

TEACHER'S STRATEGIES IN REDUCING STUDENTS' DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIOR IN INDONESIAN EFL CLASSROOM

Umar

Universitas Sulawesi Barat, Indonesia
Email: umar@unsulbar.ac.id

Rahmat Khair

Universitas Sulawesi Barat, Indonesia
Email: rahmatkhair@gmail.com

APA Citation: Umar., & Khair, R. (2022). Teacher's strategies in reducing students' disruptive behavior in Indonesian EFL classroom. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 10(2), 543-554. <https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v10i2.6254>

Received: 02-02-2022

Accepted: 22-04-2022

Published: 30-06-2022

Abstract: The objectives of this research were (1) to explore kinds of students' disruptive behaviors, (2) to find out teacher's strategy in managing students' disruptive behavior, (3) to explore factors causing students' disruptive behavior and (4) to find out the impact of students' disruptive behaviors on students' speaking skill in SELF classroom of a senior high school. This research applied case study design in order to get more understanding about the phenomenon of students' disruptive behaviors. In terms of participant, the researcher focused on observing the SEFL students of eleventh year at SMA Negeri 1 Tinambung, West Sulawesi. There were eleven classes and the researcher took one class purposively. Classroom observation was conducted in order to get the data about kinds of students' disruptive behavior, teacher's strategy in dealing with disruptive behavior, and impact of students' disruptive behavior on students' speaking skill. Moreover, semi-structured interview was used to get factors causing students' disruptive behavior. There are eight kinds of disruptive behavior found in this research along with the new one namely inattention, apathy, moving about the room, annoying others, cheating, needless talk, disrupting (shouting), and exaggeration talk. In order to deal with students' disruptive behavior, the teacher applied some strategies namely, proximity interference, touch interference, signal interference, calling out names, asking questions, request & demands, and psychological punishment. Researcher also found five factors that cause students' disruptive behavior which were classified into three categories namely physiological factor, environmental factors, and social factors and found that that disruptive behavior impacted linguistically on students' speaking skills that covers students' fluency, vocabulary, accuracy, and pronunciation.

Keywords: *disruptive behavior; teacher's strategy; English teaching; English learning; SEFL classroom.*

INTRODUCTION

Disruptive behavior or misbehavior is behavior that violates class rules, demean others, or is otherwise incompatible with legal or social norms of the society. This kind of behavior falls into two categories; student unwillingness to work as directed and students' causing unwarranted distractions (Charles, 2014). Haroun and O'Hanlon (1997) defined disruptive behavior as an activity which caused distress for teachers, which disturbed good order in the classroom, and caused trouble, which led teachers to make continual comments to the students. This behavior is a phenomenon that causes fear and consternation for most teachers. It takes many forms including, disruptive talking, inaudible

responses, sleeping in class, tardiness and poor attendance, failure to do homework, cheating in tests and exams and willingness to speak in the target language (Seli, Syafitri, Oktaviani, 2021). Fact that disruptive behavior in the classroom is an undeniable problem faced by teachers of all generations (Abeygunawardena & Vithanapathirana, 2019). Rivas (2009) believed that the phrase disruptive behavior are synonymous with the word incivility which considered as a rude behavior that disrupt teaching and learning process. In line with this, Feldmann (2001) stated that incivility is any action that interferes with a harmonious and cooperative learning atmosphere in the classroom.

According to Reed and Kirkpatrick (1998), the

term “disruptive” and “misbehaving” are used synonymously. Misbehavior in school is behavior that violence class rules, demeans others, or is otherwise incompatible with the legal norm or social norms of the society. Villafranca, Hamlin, Enns, & Jacobsohn (2017) defined disruptive behavior as behavior that does not show others an adequate level of respect and causes victims or witnesses to feel threatened. Stavnes (2013) also defined disruptive behavior as the behavior that inhibits the students' own learning, the peers learning and/or the teacher's ability to operate efficiently in the classroom.

Based on some definitions of disruptive behavior above, it can be concluded that disruptive behaviors are any unacceptable behaviors that is considered to be rude and impolite that disrupt teaching and learning process. However, it cannot be denied that the teacher still expects that students' behavior can be changed to be better and better (Ardin, 2020).

There are four types of disruptive students' behavior that teachers must deal with. They are called as ABCD of disruptive behavior; aggression, breaking rules, confrontations, and disengagements (Charles, 2014). Aggression refers to the hostile attitude towards others. It can be student to student or even student to teacher. Three types of aggression based on its occurrence are physical aggression, verbal aggression, and passive aggression. Physical aggression refers to the action of hitting, kicking, biting, pinching, pulling, and slapping. Verbal aggression refers to the verbal action such as put-downs, swearing, ridiculing, and name-calling. Passive aggression refers to the stubborn action of refusing to comply with reasonable requests or refuse to take an order.

Disruptive behavior in the classroom is one of the most widely expressed concerns among teachers and school administrators (Duesund & Ødegård, 2018). From the statements, it can be concluded that disruptive behavior may disrupt not only student but also teaching and learning process. The belief is that the presence of disruptive behavior or discipline issues in the classroom negatively affects students learning (Gómez Mármol, Sánchez Alcaraz Martínez, Valero Valenzuela, & De la Cruz Sánchez, 2018) and lowers students' academic performance (Granero-Gallegos, Gómez-López, Baena-Extremera, 2020). Indeed, student misbehaviour negatively affected class time, content, and attitude (Muna, 2019).

