

Classroom management practices and student disruptive behavior

Nanyele, Stephen*, Kuranchie, Alfred and Owusu-Addo, Augustine

Catholic University College of Ghana, Sunyani, Ghana.

*Corresponding author. Email: snanyele@yahoo.co.uk

Copyright © 2018 Nanyele et al. This article remains permanently open access under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Received 15th May, 2018; Accepted 2nd September, 2018

ABSTRACT: The paper set out to ascertain disruptive behaviours prevalent in pre-tertiary classrooms and teachers' classroom management styles. The cross-sectional descriptive survey study was designed along quantitative paradigm. Professional teachers with more than two years of post-training experience in the classroom qualified to provide data to address the research problem. Data gathering was done via administration of questionnaires. The study unveiled noise making, chatting with others, inattentiveness and harassment as the major disruptive behaviours experienced by the teachers and teacher-centeredness was adopted by majority of the teachers as a classroom management style. The study further evinced differences in the classroom management styles of male and female teachers as well as very experienced, experienced and less experienced teachers. Educational authorities need to retrain teachers in the jurisdiction on appropriate classroom management style.

Keywords: Classroom management, student-centeredness, teacher centredness and disruptive behaviours.

INTRODUCTION

Classroom management refers to every word and action that teachers take in the classroom to orchestrate, enhance and elevate student achievement (Marzano and Marzano, 2003; Weinstein, 2004). It is also construed to denote actions taken to create and maintain a learning environment conducive to successful instruction. The action entails arranging the physical environment, establishing rules and procedures, and maintaining students' attention to lessons and engagement in activities (Brophy, 2006). Wong et al. (2012) contends that classroom management entails the practices and procedures that enable teachers to teach and students to learn. The author adds that there are four things that need to be observed in a well arranged classroom, which are: i) students are deeply involved in what they learn in class; ii) students know what is expected of them in class, and they are generally successful in their learning; iii) little time is wasted, there is little confusion or disruption in the classroom; and iv) much work goes on as the climate of the classroom is relaxed and pleasant.

Evertson and Weinstein (2006) also posit that classroom management is the activities that are taken to make an

environment supportive to enhance both academic and social-emotional learning. This definition connotes that the actions taken by teachers tend to help students to acquire knowledge from what is taught for their cognitive, psychomotor as well as affective development. Invariably, effective classroom management does not only lead to development of learners' academic competence but also fortification of their social and emotional competence. Teachers' classroom behaviour and activities also contribute to achieving students' social development, which is a vital aim of education (Ten Dam and Volmen, 2007). It is then reasoned that classroom management is critical in helping students to learn and also develop good behaviour acceptable in the society. Classroom management needs to be effective in order to facilitate teaching and learning. Teachers, therefore, need to adopt appropriate strategies to help achieve the multiple learning goals for which students enroll in formal education.

Evertson and Weinstein (2006) further postulate that there are five kinds of actions that teachers can take in the classroom to enhance students' academic and social gains, which are to i) develop caring, supportive

relationships with and among students, ii) organise and implement instructions in ways that optimize students' access to learning, iii) encourage students' engagement in academic tasks, which can be done by using group management, iv) promote the development of students' social skills and self-regulation and v) use appropriate interventions to help students with behavioural challenges. Effective classroom management commences with physical preparation of the classroom itself. The physical environment should reduce or eliminate a number of potential problems that can affect teaching and learning (Good and Brophy, 2002).

In the classroom, teachers encounter disruptive behaviours by students. As Seidman (2005) posits, encountering disruptive behaviour in the work setting of teachers is unavoidable. Myriad of disruptive behaviours are exhibited by students, which need to be managed effectively and efficiently for teaching and learning to take place. According to Kuranchie (2015), students tend to exhibit disruptive behaviours such as chatting, eating and drinking, noise creation, verbal abuse, intimidating and use of pejorative and derogatory words, among others, which tend to hinder effective flow of teaching and learning. Alamarat (2011) found, among others, vandalism, theft, destruction of properties and violence against both teachers and students as the major challenges that teachers encountered in public schools in Tafila province. Also, in a survey of 10th graders, the students indicated the following as misbehaviours demonstrated in class: getting to class late, cutting classes and breaking school rules (The National Center for Education Statistics, 2010). Studies by Farrell (2005) and Beaman (2006) also revealed the following as major disruptive behaviours prevalent in the classrooms they studied: excessive noise making, disobedience and aggression. Borich and Tombari (2004) found that 55% of school problems related to noise making and conversation with colleagues. Earlier, Owaidat and Hamdi (1997) had found quarrels, beating other students, cheating in examinations and reports, and lateness to class as prevalent disruptive behaviours in classrooms.

