

Assessment of Students Misbehavior and Handling Strategies in West Shewa Zone

Negesse Gemechu¹ Fekede Tuli² Dengea Etea³
Department of Teacher Education, University of Ambo, Ethiopia

Abstract

Recent studies suggest that an assessment of students' misbehavior and sustaining positive school climate for all students is important in order to support all students in reaching their full potential. The purpose of this study was to assess students' misbehavior and handling strategies in West Shewa Zone. The study was conducted using mixed research method and explanatory sequential mixed research design. In the first case, in order to obtain quantitative data a close ended questioner were administered to 250 teachers and 321 students and analyzed with the help of descriptive statistics namely: mean score, standard deviation, percentages and t-test. In the second case, qualitative data was obtained through semi structured interview and focused group discussion. The result of the study shows the existence of students misbehavior that ranges from mildly stressful to extremely stressful. Participating in unauthorized political activism, exhibiting antisocial behavior, cheating on tests and in-class assignments, failing to submit homework, misuse of privileges, entering prohibited areas at school, leaving the school without permission were the major kinds of misbehavior observed at schools. In addition lack of parental support, low achievement in academic subjects, lack to obey the existing discipline polices and orders were some of the dominating causes for students misbehavior. Implications, which are assumed to improve student's misbehavior, were highly recommended in the study.

Keywords: misbehavior, discipline, coping strategy

DOI: 10.7176/JEP/11-34-06

Publication date: December 31st 2020

STUDENTS MISBEHAVIOR AND HANDLING STRATEGIES

Students Misbehavior

There is a global debate around the causes for student's misbehavior. For instance, Neel and Cessna (1993) stated that, student misbehavior is exhibited in order to attract the attention of classmates and teachers, to gain power or control, to mask academic incompetence, to affiliate with a particular peer group, for self-gratification and/or self-expression, or to satisfy a craving for justice or revenge. For others, the desire to get respect and popularity and emotional responses that interfere with their behaving are some of the factors for student's misbehavior Rodkin, Farmer, Pearl, & Van Acker (2000). Oudeans (2003) in other cases found that student may be bored because they already learned the material, the pace is too slow, the instructional delivery is poor, or the concept being taught is perceived to be irrelevant or culturally unrelated to the student's needs or interests. On the other hand Cox and Gunn (1980) cited two explanations why misbehave in socially appropriate ways. First, the child may not know what socially appropriate behavior is. Second reason may be a lack of practice in behaving appropriately i.e. Having the knowledge of socially acceptable behavior, but lack practice in using it. As the result, the factor attributed for students misbehavior among educators were appeared to be different.

However, students misbehavior affects the route to economic prosperity, the key to scientific and technological advancement, the means to combat unemployment, the foundation of social equity, and the spread of political socialization and cultural vitality Psacharopoulos(1985). As to the impact/ effect of student misbehavior (Jackl, 2006) indicated that student misconduct leads to more disorder and the erosion of the learning environment for all students. Adding to this Barton, Coley, and Wenglinsky (1998) stated that lack of student discipline can affect the schools' primary objective of providing quality academic instruction. In addition, If students are misbehaving, they are spending much of their time on discipline cases, and as such they are obliged to spend less time on their learning, and this means that the contents are not to be completed and the students obtain inadequate preparation time for the examinations and learning Nakpodia, (2010), Alemayehu (2012) and Oluremi (2013). According to Nakpodia (2010) and John (2013) disciplinary problems is a major cause for teachers to feel insecure. Similarly, teachers subjected to abuse or intimidation report experiencing fears for their safety, lack of sense of dignity at work, intense feelings of anger, humiliation, isolation and depression (Azizi et.al, 2009 Tan and Yuanshan, ND). In other words, when students misbehave, their academic performance suffers, and the misbehavior intensifies and becomes more frequent (Myers, Milne, Baker, & Ginsburg, 1987). Disruptions hamper lessons for all students and as a result, little teaching or learning takes place because teaching would be more effective if teachers did not have to spend too much time dealing with disruptive behavior Myers, Milne, Baker, & Ginsburg, (1987).

As the result in order to attain the goal of education in general and to increase the quality of education in particular the Ethiopian education and training policy have given due attention for students misbehavior MoE

(1994). In this regards, the policy broadly sets the objectives in relation to students discipline. Accordingly, one of its general objectives urges the bringing-up of citizens who respect human rights, standing for the wellbeing of the people as well as equality and justice and peace endowed with democratic culture and discipline MoE (1994).

