Michelle Zhang

20479259

Assessment 1

Report

Due: 2021-08-15 - 11:59pm

Length: 2000 words

(Consent forms submitted separately)

Literature Review

Student misbehaviour is a persistent cross-cultural phenomenon affecting teachers' work (Eggleston et al., 2021), "aimed at achieving a social response" (de Nobile et al., 2017, p.221). This qualitative investigation seeks to understand "why students misbehave in school" to determine implications for practice. Supporting literature was assessed for contextual and thematic relevance to the study, and diversity of methodology and perspectives represented. Underlying themes include teacher methods and expectations, family influence, and environmental and psychological factors.

More student perspectives are present in the literature (Egeberg & McConney, 2018; Gault-Sherman, 2012; Orejudo et al., 2020; Patrick & Gibbs, 2012) to fill student representation gaps in the study. Crawshaw (2020) reviews international teachers' perspectives across three decades, noting common misbehaviour hierarchies and minor cultural differences, which underpinning perspective differences and behavioural categories in the study. Understanding of current teaching practices can determine the relevance of interview content. Eggleston et al. (2021) investigates teacher competence and how exclusionary practice results in student misbehaviour. Comparative studies of student-teacher relationships offer insight into conflict, coercion and student-teacher perspective differences (Orejudo et al., 2020; Scherzinger & Wettstein, 2019). Glasser's Choice Theory about student needs (de Nobile et al., 2017) support student beliefs about building relationship through classroom management (Egeberg & McConney,

2018). Deeper insight into student-teacher relationships supports study findings.

Family influences can impact student behaviours and parent-child relationships are at the centre of this. Synthesizing two-way behavioural impact (Gault-Sherman, 2012) with parental influences on student moral understanding (Patrick & Gibbs, 2012) can strengthen understanding of external influences affecting student behaviour, assisting understanding behavioural motives. Parents' involvement positively affects younger; and well bonded adolescents (Gault-Sherman, 2012), whilst increased autonomy tends to diminish parental influence (Gault-Sherman, 2012; Patrick & Gibbs, 2012). These interrelationships will be accounted for when assessing interview perspectives to supplement the student representation gap in the study. Psycho-social and environmental factors (de Nobile et al., 2017) and learning difficulties can affect student engagement (Gault-Sherman, 2012; Merga, 2019) and feelings of connectedness (Egeberg & McConney, 2018). Assessment of these can assist with determining praxis.

Interview Findings

In accordance with ethics protocol, participants received information sheets outlining the study purpose, consent forms and clarifications. Signed consent forms were collected prior to commencing. Six participants (P1-P6) were selected based on preliminary assessment for diversity of gender (50%) and teaching-parenting statuses (TPS), see Figure 1. Zoom interviews were conducted over 5 days, spanning 25-35

minutes each. Demographics (Figure 1) were collected followed by open-ended prompts for cultural and parenting backgrounds. The key question was asked. "In your opinion, why do young people misbehave in school?" Open-ended questions followed to elicit elaboration, explanation, and topic focus. Interview notes were clarified with participants to conclude, and digitally transcribed into an Airtable database. Data was coded and critically analysed for exploration of meaning and context.

Figure 1

Participants

	TPS/Relevant occupations	Age	Gender
P1	Pre-service Teacher (PST) Parent Tutor	36	F
P2	Non-Teacher Parent	58	M
P3	Non-Teacher	30	M
P4	Teacher Parent	30	M
P5	Non-Teacher Parent Speech Pathologist	34	F
P6	Teacher	31	F