In a study to ascertain major forms of disruptive behaviours, Seidman (2005) found student chatting and laughing among themselves and active cell phone use during class. Yet another study found disparaging teachers, arguing with classmates, actively disputing course grades and requirements and inattentiveness as major disruptive behaviours (Meyers et al., 2006).

Varied effects of students' disruptive behaviours have been unraveled by systematic and scientific investigations. Disruptive behaviours interfere with positive learning environment (Shine and Koh, 2007), obstruct learning and influence retention (Young, 2003), affect student gratification and their performance (Meyers et al., 2006), influence teacher effectiveness (Raptakis, 2005) and affect teachers' job satisfaction, stress levels and turnover rate (Adera and Bullock, 2010, Clunies-Ross et al., 2008).

Ingersoll and Smith (2003) also found that some teachers left the teaching profession due to their inability to manage the problems of classroom behaviours. Similarly, studies have found that the challenges that young teachers encountered in managing students' disruptive behaviours lead to intention to leave, attrition and burnt out (Goddard and Goddard, 2006, McKenzie et al., 2011).

Administrators, teachers, parents and students do report that misbehaviours interfere greatly with the ability of teachers to teach proficiently and with the ability of students to learn effectively (Charles, 2002, Evertson and Weinstein, 2006). Consistent with the foregoing, Witzel and Mercer (2003) contend that classroom disruptive behaviours have effect on learning chances and potential attainment of students. The outcomes of the various researches indicate that the disruptive behaviours exuded by students in class have diverse repercussions not only on students but also on teachers. This development may have led to a suggestion by Manning and Bucher (2007) that students' disruptive behaviours need to be addressed by teachers. So if students' disruptive behaviours are prudently managed, it aids to increase teachers' satisfaction to deliver at their utmost best to engender positive attitude, improved behaviour and high performance of students.

Managing disruptive behaviours require skills to create the requisite positive and vibrant learning environment. Managing a classroom entails maintaining a positive learning environment where all students would be able to learn without disturbances (Hill, 2002). This requires the use of classroom management strategies that support and facilitate student learning outcomes. Teachers need to effectively deal with misbehaviours if they are to realize their instructional objectives and consequently educational goals.

Classroom management is very essential to students' performance. As ineffective classroom management results in poor achievement of students (Marzano et al., 2003). According to Wong and Wong (2009), a major contributory factor to high academic achievements of student is classroom management. In support of this point, Jones and Jones (2004) asserted that effective learning takes place in a well-managed classroom. They averred that unproductive social and academic behaviours can be traced to failure to create an educational climate conducive to learning.

It is evident that classroom management is essential in maximizing both academic and social gains of students. Jones and Jones (2007) asserted that greater aspects of classroom challenges can be prevented by creating positive and safe classroom setting. The repercussion of teachers' inability to manage classrooms transcends poor students' academic to social incompetence.

The research problem

Classroom management is very essential in enhancing

student achievement and social behaviour. Classroom is supposed to be a safe place for both the old and the young, males and females, introverts and extroverts, low and high achievers. Hence, managers of classroom need to be effective in managing the learning environments. Undoubtedly, poor classroom management does not only impinge negatively on students' academic competence but also their social competence. Misbehaviours tend to interrupt classes, which negatively affect students' academic and social development. A study by researchers at West Ed revealed that the detrimental effect of problem behaviours multiple with teachers who lacked classroom management skills (Aronson et al., 1999). This demands the creation of a congenial atmosphere for all students to unearth and develop their potentials. Classrooms need to serve as fertile grounds for teachers to nurture students' behaviours that are acceptable in the society and workplace. Teachers are in a better position to identify and manage anti-social behaviours of students to benefit the latter, their families and the society. Essentially, teachers need to manage students to develop both socially and academically. This underscores the need to identify disruptive behaviours experienced in schools and classrooms and the teachers' classroom management style. Although creating conditions that are conducive for students to enhance their capability and sustaining on-task engagement is difficult due to the impulsive nature of the classroom and the variety of activities which happen simultaneously in the classroom (Procknow and Macfarlane, 2008).