However, the situation in West shewa Zone high schools seems to be serious. This is to say that, researchers were observed serious disciplinary problems in different west shewa zone secondary schools. For instance, in many secondary schools researchers were observed serious disciplinary problems while they were assessing students for practicum courses. Disciplinary problem as assault by students on teachers and other students, verbal abuse, offensive language against teachers and other students, sexual and other forms of harassment, threat and intimidation of teachers and other students, possessing offensive weapons, supplying or using illegal drugs, were observed. Hence, all the this facts or rationales mentioned initiated the researcher to conduct a research on assessing students' misbehavior and coping strategies in west shewa zone governmental schools. On the bases of these problems, the following research objectives were stated:

- To identify the nature of current student misbehavior in secondary schools.
- To identify the root causes of student misbehavior
- To describe the nature of coping strategies or disciplinary measures applied to student misbehavior
- To identify ways to address inappropriate student behavior and to build up on strategies that promotes positive behaviors
- To provide pertinent recommendation for the professional handling of student behavior.

Methods

Participant

The total population of the study was 6461 students and 570 teachers. Using (Yamane, 1967) formula for calculating sample size by considering a 95% confidence level and $p = 0.5$, from the total population of 6461 students 321 students of which 179 male and 142 female students were selected. With the same reasoning, from 570 teachers 250 teachers of which 236 male and 24 females were selected. Accordingly, participants consisted of ($n=34$) students and ($n=14$) teachers from Ginchi secondary school, ($n=37$) students and ($n=15$) teachers from Gindeberet secondary school, ($n=22$) students and ($n=9$) teachers from Meta Robi secondary schools, ($n=33$) students and ($n=13$) teachers from Guder secondary schools, ($n=19$) students and ($n=8$) teachers from Shenan secondary school, ($n=28$) students and ($n=11$) teachers from Gedo secondary school ($n=28$) students and ($n=11$) teachers from Bako secondary schools ($n=15$) students and ($n=6$) Ifata secondary school ($n=8$) students and ($n=3$) teachers from Meti secondary schools, ($n=26$) students, ($n=10$) teachers Jaldu secondary school were selected.

Materials

In order to identify the most frequently observed students misbehavior and the causes for students misbehavior, respondents were asked to rate 50 different types of misbehavior items and 11 different items related to the causes for students misbehavior. The items in both cases, involves a scale of 1-3. Where 1 = never observed, 2 = sometimes observed 3 = always observed. The mean score for each of the sample for the fifty different items was computed and compared with mean score ($M = 2.0$). In both cases, the total scores for each category were calculated by summing responses for the three related indicator items. A one-sample t-test, comparing each total categorical mean to the mean score ($M = 2.0$) from a hypothetical categorical normal distribution was conducted. In addition, in order to identify misbehavior coping strategies respondents were asked to rate 16 different types of coping strategy items that involve a scale of 1-5. Where 1 = Never used, 2 = Rerly used 3 = Sometimes used 4 = Often used, 5 = Always used. The mean score of each of the sample for the sixteen different items was computed and compared with mean score ($M = 3.0$). The total scores for each category were calculated by summing responses for the three related indicator items. A one-sample t-test, comparing each total categorical mean to the mean score ($M = 3.0$) from a hypothetical categorical normal distribution was conducted.

Procedures

Primarily, for quantitative part participants was selected using stratified sampling method in order to select participants proportionally from all secondary schools. Next, from each secondary school samples were selected with simple random sampling in order to provide equal chances for all participants. Lastly, those directors who were assumed to better understand the issue under investigation were selected using purposive sampling method for interview and focus group discussion purpose.

The study was conducted using mixed research method. Mixed research method was used for the very reason that, the study involves the usage of questioner developed as the survey instrument and was administered to the selected teachers to obtain quantitative data. Once the data was collected, it was analyzed using quantitative method with the help of descriptive statistics namely: mean score, standard deviation, percentages, t-test (for variables with two groups). In order to make the analysis of data easier SPSS version 23 was used.

Similarly, qualitative data that was obtained through focused group discussion and interview was analyzed with the help of qualitative data analysis method. An explanatory sequential mixed design was utilized in the study

in that, researchers were first gathered quantitative data and based on the quantitative data, interviews and focused group discussion were developed.

Results

In order to answer the first question (What are the views of administrators, teachers, students regarding current students misbehavior?) firstly, respondents were asked to answer the question which states that, “Is there students misbehavior in your school?” the majority of students 290(90.4%) and of teachers 245(98%) responded the “yes” response to the question, indicating that the majority of respondents were reflected their witness for the existence of students misbehavior in west Shewa zone.

