



Copyright © 2021 FTK Ar-Raniry Press  
All rights reserved  
Printed in Indonesia



## DIFFERENCES OF MALE AND FEMALE STUDENTS' DISRUPTION AND ENGLISH TEACHER INTERVENTION

Siti Khasinah<sup>1</sup>; Elviana<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Univesitas Islam Negeri Ar-Raniry, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup> Univesitas Islam Negeri Ar-Raniry, Indonesia

[siti.khasinah@ar-raniry.ac.id](mailto:siti.khasinah@ar-raniry.ac.id) ; [elviana.baharuddin@ar-raniry.ac.id](mailto:elviana.baharuddin@ar-raniry.ac.id)

### Abstract

*Students' disruptive behavior is classroom disturbance which can interrupt the learning process. This misbehavior of students needs to be controlled so that the learning process can run smoothly and effectively. The purposes of this study were to determine the differences in the types of disruptive behavior of male and female students at SMKN I Kota Banda Aceh, Langsa and Lhokseumawe, as well as the differences in the interventions given by English teachers to them. The quantitative design was used by employing questionnaire as data collection technique which was distributed to 298 students consisting of 90 male students and 208 female students. Quantitative data were analyzed using Mann Whitney formula (U test) with the help of SPSS. 26. The results showed that there was significant difference in the types of disruptive behavior between male and female students, but there was no difference in the intervoention of the teachers on disruptive behavior done by male and female students.*

**Keywords:** *classroom disruption, intervoention strategy, differences*

### 1. Introduction

Students' disruptive behavior is a type of behavior that can interfere with the continuity of the learning process in the classroom. In simple terms, this behavior can mean the way a person behaves that creates chaos and disrupts a process that should take place normally and intact (Webster, 2017). This bad behavior is described by Charles (2004) as behavior that is considered inappropriate in the situation in which it occurs. Furthermore, Cruickshank, Jenkins, & Metcalf (2009) stated that when it is

associated with classroom learning, disruptive behavior is behavior that can interfere with other students and teachers in carrying out classroom learning. Many researchers categorize classroom misbehavior as activities that disturb class order and cause problems for teachers, such as making nonverbal noise, disobedience, speaking out of turn, laziness and sluggishness, not being on time, obstructing others, physical aggression, untidiness, shifting places, and verbal abuse (Houghton, Wheldall, & Merrett, 1988; Wheldall, & Merrett, 1988; Little, 2005). That is, any

disruptive activity that occurs in the classroom while learning is in progress can be referred to as disruptive behavior.

There are many types and forms of student disruptive behavior in the classroom. Richards & Renandya (2002) state that there are three types of disruptive behavior that commonly occur in language classes; the back-row distractor, the nonparticipants, and the over exuberant student. In line with this, Cruickshank, et al (2009) stated that there are behaviors that often occur in classroom such as: aggression in the form of physical and verbal attacks and displays of violence; immoral acts such as cheating, lying and stealing; defiance of authority such as refusing to obey teachers or disrespectful behavior; speak loudly, call, throw objects; indifferent behavior such as daydreaming and playing games. Other forms are arriving late or leaving early; noisy students (talking and other distracting noises); and other behaviors such as sharing notes, sleeping, eating, inattentiveness, domineering students, depressed students, challenging teacher authority, online networking disorders, and even cheating (Tomorrow's Teaching and Learning, (2017); Ann Daniels (2013); Richards & Farrell (2011); Rivas, (2009); Maurer, Sturges, Diana, Danny, Sun-A & Allen (2009). Other forms are out of turn talking, indifference, daydreaming, and laziness (Sun & Shek, 2012). Puspitaloka & Syafitri (2019) found a number of students' bad behavior towards English lessons in the form of indifference; daydreaming, doodling and looking out the window; distractions such as talking to friends, inappropriate laughing and shouting during learning; disturbing others such as provoking, teasing, and name-calling. Disturbances like this

will affect the teaching and learning process. Classes that are frequently disturbed by student misbehavior typically have less academic time, and students in those classes tend to have lower grades (Shinn, Ramsey, Walker, Stieber & O'Neill, 1987).