If this condition is not handled properly, it will become an obstacle in teaching and learning process. Moreover, students' disruptive behavior is considered to have a direct link with the mental, physical, and emotional well-being of teachers and may deteriorate teachers' ability to educate the students to some extent (Shakespeare, Peterkin, & Bourne, 2018). Factors such as a bad influence from the community, a lack of preparation, and low teaching quality, poor parenting, students' attitude towards learning, and students' emotional and mental problems (Khasinah, 2017) can cause unsuitable behavior in the classroom. It cannot be denied that the different nature of students they bring into the classroom can lead to problems (Vongvilay, Fauziati, & Ratih, 2021). In most cases, children in elementary school may act disruptively because they have less capacity of self-control (Augimeri, Walsh, Donato, Blackman, & Piquero, 2018). But, many has been reported for disruptive behavior may occur in adolescent, between the ages of 10 and 19 years who attend junior high school and senior high school.

In fact, multiple research studies suggested that students' behavioral problem at all levels are influenced by a myriad of factors and educators' responses to these conditions must be based on careful evaluation of each learner's specific circumstance coupled with the educators' roles in the classroom (Simpson, 2022). Furthermore, according to Maazouzi (2017), there are some solutions to students' misbehavior including setting the discipline plan and better classroom management, building more positive interaction and respect, applying more suitable method, and keeping calm and patient. Intervention strategies most often proposed in the literature to combat discipline issues in the classroom are, for example: praising, motivating, or reinforcing students; maintaining a positive/close relationship with students; formulating basic classroom rules at the beginning of the courses; adapting student-centered learning, and frequently changing the seating arrangements (Rafi, Ansar, & Sami, 2020).

Hue & Li (2008) suggested two strategies in dealing with students' disruptive behavior; non-verbal and verbal intervention strategies. When a problem is getting worse or some more disruptive behavior takes place, the teacher has to consider employing non-verbal coping strategies. But, when non-verbal interventions fail to redirect the

students to appropriate tasks, verbal coping skills are needed.

In non-verbal intervention and coping skills proposed by Levin & Nolan (as cited in Hue & Li, 2008), there are four strategies to be employed by the teacher namely planned ignoring, signal interference, proximity interference, and touch interference. Planned ignoring refers to neglecting off-task behavior in a deliberate manner. Disruptive behavior is often reinforced by the attention given to it by the teacher and peers in the classroom, and ignoring it reduces its occurrences. It is suggested that planned ignoring should be confined to those off-task behaviors which create little disturbance in the classroom.

Moreover, if none of the above strategies fail in managing students' disruptive behavior, verbal-intervention strategies are needed. There are six verbal-intervention strategies in managing disruptive behavior proposed by Levin & Nolan (as cited in Hue & Li, 2008) namely praising peers, boosting interest, calling on students, using humor as a tension-breaker, asking questions, and request & demands.

The more frequent disruptive behavior exists in a classroom; the more negative students' outcome can be as the behavior affects the learning process (Kessels & Heyder, 2020). Learning outcomes can be interpreted as a change in behavior as a result of a learning process that includes students' mastery of the knowledge and skills set, after the students through the process of leaning (Khalidiyah, 2015). In the present research, the researcher tried to investigate the students' leaning outcomes especially in speaking skills. Outcomes is extremely important in learning because it helps to show that students are able to take the knowledge that they have learned and apply it. Tutors do play a role in achieving student learning outcomes, but actually students are in control of their learning outcomes (Eriyanto, Roesminingsih, Soedjarwo, Soeherman, 2021). Without outcomes, teachers have no way of knowing that the students understand the information to a level necessary to ensure that they can demonstrate the learning. For example, you can read a chapter from a textbook and you may think that you have retained the information, but the process of writing an essay about the information is much different, and a way to demonstrate what you have learned in a practical way, otherwise completing the reading serves no

purpose.

In the practice, English subjects in junior high school are taught in an integrated manner that includes receptive skills (listening and reading) and productive skills (speaking and writing). In the present study, the researcher tried to analyze students' learning outcome especially in productive skills which is speaking ability.

In measuring speaking ability, there are two main aspects namely fluency and accuracy (Gower, Phillips, & Walters, 1995). Accuracy is concerned with the use of grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation. While fluency is dealing with the ability to keep going when speaking spontaneously.

In fact, a number of studies from educational background have investigated student's disruptive behavior and its handling. The previous researchers, Ardin (2016) only focused on the strategies in decreasing disruptive behavior using interpersonal communication, Wulandari (2011) focused on the analyzing general strategy in dealing with disruptive behavior and investigating the difficulties of the teaching in implementing the strategies, Sufahmiati (2015) only focused in investigating causes and types of students' disruptive behavior, and Pita (2017) only focused in examining teacher's strategies in managing disruptive behavior without analyzing the impact of disruptive behavior on English teaching and learning outcomes of the students. Based on those previous studies, only few studies had given attention to handling students' disruptive behavior in EFL classroom through some strategies and the impact of disruptive behavior on English teaching and learning outcomes especially in speaking skill. This gap needs to be covered by conducting this research.