Once, the existence of students misbehavior in west Shewa secondary schools was identified, next researchers were attempted to identify whether or not the situation was hampering the teaching learning process. To this end, respondents were asked to give their viewpoints about whether the misbehavior situation hindered their teaching learning process in their school. The majority of students 288(89%) and of teachers 241(96%) responded the “yes” answer to the question. This respondent’s view indicated that, student’s misbehavior was one of the factors that hindered the teaching learning process in west Shewa secondary school.

Though, the majority of teachers and students reflected the existence of students misbehavior in their own schools and it found to affect the implementation teaching learning process, the larger numbers of teachers who were teaching in the secondary schools reported that they failed to conduct an action research to solve misbehavior related behavior 144(57.6%) at their school. In addition, open ended questions were presented for teachers to respond to the reason why they failed to conduct an action research in order to solve student’s misbehavior. They raised such an issue as work load, lack of time, lack of reward, lack of interests to conduct an action research were some of the factors that was mentioned by teachers.

Table-1 Teacher-student response to misbehavior related question

Items	Student				Teachers				Total	%		
	Yes		No		Yes		No					
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%				
1. Is there student’s misbehavior in your school?	290	90.4	31	9.6	321	100	245	98	5	2	250	100
2. Do you feel that misbehavior is a hindrance to teaching-learning?	288	89.7	33	10.3	321	100	241	96	9	4	250	100
3. Have you ever conducted an action research on student misbehavior?	-	-	-	-	-	-	106	42.4	144	57.6	250	100

After the researchers were identified, the existence of student’s misbehavior in west Shewa zone secondary schools, next they were tried to identify its degree of occurrences. As can be seen from table-2 the majority of students 229(92%) and teachers 291(88%) responded the existence of students misbehavior that ranges from mildly stressful to extremely stressful. Only, a smaller percentage of students 21(8%) and teachers 40(12%) denied the stressfulness degree of students misbehavior.

Table-2 Degrees of student’s misbehavior as perceived by teachers and student

Degree of students misbehavior	Students		Teachers	
	F	%	F	%
Not at all stressful	21	8	40	12
Mildly stressful	63	25	35	11
Moderately stressful	113	45	69	21
Very stressful	29	12	127	40
Extremely stressful	24	10	50	16
Total	250	100	321	100

In addition to the above analysis, an attempt has been made in order to identify the most frequently observed student’s misbehavior in West Shewa secondary schools. Accordingly, teacher and student respondents were asked to rate a 50 different types of misbehavior items that involve a scale of 1-3. Where 1 = never observed, 2 = sometimes observed 3 = always observed. The mean score of each of the sample of the fifty different items were computed and compared with mean score ($M = 2.0$). The total scores for each category were calculated by summing responses for the three related indicator items. A one-sample t-test, comparing each total categorical mean to the mean score ($M = 2.0$) from a hypothetical categorical normal distribution was conducted.

Teacher responses

The result obtained from teacher respondents mean scores for each of the fifty items revealed that 26 (52%) of the items were considered as a variable that was always observed, 3(6%) of the items were considered as a variable

that was sometimes observed and the remaining 21(42%) items were considered as a variable that was non-observable. Accordingly, the result obtained from teacher respondents reveals that: “participating in unauthorized political activism in school” ($M=2.43, SD=0.56$) “exhibiting antisocial behavior” ($M=2.4, SD=0.49$), “cheating on tests and in-class assignments/examination” ($M=2.37, SD=0.49$), “having a negative attitude toward school”, ($2.35, SD=0.48$), “failing to follow instructions” ($M=2.23, SD=0.64$), “failing to submit homework at all” ($M=2.16, SD=0.56$), “failing to bring necessary materials to class” ($M=2.15, SD=0.68$), “failing to accept responsibility for actions” ($M=2.14, SD=0.60$), “unnecessary talking without permission in the classroom” ($M=2.12, SD=0.49$) “striking or injuring school employees” ($M=2.11, SD=0.19$) were some of the top ten kinds of frequently observed students misbehavior that were responded by teachers.

