American Journal of Education, Teaching and Social Policy
2113-136X (Print), ISSN 2113-139X (Online)
European Article Number (EAN): 7642-8982
Journal Homepage: https://originaljournals.com

THE EFFECTS OF CLASSROOM DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIOUR ON LEARNING IN JUNIOR HIGH FORM THREE STUDENTS IN THE UPPER DENKYIRA EAST MUNICIPAL

(Article Type: Original Article, Submitted: June 24, 2021; Accepted: July 2, 2021, Published Online: August 5, 2021). Volume 3, Issue 2, pp. 1-11

Indexing: All work published in this series are submitted to the Web of Science CitationIndex, to Scholastica, Scopus, ResearchGate, Academia.edu, Medium Research, and to Google Scholar.

Zacharia Mohammed
Mampong Technical College of Education, Asante Mampong, Ghana

ABSTRACT:
Background: A classroom disruption is generally regarded as behaviour a reasonable person would view as being likely to substantially or repeatedly interfere with the conduct of a class (Pavela 2001). This study is aimed to identify the effects of classroom disruptive behaviour on learning of junior high form three students in the Upper Denkyira East Municipal in the Central Region of Ghana.
Methods: The study employed a mixed-method design. The sample frame was 2446 junior high form three students from 78 basic schools.
Results: The study concludes that the respondents have an opinion that classroom noise and teasing as factors of disruptive behaviours have a negative effect on students learning among form three junior high school students in the Upper Denkyira East Municipal. It was indicated that classroom noise lowers academic achievement for disruptive students and was rated as the most influential variable on the measured factor (M=4.25, SD=0.643, CV=0.151).

Keywords: Disruptive behaviour, junior high school, negative teacher, Upper Denkyira East Municipal.

1. Introduction

Every human sphere exhibits a particular behaviour that emanates from it. At the Junior high school level, classrooms have their expected behaviour. Such classroom behaviours vary from class to class and they are of two parts; negative and positive behaviours. Negative behaviour when it affects the easy flow of learning. Some examples of negative behaviours are disobeying teachers, fighting, cheating in class, and many others. This negative classroom behaviour could be called different names, ranging from classroom misbehaviors, maladaptive behaviours or disruptive behaviours. The behaviour is positive when it promotes learning. Some examples are completing homework, being attentive in class, attending school on time and among others.

Surveys on the effects of classroom disruptive behaviours have generally indicated that the issue of destructive classroom behaviour has become progressively more important to schools (Hood & Hood 2001; Arbuckle & Little 2004). This is because teachers dealing with student's destructive behaviours in the classroom take up a considerable proportion of teaching time, which in turn affects the quality of the students' learning outcomes. Issues related to student behaviour increasingly are becoming a shared concern especially as behaviour is one of the dominant discourses of schooling (Ball, Marguire & Braun 2012). In many countries such as Australia, Italy, there is a growing sense of social anxiety about students' behaviour in schools (Ball, et al 2012). The media illustrate society's unease by consistently reporting widespread public and political concern over allegedly negative and deteriorating student behaviour in the nation's public schools (Cameron, 2010, Donnelly, 2009) Some teachers are often not equipped to deal with some types of extreme disruptive behaviour and as a result, the student is either sent out of class or the problem escalates, eventually leading to some sort of students' riots or unrest. Donkor (2002) mentioned that three pupils of the local Islamic basic school at Kwame Danso were suspended from classes for several weeks after they besmeared their teacher's room with excreta when they were punished for wrongdoing in the classroom. Donkor explained that the suspension affected the pupils' learning since they stayed out of school for several days.

American Journal of Education, Teaching and Social Policy
2113-136X (Print), ISSN 2113-139X (Online)
European Article Number (EAN): 7642-8982
Journal Homepage: https://originaljournals.com

At all levels of education, especially at the basic school level, classroom disruptive behaviours are considered to be a very serious problem for the teacher. This is because society attaches great value to discipline and this must be imparted to the children at a very early age in life. Ideally, students are supposed to know that the teacher is in charge of the classroom and that proper behaviour and attention towards their studies are of utmost importance. However, this is not always the case. In almost all the educational levels, students exhibit some form of indiscipline either in the classroom or outside the classroom. The disruptive behaviours, which exist within the classrooms, if viewed closely are normal developmental behaviour of students or pupils, but if not tackled properly, will pose a great problem to teaching and learning. According to the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF, 2011), the following are some examples of normal developmental behaviour characteristics of students or pupils (adolescents); need to release energy, with sudden outbursts of activity, a desire to become independent and to search for adult identity, overreacting to ridicule, embarrassment and rejection, seeking approval of peers and others with getting attention behaviours.