Considering the facts and the issue in the background, the researcher intended to conduct a research under the title "Teacher's Strategies in Managing Students' Disruptive Behavior in Indonesian SEFL (Speaking English as Foreign Language) Classroom of a Senior High School".

METHOD

In this research, the researcher used case study design to explore the phenomenon of disruptive behavior among students in EFL classroom. In collecting the data, the researcher used passive observation by recording and observing teacher's

strategy and students' disruptive behavior in English teaching and learning process. The result of this research was made in the form of descriptive so the readers can get complete information from the result of this research.

In qualitative research, selecting the sample is the process of selecting the small number of individuals for a study so that the individual chosen would be able to help the researcher understand the phenomenon under the investigation. The purpose is to choose participants who would be good informants who had the ability to be reflective and thoughtful, to communicate effectively with the researcher, and to be comfortable with the researcher.

In order to get the data, this research applied purposive sampling. In purposive sampling, researcher intentionally select individuals and sites to learn or understand the central phenomenon (Creswell, 2013). It means that purposive sampling is a technique of choosing sampling based on specific consideration. The participants of this research were one teacher and six students of senior high school of SMAN I Tinambung, West Sulawesi in academic year of 2019/2020. They were selected purposively based on the criteria that the eleventh grade students of SMAN I Tinambung who are categorized as the most disruptive in the classroom and teacher has experienced students' problem behavior and taught English more than ten years in that school, besides the teacher was a certified teacher, and had obtained master's degree in English Language education.

Observation. The researcher observed teacher's strategies and student's behavior in the classroom during English teaching and learning process. Observation was conducted to get the data about teacher's strategies. The data were collected by using video and/or audio recorder. During the observation, the researcher acted as an external observer in which he was not directly involved in the situation being observed.

Interview. After conducting the observation, the researcher interviewed teacher by using semi-structured interview to collect the data about the cause of students' disruptive behavior and the impact of disruptive behavior on English teaching and learning outcomes of the students.

Data analysis. To analyze the data, the researcher used thematic data analysis proposed by Braun & Clarke (2006). Thematic analysis is the

process of identifying patterns or themes within qualitative data. The goal of a thematic analysis is to identify themes, i.e. patterns in the data that are important or interesting, and use these themes to address the research or say something about an issue. The following are six phases in analyzing the data:

Become familiar with the data. The first step in any qualitative analysis is reading, and re-reading the transcripts. In this step, the researcher has to be very familiar with his entire body of data or data corpus (all the interviews and observation data).

Generate initial codes. After becoming familiar with the data, the researcher generated initial codes. In this step, the researcher started to organize the data in a meaningful and systemic way. Coding reduces lots of data into small chunks of meaning.

Search for themes. A theme is a pattern that captures something significant or interesting about the data and/or research question. As Braun & Clarke (2006) explained, there are no hard and fast rules about what makes a theme. A theme is characterized by its significance. In this step, the researcher examined the codes and some of them clearly fitted together into a theme called "teacher's strategies and students' disruptive behavior".

Review themes. During this step, the researcher reviewed, modified and developed the preliminary themes that has been identified in step 3 whether they make sense or not. At this point it is useful to gather together all the data that is relevant to each theme. In this step, the researcher red the data associated with each theme and considered whether the data really support it.

Define themes. This process involves utilizing the labels created for the theme and providing a comprehensive name that describes the relationship or meaning conveyed in the theme. Once this was completed, the researcher defined the theme according to the content and meaning of the codes. This definition summarizes the content of what is discussed within the theme.

Writing-up. After the themes are defined and named, the researcher wrote up the final report. The researcher also presented the findings and interpretation of the data during this step.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

It is identified that there are eight kinds of

disruptive behavior that occurred regularly during English teaching and learning process. The eight kinds of disruptive behaviors then classified into three categories namely low disruptive behaviors, moderate disruptive behaviors, and high disruptive behaviors. The first finding showed that inattention as disruptive behavior in learning English. Inattentive students tended to looking out of the windows. They said that the reason of doing such a thing was because the distraction that came from outside the classroom such as noisy students hanging around and they often thought about things irrelevant to the lesson. This behavior is categorized as disruptive behavior as it obstructed the teaching and learning process and they did not pay attention to the lesson.



Picture 1. *Inattention*

The picture above displays a student who was sitting in the back looked out of the window. The image depicts the condition where student distracted by some students who was hanging around during the lesson.

The second type of students' disruptive behavior is apathy. Apathetic students tended to refuse to engage during the English teaching and learning process. When teacher asked them to finish the assignment or to participate in English presentation, they tended to refuse or they just remained silent. This condition certainly disrupted the learning process.

T : (shouting) *"duduk! Duduk situ."* (giving student digital dictionary). *"Jadi masing-masing yang punya hp tolong diliat saja kamus di hp nya. Begini tolong duai saja hp nya. Ndak adakah kamus anumu, yg offline."* (Sit down!, Sit there!. So each one of you please look up on your digital dictionary. You can use one phone together. Don't you have an offline dictionary?)

S1 : (laughing)

T : *"ini apa yang dikerja?"* (What are you doing here?)