Table-3 Teachers perception towards the occurrence of students misbehavior

S/N	Kinds of student misbehavior	N	Mean	SD	t	Sig
1	Participating in unauthorized political activism in school	249	2.43	0.50	77.29	00
2	Exhibiting antisocial behavior.	249	2.41	0.49	77.15	00
3	Cheating on tests and in-class assignments/examination.	249	2.37	0.49	76.49	00
4	Having a negative attitude toward school.	249	2.35	0.48	77.68	00
5	Failing to follow instructions.	249	2.23	0.64	54.85	00
6	Failing to submit homework at all.	249	2.16	0.56	60.96	00
7	Failing to bring necessary materials to class.	249	2.15	0.68	50.06	00
8	Failing to accept responsibility for actions.	249	2.14	0.60	56.05	00
9	Unnecessary talking without permission in the classroom.	249	2.12	0.49	68.96	00
10	Striking or injuring school employees.	249	2.11	0.19	15.20	00

Students Response

The average rating, or mean, for each item 1 through 50 ranged from 1.5 to 2.62 and showed that, 23(46%), of the items were considered by students as a variable that were always observed and the remaining 27 (54%) items were considered as non-observable variable.

More specifically, Out of the 50 analyzed data the top 10 frequently observed students misbehavior were presented in table-4. It includes: “Misuse of privileges” ($M=2.62, SD=0.49$), “Failing to submit homework at all” ($M=2.62, SD=0.49$), “Entering prohibited areas at school” ($M=2.62, SD=0.49$), “Participating in unauthorized political activism in school” ($M=2.60, SD=0.49$), “Leaving the school without permission” ($M=2.59, SD=0.50$), “Exhibiting antisocial behavior” ($M=2.59, SD=0.50$), “Cheating on tests and in-class assignments/examination.” ($M=2.57, SD=0.50$), “Displaying inappropriate sexual behavior” ($M=2.57, SD=0.50$), “Being dishonest toward teachers and others” ($M=2.55, SD=0.50$) “Making inappropriate comments to others.” ($M=2.5, SD=0.50$) were some of the top ten kinds of frequently observed students misbehavior that was responded by teacher respondents.

Table-4 Students perception towards the occurrence of students misbehavior

S/N	Kinds of misbehavior	N	Mean	SD	t	Sig
1	Misuse of privileges.	321	2.62	.49	96.29	00
2	Failing to submit homework at all.	321	2.62	.49	96.29	00
3	Entering prohibited areas at school.	321	2.62	.49	96.29	00
4	Participating in unauthorized political activism in school	321	2.60	.49	94.56	00
5	Leaving the school without permission.	321	2.59	.50	93.14	00
6	Exhibiting antisocial behavior.	321	2.59	.50	93.14	00
7	Cheating on tests and in-class assignments/examination.	321	2.57	.50	92.45	00
8	Displaying inappropriate sexual behavior.	321	2.57	.50	92.45	00
9	Being dishonest toward teachers and others.	321	2.55	.50	91.55	00
10	Making inappropriate comments to others.	321	2.5	.50	89.42	00

For the purpose of triangulation responses obtained from both teachers and students were cross-checked. Both respondents were agreed that “participating in unauthorized political activism in school”, “cheating on tests and in-class”, “exhibiting antisocial behavior”, “failing to submit homework at all” were some of the most frequently observed misbehavior in west Shewa secondary schools.

In addition to the above facts, the result obtained from interviews of directors also supports the views portrayed by teachers and students. For instance, director “M” states that most students were observed as spending much of their time in political situation, in destroying school and societal properties and they found to less dealing with academic issues. Adding to this idea this director reported that those students who have an interest towards their learning were influenced by the majority of the student and as such they were obliged/influenced by their peers to show antisocial behavior. Director “M2” also states that the major problem of students of this day involves

cheating on the test and examination. Most students do not show interests in learning rather they were much more interested in political activism and showing antisocial behavior.

Perceived causes for students misbehavior

In order to provide an answer for the second question (What factors, as perceived by the participants, plays the dominant role for student's misbehavior?), respondents were asked to rate the level of the causes of students misbehavior. Accordingly, respondents were asked to rate 11 different items that involve a scale of 1-3. Where 1 = Never cause, 2 = Minor cause, 3 = Major cause. The mean score of each of the sample of the 11 items was computed and compared with the mean score ($M = 2.0$). The total scores for each of the 11 items were calculated by summing responses for all items. A one-sample t-test, comparing each items mean score to the mean score ($M = 2$) from a hypothetical categorical normal distribution was conducted.

Teachers response for the causes of students misbehavior

Out of the 11 items, all of the items 11 (100 %) perceived by the teachers to be the causes for students misbehavior table. The first five top cause for students misbehavior according to teachers view includes: "low achievement in academic subjects" ($M=2.4, SD=.64$), "student disrespect for authority and rules" ($M=2.3, SD=.69$), "lack of student interest and negative attitude in subject matter" ($M=2.3, SD=.65$), "lack of parental support", ($M=2.3, SD=.59$), "Inability to prepare and implement effective lesson planning" ($M=2.2, SD=.73$).