According to Mmegi, (2008) as cited by Felicity-Anne, (2015) students' inattention in class is a major cause of poor performance by students in the Botswana General Certificate of Secondary Examinations (BGCSE). Another situation of classroom disruptive behaviour is reported by Miah (2012). According to Miah, on April 13, 2004, a student of Christ Ebenezer junior high school at Darkuman, Accra, stole a colleague's items in class and was suspended for two weeks which affected his learning. Miah added that in the same school on July 16, 2007, two boys fought seriously in class, and this disrupted learning for several hours. Again, on November 24, 2008, some students cheated in examinations in the same school and were prevented from writing the exams which affected their performance.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Research Design

There are three key approaches (qualitative, quantitative, and mixed) to every research which determines whether a mono or mixed research approach is employed. The approach a researcher employs is also largely influenced by the ontological (world view) and epistemological (theory of knowledge) paradigms of the researcher (Lincoln &Guba, 2000; Mertens, 1998; Crotty, 1998 cited in Creswel,2009). These are the basic beliefs that guide the actions and inactions of researchers. That is, the ontological and epistemological paradigms also inform the type of approach, instruments, data collection method, and the analytic strategy a researcher employs in a piece of research (Creswell, 2009). Based on the topic of this study which renders itself for both quantitative and qualitative analysis, a mixed-methods approach was adopted for the study. The research questions begin with 'what' and 'how' and therefore fall in the area of descriptive research (Cooper & Schindler, 2000). However, this same study requires a detailed explanation of the issue under study, the use of descriptive research alone was not adequate to generate significant data to answer the questions that were raised in the research questions. Consequently, the researcher had to look at an alternative approach that could use descriptive research in combination with other specific research approaches that will generate some narratives and this gave rise to the choice and use of the mixed-method approach.

2.2 Mixed-Method Design

For any research process, a systematic research design is appropriate in enabling the researcher to arrive at valid findings and logical conclusions. According to MacDaniel & Gates (1996) research design is a systematic plan that has to be followed to reach the objectives of the study. As a result, the researcher was focusing on a design that spells grounds for the collection and analysis of data in a way to achieve relevance to the research purpose with economy in procedure. This follows that the researcher has to devise a plan that conforms with the overall objectives of the study. According to Creswell (2009), there are three types of mixed approaches; sequential, concurrent, and transformative mixed-method approaches. For purposes of this study, a sequential approach was adopted. Consequently, both quantitative and qualitative data were collected one after the other. Sequential mixed methods procedures are those in which the researcher seeks to elaborate on or expand on the finding of one method with

another method. This may involve beginning with a qualitative interview or observation for exploratory purposes and following up with a quantitative survey method with a large sample so that the researcher can generalize results to a population. Alternatively, the study may begin with a quantitative method in which a theory or concept is tested, followed by a qualitative method involving detailed exploration with few cases or individuals (Creswell & Plano Clark 2007). Under the quantitative approach, the survey method was used, while the exploratory sequential design was used under the qualitative approach

2.3 Survey Approach

With the quantitative studies, the researcher used a descriptive survey. Survey research provides a quantitative or numeric description of trends, attitudes, or opinions of a population by studying a sample of that population (Creswell, 2008). In descriptive studies, the researcher decides on what he/she wants to find out, identifies the study population, selects a sample, and contacts the respondents to find out the required information (Kumar, 1999). The survey approach was adopted because the study is conducted once and gives an overall view of the issues under study. It also attempts to capture the characteristics of the population by making inferences from a sample characteristic thereby allowing some of the issues to be tested quantitatively (Cooper& Schindler 2000). Invariably the generalizations about the findings are presented based on the representativeness of the sample and the validity of the design. The researcher acquired the list of all the junior high schools and the form three students' enrolment from the municipal education directorate. The purposive sampling technique was used to select four schools due to their relevance to the study and the stratified sample technique was used to select 162 students from the four schools. This was to ensure that male and female students were selected proportionally according to their numbers in the form of three classes. The survey questionnaire was administered to 162 junior high forms three students in the Upper Denkyira East municipal in the Central region of Ghana.