S1 : (silent)

T : *"ini apa kendalanya ini?"* (What is your problem?)

S2 : *"ndak tau bu."* (Don't know, ma'am)

T : *"tulis problem-mu. Apa problem-mu?"* (Write your problem. What is your problem?)

S2 : (silent)

T : *"ini kamu bagaimana?"* (What about you?)

S3 : (silent)

T : *"tulis apa yang menjadi problem-mu. Apa masalah di sekolah kah, di rumahkah, apa saja yang menjadi masalahmu."*

S : *"tidak tahu bu!"*

Extract 1. *Apathy*

The extract above shows the refuse from the students when the teacher asked them to do their work and some of them remain silent. When the first student was asked to use digital dictionary, he laughed as an act of refuse. This behavior of work refusal is categorized as disruptive as they ignore teacher's directions completely and disengaged from lesson activity. They did not care about doing well in classroom.

The next type of disruption is moving around the room. It considered as disruptive since it may attract other student's attention and even break their focus in learning English. Some students got up from their seats and wandering around without permission. The student was wandering around to bother other students and disrupting the class.



Picture 2. *Moving around*

The picture above depicts the students who moved around without permission and got reprimands from their teacher. It was such a time-consuming for the teacher to address the students who moved and told them to sit down. They also became the center of attention for other students.

The next type of disruptive behavior is annoying others. The most frequently annoyance that the students made is borrowing other student's stuff without permission, such as dictionary, pen,

and phone (digital dictionary). This condition may lead to noise and certainly can distract other students to focus on the lesson.

S1 : (standing) "wee"

T : (pointing) "*mana anumu kah? Apa yang kita cari? Kamus? Mana hp-mu?*" (Where is yours? What are you looking for? Dictionary? Where is your phone?)

S2 : "*nambe hp ta bu.*" (he took my phone, ma'am)

S1 : "*tidak bawa bu.*" (I don't bring it, ma'am)

Extract 2. Annoying others

From the extract above, student who did not have digital dictionary annoyed other student by forcing her to let him borrow the phone (that contains digital dictionary). This condition certainly caused the concentration of other students in learning to be disturbed.

The next is cheating. Cheating is categorized as disruptive behavior since it can obstruct English learning process. The researcher found that students cheated in classroom because they could not think any longer and finish their assignment on time.

T : "*itu, yang itu tadi ditulis, ada Bahasa Inggrisnya, dibawahnya ada translationnya, kemudian ada pertanyaan sebanyak 10 dan jawab baru dikumpul. Tulis nama kelompoknya yah!*" (The task you have written has English and its translation, then it has 10 questions, you have to answer then collect it. Write your group name!)

S : "*iye, bu!*" (Yes, ma'am)

T : "*silahkan! Wee.. apakah? (clapping hands) Kalau sementara belajar ndak usah keluar-keluar! Wee duduk! Duduk! (pointing) apa kau bikin disitu? Kembali ke kelompokmu! Jangan liat pekerjaannya kelompok lain!*" (Please! What? Don't go out! Sit down! Sit! What are you doing there? Go back to your group! Don't look at another group's assignment!)

(Bells are ringing)

T : "*cepat kumpul!*" (Collect it quickly)

Extract 3. Cheating

The extract above depicts the condition where a student went to another group in order to look (cheat) the assignment because his group could not finish the assignment on time. As a result, the other students who involved in the group were not concentrated in doing their work.

The sixth type of students' disruptive behavior is needless talk. Chatting during the English teaching and learning activity is considered

disruptive. They talked about something unrelated to the lesson. This behavior is considered as disruptive as it can obstruct English teaching and learning process. During classroom observation, the researcher also found students who do excessive and impermissible talking. It can shatter their own concentration and the other students as well. It can also cause other students to join in the talking as well.



Picture 3. *Needless talk*

The picture above depicts some students who points at another student while talking. It can be seen from the picture also that other student laughing at it. This condition distracted other students to focus on the learning activity as they joined the needless talking.

The next type of disruptive behavior is disrupting. The act of disrupting such as shouting out during the lesson and laughing inappropriately were the most disrupting that happened in the class. This behavior can be categorized as disrupting. This condition certainly breaks other student's attention. The student who shouted certainly became the center of attention for the others and it certainly break their focus in learning English.

T : "*sampai dimana tadi. Jadi 4 orang 1 kelompok yah. Silahkan dibagi temannya. Mana temanmu?*" (So, 4 members in 1 group. Please divide it. Where is your friend?)

S1 : "*itu disana bu.*" (There she is, ma'am)

T : "*ok silahkan pindah.*" (okay, please move)

T : (pointing at another student) "*kalau kau siapa?*" (What about you?)

S2 : (shouting) "*ini bu!*" (Here, ma'am!)

T : "*coba tolong bergabung sama kelompoknya masing-masing.*" (Please join with your group)

Extract 4. Shouting

The extract above shows that when teacher instructed the students to form in groups, one of them shouted out at her. The student who shouted

certainly became the center of attention for the others and it certainly break their focus in learning English.

During the observation, the researcher found seven strategies that teacher applied to address the disruption. The seven strategies then classified into two categories namely non-verbal intervention and verbal intervention strategies. The first finding shows that teacher used signal interference. There are three kinds of signal interference that teacher used; nodding head, staring students who misbehave, and pointing, but pointing is the most frequently used strategies in coping with disruptive behavior.