A sentiment expressed by most participants regarding the "variety of reasons" (P3) that students misbehave (P3-6) was "Where do you start?" (P4). All participants attributed causes of misbehaviours to classroom contexts, student needs and characteristics. Majority raised concerns for engagement and external factors (Figure 2). Influence, attention, and proximity of peers were commonly discussed (P1-4, P6), highlighting student social needs underpinned by "lack of family support" (P4) and "[misunderstanding] expectations" (P5). Teachers and younger participants tended to define misbehaviour as "behaviours not modelled on teacher expectations" (P3, P4, P6). P4 for example, takes the approach that "calling out isn't misbehaviour." Less severe behaviours appeared more frequently (Figure 3) and participants attributed severity of misbehaviours to perceived impact on teaching goals (P2, P6). Feelings of "condescension" from teachers (P3) threaten student-teacher relationships, their need for connection (P6) and autonomy (P1-2). Students require support and motivation to connect to content. Disconnect emerges from "boring content" (P6) or "incomprehension of material" (P3). Key external factors impacting engagement include social preoccupation, family structures (P1-5), "traumatic experiences," "learning difficulties" (P4-5), exhaustion, and hunger (P3-5). Disengagement overlaps all cause of misbehaviour and should be viewed as a symptom rather than cause of misbehaviour. Cause of misbehaviour is informed by interrelationships of student behaviour and teacher expectation. External factors and student characteristics determine how behaviours manifest and understanding of student needs underpins behavioural management.

Figure 2

Misbehaviour reasons

	Subcategory	Frequency	Interviews
Classroom context	Peers Teacher Misunderstanding expectations	29	6
Needs not met	Autonomy Connection Support	26	6
Disengagement	Motivation Content	23	5
External factors	Family expectations Home structure Preoccupations	16	5
Student character	Self-regulation Personality Learning difficulties	12	6
Pain & discomfort	Psychological Physical	11	3

Figure 3

Misbehaviour types

Severity of disruption/Frequency	Types of behaviour	interviews
Minor distractions (11)	Self-distracting activities	6

	Talking out of turn Eating in class Not listening	
Minor disruptions (12)	Off-topic conversations Joking with teachers Throwing things Yelling out	4
Non-compliance (6)	Non-compliance Instigate trouble Lying	4
Aggression (9)	Aggression to students Vandalism Aggression to teachers	3
Delinquency (5)	Damaging property Selling vapes Smoking & drinking Stealing Violence	2

Synthesised Findings

Teacher expectations, competence and methods are common themes in the literature and study. P6 indicated that student misbehaviours are subject to teacher expectations calling them "behaviours that you don't want." Crawshaw (2015) also investigates the fluidity of misbehaviours, citing variation of perceived "selfishness" over time, and a New Zealand study did not classify "physical aggression, fighting and weapon

carrying" (p.307) as severely as the present study. Both students and teachers believe in relationship building (Egeberg & McConney, 2018). The literature provides comparative insight into student-teacher relationships and perceptions affected by different priorities for learning outcomes and personal needs (Scherzinger & Wettstein, 2019). The interview does not have student representation but produces similar results which suggest approaching disruption with curiosity not judgement (P1, P6). In addition, the literature also illuminates unproductive pedagogical methods of coercion (Orejudo et al., 2020) and exclusion (Eggleston et al., 2021).

Quinn et al. (2017) and P6 share sentiments that student engagement is "more than the absence of overt [behaviours]" (p.808), such that silent misbehaviours may not be disruptive, but has serious implications for student learning at higher frequencies. All participants discussed diverse unmet student needs for autonomy, connection, and support, which aligns with multiple literature including the Lyford model for positive learning environments and Glasser's Choice Theory (de Nobile et al., 2017). Disinterest in subject or material reoccurs in the study and can lead to off-task or disruptive behaviours (P1, P3, P5-6). Quinn et al. (2017) suggests that student- teacher connections can benefit student connection to content, by eliciting feedback to complement teaching strategies (p.820). The literature and interview cite multiple barriers to learning including linguistic barriers (Merga, 2019), "ADHD or ASD" (P4-5), which impact students' ability to connect to the content. Interviewees suggested that students may misbehave to distract peers from

"incomprehension of material" (P3) and inherently the real problem of insufficient learning support. Additionally, simple needs like hunger, exhaustion, and sleep (P3-5) are only mentioned in the interview.

The interview findings and literature explore family and external influence from multiple perspectives. Autonomy and self-regulation are juxtaposed by P5 and P6, citing "inability to self-regulate" (p5-6) and "love for freedom" (P1-2), as causes of misbehaviour. Students may exploit the school environment to misbehave if there is lack of freedom or a threatening environment at home (P1, P2, P4). In contrast, Gault-Sherman (2012) looks at the bi-directional parent-student relationship and impact of attachment on student behaviour. "Traumatic experiences" and "socioeconomic disadvantage" (P4; Merga, 2019, p.381) are common themes uncovering endless causes for misbehaviour. P4 attributes "separated parents," "lack of structure," and family disputes to "lack of support at home," directly impacting students' wellbeing and "priority for learning" (P1). Merga (2019) describes challenges for EALD students traumatised from war, refugee camps, and "often illiterate in their [first] language" (Merga, 2019, p.381).

The study offers qualitative insight into current and localised opinions and practice, connecting multiple elements and external factors which cause misbehaviour. The literature complements this with student and international perspectives, deeper theoretical understanding of recurring themes and broader methods and sample sizes. The

subjective notion of misbehaviour is underpinned by interrelationship between teacher competence, content and student needs and traumas. This is further influenced by cultural and socio-economic backgrounds and family structures. These combined factors create misbehaviour as symptomatic disengagement. Not all student disengagement requires behavioural management, but all symptoms of disengagement will affect student learning.

Implications for praxis

Multiple perspectives about "why young people misbehave in school" were examined in this study supported by relevant contemporary literature. Teacher participants were able to offer much deeper student centred solutions. This reflection was utilised to determine these implications for classroom practice. Consideration must be given to the subjectivity of misbehaviour when communicating personal expectations with students. Disengagement and misbehaviour should be treated as symptoms of unmet needs and investigated. Innumerable environmental and social factors impact students which contribute to the manifestation of behaviours in class.

Misbehaviour is enduring, transcultural (Crawshaw, 2015), subjective and contextual, representing behaviours incompatible with personal; or conventional expectations (P3, P6). It is not caused by the student but informed by our relationship. Students have reason for their behaviour

and to manage expectations I must communicate mine. Students 'thrive' in an "environment which fosters and develops choice, accomplishment and positive relationships." (NSW Department of Education and Communities [DEC], 2015, p.5). Misbehaviours may be a result of uninteresting content, teacher incompetency (Quinn et al., 2017), or activities which are too long (P6). By engaging with colleagues, setting clear expectations, and showing interest in student perspectives, we can develop professional knowledge of our students (AITSL, 2018) and build relationships which foster honest feedback, self-regulated expectations, and student autonomy (Quinn et al., 2017) to reduce student and teacher misbehaviour. Limitations include the availability of shared data and time allocated to support school-wide action. Additionally not all behaviours can be negotiated it jeopardises safety of students or staff.

Despite being mistaken for non-compliance, student disengagement often represents unmet needs for social engagement, comfort, learning support or autonomy (P3-5). Understanding and responding to "the learning strength and needs" of students (AITSL, 2018) is crucial to my practice as demonstrated by the drastic difference in value of insights offered by teachers in the study. The fundamental cause of misbehaviours can be attributed to the needs of students "aimed at achieving a social response" (de Nobile et al., 2017, p.221). As teachers we're not required to 'manage' every off-task behaviour, but rather investigate the symptoms with genuine interest to 'connect' with

students and determine underlying reasons for misbehaviour to support students. Understanding needs means that simple adjustments can be made, such as seating arrangements; or even whole school class distributions; which minimise distractions and optimises peer-support for learning. Wellbeing needs to be a collective focus for schools to create positive learning environments which includes and supports student diversity and needs "to reach their full potential" and "engage in pro-social behaviour" (DEC, 2015, p.5). Limitations include external factors such as trauma, social conflict and family instability which may require escalations.

