class					
8.17	Prevalence of illegal video homes					
8.18	Students are addicted to 'chat'					
8.19	The school's rules are loose					
8.20	Absence of guidance and counselling service					

Would you please write down some ideas you think are causes of students' disruptive behavior in English classes? -----

9. The following statements show **how teachers respond to** disruptive behavior in English classrooms.

Please put a "√" to show your degree of agreement or disagreement to the proposition given.

No	Our English teacher often	Frequency				
		always	often	sometimes	rarely	Never
10.1	reminds us classroom rules					
10.2	monitors pair and group work					
10.3	reacts to every misbehaviour					
10.4	ignores every misbehaviour					
10.5	Shouts at students					
10.6	ridicules and insults students					
10.7	applies physical punishment					
10.8	makes the students leave the class					
10.9	Sends the students to the principals					
10.10	Calls student's by name					

10.11	Warns the student					
10.12	praise for good behaviour					
10.13	Create rapport with the students					

Would you please write down additional points with regards to how teachers respond to students' disruptive behavior in your classes? -----

Thank you!

Appendix-B

2. An interview guide answered by Students

The aim of this study is to investigate the types and causes of EFL classrooms problems and suggests their possible solutions and recommendations. Hence, your cooperation in giving genuine information will be of great value for the success of the study. To this end, the interview items/questions are meant to gather your views/opinions about issue related to misbehaviour and coping strategy in your English classroom. Therefore, carefully consider the overall climate in your classroom as you answer each question.

N.B-All your responses will be kept confidential.

Part One- General Information on Personal Data

1. Sex A. male ☐ B. Female ☐
2. Grade level A. 9th ☐ B. 10th ☐
3. Place of residence A. Urban ☐ B. Rural ☐

An interview guide lines key informants of students

1. What kinds of students' disruptive behaviours are reflected in English classrooms?
2. What impacts do these disruptive behaviours have on the teaching learning process?
3. What kinds of students are liable to disruptive behaviour, and why do you think they are?
4. Of the disruptive behaviours you have experienced so far, which ones are dominant?
5. Why do students exhibit disruptive behaviours?
7. How do teachers cope with students' disruptive behaviours?
8. Do you think your school has a working classroom ground rules? If you do not, why?

Appendix- C

3. An interview guide for focused group discussion participants (teachers)

The aim of this study is to investigate the types of students' disruptive behaviours and their causes. Hence, your cooperation in giving genuine information will be of great value for the success of the study. To this end, the interview items/questions are meant to gather your views/opinions about issue related to misbehavior and your coping strategy in your English classroom. Therefore, I kindly request you to respond to each question in line with your experiences of classroom management N.B- All your responses will be kept confidential.

An interview guide for focused group discussion participants of teachers.

1. What kinds of student disruptive behaviours are reflected in English classrooms?
2. How often do you experience the behaviours?
3. What impacts do these disruptive behaviours have on the teaching learning process?
4. What kinds of students are liable to disruptive behaviour, and why do you think they are? Please, consider sex, place of residence, academic status and family background of students.
5. Of the disruptive behaviours you have experienced so far, which ones are dominant?
6. Why do students exhibit disruptive behaviours?
7. How do you cope with students' disruptive behaviours in your classroom? What kinds of preventive and intervention strategies do you use?

Appendix- D

4. Classroom Observation Checklist

Major classroom disruptive behaviours reflected and teacher's reactions towards the behaviours

Teacher - -----

Days	Disruptive Behaviour the Students reflected	Teacher's reaction towards the behaviours	Comments
Day-One			
Day-Two			
Day-Three			

Appendix- E

Afan Oromo Version of the Questionnaire and interview answered by the Students

1. Bargaaffii Qorannoo barattoota mana barumsaa Ingibii sadarkaa 2ffaan guutamu.

Jaallatamoo barattootaa,

Ani Yunvarsitiiti Saayinsii fi Teknooloojii Adaamaatti kaadhimamaa barataa digirii 2ffaa yoon ta'u yeroo ammaa qorannoo gaggeessaan jira. Kaayyoon qorannoo kanaas amaloota jeequmsa barattootaa gurguddoo daree barnootaa mana barumsaa Ingibii sadarkaa lammaffaa keessatti calaqisan fi malleen barsiisotni jeequmsa kana ittiin too'atan addaan baasuun yaada furmaataa kaa'uufi. Kanaafuu hirmaannaa ati odeeffannoo sirrii kennuun gumaachitu fiixaan ba'iinsa qorannichaatiif bu'aa guddaa qaba waan ta'eef yeroo deebii kennitu haalota daree keessatti calaqisan sirritti xiinxaluun akka guuttu kabajaan si gaafadha.

Hub. Deebii ati kennitu iccitaan qabamee faayidaa qorannoo qofaaf oola. Maqaa kee barreessuun hin barbaachisu.

