# Teachers' Role in Dealing with Student's Disruptive Behavior in the Classroom

## By

**Raza Ullah Khan**
M. Phil Scholar, Department of Education, the University of Haripur, Khyber PakhtonKhawa
Email: kraza4939@gmail.com

**Dr Tehseen Tahir**
Assistant Professor, Department of Education, the University of Haripur
Email: dr.tehseen78@gmail.com

**Dr Umbreen Ishfaq**
Associate Professor, Department of Education, the University of Haripur
Email: umbreenishfaq@hotmail.com

**Miss Haleema Nawaz**
PhD.Scholar, Department of Education, the University of Haripur, Khyber Pakhton Khawa
Email: haleema.kf929@gmail.com

## Abstract

The main purpose of this study was to get an insight about the role of teachers in dealing with the classroom. The method of this study was quantitative research. The research type was a case study. Teachers who were teaching in the primary schools of Lower Dir constituted the population of the study. Six hundred and twenty-four (624) teachers were taken as samples. A questionnaire was developed on five-point Likert Scale and was distributed among the sampled teachers and collected their responses regarding the role of teachers in dealing with student's disruptive behavior in the classroom. It was observed that Teachers made relatively little attempt to enhance good classroom behavior; instead, they used harsh measures like punishment to deal with disruptive students. The use of constructive criticism, tolerance, and relational support techniques was restricted due to their reliance on punitive measures, which are seen to be more effective at encouraging good classroom behavior by allowing pupils to take responsibility for their own actions. It is suggested that teachers, policymakers, and the government pay close attention to the disruptive behavior of Primary School pupils in Pakistan in order to address this issue and ensure the country's educational system is of high quality. For this reason, administrators and teachers may arrange suitable trainings to prepare them for disruptive behavior and classroom management.

**Key Words:** Teachers' Role, Dealing, Student's Disruptive Behavior, Classroom

## Introduction

Various terms define disruptive behavior in the school context. These include 'problematic behavior', 'off-the job behavior', and 'disruptive behavior' (Ahmad, Gul, & Kashif, 2022; Gul & Khilji, 2023; Salameh et al., 2022). A Behavior is considered destructive if it is inappropriate for the context in which it occurs (Charles, 2011). In school settings, such behavior contradicts perspectives, rules and principles harms learning and educational activities, and impedes students' societal growth (Duesund, 2014; Ogden, 2009).

Children who express their emotions are one of the biggest worries for instructors right now (Henricsson & Rydell, 2004). Destructive and violent behavior, resistance, melt downs, aggressive and restless behaviors are only a few examples of these characteristics (Henricsson & Rydell, 2004).

There is a rise in the number of students with behavioral issues in classrooms (White 2001) and students seeking treatment for disorders like attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), the most public mental illness among children (Miller, 2006), and emotional and behavioral disorders (EBD) (Rani Gul et al., 2022; Rani  Gul et al., 2022; Zhou et al., 2022). It is claimed that the ability to manage disruptive kids is crucial to the constructivist approach and classroom order (Matsoga, 2003; Njoroge & Nyabuto, 2014; Närhi, Kiiski & Savolainen et al., 2017; Semali & Vumilia 2016). However, scholarly evidence show that many pre-and in-service teacher programs lack concrete strategies to equip student-teachers with competencies necessary to deal with students with different behavioral problems in the classroom (Ayub, Gul, Ali, et al., 2021; Gul, Tahir, et al., 2021). Based on  the reflection of the researcher brings into being that there were three categories of student's  disruptive behaviors according  to Charles (1999).

Class disruption is behavior that actively or continually disrupts classroom learning. Certain disruptive behavior includes bullying teacher or other through physical violence, disruptive or erratic behavior, yelling at classmates, reading newspapers or other content, using mobile phone, and other (Ahmad & Gul, 2021; Gul, Ayub, et al., 2021; Gul, Muhammad, et al., 2021). It is found that the children involved in these behaviors interfere with their learning and leads to lower scores and a higher dropout rate in their education career (Finn, 1995). The disruptive student might show some annoying behaviors that include asleep in lecture, coming late, involving in chat either with other class fellows or on their mobile phones, quarreling with the instructor, texting, playing video games or even in some cases becoming aggressive **(Ahmad, Gul, & Zeb, 2022; Rani Gul et al., 2022; Gul, Ayub, et al., 2021)** reviewed the academic success of students classified as disruptive or inattentive. Individuals who fail to engage in learning activities or who actively seek to disconnect were defined as inattentive students. According to Spivack and Cianci (1987) the disruptive students are those who "embarrass [or] anguish classmates, interrupt with others' work, are...drawn into noise maker, verbally abuse and control". The findings indicate that children who were neither disruptive nor inattentive did much better on academic tests, and it was noted that defined off-task behavior resulted in lower learning as measured by academic tests. Furthermore, the disruptive children outperformed the inattentive children on academic tests (Ayub, Gul, Malik, et al., 2021; Batool et al., 2022; Gul, Ayub, et al., 2021). Children who were termed as disruptive and inattentive did not perform significantly poor academically than children who only had one label. According to the researchers, it is critical to observe not only the children who are visibly disruptive, but also the children who are in attentive. It is suggested that as a student grows older, learning habits and classroom behavior may be difficult to change once a behavior has been formed (Bukhari et al., 2021; Gul & Khilji, 2021; Gul, Tahir, et al., 2021).

Similarly, Bru (2009) studied the disruptive students and their learning achievement. Student and teacher feedback on academic outcomes of the students consisted in the study. Misbehavior of the student's evaluated by the following questions: speaking to others of the students without consent of the teacher, disturbing others, speaks without asking, and makes the teacher disturbed,(Bru, 2009) did not found significant difference in grades of disruptive students in the classroom, as like the findings of Finn, Pannozzo, and Voelkl,et al., (1995);

Steps taking by Organization may contain for a while or forever take out the student from the class, firing the student from the department, placing them on probation  or take out them from the organization altogether. Any one of these actions may harm the student's academic improvement and, in the long run, may put their completion of a degree at risk (Johnson, 2012). Instead of taking these actions, faculty can attempt different alterations that may yield  a win conclusion (Gul, Tahir, et al., 2020; Gul, Zakir, et al., 2021; Said et al., 2021). This can be accomplished by preventing disruptive behavior while not coming student's academic progress. To achieve this, cooperation/collaboration between the faculty member and the academic dean about the student's behavior may be essential (Kuo, 2009). While teachers endeavor to find new methods to interact with their students via technology, we must pay close attention to what we are teaching to our students (Gul, Kanwal, et al., 2020; Gul & Rafique, 2017; Khan et al., 2023). The study recommends that courses must be based on students' experiences and should encourage dynamic and versatile thinking, compassion, and tolerance among students. Teachers should be prepared to act as facilitators. This shift from traditional teaching to online may provide ample opportunities for teachers for self-learning by studying from a range of platforms and support customized learning. The instructors should be trained as "competent" individuals who can go with students' expectations (Batool et al., 2021; Gul, Kanwal, et al., 2020; Gul et al., 2023; Muhammad Tufail et al., 2022; Salameh et al., 2022)

## Research Questions

1.      What are the causes of disruptive behavior among students at primary level perceived by teachers?
2.      What techniques do teachers use to deal the disruptive behavior of students at primary level?

## Objectives of the Study

Objectives of the study were:

1.      To find out the perceptions of teachers about disruptive behavior of students at primary level.
2.      To find out the causes of disruptive behavior in classroom perceived by the teachers at primary level.
3.      To explore the strategies adopted by the teachers to cope with student's disruptive behavior in classroom in the primary level.

## Significance of the Study

For all the following stakeholders, this research may be beneficial:

*Teachers*

The present study may be useful for the teachers to find the causes of disturbing behavior which are often challenging in the classroom and to employ different techniques and provide the foundation for a more constructive method of responding to disruptive actions.

*Parents*

The findings of this research work may help parents to understand how disruptive activity affects children and will lead them to provide proper direction and monitoring in

decreasing the disruptive behavior which often cause low performance in their educational/academic matters.

*Educators*

The study may help educators to comprehend the root causes of disruptive behavior so they may develop plans and procedures to stop it in the classroom.

*Future Researchers*

The research might be useful for the upcoming researchers to incorporate their own concepts and improve the effectiveness of research.

# Limitations of the Study

Research respondents included Government Primary School teachers. According to sample size most of the participants were male (n=624, male 346, female=278). This study was based upon the role of Government Primary School teacher's in dealing with student's disruptive behavior.

1.      The study is only applicable to District Lower Dir Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.
2.      The study was carried out using the information that the teachers provided.
3.      The questionnaire was created with our research objectives in mind.

# Delimitation of the Study

This research was restricted to only Government Primary School teachers of District Lower Dir KPK. The present study was delimited to the teachers working in the Government Primary Schools of District Lower Dir KPK.

# Research Design

Quantitative method will be adopted for this study, because the quantitative results are possible to be generalized to entire population or a sub-population as it comprises the greater sample which is randomly selected (Carr, 1994). Besides, statistical software such as SPSS is uses for analyzing the data sample as it is less time consuming (Connolly, 2007).

# Population

All Government Sector Primary Schools (male 804 and 436 females) at District Lower Dir were constituted as population of the study (Department of Elementary & Secondary Education 2022).

# Sample

The key purpose of this research study was to find the role of teachers in dealing with student's disruptive behavior in the classroom at Primary School level. The research advisor (2006) was used to draw sample size. Out of 1,240 Government Primary Schools (male 98 and female 76) and 4,908 Primary Teachers (male=3016, female=1892) 624 Primary Teachers (Male=346, female=278) were taken as a sample.

*Table of Sample Demographics*

| Variables | Frequency | Total frequency | Percentage | Total percentage |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Gender | | | | |
| Male | 346 | 624 | 55.44 | 100 |
| Female | 278 | | 44.55 | |

## Research Tool

The researcher designed Questionnaire for data collection from Government Primary School Teachers from Lower Dir. A Questionnaires based on 5-points Likert scale was used for the collection of data from respondents, these point scales were a.) Strongly agree, b.) Agree, c.) Undecided, d.) Disagree and e.) Strongly disagree to get the perception of the teachers.

## Data Collection

The researcher personally visited the data sources to collect data from the sample. The data were collected from Primary School Teachers. The obtained data were used for analysis and recommendations.

## Data Analysis

The following statistical analysis applied to measure the constructs of research. Descriptive analysis and the t-test were used to analyze the records. T-test was practiced to match the responses of Male and Female teachers.

**Table 1:** *Summoning the student parents to school.*

| Gender | N | Mean | SD | Std. error mean | T | P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| M | 346 | 4.07 | 1.140 | .062 | 2.155 | .032 |
| F | 278 | 3.87 | 1.170 | .069 | | |

Table displays the gender comparison (both men and women). As demonstrated by t-values (2.155), Males (N = 346, Mean = 4.07, SD = 1.140, Standard error mean =.062) have a higher perception than females (N = 278, Mean 3.87, SD = 1.170, Standard error mean =.069). A significant difference found between groups was determined by the P-value (.032 < 0.05).

**Table 2**: *Investigating misbehavior.*

| Gender | N | Mean | SD | Std. error mean | T | P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| M | 346 | 3.71 | 1.441 | .079 | 2.270 | .024 |
| F | 278 | 3.95 | 1.183 | .070 | | |

Table shows how (male and female) compare. As demonstrated by t-values (2.270), Males (N = 346, Mean = 3.71, SD = 1.441, Standard error mean =.079) had lower perception than females (N = 278, Mean 3.95, SD = 1.183, Standard error mean =.070). A significant difference between groups was demonstrated using the P-value (.024 < 0.05).

**Table 3:** *Have a conversation with the students after the lesson.*

| Gender | N | Mean | SD | Std. error mean | T | P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| M | 346 | 3.78 | 1.372 | .075 | 3.357 | .001 |
| F | 278 | 4.13 | 1.143 | .067 | | |

Table shows a comparison between the genders (both men and women). Females (N = 278, mean 4.13, SD = 1.143, standard error mean =.067) have higher perception than males (N = 346, mean = 3.78, SD = 1.372, standard error mean =.075). The t-value (3.357), there is a significant difference between groups, as evidenced by the p-value (.001 > 0.05).

**Table 4:** *Warning to the students not to misbehave again.*

| Gender | N | Mean | SD | Std. error mean | T | P |
|--------|------|------|-------|-----------------|------|------|
| M | 346 | 3.59 | 1.001 | .055 | .428 | .668 |
| F | 278 | 3.55 | 1.082 | .064 | | |

Table compares the genders (male and female). Females (N = 278, mean 3.59, SD = 1.082, standard error mean =.064) have lesser perception than males (N = 346, mean 3.59, SD = 1.001, standard error mean =.055). The states of the t-value (.428) there is no significant difference between groups, as evidenced by the p-value (.668 > 0.05).

**Table 5:** *Make sure all the students are given work to do as soon as possible.*

| Gender | N | Mean | SD | Std. error mean | T | P |
|--------|------|------|-------|-----------------|-------|------|
| M | 346 | 3.91 | 1.100 | .060 | 2.688 | .007 |
| F | 278 | 4.14 | .938 | .055 | | |

Male and female genders are compared in Table5 .Males had a lower perception (N = 346; mean 3.91; SD 1.100; standard error mean.0640) than females (N = 278; mean 4.14; SD .938; standard error mean.055). States of the t-value (2.688) A significant difference between groups is indicated by the P-value (.007 < 0.05).

**Table 6:** *Punish the students if the misbehavior persists.*

| Gender | N | Mean | SD | Std. error mean | T | P |
|--------|------|------|-------|-----------------|-------|------|
| M | 346 | 3.60 | 1.458 | .080 | 1.688 | .092 |
| F | 278 | 3.79 | 1.400 | .083 | | |

Table shows the gender (male and female) comparison. Males (N = 346; mean 3.60; SD 1.458; standard error mean.080) had a lower perception than females (N = 278; mean 3.79; SD 1.400; standard error mean.083). The different t-value states (1.688) No significant difference found between groups is indicated by the P-value (.092 > 0.05).

**Table7:** *Speak to the people in a firm and assertive manner.*

| Gender | N | Mean | SD | Std. error mean | T | P |
|--------|------|------|-------|-----------------|------|------|
| M | 346 | 3.22 | 1.221 | .067 | .062 | .951 |
| F | 278 | 3.23 | 1.290 | .076 | | |

Table compares the genders (male and female). Males (N = 346; mean 3.22; SD 1.221; standard error mean.067) had a lower perception than females (N = 278; mean 3.23; SD 1.290; standard error mean.076) t-value states (.062) A non-significant difference between groups is shown by a P-value (.951 > 0.05).

**Table 8:** *Guide students towards reengaging in the work.*

| Gender | N | Mean | SD | Std. error mean | T | P |
|--------|------|------|-------|-----------------|------|------|
| M | 346 | 3.95 | .994 | .054 | .669 | .503 |
| F | 278 | 4.01 | 1.038 | .061 | | |

Table compares (male and female) genders. Males (N = 346; mean 3.95; SD .994; standard error mean.054) had lower perception than females (N = 278; mean 4.01; SD 1.038; standard error mean.061). The t-states value's (.669) No significant difference found between groups is indicated by the P-value (.503 > 0.05).

**Table 9:** *Involve a more senior member of staff if the misbehavior persists.*

| Gender | N | Mean | SD | Std. error mean | T | P |
|--------|-----|------|-------|-----------------|------|------|
| M | 346 | 4.05 | 1.125 | .061 | .449 | .653 |
| F | 278 | 4.09 | 1.087 | .064 | | |

The comparison between genders is seen in table (male and female). Males (N = 346, Mean = 4.05, SD = 1.125, Standard error mean =.061) have poorer perception than females (N = 278, Mean 4.09, SD = 1.087, Standard error mean =.064), as evidenced by t-value (.449), and P-value found no significant difference between groups (.633 > 0.05).

**Table 10:** *Establishing clear classroom rules.*

| Gender | N | Mean | SD | Std. error mean | T | P |
|--------|-----|------|-------|-----------------|-------|------|
| M | 346 | 3.71 | 1.354 | .074 | 2.814 | .005 |
| F | 278 | 4.00 | 1.184 | .070 | | |

The gender comparison is seen in table (male and female). Males (N = 346, Mean = 3.71, SD = 1.354, Standard error mean =.074) have lesser perception than females (N = 278, Mean 4.00, SD = 1.184, Standard error mean =.070) As indicated by t-value (3.816), The P-value revealed a substantial change between the groups (.005 < 0.05).

**Table 11:** *When the student engages in the problem behavior, you provide one-to-one instruction to get the student back on-task.*

| Gender | N | Mean | SD | Std. error mean | T | P |
|--------|-----|------|-------|-----------------|-------|------|
| M | 346 | 3.64 | 1.033 | .056 | 3.603 | .000 |
| F | 278 | 3.94 | .998 | .059 | | |

The comparison between male and female genders is shown in Table  Males (N = 346, mean = 3.64, SD = 1.033, standard error mean =.056) perceptions were lower than females (N = 278, mean 3.94, SD = .998, standard error mean =.059). The t-value has shown (3.603) The P-value (.000 0.05) shows a significant difference between the groups.

**Table 12:** *When the student engages in the problem behavior, do you stop interacting with the students.*

| Gender | N | Mean | SD | Std. error mean | T | P |
|--------|-----|------|-------|-----------------|-------|------|
| M | 346 | 3.40 | 1.249 | .068 | 1.608 | .108 |
| F | 278 | 3.24 | 1.306 | .077 | | |

Table shows the gender (male and female) comparison. Males (N = 346; mean 3.40; SD 1.249; standard error mean.068) had a higher perception than females (N = 278; mean 3.24; SD 1.306; standard error mean.077). The different t-value states (1.608) A non-significant difference between groups is indicated by the P-value (.108 > 0.05.

## Discussion

However, the present researche study mainly attentive on the framework of classroom management at the primary level. It is clear from the findings of various researchers that

disruptive behavior has always caused unease between peers, colleagues, and classmates of different ages. The study's narrow focus made it easier to get the results expected of it and made it possible to accomplish its goals. Since the use of corporal punishment was prohibited, disruptive behavior has become a significant issue for teachers and administrators in Lower Dir's Primary schools (Ahmad, Gul, & Imtiaz, 2022; Ali et al., 2021; Batool et al., 2022; Gul, Khan, et al., 2020). The confusion is indeed a topic of discussion among Primary school teachers, and it obviously refers to behavior and classroom management. Disruptive behavior by a student does not hurt him or her, but it does disrupt the entire class, and in extreme situations, it completely undermines the entire system. Teachers, students, and parents are all concerned regarding disruptive behavior. During data collection, the researcher discovered that most teachers took a great interest in completing the questionnaire and reporting the perception, causes and strategies of disruptive behavior, which enhanced the researcher's commitment.

## Conclusions

(Henricsson & Rydell, 2004), stated that a difficult task is when children's externalizing their behaviors in front of teacher's "face" inside classroom. Government Primary School Teachers facing Disruptive behavior from students on regular basis in their classrooms. The teachers more often spent maximum time regarding student's their discipline and less on the actual lesson plans they prepared (Ayub, Gul, Malik, et al., 2021; Gul & Reba, 2017; Saleem et al., 2021; Sohail et al., 2018). The research has shown that neurobiological disorder may cause child's behavior, as like "Attention deficit hyperactivity disorder", or can may be due tosome traumatic events they faced. The aim of this research study was to understand the Role of Teachers in dealing with Student's Disruptive behavior at Government Primary School Level.This study employed a quantitative approach, and the researcher used a questionnaire to gather data from a sizable sample size. While teaching at Government Primary School Level Teachers faced disruptive classroom issues of students, teachers stated the main causes of student's disruptive behavior like most of the students speak without permission, playing with hands and pen, making complaints against his/her fellow, chatting with one another during teaching they stated the strategies adopt while reacting to disruptive behavior.

## future implications

The following recommendations are made:
1. To prevent and minimize the consequences of disruptive behavior, methods of teaching may be modified in knowledge of the behavior of the students.
2. In order to highlight the consequences, treatment, and effects of students' disruptive behavior, educational institutes may organize workshops on the subject of student's disruptive behavior for students, teachers and parents.
3. In order to identify the attitude, finding the good, bad, better, and extraordinary behavior of students along with decreasing student's disruptive behavior, a rating system should be adopted. Additionally, admissions and scholarships can also be provided through this system.
4. To motivate students to study, teaching strategies may be strengthened, when students are actively involved in their study, they act more responsibly.
5. Friendly teaching techniques and classroom management techniques must be taught to teachers and school administrators. Therefore, the next generation would become more emotionally stable.

6.    School authorities must reject disciplinary measures in their area of responsibility while still upholding rules and regulations. Because they are more certainly necessary, modern disciplinary methods should replace those that are out of date.

# References

Ahmad, I., & Gul, R. (2021). Impact of online service-learning on civic and social justice behavior of undergraduate laboratory-based graduates. Human Arenas, 1-16.

Ahmad, I., Gul, R., & Imtiaz, U. (2022). COVID-19 Outbreak, Challenges and Possibilities for Online System of Education. In An Interdisciplinary Approach in the Post COVID-19 Pandemic Era. Nova Publishers. https://doi.org/ https://doi.org/10.52305/KCJU7458

Ahmad, I., Gul, R., & Kashif, M. (2022). A Qualitative Study of Workplace Factors Causing Stress Among University Teachers and Coping Strategies A Qualitative Study of Workplace Factors. Human Arenas, 1-23.

Ahmad, I., Gul, R., & Zeb, M. (2022). A qualitative inquiry of university student's experiences of exam stress and its effect on their academic performance. Human Arenas, 1-11.

Ali, I., Gul, R., & Khan, S. S., Karim. (2021). An evaluative study of English contrastive rhetoric in pashtu speaking areas of Pakistan: A case study of District Swat. Linguistica Antverpiensia, 2021(1), 2183-2203.

Ayub, A., Gul, R., Ali, A., & Rauf, B. M. (2021). Cultural and educational stress: a case study of brahui speaking ESL and EMI periphery students. Asian EFL Journal, 28, 239-260.

Ayub, A., Gul, R., Malik, M., Sharjeel, M. Y., & Rauf, M. B. (2021). Achievement in Mathematics at Elementary School Level in Quetta City, Balochistan. Ilkogretim Online-Elementary Education Online, 20(3), 262-270.

Akinbami, L, Liu, X., Pastor, P., & Reuben, C. (2011). Attention deficit hyperactivity disorder among children aged 5-17 years in the United States, 1990-2009. NCHS data brief, (70), 1-8.

Batool, S., Tahir, T., Gul, R., & Ishfaq, U. (2021). Attribution styles of deaf children: Application of Weiner theory. Webology, 18(3), -.

Batool, S., Tahir, T., Rani Gul, M., & Nawaz, H. (2022). An Educational Intervention To Optimize Physical Wellness Of University Students. Journal of Positive School Psychology, 6(8), 3779-3792.

Bukhari, S. K. U. S., Gul, R., Bashir, T., Zakir, S., & Javed, T. (2021). Exploring managerial skills of Pakistan Public Universities (PPUs)'middle managers for campus sustainability. Journal of Sustainable Finance and Investment, 1-19.

Bear, G. G. (1998). School discipline in the United States: Prevention, correction, and long term social development. School Psychology Review 27(1), 14-32.

Booth S.S. (2017). Planned ignoring. In G. Geng, P. Smith, & P. Black (Eds.), The challenge of teaching (pp. 181-187). Springer.

Bradshaw, C. P., Waasdorp, T. E., & Leaf, P. J. (2012). Effects of school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports on child behavior problems. Pediatrics, 130(5), 1136-1145.

Bradshaw, C. P., Waasdorp, T. E., & Leaf, P. J. (2012). Effects of school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports on child behavior problems. Pediatrics, 130(5), 1136-1145.

Bru, D. (2009). Academic outcomes in school classes with markedly disruptive pupils. Social Psychology of Education, 12(4), 461-479.

Carr, L. T. (1994). The strengths and weaknesses of quantitative and qualitative research: what method for nursing?. Journal of advanced nursing, 20(4), 716-721.

Charles, C. M., Gail, W. S., & Karen, B. B. (1999). Building classroom discipline. (6th ed.). New York: Longman.

Chitiyo, M., May, M. E., & Chitiyo, G. (2012). An assessment of the evidence-base for school-wide positive behavior support. Education and Treatment of Children, 35(1), 1-24.

Clunies-Ross, P., Little, E., & Kienhuis, M. (2008). Self-reported and actual use of proactive and reactive classroom management strategies and their relationship with teacher stress and student behavior. Educational psychology, 28(6), 693-710.

Connolly, P. (2007). Quantitative data analysis in education: A critical introduction using SPSS. Routledge.

Deitz, S. M., & Hummel, J. H. (1978). Discipline in the schools: A guide to reducing misbehavior. Educational Technology.

Dicke, T., Elling, J., Schmeck, A., & Leutner, D. (2015). Reducing reality shock: The effects of classroom management skills training on beginning teachers. Teaching and Teacher Education, (48), 1-12.

Drewery, W. (2014). Restorative practice in New Zealand schools: Social development through relational justice. Educational Philosophy and Theory, 48(2), 191–203.

Duesund, L. (2014). Students' perception of reactions towards disruptive behavior in Norwegian and American schools. Emotional and Behavioral Difficulties, 23(4), 410-423.

Evertson, C. (2007). Creating conditions for learning: A comprehensive program for creating an effective learning environment, classroom organization and management program. Nashville, TN: Peabody College, Vanderbilt University.

Evertson, C. (2007). Creating conditions for learning: A comprehensive program for creating an effective learning environment, classroom organization and management program. Nashville, TN: Peabody College, Vanderbilt University.

Feltner, B., & Goodshell, D., R. (1972). The academic dean and conflict management. The Journal of Higher Education, 43(9), 692-701.

Finn, J. D., Pannozzo, G. M., & Voelkl, K. E. (1995). Disruptive and inattentive-withdrawn behavior and achievement among fourth graders. The Elementary School Journal, 95(5), 421-434.

Gul, & Khilji, G. K. (2023). The Readiness of Schools for an Online System of Education amid the COVID-19 Pandemic in Quetta, Balochistan. In Digital Innovation for Pandemics (pp. 21-44). Auerbach Publications.

Gul, R., Ahmad, I., Tahir, T., & Ishfaq, U. (2022). Development and factor analysis of an instrument to measure service-learning management. Heliyon, 8(4), e09205.

Gul, R., Ayub, A., Mazhar, S., Uddin, S. S., & Khanum, M. (2021). Teachers' perceptions on students' cultural and linguistic diversity and its impact on their approaches towards culturally teaching practices. TESOL International journal, 16(3-2).

Gul, R., Kanwal, S., & Khan, S. S. (2020). Preferences of the teachers in employing revised blooms taxonomy in their instructions. Sir Syed Journal of Education & Social Research, 3(2), 258-266.

Gul, R., Khan, S. S., Mazhar, S., & Tahir, T. (2020). Influence of logical and spatial intelligence on teaching pedagogies of secondary school teachers. Humanities and Social Sciences Reviews, 8(6), 01-09.

Gul, R., & Khilji, G. (2021). Exploring the need for a responsive school curriculum to cope with the Covid-19 pandemic in Pakistan. Prospects, 51(1-3), 503-522.

Gul, R., Muhammad, T., Mumtaz, M., & Shaheen, L. (2021). Does intelligence matters in teaching? Exploring the impact of teachers intelligence on teaching pedagogies of secondary school science teachers. Journal of Multicultural Education, 7(3).

Gul, R., & Rafique, M. (2017). Teachers preferred approaches towards multiple intelligence teaching: Enhanced prospects for teaching strategies. Journal of Research and Reflections in Education, 11(2).

Gul, R., & Reba, A. (2017). A study of multiple intelligence and social profiles of secondary school teachers, Peshawar. Journal of Applied Environmental and Biological Sciences, 7(6), 226-235.

Gul, R., Tahir, I. U., & Batool, T. (2021). Impact of teachers workload on their time management skills at university level. Indian Journal of Economics and Business, 20(3).

Gul, R., Tahir, T., & Ishfaq, U. (2020). Teaching as A Profession, Exploring the Motivational Factors, and the Motives to Stay in the Field of Teaching. Ilkogretim Online-Elementary Education Online19(4).

Gul, R., Tahir, T., & Ishfaq, U. (2023). Perspectives of the Teachers on Challenges and Possibilities to Online System of Education amid COVID-19 Outbreak in Balochistan, Pakistan. SAGE Open, 13(1), 21582440231155063.

Gul, R., Tehseen, T., Batool, S., Ishfaq, U., & Nawaz, M. H. (2022). Effect Of Different Classroom Predicators On Students Behavioral Engagement. Journal of Positive School Psychology, 6(8), 3759-3778.

Gul, R., Zakir, S., Ali, I., Karim, H., & Hussain, R. (2021). The impact of education on business opportunities for women entrepreneurs in public & private television advertisements in Pakistan. Industrial Engineering and Management Systems, 20(2), 140-147.

Ghazi, S. R., Shahzada, G., Tariq, M., & Khan, A. Q. (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.

Greene, R. W. (2009). Lost at school: Why our kids with behavioral challenges are falling through the cracks and how we can help them (1st ed.). Simon and Schuster.

Henricsson, L., & Rydell, A. M. (2004). Elementary school children with behavior problems: Teacher-child relations and self-perception. A prospective study. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly (1982-), 50(2), 111-138.

Hubbell, L, & Hubbell, K. (2010) when a college class becomes a mob: coping with student's cohorts. College student journal, 44(2).

Infantino, J., & Little, E. (2005). Students' perceptions of classroom behavior problems and the effectiveness of different disciplinary methods. Educational Psychology, 25(5), 491-508.

Jacobsson, C. (2001). Managing Human Service Organizations. Department of Psychology, Göteborg University.

Johnson, B. (2012). Being the dean of students in challenging times. Independent school, 71(4), 76-81.

Kauffman, J. M., Mostert, M. P., Trent, S. C., & Pullen, P. L. (2011). managing classroom behavior: A reflective case-based approach (5th ed.). Pearson.

Kayıkçı, K. (2009). The effect of classroom management skills of elementary school teachers on undesirable discipline behavior of students. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 1(1), 1215-1225.

Kelm, J. L., & McIntosh, K. (2012). Effects of school-wide positive behavior support on teacher self-efficacy. Psychology in the Schools, 49(2), 137-147.

Khan, H., Gul, R., & Zeb, M. (2023). The Effect of Students' Cognitive and Emotional Engagement on Students' Academic Success and Academic Productivity. Journal of Social Sciences Review, 3(1), 322-334.

Kourkoutas, Y. (2013). Immobilization technologies in probiotic food production. Journal of nutrition and metabolism, 2013.

Kuo, H. M. (2009). Understanding relationships between academic staff and administrators: An organizational culture perspective. Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 31(1), 43-54.

Mahvar, T., Farahani, M. A., & Aryankhesal, A. (2018). Conflict management strategies in coping with students' disruptive behaviors in the classroom: Systematized review. Journal of Advances in Medical Education & Professionalism, 6(3), 102-114.

Matsoga, J. T. (2003). Crime and school violence in Botswana secondary education: the case of molding senior secondary school. Ohio University.

Matsoga, J. T. (2003). Crime and school violence in Botswana secondary education: the case of molding senior secondary school. Ohio University.

McCluskey, G. (2018). Restorative approaches in schools: Current practices, future directions. The Palgrave international handbook of school discipline, surveillance, and social control, 573-593.

Miller, A. (2006). Understanding Behavior Problems in Urban Elementary Schools. Trinity College Digital Repository.

Muhammad Tufail, Shahzad Khan, Rani Gul, & Rashid, M. H. U. (2022). Servant Leadership and Knowledge Hiding: The Moderating Role of Personality Traits in Academic Settings. International Review of Basic and Applied Sciences, 10(2), 225-236.

Närhi, V., Kiiski, T., & Savolainen, H. (2017). Reducing disruptive behaviors and improving classroom behavioral climate with class-wide positive behavior support in middle schools. British Educational Research Journal, 43(6), 1186-1205.

Njoroge, P. M., & Nyabuto, A. N. (2014). Discipline as a factor in academic performance in Kenya. Journal of Education and Social Research, 4(1), 289-307.

O'Connor, E. E., Dearing, E., & Collins, B. A. (2011). Teacher-child relationship and behavior problem trajectories in elementary school. American Educational Research Journal, 48(1), 120-162.

Ødegård, M. (2011). Disorder in schools: Dasein and absorbed coping (Master's thesis). Ratcliff, N., Jones, C. R., Costner, R. H., Savage-Davis, E., & Hunt, G. H. (2010). The elephant in the classroom: The impact of misbehavior on classroom climate. Education, 131(2), 306-314.

Osher, D., Bear, G. G., Sprague, J. R., & Doyle, W. (2010). How can we improve school discipline? Educational Researcher, 39(1), 48-58.

Overland, S., (2007). Anxiety, depression, and cause-specific mortality: the HUNT study. Psychosomatic medicine, 69(4), 323-331.

Pas, E. T., & Bradshaw, C. P. (2014). What affects teacher ratings of student behaviors? The potential influence of teachers' perceptions of the school environment and experiences. Prevention science, 15, 940-950.

Payne, R. (2015). Using rewards and sanctions in the classroom: Pupils' perceptions of their own responses to current behavior management strategies. Educational Review,67(4), 483-504.

Phoumchay, V., Endang, F., and Koesoemo, R. (2021). Types and Causes of Students' Disruptive Behaviors in English Class: A Case Study at Dondaeng Secondary School, Laos.Journal of Humanities Research, 22(2), 72-83.

Rosenberg, M. S., & Jackman, L. A. (2003). Development, implementation, and sustainability of comprehensive school-wide behavior management systems. Intervention in School and Clinic, 39(1), 10-21.

Ruttledge, R. A., & Petrides, K. V. (2012). A cognitive behavioral group approach for adolescents with disruptive behavior in schools. School Psychology International, 33(2), 223-239.

Said, H., Shah Bukhari, S. K. U., Gul, R., & Ibna Seraj, P. M. (2021). Barriers to sustainability at Pakistan public universities and the way forward. International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-09-2020-0352

Salameh, A. A., Akhtar, H., Gul, R., Omar, A. B., & Hanif, S. (2022). Personality Traits and Entrepreneurial Intentions: Financial Risk-Taking as Mediator. Frontiers in Psychology, 13, 927718-927718.

Saleem, A., Gul, R., & Dogar, A. A. (2021). Effectiveness Of Continuous Professional Development Program As Perceived By Primary Level Teachers. Ilkogretim Online-Elementary Education Online 20(3).

Semali, L. M., & Vumilia, P. L. (2016). Challenges Facing Teachers' Attempts to Enhance Learners' Discipline in Tanzania's Secondary Schools. World Journal of Education, 6(1), 50-67.

Sharpe, S. (1987). Cerebral ischemia and reperfusion: prevention of brain mitochondrial injury by lidoflazine. Journal of Cerebral Blood Flow & Metabolism, 7(6), 752-758.

Shepherd, T. L., & Linn, D. (2014). Behavior and classroom management in the multicultural classroom. Sage.

Simonsen, B., Fairbanks, S., Briesch, A., Myers, D., & Sugai, G. (2008). Evidence-based practices in classroom management: Considerations for research to practice. Education and treatment of children, 351-380.

Sohail, M., Gul, R., & Mushtaq, R. (2018). The Establishment of Azad School Utmanzai and Anjuman-i-Islahul Afaghina: A Successful Methodology of Organizational Excellence (1921-1946). Global Social Sciences Review, 3(3), 193-206.

Sorlie, M. A., & Ogden, T. (2014). Less problem behavior in primary school? - Teacher Assessments in a 10-year perspective. Norwegian educational journal, 98(03), 190-202.

Spivack, G., & Cianci, N. (1987). High-risk early behavior pattern and later delinquency. In J. D. Burchard & S. N. Burchard (Eds.), Prevention of delinquent behavior. Vermont conference on the primary prevention of psychopathology, 10, 44–74.

Stough, L. (2013). The place of classroom management and standards in teacher education. Handbook of classroom management (1st ed.), 919-934.

Sullivan, A. M., Johnson, B., Owens, L., & Conway, R. (2014). Punish them or engage them? Teachers' views of unproductive student behaviors in the classroom. Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 39(6), 43-56.

White, R., Algozzine, B., Audette, R., Marr, M. B., & Ellis Jr, E. D. (2001). Unified discipline: A school-wide approach for managing problem behavior. Intervention in School and Clinic, 37(1), 3-8.

Woodcock, S., & Reupert, A. (2017). A tale from three countries: the classroom management practices of pre-service teachers from Australia, Canada and the United Kingdom. Teacher Development, 21(5), 655-667.

Woodcock, S., & Reupert, A. (2017). A tale from three countries: the classroom management practices of pre-service teachers from Australia, Canada and the United Kingdom. Teacher Development, 21(5), 655-667.

Wubbels, T. (2011). "An international perspective on classroom management: What should prospective teachers learn?" Teaching Education, 22(2), 113–131.

Zhou, G., Gul, R., & Tufail, M. (2022). Does servant leadership stimulate work engagement? The moderating role of trust in the leader. Frontiers in Psychology, 13. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.925732