Picture 4. *Signal interference*

The picture above depicts that the teacher used signal interference by pointing student who was playing around in his seat and disengaged from English learning.

The next strategy is proximity interference. When students misbehaved, teacher tended to use proximity interference by getting close and approaching them. The teacher closed the distance between herself and the students who acted disruptively. Some students behaved when the teacher addressed their disruptive behavior, but when the teacher walked away, they tended to repeat their behavior again.



Picture 5. *Proximity interference*

Another strategy that teacher applied is touch

interference where the teacher touched the back of her student's shoulder to warn him not to behave badly. She made a non-aggressive physical contact with her student as a way of showing disapproval.



Picture 6. *Touch interference*

The picture above depicts the teacher touched the back of a student's shoulder to address the disruptive behavior. She made a non-aggressive physical contact with her student as a way of showing disapproval. It can be seen that from the picture, the teacher asked the student to move to another seat because he made needless talk with his friends in the back.

The next strategy is calling out names. The condition of noise in the classroom may lead students to behave disruptively. As a result, teacher tended to raise her voice in order to get attention from her students. But when it failed, teacher tended to calling out name who made disruption to address the disruptive behavior directly.

- T : (checking student's assignment)
"oke, coba perhatikan ini. Ini kan kata sifat toh, jadi klo awalnya ada subjek itu ditengahnya ada to be, apa subjek nya disini?" (Okay, pay attention to this. This is adjective, right? So if the subject comes first, there has to be to be in the middle, what is the subject here?)
S1 : "I, bu." (I, ma'am)
T : "apa to be-nya kalau pake I?" (What is the to be of "I")
S1 : "am."
T : "okay, taromi disitu." (Okay, put it there)
T : "hei! Berenti ribut! Hus! Ihsan! Jangan ribut!" (Hey! Stop talking! Hush! Ihsan! Don't be noise!)
S2 : "bu, begini bu?" (Like this, ma'am?)
T : (checking another student's assignment)

Extract 5. *Calling out names*

The extract above shows when the teacher tried to explain the lesson to a student individually, students in the back seat made noise. Apparently, this condition broke the concentration of other students and could not listen to what teacher has said. At first, the teacher asked them to stop

talking. But they kept talking. As a result, the teacher then addressed a student who talked during the lesson by calling out his name directly.

Another strategy that teacher applied is asking questions directly to the students who misbehaved. The teacher sent message in the form of a question to caution off-task students about their disengagement or disruptive behavior in the classroom to redirect them back to learning in EFL classroom.

S1 : "you should build self-confidence."

T : "you should build self-confidence. *Apa artinya itu dalam Bahasa Indonesia? Coba yang di belakang. Hoe! Apa itu artinya?*" (What is the meaning in Indonesia? Students in the back, please answer! Hoe! What is the meaning?)

S2 : "Apa, bu?" (What is it, ma'am?)

T : "Apa artinya itu di atas?" (What is the meaning of it?)

S2 : (silent)

T : "*makanya dengarkan temanmu kalau membaca!*" (You should listen to your friend when she read it)

Extract 6. Asking questions

It can be seen from the extract above that when a student did a presentation in front of the class, students who sat in the back tended to make noise. This condition certainly made concentration of the presenter and other students to be broken and payed less attention to the lesson. In order to stop it, teacher asked questions directly to students who made the noise. But when the teacher asked the question related to the material, the students who made noise did nothing but remain to be silent. As a result, the condition of the class was less noisy.

The last strategy is request and demands. Request and demands are polite statements and orders made by the teacher explicitly and publicly in the class. It is used to show disapproval of disruptive behavior and an expectation that the student involved will become engaged again in the learning task or activity.

T : (checking another student) "kenapa ndak dikerja lagi? Jangan berhenti! Makanya dikasi tadi contoh supaya anda bersemangat untuk kerja." (Why do you stop? Don't stop! That's why I gave you an example so you will have enthusiasm in doing assignment)

S : "bu... ini bu...!" (ma'am.... this is it, ma'am...!)

T : (checking another student)

T : "*oke coba liat yang sudah selesai! Silahkan yang sudah selesai.*" (Okay, let me see! Please, who is done?)

Extract 7. Request and demands

The extract above shows a way of the teacher in stopping disruptive behavior that her students made, in this case; needless talk. In the dialogue, teacher approached a student who talked during the lesson. It can be seen from the extract above that the teacher gave demand to her student by asking him to continue doing his assignment.

The last strategy that teacher used to manage students' disruptive behavior was psychological punishment. This type of punishment may bring psychological effect to the students, such as emotion or shame.



Picture 7. Psychological punishment

The picture above depicts the strategy used by the teacher to manage students with disruptive behavior. When students refused to engage in learning English, the teacher asked them to stand in front of the class as a punishment.

When students act disruptively, there were always reasons why they acted like that. In this research, researcher found five factors that cause students' disruptive behavior which were classified into three categories namely physiological factor, environmental factors, and social factors. Psychological factor covers the boredom and individual problem. Students tend to act disruptively because they feel bored in classroom. It shows that the students bored because they have lack of interest in learning English. As a result, when they get bored, they tend to do whatever they want to fulfil their needs and stop their boredom. Sometimes they have problems in home and when they are in school, they keep thinking about it. They may disengage from the lesson activity, refuse to participate, or doing things they want in order to get out of the problem temporarily.