Kutaa tokkoffaa – Odeeffannoo waliigalaa dhuunfaa

1. Saala A. Dhi ☐ B. Dha ☐
2. Kutaa A. 9^{ffaa} ☐ B. 10^{ffaa} ☐
3. Bakka jireenyaa A. Magaalaa ☐ B. Baadiyyaa ☐

Kutaa lammaffaa- Gaaffilee ijoo

6. Daree kee keessatti garee barattootaa kamtu irraa caalaa jeeqa jettee yaadda? Garee armaan gadii waliin madaalii deebii kenni, akkasumas maaliif jettee akka yaaddu yaada kee kaa'i.

- 6.1 A. barattoota dhiiraa ☐ B. barattoota dubaraa ☐ C. walqixa jeequ ☐ D. Hin beeku ☐

Deebiin kee dhiira ykn dubaraa yoo ta'e, maaliif? -----

- 6.2 A. Barattoota magaalaa ☐ B. barattoota baadiyyaa ☐ C. walqixa ☐ D. Hin beeku ☐

Yoo deebiin kee magaalaa yookiin baadiyyaa ta'e, maaliif? -----

- 6.3 A. barattoota barnootaan cimoo ☐ B. Barattoota barnootaan laafoo ☐ C. walqixa ☐
D. hin beeku ☐

Yoo deebiin kee Cimoo ykn laafoo ta'e, maaliif? -----

6.4 A. Barattoota maatii lamaanu qaban ☐ B. Barattoota maatii tokko ykn lamaanuu hin qabne ☐

C. walqixa jeequ ☐ D. Hinbeeku ☐

Yoo deebiin kee A ykn B ta'e maaliif? -----

7. Amalootni jeequmsaa gabatee armaan gaditti keessatti tarreeffaman daree barnoota wayitii Afaan Ingilizii keessatti ni calaquisuu jedhamee yaadama. Kanneen tarreeffaman keessaa daree keessan keessatti hagam irra deddeebi'anii akka calaqqisan filannoo siif kenname jalatti mallattoo “√” kaa'uun deebii kee agarsiisi.

Lak.	Amaloota	Irra deddeebii (hagam calaqqisu)				Gonku maa
		Yeroo hundaa	Yeroo hedduu	Darbee darbee	Yeoo muraasa	
7.1	Asaasuu					
7.2	waldhiibuu					
7.3	Qoosuu					
7.4	Teessoo sosochoosuu					
7.5	Eyyama male bakka geeddaruu					
7.6	Wal-loluu					
7.7	Barnoota barsiifama jiru dhiisuun waan biraa hojjechuu					
7.8	Darabee eeguu dhiisuu					
7.9	Barsiisaa jalaa callisuu					
7.10	Hiriyaatti dutuu/iyyuu					
7.11	Yeroo barataan A/ Ingiliziin dubbachuu yaalu itti kolfuu					
7.12	Barataa biro waamuu					
7.13	Gumgumuu					
7.14	Namaaf kabaja dhabuu					
7.15	Hojii kennamef hojjechuu diduu					
7.16	Hordofuu diduu/yaadaan baduu					

7.17	Kitaaba dhiisanii dhufuu					
7.18	Qabeenya M/B mancaasuu					
7.19	Barfatanii dhufuu					
7.20	Moobaayilii tutuquu/iyyisiisuu					
7.21	Mana biro arrabsuu					
7.22	Hiriyaa wajjin odeessuu					
7.23	Oso hin eyyamsiisin daree seenuu ykn daree ba'uu					
7.24	Battallee fi Qormaata walirraa hatuu					
7.25	Meeshaa walitti darbachuu					
7.26	Barattoota biroo rukutuu/madeesu					
7.27	Uffata seeraa uffachuu diduu					
7.28	Daree keesatti rafuu					
7.29	Barsiisaatti falmuu					
7.30	Meeshaa miidhaa geessisan fiduu					

Maaloo, amala jeequmsaa barattootaa daree barnootaa wayitii A/ Ingiliziitti calaqisan kan birraa yoo jiraate bakka duwwaa armaan gadii akka tarreessitu kabajaan sin gaafadha. -----

8. Yaadonni armaan gadii gabatee keessatti tarreeffaman amala jeequmsa barattootaa daree barnootaa wayitii A/ Ingiliziitti calaqqisaniif sababa ta'u jehamanii amanamu. Atis yaadota kana of-eeggannoon dubbisuun sadarkaa waliigaluu fi waliigaluu dhiisuu kee lakkoofsa kenname jalatti mallattoo“√” agarsiisi. Lakkoofsonni kennaman 5= Sirritin waligala 4=Waliingala 3=murteessuu hin danda'u 2=Waliihingalu 1= Goonkumaa waliihingalu

T/I	Sababoota	Sadarkaa sababoota kennamanirratti walii galuu ykn waliigaluu hafu				
		5	4	3	2	1
8.1	Barataan fedhii barumsaa dhabuu					