Table -5 Teachers response to the causes of students misbehavior

	N	Mean	SD	T	Sig
1 Low achievement in academic subjects	250	2.4	.64	58.5	.00
2 Student disrespect for authority and rules	250	2.3	.69	53.2	.00
3 Lack of student interest and negative attitude in subject matter	250	2.3	.65	55.7	.00
4 Lack of parental support	250	2.3	.59	60.1	.00
5 Failure of teachers to obey the existing discipline polices and orders	250	2.2	.73	48.4	.00
6 Inability to prepare and implement effective lesson planning	250	2.2	.75	47.0	.00
7 Lack of administrative support	250	2.2	.68	50.6	.00
8 Teachers inability to maintain discipline	250	2.2	.71	48.6	.00
9 Failure to integrate methods and contents with abilities and needs of learners	250	2.1	.68	48.5	.00
10 Imbalance between student rights and students responsibilities	250	2.1	.73	45.8	.00
11 Inability of teachers to effectively communicate with students	250	2.0	.71	44.9	.00

Students response for the causes of students misbehavior

An analysis of Students respondent mean scores for each of the 11 items for level of students misbehavior revealed that all items had mean score greater than 3.00. This indicate that out of 11 items for the causes of students misbehavior 11 items (100 %) were perceived as the causes of students misbehavior. Accordingly, the first five top causes for students misbehavior in order from larger to smaller includes: "Imbalance between student rights and students responsibilities" ($M=2.32, SD=0.74$); "Lack of parental support" ($M=2.29, SD=1.82$); "Failure of teachers to obey the existing discipline polices and orders" ($M=2.19, SD=0.73$); "Low achievement in academic subjects" ($M=2.17, SD=0.70$), "Student disrespect for authority and rules", ($M=2.16, SD=0.74$) "student disrespect for authority and rules", ($M=2.16, SD=0.74$).

Table-6 students response to the causes for students misbehavior.

Causes of misbehavior	N	Mean	S.D	T	Sig
1 Imbalance between student rights and students responsibilities	321	2.32	.74	55.7	.00
2 Lack of parental support	321	2.29	1.82	22.6	.00
3 Failure of teachers to obey the existing discipline polices and orders	321	2.19	.73	53.9	.00
4 Low achievement in academic subjects	321	2.17	.70	55.4	.00
5 Student disrespect for authority and rules	321	2.16	.74	52.6	.00
6 Inability of teachers to effectively communicate with students	321	2.15	.73	52.3	.00
7 Teachers inability to maintain discipline	321	2.15	.73	52.4	.00
8 Lack of administrative support	321	2.12	.73	52.1	.00
9 Inability to prepare and implement effective lesson planning	321	2.11	.70	53.5	.00
10 Failure to integrate methods and contents with abilities and needs of learners	321	2.09	.74	50.6	.00
11 Lack of student interest and negative attitude in subject matter	321	2.09	.70	53.6	.00

In summary, both teachers and students in their five top response for the causes of students misbehavior included; "lack of parental support", "low achievement in academic subjects, student's failure of teachers to obey the existing discipline polices and orders" as the dominating factors for students misbehavior.

Similarly, the response obtained from an open ended question revealed that, the main causes for students' misbehavior includes teachers failure to implement rules and regulation of the schools. Similarly, the evidence obtained from administrative interview and open ended question indicated that, most teachers were failed to exercise rules and regulation due to the fear that emanates from political instabilities of the country. By the same reasoning the result obtained from students FGD and director interview indicated that, most teachers failed to effectively communicate with students in order to solve their and most parents were failed to follow their children and strive to minimize the misbehavior.

Coping strategy

In order to answer the third research question(What are the views of administrators, teachers and students regarding current student misbehavior coping strategies?)teacher and student respondents were asked to rate the different kinds of misbehavior coping strategies. Accordingly, teacher and student respondents were asked to rate a 16 different types of coping strategy items that involve a scale of 1-5. Where 1 = Never used, 2 = Rarely used 3 = Sometimes used 4= Often used, 5= Always used table. The mean score of each of the sample for the fifty different items was computed and compared with mean score ($M = 3.0$).

In addition, the total scores for each category were calculated by summing responses for the three related indicator items. A one-sample t-test, comparing each total categorical mean to the mean score ($M = 3.0$) from a hypothetical categorical normal distribution was conducted.