2.4 Exploratory Design

The exploratory design is a two-phase approach and writers refer to it as Exploratory Sequential Design (Creswell, Plano Clark, et al, 2003). The design intends that the results of the first method (qualitative) can help develop or inform the second method (quantitative) (Greene et al, 1989). This design starts with qualitative data, to explore a phenomenon, and then builds to a second, quantitative phase. Researchers using this design-build on the results of the qualitative phase by developing an instrument, identifying variables, or stating prepositions for testing based on an emergent theory or framework. These developments connect the initial qualitative of the subsequent quantitative component of the study. The researcher employed this design because the study focused on an in-depth analysis of the effects of classroom disruptive behaviour on learning of junior high school form three students which required observation of the respondents and also the administration of questionnaires. The two-phase nature of the exploratory design makes it straightforward to describe, implement and report. This design is easily applied to multiphase research studies in addition to single studies. One of the challenges of the exploratory sequential design is that the two-phase approach requires considerable time to implement. Researchers need to recognize this factor and build time into their study's plan.

2.5 The population of the Study

Polit and Hungler (1996) as cited by Amedahe and Gyimah (2008) defined a population as the entire aggregation of cases that meet designated criteria. The population always comprises the aggregation of elements in which the researcher is interested. The target population in this study was all junior high form three students in the Upper Denkyira East Municipal in the Central region of Ghana. The justification for the choice of the form three students is that they have spent two years in the school already and are more familiar with discipline issues in the school. Also, the form three students see themselves as seniors and most often fail to obey simple schools. The total number of the form three students is 2,446. Out of the 2,446 form three students, 1255 are boys while 1191 are girls (Ghana Education Services, school census 2018). Researchers usually sample from an accessible population and hope to

American Journal of Education, Teaching and Social Policy
2113-136X (Print), ISSN 2113-139X (Online)
European Article Number (EAN): 7642-8982
Journal Homepage: https://originaljournals.com

generalize to a target population. There were 60 public junior high schools and 18 private junior high schools bringing the total schools 78. The accessible population was the form three students in four schools which were purposively selected from the 78 junior high schools within the municipality. This consisted of two public and two private schools with 283 students. The public schools had 144 students while the students in the private schools were 139. The total number of male students was 148 and the number of female students was 135.

2.6 Sample and sampling technique

According to Krejcie and Morgan (1970), for a known population of 280, the sample size should be 162. The accessible population for this study was 283 students therefore the researcher selected 162 students as the sample size to represent the accessible population of 283 students. A multi-stage sampling technique was used for the study. Firstly, the researcher used the purposive sampling technique to select four schools from the 78 schools. The purposive sampling technique was used because in the opinion of the researcher those schools were relevant to the study. The technique ensured that schools sampled consisted of both private and public schools that were particularly knowledgeable about the issues under study. The next stage was the selection of the 162 students from the four schools.

The researcher used the stratified sampling technique to select 162 students from the four schools selected. The stratified random technique was appropriate in selecting the respondents proportionately from each of the schools. It also enabled the male and female representation proportionately. The enrolment of the form three students was as follows; School A=78 students (male 39, female 39), School B=66 students (male 31, female35), School C=92 students (male 52, female 40) and School D=47 students (male 26, female 21). The formulae; n/N*s, was used to determine the respondents from each of the four schools, where n =class enrolment, N= total enrolment of form two students in the four schools, s= sample size. The simple random technique was finally used to select the students the respondents from their various schools. This was to give each student the equal opportunity to be represented to avoid biases. Based on the total number of respondents to be selected from each school, Yes and No were written on small pieces of paper with the number of Yes being equal to the number of students to be selected. The papers were mixed in a container, and the students were asked to pick them in turns. This was done separately for male and female students. The representation of the respondents for the schools was as follows; School A=44 (22 males, 22 females), School B=38(17 males, 21 females), School C=53(29 males, 24 females), and School D=27 (14 males, 13 females).

2.7 Research instrument

The instruments used in the data collection of the study were questionnaires and an observation checklist.

2.8 Questionnaire

A questionnaire consists of a list of questions or statements relating to the aims of the study, the hypothesis, or research questions to be verified and answered to which the respondent is required to answer by writing (Amedahe & Gyimah 2008). The researcher adapted the self-evaluation questionnaire of the adolescent by (Loranger & Arsenault 1989). The questionnaire had close-ended questions. The close-ended questions were used to elicit information from the students on the effects of classroom teasing and students' noise on learning.

A questionnaire was chosen as the instrument for data collection because it has a wider coverage and secondly, all the respondents were students who could read and write. The questionnaire had two sections. Section one asked for personal information such as sex, age, and nature or type of school (public or private). The second section asked for the effects of classroom teasing and noise-making by students on learning. In section two the questions had a five-point scale response format (SA= Strongly Agree, A= Agree, U= Uncertain, D= Disagree and SD= Strongly Disagree) which respondents choose from. There were 16 question items in all.