8.2	Xiyyeeffannoo barbaacha					
8.3	Haalaa barsiisaan itti barsiisu gaarii ta'uu hafuu					
8.4	Walitti dhufeenyi barsiisaa fi barataa laafuu					
8.5	Barsiisaan barnoota salphisee dhiyeessuu					
8.6	Barnootni galuufii hafu/ itti cimuu					
8.7	Seera ittiin bulmaata daree wallaaluu					
8.8	Baay'achuu barattootaa					
8.9	Jibbiinsa barnoota A/ Ingilizii					
8.10	Dhiibbaa miidiyaaa adda addaa					
8.11	Hordoffiin maatii laafaa ta'uu					
8.12	Barsiisaan walitti fufiinsaan too'achuu hafuu					
8.13	Barsiisaan aarii qabaachuu					
8.14	Barsiisaan barattoota hunda walqixa adabuu					
	dadhabuu					
8.15	Barataan nuffuu					
8.16	Dareen barnoota mijataa ta'uu hafuu					
8.17	Barsiisaan guyyaatti al-lama deebi'ee barsiisuu					
8.18	Manni fiilmii seeraan alaa babal'achuu					
8.19	Barataan araada caatiin qabamu					
8.20	Hodoffii fi too'annaan barattootaa akka mana barumsichaatti laafaa ta'uu					

Maaloo,yaadota biroo daree barnootaa wayitii A/ Ingiliziitti amala jeequmsa barataaf sababa ta'a jettee amantu yoo jiraate bakka duwwaa armaan gadii irratti tarreessi.

9. Yaadonni armaan gadii haala barsiisaan tokko daree barnootaa itti hoogganuu qabu kan agarsiisanu dha.Yaadota kaa'aman sirriitti dubbisuun barsiisaa kee wayitii A/ Ingiliziitti hagam akka irra deddeebi'ee raawwatu sadarkaaa waliigaltee kee mallattoo “√” kaa'uun agarsiisi.

No	Barsiisaan A/Ingilizii keenya	Irra deddeebii				
		Yeroo hundaa	Yeroo hedduu	Darbee darbee	Yeoo muraasa	Gonku maa
10.1	Seera daree nu yaadachiisa					
10.2	Hojii garee fi cimdii ni too'ata					
10.3	amala jeequmsaa hunda too'ata					
10.4	amala jeequmsaa xixiqqo ni dhiisa					
10.5	Barattootatti duta					
10.6	Barattoota arabsuun salphisa					
10.7	Barattoota rukuta					
10.8	Barattoota jeeqan gad baasa					
10.9	Barattoota hoggantootatti erga					
10.10	Barattoota maqaa isaaniin ni waama					
10.11	Barattoota akeekkachiisa					
10.12	Barataa amala gaarii ni galateeffata					
10.13	Barattoota ni sodaachisa					
10.14	Barattootatti haaloo qabata					
10.15	Sababa barattootni muraasni jeeqaniif barataa hunda adaba					

Maaloo,haala barsiisaan kee wayitii A/Ingiliziitti amala jeequmsa barattootaa ittiin too'atu kan biraa yoo jiraate bakka duwwaa armaan gadii irratti barreessi.

Galatoomaa!

Appendix- F:

2. Afgaaffii Qorannoo Barattootaaf Qophaa'e

Kaayyoon qorannoo kanaa amaloota jeequmsaa gurguddoo daree barnootaa wayitii A/Ingilizii mana barumsaa Ingibii sadarkaa lammaffaa keessatti calaqisan fi malleen barsiisotni jeequmsa kana ittiin too'atan addaan baasuun yaada furmaataa kaa'uufi. Kanaafuu hirmaannaa ati odeeffannoo sirrii kennuun gumaachitu fiixaan ba'iinsa qorannichaatiif bu'aa guddaa qaba. Kanaafuu afgaaffiin kun kan qophaa'eef yaadota dhimmoota amala jeequmsa barattootaan wal qabate fi haala hooggansa daree barsiisotaa addaan baasuufi dha waan ta'eef yeroo beebii kennitu haala daree barnootaa wayitii A/Ingilizii yaada keessa galchuun akka naaf deebistu kabajaan si gaafadha.

Hub- Deebii ati kennitu iccitaan qabamee faayidaa qorannoo qofaaf oola.

Kutaa 1ffaa- Odeeffannoo waliigalaa

1. Saala A. Dhi ☐ B. Dha ☐
2. Kutaa A. 9^{ffaa} ☐ B. 10^{ffaa} ☐
3. Bakka jireenyaa A. Magaalaa ☐ B. Baadiyyaa ☐

Kutaa 2ffaa-Afgaaffii barattootaaf

1. Amala jeequmsaa barattootaa akkamiitu wayitii A/Ingiliziitti daree keessatti calaqisa?
2. Amalli jeequmsaa kun adeemsa baruu barsiisuu irratti miidhaaa akkamii geesisuu danda'a ?
3. Barattoota akaakuu akkamiitu irra guddaa amala jeequmsaa calaqqisiisaa, maaliif jettee yaadda? Fkn Dhiira fi dubara, magaalaa fi baadiyyaa ...kkf
4. Amala jeequmsa barattootaa hanga yoonaatti argite keessaa isaan kamfaatu ijoo dha ?
5. Sababootni barattootti amala jeequmsaa calaqqisiisaniif maal fa'i jettee yaada?
6. Barsiisaan kee maloota ykn tooftaalee akkamiitiin amala jeequmsa barattootaa taa'ata?