Teacher responses

As the result obtained from teacher respondents mean scores for each of the sixteen items reveals, 7 (43.5%) of the item was considered as a variable that was used as the coping strategy, 9(57.5%) items were not used as the coping strategy.

Hence, out of the sixteen items, the items considered as coping strategy by teachers includes. "Corporal punishment" ($M=3.28,SD=1.17$), "Applying friendship relationship to the student" ($M=3.24,SD=1.16$), "In school suspension" ($M=3.20,SD=1.18$), "Use of tolerance" ($M=3.18,SD=1.13$), "Strengthening school and community relationship"($M=3.16,SD=1.21$), "Allowing students to help resolve conflicts among their peer"($M=3.15,SD=1.24$), "Orienting/ discussing with student and staff" ($M=3.07,SD=0.97$), were some of the coping strategy that teachers are using for students misbehavior.

Table-7 Teachers response to coping strategy

Coping strategy	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	Sig. (2-tailed)
1 Corporal punishment	250	3.28	1.17	44.20	.000
2 Applying friendship relationship to the student	250	3.24	1.16	43.98	.000
3 In school suspension	250	3.20	1.18	42.82	.000
4 Use of tolerance	250	3.18	1.13	44.56	.000
5 Strengthening school and community relationship	250	3.16	1.21	41.48	.000
6 Allowing students to help resolve conflicts among their peer	250	3.15	1.24	40.12	.000
7 Orienting/ discussing with student and staff	250	3.07	0.97	50.25	.000
8 Improving staff student Relationship	250	2.99	1.20	39.46	.000
9 Asking professional support	250	2.87	1.15	39.35	.000
10 Out of school suspension	250	2.74	1.12	38.57	.000
11 Developing smooth relationship	250	2.72	1.19	36.23	.000
12 Talk to others and give each other support	250	2.72	1.00	43.23	.000
13 Giving warning for students	250	2.66	1.11	38.14	.000
14 Discussing with parents to recognize and correct discipline at home	250	2.62	1.11	37.19	.000
15 Praising or awarding students for good behavior	250	2.60	1.29	31.81	.000
16 Developing and employing appropriate school/classroom discipline	250	2.29	1.17	30.90	.000

b/Students response to coping strategy

In order to answer the third research question(What are the views of administrators, teachers and students regarding current student misbehavior coping strategies?) student respondents were asked to rate the different kinds of misbehavior coping strategies. Accordingly student respondents were asked to rate a 50 different types of misbehavior items that involve a scale of 1-3. Where 1 = never used , 2 = sometimes used 3 = always used

table. The mean score of each of the sample for the sixteen different items was computed and compared with mean score ($M = 2.0$).

In addition, the total scores for each category were calculated by summing responses for the three related indicator items. A one-sample t-test, comparing each total categorical mean to the mean score ($M = 2.0$) from a hypothetical categorical normal distribution was conducted.

As the result obtained from teacher respondents mean scores for each of the fifty items revealed that, 12 (75%) of the item was considered as coping strategy, 4(25%) items were not regarded as a coping strategy.

Hence, the coping strategies for students misbehavior according to student view includes: "corporal punishment" ($M=2.20, SD=.72$), "Use of tolerance" ($M=2.20, SD=.72$), "In school suspension" ($M=2.18, SD=.72$), "Talk to others and give each other support" ($M=2.18, SD=.72$), "Asking professional support" ($M=2.13, SD=.72$), "Out of school suspension" ($M=2.13, SD=0.73$), "Orienting/ discussing with student and staff" ($M=2.10, SD=.84$), "Improving staff student Relationship" ($M=2.10, SD=0.84$), "Discussing with parents to recognize and correct discipline at home" ($M=2.07, SD=.76$) "Developing smooth relationship" ($M=2.07, SD=.76$), "Giving warning for students" ($M=2.05, SD=.74$) "Applying friendship relationship to the student" ($M=2.05, SD=.74$) were some of the coping strategies that was reported by students