To position teachers to effectively deal with, *inter alia*, disruptive behaviours may account for inclusion of classroom management courses in the curricular of teacher education programmes. Klamer-Hoogma (2012) emphasized that effective teachers ought to acquire a wide range of skills in managing classrooms and it is the teacher education programme which should avail them to teacher trainees. The courses are expected to equip teacher trainees with the requisite competencies in classroom management including behaviour regulation and management practices. If teachers are equipped with the competence for classroom management, they are expected to create ideal classrooms where students can feel free to contribute to discussions, ask and answer questions, show dissenting views and critique others' viewpoints including that of teachers, respect their teachers and colleagues and also follow instructions more appropriately.

Theoretical framework

Student-centeredness and teacher-centeredness are classroom management styles which underpinned the study. Student-centred classroom management style is where students have the leverage to contribute to the affairs of the class. Students make inputs into decision

making (as there is shared decision making and team work) which makes students take responsibility. Teachers take control of the class but value the views of students. With this style, leadership is shared and discipline comes from individual students. Learner-centredness is informed by the constructivist school of thought, which encourages students to be active in the learning process and employ humane teaching strategies. In this classroom, there is shared leadership, community building and a balance between the needs of the teachers and students (Garret, 2008). Rules also emanate from both students and teachers when this style is adopted. According to Marzano et al. (2003), in student-centred classroom, teachers negotiate classroom rules with students. Positive student-teacher relationship is evident in this classroom, which turns up to be very efficient in managing student behaviour (Bohn et al., 2004).

Conversely, teacher-centred classroom is where the teacher is seen as the only leader and the custodian of knowledge. Teachers make all the rules for the students to adhere to without discussion with or contributions from students. According to Dollard and Christensen (1996), in teacher-centred classrooms, control is of a vital significance and power is transferred hierarchically. Teachers exercise control over the students in the class. Also, in such classrooms, obedience is valued over creativity and inactive learners over active learners (Freiberg, 1999). Teachers who adopt teacher-centred classroom management approach tend to use punishment like reprimands, frowns, time out and loss of privileges to manage undesirable behaviours (Lovitt, 1990). Such teachers also use extrinsic motivation to impact students' behaviour (Garret, 2008). The current study purported to ascertain the application of these management styles in senior high schools.

Objectives of the research

The main reasons for conducting the research were to:

1. Ascertain prevalent disruptive behaviours students demonstrate in class.
2. Unearth classroom management style adopted by teachers.
3. Examine differences in classroom management styles of male and female teachers, and well-experienced, experienced and less experienced teachers.

METHODOLOGY

Study design and population

The study was executed along quantitative dimension using cross-sectional survey design. The study principally sought to describe existing situations with regard to

students' comportment and teachers' classroom management practices. The study utilised professional teachers with at least two years post-professional training experience in the classroom. The teachers ought to be teaching in senior high schools to qualify for inclusion in the research. As part of teacher education programmes, classroom management is taught either as a stand-alone course or embedded in school administration, where they are exposed to the rudiments of class management. Hence, professional teachers are expected to be familiar with theories and techniques of classroom management. Non-professional teachers who have not been exposed to classroom management did not meet the selection criterion for inclusion in the study. The study participants were drawn from 15 post basic schools in the Brong Ahafo region of Ghana.

Instrument and data analysis

Classroom Management Style and Disruptive Behaviour Questionnaire (CMSDB) was designed to generate data to answer the research questions. The questionnaire had mainly closed ended items with likert scale of measurement. The instrument had three sections. Section "A" deals with demographics, Section "B" on student disruptive behaviours and Section "C" concerned classroom management styles. The instrument was validated prior to its administration. It was pilot-tested on professionally trained teachers of two schools, which did not form part of the main study. Cronbach alpha was used to check the reliability co-efficient of Sections "B" and "C" of the instrument. The analysis yielded reliability alpha of $r=0.87$ and $r=0.84$ respectively.

The data was analysed using Statistical Product for Service Solution (SPSS), version 20. Descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) was used to analyse the demographic data and the research questions while inferential statistics (Independent samples t-test and one way analysis of variance-ANOVA) was used to test the hypotheses. For ethical reasons, the teachers were asked not to write their names and schools on the questionnaire. They were also assured of confidentiality and anonymity of the data provided. They were again assured that their responses would be aggregated and reported together to conceal individual responses.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The bio-data of the participants are presented in the Table 1. The result indicates male dominance in the staffing of the schools, which participated in the research exercise. This is because the males formed 60.8 percent of study sample. The female representation is less than 40 percent. This suggests that there is the need to encourage more females to aspire to teach at that level of education. With

Table 1. Bio-data of study participants.

Item	Frequency	Percent (%)
Sex		
Male	258	60.8
Female	166	39.2
Total	424	100.0
Age range		
Up to 30 years	50	11.8
30 - 40 years	241	56.8
Above 40 years	133	31.4
Total	424	100.0
Professional qualification		
Diploma	69	16.3
Bachelor's	223	52.6
Postgraduate diploma	75	17.5
Master's	57	13.4
Total	424	100.0
Years in service		
Up to 10 years	95	22.4
10 – 20 years	219	51.7
Above 20 years	110	25.9
Total	424	100.0

respect to age, the results show that majority of the participants (56.8%) were between 30 and 40 years, which demonstrate relatively young staff in the schools. Consequently, this revelation is good for the country since the youth are in the majority in the education delivery at the second cycle.

The results further show that a disproportionate chunk of the staff holds bachelor's degree in education related courses. Those with that level of professional education in teaching constituted more than half of the sample. It is an indicative of how well teachers are upgrading themselves in their chosen career. The results also demonstrate that only a small portion of the sample has had less than a decade experience in the teaching service. Many of the participants had had more than a decade experience in teaching, which demonstrate adequate work experience. The background information of the study participants insinuate that they have the requisite professional experience and competence to provide credible responses for the exercise. Majority of them were advance in age, had high qualification in the education discipline and experience in teaching. Such participants were familiar with students' disruptive behaviours and classroom management practices.

A rationale of the research was to discover the major disruptive behaviours that students exhibited in class. Mean and standard deviations were used for the analysis

Table 2. Disruptive behaviour students exhibit in class.

Disruptive behaviours	M	S. D
Noise making	3.85	0.98
Chatting with others	3.82	1.04
Inattentiveness	3.78	1.02
Harassment	3.30	1.25
Sleeping in class	2.85	0.86
Non-compliant of rules	2.78	1.00
Pretending to need help	2.67	0.81
Writing on walls	2.43	0.99
Entering and leaving class at will	2.32	1.00
Eating in class	2.32	0.99
Walking about in class	2.31	0.92
Hindering others from contributing in class	2.27	0.95
Damaging furniture in class	2.26	0.91
Spitting on the floor	1.96	1.03
Mean of means	2.78	1.04

of the research question. The scores of the items on the various disruptive behaviours have been arranged hierarchically from highest mean value to the lowest. Higher mean value designates high level of disruptive behaviour whereas lower mean value depicts low level of disruptive behaviour. The outcomes of the analysis of the disruptive behaviours are presented in the Table 2.

The results show that the mean values of the disruptive behaviours ranged from 3.85 to 1.96. The first four items had mean values in excess of the cut-off point. So the major prevalent disruptive behaviours in the schools are noise making, chatting with others, inattentiveness and harassment. Noise making had the highest mean value of 3.85 and standard deviation of 0.98. The result illuminates that most of the classrooms experienced a lot of noise while teaching and learning was in progress. This situation can affect the effectiveness of teachers in achieving their objectives. Noise making was prevalent in the classrooms probably because teachers did not set in place rules and regulations to be obeyed by students. Wong et al. (2012) indicated that rules agreed on by students and teachers when enforced tend to reduce indiscipline. Noise making seems to an enigma and albatross on the necks of many teachers. Literature is replete with findings of prior researches that noise making is a disruptive behaviour experienced by teachers (Borich and Tombari, 2004; Seidman, 2005; Meyers et al. 2006).

The second highest disruptive behaviour per the results is chatting with others, with a mean value of 3.82 and standard deviation of 1.04. Students' chatting with their colleagues in class tends to disrupt teaching and learning. It has the tendency to make others to lose concentration on the lesson. However, a student may consider talking with other students sitting beside them as perfectly normal, oblivious of the effect on other students in the class (Johnson, 2012). Hence, teachers have a duty to

constantly remind students of the need to be quite during teaching and learning. Teachers also need to use group alert skills in reducing disruptive behaviour in class.

Inattentiveness was found to have a mean value of 3.78 and a standard deviation of 1.02. The values demonstrate that this disruptive behaviour is also highly prevalent in the classrooms. Students can engage in all sorts of activities in class which do not make them pay attention.

The last prevalent disruptive behaviour in the classrooms is harassment, which had a mean value of 3.30 and a standard deviation of 1.25. In class, students can use varied means to harass their peers in class, which negatively affects teaching and learning.

Another rationale of the research was to ascertain the classroom style adopted by the teachers. To answer the question of *what classroom management style do teachers adopt*, descriptive statistics analysis was done. The outcomes of the analysis are presented in the Table 3.

From the results, the mean scores for teacher-centeredness ($M=3.11$, $SD=.95$) are higher than that of student-centeredness ($M=2.68$, $SD=.94$). The results, therefore, mean that the teachers adopted teacher-centered style of classroom management more than student-centeredness. Most of the teachers tended to dominate in class, excluding students from the management of affairs during teaching and learning. This revelation contradicts most studies such as Yaşar (2008), which found student-centeredness as a preferred classroom management style by most teachers. By not adopting student-centeredness, students would be denied valuable resource that improves learning outcomes in both academic and social trajectories of educational goals. The use of student-centeredness helps to develop students' social, emotional and behavioural competencies as well as their academic competence (Hester, 2002). When students feel connected to their teachers and peers as valued members of the learning community, they are more prepared to actively engage in instructions (Adeock, 2011), which ultimate improve learning outcomes.

Other questions which needed answers are: *do both male and female teachers adopt the same management style in the classroom and do well experienced, experienced and less experienced teachers adopt the same classroom management styles?* Two hypotheses were therefore formulated to find answers to the questions.

H₀: There is no significant difference in the classroom management styles adopted by male and female teachers.

Independent samples t-test was conducted to ascertain differences in the classroom management styles of teachers. The analysis was done at a significant level of 0.05 and the outcome is presented in the Table 4. The analysis demonstrates clear differences in the classroom management practices of the male and female teachers. With a p-value of 0.002, there is significant difference in

Table 3. Classroom management styles adopted by teachers.

Statements	Mean	Std. Dev.
Teacher-centeredness		
I create a controlled atmosphere in class for effective learning.	3.69	0.87
I ensure that students learn to obey rules than to come up with their own decisions.	3.57	0.98
I do evaluate students' behaviours as they do not know what is right.	3.42	0.93
I replace old rules when they are not working well based on my knowledge and experience.	3.25	0.87
I direct students to do the right things without their inputs.	2.99	0.98
I do not offer help to students during instructions.	2.38	1.05
I disallow students' entry into class when they are late.	2.50	1.03
Mean of means	3.11	0.95
Learner-centeredness		
I urge students to offer suggestions when coming up with rules.	3.12	0.82
I allow students to pursue their interest in class	3.01	0.90
I provide chance for students to solve problems if some of them have.	3.03	0.93
I behave as a student and helper in class.	2.97	0.92
I allow students to evaluate their behaviour in class.	2.48	0.89
I assign students to seats in class in the first week of re-opening.	2.16	1.07
I make students take responsibility for their own actions and behaviours.	2.04	1.10
Mean of means	2.68	0.94

Table 4. T-test of classroom management styles of male and female teachers.

Sex	N	Mean	SD	df	t	p
Male	258	3.0817	0.94225	420	420	0.002
Female	166	2.8727	0.90097	412.735		

the classroom management styles of the male and female teachers. The hypothesis is therefore not supported. The male teachers did not employ the same classroom management style as their female counterparts did in managing their classrooms. Per the results, ($M=3.08$, $SD=.94$) for male teachers and ($M=2.87$, $SD=.90$) for female teachers, the male teachers adopted student-centered classroom management style than the female teachers. This is contrary to findings by Erol (2006) which found that the female teachers had favourable disposition for students with regard to the classroom management approaches than the male teachers.

H₀: There is no significant difference in the classroom management styles adopted by well experienced, experienced and less experienced teachers.

ANOVA was conducted to check differences in the classroom management styles of teachers who have had up to a decade, two decades and more than two decades experience in teaching. In the study, teachers were categorised as follows: less than 10 years in teaching are less experienced, 10 and 20 years in teaching are

experienced and more than 20 years in teaching as well experienced. The outcomes of the analysis are presented in Table 5. The data presented in the table depicts differences in the classroom management styles of the three categories of teachers. The well experienced, the experienced and the less experienced teachers did employ different styles in running affairs in class for optimal learning outcomes.

Having established significant differences in the classroom management styles by the teachers, further analysis using Tukey post hoc was performed to locate where the differences lied. The outcomes of the analysis are shown in Table 6. The data analysis shows that the difference lies between teachers who have had less than 10 years teaching experience and those with more than 20 years of teaching experience. Hence, the hypothesis is not supported. The results connote that the experienced and the much experienced teachers employed different classroom management style from the less experienced teachers. The result is consistent with Yaşar (2008) study outcome that the more experienced teachers employed different classroom management style from what the less experienced did.

Table 5. ANOVA of classroom management styles of teachers.

Management styles	Sum of square	df	Mean squares	f	Sig.
Between groups	15.305	2	5.102	5.448	0.001
Within groups	393.299	422	0.936		
Total	408.604	424			

Table 6. Post hoc analysis of classroom management styles of teachers.

Years of teaching experience	Years of teaching experience	Mean difference (I-J)	Standard error	Sig.	95% Confidence interval	
					Upper bound	Lower Bound
Up-to-10	10-20	-0.41580	0.17680	0.088	-0.8718	0.0402
	Above 20	-0.59321	0.18555	0.008	-1.0718	-0.1146
10-20	Up-to-10	0.41580	0.17680	0.088	-0.0402	0.8718
	Above 20	-0.17741	0.11035	0.375	-0.4620	0.1072
Above 20	Up-10	0.59321	0.18555	0.008	0.1146	1.0718
	10-20	0.17741	0.11035	0.375	-0.1072	0.4620

Conclusion

Creating congenial atmosphere for teaching and learning to thrive is expected of teachers who have had the privilege of undergoing professional preparation. Teacher trainees go through both theoretical and practical training to, *inter alia*, acquire the competence to create the learning environment for effective teaching and learning to occur. In view of this, it was deemed expedient and imperative to unravel the disruptive behaviours that students exude in class and classroom management style employed by teachers in ensuring that students receive good quality education. It emerged from the study that noise making, chatting with others, inattentiveness and harassment are the major students' disruptive behaviours the teachers encountered in class. The findings corroborate many studies that have been conducted on the issue across the globe meaning that they are not Ghanaian or African problems. It is a world-wide issue, which needs attention. It therefore behoves educational authorities and teachers to help students who do not behave well to change their actions. Via programmes like talk shows, seminars and symposia, students could be educated more on the detrimental consequences of disruptive behaviours in class and the need for them to change.

The research also disclosed that most teachers used teacher-centeredness than student-centeredness as their classroom management strategy. The teacher-centeredness adopted by most of the teachers may partly account for the prevalence of the disruptive behaviours in class. The teachers adopting teacher-centeredness is in sharp contrast to the ideal way of managing the academic and social life of students. As Jones and Jones (2004) found, using classroom management style that creates a supportive learning environment engenders a change in

behaviour. It is worthwhile for educational authorities to retrain teachers to update their knowledge and skills on classroom management to be able to create functional learning environment that minimizes disruptive behaviours during instructions. The teachers need to be encouraged and conscientized to adopt student-centered style of classroom management. They need to learn and hone skills that would enable them construct environments which support and facilitate teaching and learning to meet academic, social and emotional goals of education. Besides, the male and female teachers were found to adopt different styles of managing their classrooms so were the well experienced, the experienced and the less experienced teachers. Based on the findings of this research, any attempt to improve on teachers' classroom strategies needs to focus more on female and less experienced teachers.

The study is significant in several ways: Firstly, it has the propensity to aid teachers to know more about student disruptive behaviours and how best to handle them to optimize students' behaviour and performance. Secondly, it would help educational administrators in making decisions with respect to teacher training programmes (what to include in teacher education curricular to equip student-teachers with the competence needed to deal with disruptive behaviours). Thirdly, the study checked differences in classroom management style of different categories of teachers, which may trigger further studies to validate them. The differences in the classroom management styles of teachers can guide practice. Fourthly, the study contributes to literature on student disruptive behaviour and classroom management in the Ghanaian context.

The research employed a self-completed questionnaire for the data collection. The researchers did not make

attempt to empirically verify whether the students put up those disruptive behaviours and whether the teachers practised what they reported. Future research should use observational method as well to confirm what teachers report to be predominant disruptive behaviours in their classrooms as well as their classroom management practices. Besides, a semi-structured instrument needs to be used in future research to gather data on students' disruptive behaviours and teachers' classroom management strategies. Such an instrument will help derive more unanticipated data to prove more insights in the research problem. Future research can also check mediating role of teacher character or attitude in the relationship between classroom management and students' behaviour. Finally, other theories on classroom management styles could be investigated to ascertain their usage as this study was limited to only teacher-centeredness and student-centeredness.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