Galatoomaa!

Appendix- G

Transcriptions of Responses of Students' Interview

Interview one

Key: **R= Researcher**

S1=Student one

R= Researcher

Q1. What kinds of students' disruptive behaviours are reflected in your classroom during English Language teaching Period?

S1:

In our classroom, the kind of disruptive behaviour reflected in English language period are murmuring, talking to friends continuously, leaving the classroom, moving seats, not bringing their textbook and leaving the classroom to borrow textbook from other classes are the major ones. In addition, laughing to students when they try to speak in English, using cell phones during class, not coming to school on time and changing seat are also reflected in our classroom during lesson presentation. These problems are more serious when two or more classroom students are mixed.

R= Q2. What impacts do these disruptive behaviours have on the teaching learning process?

S1:

The disruptive behaviours of students have a negative impact on the teaching learning process. First, it spoils the good relationship that exists between the teacher and the students. Hence, it results in poor achievement of the students' mark. It also makes the other students i.e., who were not disruptive, unable to learn when the teacher sometimes leaves the class because of the problem disruptive students create. In addition, when the class becomes chaos due to the disruptive students, other students may hate the language and language classrooms.

R= Q3. What kinds of students are liable to disruptive behaviour and why do you think they are?

S1:

In our classroom, male students are more disruptive than female students even though the females also sometimes reflect disruptive behaviour. In addition, urban students reflect behaviours more than rural ones. I think urban students consider themselves as all-knowers and try to boast over the rural ones. Furthermore, urban students are near to different media and are influenced by them. I do not know if students who have both parents or single parental/ orphans are more disruptive. However, I think slow learners reflect disruptive behaviours more than the clever students.

R= Q4 *Of the disruptive behaviours you have experienced, which ones are the dominant?*

S1:

The same kind of disruptive behaviours are not always repeatedly reflected in the classroom. However, the dominant ones are disruptive talking to their friends, murmuring at the desk, and excessive moving in the classroom to share text books with others, changing seat, not being punctual, and inattentiveness the usually reflected in the classroom.

R= Q5 *Why do students exhibit disruptive behaviour?*

S1:

I think the students exhibit disruptive behaviour for different reasons. In our classroom, the students exhibit disruptive behaviours when they hate the teacher and the lesson for several reasons. Most students do not like learning English because they said that it is difficult to learn and it is not their mother tongue. Some other students exhibit disruptive behaviour because they are careless and go not have bright future. On our teacher's side, for example, when the he does not teach well and does not take corrective measures to maintain classroom discipline the students begin acting differently. Our English teacher does not react to misbehaviours in the classroom. He simply stays at the front and write short note or try to explain the lesson but most students do not listen to him. The students simply do what they wish. In addition, there is no good relationship between the teacher and the students. Our teacher does not want to understand the students' problems and why they reflect the disruptive behaviours. He does not personally ask the disruptive student and advice him/her.

R= *How does your teacher cope with students' disruptive behaviour?*

Q6 S1:

Our English teacher seems to ignore the disruptive behaviour of students reflected in the classroom. The students do whatever they wish. We were not told what to do and what not to do. Our teacher sometimes shouts at the students and forces them to leave the class. He also sometimes leaves the class without conducting the lesson when he becomes angry at the students. We do not have a classroom ground rule for English period but we were told the school rules only once at the beginning of the academic year.

Interview Two

Key: R=Researcher

S2=Student Two

R: *Q1. What kinds of students' disruptive behaviours are reflected in your classroom during English Language teaching?*

S2 :

The kind of disruptive behaviour I usually observe in English language teaching classroom are whispering, laughter, changing seats, coming late to class, not bringing their text book, excessive talking to his/her fellow student, refuse to respond to the teacher and watching photos/ videos on their cell phone are reflected.

R: *Q2. What impacts do these disruptive behaviours have on the teaching learning process?*

S2:

When the students disrupt in the classroom, other students face difficulties to listen to the teacher. It also creates conflict between the teacher and the students.

R: *Q3. What kinds of students are liable to disruptive behaviour and why do you think they are?*

S2:

I think male students are more disruptive than female students because they usually rely on their strength. In addition, in my opinion, urban students are more disruptive than their rural counterparts. Urban students seem to dominate the rural ones because they consider themselves as if they are more civilized than rural students. As to whether clever students or slow learners are more disruptive, as I observed, slow learners are more disruptive than clever ones. The reason, in my opinion, is that slow learners do not have vision, and they wrongly convinced themselves that they could not understand the lesson being taught. I do not know whether students who have both parents or single parental/orphans are more disruptive

R: *Of the disruptive behaviours you have experienced, which ones are the dominant?*

Q4 S2:

The dominant disruptive behaviour reflected in our classroom during English language lesson are most students excessively talk to their friends, murmur at desk, do not bring their text book but move to other students to share with them when an activity is given or during reading lesson or they often leave the classroom to borrow books from other classes.