Table-8 Students response to coping strategies

Coping strategy	N	M	SD	T	Sig. (2-tailed)
1 Corporal punishment	321	2.20	.72	54.5	.000
2 Use of tolerance	321	2.20	.72	54.5	.000
3 In school suspension	321	2.18	.72	54.3	.000
4 Talk to others and give each other support	321	2.18	.72	54.3	.000
5 Asking professional support	321	2.13	.72	52.7	.000
6 Out of school suspension	321	2.13	.73	52.0	.000
7 Orienting/ discussing with student and staff	321	2.10	.84	44.6	.000
8 Improving staff student Relationship	321	2.10	.84	44.6	.000
9 Discussing with parents to recognize and correct discipline at home	321	2.07	.76	48.4	.000
10 Developing smooth relationship	321	2.07	.76	48.4	.000
11 Giving warning for students	321	2.05	.74	49.2	.000
12 Applying friendship relationship to the student	321	2.05	.74	49.2	.000
13 Praising or awarding students for good behavior	321	1.95	.76	46.0	.000
14 Strengthening school and community relationship	321	1.95	.76	46.0	.000
15 Allowing students to help resolve conflicts among their peer	321	1.90	.79	42.8	.000
16 Developing and employing appropriate school/classroom discipline	321	1.90	.79	42.8	.000

In general both teachers and students were agreed that: corporal punishment, in school suspension, Use of tolerance, allowing students to help resolve conflicts among their peer, "Orienting/ discussing with student and staff were the strategies that teachers were using in order to correct students misbehavior

Lastly, an attempt has been made in order to identify the perceived barriers to effective disciplinary practices? The major barriers for effective disciplinary processes according to teachers perception includes "Corporal punishment" ($M=2.39, SD=.72$), "Detention" ($M=2.31, SD=.76$), Out of school suspension ($M=2.30, SD=.79$), calling student parents ($M=2.28, SD=.8$), and asking professional support ($M=2.26, SD=.72$)

Table-9 Teachers perceived barriers to effective disciplinary practices

	N	M	S.D	T	Sig
1 Corporal punishment	250	2.39	.72	52.38	.00
2 Detention	250	2.31	.76	47.77	.00
3 Out of school suspension	250	2.30	.79	46.02	.00
4 Calling student parents	250	2.28	.81	44.39	.00
5 Asking professional support	250	2.26	.72	49.43	.00
6 Discussing with parents to recognize and correct discipline problem at home	250	2.26	.73	49.06	.00
7 In school suspension	250	2.17	.79	43.46	.00
8 Giving warning	250	2.16	.81	42.39	.00
9 Praising or awarding students for good behavior	250	2.13	.85	39.30	.00
10 Allowing students to resolve conflicts among their peer/peer mediation	250	1.92	.78	38.99	.00
11 Discussing/ orients students and staff	250	1.91	.79	38.43	.00
12 Improving staff student relationship	250	1.86	.81	36.29	.00

Students Response

Lastly, an attempt has been made in order to identify the perceived barriers to effective disciplinary practices? The major barriers for effective disciplinary processes according to teachers perception includes detention ($M=2,20, SD=.72$), discuss/ orients students and staff ($M=2,19, SD=.72$), in school suspension ($M=2,18, SD=.72$), corporal punishment ($M=2,18, SD=.72$), and Out of school suspension ($M=2.136, SD=.73$)

Table-10 Students perceived barriers to effective disciplinary practices

	N	M	S.D	t	Sig
1 Detention	321	2.20	.72	54.53	.000
2 Discussing/ orients students and staff	321	2.19	.72	54.40	.000
3 In school suspension	321	2.18	.72	54.30	.000
4 Corporal punishment	321	2.18	.72	54.30	.000
5 Out of school suspension	321	2.13	.73	52.03	.000
6 Giving warning	321	2.13	.73	52.03	.000
7 Improving staff student relationship	321	2.10	.84	44.56	.000
8 Asking professional support	321	2.10	.84	44.56	.000
9 Allowing students to resolve conflicts among their peer/peer mediation	321	2.07	.76	48.40	.000
10 Praising or awarding students for good behavior	321	2.05	.74	49.23	.000
11 Discussing with parents to recognize and correct discipline problem at home	321	1.95	.76	45.97	.000
12 Calling student parents	321	1.90	.79	42.84	.000

In general, both teachers and students were agreed that, the major barriers for effective disciplinary processes includes corporal punishment, in school suspension and Out of school suspension and detention

Conclusions

The majority respondents confirmed the existence students misbehavior that ranges from mildly stressful to extremely stressful. They, reported not only the influence of misbehavior in the implementation of teaching learning process but also teachers' inability to conduct an action research at schools so as to resolve misbehavior related problems. Factors such as work load, lack of time, lack of reward, lack of interests were some of the reported problem that hindered them from implementing the action research project.

As the result obtained from the analyzed data indicated : participating in unauthorized political activism in school, cheating on tests and in-class, exhibiting antisocial behavior, failing to submit homework at all, destroying school and societal properties and less emphasizing on academic issues were the most frequently observed misbehaviors in the west Shewa secondary schools.