American Journal of Education, Teaching and Social Policy
2113-136X (Print), ISSN 2113-139X (Online)
European Article Number (EAN): 7642-8982
Journal Homepage: https://originaljournals.com

2.8 Observation checklist

Observation checklist refers to simple forms in which the observer uses checkmarks to indicate which behaviour from a long list of potential behaviours occurred during the observation period (Reynolds & Kamphaus 1998). This was used to ascertain the truth of the student's responses in the questionnaire in relation to classroom disruptive behaviour and its effects on learning. The checklist was designed such that it specified the particular classroom disruptive behaviour that occurred in the classroom, the frequency at which it occurred, and how it affected learning. Fifteen (15) different classroom disruptive behaviours were selected for the checklist.

2.10 Validity of the instruments

The instruments were validated firstly by two senior tutors at the Department of Education and Professional Studies at the Mampong Technical College of Education to ensure that they were more suitable. Again, the instruments were given to an expert to ensure that they were valid.

2.11 Reliability of the instrument

The instruments were pilot tested to ten (10) students within the population but outside the sample to determine the reliability. The data was analyzed using Cronbach's coefficient alpha which was found to be 0.73 making the instruments reliable.

2.12 Data collection procedure

The researcher obtained an introductory letter from the College of Distance Education, University of Cape Coast. This was sent to the municipal director of education at the Upper Denkyira East Municipal for permission to enter the schools. Upon arriving at the schools, the researcher introduced himself to the headteachers and with the help of the teachers the respondents were selected and lessons were organized for the researcher to carry on with the observation. Two weeks after the observation, the researcher went back to the schools and administered the questionnaires.

2.13 Data analysis plan

Data analysis as suggested by Frankel and Wallen (2000) is the process of simplifying data to make it comprehensive. According to Frankel and Wallen, data analysis usually involves reducing accumulated data to manageable, developing summaries, looking for patterns, and applying statistical techniques. Since the study adopted a mixed-method design, the researcher did both quantitative and qualitative analysis. The data collected were described and analyzed using percentages, frequencies, simple linear regression, and the Independent Sample t-test. The qualitative data for research questions one and two were analyzed using percentages and frequencies while the quantitative data were analyzed by using simple linear regression. The Independent Sample t-test was used to analyze research questions three and four.

3. Results

3.1 CSocio-Demographic Characteristics

This section discusses the socio-demography characteristics of the respondents and the variables were school type gender and school name. Table 1 shows the distribution of school type, gender, and school name.

American Journal of Education, Teaching and Social Policy
2113-136X (Print), ISSN 2113-139X (Online)
European Article Number (EAN): 7642-8982
Journal Homepage: https://originaljournals.com

Table 1 Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Variables	Category	Frequency	Percentages
Gender	Male	82	50.6
	Female	80	49.1
School Type	Public	97	59.9
	Private	65	40.1
School name	School A	44	27.2
	School B	38	23.5
	School C	53	32.7
	School D	27	16.7

Source: Field Survey, Oppong (2020)

Table 1 revealed that 82 (50.6%) of the respondents were males while 80 representing (49.1%) were females. On school type distribution of the respondents, Table 1 indicates that the majority of the respondents are from public schools representing 97 (59.9%) of the respondents while 65 of them are from private schools representing 40.1%. With respect to the school's name of the respondents, the results indicate that the majority of the respondents 53, representing 32.7% are from school C, 44 of the respondents representing 27.2% were from school A, 38 of the respondents representing 23.5% are from school B and 27 of the respondents representing 16.7% are from school D.

3.2 Effects of Classroom Noise on Learning

To determine the levels of opinions of respondents of the effect of classroom noise on learning behavour of students, respondents were asked to rate their levels of agreement using a Likert scale questions of 1-5 on variables leading to effects of classroom noise on learning, with 1 showing strongly disagree and 5 showing strongly agree. Means, standard deviation, and coefficient of variations were computed and values less than 3 indicate absences of opinions. The results of the means, standard deviations, and coefficient of variations of each variable leading to the effects of classroom noise on learning are shown in Table 2

Table 2. Effect of Classroom Noise on Students Learning

Variables	Mean	Std	Coef. of Variation
It leads to lower grades of students	4.03		0.7910.196
It leads to student's dropout from school	4.12		0.7370.179
It brings about mismanagement in instructional time	3.96		0.7630.193
Lowers academic achievement for disruptive students	4.25		0.6430.151
Decreases student's engagement and motivation	4.13		0.7400.179
It brings about teacher stress and frustration	3.91		0.7630.195
It leads to difficulty in finishing classwork	4.14		0.7470.180
It disrupts the flow of a lesson	4.05		0.7540.186
Mean of Means	**3.88**		**0.7910.204**