R: Q5 .Why do students exhibit disruptive behaviour?

S2:

The students exhibit disruptive behaviour because, I think, they developed the sense of ‘I can’t’. They do not try to pass through different challenges and they easily loss hope. In addition, the students reflect the disruptive behaviour when our teacher does not properly conduct the lesson. Furthermore, I think, a little parental follow up about their children. Most students exhibit disruptive behaviour when what was being taught was not clear for them. When they are unable to understand what the teacher was saying, they start doing things like writing notes of another subject. Our English teacher does not translate the lesson in to our mother tongue because he can’t speak Afan Oromo.

R: Q6 How does your teacher cope with students’ disruptive behaviour?

S2:

Our English teacher sometimes advices disruptive students when they reflect the behaviours. However, most of the time, he becomes angry and shouts at the students. We do not have classroom ground rules for English lesson but as a school, there are several rules we are expected to follow.

Interview Three

Key: R= Researcher

S3=Student Three

R: Q1.What kinds of students’ disruptive behaviours are reflected in your classroom during English Language teaching?

S3:

The kind of disruptive behaviours reflected in our classroom during English classroom lesson presentation are inattentiveness, undermining teachers, moving in the classroom, laughter, whispering, murmuring, not bringing their text book, and not doing home works and class works are reflected. In addition, the students sometimes leave the class for no reason and stay outside. They also come to school late and copy others assignments.

R: Q2. What impacts do these disruptive behaviours have on the teaching learning process?

S3:

When the students exhibit disruptive behaviours, the classroom become noisy and other students cannot hear what the teacher is saying. Hence, a little learning takes place. In addition, when students act impolitely towards the teacher, he may not teach us properly as he used to be. Besides, the students’

disruptive behaviour may spoil the relationship of the teacher and the students which may affect the learning teaching process.

R: Q3. *What kinds of students are liable to disruptive behaviour and why do you think they are?*

S₃:

The kinds of students liable disruptive behaviour are female students. Female students are easily deceived by minor satisfactions like using mobile phones. On the other hand, urban students seem to disrupt than rural ones even though rural students sometimes exhibit disruptive behaviours. Urban students more exposed to several media and action films that exposes them to act differently. In our classroom, slow learners are most often disruptive than clever students because slow learners do not have goals as they loss hope easily and few clever students exhibit disruptive behaviour.

R: Q4 *Of the disruptive behaviours you have experienced, which ones are the dominant?*

S₃:

The disruptive behaviours I have experienced the dominant ones are excessive talking to friends, murmuring, not bringing their text book, and not doing assigned tasks are the main I usually observe. In addition, most students mostly come to class late, always copy other students' assignments and leave the classroom to borrow text book from other classes as they do not bring their own.

R: Q5 .*Why do students exhibit disruptive behaviour?*

S₃:

In my opinion, the students' indifference and holding the sense of 'I can't' is the major one. Most disruptive students are those who are usually careless and lack their parents' supervision. It seems they come to school to disrupt and consider coming to school as their leisure time activity. On the other hand, students disrupt when the teacher does not teach well because of lack of knowledge on what he is teaching. Our English teacher sound is inaudible, so the students rarely listen to him and usually talk private issues rather than listening to him. Moreover, our English teacher does not teach us additional lesson other than what is on the text book. He usually directly copy from the text book to the blackboard and explain it. This makes the lesson boring and the students begin to misbehave. Our English teacher tries to take corrective measures against disruptive students. He sometimes advises us not to disrupt but none of the students accept his advice because they knew that he not serious to maintain classroom discipline.

R: Q6 *How does your teacher cope with students' disruptive behaviour?*

S3:

Our English teacher does not care whatever behaviour the student exhibit. He does not try to maintain peace and orderly classroom. When there is a group work, large number of students gathers at one place to share books with others because many of them usually do not bring their text book with them. The teacher often spend most of his time giving instruction to each group as most of them do not listen to the teacher when he gives directions how to do the group work.

Interview Four

Key: R= Researcher

S3=Student Three

Researcher

Q1 *What kinds of students' disruptive behaviours are reflected in your classroom during English Language teaching?*

S4= In our classroom, the disruptive behaviours reflected are refusing to do class work or homework, not listening to the teacher, giving the teacher a nick name, not bringing their textbook, talking to their friends while the teacher is in the classroom are the major ones. In addition, some students deliberately laugh or yawn to disturb the class and some students work on other subjects other than the one being taught.

R: Q2= *What impacts do these disruptive behaviours have on the teaching learning process?*

S4= disruptive behaviours have different impacts on students to learn and teachers to teach. On the students side it affects the students achievement as there is no or little learning takes place when students disrupt. The students hardly hear what the teacher is saying. On the teacher side, he may spend most of his time dealing with those disruptive students and may not cover the portion in time.