Misbehaviours which manifest in school are the iceberg tips to determining causation of student behaviours. Some of the endless factors influencing student behaviour include cultural differences at home, socio-economic background, family instability, peer conflict and trauma (P1-6). The purpose "trauma-sensitive" response is not to show sympathy for the student, but to "develop empathy" and "act on it" (Eggleston et al., 2021, p.95). As a teacher I am unable to anticipate every problem a student faces, but I can assist in their management of issues which arise by fostering an environment involving activities which develop "self-efficacy" and "resilience," to equip them with skills to self-manage "behaviours, decision making and relationships." (DEC, 2015, p.5). Schools should also engage families and school communities (DEC, 2015, p.5) "to break down barriers and make resources" to support student inclusion and diversity (Eggleston et al., 2021, p.60).

Overarching limitations include the availability of resources, funding and time, however schools are obliged to "implement comprehensive" strategies which support positive learning environments "with clearly defined behavioural expectations" (DEC, 2015, p.8). Additionally, specific behaviours can be underpinned by trauma and mental health implications outside the scope of teachers work and procedures need to be in place to implement escalations in a way which caters to student needs, trust, and comfort. A wide range of issues emerge from unmet needs which influence student behaviours. Intertwining environmental, social, psychological, relational, and emotional factors fuse to interact with teacher expectations determined by student-teacher relationships before manifesting as misbehaviour in the classroom. These behaviours need investigation to determine underlying needs.

References

Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership. (2018). Australian Professional standards for Teachers. https://www.aitsl.edu.au/docs/default-source/national-policy-framework/australian-professional-standards-for-teachers.pdf

Crawshaw, M. (2015). Secondary school teachers' perceptions of student misbehaviour: A review of international research, 1983 to 2013. *Australian Journal of Education*, *59*(3), 293-311. https://doi.org/10.1177/0004944115607539

de Nobile, J., Lyons, G., & Arthur-Kelly, M. (2017). *Positive Learning Environments: Creating and Maintaining Productive Classrooms* (2nd ed.). Centage Learning.

Egeberg, H., & McConney, A. (2018). What do students believe about effective classroom management? A mixed-methods investigation in Western Australian high schools. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, *45*, 195-216. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-017-0250-y

Eggleston, K., Green, E., Poe, S., & Shakeshaft, C. (2021). *Developing Trauma-Responsive Approaches to Student Discipline: A Guide to Trauma-Informed Practice in PreK-12 Schools*. Routledge.

Gault-Sherman, M. (2012). It's a Two-Way Street: The Bidirectional Relationship Between Parenting and Delinquency. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *41*, 121-145. 10.1007/s10964-011-9656-4

Merga, M. (2019). "Fallen through the cracks": Teachers' perceptions of barriers faced by struggling literacy learners in secondary school. *English in Education*, *54*(5), 371-395. https://doi.org/10.1080/04250494.2019.1672502

NSW Department of Education and Communities. (2015). *The Wellbeing Framework for Schools*. https://education.nsw.gov.au/content/dam/main-education/student-wellbeing/whole-school-approach/Wellbeing_Framework_for_Schools.pdf

Orejudo, S., Navarro, J., Vicente, E., & Cardoso, M. (2020). Student Misbehaviour and Teacher Coercion. A Comparative Study of Contextual Factors in Primary and Secondary Education Teachers. *International Jorunal of Environmental Research and public health*, *17*(24), 9429. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17249429

Patrick, R., & Gibbs, J. (2012). "Inductive Discipline, Parental Expression of Disappointed Expectations, and Moral Identity in Adolescence." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *41*(8), 973-983. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-011-9698-7

Quinn, D., Hemphill, S., & Heerde, J. (2017). Associations between teaching quality and secondary students' behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement in school. *Social Psychology of Education*, *20*, 807-829. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-017-9401-2

Scherzinger, M., & Wettstein, A. (2019). Classroom disruptions, the teacher–student relationship and classroom management from the perspective of teachers, students and external observers: a multimethod approach. *Learning Environments Research*, *22*, 101-116. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-018-9269-x