Source: Field Survey 2021

Table 2 summarizes the means, standard deviations and coefficient of variations of variables leading to effects of classroom noise on student learning. It indicated that classroom noise lowers academic achievement for disruptive students and was rated as the most influential variable on the measured factor [M= 4.25, SD = 0.643, CV = 0.151], which revealed respondents' opinions on the variable relatively close around the mean score with small coefficient

American Journal of Education, Teaching and Social Policy
2113-136X (Print), ISSN 2113-139X (Online)
European Article Number (EAN): 7642-8982
Journal Homepage: https://originaljournals.com

of variation. Classroom noise leads to difficulty in finishing class work was rated second [M = 4.14, SD = 0.747, CV = 0.180], which also demonstrate a close view of respondents. Classroom noise decreases student's engagement and motivation was identified as the third variables [M = 4.13, SD = 0.740 CV = 0.179]. The fourth rated variable is classroom noise leads to student's dropout from school [M = 4.12, SD = 0.737, CV = 0.179]. Classroom noise disrupts the flow of a lesson was ranked fifth [M = 4.05, SD = 0.754, CV = 0.186]. Classroom noise leads to lower grades of students was rated sixth [M = 4.03, SD = 0.791, CV = 0.196] with the highest coefficient of variation indicating respondents' opinions relatively dispersed more than the rest of the variables. Classroom noise brings about mismanagement in instructional time was rated seventh [M = 3.96, SD = 0.763, CV = 0.193]. Classroom noise brings about teacher stress and frustration were rated eighth [M = 3.91. SD = 0.763, CV = 0.195] indicating respondents opinions dispersed. The overall mean, standard deviation and coefficient of variation are 3.88, 0.791 and 0.204 respectively indicating that overall, the respondents had opinions that classroom noise has effect on students learning.

3.3 Effect of Teasing on Students Learning

To determine the levels of opinions of respondents of the effect of teasing on students learning, respondents were asked to rate their levels of agreement using a Likert scale questions of 1-5 on variables leading to effects of teasing on students learning, with 1 showing strongly disagree and 5 showing strongly agree. Means, standard deviation, and coefficient of variations were computed and value less or equal to 3 indicates absences opinions. The results of the means, standard deviations, and coefficient of variations of each variable leading to the effects of teasing on students learning are shown in table 3.

Table 3. Effect of Teasing on Students Learning

Variables	Mean	Std	Coef. of Variation
Students may not achieve their academic goals	4.33		0.7720.178
Students may lack companionship	4.27		0.6940.163
It brings about emotional trauma of students	4.17		0.7500.179
It lowers the confidence levels of students in class	4.34		0.7240.167
It discourages students from participating in-class activities	4.49		0.7070.157
It makes the student feel helpless in class	3.16		1.1150.354
It causes inattentiveness in class	3.48		1.2220.351
Students feel annoyed in class	3.30		1.6410.497
Mean of Means	**3.94**		**0.9530.242**

Source: Field Survey 2021

Table 3 summarizes the means, standard deviations, and coefficient of variations of variables leading to the effects of teasing on student learning. It indicated teasing discourages students from participating in-class activities and was rated as the most influential variable on the measured factor [M= 4.49, SD = 0.707, CV = 0.157], which revealed respondents' opinions on the variable relatively close around the mean score with a small coefficient of variation. Teasing lowers the confidence levels of students in class was rated second [M = 4.34, SD = 0.724, CV = 0.167], which also demonstrate a close view of respondents to the average opinion. Students may not achieve their academic goals was identified as the third variables [M = 4.33, SD = 0.772, CV = 0.178]. The fourth rated variable is students may lack companionship [M = 4.27, SD = 0.697, CV = 0.163]. Teasing brings about emotional trauma of students was ranked fifth [M = 4.17, SD = 0.750, CV = 0.179]. Teasing causes inattentiveness in a class of students was rated sixth [M = 3.48, SD = 1.222, CV = 0.351] with the highest coefficient of variation indicating respondents' opinions relatively dispersed around the mean responses. Teasing cause students to feel annoyed in class was rated seventh [M = 3.30, SD = 1.641, CV = 0.497] indicating high disperse opinions of the respondents. Teasing makes the student feel helpless in class were rated eighth [M = 3.16. SD = 1.115, CV = 0.354] indicating respondents opinions dispersed around the

American Journal of Education, Teaching and Social Policy
2113-136X (Print), ISSN 2113-139X (Online)
European Article Number (EAN): 7642-8982
Journal Homepage: https://originaljournals.com

mean. The overall mean, standard deviation and coefficient of variation are 3.94, 0.953, and 0.242 respectively indicating that overall, the respondents had opinions that teasing has an effect on students learning.