Harmer (1991) said that disruptive behavior as described above can be carried out by children, adolescents and adults, although with different types of disruption. In addition to age, male and female students can also behave differently (Mahasneh, & Nor, 2011; Merdekasari & Chaer, 2017). The delinquency rate of male students is higher in terms of the type of disruption carried out (Fuadah, 2011). Trisnawati, Nurihsan & Dahlan (2019) find that male students perceive disruptive behavior in class as normal compared to female students. Whatever the type of disruptive behavior students do in the classroom, it will certainly interfere with the comfort and teaching and learning activities, especially if there is no preventive action and intervention from the teacher after first knowing the factors that cause disruption in the classroom.

Among the factors that cause disruption in the classroom are students' internal factors and external factors such as teachers and the environment (Graham in Sarwono, 2007; Puspitaloka & Syafitri, 2019; Harmer, 1991; Khajloo, 2013; Santrock, 2002). Student factors such as low self-control, peer influence, pessimism, and learning difficulties. In line with the opinion above, Yuan & Che (2012) mentions three causes of students doing misbehavior, namely students, teachers, and the environment. Safdar, Gulap, Tariq & Qayum (2013) added that parents have the potential to be the cause of

student delinquency in class.

Teacher becomes an important factor in preventing and handling all forms of disruption in the classroom. The teacher's ability in classroom management determines that learning will take place in a conducive manner (Lewis & Sugai, 1999; Ur, 1996), making class rules such as learning contracts or codes of conduct can prevent disruption (Colvin, Kame 'enui, & Sugai, 1993; Harmer, 1991), including establishing good interactions in the classroom (Brown, 2001; Charles, 2004; Marsh, 2008; Ur, 1996; Terada, 2019). In addition to prevent disturbances in the classroom, teachers are also able to overcome problems that arise by implementing various intervention strategies so that problems or disturbances do not widen, escalate, and hinder the learning process. In this case, the teacher must react positively and focus (Bellon, Bellon, & Blank, 1996), act quickly (Albert 2003; Marzano, Marzano & Pickering, 2003) and practice good management (Oliver, Wehby & Reschly, 2011). Besides, teachers must plan and manage learning well and effectively (Barry & King 1998; Hansen & Childs 1998; Hendrick 2001; Safitri, 2011; Rao, 2015).

Cruickshank, et al (2009) suggested 5 intervention strategies that can be done by teachers, namely: interventions such as abandonment (extinction), mild-desists, such as non-verbal interventions, reprimands, and time-limited light punishments (time-out), and stricter punishment (severe punishment) can be an accurate strategy in resolving and dealing with bad behavior in the classroom, even if it needs to be referred to outside resources (Meador, 2019). Harmer (2003) describes several intervention strategies, namely; act immediately (act

immediately), focus on behavior not on students (focus on the behavior not the student), overcome and prevent things that will happen in the future (taking things forward), reprimand personally, keep calm and also use colleagues (such as counseling teachers) and institutions. In English classes, cases that often arise are class monopoly by the over exuberant students who try to dominate the conversation during English speaking time which can make other students disappointed (Hedge, 2008; Brown, 2001), or students interfere by using L1 (Richards & Renandya, 2002; Harmer, 1991).

Teachers need to use varied strategies in controlling and solving disruptive behavior problems (McCaskey, 2015; Raza, 2014; Ghazi, Shahzada, Tariq, & Khan, 2013) because teachers have to deal with and solve problems that occur in the classroom (Asiyai, 2014; Rindu & Ariyanti, 2017). Every intervention made by the teacher is important, as long as it is in accordance with the type and level of disruption occurs in the classroom. This disruptive behavior generally occurs in all schools, both in the regions and in urban areas, carried out by male or female students, by elementary to high school students, including SMK in mixed-class or single-sex classes. An example is the case of burning *rapor* by 4 elementary students or a junior high school students who persecuted his teacher for not smoking in class. Based on the author's experience from the observation reports of students in Micro Teaching and PPL classes in English program, there were many disturbances done by both male and female students with various types of disorders, but sometimes the teacher just ignored them, even if learning was disrupted. Thus, a more in-depth study is