- Adera, B. A., & Bullock, L. M. (2010). Job stressors and teacher job satisfaction in programs serving students with emotional and behavioral disorders. *Emotional & Behavioural Difficulties*, 15(1), 5-14.
- Al-amarat, M. S. (2011). The classroom problems faced teachers at the public schools in Tafila province and proposed solutions. *International Journal of Education*, 3(1), 37-48.
- Aronson, J., Zimmerman, J., & Carlos, L. (1999). *Making time count. Policy brief*. Available at www.WestEd.org/policy.
- Beaman, R. (2006). *Behavioural interactions in the secondary school between teachers and students: What they say, what they do*. Unpublished Dissertation. Nacquarrie University, Sydney, Australia.
- Bohn, C. M., Roehrig, A. D., & Pressley, M. (2004). The first days of school in effective and less effective primary-grades classrooms. *Elementary School Journal*, 104, 269-287.
- Borich, D., & Tombari L. (2004). *Educational assessment for the elementary and middle school classroom*. (2nd ed.). New Jersey, NJ: Pearson Education Inc.
- Brophy, J. (2006). History of research on classroom management. In Evertson, C. M., & Weinstein, C. S. (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues* (pp.17-43). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Charles, C. M. (2002). *Essential elements of effective discipline*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Clunies-Ross, P., Little, E., & Kienhuis, M. (2008). Self-reported and actual use of proactive and reactive classroom management strategies and their relationship with teacher stress and student behaviour. *Educational Psychology*, 28(6), 693-710.
- Dollard, N., & Christensen, L. (1996). Constructive classroom management. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 29(2), 1-24.
- Evertson, C. M. & Weinstein, C. S. (Eds.) (2006). *Handbook of classroom management. Research, practice, and contemporary issues*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Farrell, R. (2005). Teachers, parents and classroom behaviour: A psychological approach. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 75, 336-338.
- Freiberg, H. J. (Ed.). (1999). *Beyond behaviorism: Changing the classroom management paradigm*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Garret, J. (2008). Student-centred and teacher-centred classroom management: A case study of three elementary teachers. *Journal of Classroom Management Innovation*, 43(1), 34-47.
- Goddard, R., & Goddard, M. (2006). Beginning teacher burnout in Queensland schools: Associations with serious intentions to leave. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 33, 61-75.
- Good, L. T., & Brophy, J. E. (2002). *Looking in classrooms*. (6th ed.). New York: Longman.
- Hester, P. (2002). *What teachers can do to prevent behaviour problems in school?* New Jersey, NJ: Pearson Education Inc.
- Ingersoll, R. M., & Smith, T. M. (2003). The wrong solution to the teacher shortage. *Educational Leadership*, 60(8), 30-33.
- Johnson, B. (2012). Being the dean of students in challenging times. *Independent School*, 71(4), 76-81.
- Jones, V. & Jones, L. (2004). *Comprehensive classroom management: Creating communities of support and solving problem*. (7th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education Inc.
- Jones, V., & Jones, L. (2007). Creating a safe and supportive learning community. In Burvikovs, A. (Ed.), *Comprehensive classroom management* (pp. 71-119). Boston, MA: Pearson Education Inc.
- Klamer-Hoogma, M. (2012). *Classroom management*. The Netherlands: Noordhoff Uitgevers.
- Kuranchie, A. (2015). *The educator's guide*. Kumasi: Bookworm Publications.
- Lovitt, T. (1990). *Managing inappropriate behavior in the classroom*. Virginia: The Council for Exceptional Children.
- Manning, M., & Bucher, K. T. (2007). *Classroom management: Models, applications and cases*. New York, NY: Pearson Education Inc.
- Marzano, R. J., & Marzano, J. S. (2003). The key to classroom management, *Educational leadership*, 9, 6-13.
- Marzano, R. J., Marzano, J. S., & Pickering, D. J. (2003). *Classroom management that works. Research-based strategies for every teacher*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).
- McKenzie, P., Rowley, G., Weldon, P., & Murphy, M. (2011). *Staff in Australia's schools 2010. Report prepared for the Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations*. Melbourne: Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Meyers, S. A., Bender, J., Hill, E. K., & Thomas, S. Y. (2006). How do faculty experience and respond to classroom conflict? *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 18(3), 180-187.
- Owaidat, A., & Hamdi, N. (1997). Behavioral problems of male students in 8th, 9th and 10th classes in Jordan and variables related to those problems. *Drasat Al-Ahlem Altrbwai University of Jordan*, 24(2), 298-315.
- Pronknow, J. E., & Macfarlane, A. (2008). Classroom management: Tailoring teaching for the needs of diverse learners. A Paper presented at the NZARE Conference (2008), Palmerston North, New Zealand.
- Hill, J. (2002). Biological, psychological and social processes in the conduct disorders. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 43(1), 133-164.

- Raptakis, D. M. (2005). *The highly qualified teacher: Perceptions of parents, teachers and principals at the elementary and middle school levels*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Johnson & Wale University, Rhode Island.
- Shin, S., & Koh, M. S. (2007). A cross-cultural study of teachers' beliefs and strategies on classroom behavior management in urban American and Korean school systems. *Education and Urban Society*, 39(2), 286-309.
- Seidman, A. (2005). The learning killer: Disruptive student behaviour in the classroom. *Reading Improvement*, 42(1), 40-46.
- Ten Dam, G. K., & Volman, M. (2007). Educating for adulthood or for citizenship: Social competence as an educational goal. *European Journal of Education*. 42(2), 281-298.
- Weinstein, C. S. (2004). *Transformational leadership and the resource development professional*. New York, NY: Wiley and Sons.
- Witzel, B. S., & Mercer, C. D. (2003). Using rewards to teach students with disabilities: Implications for motivation. *Remedial and Special Education*, 24, 88-96.
- Wong, H. K., & Wong, R. T. (2009). *The first days of school: How to be an effective teacher* (4th ed.). Mountain View, CA: Harry K. Wong Publications.
- Wong, H., Wong, R., Rogers, K., & Brooks, A. (2012). Managing your classroom for success. *Science and Children*, 49(10), 60-64.
- Yaşar, S. E. D. A. (2008). Classroom management approaches of primary school teachers. *Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi*.
- Young, J. (2003). We're taking notes here. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 49(48), 29-30.