3.4 Observable Classroom Disruptive Behaviour of Students

To identify the destructive nature of the students in general in the study area to assess the difference of classroom disruptive behaviour among gender and type of school. The researcher observed the classroom behaviour of the students for one month and rated the class disruptive severity behaviour as (1=not seriously, 2=seriously, 3=very seriously). Means, standard deviation, and coefficient of variations of general classroom disruptive behaviours of the respondents were computed and values less than2 indicates are indicated as absences of classroom disruptive behaviours. The results of the means, standard deviations, and coefficient of variations of general disruptive behaviours are shown in table 4

Table 4. Observable Classroom Disruptive Behaviours of Students

Observed Disruptive Behaviours	Mean	Std	Coef. of Variation
Fidgeting in seat		2.070.723	0.178
Getting out of seat		2.06	0.6840.163
Interrupting others in class		2.100.689	0.179
Talking about or doing something else in class		2.14	0.7180.336
Challenging class authority and rules		2.190.671	0.157
Arriving late in class		2.170.684	0.354
Talking out of turn		2.110.678	0.351
Joking /playing with smart phones or calculators		2.240.676	0.302
Eating in class		2.200.685	0.311
Giving chorus responses		2.010.616	0.306
Bullying peers in class		2.100.684	0.326
Mean of Means		**2.13**	**0.6820.320**
Un Observed Disruptive Behaviours			
Physical aggression		1.99	0.6300.167
Teasing of peers in class		1.940.720	0.497
Banking/ dragging tables or chairs		1.85	0.7580.409
Borrowing objects of peers without notice		1.88	0.6280.334
Mean of Means		**1.920.684**	**0.356**

Source: Field Survey 2021

Table 4 summarizes the means, standard deviations and coefficient of variations of general disruptive behaviours generally in class. It indicated Joking /playing with smart phones or calculators was rated as the most influential variable by the observer on the measured general disruptive behavior of students [M= 2.24, SD = 0.676, CV = 0.302], which revealed respondents 'disruptive behaviours are close around the mean score disruptive behaviours with high coefficient of variation .Eating in class was rated second by the observer [M = 2.20, SD = 0.685, CV = 0.311].Challenging class authority and rules rated third by the observer [M = 2.19, SD = 0.671, CV = 0.157].Arriving late in class was rated fourth by the observer [M = 2.17, SD = 0.684, CV = 0.354], which also demonstrate a close disruptive behaviours around the average value. Talking about or doing something else in class was identified as the fifth observable variables [M = 2.14, SD = 0.718, CV = 0.336]. The sixth rated variable is talking out of turn [M =2.11, SD = 0.678, CV = 0.351]. Interrupting others in class and bullying peers in class was ranked seven the observer [M = 2.10, SD = 0.689, CV = 0.179] and. [M = 2.10, SD = 0.684, CV = 0.326] respectively. Fidgeting in seat was rated eight disruptive behaviors observed by the observer [M = 2.07, SD = 0.723, CV = 0.178] indicating disruptive behaviour relatively close around the mean responses. Getting out of seat was rated ninth disruptive behaviour [M = 2.06, SD

American Journal of Education, Teaching and Social Policy
2113-136X (Print), ISSN 2113-139X (Online)
European Article Number (EAN): 7642-8982
Journal Homepage: https://originaljournals.com

= 0.723, CV = 0.178]. The overall mean, standard deviation and coefficient of variation are 2.13, 0.682 and 0.320 respectively indicating that overall, the respondents had generally had these disruptive behaviours in class.

The unobserved disruptive behaviours are Physical aggression [M = 1.99. SD = 0.630, CV = 0.167]. Teasing of peers in class [M = 1.94. SD = 0.720, CV = 0.497]. Banking/ dragging tables or chairs [M = 1.85, SD = 0.758, CV = 0.409]. Borrowing objects of peers without notice [M = 1.88. SD = 0.628, CV = 0.334]. The overall mean, standard deviation and coefficient of variation are 1.92, 0.684 and 0.356 respectively indicating that overall, students do not have such disruptive behaviours in class.

3.5 The difference in Classroom Disruptive Behaviour between Genders

This section of the study examines gender differences in students' classroom disruptive behaviour. An independent samples t-test was used to assess the difference in terms of means of observed disruptive behaviours. Observed serious disruptive behaviours averages were computed to obtain continuous data. The results of the independent samples t-test are shown in table 5.