needed to find out class disruption, whether carry out by male or female students. In SMK there are single gender classes and mixed classes with an unequal number of male and female students, especially in English class as a foreign language, there is potential for disruption. Based on these arguments, this study focuses on finding the differences in the disruptive behavior of male and female students in English classes as well as the differences in the interventions carried out by English teachers in dealing with the disruptions made by male and female students at SMKN 1 Kota Banda Aceh Lhokseumawe, and Langsa, Ace, Indonesia.

## 2. Method

The variables in this study are disruptive behavior and teacher intervention. The research was conducted at SMKN 1 Banda Aceh City, Lhokseumawe City and Langsa City. In accordance with the research objectives that have been stated, the research method used in this study was quantitative research by testing comparative hypotheses. The population in this study were grade IX students from the three SMKN 1. The purposive sampling technique was used in accordance with the objectives of the research. The sample amounted to 298 students consisting of 208 female students and 90 male students. Data were collected using a closed questionnaire using Likert scale, namely the scale model used was a rating that is added up from Likert with four alternative answers. Alternative answers in this questionnaire are: Always (SL), often (SR), Rarely (JR) and Never (TP). The scoring guideline is from 4 to 1 for favorable items and 1 to 4 for unfavorable items. The final value is the value obtained from each

item of the question.

The instrument used for data collection in this study was the disruptive behavior scale which was prepared with a blueprint according to the theory from Ur (1996); Cruickshank, Jenkins, & Metcalf (2009); & Hammer (1991). There are five aspects that are measured, namely: 1). Types of Disruption; the indicators are The Back Row Distractor, The Non-Participant (the passive students), The Over-Exuberant Student (students who are very domineering); 2). Forms of Disruptive Behavior; the indicators are Aggression, Immoral Actions, Opposing Authority, Loud Talking, Indifference Behavior; 3). Causes of Disruptive Behavior; indicators are Teachers, Students and Institutions; 4). Prevention of Disruptive Behavior; indicators are English teachers; 5). Intervention Strategy is extinction, Mild Desist (Soft Reprimand), Hard Reprimand, Time Out, Severe Punishment, and Referring to Institutions or Counseling Teachers.

The items of questionnaire were based on these five aspects obtained 91 questions consisting of favorable and unfavorable ones. The instrument, before being given to the subject under study, first performed a qualitative and quantitative analysis. Qualitatively, the instrument was analyzed and validated by 2 experts to see whether the items had worked or not based on logistical validity. After being revised, the items were tested quantitatively to SMTI Banda Aceh students. The trial was conducted on subjects who had the same characteristics as the research subjects. Furthermore, the valid and reliable items were reassembled and given to the subject to be studied. The instrument was given to students with several statements to measure the

differences in the disruptive behavior of male and female students as well as the differences in the interventions given by the English teacher at SMKN 1 to them. The data analysis technique used to test the comparative hypothesis was using the Mann Whitney formula (U test). The formula is used to test the significance between two independent samples that are not equal in number. This test is used as an alternative to using the t-test if the parametric requirements are not met. The requirements are: ordinal, interval or ratio scale data; consists of 2 independent or independent groups; the data for group I and group II do not have to be the same amount; and the data does not have to be normally distributed. Therefore, there is no need to test the normality of the data (Syofian, 2013). In this study, the Mann Whitney test data processing was done with the help of the SPSS application. 26.