- A : “*oh... begitu?*” (oh, like that?)
B : “*iyee, pak.*” (yes, sir)
A : “*oke. Ee. Apalagi selain keluar... ee keluarji tapi minta izin di?*” (what else? Out of the classroom without permission right?)
B : “*minta izinka padahal saya jenuh di dalam, pak. Yak... yak sifat manusia lah pak, pasti ada jenuhnya meskipun pelajaran yang kita sukai ya kadang jenuh lah.*” (I permit before going out of classroom because I feel bored even though for the lesson I like)
A : “*apa itu yang bikin jenuhki?*” (what makes you feel bored?)
B : “*ya lamaki dalam belajar.*” (the teaching takes too long)

Extract 8. Psychological factor

From the result of the interviewee above, it can be concluded that uninterested material of English and time-consuming teaching makes students to feel bored. As a result, they tend to find a way to fulfil their needs by acting disruptively.

The next factor is environmental that covers physical discomfort and noise from outside the classroom. Physical discomfort such as inappropriate temperature of the classroom may lead students to behave disruptively. When temperatures are too hot, the brain is constantly reminding the body to do something about that condition. Because of the constant interruption, it is hard for the student to stay focused.

- A : “*maksudnya apakah sudah nyamanmi ditempati belajar atau bagaimana?*” (I mean is it comfortable to be occupied to learn?)
B : “*Ya tidak nyaman, kak. Lebih nyaman kelas disana kak sebelum di-rolling. Kalau disini kak panas.*” (It’s not comfortable. I prefer another room before we get rolled to this class)
A : “*oke dek. Sekarang bagaimana menurutta ini kondisi kelasta?*” (Ok, now what do you think of this class’ condition?)
B : “*apa itu kak?*” (What is it?)

Extract 9. Environmental factor

The extract above shows that a high temperature of the classroom may lead them to behave disruptively. The student think that the class condition is not comfortable enough to be occupied to learn. In this case, it shows that high classroom temperatures, can affect students’ ability to learn and function. When temperature is too hot, the brain is constantly reminding the body to do something about that condition. Because of the constant interruption, it is hard for the student to

stay focused.

The last factor is social factors that covers gender differences. Based on the findings, it can be concluded that boys tend to be more disruptive than girls in SEFL classroom of senior high school.

- A : “*selain kita dek, siapa lagi yang sering ribut ato mengganggu disini? Kalau dari observasiku kemarin toh ini yang dibelakang paling sering, heheh.*” (Besides you, who else tend to be disruptive in this class? I have seen students in the back who tend to be disruptive most)
B : “*iyee pak di belakang heheh ini juga pak e.*” (pointing at another student) “*hahaha apalagi kalau laki-lakinya pak paling sering ribut.*” (yes, sir, students who sat in the back, the most disruptive comes from the boys)
A : “*ohhh jadi kalau perempuan iya ndak?*” (ohhh what about the girls?)
B : “*biasaji pak tapi jarang.*” (seldom, sir)

The researcher also found the impact of disruptive behaviors on students’ speaking skills. Disruptive behaviors impacted linguistically on students’ speaking skills that covers students’ fluency, vocabulary, accuracy, and pronunciation. Students with disruptive behavior tend to have low achievement or score in speaking skills.

Fluency

For the first category, the researcher observed some students in the class who tend to be disruptive in class during English teaching and learning. It was found that there were some students got a low score in fluency. It is not because of their shyness, but most of them are lack of vocabularies. For some time, they tend to be talkative during English lesson.

- S1 : “I feel very thin. I feel... very thin.”
T : “I feel very thin. Dia merasa sangat.... kurus! What is the solution for Indah?”
S2 : “you should eat...”.
T : “you should?”
S1 : “you should eat aii...”
T : “you should apa tadi?”
S1 : “you should eat (inaudible) food.”
S2 : “nutritious food!”

Extract 10. Fluency

It can be seen from the extract above that students who tend to be disruptive in classroom were not able to speak in English fluently because they could not make a long conversation with his friend in speaking activities when they are asked

by the teacher.

Vocabulary

Most students still had problems with vocabulary mastery especially students with disruptive behavior. They found it hard to find a perfect or correct words in speaking activities. The use of vocabulary in speaking was very limited in conveying certain purposes. So the information conveyed was difficult to understand. They asked the teacher and their friend when speaking activities took place. At the end of the lesson the teacher always provided vocabulary to students and common expression that could be used in speaking. This was proven from the observation result below:

T : *"nah begitu yah ditulis apa problem-nya, nanti kalau naik dicarikan solusi sama temannya. Coba Indah, ada? Sudah? Oke silahkan Indah. Perhatikan temannya Indah!"* (write the problems first, then you'll friend will find solutions. Indah, have you finished? Okay, please. Pay attention to your friend, Indah!)

S1 : "I always get.... I always get... stomach... ec?" (laughing)

T : "I always get stomach?"

S2 : "ache!"