Table 5. Independent-Samples t-test of Classroom Disruptive Behaviour between Gender

Gender	N	Means	Mean Diff.	t	df	P-value
Male	82	2.1716	0.0938	-2.068	160	0.040
Female	80	2.0787				

Source: Field Survey 2021

The descriptive statistics output from table 5 shows means and mean difference of disruptive behaviours of gender of students [Male = 2.1716, Female = 2.0787, Mean difference = 0.0938]. The table further indicated independent samples test with a t-value of -2.068 and degree of freedom of 160 with a corresponding p-value of 0.040 [p-value < 0.05]. Since the p-value is less than 5% significant level, it indicates that the difference seen in the means is significant. The results revealed that females possessed disruptive behaviours in class than males in the study area.

3.6 The difference in Classroom Disruptive Behaviour between Schools

This section of the study examines the type of school difference in students' classroom disruptive behaviour. An independent samples t-test was used to assess the difference in terms of means of observed disruptive behaviours. Observed serious disruptive behaviours averages were computed to obtain continuous data. The results of the independent samples t-test are shown in table 5.

Table 5. Independent-Samples t-test of Classroom Disruptive Behaviour between Schools

School Type	N	Means	Mean Diff.	t	df	P-value
Public	97	2.1902	0.10962	-2.403	160	0.017
P**rivate**	65	2.0806				

Source: Field Survey 2021

The descriptive statistics output from table 6 shows means and mean difference of disruptive behaviours of school type [Public = 2.1902, Female = 2.0806, Mean difference = 0.10961]. The table further indicated independent samples test with a t-value of -2.403 and degree of freedom of 160 with a corresponding p-value of 0.017 [p-value < 0.05]. Since the p-value is less than 5% significant level, it indicates that the difference seen in the means is significant. The results revealed that public schools possessed disruptive behaviours than schools in the study area.

American Journal of Education, Teaching and Social Policy
2113-136X (Print), ISSN 2113-139X (Online)
European Article Number (EAN): 7642-8982
Journal Homepage: https://originaljournals.com

4. Discussion

In order to examine the effect of classroom noise on students learning, the effect of classroom noise on learning variables was rated by JHS students in order of merit. The means, standard deviations, and coefficient of variations of the variables were computed. The high rated effect of classroom noise on learning by the students indicated that it lowers academic achievement for disruptive students, leads to difficulty in finishing classwork, decreases student's engagement and motivation, leads to student's dropout from school, and disrupts the flow of a lesson. The high rated opinions of the effect of classroom noise on learning stated above by the students are homogeneous with fewer coefficients of variations (CV) indicating common opinions. The overall mean of means shows that generally, students have opinions that classroom noise affects learning in the sense that the results in table 2 mean of means is above the midway rating. This is in line with the words of Carrell & Hoekstra (2010) who said that teachers most often stop lessons to control noise making in class which normally sends the students' learning backward.

On the objectives to examine the effect of teasing on students learning. Students given were questionnaires to rate the effect of teasing on learning in order of merit. The means, standard deviations, and coefficient of variations of the variables were computed. The high rated effect of teasing on learning by the students indicated that teasing discourages students from participating in-class activities, Teasing lowers the confidence levels of students in class, Students may not achieve their academic goals as a result of teasing, students may lack companionship as a result of teasing, Teasing brings about the emotional trauma of students, Teasing causes inattentiveness in a class of students, Teasing cause students to feel annoyed in class, Teasing makes the student feel helpless in class. The first five high-rated opinions of the effect of teasing on learning stated above by the students are homogeneous with fewer coefficients of variations (CV) indicating common opinions. The last four high-rated opinions of the effect of teasing on learning are heterogeneous with a high coefficient of variation indicating dispersed opinions of respondents. The overall mean of means shows that generally, students have opinions that teasing affects learning in the sense that the results in table 3 mean of means is above the midway rating. This is supported by the literature as follows; Verbal bullying in classrooms results in low academic achievement as victims tend to be absent more often, spend less time and energy on their classwork, and do not concentrate in class (Beram 2009). Again, Patchin and Hamduja (2010) indicated that students who are teased in the classroom feel hurt, embarrassed, insecure, low self-esteem, and self-blame resulting in lower-class achievements.