### 3. Result and Discussion

#### a. Result

The data in this study were obtained from questionnaire responses that measure the differences of male and female students' disruption of and English teachers' intervention in dealing with male and female students who perform disruptive behavior in the classroom. Respondents were 298 students consisting of male and female students at SMKN 1 Kota Banda Aceh, Lhokseumawe and Langsa. The data were analyzed quantitatively using non-parametric statistics using Mann Whitney formula with the help of the SPSS application. 26. The results are used to test the first hypothesis, as shown in the following table:

Table 1 Average Score of Disruptive Behavior Rating Test of Male and Female Students

Disruption Score	Group	N	Average level	Total Rating
	1	209	154,23	32235,00
	2	89	138,38	12316,00
	Total	298		

From the analysis of the output of SPSS 26 in the ranking table, the results of the female student group with the number of respondents  $N = 209$  with a total rating of 32235 and the male group the number of respondents  $N = 89$  with a total rating of 12316. The average results of the ranking test are more women with a total of 154, 23 and men with a total of 138, 38.

The hypotheses proposed in this study are:

Ho: there is no significant difference in students' disruptive behavior between boys and girls.

Ha: there is a significant difference in students' disruptive behavior between boys and girls.

Testing this hypothesis can be seen from the results of the Z value in the table below:

Table 2 Mann Whitney Test Calculation Results

	Disruptive behavior scores
Mann-Whitney U	8311,000
Z	-1,454
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0,146

Based on the results of the calculation using the Mann Whitney formula, the  $Z_{\text{observation}}$  value is -1.454, so for the acceptance of the hypothesis it can be seen from the test criteria taken based on the comparison between  $Z_{\text{observation}}$  and  $Z_{\text{table}}$ . That is, if  $-Z_{\text{table}} < Z_{\text{observation}} < Z_{\text{table}}$ , then Ho is accepted and if  $Z_{\text{observation}} < -Z_{\text{table}}$ , then Ho is rejected. The value of  $Z_{\text{observation}}$  is the value of SPSS results while  $Z_{\text{table}}$  is searched using the normal distribution table by: determine the value of  $\alpha = 5\%$ . If two sides,  $Z_{\text{table}} = 1-$

$0.05/2 = 1 - 0.025 = 0.975$ , the value of 0.975 in the normal distribution table = 1, 96. The comparison between  $Z_{\text{observation}}$  and  $Z_{\text{table}}$  is obtained that  $Z_{\text{observation}} < Z_{\text{table}}$  then  $H_0$  is rejected, namely  $-1.454 < -1, 96$  then  $H_0$  is rejected and  $H_a$  is accepted, it can be concluded that there are significant differences in student disruptive behavior between boys and girls.

The difference in the intervention given by the English teacher for male and female students was obtained from the results of data analysis also using the Mann Whitney formula with the help of the SPSS application.<sup>26</sup> The results of this analysis are used to test the second hypothesis, which can be seen in the following table:

Table 3 Average Value of Teacher Intervention Ranking Test on Male and Female Students

Intervention	Group	N	Average level	Total Rating
Strategy Score	1	209	158,77	33183,50
	2	89	127,72	11367,50
	Total	298		

From the ranking test table, the results of the female student group with the number of respondents  $N = 209$  with a total rating of 33183.50 and the male group the number of respondents  $N = 89$  with a total rating of 11367.50. The average results of the ranking test are more female with a total of 158.77 and male with a total of 127.72.

The hypotheses in this study are:

$H_0$ : There is no difference in the intervention strategy given by the English teacher for male and female students at SMKN 1

$H_a$ : There are differences in the intervention strategies given by the English teacher for male and female students at SMKN 1

Testing this hypothesis can be seen from the results of SPSS.<sup>26</sup>, based on the Z value in the table below:

Table 4 Mann Whitney Test Calculation Results for Interventions at SMKN 1

	Disruption Score
Mann-Whitney U	7362,500
Z	-2,848
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0,004

Based on the results of the analysis,  $Z_{\text{observation}}$  is  $-2.848$ , so for the acceptance of the hypothesis it can be seen from the test criteria taken based on the comparison between  $Z_{\text{observation}}$  and  $Z_{\text{table}}$ . The comparison between  $Z_{\text{observation}}$  and  $Z_{\text{table}}$  shows that  $Z_{\text{observation}} < Z_{\text{table}}$ , namely  $-2.848 > -1.96$  means  $H_0$  is accepted and  $H_a$  is rejected. It can be concluded that there is no difference in the intervention strategy given by the English teacher for male and female students in SMKN 1.

### b. Discussion

Analysis of the results of the questionnaire using Mann Whitney formula shows that there are differences in the disruptive behavior of male and female students at SMKN 1. From the average scores in both groups, it can be seen that the average disruptive behavior of female students is higher than the average disruptive behavior of male students. Female students sit in the back row more often, dominate in learning activities such as taking over learning activities because they feel capable of learning material, and inviting friends to do other activities during class hours compared to male students. This is because the number of female students in the class is greater than the number of male students. Meanwhile, the male students' disruption was in the form of diverting

their friends' attention to things outside of learning, disturbing their friends, cutting off the teacher's explanation, going in and out of class, doing fun, sleeping, being lazy to do assignments, skipping work and shouting. This is different from Fuadah (2011) who found on the contrary that the acquaintance level of male students was higher.

This disruptive behavior cannot just happen, but can occur from several factors such as the teacher as the main factor in managing learning in the classroom that can affect student behavior (Hammer, 1991). The ability of teachers who are not ready to teach will provide opportunities for students to make disturbances in the classroom (Colvin, Kame'enui, & Sugai, 1993; Lewis & Sugai, 1999; Ur, 1996; Brown, 2001; Charles, 2004; Marsh, 2008; Ur, 1996; Terada, 2019). Then the factor of students who disturb friends, who dominate or are too passive in the classroom, who seek attention and who have learning difficulties (Puspitaloka & Syafitri, 2019; Harmer, 1991; Khajloo, 2013; Santrock, 2002). Likewise, institutional factors can also cause disruptive behavior such as learning facilities and a bad school environment, including parents of students (Safdar, Gulap, Tariq & Qayum, 2013).

Forms of behavior that appear in the classroom such as aggression, immoral actions, defiance of authority, loud speaking and indifferent behavior; different between male and female students. The form of behavior carried out by male are students talking in class, inviting their classmates to talk about things outside of class, making fun of other friends, teasing when teaching and learning takes place, often asking for permission to leave class, responding to teacher's words that are not appropriate, sleeping, lazy doing homework, skipping and screaming. While the disruptive behavior of female students such as scolding friends, making jokes, chatting loudly, threatening

friends to give assignments, doing other activities while learning is in progress, gossiping, and dressing up in class.

The results of this study support research findings that has been carried out by Wulandari (2011) at SMKN 11 Surabaya which found that the types of delinquency found in the form of commotion when the teacher explains the lesson, disturbs friends, is busy with other activities and continues to talk while the lesson takes place in the classroom. This finding is also in line with Mahasneh & Nor (2011) that the disruption made by male and female students is different. Another study, namely a study conducted by Debreli & Ishanova (2019), found the types of student bad behavior that occurred in English classes, namely using their mother tongue (L1) or regional languages, asking irrelevant questions, using cell phones, speaking excessively and less participating during lesson time. Behaviors that can interfere with the learning process in the classroom as mentioned above need to be addressed by the teacher.

Teachers must react positively to build a safe and comfortable classroom. Bellon, Bellon & Blank (1996) state that responding to or reacting to inappropriate student behavior is a process of helping students control themselves to enable them to work and learn productively in the classroom. Teachers must be alert from the start of classroom learning to what will happen in the classroom and ensure that all students are aware that their teacher will continue to interact and supervise to control students. The teacher must be observant and be able to detect disturbances that will appear in the classroom and be able to carry out appropriate strategies to prevent and overcome disruptive behavior in the classroom during the learning process.

The results of data analysis and the testing of

the second hypothesis showed that the intervention given by the English teacher for male and female students was not different. The intervention given by the English teacher is very dependent on the treatment given to the type and form of behavior carried out by students in the classroom. Teachers in overcoming small-scale disruptive behavior in English classes are by ignoring, reprimanding students, talking about the reasons they make mistakes, approaching them personally and classically, replacing class activities, and giving impromptu tests. As for behavior that is very disturbing in the classroom, such as a big case, the teacher will give punishments, refer to the counseling teachers and students' parents. The treatment given is sometimes carried out directly in the classroom when small disturbances occur, carried out outside the classroom after learning is over for moderate cases, and carried out after learning is over in collaboration with counseling teachers, parents and the school concerned for large cases. Handling of these disturbances must be done quickly and positively by the teacher as a manager in the classroom (Albert 2003; Marzano & Pickering, 2003).

Another similar finding is that teachers do not differentiate interventions for students from different ethnicities (Abacioglu, Volman, & Fischer, (2019)). In line with the research conducted, Safitri (2011) found that in overcoming the problem of student disruptive behavior, it begins with preventive measures, namely the teacher presents interesting and lively lessons, explains classroom rules and procedures, keeps students busy with meaningful tasks and uses classroom management effectively. In the learning process the teacher also cooperates with students, showing humor and enthusiasm in teaching so that it can reduce the bad behavior of students who are bored in the learning process. Ways to deal with distractions in

the classroom can be done with (non-verbal) cues such as eye contact, moving over, a light pat on the shoulder and also verbally with an immediate or delayed reprimand, the most important thing is that the warning states what students should do instead of talking about what was wrong to do. Praising good behavior also needs to be done by teachers because praise can motivate students to do better.

#### **4. Conclusion**

From the discussion above, it is known that the disruptive behavior of female students is higher than that of male students because there are more female students in the classroom. The type of behavior found in the form of female students is more often sitting in the back row. They are also very dominant in learning activities such as dominating learning activities because they believe they have mastered the learning material, and influence their friends to do other activities during class hours compared to male students. Meanwhile, male students tend to divert their friends' attention to things outside of learning, annoy friends, interrupt the teacher's explanation, go in and out of class, do fun things, sleep, be lazy to do assignments, skip school and shout. The intervening by English teachers on disruptive behavior in English class is the same, depending on the type and form of disruptive behavior shown by both male and female students. If there are different problems and disturbances, the treatment given is different. That is, English teachers do not differentiate interventions based on gender, but rather based on the type and form of interference they perform. Thus, it can be concluded that there are differences in disruptive behavior between male and female students at SMKN 1 Kota Banda Aceh, Lhokseumawe, and Langsa, but there is no difference in the interventions given by English



teachers for male and female students at the school.

This research still has some limitations. Among them is the timing of data collection that is not precise because it was carried out in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic, that caused researchers had difficulty getting access to schools and only enable them to obtained information from limited respondents. For this reason, data collection was only carried out using one instrument, in fact there should be a triangulation process to strengthen the analysis and research findings. To achieve expectations, further research is important to do because the findings of this kind of research are very important to support and promote intervention strategies carried out by teachers in dealing with various types and forms of disruptive behavior in the classroom in a gender responsive manner.

## Bibliography

- Abacioglu, C. S., Volman, M., & Fischer, A. (2019). *Teacher interventions to student misbehaviors: The role of ethnicity, emotional intelligence, and multicultural attitude*. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Teacher-interventions-to-student-misbehaviors%3A-The-Abacioglu-Volman/b0d1a445808fa3423167c154cd314ad1528e2380>
- Albert, L. (2003) *Cooperative Discipline*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, Circle Pine, MN: American Guidance Service
- Asiyai, R. I. (2011). Effective Classroom Management Techniques for Secondary Schools. *An International Multi-Disciplinary Journal*. 5 (1), 282-291. ISSN 1994-9057 (Print) ISSN 2070-0083.
- Barry, K & King, L. (1998) *Beginning teaching and Beyond*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. Katoomba: Sosial Science Press
- Bellon, J.J., Bellon, E.C., & Blank, M.A. (1996) *Teaching from A Research Knowledge Base*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. San Francisco: Longman.
- Charles, C.M. (2004) *Building Classroom Discipline*, 7<sup>th</sup> edition edn, New York, Longman,
- Colvin, G., Kame'enui, E. J., & Sugai, G. (1993). Reconceptualizing behavior management and school-wide discipline in general education. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 16, 361-381.
- Cruickshank, D.R., Jenkins, D.B., Metcalf, K.K. (2009) *The Act of Teaching*, New York, McGraw-Hill
- Daniel, V.I. (2017, July 14<sup>th</sup>) How to Manage Disruptive Behavior in Inclusive Classrooms. Retrieved from <https://www.teachervision.com/classroom-discipline/how-manage-disruptive-behavior-inclusive-classrooms>
- Daniels, A. (2013, July 1). Dealing with Disruptive Student Behavior. Retrieved from <http://www.livestrong.com/article/147291-what-is-disruptive-behavior-in-the-classroom/>
- Debreli, E., Ishanova, I. (2019). Foreign language classroom management: Types of student misbehaviour and strategies adapted by the teachers in handling disruptive behavior. *Cogent Education*. 6 (1).
- Disruptive and Behavior (2012, July, 10). Retrieved from <http://www.merriamwebster.com/dicti>

- [onary/disruption](#)
- Ellis, E. (2018) Teachers' Perceptions about Classroom Management Preparedness. Dissertation. Walden University
- Fuadah, N. (2011). Gambaran Kenakalan Siswa Di SMA Muhammadiyah 4 Kendal. *Jurnal Psikologi*. 9 (1). 29-40.
- Ghazi, S. R, Gulap Shahzada, Muhammad Tariq, & Abdul Qayum Khan. (2013) Types and Causes of Students' Disruptive Behavior in Classroom at Secondary Level in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. *American Journal of Educational Research*. 1 (9). 350-354
- Hansen, J.M & Childs, J. (1998) Creating A School Where People Like To Be, *Educational Leadership*. 63 (4). 172-174
- Hara, B. (2011). Disruptive student behavior (the professor edition). *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. <http://chronicle.com/blogs/professional/disruptive-student-behavior-the-professor-edition/29972>
- Harmer, J. (1991). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. London: Longman
- Hatch, E and Farhady, H (1982). *Research Design and Statistics for Applied Linguistics*, London: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.
- Hedge, T. (2008) *Teaching and Learning in Language Classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University press
- Houghton, S., Wheldall, K., & F. Merrett, (1988). Classroom behavior problems which secondary school teachers say they find most troublesome. *British Educational Research Journal*. 14 (3), 297-312. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/2331186X.2019.1648629>
- Ibrahim, M. H. A. R. (2016). Classroom Management; The Effectiveness of Teacher's Roles. *Education and Linguistics Research*., 2 (1). ISSN 2377-1356
- Little, E. (2005). Secondary school teachers' perceptions of students' problem behaviours. *Educational Psychology*, 25 (4), 369-377.
- Mahasneh, A.M & Nor, S. Md. (2011). Characterizing Misbehaviour among Jordanian High School Students. *Semantic Scholar*. DOI: 10.5539/ASS.V7N12P3
- Marsh, C. (2008) *Becoming A Teacher Knowledge, Skills, and Issues*. Australia: Pearson
- Marzano, R.J., Marzano, J.S., & Pickering, D.J. (2003) *Classroom Management that Works: Research-Based Strategies for Every Teacher*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development
- Maurer, Trent W.; Sturges, Diana; Averette, Danny; Lee, Sun-A; & Allen, D. (2009). Perceptions of Disruptive Classroom Behaviors.
- McCaskey, J. (2015). Elementary School Teachers' Levels of Concern with Disruptive Student Behaviors in the Classroom. Disertasi, Walden University.
- Meador, D. (2019). *Strategies to Handle a Disruptive Student*. <https://www.thoughtco.com/the-best-strategies-to-handle-a-disruptive-student-3194625>
- Merdekasari, A & Chaer, M. T. 2017. Perbedaan perilaku agresi antara siswa laki-laki dan siswa perempuan di SMPN 1 Kasreman Ngawi. *Jurnal Psikologi Pendidikan & Konseling*. 3 (1), 53-60.

Merriam-Webster.com.

<http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/sotlcommons/SoTL/2009/24>

Puspitaloka., & Syafitri. (2019). The Analysis of Student's Misbehavior in Learning English Lesson. <https://jurnal.unimus.ac.id/index.php/ELLIC/article/view/4717>

Raza, A. M. (2014). Dealing with Disruptive Students Express, *International Journal of Multi Disciplinary Research* ISSN: 2348 – 2052, Vol. 1, Issue 12, Dec 2014 Available at: [www.express-journal.com](http://www.express-journal.com)

Richard, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2006). *Methodology in Language Teaching An Anthology of Current Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J.C. Farrel, T.S.C. (2011) *Practice Teaching A Reflective Approach*. New York: Cambridge Univ Press

Rindu, I & Ariyanti. (2017). Teacher's Role in Managing the Class during Teaching and Learning Process. Widya Gama Mahakam Samarinda University. *Journal of Linguistic and English Teaching*. 2 (1), P-ISSN: 2477-1880; E-ISSN: 2502-6623

Rivas, P. (2009). An exploratory study of disruptive behavior and incivility in higher education classrooms. Paper presented to the BERA (the British Educational Research Association) Annual Conference. Edge Hill University. <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/184234.pdf>

Rose, L. C., & Gallup, A. M. (2005). The 37th annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup poll of the public's attitudes toward the public

schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 87(1), 41- 57.

Safari, Irwan (2011). Mengelola Perilaku Buruk Peserta Didik Yang Ringan Di Kelas. <https://enewsletterdisdik.wordpress.com/2011/01/18/mengelola-perilaku-buruk-peserta-didik-yang-ringan-di-kelas/>

Santrock, J.W. (2002). *Life Span Development: Perkembangan Masa Hidup*. Edisi kelima. (terjemahan). Jakarta: Erlangga.

Sarwono, S.W. (2007). *Psikologi Remaja*, (Rev. Ed). Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Perkasa

Shinn, M. R., Ramsey, E., Walker, H. M., Stieber, S., & O'Neill, R. E. (1987). Antisocial behavior in school settings: Initial differences in an at-risk and normal population. *The Journal of Special Education*, 21, 69-84.

Sun, R. C. L & Shek, D. T. L (2012). Student Classroom Misbehavior: An Exploratory Study Based on Teachers' Perceptions. <https://doi.org/10.1100/2012/208907> <https://www.hindawi.com/journals/tswj/2012/208907/>

Siregar, S. (2014). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif: Dilengkapi Perbandingan Perhitungan Manual & SPSS*, Jakarta: Kencana Prenadamedia.

Terada, Y. (2019). 8 Proactive Classroom Management Tips. <https://www.edutopia.org/article/8-proactive-classroom-management-tips>

Tomorrow's Teaching and Learning (2017, July 10<sup>th</sup>), Dealing with Disruptive Student Behavior. Retrieved from <https://tomprof.stanford.edu/posting/1353>

- Trisnawati, E., Nurihsan, J., & Dahlan, T. H. (2019). Apakah Terdapat Perbedaan Perilaku Mengganggu di Kelas Antara Siswa Laki-laki dan Perempuan? *PSIKOLOGIKA: Jurnal Pemikiran dan Penelitian Psikologi*. 24(1), 1-12
- Ur, P. (1996). *A Course in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wheldall, K., Merrett, F. (1988). Which classroom behaviors do primary school teachers say they find most troublesome. *Educational Review*, 40 (1), 13-27.
- Yuan, X., & Che, L. (2012) How to deal with student misbehaviour in the classroom? *Journal of Educational and Developmental Psychology*, 2(1), 143- 150.