T : "ya... stomachache! *Dia selalu sakit perut.* What is the solution for Indah?"

Extract 11. *Vocabulary*

From the observation above, it shows that students who joined the speaking class and presented in front of his friend find it difficult to find a match word. In the extract above, students found it hard to express the word of stomachache. When it happened, all he did was laughing and this condition constantly broke the focus of the other students and changed the classroom atmosphere.

Accuracy

The speaker who tend to be disruptive in classroom made mistakes on basic grammar such as the use of phrases, simple sentences and compound sentences in the use of tenses. They sometimes made mistakes in the use of speaking. It was proven from the result of observation below when they were speaking in the classroom:

S1 : "Hi, miss. Is there a horror movie airing today?"

S : "Yes, do you want to watch this horror movie?"

S1 : "Yes, what do you think?"

S2 : "Yes, it seems like it will be fun."

S1 : "Ok miss, I ordered two tickets for this movie."

Extract 12. *Accuracy*

The extract above was taken from the observation during the speaking class. It can be seen from the dialogue; the students were doing role-play. There were three characters, S played as a ticket seller who sell the tickets of horror movie to S1 and S2. It can be seen from S1 dialogue the grammar was incorrect since the condition was in the present day. So, the word should be rearranged.

Pronunciation

The speaker sometimes mispronounced new words. They rarely made pronunciation mistakes because every meeting they were taught how to pronounce words correctly. Intonation and stress also sometimes misplaced in their use when they found new words. This was proven from the observation result that was done in the classroom when they were learning pronunciation, as below:

S : "sini saya! If I were asked to describe a vegetarian, I would immediately mention that they are very disciple people. It has been proven that there exists a remarkable korelation.... (Let me! korelation...."

T : "correlation!"

S : "between the puple..."

T : "bukan puple, people! (not "puple", people!)"

S : "people who succeed and people who follow a disciplined lifestyle. Vegetarians, always concerned about quality and discipline, develop a greater social responsibility that motivates them to improve their environment."

T : "environment!"

S : (laughing)

T : "ya, lanjut! Jangan ketawa!" (Yes, go on, don't laugh!)

Extract 13. *Pronunciation*

The extract above shows the mispronunciation that made by students who tend to be disruptive in classroom. When the teacher made correction on his pronunciation, the students who tend to be disruptive in classroom just laughed. And this condition constantly broke his own concentration and the other students' focus in learning English.

CONCLUSION

There are eight kinds of disruptive behavior found in this research along with the new one namely inattention, apathy, moving about the room, annoying others, cheating, needless talk, disrupting

(shouting), and exaggeration talk. In order to deal with students' disruptive behavior, the teacher applied some strategies namely, proximity interference, touch interference, signal interference, calling out names, asking questions, request & demands, and psychological punishment.

There were several factors causing students to act disruptively namely internal and external factors. Psychological factor covers boredom and individual problem, while external factors covers physical discomfort, noise from outside the classroom, and gender differences. The students' disruptive behaviors have an impact on students' speaking skills. Based on the findings, it can be concluded that students with disruptive behavior tend to have low achievement in speaking.

One of the reasons students to behave disruptively is boredom. To minimize the disruption, teacher should make the lesson fun and interesting. If the teacher can get students see the English lesson is fun, rather than as work, the students are less likely to be bored and disruptive. Students who disrupt in class find it hard to focus on one activity for any length of time. So, the teacher should keep the lesson varied, use lots of different exercises and plenty of practical and active work that is interesting.

Teacher should be aware of the causes of students' disruptive behavior. In this case, the teacher should prevent the disruptive behavior before it occurs, and this can be assured through the school personnel, family, and the school environment. To prevent the disruption, teacher should choose the best strategy that make students feel good and cared for. For the next researchers, the further studies are suggested. The findings in this research need to be investigated deeply. It is suggested to spend more time in observing students' disruptive behavior to get in depth analysis about the kinds of students' disruptive behavior and how to handle it. Furthermore, the result of this research can be used as an additional reference for further research.

REFERENCES

- Abeygunawardena, K. A. V., & Vithanapathirana, M. V. (2019). The role of teacher to address issues of disruptive behavior of student learners in mathematics classrooms: A study in the Sri Lankan context. *PUPIL: International Journal of Teaching, Education and Learning*, 2(3), 1520–1529.
- Ardin, H. (2016). *Decreasing student's disruptive behaviors in learning English through interpersonal communication: A case study at SMP Negeri 18 Makassar* (Master Thesis). Pascasarjana.
- Ardin, H. (2020). Factors causing students' disruptive behavior in learning English: A case study. *International Journal in Applied Linguistics of Parahikma*, 2(1), 9–17. Retrieved from <https://journal.parahikma.ac.id/ijalparahikma/>
- Augimeri, L. K., Walsh, M., Donato, A., Blackman, A., & Piquero, A. R. (2018). SNAP (Stop Now And Plan): Helping children improve their self-control and externalizing behavior problems. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 56, 43–49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2017.08.010>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- Charles, C. M. (2014). *Building classroom discipline: Pearson new international edition*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches*. USA: Sage Publication, Inc.
- Duesund, L., & Ødegård, M. (2018). Students' perception of reactions towards disruptive behaviour in Norwegian and American schools. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*, 23(4), 410–423. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632752.2018.1469847>
- Feldmann, L. J. (2001). Classroom civility is another of our instructor responsibilities. *College Teaching*, 49(4), 137–140.
- Eriyanto, M. G., Roesminingsih, M.V., Soedjarwo., Soeherman, I. K. (2021). The effect of learning motivation on learning independence and learning outcomes of students in the package c equivalence program. *IJORER: International Journal of Recent Educational Research*, 2(4), 455–467.
- Gower, R., Phillips, D., & Walters, S. (1995). *Teaching practice handbook*. Heinemann London.
- Gómez Mármol, A., Sánchez Alcaraz Martínez, B. J., Valero Valenzuela, A., & De la Cruz Sánchez, E. (2018). Perceived violence, sociomoral attitudes and behaviours in school contexts *Journal of Human Sport and Exercise*, 13(1). <http://dx.doi.org/10.14198/jhse.2018.131.14>
- Granero-Gallegos, A., Gómez-López, M., Baena-Extremera, A., & Martínez-Molina, M. (2020). Interaction effects of disruptive behaviour and motivation profiles with teacher competence <https://doi.org/10.20319/pijtel.2019.23.152173>