R: Q3= *What kinds of students are liable to disruptive behaviour and why do you think they are?*

S4=

In our classroom, as I observed so far male students are more disruptive than female students. I think male students are less disciplined than female ones as the culture of society on the females to behave well whereas males' aggressiveness is considered as natural. In addition, urban and slow learners are also more disruptive than rural and clever counterparts respectively. In my opinion, urban students are exposed to different media channels that makes them act differently and the slow learners do not have bright future.

R: Q4. *Of the disruptive behaviours you have experienced, which ones are the dominant?*

S4= Of the disruptive behaviours I observed, the most common ones are talking friends excessively, not doing assigned tasks, murmuring, not listening to the teacher and doing other things other than the teachers tells them.

R: Q5= *Why do students exhibit disruptive behaviour?*

S4= Most students exhibit disruptive behaviour when what was being taught was not clear for them. When they are unable to understand what the teacher was saying, they start doing things like writing notes of another subject. In addition, some students disrupt when they hate the lesson and the teacher as well for some reason. Other students misbehave because they have bright future and give little attention to learning English language.

R: Q6= *How does your English teacher cope with students' disruptive behaviour?*

S4 = When the students misbehave, our teacher usually warns the students. If they keep on misbehaving, he may ask them to leave the class or shout at them. Sometimes he asks the students to bring their parents or he makes them sign not to repeat it again. He also sometimes send the disruptive students to the principals.

Interview Five

Key: **R= Researcher**

S5=Student Five

Researcher

Q1 *What kinds of students' disruptive behaviours are reflected in your classroom during English Language teaching*

S5: The kinds of students' disruptive behaviours reflected during in English lesson are disruptive talking, not doing assigned tasks like home work or class work, moving in the classroom without permission, standing in the middle of classroom, not paying attention when the teacher is teaching are the major ones.

R: Q3. *What kinds of students are liable to disruptive behaviour and why do you think they are?*

S5: The kinds of students liable to disruptive behaviours are especially those who have goals and visions. Most slow learners, male students and students from urban centres are more disruptive than others.

R: Q5= *Why do students exhibit disruptive behaviour?*

S4: Students may disrupt due to different factors. Most students disrupt for they come to school for no good purpose. They come to school without aims and ambitions. They do not want to learn because they come to school to satisfy their parents need. Some others may have parental or/and economical problems. The students also exhibit problem behaviour when they could not understand what is being taught or when they did not like the teacher the language.

R: Q6= *How does your English teacher cope with students' disruptive behaviour?*

S4 = When the students misbehave, our teacher tries to maintain classroom discipline. However, the students often do not listen to him. Therefore, he most often ignores the problem. He does not take corrective measures on misbehaving students, so the students usually disrupt and do not obey the teacher.

Appendix- H

Classroom Observation Result - Teacher One

Major classroom disruptive behaviours reflected and teacher's reactions towards the behaviours

Days	Disruptive Behaviour the Students reflected	Teacher's reaction towards the behaviours	Comments
Day-One	Came late to class, changed seat, talked to friends excessively, argued with friends, inattentiveness, left the classroom to fetch textbook, laughed at other students when they try to speak in English,	No reaction at all. He sat at his desk and checked their exercise books. Then, he wrote the answer on the blackboard and continued teaching. He did not call any student by name.	He should have told them to keep quiet. He also should have established a classroom ground rules to follow
Day-Two	Murmured, moved seats, inattentiveness, changed seat, talked to friends excessively, moved to other student to share text book, handled over materials.	Standing near the blackboard, he told them to keep quiet only once and continued teaching. However, the students kept on making noises. He did not call any student by name.	He should have approached the disruptive students and talked to them to stop their disruptive talking
Day-Three	Whispered, inattentiveness, talked to friends excessively, Came late to class, jostled each other, irresponsiveness, not doing assigned task, calling out.	Entered the classroom and started writing short note. He didn't ask them to stop making noise. Some students were talking each other while he is teaching. He did not call any student by name.	He should have maintained the classroom discipline before starting the lesson.

Classroom Observation Checklist- Teacher Two

Major classroom disruptive behaviours reflected and teacher's reactions towards the behaviours

Days	Disruptive Behaviour the Students reflected	Teacher's reaction towards the behaviours	Comments
Day-One	talked to friends excessively, left the classroom to fetch textbook, entered classroom without asking permission, whispered at the desk, threw objects,	Spent most of time standing in front of the students and lecturing He shouted and warned one of the misbehaving student. He did not call any student by name.	He should have moved around the classroom and towards the disruptive students and give them signal. No established ground rule posted

Day-Two	Came late to class, inattentiveness, left the classroom to fetch textbook, refused to do assigned task, reacted dishonestly towards the teacher.	It was reading lesson and he wrote the topic on the blackboard. He asked them to read and several students gathered to share books. When the students left to fetch text book he said nothing to them. He did not call any student by name.	He should have made the students bring their textbook with them. Reading lesson should be given individually or in pairs.
Day-Three	Changed seat, disruptive talking, inattentiveness, talked to other student through the window, handled materials to other student through the window, murmured at the desk.	He sat at his desk and checked their homework. Many students surrounded him and he didn't tell the disruptive students to keep quiet.	He should have told checked their exercise book at their desk maintaining eye contact with them.