Similarly, responses obtained from questioner, interview and FGD revealed that: lack of parental support, low academic achievement, teachers' inability to maintain the existing discipline polices and orders were the dominating factors for the causes of students misbehavior. Responses obtained from an open ended question revealed that, teachers inability to implement school rules and regulation emanates from the political situations of the country (politicians in some areas expected teachers to resolve the political situation of the country).

With the same reasoning, teachers and students were agreed that: corporal punishment, in school suspension, use of tolerance, allowing students to help resolve conflicts among their peer, orienting/ discussing with student and staff were the strategies that teachers were using in order to correct students misbehavior. Lastly, the analyzed data indicated that, the major barriers for effective disciplinary processes includes corporal punishment, in school suspension and out of school suspension and detention.

Recommendations

Based on the results obtained from the research the following recommendations were made:

1. Since the study shows misbehavior related factors found to affect the teaching learning process to the larger extent, teachers in west shewa zone secondary schools are highly recommended to conduct action research so as to solve misbehavior related problems.
2. Since most teachers reported that work load, lack of time, lack of reward, lack of interests were some of the factor that affected them in conducting action research to solve misbehavior related factor the responsible bodies are expected to solve these teachers related factors so that teachers are get involved in solving misbehavior related problem.
3. The responses obtained from both teachers and students shows that , participating in unauthorized political activism in school, cheating on tests and in-class, exhibiting antisocial behavior, failing to submit homework at all were some of the most frequently observed misbehavior in west Shewa secondary schools, efforts should be increased so as to reduce these behavior.
4. Teachers and students in their five top responses for the causes of students misbehavior indicated; lack of

parental support, low achievement in academic subjects student, failure to obey the existing discipline polices and orders as the dominating factors for students misbehavior .

5. Most secondary schools in west shewa zone uses corporal punishment, in school solve and out of school suspensions in order to solve students misbehavior. Hence, it is what is expected of teachers to use positive re-enforcers rather than using punishments so as to correct students misbehavior.

Reference

- Duke, D. L. (1979). Editor's preface. In D. L. Duke (Ed.), *Classroom management (78th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part 2)*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cox, R.D. & Gunn, W.B. (1980). Interpersonal skills in the schools: Assessment and curriculum development. In D.P. Rathjen & J.P. Forset (Eds.), *Social competence: Interventions for children and adults*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Babbie, E. (1973). *Survey research methods*. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing company.
- Barton, P., Coley, R., & Wenglinisky, H. (1998). *Order in the classroom: Violence, discipline, and student achievement*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Neel, R. S., & Cessna, K. K. (1993). Behavioral intent: Instructional content for students with behavioral disorders. In K. K. Cessna (Ed.) *Instructionally differentiated programming: A needs-based approach for students with behavior disorders* (pp. 31-39). Denver: Colorado Department of Education.
- Oudeans, M. K. (2003). Strategic use of school personnel: Providing meaningful behavioral supports for students with challenging behaviors and the school personnel who work with them. In L.M. Bullock and R.A. Gable (Eds.), *Highlights from the Forum on School-Wide Proactive Approaches to Working with Students with Challenging Behaviors* (pp. 18-24). Arlington, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.
- Rodkin, P., Farmer, T. W., Pearl, R., & Van Acker, R. (2000). The heterogeneity of popularity in boys: Antisocial and pro-social configurations. *Developmental Psychology*, 36, 14-24.
- Myers, D., Milne, A., Baker, K., & Ginsburg, A. (1987). Student discipline and high school performance. *Sociology of Education*, 60, 18-33.
- Creswell, J.W. (1994). *Research design: qualitative and quantitative approaches*. London: SAGE Publication.
- _____. (2003). *Research design: qualitative and quantitative approaches and mixed methods approach*. London: SAGE Publication.
- Flick, U. (2002). *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. (2nd Ed.). London: Sage Publication.
- Merriam, S. (1988). *Case Study Research in Education: A Qualitative Approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Psacharopoulos, G. (1985). Returns to Education. A Further International Update And Implications. *Journal of Human resources*, 20 (4), 583-604. obtained from <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>
- Morris, L.L., & Gibbon, C. (1978). *How to Measure Program Effectiveness*. California: Sage Publication.
- Kaliska, P. (2002) A Comprehensive Study Identifying the Most Effective Classroom Management Techniques and Practices. unpublished MSc thesis. The Graduate School. University of Wisconsin-Stout.
- Salant, P., & Dillman, D. A. (1994) *How to conduct your own survey*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Rubin, H. J. and Rubin, I. S. (1995). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage.