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Abstract: The purpose of this study was to identify the perceptions of high school teachers and students in Ankara province depending on the frequency of misbehaviors and the disturbance levels of these misbehaviors. The study was designed and carried out as a descriptive study using a survey model. The data of the study was collected through the administration of a questionnaire titled “Student Misbehaviors” on 378 high school teachers and 909 high school students. The general views on the dimensions of the study are depicted through tables reflecting the arithmetic means and standard deviations computed from the data. All dimensions are compared in relation to gender. In dual comparisons a t-test was used in the study. The significance level was taken as 0.05. The study showed that teachers are confronted by student misbehaviors more frequently and are disturbed by these misbehaviors more than the students. From the findings, it is recommended that the dimensions and frequencies of student misbehaviors should be monitored effectively during the academic year and in the education framework a “school based positive student behavior plan” should be prepared and implemented.
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INTRODUCTION

Social organizations are established to achieve specific goals and they exist as long as they realize these goals at an effective and sufficient level. When education institutions are considered, it is of utmost importance to establish and maintain a school and classroom order which will serve best in the achievement of its education objectives. In this context, it can be concluded that school and classroom order is a critical element for the functioning of an education system. Behavioral order, which is a sub-dimension of school and classroom order, is a combination of all guiding actions and rules that enable students to exhibit within acceptable limits the acts/behaviors necessary to be exhibited at a specific school and classroom level [1]. When the school and classroom order is disrupted, the control over the functioning of the same is also hindered and deviation from objectives becomes indispensable. “Ensuring discipline”, or with a new definition of the concept, “Establishing behavior order” [2] is defined as the process of setting behavior rules and creating “rule abiding” behavior in individuals [3].

Student Misbehaviors: Behavior is the combination of thoughts, attitudes and acts of an individual. Behaviors can be classified as “good or bad”, “right or wrong”, “beneficial or harmful”, “efficient or inefficient” and “desired or undesired” on the basis of pre-set criteria. Criteria set for behaviors may change depending on the time, space, objective, situation and group. In this sense, “misconduct” is a behavior which is thought (on the basis of a specific criterion or criteria set) not to be appropriate for the time of the behavior, for a specific space, purpose, situation, condition and group. In terms of school and classroom, “misconduct” is a behavior not appropriate for schools and classroom management and settings [4]. Misbehaviors include the behaviors that disrupt learning-teaching activities, disrupting the learning process of the student exhibiting misbehavior and that of all other students, creating physical and psychological discomfort and doing harm to properties at school or in the classroom [5]. When student misbehaviors are considered, it is understood that some of these behaviors are relatively small (unauthorized talking in the classroom) and can be easily coped with for a short time, while some of these behaviors are more serious (bringing cutter and perforator...
tools to school) and are harder to cope with over a longer time. In addition, it is possible to say that some misbehaviors are limited with school (violating clothing rules at school), some others are limited with classroom (cheating) while some others are related with out-of-classroom settings (violating the rules of waiting in a queue in the dining hall). Regardless of their characteristics, student misbehaviors disrupt the functioning of a school, disturb school administration, teachers, parents, school personnel and even students; and as a result, lead to great loss of time, effort and output.

**Student Misbehaviors and the Dimensions of These Behaviors:** In recent years, student misbehaviors are observed to be included in the most important problems of society and education institutions at a gradually increasing level. Parents regard school discipline as a fundamental issue [6] and state that they are negatively affected from the in and out-of-school chronic behavioral and academic problems of their children [7]. School administration underlines that student discipline and school security is one of the basic problems causing anxiety [8] and that “negative effects of the environment on the student” is one of the most important factors creating stress on them [9].

Teachers state that one of the most important and complex problems they confront in the classroom is the difficulty of ensuring classroom discipline [10]. When studies on the at-work stress sources of teachers are examined, it is observed that teachers foremost point out that “students continuous misbehaviors” are the source of their work stress [11-13]. Teachers experience too much difficulty in dealing with student misbehaviors and quit work particularly in the first three years of their profession [4, 6]. Student misbehaviors disrupt the learning order by disturbing the teaching-oriented acts and activities of teachers in the classroom setting [14] and decrease educational quality particularly in public schools located in city centers [15]. Teachers waste an important part of their time trying to manage student misbehaviors in the classroom [16] and can only spare a limited time to effective learning activities [17]. All of these findings point out how teachers are disturbed by student misbehaviors.

Student misbehaviors most frequently encountered by teachers are; unauthorized speaking in the classroom or other common settings, not taking responsibility of their own acts, not bringing the required materials to class, trying to be funny, not participating in classroom activities, preventing others from working, using vulgar language, absenteeism, coming to class without making any preparations for the lesson, not doing assigned homework, disturbing others [18], disrupting the lesson, preventing teachers from doing their work, wandering around the classroom without permission, not being interested in the lesson, not fulfilling the responsibilities assigned, violating school rules [2], making noise, speaking unnecessarily, unauthorized speaking in the classroom, complaining about friends and speaking loudly in the classroom [19-21]. According to teachers, rarely exhibited behaviors include attempted murder, participation in out-of-school protests, attempted desecration, participation in political demonstrations in school, bringing undesired tools and materials to school, making physical attacks on school personnel, bringing disorder, winding somebody deliberately, stealing examination questions and bringing a weapon to school [18], truancy, improper attitudes towards teachers, violating schools rules [2], eating and drinking in the classroom without permission, causing damage to school furniture, cheating, theft [20], drug use and encouraging others to use drugs [21].

In his study, Psunder [2] suggests that teachers are most disturbed by student misbehaviors such as “improper attitudes towards other students”, “causing material damage”, “improper attitudes in general” and “improper attitudes towards teachers” while they are least disturbed by misbehaviors such as “tardiness” and “truancy”. A study similar to the Psunder’s is conducted by Türümkişi and Yıldız [20] and it has been revealed in this study that misbehaviors disturbing teachers mostly include “swearing to friends”, “making physical attacks on friends”, “theft”, “taunting of friends”, “lying to teachers”, “doing damage to school property” and “doing damage to the property of others”, while the least disturbing misbehaviors are listed by teachers as “rejecting to study with other classmates”, “resisting the demands of the teacher”, “trying to attract the attention of the teacher and the classroom”, “eating or drinking covertly”, “speaking to oneself”, “making friends laugh” and “daydreaming”.

Students are also confronted with some student misbehaviors and are disturbed by these behaviors. Sheets [22] states that misbehaviors encountered by high school students most frequently are “trying to entertain classmates”, “throwing of paper balls” and “disruption of teaching activities of teachers”. Psunder [2], on the other hand, lists the misbehaviors observed by the students most frequently as “disruptions of lessons”, “other misbehaviors that are not violations of school rules” and
“improper attitudes towards other students”. The same study also suggests that [2] students are most disrupted by “improper attitudes in general”, “improper attitudes towards other students”, “other misbehaviors that represent violations of school rules”. The least disturbing misbehaviors for the students are listed as “truancy” and “misbehaviors during lessons which cause no direct disruptions”. It is possible to find some studies about misbehaviors encountered in Turkish schools and conducted on the basis of student views; however, it is recognized that the common issue is violence at schools. Studies conducted on the views of high school students have revealed that students are often involved in fights and are wounded; they join gangs; carry cutter and perforator tools and weapons; are subjected to violence and use violence; and they drop out of school as they do not feel safe [23, 24]. Study results have shown that the misbehaviors confronted by students most frequently are making noise in the school garden, cheating, students romping with each other and the least confronted misbehaviors are drug use, incentives to use drugs and pressing of emergency buttons [21].

Student misbehaviors can be grouped in different ways. Burden [1] groups student misbehaviors on the basis of their characteristics into three categories: mild misbehaviors, moderate misbehaviors and severe misbehaviors. a) Mild Misbehaviors: minor defacing of school property or property of others, acting out, talking back, talking without raising a hand, getting out of their seat, disrupting others, sleeping in class, tardiness, throwing objects, exhibiting inappropriate familiarity, gambling and eating in class; b) Moderate Misbehaviors: unauthorized leaving class, abusive conduct towards others, noncompliant, smoking or using tobacco in class, cheating, plagiarizing or lying, using profanity, vulgar language or obscene gestures and fighting; c) Moderate Misbehaviors: defacing or damaging school property or property of others, theft, possession or sale of another’s property, truancy, being under the influence of alcohol or narcotics, selling, giving or delivering alcohol, narcotics or weapons to another person, assault or verbal abuse of the teacher, assault of other students, incorrigible conduct, noncompliance, sexual misconduct and coercion.

Charles [4] classifies student misbehaviors into five categories: a) Aggression: physical and verbal attacks by students on the teacher or other students, b) Immorality: acts such as cheating, lying and stealing, c) Defiance of authority: refusal, sometimes hostile, to do as the teacher requests, d) Class disruptions: talking loudly, calling out, walking about the room, clowning, tossing objects, e) Goofing off: fooling around, not doing assigned tasks, dawdling and daydreaming. Baer, Goodall and Brown [25] classify student misbehaviors into six categories: a) Misbehaviors violating social standards: theft, cheating, lying, using vulgar language, b) Illegal misbehaviors: defacing, using drugs and alcohol, carrying a weapon, c) Physically dangerous misbehaviors: hitting, beating, throwing objects, various physically harming misbehaviors, d) disrespect to others’ rights: verbal abuse, disturbing others, trying to keep specific students out of the classroom activities, sponging on others, e) Disrupting learning: laughing, talking too much, wandering in the classroom, sending messages covertly, whispering. Cipani [26], on the other hand, classifies misbehaviors into two categories as “minor disruptive behavior” and “severe disruptive and aggressive behavior”. Minor disruptive behaviors (of small size) are listed as getting out of their seat, unauthorized talking, loud talking and other behaviors that disrupt the learning environment. Severe disruptive and aggressive behaviors are listed as physical aggression (i.e., hitting or striking another child with an object), property destruction (i.e., grabbing or throwing a book, tearing up paper or books, or hitting the desk or wall with an abrupt and forceful action) and verbally abusive behavior (i.e., profanity, name-calling, scolding, throwing tantrums).

Even though the above-mentioned classifications are different from each other, misbehaviors are similar in some ways and some student behaviors are regarded as learning misbehaviors for each school setting.

Objective and Scope of the Study: The objective of this study was to determine -on the basis of teacher and student views- the frequency and disturbance levels of student misbehaviors disrupting the general functioning of the school and teaching-learning process and to evaluate these behaviors in terms of some specific variables (gender and the settlement area where the school is located). The following questions were attempted to be answered in the scope of this basic objective:

1. For the misbehaviors disrupting the general functioning of the school: a) What are the student and teacher views about the frequency and disturbance levels of misbehaviors?; b) Are there any differences between the student and teacher views regarding the frequency and disturbance levels of misbehaviors?; c) Do the student and teacher views regarding frequency and disturbance levels of misbehaviors change in terms of the “gender” variable?.
2. For the misbehaviors disrupting the teaching-learning process: a) What are the student and teacher views on the frequency and disturbance levels of misbehaviors?; b) Are there any differences between student and teacher views regarding the frequency and disturbance levels of misbehaviors?; c) Do student and teacher views about the frequency and disturbance levels of misbehaviors change in terms of the “gender” variable?

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Participants: The data was obtained by applying the “Student Misbehaviors Questionnaire” developed by researchers to 378 high school teachers [333 of whom are employed in metropolitan (urban) districts and 45 of whom are in surrounding (rural) districts] and 909 general high school students [847 of whom are attending schools in metropolitan (urban) districts and 62 of whom are at schools in surrounding districts].

Development and Administration of Questionnaire: Firstly, related literature was reviewed and then the behaviors to be included in the questionnaire were listed in the questionnaire development process. Firstly, specialists’ opinions were taken to ensure questionnaire validity and then the required corrections were made in the light of these comments. A total of 44 items were included in the questionnaire at the end of the necessary corrections. Teachers and students were asked to answer two questions basically: a) How often are you confronted with misbehaviors? and b) To which extent do these misbehaviors disturb you? At the end of the calculations made on the data collected from pilot application made with the participation of 225 people, an alpha reliability coefficient of the questionnaire was calculated as 0.8986. Accordingly, two main dimensions and five sub-dimensions were decided as follows and appropriate articles were written for each sub-dimension:

1) Misbehaviors disrupting the general functioning of the school

a) Misbehaviors related with school rules: Absence without excuse, leaving school without permission within school hours, bringing to/using dangerous materials/tools prohibited in school, violating clothing rules of the school, violating meeting and ceremony rules, polluting the environment, preventing school-parent communication, trying to unsettle the authority of the school administration and of the teacher.

b) Misbehaviors related with social values: Lying, taking the belongings and/or money of others by deception, using vulgar language by violating proprieties, exhibiting behaviors possible to be regarded as theft.

c) Misbehaviors related with aggression: Verbal abuse of other students, verbal abuse of teachers, administrators and other people in the school, solving problems by fighting, doing harm to school property and the properties of others, physical abusive contact towards teachers, disturbing friends and teachers by frightening or in similar ways, using friends forcefully for ones own benefits and demands, pushing, shouldering and hitting friends in different settings in the school, verbal and physical abuse.

2) Misbehaviors disrupting teaching-learning process

a) Misbehaviors related with preparation for lesson: Not bringing the necessary materials to the lessons (book, notebook, eraser, ruler, etc.), coming to class unprepared for the lesson (without doing homework or studying for the lesson), being late for class without any excuse, continuing to talk when the teacher comes into the classroom.

b) Misbehaviors disrupting the course of a lesson: Continuous complaints, using friends’ property without permission, cheating, interrupting the speaking student/teacher, sleeping during the lesson, chewing gum, eating and drinking during the lesson, reading book/serials not related with the lesson, asking unnecessary questions during the lesson, trying to be funny, sending messages to friends, making noises, wandering in the classroom without permission, unauthorized talking, listening to music via earphone, locking out the window, talking to friends rather than listening to the lesson and not doing the tasks assigned.

Questionnaire articles were structured on the basis of a 5 point Likert type scale and teachers and students were asked to grade their views on a 1-5 interval. The questionnaire was applied during the 2006-2007 academic semester.

Data Analysis: Means and standard deviations for the obtained data were calculated at the end of the application so as to determine the general situation of each sub-dimension. Then, teacher and student views of each sub-dimension were compared. A t-test was used for the dual comparisons of mean values. Significance
level was taken as .05. Mean range was calculated as (5-1=4, 4/5 = 0.80) for the means expressed in numbers; range values used for the evaluations were determined as “(a) 1.00-1.80: Never/none, (b) 1.81-2.60: Rarely/slightly, (c) 2.61-3.40: Sometimes/moderately, (d) 3.41-4.20: frequently/considerably and (e) 4.21-5.00: Always/Highly”. Findings were interpreted on the basis of these range values.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Study findings and the discussions based on these findings are presented on the basis of sub-problems.

1. Views on the misbehaviors disrupting the general functioning of schools
1.1. Teacher and student views: When teacher and student views on the frequency and disturbance levels of misbehaviors disrupting the general functioning of the school are examined (Table 1), it is observed that teachers perceive the frequency and disturbance levels of these misbehaviors at a higher level than compared with students. While students generally state that they are rarely confronted with the behaviors in this sub-dimension (X=2.44, X=2.13, X=2.20), teachers state they experience these behaviors more often (sometimes) (X=3.14, X=2.73, X=2.73). In this scope, it is possible to conclude that the misbehaviors included in this sub-dimension do not pose a dominant problem.

The most frequently confronted misbehaviors related with school rules sub-dimension are “Violating clothing rules of school” and “Polluting the environment (throwing rubbish on the ground and spitting)” for both groups. Some findings related with this dimension can be deemed parallel with the related literature. For instance, in the study conducted by Mercan [27] by scanning school discipline records, it was found out that the misbehavior most frequently discussed at school discipline boards in secondary education institutions is “violation of clothing regulations”. Coming to school in clothes violating rules can be interpreted as the attempt to reflect their personalities and/or to be recognized. In today’s environment where every kind of diversification is on the increase, limitation of clothing diversity may not comply with the personality characteristics of students. Bringing and/or using dangerous materials prohibited in school is included in the most frequently observed behaviors in many studies [23, 24, 28, 29, 2]; however, this finding is not parallel to the findings of this study.

While students perceive the misbehaviors in this sub-dimension as moderately and mildly (X=2.87) disturbing, teachers perceive the same misbehaviors considerably (X=3.89) disturbing. This situation may result from the difference in the view of these two groups about the necessity of school rules. However, the fact that both groups find environmental pollution misbehavior considerably disturbing shows that both groups are sensitive to environmental cleanliness although the frequency of confrontation with such misbehaviors is different in both groups.

Misbehaviors related with social values are confronted by teachers (X=2.73) more frequently than by students (X=2.13) (Table 1). While the observation frequency of such behaviors by students corresponds to “rarely” and “never” ranges, teacher’s views change between “sometimes” and “frequently” ranges. Although the means of these two groups differ, they have perceived the same misbehaviors as “high” with the same order. “Using vulgar language violating proprieties” and “Lying” are the misbehaviors frequently observed in this dimension. A basic point to be emphasized in terms of these misbehaviors is that behaviors in this dimension are the ones that are adopted at primary school level. It is quite difficult to change the misbehaviors adopted in this period at later ages. It can be stated that these misbehaviors are exhibited at quite high levels, which can pose an important problem for teachers. Although students state they are confronted with such misbehaviors rarely, this can be interpreted as their being accustomed to such misbehaviors. When compared with the related literature, findings of this study are parallel to findings obtained in many other studies. In their studies conducted on the basis of teacher views, Tucker [29], Croom and Moore [18], Cotton [30] and Psunder [2] have listed “disrespect to teachers” and “use of vulgar language” as frequently encountered misbehaviors. At the end of their study, Johnson and Fullwood [28] have listed “stealing properties of others” “using vulgar language”, “disturbing/frightening other students” behaviors as the student misbehaviors most frequently observed by high school teachers. Studies conducted by Tümen [20], Öztürk [31] and Keskin [19] are also parallel to the findings obtained in this study. Misbehaviors included in this dimension are perceived as “considerably” disturbing by both teachers (X=4.14) and students (X=3.45). It can be concluded that these misbehaviors are the behaviors not approved by both groups. That -particularly- “lying” behavior is defined as the most disturbing behavior for both groups is an important conclusion.
Findings related with the frequency and disturbance levels of misbehaviors related with aggression (Table 1) show that students are “rarely” confronted with the misbehaviors included in this dimension (x̅=2.20) while teachers are “sometimes” confronted with the same (x̅=2.73). Both teachers and students list “Verbal abuse of friends” and “Solving problems by fighting rather than reconciliation” behaviors as the most frequently observed behaviors. Students state that they perceive these behaviors “sometimes”, while the teachers state that they perceive the former behavior “frequently” and the latter “sometimes”. We should underline the fact that the second behavior is related with physical violence. It can be said that due to its content and effect, this behavior -although encountered sometimes- is confronted at a frequency that disturbs school order.

In a study conducted by Özcebe et al. [24] to determine the violence behaviors observed in the last three months in 400 first grade students attending three high schools in Ankara Province, have revealed that the frequency of students confronting violent behaviors due to any reason is 45.5% and an important part of violent acts occur at school. This study points out how wide-spread the violent and aggression behaviors are in schools. It is clear that in schools aggression and violence is so wide-spread. However, it can be said that the results of the study conducted by Özcebe et al. [24] do not comply with the results obtained in this study. The difference between the method and the samples of the studies may have resulted in such differences. The study made by Özcebe et al. [24] is similar to this study in terms of the study area (high schools in Ankara province). However, the fact that the study is limited only with three high schools shows that the results can not be generalized for the whole of Ankara province. Beyond all, the study results reveal that behaviors including violence and aggression are phenomena exhibited at various frequency levels in schools.

Table 1: Distribution of teacher and student views about the misbehaviors disrupting general functioning of the school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Misbehavior groups disrupting the general functioning of the school</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Disturbance level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x̅</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Rules</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Values</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.933</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P<.05

"Physical abusive contact towards teachers" and "frightening and disturbing teachers by similar ways" behaviors are defined as the least confronted behaviors for both students and teachers. The fact that teacher and student views correspond to "never" or "rarely" ranges can result in the comment that behaviors which "use force against teachers" and "disturb teachers in different ways" do not pose an important problem for school settings. In the light of these inferences, we can suggest that violence related behaviors are generally observed between students and the dimension reflected to teachers is quite limited.

When the findings on the disturbance level of aggression related with student misbehavior (Table 1) are analyzed, we see that the disturbance level of these behaviors is perceived as considerably high regardless of their frequency. While the students perceive the behaviors in this dimension as moderately and highly disturbing, teachers perceive these behaviors much more disturbing than students. Since tolerance and ignorance is not possible for behaviors of violence and aggression, high disturbance level is expected in terms of these behaviors. This result is parallel to the studies in literature [20]. When the studies conducted on the teachers’ at-work stress sources are examined, it is seen that teachers point out that “students always exhibit misbehavior” as the source of at-work stress [11-13], that violent behaviors of students which disrupt the classroom activities are expressed as the most stressful student behavior [32, 33] and that one of the fundamental reasons behind teacher dissatisfaction is that violent misbehavior is exhibited by students [34]. This study reveals that violent and aggressive behavior is not wide-spread; however, it is important to completely eliminate such behaviors for the security of the education settings and the efficiency of the services rendered.

1.2. Differences between teacher and student views:

Findings on student and teacher views about the frequency and disturbance levels of misbehavior related
Table 2: Comparisons of student and teacher views about the misbehaviors disrupting the general functioning of the school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th></th>
<th>Disturbing level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School rules</td>
<td>Social values</td>
<td>Aggression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Teacher</td>
<td>-14.70*</td>
<td>-1.297*</td>
<td>-11.280*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Student)</td>
<td>2.624*</td>
<td>2.243*</td>
<td>1.541*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Teacher)</td>
<td>4.156*</td>
<td>1.516*</td>
<td>4.235*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P<.05

with school rules (Table 2) show that there is a meaningful difference between the views and that this difference is high in favor of teachers. It is concluded that teachers (t=3.14) are confronted with misbehavior related with school rules more than students (t=2.44) and they are disturbed by these behaviors (t=4.14) at a higher level than students (t=3.45). It is an expected result that teachers are disturbed by such behavior more than students due to their positions and education. The fact that some such behaviors do not disturb students (for instance absenteeism without an excuse and violating clothing rules) may result from the possibility that students evaluate the frequency of these behaviors at lower levels.

When the comparisons of student and teacher views on student misbehavior related with social values (Table 2) are analyzed, it is seen that there is a meaningful difference in favor of teachers in terms of both frequency and disturbance levels of these behaviors for both teachers and students. Teachers (t=2.73) observe these behaviors more than students (t=2.13) and find them more disturbing (t=3.45) than students (t=4.14). Teachers observe the behaviors in this dimension more frequently and find them more disturbing since they work in the field of education and are role models for students and have a social value framework.

It is seen that there is a meaningful difference between student and teacher views in favor of teachers in the frequency and disturbance levels of student misbehavior related with aggression (Table 2).

In other words, teachers (t=2.73) observe behaviors in this dimension more frequently than students (t=2.20) and they (t=3.24) find these behaviors more disturbing than students (t=4.11). This can be interpreted as the failure of students to distinguish between the behaviors expected from them and the behaviors including aggression and their inability to evaluate the results of the misbehaviors.

1.3. Differences between teacher and student views on the basis of gender variable: Views of female students about the frequency of misbehaviors related with school rules (t=2.52), social values (t=2.19) and aggression (t=2.24) sub-dimensions are different from the views of male students (respectively t=2.34, t=2.05, t=2.14) and the difference is in favor of female students (Table 2). A similar situation also evident for the disturbance levels of these behaviors. The views of female students on the disturbance levels of misbehavior regarding school rules (t=2.98), social values (t=3.59) and aggression (t=3.39) sub-dimensions are different from the views of male students (respectively t=2.72, t=3.28, t=3.04), while the difference is in favor of female students (Table 2). Female students may have perceived such behavior in this way as they tend to comply with school rules and are bound to social values more than males. The study conducted by Mercer [27] shows that the number of male students who are given warnings and reprimanded due to misbehavior in the scope of school rules outnumbers the warning or reprimand given to females. With regard to aggression, it is more difficult for female students to exhibit such behavior in this dimension. Female students may be more affected than male students from such misbehaviors and, in turn, may have monitored such behaviors more carefully.

Views of female teachers about the frequency of misbehaviors included in the school rules (t=3.28) and aggression (t=2.83) sub-dimensions are different from the views of male teachers (respectively t=3.01, t=2.65) and the values differ in favor of female teachers (Table 2). Similarly, the views of female teachers about the disturbing level of misbehaviors included in the school rules (t=4.06) and aggression (t=4.21) sub-dimensions are higher (in favor of female teachers) than the views of male teachers (respectively t=3.73, t=4.06, t=4.01) (Table 2). Views of female (t=2.78) and male (t=2.68) teachers about the social values dimension do not differ in terms of the frequency of these behaviors while the views of female teachers (t=4.23) differ from the views of male teachers (t=4.06) in terms of the disturbing level of these behaviors. This difference is in favor of female teachers (Table 2). In other words, teachers are disrupted
at different levels from the behaviors they observe with similar frequencies. This difference may result from the meanings female teachers attribute to the behaviors at social values dimension. The reason behind the gender-based difference between the teacher views about school rules may be the sensitivity of female teachers to the school order.

2. Views on the misbehaviors disrupting the learning-teaching process

2.1. Teacher and student views: While the frequency of confrontation by students on the behaviors included in the “preparation for lessons” dimension corresponds to “sometimes” (x=2.72), the range and frequency of confrontation by the teachers with the same behaviors corresponds to “frequently” (x=3.48) range (Table 3). While students find the misbehavior related with this dimension as disturbing at a “moderate” (x=2.83) level, teachers find them “considerably” (x=4.11) disturbing. Findings show that confrontation with such behavior disturbs teachers at a higher level than students. Teachers’ high expectations from students may result in the assumption that these behaviors are observed at high frequencies. While teacher expectations generally reflect an ideal situation, students may take “behaving in compliance with the expectations and behaviors of their surrounding” as a basis for their own expectations and behaviors. Regardless of the group, it can be foreseen that students’ not doing their homework and not performing the tasks assigned to them in the scope of this dimension disrupts the continuation of learning activities and the achievement of learning objectives. This situation reveals that teachers -as the people responsible from the conduct of education activities- are exposed to some problems. Students being prepared for a lesson before it begins affects how the learning activities are carried out. For instance, any student who has failed to bring course materials may disrupt the success of a planned learning approach. However, to decrease the misbehaviors included in this scope, student interests, requirements, age and success levels should be considered during the preparation to be made before the lesson starts (homework, initial researches, etc). Misbehaviors related with “making preparation for the lesson and undertaking responsibilities” are shown as the main problems of schools in many studies as well. In the study conducted by Sarpkaya [21] in high schools, it is revealed that misbehavior related with “making preparation for the lesson” is among the most frequently observed misbehaviors. In the study conducted by Öztkara [31] on the basis of primary school teachers’ views; it is concluded that in the “not undertaking responsibilities” dimension, the behavior of “not doing homework”, “not fulfilling the duty assigned in the classroom”, “failing to bring required materials” and “making parents do homework” are wide-spread at primary school level. This situation shows that such behavior may originate from the habits adopted in primary school. In addition, it can be stated that students -who are concerned about the university entrance examination and who follow the study schedule and tempo decided by the private preparation courses- attend, ignore “making preparations for the lesson” and other responsibilities. Research findings are parallel to the findings of the studies mentioned above, particularly to the studies on high school students and the latest study. Beside the violence behaviors most frequently observed in schools, the behavior of failing to undertake responsibilities (coming to class without any preparation for the lesson, not doing homework, lying, truancy, absentee, etc.) are gradually included in the “frequently observed behaviors” [35, 18, 2].

The frequency of observing student misbehavior with regard to disrupting the course of a lesson and the means and standard deviations of teacher views are given in Table 3. In terms of both frequency and disturbance level, the means of teacher views are higher than the means of students. The mean value of student views on the frequency of observing such behaviors corresponds to “rarely” (x=2.44), while the mean of teacher views corresponds to “sometimes” (x=2.83) range. According to this data, it can be concluded that the behaviors that disrupt the course of the lesson are not wide-spread. When analyzed on the basis of behaviors, both students and teachers regard nearly the same behaviors as being more frequently observed in their group, regardless of the difference between their mean values. Teachers have
marked “Interrupting the speaker, talking during the lesson without permission, trying to be funny during the lesson, making noise during the lesson, looking outside the window, talking to friends rather than listening to the lesson, and cheating” as the behaviors observed more frequently. Among these behaviors “cheating” is defined by students as the most frequently observed behavior and teachers verify this statement with a close mean value, which has made us think that cheating is a widespread behavior in schools.

When the behaviors disrupting the course of the lesson are analyzed in terms of their disturbance levels, it is seen that students identify these behaviors as disturbing at a “moderate” ($\bar{x}=2.80$) level while teachers find them “considerably” ($\bar{x}=3.85$) disturbing. It can be concluded that teacher and student views on the frequency of this behavior are parallel to disturbing behavior. Similarly, they define the same behaviors as more disturbing. Teachers define “Interrupting the speaker, sleeping during the lesson, making noise during the lesson, talking to friends rather than listening to the lesson and cheating” as the most disturbing behaviors. It is seen that these behaviors can directly affect the conduct of classroom activities. It is surprising to see that although teachers find “cheating” “considerably” disturbing, they do not find it as disturbing as making noise. In addition, cheating is an instant and undesired behavior. On the other hand, noise is a condition that lasts for the whole lesson and semester, it disrupts the continuation of learning activities and is not desired in terms of the efficiency of communication and learning. In other words, healthy functioning of the process is one of the key factors that brings success to the student and it is not expected from a student who is faced/directed towards success to cheat. This finding, therefore, has made us think that teachers’ classroom management ability is not at a sufficient level.

Findings also show that the behaviors exhibited in this dimension are perceived as considerably disturbing. The fact that the classroom is a place where teachers most interact with students may result in perceiving these behaviors as more disturbing. In this study, disturbance levels of behaviors seem higher than the actual frequency. Another point to be underlined here is that the ability of teachers with regard to classroom management and conduct of teaching-learning activities may be a factor in the development of these behaviors [36]. For instance, in a classroom where a teacher always uses a straight expression approach, it would be expected that students will get bored and, in turn, will exhibit such misbehaviors. Therefore, the main problem here is not the exhibition of misbehaviors by students but how the teaching activity which directs students to misbehaviors is structured. Thus, it is important to analyze the reasons behind misbehaviors as well as the misbehaviors themselves.

2.2. Differences between the views of teachers and students: The comparison of teacher and student views on the frequency and disturbance levels of student misbehaviors related with “making preparation for the lesson” is given in Table 4. According to this table, there is a meaningful difference between student and teacher views. It is observed that teachers ($\bar{x}=3.47$) encounter the behaviors in this dimension more than students ($\bar{x}=2.72$) and teachers define them as being ($\bar{x}=4.11$) more disturbing than students ($\bar{x}=2.83$). This finding can be interpreted as the failure of students to understand the importance of “preparation for the lesson” phase.

Table 4 findings which compares the views of teachers and students regarding student misbehavior relating to the interruption of the course of lessons (Table 4) reveal that there is a meaningful difference in favor of teachers in terms of frequency and disturbance levels of these behaviors both for students (respectively $\bar{x}=2.44$, $\bar{x}=2.80$) and teachers (respectively $\bar{x}=2.83$, $\bar{x}=3.85$). The reason behind this difference may be related with how teachers and students perceive their roles and the classroom order.
2.3. Differences between student and teacher views in terms of the gender variable: Table 4 gives the gender-based comparison of teacher and student views about the frequency and disturbance levels of misbehaviors related with the preparation for lessons. There is a meaningful difference between students in terms of both frequency and disturbance levels of the behaviors in this dimension. Female students (\( \bar{x} = 2.81 \)) state that they encounter such behaviors more frequently than male students (\( \bar{x} = 2.61 \)) and are more disturbed (\( \bar{x} = 2.94 \)) than male students (\( \bar{x} = 2.69 \)) as well. This may result from the sensitivity of female students and their exhibiting such behaviors less than male students. When the behaviors in this dimension are analyzed in terms of the gender of teachers, it is found that no gender-based meaningful difference has been observed in the frequency of these behaviors among teachers; in other words, they are observed at similar frequencies. Although the frequency is similar, there is a meaningful difference in favor of female teachers in terms of disturbance levels of this behavior. Female teachers are more disturbed by the behaviors observed at similar levels. This may be explained by the ability of teachers to cope with misbehaviors as well as the difference in their professional sensitivity. Some behaviors may disturb male teachers less.

Table 4 gives the gender-based comparison of teacher and student views regarding misbehaviors related to the disruption of the course of a lesson. When the table is analyzed, it is revealed that there is a meaningful difference in favor of female students and teachers in terms of the frequency and disturbance levels of these behaviors. Females observe these behaviors more frequently and find them more disturbing. This finding can be interpreted in favor of females being more strict about following rules or they strongly believe in living according to rules.

**CONCLUSIONS**

The first basic suggestion to be made in the light of all these discussions and the basic study findings is that teachers observe misbehaviors more frequently than students and they are more disturbed when confronted with such behaviors. Student misbehaviors that are observed most frequently by both students and teachers are the behaviors in the “preparation for lessons” and the least frequently observed student behaviors are the behaviors in “social values and aggression”. The second basic suggestion is that teachers are disturbed by misbehaviors more than students are. “Social values” is the most disturbing dimension and “the course of lessons” is the least disturbing dimension for both students and teachers. The noteworthy point here is that groups are considerably disturbed by the behaviors included in the dimension of social values although they rarely observe the behaviors in this group. The third suggestion is that female teachers and female students observe misbehaviors more and are disturbed by these behaviors more than male teachers and male students. This situation reflects the gender-based sensitivity against misbehaviors. As a conclusion, it can be stated that misbehaviors observed in schools included in the study are not at a level to negatively affect the school and classroom order; however, teachers and students are sensitive against some misbehaviors.
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