Classroom Observation Results -Teacher Three

Classroom disruptive behaviours reflected and teacher's reactions towards the behaviours

Days	Disruptive Behaviour the Students reflected	Teacher's reaction towards the behaviours	Comments
Day-One	Came late to class, talked to friends excessively, left the classroom to fetch textbook, did not listen to the teacher & talked private issues, refused do assigned tasks.	It was a group work lesson and he told them to do in groups. He sat at the front desk and started reading his book. There was much noise and he didn't monitor the groups. He did not call any student by name.	He should have monitored the groups and facilitated the discussion to minimise disruptions. No established ground rule posted.
Day-Two	Entered classroom without asking permission, not keeping turn, laughed at other students when they try to speak in English, calling out, changed seat without permission, refused do assigned tasks, came to class late	He didn't say anything to those entered classroom without permission. But advised the students not to laugh at the student who tried to speak in English. He did not call any student by name	He should have asked the late comers why they were late and advice them not to repeat it again. It was interesting that he advised those who laughed at the students tried to speak in English.

Day-Three	Left the classroom to fetch textbook, inattentiveness, murmured at the desk, mocked(imitated the teacher), talked to friends excessively,	He was giving a short note on grammar topic. He didn't try to stop them making a noise. He finished writing and started explaining the lesson. Some students were still talking to each other. He called some students by name when he wanted to ask question.	He should have glanced back at the students meanwhile. He also should have obtained all the students attention before starting explaining the lesson. It was interesting that he tried to study their names.
-----------	---	---	--

Appendix- I

Transcriptions of focus group discussion

Key: R= Researcher T1= Teacher one T2= Teacher two T3= Teacher three

R- Q1. What kinds of student disruptive behaviours are reflected in English classrooms?

T1- Well, the problem of disruptive behaviour of students is, now days, has been increasing especially in the actual classroom setting. From the fact that it is ongoing event, its power to distract the peaceful learning teaching process is profound. As English is a foreign language for the students, they need to be secured and feel freedom when they learn it. Second, the disruption also comes not only from the classroom but reflected from outside the classroom by other classes of students. When we consider the disruption that arise from within the classroom, not bringing their exercise book, inattentiveness, lack of targeted goal, not brining their textbook, not wearing their uniform, murmuring at large and imitating female or males sound are some to mention.

T2. Well, thank you for the chance first and to add some more, the students make high noise. When there is a pair and group work, the students make noise to borrow things from their classmates. Others move out of the class to borrow textbooks because many of them do not bring their textbook with them. When I tell them it would be checked, those students who do not have the text book, moves to the other students to share the book him/her. Thus, it is hard to maintain the classroom discipline. This will affect the teaching learning process in advance. When the students move from their seat, they even do not ask permission. In addition, as their interest is very little for learning, they usually copy others students work and they do not do their own.

T3. The disruptive behaviour that mostly reflected in EFL classroom is that, the students usually whisper. This especially chronic when a pair works is given and the students use this opportunity to disrupt. On the other hand, when a group work is given they usually do not ask the teacher. They ask their talk to friends to ask them and this give them the chance to make noise. Disruptive students always disrupt and when I turn back to the blackboard to write a short note, they move in the classroom. In EFL class, telling the students to do something means is opening a door for them to disrupt.

R-Q2 What impacts do these disruptive behaviours have on the teaching learning process?

T2= The students' disruptive behaviour has a negative impact on teaching learning process. For instance, when noise occurs, the students' attention is shifted towards it makes them unable to concentrate on their learning. Thus, it distracts the smooth flow of the lesson, hurts the motivated students and consumes considerable teachers' teaching time.

T3= The problem that disruptive behaviour of students create can be seen from two angles. First, when students reflect disruptive behaviour in my classroom, it usually hurts my motivation I cannot teach as effectively as I prepared myself to conduct the lesson. Secondly, there are students who have interest and motivation to learn. When I take time to deal with those disruptive students, students those who have interest usually lose their time to learn most effectively. Therefore, disruptive behaviours of students have a negative impact not only on the teacher who teaches but also on the students who have interest to learn.

T1- To add some more impacts, I see the problem from two directions. First, when I deal with the disruptive behaviour of students, I can't go along with those students on the right track. This is a great burden. Second, when disruptive behaviour occurs, the teacher stops the teaching learning process and starts negotiating them to involve them in the lesson. Thus, he invests considerable time dealing with them. Therefore, this results in failure of the objectives of the lesson. Students come to school to learn two things. These are skill and knowledge, and when the disruptive behaviour of students is reflected in the classroom, the students learn neither of these two.

R=Q3 What kinds of students are liable to disruptive behaviour, and why do you think they are?

Please, consider sex, place of residence, academic status and family background of students.

T1- Most disruptive students in my classroom are low achievers. High achievers don't usually reflect undesired behaviour. One way or another, low achievers do not want the class go smoothly. Even though high achievers want go the classroom go smoothly, they are usually influenced by the low achievers when the number of low achievers gradually increases. Many disruptive students in my classrooms are single parental. They have lost either of their parents or both. These students are economically unsecured because their parents' income is very low and they usually lack self esteem. Thus, they consider the classroom as a battle field. They lack motivation due to the problem they have. Therefore, they act in the classroom in the way that pleases them. They do not have aspiration to score good mark. The do not accept the 'no pain; no gain' principle.

T2- From my long period of teaching experience, comparing male and female, males are more disruptive than females. Female students do not character of misbehaving from their nature. When I compare slow learners or low achievers to clever ones, slow learners most often reflect disruptive behaviour in my classroom. The slow learners usually have the target to disrupt and they strive to achieve this. However, the clever students usually ask questions and even in the absence of the teacher they try to read their books and hence they do not disrupt. The disruptive students are those do not have goals and bright future to go to preparatory schools, universities and the like.

T3= In my classroom, the low achiever students usually disrupt because they do not have goals and vision. They simply come to school because their parents send them to go. Most of them do not have text books and exercise books so do have what to do. Hence, they disrupt. Comparing rural and urban students, I think, rural students are more disruptive because they are not under their parents supervision. The main cause for the disruptive behaviour students in our school is loss of interest.

R-Q4. Why do students exhibit disruptive behaviours?

T1= For the cause of disruptive behaviour of students, the following are responsible: Teachers, the school, parents of the students and the community. There is a little follow up of parents about their children. They are also indifferent about their children's learning and this can be taken as the major cause for the students to disrupt. Regarding the school, there are no facilities in the school compound like good tearoom, bread, shop...etc. On the other hand, there is no trained psychological counsellor serving for the school to build the students' self esteem. Only the teachers are struggling with the problem and there is no contribution of parents, guards, the school and others. The other problem is, the school rule is loose. The students are not receiving corrective measures whatever problem they create. The school rules and measures being taken are powerless and not stringent to maintain discipline. The school administration usually identifies the low income standard students to support but in practice nothing existed. They were not even given a pen or exercise books. Generally, the school seems to ignore the problem because no measures are being taken when the students habitually come to school late and jump over the fence of the school.

T2- To add some more, the school administration is not taking corrective measures on the undisciplined students. Whenever the teachers had conflicts with these students, the school administration usually tries to arbitrate between the teachers and the misbehaving student rather than taking corrective measures. The school makes the student sign five to six times not to repeat his bad behaviour.

7. How do you cope with students' disruptive behaviours in your classroom? What kinds of preventive and intervention strategies do you use?

T2- When the students disrupt repeatedly, I usually advice them. If they continued making problems make them to sign not to repeat and do nothing other than this.

T3- I identify the disruptive students and advice them. If they repeat the same problem, I make them to sign not repeat again. Lastly, when they insist on making troubles, I make them to come with their parents and discuss with them about the problem. I usually skip minor problems.

R- Q Do you have a ground rule or code of conduct for English classroom?

T1- To minimize the movement of students, I recently have established a ground rule to make the students bring their exercise book. Now, they have started bringing their text book. However, not many of them are bringing and there is still a problem existing.

T2- Ground rules are very necessary for English classroom lessons. The text book itself also orders to have a ground rule. I used to use a ground rule written on a small board five years ago but it had no hole to hang on the wall and the other shift students tore it. I used to make the students write on their text book but I usually forget to remind them and I no longer use it now.

T3- I do not have a ground rule for English classroom because I didn't realize it was important.

R-Q Have you ever received any seminar or workshop on how to deal with the disruptive behaviours of students in EFL classroom?

T1- Classroom management skill is very important for a teacher to conduct his/ her lesson smoothly because management is a systematic arrangement of something. If a teacher has no knowledge how to manage students' behaviour, he/ she face problem to convey the instructional content. This may hurt the students and the teacher himself as well. I have worked for thirty years as teacher but I have never received any seminar or workshop on classroom management skill.

T2- I have never received any training or seminar on classroom management skill. However, when once I took English language improvement program, I was trained on a classroom management skill as one part of focus area in the module.

T3- I have never received a special training on classroom management. But when I was in the university I took a methodology course and I had chance to get the skill of classroom management in that course.

R- Lastly, I appreciate if you would like to say something concerning the disruptive behaviour of students in EFL classroom at our school.

T1- The problem of disruptive behaviour of students is not only the concern of EFL teachers. The teachers' indifference to the problem is worsening the condition. They do not tend to change the behaviours; they are reluctant and not determined to solve the problem but we are within the problem. Not only English teachers but also other teachers of the school should be responsible and committed. Parents should follow up their children. The school administration and parents of the students should work together to minimize the problem.

R. I would like to thank you all for your cooperation and scarifying your precious time to take part in this focused discussion.