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Abstract

The objectives of this research were to find out the kinds and factors of students’ disruptive behavior in learning English, to find out teacher’s strategy in managing students’ disruptive behavior, and to find out the impact of students’ disruptive behavior on students’ speaking skill. This research applied descriptive qualitative research design in order to get more understanding about the phenomenon of students’ disruptive behavior. 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 impat of students’ disruptive behavior on students’ speaking skill. Moreover, semi-structured interview was used to get factors causing students’ disruptive behavior. Based on the observation result, there are eight kinds of disruptive behavior namely inattention, apathy, moving about the room, annoying others, cheating, disrupting in form of shouting, needless talk, and exaggerated talk. The researcher also found seven strategies that teacher used in dealing with disruptive behavior namely touch interference, proximity interference, signal interference, request & demands, calling out names, asking questions, and psychological punishment. In order to get the data about factors causing disruptive behavior, the researcher did the interview and found several factors namely psychological factor, social factors, and environmental factors. In order to get the data about the impact of disruptive behavior on students’ speaking skills, the researcher used observation and found one impact namely linguistic impact.
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# 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). From the statements, it can be concluded that disruptive behavior may disrupt not only student but also teaching and learning process. If this condition is not handled properly, it will become an obstacle in teaching and learning process. In most cases, children in elementary school may act disruptively because they have less capacity of self-control (Augimeri et al., 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, a number of studies from educational background have investigated student’s disruptive behavior and its handling. The previous researchers, Ardin (2016) only focuses on the strategies in decreasing disruptive behavior using interpersonal communication, Wulandari (2011) focuses on the analyzing general strategy in dealing with disruptive behavior and investigating the difficulties of the teaching in implementing the strategies, Sufahmiati (2015) only focuses in investigating causes and types of students’ disruptive behavior, and Pita (2017) only focuses 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 intends 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**."

# LITERATURE REVIEW

DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIORS

Haroun and O'Hanlon (1997) define 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. 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, et al., (2017) define 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.

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.

TEACHER’S STRATEGIES

Hue & Li (2008) suggests 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, and asking questions, and request & demands.

STUDENTS’ OUTCOMES

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 tries 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. 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 will try to analyze students’ learning outcome especially in productive skills which is speaking ability.

In measuring speaking ability, there are two main aspect 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.

# RESEARCH METHOD

A qualitative design was applied in this research. According to Gay et al. (2011), qualitative research is the collection, analysis, and interpretation of comprehensive narrative and visual data in order to gain insight into a particular phenomenon, furthermore, the purpose of qualitative research focuses and deals with promoting a deep understanding of a particular phenomenon namely environment, a process, or even a belief.

In this research, the researcher used descriptive qualitative method to explore the phenomenon of disruptive behavior among students in EFL classroom. Where 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.

RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

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 participant 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.

DATA COLLECTION METHOD

1. 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.

1. 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:

1. 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).

1. 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.

1. 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) explain, 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.

1. 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.

1. 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 is completed, the researcher will define the theme according to the content and meaning of the codes. This definition summarizes the content of what is discussed within the theme.

1. 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.

# RESULT

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 shows that inattention as disruptive behavior in learning English. Inattentive students tend to looking out of the windows. They said that the reason of doing such a thing was because the distraction that comes from outside the classroom such as noisy students hanging around and they often think about things irrelevant to the lesson. This behavior is categorized as disruptive behavior as it obstruct the teaching and learning process and they did not pay attention to the lesson.

The second type of students’ disruptive behavior is apathy. Apathetic students tend 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 tend to refuse or they just remain silent. This condition certainly disrupts the learning process. The next type of disruption is moving about 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.

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 noisy and certainly can distract other students to focus on the lesson. 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.

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.

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. These behavior can be categorized as disrupting. This condition certainly break other student’s attention. The student who shout 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 use signal interference. There are three kinds of signal interference that teacher use; nodding head, staring students who misbehave, and pointing, but pointing is the most frequently used strategies in coping with disruptive behavior.

The next strategy is proximity interference. When students misbehave, teacher tend to use proximity interference by getting close and approaching them. The teacher closes the distance between herself and the students who act disruptively. Some students act silently when the teacher address their disruptive behavior, but when the teacher walked away, they tend to repeat their behavior again. 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.

The next strategy is calling out names. The condition of noisy in the classroom may lead students to behave disruptively. As a result, teacher tend to raise her voice in order to get attention from her students. But when it fail, teacher tend to calling out name who made disruption to address the disruptive behavior directly. Another strategy that teacher applied is asking questions directly to the students who misbehave. The teacher sent message in the form of a question to caution off-task students about their disengagement or disruptive behavior in the classroom will help to redirect them back to learning in EFL classroom.

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.

When students act disruptively, there 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 feel 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.

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. 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.

Related to the fourth research question, the researcher 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.

# DISCUSSION AND 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 viewing the English lesson as 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 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.
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