On the objectives to examines gender differences in students' disruptive behaviours. An independent samples t-test was used to assess the difference in terms of their mean generally observable disruptive behaviours used in the study. The descriptive statistics from table 5 shows the mean of classroom disruptive behaviours of gender and indicates that average classroom disruptive behaviours of the male are higher than female. The results conclude that since the p-value in table 5 is less than a 5% significant level, it indicates that the difference seen in the means is significant. Hence males have higher classroom disruptive behaviours than females among JHS 3 students. In the literature, it was revealed that physically, boys tend to be more active than girls, and by the same token more restless if they have to sit for long periods. They are also more prone than girls to rely on physical aggression if they are frustrated (Espelage & Swearer, 2004)

On the objectives to examines school type difference in classroom disruptive behaviours. An independent sample t-test was used to assess the difference in terms of their mean generally observed classroom disruptive behaviours used in the study. The descriptive statistics from table 6 show the mean of classroom disruptive behaviours of school type and indicate that average classroom disruptive behaviours of public schools are higher than in private schools. The results conclude that since the p-value [p-value = 0.017] in table 6 is less than 5% significant level, it indicates that the difference seen in the means is significant. Hence public schools have higher classroom disruptive behaviours than private schools among JHS 3 students. This is supported by the work of Belford (2010). According to Belford, the school management of private schools attach seriousness to the goal of discipline the public schools therefore classroom disruptive behaviour in public schools is higher than in private schools.

American Journal of Education, Teaching and Social Policy
2113-136X (Print), ISSN 2113-139X (Online)
European Article Number (EAN): 7642-8982
Journal Homepage: https://originaljournals.com

5. Conclusion

The general objective of the study is the effects of classroom disruptive behaviour on learning in junior high form three students. The study concludes that the respondents have an opinion that classroom noise and teasing as factors of disruptive behaviours affect students learning among form three JHS students Upper Denkyira East Municipal. The findings of the study further indicated that the students have classroom disruptive behaviours and concluded that males and public-school student disruptive behaviours significantly out the way that of females and private school students in the municipal.

Reference

Amedahe, F. and Gyimah E. A. (2008). Introduction to Education Research. Hampton Press, Cape Coast.
Ali, A. M. & Gracey, D. (2013). Dealing with student Disruptive behavior in the classroom.
Arbuke, C. & Little, E. (2004), Teachers' Perceptions and management of disruptive classroom behaviour during the middle years. Australian Journal of Education and Developmental psychology 4: 59-70
Babbie, E. (1990). Survey Research Methods, 2nd ed. Belmont, Calif: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
Ball, S.J., Maguire M. and Broun, A. (2012). How schools do policy: Policy Enactments in Secondary schools, Routledge.
Bauman, S. (2008), Victimization by bullying and harassment in high school: Findings from the 2005 youth risk behaviour a survey in a South-western state. Journal of school violence 7, (3) 86-104
Belford, T. (2010), Discipline in the private schools, the globe, and mail.com
Beran, T. (2009) Correlates of Peer victimization and achievement: An exploratory model, psychology in the schools, 46 (4), 348-361
Carran, D. T., & Kellner, M.H., (2009) Characteristics of bullies and victims among students with emotional disturbance attending approved private special education schools, Behavioural Disorders 34 (3) 151-163
Carney, J.M. (2008), Perceptions of bullying and associated trauma during adolescence. Professional school counselling, 11(3) 179-188
Creswell, J.W., Plano Clark, V.L., Gutmann, M. & Hanson, W., (2003), Advanced Mixed Methods research designs, Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioural research (pp.209-240) Thousand Oaks CA: Sage
Creswell, J.W. (2008) Research Design, Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches. 3rd ed. University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Daily Graphic (2019), Online editorial, Graphic communications group limited.
Donnelly S. (2009). One moment of madness (P.48) In, Palmer C. (Ed) Sports poetry. UcLan, Preston, UK. (Football, Violence, Eric Cantona)
Donkor S, (2002, April 6) Three pupils besmear teacher's room with excreta. Daily Graphic (N0. 148490) page .24
Douglas, J., Moyes, D., and Douglas, A. (2016) Impact of Disruptive Behavior in the classroom; Student Perspective. Education Excellence 6.4 p1.
Duncan, R.D. (1999) Peer and sibling aggression: An investigation of intra-extra- familial bullying. Journal of Interpersonal violence, 14, 871-886
Ellis, J. (2015). Boys and Girls: why they behave differently. Tutor hub social community.
Fraenkel, J.R., Wallen, E. N. and Hyun, H. H. (2000) How to design and Evaluate Research in Education. 8th ed. McGraw Hill, The McGraw Hill companies
Felicity-Anne J., (2015) Addressing negative classroom behaviour in selected schools in Francistown, Botswana