- and school satisfaction in secondary school physical education. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(1), 114. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17010114>
- Haroun, R., & O'Hanlon, C. (1997). Teachers' perceptions of discipline problems in a Jordanian secondary school. *Pastoral Care in Education*, 15(2), 29–36. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0122.00053>
- Hue, M., & Li, W. (2008). *Classroom management: Creating a positive learning environment*. Hong Kong University Press.
- Kessels, U., & Heyder, A. (2020). Not stupid, but lazy? Psychological benefits of disruptive classroom behavior from an attributional perspective. *Social Psychology of Education*, 23, 583–613
- Khalidiyah, H. (2015). The use of animated video in improving students' reading skill (A quasi-experimental study of seventh grade student at a junior high school in Jalancagak, Subang). *Journal of English and Education*, 3(1), 59–79.
- Khasinah, S. (2017). Managing disruptive behavior of students in language classroom. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, 4(2), 79-89. <https://jurnal.ar-raniry.ac.id/index.php/englisia/article/view/1661/1274>
- Maazouzi, K. (2017). Discipline problem in the classroom and its remedies. *London Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Sciences*, 17(3), 63–73. <https://research.journalspress.com/index.php/socialscience/article/view/203>
- Muna, F. (2019). Effects of classroom disruptive behaviour in Brunei Darussalam. *Asian Journal of Research in Education and Social Sciences*, 1(2), 10-20.
- Pita, Y. F. R. (2017). A descriptive study of the teacher's technique on controlling the students' misbehavior in SMPN 1 Sukasada. *International Journal of Language and Literature*, 1(1), 72–79.
- Rafi, A., Ansar, A., & Sami, M. A. (2020). The implication of positive reinforcement strategy in dealing with disruptive behavior in the classroom: A scoping review. *Journal of Rawalpindi Medical College*, 24(2), 173-179. <https://doi.org/10.37939/jrnc.v24i2.1190>
- Reed, D. F., & Kirkpatrick, C. (1998). Disruptive students in the classroom: A review of the literature. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED443911>
- Rivas, P. (2009). An exploratory study of disruptive behaviour and incivility in higher education classrooms'. In British Educational Research Association Annual Conference (pp. 2-5). University of Manchester.
- Seli, S., Syafitri, D., & Oktaviani, A. (2021). A study on students' disruptive behaviors in english online classroom and its solution by the lecturers. *Linguistic, English Education and Art (LEEA) Journal*, 5(1), 83-99.
- Shakespeare, S., Peterkin, V. M. S., & Bourne, P. A. (2018). A token economy: An approach used for behavior modifications among disruptive primary school children. *MOJ Public Health*, 7(3), 89-99. <https://doi.org/10.15406/mojph.2018.07.00212>.
- Simpson, R. (2022). A case study of the perceived impact of disruptive behavior among grades 9 and 11 students on their academic performance at a corporate high school. *Journal of Education*, 5(1), 28-42. <https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t5051>
- Stavnes, R. L. (2013). *Disruptive behavior in school: Disruptive behavior as physical movements* (Master's thesis). University of Oslo.
- Sufahmiati, S. (2015). *Perilaku disruptif siswa dalam belajar bahasa Inggris* (Masters, Pascasarjana). Retrieved from <http://eprints.unm.ac.id/6233/>
- Villafranca, A., Hamlin, C., Enns, S., & Jacobsohn, E. (2017). Disruptive behaviour in the perioperative setting: A contemporary review. *Canadian Journal of Anesthesia / Journal Canadien d'anesthésie*, 64(2), 128–140. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12630-016-0784-x>
- Vongvilay, P., Fauziati, E., & Ratih, K. (2021). Types and causes of students' disruptive behaviors in English class: A case study at Dondaeng secondary school, Laos. *Jurnal Penelitian Humaniora*, 22(2), 72-83.
- Wulandari, L. (2011). Teacher's strategies in dealing with the students' disruptive behavior in teaching and learning process at the eleventh grade of SMKN 11 Surabaya (PhD Thesis). IAIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya.